लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी
L.B.S. National Academy of Administration
मसूरी
MUSSOORIE
पुस्तकालय
LIBRARY

अवाप्ति संख्या
Accession No. 101158 20836

वर्ग संख्या
Class No. 264.03

पुस्तक संख्या
Book No. Lit

GL 264.03
LIT
101158
LBSNAA

LITURGY AND WORSHIP

LITURGY AND WORSHIP

A COMPANION
TO THE PRAYER BOOKS
OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

Edited by
W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, D.D.
with the assistance of
CHARLES HARRIS, D.D.

A publication of the Literature Association
of the Church Union

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.2
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

First published *1932*
Reprinted . *1933, 1936, 1940, 1943, 1946, 1947*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

PART I. HISTORICAL

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1
The Editor, William Kemp Lowther Clarke, D.D.

WORSHIP IN GENERAL 12
Frank Herbert Brabant, M.A.

WORSHIP IN THE OLD TESTAMENT 38
William Oscar Emil Oesterley, D.D.

SYNAGOGUE WORSHIP IN THE FIRST CENTURY . . 60
Paul Philip Levertoff, D.D.

THE EUCHARIST IN EAST AND WEST 78
Frank Gavin, Th.D.

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER DOWN TO 1662 130
Frank Edward Brightman, D.D., and Kenneth Donald Mackenzie, M.A.

PART II. THE PRAYER BOOK SERVICES: THEIR SOURCES AND RATIONALE

THE CALENDAR 201
The Editor

FASTING AND ABSTINENCE 245
Arthur John Maclean, D.D., Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness

THE CHOIR OFFICES 257
Edward Craddock Ratcliff, M.A.

PAGE

THE LECTIONARY 296
The Editor

THE HOLY COMMUNION SERVICE 302
James Herbert Srawley, D.D.

COLLECTS, EPISTLES, AND GOSPELS 374
Kenneth Donald Mackenzie, M.A.

HOLY BAPTISM 410
The Editor

THE CATECHISM AND CHILDREN'S WORSHIP . . . 429
Arthur Rupert Browne-Wilkinson, M.A.

CONFIRMATION 443
The Editor

SOLEMNISATION OF MATRIMONY 458
The Editor

VISITATION OF THE SICK 472
Charles Harris, D.D.

THE COMMUNION OF THE SICK 541
Charles Harris, D.D.

THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD 616
Arthur Stuart Duncan-Jones, B.D.

THE ORDINAL 626
Walter Kelly Firminger, D.D.

PART III. SUPPLEMENTARY ESSAYS

THE LESSER HOURS 685
Edward Craig Trenholme, M.A., S.S.J.E.

THE CORONATION SERVICE 690
Leopold George Wickham Legg, M.A.

PAGE

THE CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES AND OTHER OCCASIONAL SERVICES 703
The Editor

ANGLICAN ADAPTATIONS OF SOME LATIN RITES AND CEREMONIES 729
Kenneth Donald Mackenzie, M.A.

MODERN PRAYERS AND THEIR WRITERS 749
Eric Milner-White, M.A.

EXTEMPORE PRAYER 763
Charles Harris, D.D.

LITURGICAL SILENCE 774
Charles Harris, D.D.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION SINCE 1662 783
The Editor

PRINTERS AND PRINTED EDITIONS OF THE PRAYER BOOK 798
Bret Ince (formerly of the Cambridge University Press)

THE PRAYER BOOK AS LITERATURE 806
The Editor

PRAYER BOOK TRANSLATIONS 813
The Editor

THE SERVICES OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH . 834
Reginald French, M.A.

ADDITIONAL NOTES 851

INDEX 859

LITURGY AND WORSHIP

INTRODUCTION

By THE EDITOR

When Prayer Book revision was being discussed in England and it was generally anticipated that a book would be sanctioned which would either stand in the same relation to the 1662 Book as that did to its predecessor, or be a legalised alternative, the Literature Committee of the English Church Union planned a Commentary on the New Prayer Book. The idea was that it should be written on the basis of the provisional proposals, brought up to date when these appeared in their final form, and published simultaneously with the New Book. When the revision proposals were rejected by Parliament, the situation had to be reviewed. Finally, the present editor was invited to undertake the work, under the supervision of an Editorial Board.[1]

The resulting book has been planned on different lines, which are partly explained by the title.

1. Much space has been given to the Eucharist, in keeping with the increased sense of its importance in modern Church life.

2. An attempt has been made to study Anglican problems against a background of wider knowledge—of worship in general, of Christian worship in East and West, and of its Jewish antecedents.

3. The book is a companion to the Prayer Book rather than a Commentary. It does not attempt to reproduce all the features of Procter and Frere's *History of the Book of Common Prayer*. Special attention, however, has been given to problems which have come to the front in the twentieth century.

4. What we mean by the Prayer Book is left undefined. The writers being, with three exceptions, English priests, have inevitably thought first of their own local problems, though care has

[1] This Essay is a personal utterance of the editor which commits no one but himself. The members of the Board have confined themselves to offering suggestions, which have been for the most part gratefully accepted. The contributors take no responsibility for it or for any chapter except their own.

been taken not to neglect the revisions of the sister and daughter Churches. What to make of the revised English Book has been a difficulty. On the one hand, since it was not put forth by synodical authority, some regard it as possessing only an academic interest. On the other hand, it represents in so large a measure the judgment of the Church of England as to what revision is likely to be practicable to-day, and with episcopal approval parts of it are coming to be used so widely, that it would have been pedantic to ignore it on account of its lack of synodical authorisation. Let it be said once for all that phrases like 'The English 1928 Book,' or 'Alternative Book,' are a shortened form of 'The Book of Common Prayer with the additions and deviations proposed in 1928,' the official title. As to other details of nomenclature, authors have described the traditional Prayer Book as dating from 1661, when it was approved by the Convocations, or as from 1662, when the Act of Uniformity to which it was annexed became law, according to their preference. Recent revisions are referred to by the dates when they came into use—the Canadian 1922, Irish 1927, Scottish and American 1929.

The present work may after all be more useful for being based mainly on the 1662 Book. As is pointed out elsewhere,[1] the American, Irish, Canadian and South African revisers disclaim, with various degrees of emphasis, the intention of departing from the doctrinal standards of 1662. The Bishops' Preface in the 1928 English Book takes the same line. The 1662 Book, then, is recognised as the norm, or bond of union, for the Anglican Churches. There is a danger that, if it were superseded by a new and improved Prayer Book, this bond would be loosened, since reference would then be to a document no longer in common use. In commenting primarily on the 1662 services we are dealing with the common stock of the Anglican Communion.

But no more than its sister Churches can the Church of England be permanently content with an unrevised seventeenth-century Prayer Book. It would seem to follow that some variety of usage ought to be tolerated in the Provinces of Canterbury and York. But this contention only corresponds to the facts of the situation. The mother country of the British family of nations may be expected to welcome within its borders all legitimate varieties of interpretation of Prayer Book standards. The Church of Ireland has thought fit to go to the extreme limit in banishing Catholic interpretations and adjuncts of worship, but few would maintain that rules possible in Belfast ought to be, or could be, enforced in a great cosmopolitan city like London.

Having said this, we proceed to limit its application. A distinction should be drawn between ritual and ceremonial, between liturgy and semi-liturgical or non-liturgical worship.

[1] Cf. pp. 791–7.

While the ceremonial adjuncts of a rite may vary widely, the rite itself, or its recognised varieties, should be strictly adhered to. More is involved in this than loyalty to a solemn undertaking, important as that is. Individualism and self-will are foreign to the whole idea of liturgy. The Liturgy is the prayer of the Church, something given, which, if it changes at all from generation to generation, does so very slowly, with scrupulous care for the conservatism of worshippers. There must be exceptions, we are told. For whom? The individual worshipper is a separate entity who forms his own devotional life within the framework of his God-given personality; every individual is an exception. But corporate worship is a different matter. Each member of the congregation is an exception: together they can only worship in a liturgy given by the Church. If a congregation has come to cherish substantial variations from the Prayer Book, it is as a result of the personal preferences of its priest, who has imparted them to his people. The stubborn individualism of the Englishman, even when he has Catholic leanings, is reflected in the numerous uses (happily less numerous than they were) to be found to-day.

What is to be done? Are we to return to the confusion of the early Gallican Church before the Roman type of liturgy became practically the norm, when each diocese was a law unto itself? That was recognised as an abuse even when most men lived and died within a few miles of their birthplace; it would be far worse now when the population is so mobile. The solution seems to lie along the lines of carefully regulated variation. The policy of the Roman See is most instructive. Not only are the minor variations of the Western Rite carefully preserved, but the Eastern Rites are also preserved in the Uniat books and the latinising of their adherents is forbidden.[1] Logically, therefore, we should expect two theories of consecration to be legitimate in the Roman Communion—the Western, which ascribes it to the 'Words of Institution,' and the Eastern whereby the Epiclesis is held to effect it.[2] To come nearer home: the Scottish Church allows the Eucharist to be celebrated according to three, possibly four, rites, and no ill consequences seem to follow.[3] Something similar seems to lie in front of the English Church. An instructed clergy is unlikely to be permanently content with a rite which, with one important exception, is virtually that of 1552, and the demand for the authorisation of reasonable variations is likely to

[1] *Codex Juris Canonici*, Can. 98, §§ 2, 3: 'Clerici nullo modo inducere præsumant sive latinos ad orientalem, sive orientales ad latinum ritum assumendum. Nemini licet sine venia Apostolicæ Sedis ad alium ritum transire, aut, post legitimum transitum, ad pristinum reverti.'

[2] However, the Western interpretation is implied in the Uniat books by printing the 'Words of Institution' in capitals.

[3] See p. 791 f.

become stronger. But such authorisation should be at least on a provincial basis, and deviations from the authorised alternatives will, we hope, become so abhorrent to the clergy that disciplinary action by the Bishops will be unnecessary.[1]

Similar considerations apply to the Occasional Offices. In the present conditions of English life the services connected with birth, marriage and death have a real missionary value. The traditional solemn rites of the Church, conservatively revised, as they are found in an authorised book, have an appeal which no individually revised versions can have. The people are unlikely to believe in the Church if the priest is obviously apologetic for its services or discards them in part. Mattins and Evensong, again, are the Anglican form of the Breviary and we have no authority for altering them.

Our plea, then, is for some variety of rite, but for careful adherence to the authorised variations; for the elimination of private fancy and of desire to be wiser than the Church. A priest cannot indulge these and keep the spirit of humility and obedience which is necessary if liturgy is to do its perfect work in his soul. But may not a Bishop sanction deviations? Once more let us look at Roman Catholic practice. 'Catholicism,' it was said recently, means that the laity obey the parish priest, the parish priest the Bishop, the Bishop the Pope. The Pope, we may add, according to theory, obeys the Holy Spirit, who speaks not least in the *consensus fidelium*. The Bishop is only one link in the chain and his liturgical powers are carefully defined. Since 1588 the regulation of the Liturgy has been withdrawn from him, and he is restricted to the authorising of extra-liturgical prayers, the watching over the observance of laws, and the prevention of superstition and abuse.[2] The recommendation of a Lambeth Conference Committee in 1920, asking for the recognition of the principle that 'full liberty belongs to Diocesan Bishops . . . for the adoption of other uses,'[3] gets no more support from Roman Catholic law than it does from English practice since the Reformation. The Bishop's *jus liturgicum* is surely limited to the sanctioning of services additional to those in the authorised service books and doctrinally in harmony with them. In practice, as things are at present, he will probably tolerate certain deviations from the norm of the legal services, but by way of 'economy,' not of *jus*.

Where additional services are concerned, considerable liberty

[1] Yet it should be remembered that improvements in liturgy come from spontaneous variations made by priests in touch with the needs of their congregations, which later commend themselves for wider use and ultimately for authorisation.

[2] *Codex J. C.*, Can. 1257–1261, especially 1257: 'Unius Apostolicæ Sedis est tum sacram ordinare liturgiam, tum liturgicos approbrare libros.'

[3] See pp. 705, 831.

and freedom of experiment seem desirable at our present stage, even if the results are such as shock liturgical purists. The tendency is to eliminate extravagances, and if some of the clergy, in their longing by all means to save some, seem to their colleagues to break bounds, it is best to trust to public opinion gradually to correct excesses. The great thing is that the principle should be clearly accepted—liberty in additional and non-liturgical services, coupled with humble fidelity to the liturgical standards of the Church. Popular devotions vary with the generations, as do popular hymns. They should not be stereotyped, and the demand for their insertion in the official Book of Common Prayer should be resisted. The danger of their ousting liturgical services may easily be over-estimated. It is just as likely that, as in the Roman Catholic Church to-day, their toleration will lead to a reaction in favour of liturgy.[1]

So far I have been discussing liturgy. What of the second part of our title—Worship, the inner movement of the soul of which liturgy is the outward manifestation? Only, liturgy and worship are inseparable; liturgy teaches and creates worship as truly as worship expresses itself in liturgy. Readers will find Mr. Brabant's introductory Essay a welcome innovation in a book of this description. I should like to supplement it with a few observations on the theological aspects of worship. The line of thought here sketched is one which I was led to work out owing to my inability to appropriate, and use devotionally, the theories of sacrifice associated with the names of Père de la Taille and (among Anglicans) Mr. W. Spens, still less the earlier theories of which they are a restatement; they seem to me to preserve Jewish elements the value of which for others I do not doubt, but personally I do not find them helpful.[2]

Christian worship is offered to the Father 'through Jesus Christ our Lord.' What do these familiar words mean? Let us begin with St. Paul, for whom Christian life was life '*in* the Lord.' What pagan philosophers had held of God—'in him we live and move and have our being'—he extended to Jesus Christ, Jesus of Nazareth, the expected Messiah—King of Israel, and our Lord. The Septuagint was his Bible, and there he found Jehovah called Kyrios; thus the same word in Greek meant the God of the Jews and the Lord of a pagan cult, and

[1] See p. 795, for the new policy of the American Church, which is apparently actuated by the same kind of principles as are here sketched.

[2] In working out this train of thought I have been helped most by C. E. Rolt's introduction to Dionysius the Areopagite and Cardinal de Bérulle's doctrine of 'adherence' to the Son of God as expounded by H. Bremond in the third volume of his *Histoire littéraire*. In view of its origins I shall not be surprised if to some it seems open to the objection of being Neoplatonic rather than distinctively Christian.

each set of associations contributed something to his setting forth of Jesus Christ.[1] In and with Christ the Christian died, rose, and ascended into the heavenly places; where Christ is, there he is. In some respects St. Paul's teaching was controverted, but there is no sign that this doctrine of mystical union met with opposition. That others realised it as intensely as he did is improbable, but at least it was a natural conception for the first Christians. Once we grasp this truth, the theological teaching about the relation of the Son to the Father in the Trinity becomes fraught with intense reality and applicability to our own souls, for since the Incarnation we share the movements of the Son. The Father eternally begets the Son and eternally loves Him. The Son is the stream of Godhead ever flowing from the fount of Godhead, the Light of the Sun ever streaming from the Sun. We never see the Father in Himself, only His manifestation in the Son. This eternal coming must be distinguished from the coming in time known as the Incarnation.

There is another facet of truth, seen in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. The Son or Word of God, the Logos, is manifest in creation. The whole created universe is a manifestation of the Son, that is, of that side of God which is turned towards us and which alone we see. Without the doctrine of the Trinity, emphasis on God in Nature leads to Pantheism. For Christians the universe is animated *by the Divinity of the Son.* But the Son eternally loves the Father. Consequently, there is in Him a continual response of the Universe to the Source of all being.[2] The stream that flows out from the Throne is ever returning whence it came. 'They continue this day according to thine ordinance: for all things serve thee.' Note, however, that they serve God by an inherent law of their being. The stars on their way, the passing of the seasons, the instinctive movements of bird and beast, can do no other. In creating man God parted in a sense with His omnipotence; He made beings, sons of God, who could withhold their meed of homage, deliberately standing aloof from the stream of response that ever flows back to the Throne, abstaining from participation in the love yielded by the Son to the Father.

Modernists and orthodox differ in their conception of the Incarnation. To the former it seems the crown of the evolutionary process, God appearing in man *ab intra.* The latter maintain that Christ came *ab extra;* to them the modernist view seems to imply that all happened by a natural unfolding

[1] The technical Greek terms are sometimes common to Christianity and paganism: the ideas they represent seem to me to be wholly Jewish and Christian. The pagan associations, that is, are confined to the *form* in which the Gospel was presented to converts from paganism.

[2] This does not exclude a relation between the Son and the Father independent of all creation.

apart from the personal will of God. But need the two conceptions exclude one another? May we not believe that one and the same thing, considered in terms of our planet, was the culmination of the evolutionary process and, considered *sub specie æternitatis*, a new and personal act of God, the latter being the deeper and fundamental truth? The Logos, who has been in the world as the Divine principle animating both nature and human society, now takes flesh, that is human nature, and lives the life of a man. He enters fully into the time-process, and the eternal going forth from the Father is exemplified in a special sending. 'Lo, I come to do thy will' is the purpose of the Incarnation, to live the life of perfect obedience under conditions which hitherto have led men to withhold obedience. And that homage is rendered under the most difficult conditions of all—humiliation, disgrace and intense suffering—so that the Cross is the typical and culminating act of obedience and sacrifice that saves the world (cf. Phil. ii. 8).

We now begin to see what is meant by the life of specifically Christian devotion, and by the instinct which leads the Church to conclude its prayers with 'through Jesus Christ our Lord.' Devotion is nothing less than union with our Lord, willing 'adherence' to the One who has perfectly pleased God, made Creation's response in its hardest form, that of man who can withhold it, and united the conscious response of humanity to the unconscious response of nature, thus restoring the broken unity. The stream is still coming forth and returning. Our part is to receive the saving, vivifying power of the outflowing stream and to identify ourselves with it as it returns. In other words, none but Christ has been able to respond to the Father's love in terms of created humanity. He has responded on behalf of the human race. He has redeemed us and made it possible for us to be true sons of the Father *in Him, the eternal Son.*

Practical devotion therefore consists in entering into the stream, identifying ourselves with the perfect sacrifice of the Son to the Father which we plead in the Eucharist, and thus going home to God in and 'through Jesus Christ our Lord.' 'All things are returning to unity in him through whom they took their origin, even our Lord Jesus Christ.' But under the conditions of this life no sooner do we reach the Throne—and however dim our apprehension we believe that we do reach heaven in our worship—than forthwith we find ourselves in the outflowing stream which the Father sends in His love, and if we are faithful to our calling we proceed to share in the loving acts of the Son towards humanity, which for us, as for Him when He came in time, involve sacrifice and continued dying.

Preachers, interpreting the Eucharist devotionally, sometimes say that its action takes place in heaven, not on earth; we are

caught up into the celestial realm where the Sacrifice of Calvary is pleaded. The Liturgy perfectly blends the two conceptions. If in the *Sanctus* we rise to be with our Lord in the company of angels, we are at once reminded in the *Benedictus qui venit* how earth-bound we are, needing Him to descend to us. This suggests the inadequacy of the metaphor I have used above. It savours too much of the Neoplatonic 'flight of the alone to the Alone' to be fully Christian. If it is to satisfy, justice must be done to the part played by the Church. Which reminds us that the Holy Spirit has been left out.

Christian worship is directed to the Father through the Son *in the Holy Spirit*. Our metaphor is content with two Persons only. Perhaps this is inevitable when we develop the thought of the Father who loves and the Son who is loved and in His turn loves the Father. True, we add that the Holy Spirit is the love that joins them; but it is difficult for our minds to conceive a relationship between two Persons with the same vividness as we conceive the Persons. If our Eucharistic theology is to be rich and satisfying, we must find some other way of visualising the part played by the Spirit.

We are accustomed nowadays to the conception of a life-force, which streams in and provides the motive-power of our lives. The same force which impels a weed to find its way through the asphalt path in our garden is at work in us, at a higher level of efficiency. The practical success with which we lead our lives largely depends on the extent to which we allow this force, largely instinctive, to take control, handing over the great mass of our bodily functions and daily actions to instinctive automatic functioning, in order to set free the conscious and rational part of us to direct those matters in which choice is necessary. This force is often called *libido*, a term which is used in a technical sense. 'When we so [*i.e.* as instinctive energy] define *libido*, we ought to realise that we are speaking of what many Christians would call the Holy Spirit,' says a recent writer.[1] The words are correctly chosen—not all Christians are familiar with such a conception, nor can the identification be made without qualification.[2] Something like it was familiar enough in the fourth century. St. Basil, for instance, bids us think 'of the original cause of all things that are made, the Father; of the creative cause, the Son; of the perfecting cause, the Spirit.'[3] 'It is unseemly to co-ordinate the Holy Spirit with created nature.'[4] The action of the Spirit on creation is 'as one sees a bird cover the eggs with her body and impart to them

[1] G. Coster, *Psycho-analysis for Normal People*, p. 51.

[2] The Whitsuntide hymns in *The English Hymnal* and *Hymns Ancient and Modern* contain no reference to the work of the Holy Spirit in Nature.

[3] *De Spiritu Sancto*, 38. [4] *Ib.*, 55.

vital force from her own warmth.'[1] Instinctive energy, or vital force, must not be identified with the Holy Spirit, but it manifests His operation. So in the Nicene Creed the Holy Spirit is confessed as Lord, and Giver of Life (making alive), before we reach the clauses which describe His work in the Church. The Old Testament conception of Spirit at one stage is exactly what is meant by instinctive energy; see, for example, Judges xiv. 6, 19, where 'the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon Samson.'

In our theological thinking we must discriminate between the manifestation of the Spirit in Creation which continues to-day and the presence of the Holy Spirit, coming forth from the Father and the Son, which dates from Pentecost. The relation between the two is comparable with that between the Logos and the Incarnate Son. The Holy Spirit in the full Christian sense abides in the Church. He makes the plenitude of the Father *and the Son* present to Christians to-day. Perhaps we may express the matter thus. Our Lord yielded Himself fully to the inflowing Spirit, so that His was a perfectly developed humanity, free from the obstacles, phobias, and inhibitions set up by all other men. This merely expresses in modern terms the truth of His perfect manhood. But since the Incarnation it is possible for Christians to receive the Holy Spirit in a new sense, conditioned by the humanity of Christ through which the Spirit flows to us. If the illustration of the life-stream of instinctive energy is sound, we may believe that the method of intake of energy is the same for all men, but that for Christians the stream is charged with vitality not available outside the Church, with nothing less than the life of Christ reaching them in the Spirit.[2] This supernatural life in the Church is, however, mediated to us by the ministrations of our fellow-men, sacramentally and otherwise.

We can now try to understand the special part played by the Holy Spirit in worship. Our worship is *in* the Holy Spirit. In and through the Spirit we practise corporate worship. If our part in worship is to put ourselves into the stream which is the Son's response to the Father, the impulse so to do is the work of the Spirit, helping our infirmities. Obviously the impulse results from our membership of the body—what have we that we have not received? Can any man claim that he desires to worship, or knows how to worship, without the help of his fellow-men—the yearnings of former generations expressed in the Liturgy, the instructions of parents, teachers, preachers, and books, the examples of holy lives? To return to the metaphor of the vine, if he is a cell in the plant, they are the neighbouring cells through which the life-force reaches him.

[1] *Hexaemeron*, ii. 6. Cf. Gen. i. 2: 'the Spirit of God was brooding . . . (R.V. marg.).

[2] This thought, of the sap of the Vine reaching the branches, is very familiar; here I am trying to co-ordinate it with the other operations of the Spirit.

We close a necessarily technical discussion, in which it is only too easy to over-state a view or strain a metaphor too far, with an attempt at a definition of Eucharistic worship. Eucharistic worship is the movement by which the beloved community, expressing the yearnings of the individuals that compose it, identifies itself with the sacrifice even unto death of that perfect Life of the Son which came forth from the Father in time and eternally returns whence it came. This identifying, this putting itself into the stream, is made possible by the Holy Spirit who links the individuals and makes them one Body and provides the Body with the will and power to worship. The worshipping community is swept into the mighty stream that flows unto the Throne of God, and, bathed and purified anew, it returns to the world to face its task of suffering and service.

Is worship so complicated as all that? a reader may ask. No, it is the simplest thing in the world for the childlike, the single-hearted. But we have travelled far from the days when the Christians, newly baptised in the Holy Spirit, broke bread 'with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God,' and many of us need prolonged intellectual preparation before we can surrender ourselves in utter simplicity to the Spirit of worship; the act may be instantaneous but the preliminaries take time.

The same reader may ask whether so long a book as this was necessary. Nearly every contributor has complained, What can I do in the inadequate space allotted? The fact is that there is much to be said on the subject. The antithesis to simplicity here is not so much complexity as richness. Liturgical knowledge is an integral part of Christian civilisation. We are no longer 'in the Catacombs,' but living in a world of wonderful beauty and variety. Every side of a worthy human life has its links with liturgy—birth, marriage, death, painting, architecture, music, philosophy, history, literature. Even when we have filled 800 pages we have left much unsaid. In an age of standardisation and vulgarisation, liturgy remains unvulgarised. In it we see the good manners of created beings before their Maker. The very movements of the ministers at the altar recall the dignity of the Roman gentleman. I hope that our book will not be read only by the clergy, but that educated laymen, not content with secular education and Christian piety, will find in these pages something of the riches of the House of God, as they learn about that liturgy and worship which is an integral part of Christian civilisation.

Acknowledgments in the case of a book like this would have to be very numerous if complete. I must ask a multitude of helpers to be content to be anonymous, and confine myself to

mentioning Dr. Harris, who has been at my side all the time and has read everything both in MS. and in proof; Dr. Brightman, whose criticism of parts of the book was invaluable; Dr. Darwell Stone; the Rev. K. D. Mackenzie; and Mr. S. J. Bruton, Sub-librarian at Sion College, who waited on me hand and foot whenever I visited the library for the purposes of this book.

The book falls into three parts. After a historical introduction, the Prayer Book services are discussed. The third part contains additional matter, much of which is new in books of this kind.

Capitals are used for pronouns referring to the Persons of the Trinity, according to a common modern usage, but not in quotations from the Bible, Prayer Books, and ancient books generally. It will be noticed that in two fields overlapping occurs. The history of individual services is treated in the different sections and also in the comprehensive chapter dealing with the History of the Prayer Book. Similarly Eastern Orthodox services are mentioned under their various headings and comprehensively treated in the final essay.

WORSHIP IN GENERAL

By F. H. BRABANT

(a) *The expressive and the suggestive Elements in Worship.*

ALL liturgical acts—whether they make use of words (ritual in the narrower sense), or of actions (ceremonial proper)—have a double function: one directed Godwards, expressing in outward form the thoughts and feelings of the worshippers, the other directed manwards, teaching the worshippers how they ought to think and feel by setting before them the Church's standard of worship.

This double aspect of our public services is the cause of many misunderstandings and perplexities on the part of those who do not take into consideration the real difference between private and public devotions. Thus, in the case of ceremonial, how often is the objection made that it easily becomes a piece of insincere acting. If (it is said) the genuflection does not express a real humiliation of heart before the adorable Presence, if the incense does not naturally and consciously typify the upward-soaring prayers of the congregation, how does the whole performance differ from a theatrical show, where the priests and their assistants have learned their parts and the people have (generally very inadequately) paid for their seats? The case is still worse if the ceremonial suggests or excites transitory emotions, if the worshippers are 'stupefied' by the incense or 'drugged' by impressive displays of magnificence.

The same objection is felt (in another form) in the case of elaborate liturgical forms of prayer or belief; what use can they be to *me*, if they are not *my* prayers? How can I take on my lips language which, however true for others, does not represent my spiritual experience? The depths of self-accusation which the Church enshrines in its public confessions, the ecstasy of its hymns, the ardent faith of its creeds—they are indeed admirable things, but they are far beyond what I have reached as yet. By joining in them, am I not pretending before God to be what I am not?

Certainly it is never out of place to reiterate the need for sincerity. One word from the heart does indeed please God far more than the most splendid High Mass, where amid the blaze

of the lights and the glory of the music hearts are dead and cold. But complaints of this kind are too often founded on the insecure assumption that the only function of worship is to express what is in the individual's mind already, and that, unless it is there before the ceremony or the prayer, his participation in them must be insincere and unnatural.

All this demand for a worship which shall be the 'natural' expression of what we feel, just like the demand for a devotional life always in the sunshine, without method or effort, is at bottom a confusion between the natural and the easy. We do not go to church to say, do, and think 'just what we like'; if we all arrived there feeling and thinking as we ought, no doubt our services would be simply the expression in speech and action of the inner state of our souls with all the spontaneous direction of children. But we do not, most of us, arrive like that. We come, stained and weary from a life that is largely unnatural, longing for something to lift us up into an atmosphere of spiritual peace. We ought, indeed, to 'feel at home' in church, but we come to it as wanderers returned, not like tired City men calling for our slippers and our comfortable chairs. This is why we need all the help we can get from without, the steadiness of discipline, the beauty of holiness, the unswerving faith of the Church, upon which to lean our poor half-heartedness. That is why the Liturgy not only expresses what we feel; it also teaches us what we ought to feel. The genuflection, even if it is done with little conscious devotion, stands for an ideal of adoration, and often the very act itself awakens our sluggish attention. The stately language of collect and anthem reminds us that, however far we lag behind, this is how the Church goes to the altar of God and creates in us the longing to follow as far as we can.

Worship, therefore, has not only an expressive function but also a suggestive or impressive one.[1] This distinction is important for our purpose, because in Professor Otto's theory of worship (which we shall have to consider at length) we find a preponderance of the suggestive element. In his *The Idea of the Holy* he lays great stress on the fact that the peculiar element of mystery, which lies at the heart of worship, is no everyday mood; it has often been excited by the strange and uncanny, deep forests, fantastic

[1] These terms are far from being ideal; they can be used in precisely the opposite sense. Thus a writer in *Theology* complains that Lutheran worship tends 'rather to impress than express'; here 'impressive' means too subjective, whereas in our use of the terms it is Catholic worship that is impressive and Protestant expressive. From the point of view of God, corporate worship is 'expressive' as holding up to Him the adoration of His Church; from the point of view of the individual it is 'impressive,' as exciting in him the sense of community in worship. 'Individualistic' worship is 'expressive' as starting from what the worshipper has already; 'impressive' as seeking to heighten and intensify that feeling.

shapes of rock and mountain. This 'sense of otherness' has its times and places, when and where it descends without warning. We do not come to it; rather it comes upon us.

Nor is it (he urges) the result of rational considerations. Reflection on the order of the universe may inspire intelligent admiration of its Author, as in the eighteenth-century Deism; reflection on morality may result in an attitude of respect to the laws that govern life and history; sentimental affection towards the Work and Person of Christ may be aroused by dwelling on the Gospel narrative; but there is something far more direct, more sudden, more overwhelming in the hushed adoration of the *Sanctus* or the awe-struck silence after the Consecration.

The tendency of Otto's important study of the Holy has been to focus attention on the suggestive or evocative side of worship; his able investigation of the elements of religious awe in primitive legend and ritual, his creation of new terms that have already caught the imagination of our time (the Numinous, Otherness, the *Mysterium tremendum et fascinans*), his acute analysis of the idea of the Holy as something quite independent of the rational or the moral and as being the very soul of Religion—all this has produced a theological sensation the more welcome as it comes from a country we had supposed somewhat petrified by theological negation; behind Harnack and the critics we seem to see peeping out again the Germany of Grimms' Fairy Tales.[1]

The effects of his work have been so marked that it is difficult to use the term 'worship' without seeming to imply the narrower sense of 'a feeling for the Numinous,' yet it is obvious that all public worship is not numinous. The Collect for the King, the moral exhortations at the beginning of Mattins and Evensong, or the Lesson describing St. Paul's shipwreck in the Acts do not directly aim at exciting the sense of mystery; if a feeling of 'otherness' were all that is required, we could not do better than resort to unintelligible words set to barbaric music.

Such is not, of course, Professor Otto's meaning, but it will perhaps be well to approach the question of worship without letting ourselves be hypnotised by his masterful terminology; let us therefore return to our simpler contrast between the expressive and the suggestive sides of worship.

We must not let ourselves be misled by prejudices against the 'suggestive' element; the 'stupefying' quality of incense or the 'hypnotic' influence of ceremonial is no more offensive than the fact of worshipping in a church where the windows cast a dim

[1] How curiously Professor Otto's Protestantism holds him back from what would seem to be the Catholic implications of his doctrine may be seen in his dislike of miracles (p. 67) and his suspicion of High Mass (p. 218), both, one would have thought, admirable examples of the Numinous. (All quotations are from the English translation, 1923.)

religious light, or of hearing words read from a Book full of sacred and venerable associations. It is true that all this lulls the critical side of us, but worship is not the exercise of our critical faculty; the place for that is the study or the lecture-room, not the church.[1]

Secondly, we should notice that there is no complete antithesis between the expressive and the suggestive. One cannot evoke or suggest what is not there. The Numinous (as Professor Otto is the first to admit) cannot be felt by people who have not the capacity for feeling it; as Canon Quick says,[2] 'The divinest goodness can make no impression on a human soul, unless the soul is able to express that same goodness in response. It is this truth which Otto's description of the divine as wholly other so unfortunately obscures.'

The other side of this truth needs emphasis also; if the suggestive can only work on what is already there, it is none the less true that what is already there often stands in need of the suggestion. We cannot most of us express ourselves; unless we are geniuses, we need the poet, the musician, the saint to do it for us. Poetry expresses what we could never have said, what perhaps we could never have felt consciously, unless it had been stirred in us by the voice that has the key to our hearts. So in worship the voice of the Church calls up thoughts and feelings often far beyond us, yet to which something in us faintly but firmly responds.

With this in our minds let us examine Professor Otto's account of the Numinous in some detail.

(b) *Worship and the Numinous.*

We shall begin by considering what is obviously a vital part of his position—his treatment of the ideas of the Rational and the Moral.

Professor Otto is, of course, trying to show that the Idea of the Holy is independent of the other two; he argues that God, thought of as an intelligent First Cause or as the Author of the Moral Law, is an object of admiration and respect, but not of worship, because these ideas are not concerned with mystery proper. In this he makes two assumptions—that worship is merely a sense of the Numinous (in his special, non-rational, non-moral use of the word), and secondly that there is no mystery properly so called except the Holy. Let us take the second point first.

If it is true, it follows that conceptions of God as the Truth or

[1] This is the difficulty of allowing questions to be asked in church; if we are to have regular arguments in the pulpit, no doubt it seems a grievance if no answers are permitted, but a church has (or ought to have) a numinous atmosphere, which makes such arguments out of place.

[2] *The Christian Sacraments*, pp. 114, 115.

Perfect Goodness are not mysterious. Professor Otto shows some reluctance to go as far as this; he starts off by saying (p. 1):—

> It is essential to every theistic conception of God . . . that it designates . . . Deity by the attributes Spirit, Reason, Purpose, Good Will, Supreme Power, Unity, Selfhood. The nature of God is thus thought of by analogy with our human nature of reason and personality; only, whereas in ourselves we are aware of this as qualified by restriction and limitation, as applied to God the attributes we use are 'completed,' *i.e.* thought as absolute and unqualified. Now all these attributes constitute clear and distinct *concepts*: they can be grasped by the intellect; they can be analysed by thought; they even admit of definition. An object that can thus be thought conceptually may be termed *rational.*

Later on, he feels that this needs modification (pp. 145–6):—

> God's rational attributes can be distinguished from like attributes applied to the created spirit by being not relative, as these are, but absolute. . . . *The content* of the attributes [that is, for example, of Love or Goodness in God or man] is the same; it is an *element of form* which marks them apart as attributes of God. But such an element of form is also the mysterious as such . . . Our understanding can only compass the relative. That which is in contrast absolute, though it may in a sense be *thought*, cannot be *thought home*, *thought out*; it is within the reach of our conceiving, but it is beyond the grasp of our comprehension. Now, though this does not make what is 'absolute' itself genuinely 'mysterious' . . . it does make it a genuine schema of 'the mysterious.' The absolute exceeds our power to comprehend; the mysterious wholly eludes it. The absolute is that which surpasses the limits of our understanding, not through its actual qualitative character, for that is familiar to us, but through its formal character. The mysterious, on the other hand, is that which lies altogether outside what can be thought and is, alike in form, quality and essence, the utterly and 'wholly other.'

I make no apology for the length of these quotations; they are of the utmost importance. Professor Otto starts off as though the contrast were simply between the rational attributes of God (Spirit, Reason, etc.) and the irrational, mysterious attribute of Holiness. Then, on reflection, he finds the former are not so rational after all; after calling them 'clear and distinct concepts' which 'can be analysed by thought,' he now admits that they cannot be 'thought out'; they can be 'conceived' though not 'comprehended.' But he still refuses to call them mysterious;

the rational attributes of God 'surpass the limits of the understanding by their formal character' (that is, by being absolute, not as with us relative), but they are not mysterious; only that which 'eludes the understanding in form and content alike' can be properly called a Mystery.

Professor Otto is clear then that the 'rational attributes' of God are not mysterious and that because, however puzzling Absolute Love or Goodness may be to our intellects, their 'actual qualitative character is familiar.' We must consider this strange doctrine, that such a tremendous difference of form, as the change from being relative to being absolute, leaves the content still 'familiar.'

If we were trying to frame the idea of a highly exalted archangel, between whose intelligence and our own there was set an incomparably wider gulf than that between us and the lowest of angels, we might say that the content was in a sense the same, while the difference was one of form; I doubt if the distinction would help us very much. If we compare the highest human intelligence with the first dim stirrings of consciousness in an animal, it hardly seems an adequate account to say that the content is the same; to one who after only knowing the lower passed suddenly to observe the higher it would certainly seem a mysterious change.

But, however that may be, the change we are considering is from the relative to the absolute, from man to God. If we consider it in terms of intelligence, is the Divine Mind merely a human mind under another 'form'? A Mind which has no need of knowledge from without, but has it all from within; a Creative Mind whose thoughts are acts of will, who not only knows but sustains at every moment all that is—can we not call such a Mind mysterious? A Mind that is eternal, ever active yet never changing, working through history, yet beyond time and development in time—can we say of such a Mind that its 'actual qualitative character is familiar'?

It is surely the same if we consider God as absolute Goodness; we can speak of certain dispositions of mind as absolutely good and yet there is always an implicit reference to something else, to which their goodness bears some relation. They are good, human nature and its surroundings being what they are; they are good with reference to something beyond the possessor (for we can hardly conceive a goodness which could be solitary and without concerning God or our fellow-men); they are good as against a background of evil, present or at least possible. But when we turn away from human goodness and try to imagine a goodness quite divorced from our earthly environment, a goodness self-sufficient and needing nothing beyond itself for its perfection, a goodness that existed long before evil and shall last long after

evil has disappeared, our minds are staggered by a difference, which we may or may not be ready to call a mere difference of form, but which it seems hard to dismiss as not 'genuinely mysterious.'

Professor Otto includes 'Unity and Selfhood' as rational attributes of God, 'thought of by analogy with our human nature.' Is the doctrine of the Trinity, then, no longer a mystery? Can we 'grasp by the intellect' or 'analyse by thought' the doctrine that God is Trinity in Unity, including and transcending personality? Or is it just because he has broken with the doctrine of the Trinity that he seems insufficiently aware of the mystery of God's inner Being?

This line of criticism is not a defence of obscurantism; we are only attempting to show that the so-called 'rational' attributes of God lead to ultimate mystery, just as inevitably as the attribute of Holiness; the philosopher, who ponders on God's power or goodness, needs no sudden incursion into the Numinous to awaken in him the thrill of contact with the unknown. 'Omnia exeunt in mysterium'; we reach mystery by any road, if we only go far enough.

To all this it may be replied: 'After all, there is *some* analogy, however distant, between divine thought and human, between divine love and human, enough to make it possible to use the same word in describing both, enough to make it possible to approach God (as Christians have always approached Him) under the categories of King, Father, and Friend.'

Certainly this is true, but it does not touch the question at issue. Professor Otto's position is that there are two completely contrasted categories, under which we can approach God—the rational, where we make use of human analogies and where there is no mystery, and the irrational, the Holy, which is pure mystery, where no human analogies can be used, and where form and content are alike unknown. We are maintaining that *all* the categories under which God can be approached start from human analogies and *all* end in mystery. We shall now try to show that Professor Otto's irrational category, just like the others, starts from ourselves and loses itself in the unknown.

We speak of men as good, wise and loving, using the same words as we apply to God; can we speak of men being holy, as well as God? Professor Otto is in a difficulty here. Strictly, the word 'holy' can only be used of God; it means the non-human, the wholly other, the Divine *par excellence*. But it is evident that the word is less rigorously circumscribed in common usage. Otto makes use of the word 'divination' to describe the faculty of apprehending the Numinous when it is possessed by a human being, but this causes further embarrassment. The faculty of apprehending the Numinous at once awakens the sense

of being 'unholy' and unclean, as in his favourite text, where Abraham calls himself 'dust and ashes' before God. We seem, therefore, less than ever able to call people in such a state 'holy.' Otto then says that people who are possessed by the Numinous are called holy not with reference to themselves but to the Power possessing them. Thus in the chapter on the Numinous in the New Testament (pp. 85–6) he says: 'The "kingdom" is just greatness and marvel absolute, the "wholly other," "heavenly" thing, set in contrast to the world of here and now. . . . As such, it sheds a colour, a mood, a tone, upon . . . the men who proclaim it or prepare for it. . . . This is shown most strikingly in the name by which the company of the disciples call themselves . . . the Numinous, "technical term," οἱ Ἅγιοι, the holy ones or "the Saints." It is manifest at once that this does not mean "the morally perfect" people; it means the people who participate in the mystery of the final Day.'

Men and women may then be called holy, but it would surely be a very extreme view of inspiration which held that the term 'holy' only applied to the Spirit that possessed them and not to the character of the saints themselves. St. Peter says (1 Pet. i. 15): 'Like as he which called you is holy, be ye yourselves holy in all manner of living,' implying at once likeness and distinction between the holiness of the Caller and the holiness of the called. But if the word 'holy' may be used to designate men and women, what becomes of the 'Otherness' of the category? Wherein does it differ from the other rational categories, which, like it, start from faint human analogies and become mysterious as they become absolute?

All this is of importance when we turn to Professor Otto's treatment of our Lord's Person, which requires some consideration. Here it is important to distinguish (as Otto does) the objective and subjective senses of the Numinous. In the former sense, our Lord would be the Object of worship, whose life excites the sense of the Numinous and is therefore divine; in the latter sense, as Perfect Man, He would feel to the full that sense of the Numinous which is the proper attitude of humanity towards the Divine.

Otto has a fine chapter (pp. 159–65) on the numinous impression made by Jesus on His contemporaries. He quotes St. Mark x. 32, where 'Jesus went before them . . . and as they followed, they were afraid,' but his unsatisfactory use of the word 'holy' as applied to men makes it difficult to be sure whether he regards Jesus as an object of worship. He tells us that the spontaneous and 'irresistible' impression, made on one who contemplates Christ's life in its historic setting, is: 'That is godlike and divine; that is verily Holiness. If there is a God and if He chose to reveal Himself, He could do it no otherwise than thus'

(p. 174). But when we ask what the holiness of Christ's life tells us about His Person, we are perplexed by the fact that the prophet is also called a holy man, a 'being of wonder and mystery, who somehow or other is felt to belong to the higher order of things, to the side of the numen itself' (p. 162).[1]

Still more interesting and important is Professor Otto's treatment of Christ as the Subject of the Numinous, that is, as the ideal Diviner of the Holy. Here we have an important test of the whole theory. If the typical attitude of humanity to the Divine is one of shuddering abasement (the 'dust and ashes' feeling of Abraham), then in Christ, the Perfect Man, we shall see it at its highest. It is of no use to say that He did not feel it because He was sinless, for it is one of Otto's constant contentions that the sense of abasement has nothing to do with sin, but is the natural 'creaturely' approach of man to his Creator. Can we trace, then, in Christ's filial attitude to His Father any such sense of abasement? On the contrary, He seems rather to have complete confidence in God's goodness and love; if one may say so reverently, He almost takes them for granted. '*Of course* He will hear your prayers and protect every hair of your heads.' Doubtless (as Otto says) He knows of God's anger against sin. He says: 'Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell' (Matt. x. 28), and: 'He will miserably destroy those miserable men' (Matt. xxi. 41)—both quoted by Otto—but this expresses God's relation to sinners, not to Himself, the sinless One. Doubtless again, by infinitely deepening the conception of God's purpose and love, He puts mystery into the dry and hard Pharisaic religion. No one denies that He intensified the mystery of God's Being for us; the point at issue is whether He did so by exhibiting a sense of abasement before the Numinous.

Hard pressed for examples, Professor Otto points to the Agony in Gethsemane; he says in a fine passage (p. 88):

> No, there is more here than fear of death; there is the awe of the creature before the 'mysterium tremendum,' before the shuddering secret of the numen. . . . Even those who cannot recognise 'the Holy One of Israel' elsewhere in the God of the Gospel must at least discover Him here, if they have eyes to see at all.

The Agony in the Garden is indeed a mystery into which no reverent soul would wish to pry, but we may say this: Why should this 'awe of the creature' burst on Christ just at that

[1] Notice also that his almost Bergsonian emphasis on the fact that the sense of the Numinous in Christ is irrational discourages any theological attempt to think out the relation of the Divine and Human Natures in Christ. 'Such a conclusion is not the result of logical compulsion . . . it is an immediate, underivable judgment of pure recognition, and it follows a premiss that defies exposition' (p. 174).

hour and in that place? Nothing in the Gospel narrative suggests that it was typical of His ordinary communion with the Father; rather He seems to have been astonished at such an agony in prayer, so unlike the nights of unclouded fellowship He had often spent alone with God. The traditional explanation (that in some sense He was 'bearing the sins of the world') seems to fit the facts better; it has received classical expression in Newman's Sermon on 'The Mental Sufferings of our Lord in His Passion.' [1]

We now pass on to a second point even more important. Hitherto we have admitted a special category of the Holy, and have contented ourselves with urging that there are other ways of realising mystery in God; we have now to ask whether Professor Otto is justified in creating a special and independent category of the Holy.

This is the place to consider his not very satisfactory treatment of the æsthetic judgment. He does not class Beauty among the rational attributes of God on p. 1; whether he would put it among the irrational attributes I do not feel sure; he often uses the æsthetic judgment 'This is beautiful' as being analogous to the numinous judgment 'This is holy,' both being immediate and underivable intuitions into the nature of Reality.

But there is one kind of æsthetic judgment that he feels to be very significant, and that is our sense of the Sublime. On p. 43 he recognises a close analogy between the Sublime and the Numinous. The Sublime

> has in it something mysterious, and in this it is like 'the Numinous' . . . it is at once daunting, and yet again singularly attractive. . . . Each tends to pass over into the other.

The Sublime is admitted to be a legitimate 'schematisation' of the Holy, and on p. 65 he goes still further. 'There exists a hidden kinship between the Numinous and the Sublime, which is something more than a mere analogy.'

This is important, and for the following reason. Is not Otto admitting that the Holy is equivalent to the Sublime and is really an æsthetic judgment? It will be objected that the Sublime

[1] See his *Discourses to Mixed Congregations*. Does it follow from our argument that the sense of abasement before the Numinous is connected with a sense of sin? One hesitates to pronounce on such a subject; the Genesis narrative contrasting Adam's happy fellowship with God before the Fall with his fear and self-concealmen after it seems to suggest it. In any case, as we are all sinners except Christ, this sense of abasement must remain part of our experience; even in heaven perhaps the saints remember their sins as a cause of joyous self-humiliation. It would be interesting to know whether this sense of abasement exists in children before they are fully conscious of sin. The Angels, who have known no sin, are prostrate in adoring reverence, but it is the devils who 'believe and shudder.'

is not necessarily religious; it can be felt before some magnificent piece of poetry or some majestic work of architecture or even in the realm of human character without our saying, 'This is holy; this is Godlike.'

But if our criticism of Professor Otto has hitherto been at all on the right lines we have an answer to that. We have contended that in every sphere of human experience (especially in the search for Truth, Goodness and Beauty) where the mind passes from the relative to the absolute it feels the thrill of mystery. Doubtless we are not yet at the stage of Religion; if the mystery is to become religious, there must be, as well as the thrill of contact with an absolute, that sense of response from the unknown Reality which is religious experience. But—and here is the important point—this sense of mystery may come along any of these paths. We may tremble before God as absolute Truth, absolute Goodness, absolute Beauty (in which we must carefully include the Sublime as equally the object of æsthetic judgment); now is not Otto's 'sense of the Numinous' merely our æsthetic judgment of the Sublime *become religious*? Our recognition of absolute Goodness and absolute Truth may also become religious. In that case there is no special category of the Holy. There are various categories, all of which become mysterious when regarded as absolute and religious if regarded as divine. The word 'holy' is perhaps best applied to the category of Goodness when it has become religious; the epithet 'numinous' is especially applicable to our æsthetic judgment become religious; our judgment of Truth, when raised to the Divine, may perhaps be called the Infinite (expressed in such terms as Omniscience, Omnipresence, Omnipotence).

It may be said: 'Well, after all, you *do* posit a special and underivable "religious sense" to raise the categories to the Divine.' Certainly, and this remains the immense value of Professor Otto's work; the religious sense *is* unique and independent; only we maintain that it does not work through one category only.

It may perhaps be felt that all this is too complicated to account for anything so spontaneous and immediate as an act of worship. But it must be remembered that we do not worship with parts of ourselves. A sudden and overwhelming sense of God's goodness and greatness may be the result of a complex process, the mind groping after His infinity, the conscience recognising His 'awful purity,' the feelings awe-struck before His sublimity. Apparently simple actions may on analysis prove to be made up of various constituent elements.

(c) *The Nature of Worship.*

We have suggested that worship is not to be defined simply as sense of the Numinous; we have argued that all the attributes

of God (and not merely one attribute) are clouded in mystery, but we have not attempted to deny Professor Otto's main contention that mystery lies at the heart of worship. To proceed further, we must ask what is the nature of mystery and what possible attitudes man may take up towards it.

A fact does not become a mystery simply because it is unknown; an insoluble mathematical problem or an historical event, that cannot now be reconstructed, is not necessarily mysterious; it depends upon our response to them whether they become mysterious. Without seeking to refine too minutely, we may say that there are four possible attitudes when we are face to face with the unknown.

First, there is sheer indifference; for example, I do not know the details of every conversation that went on at all the breakfast-tables of England on August 2nd, 1603; I do not know what every lion in Africa is doing at the present moment, and I do not want to know.

Secondly, I may feel curiosity; I read a detective-story and I am eager to know the solution. The fact that no solution is certain (as in *Edwin Drood*) may stimulate my interest; it is even possible to be curious about what we are sure can never be known. Thus (in spite of St. Augustine's warning) I may want to know what God was doing before the creation of the world.

Thirdly, I may feel irritation at being baffled; I may resent the limits imposed on my intelligence; it was to this feeling that Mephistopheles used to tempt Faust.

Lastly, I may feel wonder; a sense of the greatness of the universe and the smallness of the human mind may sweep soothingly over me and I may feel glad there are mysteries I cannot penetrate. Such a sense is very near Religion, which longs for mysteries, as we may see in such famous phrases as 'Credo quia impossibile,' or 'Un Dieu défini, c'est un Dieu fini.'

We should notice that all these attitudes of mind are possible (at least in theory) towards any fact. An historian might feel intensely curious to know every event that happened in his period, and long to have been there, omnipresent and omniscient; he might feel irritated that so much of the past is gone beyond recall, or he might feel a sense of awe and wonder (as Carlyle often does) that all these fleeting events, so important while they happened, are swallowed up in irrecoverable night. But the sense of wonder is far stronger when the unknown seems to be discontinuous with the known, and 'unearthly'; ghost-stories fascinate because they seem to give us glimpses of a world other than our own. If we analyse the sense of mystery that accompanies the long flow of the ages, when we cast our minds back along the time-process and can rest in no beginning, we shall find, I think, that it is not

the mere continuity of the series that impresses us; that causes weariness rather than wonder; it is a feeling of the strange events that may have filled the æons before the earth broke off from the sun. The sense is one of unfamiliarity—of 'moving about in worlds not realised.' The unknown has become the unknowable.[1]

Now Professor Otto is perfectly right in maintaining (and it is the important teaching of his great work) that the process by which this wonder becomes religious is unique; the sense of fear and astonishment before the greatness or strangeness of the universe is not yet religious; it needs the direct and irreducible experience of personal relationship to become worship.

But religious mystery has close analogies with 'the sense of greatness and strangeness' such as we get in our experience of the Sublime; for instance, both have the double aspect of being 'daunting and yet attractive' (*tremendum sed fascinans*); we have seen this in lower forms in the curiosity that is whetted by the fact that no solution seems possible, and in the ghost-story at which we shudder and yet enjoy the shudder. This double aspect is also present in the highest forms of worship. To illustrate this let us examine two cases of religious mystery—Miracle and the Sacramental doctrine of the Real Presence.

We said that in passing the frontier where the known fades off into the unknown there is always a thrill of mystery; when there seems complete discontinuity and the event appears to come from an unknowable sphere quite outside our experience, we regard it as a portent or prodigy; it is not yet religious; we regard it with dread rather than reverence. We have no religious interest in the unexpected incursion into our world from some totally disconnected sphere of Poltergeists or Elementals; if the prodigy is to become a miracle, there must be continuity, at least in the sense that the Author of the miracle is also the Author of the 'natural' order. This may be expressed by saying that a real miracle must have two moments—the negative moment of bewilderment and sheer 'otherness,' and a positive moment of acceptance, in which the miracle is seen to have connections with the Natural and even perhaps to shed light upon it.[2] Whether the two moments are simultaneous or successive, they are held together in a kind of tension.[3] The true miracle,

[1] Unknowable, that is, to the imagination: whether the *intellect* can acquiesce in an 'unknowable' is another question.

[2] We must not draw hard-and-fast lines between natural and supernatural; the 'habitual' and the 'strange' make a better contrast; a natural fact like a sunset may suddenly appear strange and wonderful; a supernatural fact like Sacramental Grace may to the dulled senses appear a 'matter of course.'

[3] These two moments do not quite correspond to Otto's two epithets of 'daunting and attractive'; for him the attractiveness is due to the very strangeness; we are suggesting that it is partly due to a sense of kinship.

therefore, has two sides; it appears to violate the order of Nature and yet to illuminate by enlarging it. It seems at once to outrage law and yet to complete it by a higher law. This is why we reject fantastic prodigies as arbitrary, not because they break a law of uniformity (God is bound by no law but that of His Love), but because they serve no purpose we can worthily ascribe to Him; our Lord rejected the devil's suggestion to throw Himself from the Temple as being no real 'proof' of His Messianic claim.

All the miracles of the Incarnate Life have these characteristics. They are beyond the natural and yet tend to illuminate the natural. The miraculous Birth consecrates and sheds light upon all other births; in seeing Christ as more than man we see ourselves as less than man should be. The Resurrection does not undo the law of death; it gives a new meaning to death as the gate to life everlasting. Our Lord's miracles of healing do not supersede the physician's art; rather they deepen and intensify our conception of the Christian practitioner. We can perhaps make this point more intelligible by a simile Let us imagine a dark dingy street suddenly lit up by the glory of the setting sun; at first our eyes are dazzled; as they grow accustomed to the splendour, the familiar shapes emerge, but they emerge transformed. They stand vested in a radiance not their own, clothed with that strange yet beautiful appearance of unfamiliarity that the evening light can give to the commonest scene. So the sense of miracle first seems to swallow up the familiar and then gives it back to us glorified and lifted up into a higher setting. By a new spiritual perspective we see things against a wider background. So for the Jews, against the fires of Sinai, always present to the mind of prophet and psalmist, Nature itself stands out in a new significance; the trees become 'the cedars of Libanus which he hath planted'; the sea is a rich treasure-house full of His marvels: 'There go the ships, and there is that Leviathan: which thou hast made to take his pastime therein.' So to our Lord the birds and the flowers and the children He loved gain fresh individuality and a more tender outline from the dark cloud of judgment that overhangs His doomed fatherland. The mysterious, that lies beyond, makes the familiar seem new and wonderful.[1]

[1] Otto in a very striking chapter shows how in the concluding chapters of Job it is the strangeness and wonder of Creation—not its purpose but almost its purposelessness—which speaks to Job of God's Presence. This is, of course, true. I say 'of course,' but it has never been more deeply scrutinised or more impressively stated than by Otto himself; it is a wonderful piece of Biblical exegesis. All the same it is not complete Otherness that Job feels, but rather the otherness of the familiar; he does not seek to express the terror and wonder of God by every kind of bizarre and eccentric simile, as is done in the extract from *Bhagavad-Gītā* quoted by Otto in Appendix II; he finds it in the rain and the snow, the ostrich and the war-horse.

Our second example of religious mystery brings us nearer to the question of worship. All the controversies about the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist really turn on these two moments in the miraculous: the negative moment seems to deny the natural and gives us a 'special' presence, wholly supernatural, breaking in upon our world at fixed places and times; the positive moment, when we receive back the natural, transformed, seems to give us an Omnipresence of Christ, continual, abiding, always and everywhere at the heart of the natural, needing no localised sanctuary or cult.

But, again, it is in the tension of the two moments that the sacred mystery resides. Professor Otto in the 8th Appendix (pp. 219, 220) has a magnificent passage of protest against the denial of 'special presences' and in defence of God's Presence as a wholly numinous idea.

> We may well be asked . . . Is not God 'omnipresent' and really present always and everywhere? . . . One is tempted to venture a very blunt reply. . . . This doctrine of the omnipresence of God—as though by a necessity of His being He must be bound to every time and to every place, like a natural force pervading space—is a frigid invention of metaphysical speculation, entirely without religious import. Scripture knows nothing of it. Scripture knows . . . only the God who is where He wills to be, and is not where He wills not to be, the 'deus mobilis,' who is no mere universally extended being, but an august mystery, that comes and goes, approaches and withdraws, has its time and hour, and may be far or near in infinite degrees, 'closer than breathing' to us or miles remote from us. The hours of His 'visitation' and his 'return' are rare and solemn occasions, different essentially not only from the profane life of every day, but also from the calm confiding mood of the believer, whose trust is to live ever before the face of God. They are the topmost summits in the life of the Spirit. . . . They are the real sacrament, in comparison with which all high, official ceremonials, Masses, and rituals the world over become the figurings of a child.

That is finely said and expresses so excellently what the Sacramentalist is always trying to point out to the anti-Sacramentalist, who objects that 'God is everywhere,' that it seems ungracious to criticise it. But the closing sentence warns the Catholic that Otto is allowing the 'abruptness' of his reply to carry him too far, and is over-stressing the negative moment of Otherness in the tension of the mystery. He admits it in the phrase where he speaks of 'the calm confiding mood of the believer, whose trust'—quite apart from the special visitations—'is to

live ever before the face of God.' There is then a continual Presence of God side by side with the hours of visitation and return.

Certainly Professor Otto is splendidly right in his protest against the idea of God as a 'natural force pervading space.' Certainly 'God is where He wills to be, and is not where He wills not to be,' but that is hardly the point at issue here. The contrast is between the special visitations of God, rare and incalculable, and Christ's promise to dwell ever in the heart of the true believer. Our devotional life is not lived on the 'topmost summits'; we kneel down to say our prayers regularly and confidently, sure of His promise to hear, whether or no He vouchsafe some special consciousness of His Presence.

This is where the Real Presence in the Sacrament comes in; just as, in the case of a miracle, the supernatural revelation of God's Presence beyond Nature shows us His Presence in Nature, so we pass from meeting Him in the Sacrament to meeting Him in the street.

The Sacrament is the link between the special and incalculable hours of visitation and 'the calm confidence' of everyday life. Through the natural signs and actions there breaks the supernatural Presence of Christ, and henceforth natural life is transfigured by the light from beyond, that streams down upon it. It is because Otto isolates the rare visitations from natural life that he misses the meaning of the Sacraments, which are supernatural but not incalculable, moments that are special but not rare.[1]

The Sacrament of the Eucharist lifts us up to heaven; joining in the worship of the angels and archangels, we ascend in spirit to that sphere where God is fully present, and which we call heaven. Yet the earthly signs and veils are not lost; the heavenly glory shines down upon them and illumines our darkness, as far as it can penetrate.[2] Thus we speak sometimes of our service being exalted to the Heavenly Altar, and sometimes of Christ descending upon our altars. Both moments are necessary; we start with the natural bread and wine, the words, the appointed minister. Then, as we offer them, they are lost (as it were) in the heavenly reality, compared with which they seem but dreams and shadows. Then comes the positive moment; they

[1] Also, of course, his description of the visitations is purely individualistic; he pictures them as visions on the mountain-top; Sacraments are visitations to a Society—the Body of Christ.

[2] Cf. the opening of the *Paradiso*:

> La gloria di Colui, che tutto muove,
> Per l'universo penetra, e risplende
> In una parte piu e meno altrove;
> In ciel, che piu della sua luce prende,
> Fu io.

are given back to us transfigured, charged, as far as earthly things can be charged, with the glory of Christ for our worship and our food. We sing to Him who sitteth on the right hand of the Father, yet we pray that He may 'dwell in us.'

All worship follows the law of this its highest expression. We start from the natural; we come to God with what we have. We do not begin by casting from us all the familiar surroundings of life; we do not take a leap straight into the wholly Other. We approach the altar with our definite petitions, our orderly liturgy, our meditations on Scripture, even our reasoned discourses and sermons. We offer up the whole of our personality, and the fire descends on the offering.

There is in worship (I speak, of course, of ideal worship) the negative moment—what Otto calls the sense of the Numinous. Our words quiver into silence; our thoughts lose themselves in infinity; our feelings tremble before the formless; our righteousness becomes uncleanness. Before the greatness of God we are nothing.

But in true Christian worship there is the positive moment also. Our human means of approach are given back to us transformed; Christ, True Man, by virtue of His Incarnation perfects and presents to the Father our poor, imperfect worship. Our words, our prayers, our actions are accepted 'in the Beloved.' But they are given back to us consecrated and enlarged. Our thoughts still have the quality of mystery behind and beyond them; we can praise God 'with the understanding' (as in Addison's Creation hymn), but we know that the theme is too high for us. We repeat over to ourselves the 'evidences' of His Love and Goodness but we know that they far transcend 'our benumbed conceiving'; we express our emotion at His Beauty and Greatness, but we know that we only hear a whisper of His Ways.

True Christian worship, then, is neither a formless ecstasy nor a dry 'parade-service,' but a consecration of all our faculties to His Glory.[1]

[1] It may be well to sum up here some of the different senses in which the word worship is used. Worship is the joyous abasement of our whole selves before the Divine Mystery as the source and sustainer of our lives (or more shortly, if less accurately, it is 'a religious attitude towards mystery'). In its negative form it is like Otto's sense of the Numinous (we refused to regard it as a separate faculty, but we admitted it as the 'moment of bewilderment' in worship); in its positive form it consists of the offering of all our faculties to God's service. (Public worship is also the corporate offering of the Church.) There are parts of Public Services (*e.g.* the sermon, some lessons and some psalms) which do not at first sight seem to be worship proper. But it is a matter of degree; in so far as any action is consciously done to the glory of God it is worship. We use the word in the more special sense of those parts of the service (*e.g.* the *Sanctus*) where the human side seems to fade away, where definite petition and thanksgiving are hushed, and we praise God for what He is.

(d) *The Art of public Worship.*

We have dwelt long enough on the psychology of worship; it is time we turned to its outward expression. We shall consider it in relation to three faculties of the soul—the æsthetic sense, the moral sense and the understanding. We shall then add a few words on the 'corporate sense' in worship.

(1) *The Æsthetic Sense—Worship and Drama.*—No taunt is more commonly directed against elaborately ornate services than the word 'theatrical.' 'Well, how did you enjoy it?' said a friend to a theatrical manager, who had just attended High Mass. 'Very well put on,' was his answer. 'Mummery,' 'play-acting,' 'posturing,' 'dressing-up'—such are the words that rise to the lips of a Puritan as he sees acolytes in lace cottas, censings, and genuflections.

Yet such is the varied suggestion of words that people who would shrink from anything theatrical in worship would not feel the same repulsion towards it if it were called dramatic, and would not be in the least offended if the narrative of the Passion were called a tragedy. After all, the connection between drama and worship is an old one. The Greek play was (in theory at least) a religious art; the altar smoked in the orchestra, and the High Priest of Dionysus presided on his throne. People who see the Mystery Play at Ober-Ammergau experience feelings very akin to worship. If there are movements on the stage by which the actors express a sense of solemnity and awe, they are surely the right movements for the public representatives of religion as they approach the altar; what Newman called 'the sacred dance of the ministers' at High Mass is more right, because more natural, than a general shuffle about anyhow of clergy and choir. After all, both drama and worship have reference to life; if the dramatic or the ceremonial gesture is unnatural, it must be not because it is art but because it is bad art.

Still it is clear there must be some point in our instinctive dislike of the theatrical; we shall find it perhaps in our feeling that the actor is 'insincere' and that the audience are only there to be 'entertained.'

We use the word 'acting' as a synonym for deceit; our Lord called the Pharisees ὑποκριταί, and the word perhaps meant 'play-actors'; the psychology of acting has been the subject of prolonged controversy. The popular view is that a great actor so completely identifies himself with his part that for the moment he *is* that person. Plato felt this so strongly that he forbade his citizens to act from fear of undermining the stability of their character. Diderot, on the other hand, maintained that the actor must always remain outside his part; otherwise he would be swept along by his emotions and lose the self-control which is

necessary to produce the right effect; and there have been actors who have told us they were so detached at moments of tragic tension that they have been trying to make one another laugh.

However that may be, it seems very unlikely that the impersonation of a part, however deeply felt, has a very profound effect on character. The very diversity of rôles makes it improbable; the same man cannot become simultaneously like Hamlet, Macbeth and Othello.

No one wishes the priest or the acolyte to feel only the 'sincerity' of the actor, however intense it may be at the moment. But we should recall here what was said about the suggestive element in worship; the mere doing of a certain thing tends, as we know, to create the appropriate feeling; there is nothing suspicious in the suggestive as such; it is not its source but its effect on character that matters; in the case of the actor the feelings are suggested with a view to pleasing the audience, and therefore disappear when he has gone home. In the case of the priest, the feelings are excited to please God, who requires them as a permanent state of mind and sees through all vain pretence. A priest who has his eye on the congregation may act a part; a priest who has his gaze fixed on God can only act in the high sense of being aroused by the dignity of his office and the solemnity of his surroundings to a worthier and holier state of mind.

We pass to the second point. The audience at a theatre are there to be 'entertained'; no one would say that a congregation comes to church for that. Yet, here again, the distinction is by no means as simple as it sounds. An audience does play an important part; the actor needs the stimulus of their applause and admiration; as we say, he has 'to get it across the footlights.' At great moments of dramatic and tragic tension the audience cease to be mere casual onlookers who have paid for their seats; they are one with the actors; they are taken out of themselves; they participate in the drama.

Whether such emotions have a real moral effect is, of course, another subject of controversy. Do the audience leave the performance of a great tragedy 'sadder but wiser men'? Do they learn from immoral drama to despise the moral law? Some would say that great drama gives a new sense of the greatness and wonder of life. Others would say that the appeal of drama is æsthetic rather than moral. A gallery of scoundrels is the first to hiss a villain, and people who show ecstatic admiration for some act of self-sacrifice on the stage will go off home and spend the evening squabbling as usual.

However that may be, there is no doubt that the relation between priest and people in worship must be a far closer one;

the minister is the representative of the people; he acts for them and they participate in what he does. This need not be pressed too literally; it is a peculiarly Anglican idea that a person must scrupulously follow the whole service. There is no need for the regimental idea that everybody must be doing the same thing at the same time. The people may say their private devotions, provided they join in the more corporate parts of the service, but the priest must feel that the people are behind him spiritually as well as physically. Here again we must stress the suggestive or evocative side of worship; the priest, the chosen trained, ordained representative, leads or directs the worship, expressing by virtue of his vocation what the people feel vaguely but cannot themselves express. Behind this there is the Liturgy, which is the voice of the Church, expressing what neither priest nor people are able adequately to express; behind all there is Christ, who perfects and presents the worship of His people to the Father.[1]

We may conclude then that worship is religious drama, a full expression and satisfaction of the æsthetic instincts. It requires (just because it is religious and done in the sight of God) a complete sincerity and, because of that, an intimate union between the worshippers and their representatives. But worship is obviously much more than that; for one thing, it is obligatory on Christians. We are not compelled to go to the theatre, and though we might hold that it is a duty to educate our æsthetic instincts, we could hardly hold either that a person who seems to have none was therefore dispensed from attendance at public services, or that forms of worship which make no appeal to the æsthetic instinct are not worship at all.

Again, we do not go to the same play week after week, but public worship has a certain uniformity; the most ardent champions of variety would hardly say that we ought to have a totally different form of service every Sunday; it is clear then that there are other elements in worship to which we must now turn.[2]

(2) *The Moral Sense—Worship and Teaching.*—The suggestive element in worship offers an analogy with teaching, and we often speak of public services as teaching by the eye or the ear. Worship teaches truth (we are to consider that later); it trains the æsthetic sense, as we have already seen; here we are to

[1] I feel that I have been stressing too much the tragic or solemn side of worship. It is evident that praise, thanksgiving, holy joy and peace also find their place in worship. They form as it were the lyrical element in it. Possibly we might even say that a certain spontaneity and 'high-spirits,' a certain natural enjoyment of the colour and movement and singing, correspond to the best element in comedy—namely, its sense of freedom and 'release.'

[2] Completely *ex tempore* services like Quaker meetings afford no parallel here; the proper parallel to drama would be to suppose that services were composed and had a run till they were taken off!

consider it as teaching morality, that is, as 'edifying.' It is a peculiarly English trait to over-stress the moral side of religion, as though it meant simply 'being good.' We are always trying to find moral lessons, and one can understand Otto's vehement protest that worship has nothing to do with morality, but is a unique sense of God's overwhelming greatness. Doubtless it is unnatural to expect a saint rising from rapt communion with God to take out a copy-book and write down what he has learned. But if we remember that, for the Christian, morality—that much-battered word—does not mean the Law or the Commandments, but personal relationship to a loving Saviour; if we remind ourselves that religion does not 'tinge morality with emotion,' but transfigures and transforms it, we shall see that worship *is* directed towards God's goodness and excites a desire to be perfect as our Father is perfect.

There are two ways in which in public worship this aspiration after divine goodness (with a due sense of the mystery at the heart of it) finds expression.

First of all there is the reading of the Scriptures (the Epistle and Gospel at the Eucharist, the Lessons in the Offices, and sermons and addresses on Biblical themes); this culminates in the reading of the Gospel, generally attended by special ceremonial, when the sayings and doings of our Lord are placed before us for our meditation. It is right that in the Divine Liturgy this should be the other central event, only second to the Consecration; Jesus in the Sacrament is the same as Jesus in the Gospel. We want the picture we have of Him in the days of His flesh to be set side by side with our Sacramental experience of Him. The visions of the saints, the hymns of the people, the legends of painting and devotion, the instructions of our manuals and catechisms—all have to be brought to the same relentless test. Are they like that knowledge of Him which we have in the record of the Evangelists?

Adoration of divine goodness involves mystery; behind every real and vivid personality there lies something mysterious; still more do we find it in the way one personality affects another. The way in which a great leader pours out from himself a power that is infectious remains the most potent method by which the world makes any moral progress. There is hardly any advance that cannot be traced to some such imposing figure; the personality of Jesus (so far more mysterious in its nature and in its power over others) has in its purest form this converting influence. Men as they adore His Holy Cross are broken-hearted and changed. Worship of Christ crucified teaches men something of the mystery of holiness.

There is another way in which public worship teaches goodness; it helps us to love our neighbour by teaching us to venerate

and love the society of the Holy Church to which we belong. The Liturgy keeps this before us by its intercessions for the Church on earth and by kindling our sense of fellowship in worship with the Church expectant in Paradise and the Church triumphant in heaven. It tells us of the communion of saints; it tells us to pray for the faithful departed; it assures us that the saints pray for us and mingle their petitions with our own. This is the importance of the historical element in liturgies; to use the same words and actions as are being used and have long been used all the world over gives a Catholic atmosphere to worship and strengthens the sense of loyalty to the beloved Society which is Christ's mystical Body; this is why religious ceremonial and rites are often so doggedly conservative, and why the study of liturgies seems rather like a branch of archæology. Prayer Book revisers and others do well to remember that, if public services ought to respond to the needs of the present, they must always owe much of their effect to old associations; who would wish to see cut out of the Eastern Liturgy the cry 'Close the doors,' which carries us back to the secret Eucharist in the infant Church?

Worship takes the social side of man and invests it with mystery. We are drawn together by the 'mystery of the fellowship.' It is also true (though the subject is too vast for us to enter upon now) that the religious sense charges moral failure with a new significance, so that it becomes a consciousness of *sin*. Otto says that the notion of uncleanness, which attaches itself to the notion of sin, is wholly numinous and has no direct moral significance. Certainly wrongdoing gets a new depth of meaning, when set against the holiness of God; an offence against infinite Love seems infinitely hateful. In the 'negative moment' of repentance the sinner feels despair and horror of himself; in the positive moment he feels reconciled. Forms of confession in our public services are helpful both because they aid us to realise sin as an offence against the fellowship of believers, and partly because they enable the Church as a body to confess its 'corporate sin.'

(3) *The Understanding and its place in Worship.*—The phrase 'corporate sin' may perhaps suggest an objection to the whole method of discussion in the last two sections; it may be said: 'You have been dealing with the whole devotional life—Bible-study, Conversion, Confession, Intercession—have these any special connection with public worship? Do they not belong equally to private piety?' We shall try to show in a moment how far worship, as being closely related to the 'corporate sense,' can be differentiated from private prayer; meanwhile we may note that some spiritual faculties seem best exercised when we are acting together with others; some seem to fit in better with less public surroundings. Thus the æsthetic element

is easily excited in a body of people (crowds being very subject to the suggestion of what is impressive and mysterious); the moral element is rather different; the sense of brotherhood is much enhanced by corporate worship, but repentance and confession are more natural in our rooms, or in the confessional, than in the course of our public services.

When we come to the part played by the understanding, it seems to be less prominent in gatherings of men; we think of the saintly scholar sitting alone in his study, not amid the tumult of debate and contradiction. Nevertheless, we say Masses of the Holy Spirit and sing the *Veni Creator* before our Conferences and Councils, invoking His blessing on our preparations to think together.

> Enable with perpetual light
> The dulness of our blinded sight.

We should hesitate, probably, to call even the most Christian discussion in an assembly an act of public worship, and we should feel that the prayers for the guidance of the Holy Spirit bear their fruit afterwards in the study or the council-chamber rather than during the Liturgy itself.

Yet perhaps we may trace even there some signs of the work of the understanding; we may take two points—(1) a sense of contact with Reality; (2) a demand for a certain coherence and rationality.

(1) Worship is far more than a pageant stimulating our instincts of appreciation, or a presentation under symbolic forms of an ideal which ought to be true. It is nothing if not a way by which the soul passes up to the highest Reality. It must have an object completely independent of itself and separate from its own feelings and fads, moods and caprices (hence the great stress in Catholic worship on the objective validity of the Sacraments); worship is, in part, the homage paid by our finite and fallible understanding to the Supreme Mind. We recognise that there is far more in the Divine than we can grasp, and believe where we cannot understand. The act of faith is directed towards facts tested and found true, and yet it sees through them the mysterious meaning behind. Thus, in the corporate act of faith, by which we say the Creeds together, we not only assent to such concrete facts as the Crucifixion and the Resurrection on the third day; we also assent to an interpretation of those facts, which carries us beyond into a spiritual world; He died on the Cross 'for us'; He rose again 'according to the Scriptures.'

(2) The understanding has another part to play, and that is to keep the expression of worship free from superstition, *i.e.* from unworthy, unedifying, incoherent elements. It holds up a certain ideal of Rationality. Mr. Shebbeare, in the last page of his book on *Problems of Providence*, well illustrates the meaning of an 'ideal of rationality.' He says:

> If a man should begin—on his death-bed or elsewhere—to find the struggle of belief too hard for him, it would be well if someone asked him plainly, What is it you fear? Do you fear that you will encounter Charon and the ferry, the Cocytuses and Styxes of pagan mythology? Do you fear, like Dostoievsky's madman, that the life beyond the grave may turn out to be something not sublime but mean, 'a small room, a bathroom, blackened by smoke and spiders in every corner'? If the sufferer has retained his sanity, he will laugh and say, 'Such things would fail to satisfy the conception, on which I have all along relied, of a rationally ordered Universe.'

It is obvious that Reason has had a hard battle in eliminating from primitive legend and rite many an irrational conception.[1] St. Paul desires to pray with the Spirit and with the understanding also (1 Cor. xiv. 15). A worthy Liturgy would seek to remove or harmonise statements about God that seemed to clash; for example, that He is perfect Love and that He desires vengeance on His enemies. This will very often mean a conflict with traditional elements; because, as a result of striving to keep up the sense of the continuous life of the community, our forms of service often preserve different strata of thought and language about spiritual things, the lower embedded in the higher. But where two attributes of God seem to us to be contrary, where we know each is true but do not see how both can be real attributes, it would be pedantry to criticise liturgical language. Thus in the Collect for Septuagesima, we pray that 'we, who are *justly punished* for our offences, may be *mercifully delivered* by thy goodness'; a precisian might ask whether God's forgiveness of sin is 'unjust,' and His punishment of sin 'unmerciful.' To this we can only reply that if we are to wait for our forms of public service till we can find language adequate to the mystery of God's Being, we had better adopt silent worship at once.

(4) *Worship and the Corporate Sense.*—We have left to the end what we have had to mention again and again, the nature of public worship as being in its essence a corporate act.

We must carefully remember what a long ladder of degrees runs between purely personal devotion and the fully corporate act, in which the worshipping multitude is of one heart and soul; nor at either end is it easy to find the pure and unmixed type; the most 'private' devotions should not be forgetful of the needs of the world and the fellowship of the Church, while in the most 'public' service the individual does not lose himself;

[1] Sometimes such primitive survivals are better dropped; sometimes they can be left as of historical interest in showing the development of the religious consciousness; sometimes they can be sublimated by allegory or mystical interpretation (cf. the controversy about the use or disuse of the Imprecatory Psalms).

he plays his part, and it is never quite the same as his neighbour's. Between these two extremes there are many stages, in which the presence of other people exerts its influence upon us. If three or four people say their prayers together, even if they say them quietly, it is never quite the same as if they were saying them in different rooms; even if they do not say or do the same thing, a *fellowship of silence is created.*

We are all familiar with the fact that people under the influence of the corporate sense 'behave differently'; they do not do the same things as they would have done if alone; sometimes they do much worse things; mobs are often more stupid and more cruel than individuals. Only if Christian people come together in the Spirit can we trust that a right corporate sense will emerge.[1] This is important, because we do not want to slip into magical or superstitious ways of thinking about this matter, as though, whenever we come together in sufficient numbers, we have this inspiring sense of fellowship guaranteed to us. It is true that, from a true corporate sense, each of us gets more than he gives; he receives from the community an enlarged and heightened sense of power, but each of us has to give first. Only on souls offering themselves and striving to do what they can does the Spirit of Christ's Body descend. Even a few people who are not doing their best can spoil the atmosphere.

The corporate sense is liberating, not because it destroys the self, but because it overcomes self-consciousness, and does away with our cramped and limited way of regarding individuality. So the spirit of a regiment gives courage and steadiness to the timorous. So, in a choir, people, who would never dare to stand up and sing solos, catch confidence from the mass of voices which sustains them. So, in a moment of great national joy, shyness disappears; the barriers between one person and another go down, and even in railway-carriages, travellers talk to each other! In public worship the same sense (now charged with the religious mystery of the Holy Fellowship, in which quick and dead are one in Christ) inspires and uplifts each worshipper; the sense of awe is heightened by the sacred drama seen and shared in by all together; love of the brethren is kindled by the sense of the Church made visible in ceremonial and audible in the ancient liturgies; apprehension of the mysteries of faith is made more courageous when the creeds are said by all.[2]

[1] From this it follows that, if a Church is really divided, it cannot worship together; hence the primitive horror of heresy as dividing the fellowship and hence the insistence of the Church that even the most gifted of its children must not despise the gathering together.

[2] Cf. Carlyle's quotation from Novalis in *Sartor Resartus:* 'My belief gains quite infinitely the moment I can convince another mind thereof.' From this point of view there is much to be said for the corporate recitation of the creed ('*We* believe').

By what special means then does worship excite the corporate sense? The most obvious way is by making people do things together; this does not mean that the service is all chorus; the use of versicle and response teaches us that a true service is neither a mumbled sacerdotal solo nor a hearty congregational community-singing, but a well-constructed drama, in which priest and people have their parts.

This doing and saying things together creates a certain rhythm, expressed sometimes by dignified movement, as in a procession, sometimes by the prose-pattern of the Collects (quite different from the pattern of private prayers). This is naturally accompanied by music, one of the quickest awakeners of the corporate consciousness.[1]

We have seen already how important is the historical element in liturgy; we are interested in drama written long ago because it is of the past; the local colour and the 'taste of the age' are a refreshing change from the present, but the Church claims a far closer intimacy than exists in any human society. Its Gospel and Canon have no archæological flavour; they are not old-fashioned or out of date. They belong to a Church which is never old, against which the gates of hell do not prevail.

Finally, we may say that public worship stimulates the corporate sense by turning our thoughts away from personal concerns to great public issues. There is a side of our religious life which is intimately private, a secret between our souls and God; but there are times when we want to forget ourselves in a larger whole: it is to this need that worship ministers, directing our minds towards the Glory of God and the welfare of His Church.

[1] This is not true of all music: some suggests reverie and solitude, but marching songs, favourite hymns, tunes with a history all help to create the common feeling.

WORSHIP IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

By W. O. E. OESTERLEY

1. *The Background of other Religions.*

MAN, from the time that he first began to be capable of thinking, experienced the conviction that supernatural beings existed who were possessed of greater power than himself. With the origin of this conviction we are not here concerned. But it is necessary to emphasise the fact that, whatever conceptions regarding them may have arisen in course of time, the mystical element, the sense of awe, inspired by the mysteriousness and unaccountability of their existence and power, played a dominant part in every age. These supernatural beings included two categories: (1) those whose existence was taken for granted and whose origin was not inquired into, and (2) the spirits of those who had once lived on earth as men.

It is obviously impossible for men to believe in the existence of such supernatural beings without formulating some ideas as to the relationship between themselves and them. Many things happened in the world of nature surrounding them which uncultured men could only attribute to the action of supernatural beings. These things affected men in many ways, sometimes very closely; therefore contact in one way or another with those who were believed to bring about these occurrences was vitally necessary; for by getting into touch with the authors there was the possibility of influencing them to act, or to refrain from acting, in regard to things which were either beneficial or detrimental to men.

It cannot be too strongly emphasised that uncultured man, in his dealings with these supernatural powers, thought and acted on the analogy of himself.

The desire for contact with supernatural beings was, therefore, inspired for two reasons: (1) for gaining their favour and thus inclining them to act favourably, and (2) to avert or appease their anger which for one reason or another might be aroused. The means for the one or the other would, naturally enough, be similar to those which would obtain among men for like purposes, viz. a gift. But clearly, even in this early stage, a certain difference of motive is observable, since a gift to obtain favour

has a positive purpose, that of pleasing, while a gift to avert wrath is of a more negative nature, the object being to prevent its results; so that one can already discern the germs of the later ideas of propitiatory and piacular sacrifices.

So far, then, it is not difficult to follow the reasoning processes of uncultured man regarding his attitude towards and relationship with these supernatural powers. But the ways of thought of early man are not always what appear to us as logical. There are some other elements to be considered in this relationship which belong to the background of worship, quite apart from the mystical element already referred to.

The institution of Totemism was, and is, very widespread among the races of mankind in their infancy and childhood. Totemism [1] is the name given to a form of society in which the members of a clan believe themselves to be descended from some animal or plant, mostly the former; kinship is, therefore, held to exist not only between the members of a clan and their animal-ancestor, but also between them and every animal of his kind; the clan takes its name from the animal in question. The totem-animal is sacred, and is therefore never harmed; only on very special occasions is it killed and eaten, and this is done by members of the clan for the purpose of getting into close touch with the divine ancestor. On such occasions the totem-animal is partaken of at a sacred meal, at which the divine ancestor is supposed to be present; and because kinship is believed to exist between the divine ancestor, the totem-animal, and the members of the clan, this sacramental partaking of the sacred animal is held to effect a union between the members of the clan and their divine ancestor. Originally this proceeding was intended to emphasise and cement kinship; and though the mystical element was obviously present, it was largely utilitarian, for by partaking of the sacred animal in which the divine ancestor was immanent the members of the clan believed that they assimilated his nature, much in the same way that a cannibal, by eating a slain enemy, felt that he absorbed his courage or strength.

Thus, we must recognise that in the religion—by which we mean the establishing and keeping up of a relationship between men and a supernatural being—of early man there were two means whereby contact between the natural man and supernatural powers was brought about; viz. by means of offering a gift and by means of partaking of a sacred animal.

We fully realise that arising from what has been said some difficult questions suggest themselves; but it is impossible to go into these without a discussion of the earlier history of the two rites mentioned, and that is out of the question here. We take as our starting-point the fact, the undisputed fact, that sacrifice,

[1] The name is of North American Indian origin.

which lies at the base of worship, has a twofold origin, and this is to be sought in the two rites mentioned. It only needs to be added that in their origin these two rites can only be looked upon as acts of worship in a modified sense; they developed into these; originally they were mainly utilitarian. They were not, as originally celebrated, intended to honour the spirit or the divine ancestor; their object was merely to obtain some benefit or to avert some harm. We desire to emphasise this, though fully aware that it is stoutly denied by some, because in the first place it explains the utilitarian element which emerges so prominently in the later history of sacrifice, and also because it illustrates the truth that divine revelation proceeds from very humble beginnings; and this, again, is but a signal proof of the love of God, who only reveals Himself to man in accordance with man's capacity of apprehension.

2. *Sacrifices in the Old Testament.*

The Hebrews, as we meet with them in the Old Testament, had reached a relatively high stage of culture even in the earliest stage of their history as we know it; therefore we must expect to find developed ideas regarding sacrifice; but, as will be seen, the more primitive ideas still persisted. Again, it must be remembered that, in using the word 'sacrifice' as commonly understood, we are using a term which by no means always corresponds with Hebrew terminology. We shall make this clear as we proceed.

The history of what we call the sacrificial system of the Old Testament may be divided into three periods; these must be very briefly surveyed.

(i) The first is the *nomadic* period, of which we have not many *data*, but sufficient to give a clear insight into what obtained regarding sacrifices. There was only one kind of sacrifice (used in the ordinary sense in connection with killing an animal), the technical term for which was *Zebach*, which means 'slaughter,' in reference to an animal slain. The meaning, object and ritual of this sacrifice as given in the Old Testament are inadequate; they must be supplemented by details from extra-Biblical sources if we are to understand the *raison d'être* and significance of this earliest type of Hebrew sacrifice.

It is called *Pesach*, translated Passover, the associations of which in English do not, however, correspond in any way with the Hebrew name (on which see further, below, p. 42). The particular point of interest about this sacrifice is that in it are adumbrated both the gift-idea and the communion-idea; and not only so, but it contains the germ also of the two purposes of the gift, the propitiatory and the piacular. This will become clear as we proceed. *Pesach* was celebrated in the spring of the

year, and one of its objects was to offer to the deity the firstlings of flocks and herds; this was a propitiatory gift to the fertility deity to incline him [1] to look favourably upon the flocks and herds and to give them fertility. An equally important element in the celebration of the festival was the manner of offering the gift; the hands of the offerer were laid on the head of the animal, and the victim's blood was then poured out at the base of the altar; this blood-offering had the object of inducing the god to refrain from injuring his devotees; an echo of this is contained in Exod. xii. 23: '. . . and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you.' [2] The wrath of the god could be aroused in a variety of ways, primarily by not fulfilling the ritual in the proper way whether by carelessness or inadvertence. Thus in this sacrifice the twofold purpose attaching to the gift-idea, viz. the propitiatory and the piacular, is in evidence. But there was a further element in *Pesach*. The victim slain was partaken of at a sacrificial meal; this is where the communion-idea of sacrifice comes in. It is true that there is little, if any, direct indication in the Old Testament of the presence of the deity at the sacrificial meal or of the belief that partaking of the sacred victim effects union with the deity; but in the wider sphere of Semitic belief generally this is amply demonstrated, and there is no reason to suppose that early Hebrew belief should have differed in essentials from that of other Semites. It must also be remembered that the Old Testament records have been much worked over in the interests of later and more developed religious conceptions; so that it is hardly to be expected that the original ideas should all find expression. It can be shown that especially in regard to *Pesach* the original elements have to a considerable extent been obliterated by later developments.

Here we must pause to consider, in the briefest possible way, two intricate matters connected with this sacrifice, and indeed with all sacrifices of a similar type, but it is at this point that they first arise; namely, what is the significance of the pouring out of the blood of the victim, and wherein is the element of worship to be discerned?

First, as to the pouring out of the blood: in common with many peoples the Hebrews believed that the life or soul of both men and animals resided in the blood (Lev. xvii. 11–14; cf. Gen. ix. 4, Deut. xii. 23); so that when blood was poured out the life of the victim went with it. But, further, the study of such things as blood-relationship, the blood-covenant, and blood-revenge shows that there was a belief in a certain compelling

[1] Originally, so the present writer would maintain, a goddess.

[2] It is natural enough that by the time this passage was written a distinction was made between Yahweh and 'the destroyer'; but it is possible that originally the fertility deity and what is called 'the destroyer' were the same.

power connected with blood on account of the vital element in it, an element which was just as active after blood had left the body as it was before.[1] Therefore the blood poured out in sacrifice was not only the offering to the deity of the life of the victim, but it also had the effect of compelling the deity to give what was required.

In answer to the question as to wherein the element of worship is to be discerned we are confronted with the difficulty of defining what worship means; we realise the inadequacy of the definition, and that it raises further questions, but we must content ourselves with saying that by worship we mean giving play to the religious instinct. In the *Pesach* sacrifice the recognition of the deity, the belief that he could give what was wanted, and the celebration of the rite, *i.e.* the gift offered and the desire to be united with him, must all be regarded as acts of worship. Prayer in the sense of the word as we understand it had as yet no place; but inasmuch as the sacrifice was in some sense an appeal to the deity, it is possible to regard this as a form of prayer. On the other hand, the fact must not be lost sight of that the *Pesach* sacrifice was mainly of a utilitarian character. To draw the line between the elements of utilitarianism and worship here is a difficult task; to a semi-cultured people like the nomadic Hebrew the two were so inextricably intertwined that the idea of distinguishing between them did not arise. The general principle is well illustrated by what is said in Gen. xxviii. 20–22: 'And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace; then shall Yahweh be my God . . .' The acknowledgment of a deity, even though under conditions, would have been thought of as an act of worship. In the same way with regard to the communion meal; to absorb the deity is to semi-cultured man primarily utilitarian, since it is a means of obtaining divine protection; if a man has received that within himself which has imparted to him something of the divine essence, as he believes, then he is able to feel assured that he is preserved from harm by a protective armour, as it were. On the other hand, the cementing of kinship with the deity, the conviction of union with him, must be regarded as a primitive act of worship. At the same time, it must be granted that, so far as the *Pesach*, in its original form, is concerned, whether or not it can be thought of as an act of worship must depend upon what we really understand by worship. We are not thinking of the rite as it is represented in

[1] To explain the why and wherefore of these things would take us too far afield; see, *e.g.*, Trumbull, *The Blood Covenant* (1887); Strack, *Das Blut im Glauben und Aberglauben der Menschheit* (1900); Curtiss, *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day* (1902).

the Old Testament, that is quite obviously a greatly developed form of what it once was. When considered in the light of primitive sacrifice, as exemplified by nomadic Semites of the present day, one must recognise that a strong case can be made out in support of the contention that all sacrifices partook originally of the nature of magic rather than of religion. This is not to deny, however, the mystical element, for even magic partakes of that.

We have dealt at some length with the *Pesach* sacrifice, because it was by far the most important in nomadic times, seeing that the fertility of the flocks and herds was believed to be dependent upon it. But that it was not the only sacrifice of the *Zebach* type may be taken for granted. We have no *data* in the Old Testament about other sacrifices belonging to this early stage; but judging from the conditions of nomadic life among the Arabs and the customs which there is every reason to believe have been in vogue for *millennia*, we are justified in holding that the nomadic Hebrews celebrated rites similar to those which still obtain among present-day nomads in Syria and Arabia. It is, therefore, probable that on many occasions, important in the lives of individuals, sacrifices were offered to the deity; these, though of the *Zebach* type, differed from the *Pesach* offering, which was *sui generis* so far as the communion meal was concerned. They were in all probability offered at the birth of a son, at a circumcision, when a tent was erected on a new spot, at a marriage, and on the anniversary of the death of the head of a clan, and of a family. On such occasions the blood of the victim was poured out, and it acted as a prophylactic—still more ancient conceptions were connected with this—the flesh being eaten at a festive meal. The whole was a religious ceremony, but the communion-idea did not originally enter in. To put the matter quite baldly—we recognise that differences of opinion are held in regard to this—the *Pesach* is of totemistic origin, while other sacrifices of the *Zebach* type are not; in the latter, choice pieces of the victim were set apart for the deity as his share; but that duty having been performed the worshippers were at liberty to enjoy themselves at a festive meal.

(ii) The second period in the history of the sacrificial system is the *agricultural*. The transition from the nomadic stage to settled life in which agriculture was the main pursuit was a gradual process among the Hebrews. In two parts of the land which they entered after the wanderings in the wilderness the shepherd life predominated. The part of the land first conquered by some of the Israelite tribes was on the east of the Jordan; here the luxuriant vegetation invited the continuance of a pastoral life. On the west of the Jordan, in the south of Palestine—the district known as the Negeb—the country abuts

on the wilderness or steppe-land, and here, too, the Hebrews continued the shepherd life even after they had adopted a more settled mode of living. But in the central and northern parts of Palestine, between the Mediterranean and the Jordan (apart from the Judæan hill-country), the Hebrews came in contact with agricultural life for the first time. Flocks and herds were kept to some extent, but the main pursuit was agriculture. From the Canaanites the Hebrews learned how to till the soil; and from them they also learned the religion inseparable from agriculture. With the religion of Canaan, *i.e.* Baal-worship, we are not here concerned, excepting in so far as it affected the development of the sacrificial system.

Religious rites which have been handed down from time immemorial are, naturally enough, retained, however altered the conditions of life may become owing to advancing civilisation. We therefore find that *Pesach* is still celebrated; but, as will be seen, it undergoes modification. For the present we leave this aside.

It is to be noted, as illustrating the tenacity of ancient custom, that even after the Hebrews had adopted a settled life in Canaan, with agriculture as their main pursuit, the chief offerings continued to be animals from the flocks and herds, *i.e.* the *Zebach* type, the slain animal, predominated. But there was this difference: in nomadic times the sacrifice of the slain animal *always* took place on or by the altar; in Canaan this *Zebach* type took two forms; on the one hand, the old form of the altar sacrifice continued, but on the other, the animal could be slain elsewhere (Gen. xviii. 7; 1 Sam. xxviii. 24, 25); yet in each case it was a *Zebach*, i.e. a sacrifice followed by a meal, and in each case the ritual act of the blood outpoured took place. The development in religious conception lies in the fact that when the animal was slain on the altar the fat and other parts were burnt as an offering to the deity; so that here we get the gift-idea, *i.e.* an act of worship proper. But this is not the only point of development regarding the *Zebach* type; for a word now becomes attached to it defining its nature, viz. *Zebach shelamim*, (abbreviated *shelem*); this definition was meant to describe the effect of the *Zebach* offering, namely, that it brought about peace and good-will between the deity and his worshippers, as well as among the worshippers themselves; hence the rendering 'peace-offering.' The gift-idea comes out clearly here again, further emphasising that the *Zebach* offering has now become a pronounced act of worship. The two terms *kalil* ('whole burnt-offering') and *'olah* ('burnt-offering') are synonymous; they both belong to the *Zebach* type, but they were additional offerings made on special occasions (2 Sam. vi. 17, 18, xxiv. 25). With the exception of the *chattath* ('sin-offering') and the *'asham* ('guilt-

offering '), to which reference will be made below, these exhaust the animal sacrifices,[1] which form developments of the original *Zebach*, of the period from the settlement in Canaan to the Exile; and it will have been seen, even from this very cursory enumeration, what an important place they had in the worship.

The other types of offerings belong more specifically to an agricultural people. In all of these the central idea is that of a gift to the deity, partly as an act of homage, partly because it is his due, he being the owner of the land which produces through his will and power, and partly as a propitiation, *i.e.* as a means of inducing him to continue to give fertility to the land. It will be observed that worship and utilitarian motives again go hand in hand. With the increasing number of technical terms applied to sacrifices during this period we do not propose to deal; it is sufficient to say that with the gradually developing conception of the nature and personality of Yahweh, as taught by the prophets, there arose concurrently a deeper sense of what was due to Him, and therefore worship in the fuller meaning becomes more intense. True, the prophets often inveigh against hollowness and insincerity of worship, but it is just therein that the proof of a developed conception of worship lies. Higher ideals necessarily originate in exceptional individuals, and though their teaching may not touch the bulk, a small leaven is formed, and this persists. Elijah spoke of only seven thousand in the land who had remained faithful to Yahweh; but it sufficed. So with the followers of the later prophets.

As to the material of these sacrifices: the shewbread, certainly one of the oldest offerings of the agricultural period, consists of twelve loaves of bread placed on a table in the holy place as food for the deity (Lev. xxi. 6, etc.); to this offering belonged also the ceremonial burning of incense; the loaves were renewed each sabbath. The other offerings consisted of corn, wine, oil, fruit, etc., everything, in fact, which the soil produced. All these offerings came under one or other of the three heads: free-will offerings (*nedaboth*); offerings made on the occasion of a vow (*nedarim*); and obligatory offerings, *i.e.* such as every worshipper was bound to offer to the deity (*kodashim*).

During the agricultural period it was natural enough that the most prominent acts of worship should have centred in the three great annual festivals: the feast of unleavened bread (*Mazzoth*), in the spring, which coalesced with the ancient *Pesach* festival, the feast of weeks (*Kazir*), and the feast of ingathering (*Asiph*). At the first of these the first-fruits of the crops were offered; the second marked the end of the harvest; and the third, called also

[1] Quite exceptional, so far as can be gathered from the records, was the sacrifice of the turtle-dove and the pigeon (Gen. xv. 9); in post-exilic times we have more information about this type of sacrifice.

Tabernacles (*Sukkoth*), celebrated the gathering-in of the harvest at the end of the year in autumn, and the beginning of the New Year (Exod. xxxiv. 22).

We have a few details of the worshippers themselves which are worth noting, for they tend to give some insight into the ideas of worship belonging to this period. In a few passages there is the mention of the need for the worshippers to sanctify themselves in preparation for the sacrifice (Num. xi. 18; 1 Sam. xvi. 5); but this seems to be in reference to a sacrificial communion meal. For ordinary sacrifices, and above all, for the feasts, the worshippers prepared themselves by purifications, etc. and by putting on festal garments. In general, the sacrificial worship of the Israelites during the whole of this period was joyful in character; 'ye shall rejoice before Yahweh your God' (Deut. xii. 12) is the prevailing note.

During the whole of the agricultural period up to the Exile the predominating idea in the sacrifices is the offering of a gift, with the object of propitiation; the utilitarian motive is still there, but to give something to Yahweh which is pleasing to Him is the main thing, and that is essentially an act of worship.

(iii) Finally, we come to the *post-exilic* period. The teaching of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and, above all, the experience of the Exile, had the effect of arousing a sense of sin among the people with which there was previously nothing comparable. In conformity with this, developments in the sacrificial system took place which are very instructive. While the full and final development was not reached for, probably, a couple of centuries after the Exile, the more essential elements in the system are likely to have found a place in the earlier parts of the post-exilic period. The basis of the whole developed system was, of course, the ancient traditional usages which had been in vogue from the time of the settlement in Canaan, but the sacrifices were increased in number and some new types of offerings were added; it is also noticeable that some of the older terms assumed an extended meaning. Without going into details, it may be pointed out that three conceptions in regard to sacrifices are especially characteristic of the developed system.

(*a*) The gift idea was, of course, not new; but it was emphasised by the use of a comprehensive term applied to all offerings, viz. *korban*, 'gift'; this term is unknown in the pre-exilic literature; the earlier term for a gift-sacrifice (*minchah*), on the other hand, came to have a more restricted meaning, being applied only to cereal offerings; but it was, nevertheless, included under the general term *korban*.

(*b*) More important, because the development in a crucial direction comes out clearly here, are the two kinds of sin-offering; they are called *'asham*, 'trespass-offering,' and *chattath*, 'sin-

offering.' Both terms occur in pre-exilic literature, but they are used there of compensation for injury; it is only in post-exilic times that they are applied to animal sacrifices on the altar. The difference between the two is not always clear, and there is some confusion in the way in which they are dealt with in Lev. v.; but in regard to the *'asham* the idea seems to have been that the guilt incurred through the trespass was atoned for by it, and was offered concurrently with the restoration of something to a fellow-man; the *chattath* was thought of as a means of the removal of sin, and therefore it is of more sacred character; it is more pronouncedly atoning than the *'asham.*

(*c*) There can be no doubt that the thought of *praise* became increasingly prominent; not that this did not exist earlier, for the *todah*-offering (the word means both 'praise' and 'thanksgiving') was celebrated in earlier times; but in the post-exilic period this specifically praise offering rose to greater importance. Probably also the incense-offering was intended to be a special act of praise; it is not mentioned in the pre-exilic literature,[1] and occurs for the first time in the Priestly Code (Exod. xxx. 34–38).

Of special importance was the *Tamid;* this was the daily morning and evening burnt-offering (Num. xxviii. 3–8; Exod. xxix. 38–42), which was a development of the pre-exilic burnt-offering and evening meal-offering (2 Kings xvi. 15). In its developed form its importance was emphasised by having a meal-offering and a wine-offering as its adjuncts (Num. xv. 4, 5) The continuous burning of the altar fire was a result of this twofold daily burnt-offering, and it is not improbable that the idea of the fire being never quenched was due to Persian influence. The word *Tamid* means 'Continuous' here[2] (cf. Num. xxviii. 3, 'a continual burnt-offering'); the abbreviated form 'the *Tamid*' in reference to this sacrifice belongs to later usage, and occurs first in Dan. viii. 11–14, xi. 31, xii. 11. It came to occupy the central position of the Temple *cultus;* the feelings aroused by its cessation in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes can be seen from the Daniel passages indicated.

Many other details could be given to show the development of the sacrificial system in the post-exilic period, but what has been said must suffice. It needs to be added, however, that in regard to all the sacrifices the ritual tends to become more elaborate, the growing sense of worship due to God demands more ornateness in externals. Further, the main object of sacrifices centres in their atoning efficacy, they are the means of becoming reconciled to God. All sacrifices, whether bloodless or otherwise, effect reconciliation (cf. Ezek. xlv. 15, 17), *i.e.* they are the means of

[1] The burning of incense in connection with the shewbread is a different thing.

[2] The adverbial use is earlier and more frequent.

obtaining divine forgiveness, thus illustrating the growth of the sense of sin. The term *le-kapper*, to effect atonement, expresses the basic idea, and the sin-cleansing power of blood becomes very marked (see, *e.g.*, Lev. iv. 5, 6, 16–18). The idea reached the zenith of its expression in the institution of the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi.); its object is stated clearly enough in Lev. xvi. 33, where it is said that the priest shall 'make atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make atonement for the tent of meeting and for the altar; and he shall make atonement for the priests and for all the people of the assembly.' It was thus an annual complete atonement for all sin; and it gave the assurance of reconciliation with God, and of a renewed right relationship with Him.[1]

3. *Other forms of Worship.*

Singing with instrumental accompaniment as an act of worship will be referred to in dealing with the Psalms as liturgical documents. But before coming to these a few words must be said about one other element in worship which belongs to the earliest times.

Sacrifices represent the most highly developed and elaborated of various ritual acts which from the earliest times have always been regarded as essential to worship, which, in fact, constituted worship; as such these ritual acts were of greater significance than we in modern times can well realise. Every action of this kind goes back to a time when magic played a dominant part, and the action was believed to be the means of bringing about what was desired; it had, according to the ideas of early man, a compelling power on the deity. A naïve example of this occurs in Exod. xvii. 8 ff., where it is told how Moses, by holding up his rod in his hand, enabled the Israelites to prevail against the Amalekites, but as soon as he let down his hand the Israelites were worsted. Similarly, Elisha, by laying his hands upon those of king Joash when he discharges his arrow, ensures for him victory over the Syrians; in this case, it is true, a magical formula is also uttered, but the manual act is an essential part of the rite (2 Kings xiii. 14–17). The same principle holds good in the domain of worship; the raising of the hand in blessing is necessary for the full benefit to be obtained (Lev. ix. 22, 23). Of a different character, but also a sacred act, is the rite of anointing which confers kingship (1 Sam. x. 1). But the most important of such ritual acts, and one which was closely associated with the sanctuary, was the sacred dance. Into this large subject we cannot go here;[2] it must suffice to

[1] See the present writer (joint author) in *Hebrew Religion: its Origin and Development*, pp. 296 ff. (1930).

[2] For a full discussion on the subject see the present writer's *The Sacred Dance* (1923); on the *Pesach* dance which gave the festival its name see pp. 50 ff.

indicate a few of the Old Testament passages in which reference is made to it, more especially the processional dance, and the ritual dance round a sacred object, as these were more especially connected with the Temple worship.

In 2 Sam. vi. 5, 14, 15, we read of 'David and all the house of Israel dancing before Yahweh with all their might.' Here we must picture to ourselves a processional dance, headed by the king, which accompanies the ark as it is carried to Jerusalem. Dances within the sanctuary are spoken of, *e.g.* in Ps. cxlix. 3: 'Let them praise his name in the dance'; Ps. cl. 4: 'Praise him with timbrel and dance'; the same type of processional dance is no doubt referred to in Ps. lxviii. 25, 26 and lxxxvii. 7.

As to the ceremonial encircling dance, a reference to this is found in Ps. xxvi. 6: 'I will wash mine hands in innocency, and will go round thine altar, Yahweh'; this points clearly to a sacred dance in the sanctuary. A more elaborate ritual dance is referred to in Ps. xlviii. 12: 'Encompass ye Zion and go round about her'; the context has a clear reference to the Temple worship. An interesting passage is Ps. cxviii. 27: 'Bind the sacrifice with cords, even unto the horns of the altar'; at first sight there would not seem to be any reference to a ritual dance here; but the word 'bind' is also used in the sense of 'join' (1 Kings xx. 14; 2 Chron. xiii. 3); in later Hebrew it means 'to surround'; the word rendered 'sacrifice' (*chag*) means, in its origin, 'sacred dance,'[1] and the word 'cords' is used of people dancing in single file with music on leaving the sanctuary (1 Sam. x. 5, a 'high place' was a recognised sanctuary in Samuel's time); there is thus every justification for rendering this passage: 'Join the sacred dance, even unto the horns of the altar'; the latter words may well refer to some ritual act according to which the dancers ceremonially touched the altar.[2] It is interesting to note that in the Mishnah[3] it is said that after the sacrifices had been offered it was customary for the priests on each day of the Feast of Tabernacles to go in procession round the altar singing this psalm; the verse quoted will, therefore, refer to this ritual processional dance.

Various other instances could be given of sacred dances during worship; in addition there are a number of other dances, all of a religious character, which were performed on stated occasions; the very fact that no less than eleven words for dancing occur in the Old Testament shows the important part it played. That it was an essential element in worship from the earliest times does not admit of doubt.

[1] For the proof of this see *The Sacred Dance*, pp. 49 f., 92.

[2] See, however, the note on p. 59.

[3] *Sukkah* iv. 2. Below we refer to the Torch-dance, which was one of the features of this feast.

4. *The beginnings of the Synagogue Worship.*

For dealing with sacrifices it seemed advisable to take a rapid glance at the subject from the earliest times to their final development. This involved some consideration of their form in post-exilic times onwards. We must now return to the period of the Exile in order to observe the beginnings of the worship of the synagogue.

The idea of non-sacrificial worship was not unknown in pre-exilic times (cf. *e.g.* Jer. vi. 16, 20, vii. 21, 22); but in the cultural stage of the Hebrews even as late as the sixth century B.C. it was only here and there that a man could be found with a sufficiently exalted soul to contemplate the possibility of purely spiritual worship; for the bulk of the people only the absolute force of circumstance could have brought it about.

And it was the circumstance of the Exile that did this.

However unhistorical the tradition of the origin of the Great Synagogue may be, it is impossible to doubt that the germs of the later synagogal worship are to be sought in the period of the Exile. Something had to take the place of the sacrificial system; and we are not without certain indications as to what did take its place.

In the religious life of the Hebrews in their own land the great events of the year were the annual festivals; these were of supreme importance from a religious point of view; they were also seasons to be looked forward to from a social point of view. It is in the highest degree unlikely that when in exile the people would forget all about those seasons which had been of such importance in their lives. We have no proof of the fact, but later practice justifies the belief that during the Exile the great yearly festivals were observed as memorials of historical events in the history of the nation; this is the case in the later Synagogue liturgy, and it is reasonable to look for the origin of the custom during the Exile. Thus, the Passover was, and still is, celebrated in memory of the Egyptian bondage, the Exodus, and the birth of the nation; the Feast of Weeks in memory of the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai; the Feast of Tabernacles to commemorate the dwelling in booths during the wanderings in the wilderness.

Further, judging from the denunciations in Ezek. xx. 12–24 against those who profaned the Sabbath, we may gather that much stress was laid on its observance during the Exile; and this is borne out by what we read in Neh. x. 31, Isa. lvi. 2–6. The Sabbath, in fact, continued to be the day of weekly worship as it had been in pre-exilic times, but now in place of the prescribed sacrifices some other form of worship arose. And what this form was is not difficult to surmise, for there was not much in the way of alternative. The presence during the Exile of both priests and prophets necessarily postulates the reading of

such books of the Law as existed, as well as the prophetical writings which had been preserved; nor will the written word have sufficed, for the preachers, *i.e.* the prophets, cannot have been wanting in fulfilling their traditional calling. At those Sabbath meetings it may be stated with confidence that public prayer was an essential element; prayer was offered during the sacrificial rites in the Temple; but the absence of the sacrifices could not have affected the continuance of the prayers. Finally, since the singing of sacred songs had for centuries been customary in the Temple worship, as we shall see in the next section, these, like the prayers, would obviously be continued irrespective of sacrifice.

We have, thus, the four elements in worship: the reading of the Scriptures; the preaching of the word; prayers; and psalmody, which became the essential and integral parts of the Synagogue liturgy.

It is worth pointing out, further, though want of space forbids our going into details, that in the account of the great congregational meeting described in Neh. viii. there are various points of procedure which correspond with traditional use in the Synagogue worship; there can be little doubt that Ezra, in conducting the ceremony, was following the precedent formed during the Exile.[1]

5. *The Psalms as Liturgical Documents.*

(i) It is no exaggeration to say that in order to grasp to the full the essence and content of the Psalms as liturgical documents we must look back to a time many centuries before that to which in their present form they belong. The Psalms are, above all things, human documents, and the human feelings to which they owe their origin are very much the same in every age. The mode of expression will differ, but the emotions which prompt the utterances do not.

Given the belief in personal supernatural beings, whether gods or goddesses, it is a matter as obvious as it is necessary that the believer will seek to communicate with those in whom he believes; and the nature of these communications will naturally correspond with the conception and feelings in regard to the divine personality entertained by the believer. The nature of such communications will differ according to circumstances, but, speaking generally, they may be described as four in number: first, there are the material requirements, primarily food and drink, which it is believed the god can supply, and which are therefore asked for; then there are evils, such as sickness, enemy onslaughts, etc., which it is believed the god can remedy; following upon deliverance from these, there is the innate feeling of

[1] The argument is not materially affected if it be urged that the procedure described in Neh. viii bears the marks of what was customary in the chronicler's day.

gratitude which will find expression; and, finally, closely connected with gratitude is the desire to please the god with whom the worshipper is on good terms, and this, too, must in one way or another be expressed. All these things are common to humanity in all ages; and if they are proper to men in the polytheistic stage of belief, the more will it be so in a henotheistic stage, and still more in that of monotheism. The nature of these communications is expressed in modern language by the terms: petition, supplication, thanksgiving, and praise; the first two, like the last two, being really variations of similar underlying ideas.

We have here four categories of utterances addressed by the worshipper to the deity; and it is obvious that each will be characterised by a mode of expression proper to it. The worshipper whose thoughts are concentrated on a petition will not be thinking of praise; nor will one who is pouring out thanksgiving be tormented with the thought of troubles. Thus, terms and forms proper to the occasion gradually take shape and traditional types of utterances become stereotyped. In course of time further developments arise following upon changing conditions of life, extraneous influences, advance in culture, and growth of religious conceptions.

Two other preliminary considerations must be noted: in regard to the four types of utterances referred to, it is in the nature of things that in their origin they will be short and pithy, a fact which of itself will tend to stereotyped terms. And further, it can be shown from many sources that from the earliest times utterances of this kind were always recited in rhythmic form; it is always the case that words of importance, from the very utterance of which something is expected, are in a primitive form of poetry.

The second thing to be noted is that inasmuch as all these types of utterances are addressed to a divine being, they are, in effect, the essential elements of which the later more formal and elaborated forms of divine worship were composed.

(ii) What has been said may be briefly illustrated by Hebrew usage in early times; though it will, of course, be realised that the cultural stage of the Hebrews as we know them, even in the earliest periods, from the Old Testament, is a relatively advanced one; so that the forms in which the few illustrations to be given now appear in the Old Testament are developed ones.

As an illustration of a petition we have one which is of high antiquity even in the form in which it has come down to us; it occurs in Num. x. 35; the accentuation in the following rendering does not quite correspond with the Hebrew; but it is near enough to give some idea of the rhythmic form:

Ărīse, Yăhwēh, thăt thў fōes bē dispērs'd,
Thăt thīne ēnĕmies flēe frŏm bēfōre thĕe.

As this was uttered in the presence of the ark there is no doubt that the worshippers in whose midst the petition was offered believed that Yahweh Himself was present; and in this case the words were spoken during what was a form of divine service.

As illustrating the supplicatory utterance we have, in the form of a blessing, the words of Num. vi. 24–26; it is in its present form post-exilic, but in its origin must go back to much earlier times; each of the three lines of which it is composed is divided into two unequal parts, the first being longer than the second:

May Yahweh bless thee	and keep thee,
May Yahweh make his face to shine on thee	and be gracious to thee,
May Yahweh lift his face toward thee	and give thee peace.

It is hardly possible to reproduce the rhythmic form of the Hebrew in English; the lines are skilfully constructed in an ascending scale; thus, the first line has three words, and the second five, and the third seven. Though the form is that of a blessing, it is in reality a supplication, as the context shows. As this is the utterance of a priest it was clearly spoken in the sanctuary when something in the nature of divine service was taking place,—indeed, that is proved by the words which follow: 'So shall they put my name on the children of Israel, and *I* will bless them,' *i.e.* Yahweh is conceived of as being present; it is He (the pronoun is emphatic) who blesses, the priest making it a prayer. Another instance of a supplication occurs in 1 Sam. i. 10, 13, and this, too, is offered in the sanctuary; it is the case of Hannah, but the words of the prayer are not recorded.

Thanksgiving is a form of praise, but the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 1 ff.), being uttered after her prayer has been heard, is in the nature of a thanksgiving.

My héart exúlteth in Yahwéh,[1]
My hórn is exálted in my Gód.[2]

Here again the original is strongly rhythmic, three beats going to each line. And again, the thanksgiving is uttered in the sanctuary. The song is a late composition, but there can be no doubt that it reflects the ancient custom of coming to the sanctuary to offer thanks to God.

Finally, to give an illustration of the utterance of praise, we have in Exod. xv. 21, a very ancient little poem, also strongly rhythmical in construction, with four beats to a line; it is, however, hardly possible to reproduce the rhythm in English:

Síng to Yahwéh	highly exálted is hé;
Hórse and ríder[3]	he cast into the séa.

That this was sung in the sanctuary is certain, and for two reasons: in the previous verse it is said that all the women went

[1] The force of the preposition in each case is 'through,' or 'by means of.'
[2] So the Greek and Latin Versions, no doubt rightly.
[3] So the Septuagint; the Hebrew has 'his rider.'

out after Miriam 'with timbrels and with dances'; the reference is thus to the sacred dance accompanied by the timbrel, or hand-drum, which took place while the dancers sang their hymn of praise to Yahweh; that such a ceremony took place in the sanctuary is self-evident. Further, the words which introduce the song are: 'And Miriam answered them'; but this does not quite express the Hebrew term, which might be better rendered: 'And Miriam sang in responses with them,' *i.e.* the song was sung antiphonally, which implies that it was sung at divine service.

(iii) We have thus four types of sacred utterance (representative of countless others which have not been preserved), in regard to each of which it can be stated with confidence that in its essence it belongs to the earliest period of Israelite history, and each of which was either sung or spoken in rhythmic form in the sanctuary; in other words, they are all what we should rightly call liturgical pieces of a primitive kind. They are the germs from which the corresponding types of psalms have been evolved. It cannot be doubted, in the light of what has been said, that many of the psalms in the Psalter were sung during the Temple services in pre-exilic times—not, it is true, in their present form, because there is every reason to believe that they have undergone elaboration in course of time, but certainly in some less developed form.

Corresponding to these four early types of sacred utterance a few illustrations from our present Psalter may be given; they are all taken from Book I (i–xli).

One cannot always draw a clear distinction between supplication and petition; but we are using the former in reference to prayer for spiritual wants (in Ps. v it is uprightness in the sight of God that is asked for), the latter in reference to prayer for material wants. As an example of the latter we have Ps. xvii, which is a petition for protection from an enemy (verses 8–14); verse 15 shows it was uttered in the sanctuary:

> As for me, may I in righteousness behold thy face,
> And sate myself with beholding [1] thine appearance.

Ps. xx is of the same type, though in this case the prayer is uttered on the eve of battle, during the offering of sacrifice (verse 3).

Ps. v is an example of the worshipper bringing his supplication before God in the sanctuary; verse 2 tells of his prayer:

> Hearken unto the voice of my cry, my king and my God,
> For unto thee do I pray.

Verses 3 and 7 show that it was uttered in the Temple; the latter runs:

[1] Following the Septuagint.

But as for me, in the multitude of thy lovingkindness will I come into thy house,
In thy fear will I worship toward thy holy temple.[1]

An illustration of thanksgiving is Ps. ix; it was originally joined to Ps. x (so in the Septuagint), as the acrostic shows;[2] that it was sung in the Temple is seen from ix. 11.

Psalms of praise are, for example, viii, xxiv, xxix. The first of these was sung in the night, judging from verse 3, and in the Temple court which was open to the sky (cf. Isa. xxx. 29); the two others were, from their contents, so obviously sung in the Temple that there is no need for any words to prove this.

The four types of psalms mentioned may without hesitation be pointed to as the earliest, so far as content is concerned, to have taken shape; but various other types came into existence in course of time; and in most cases, though probably not in all, they were sung in the Temple worship during the offering-up of sacrifices. The evidence for this is derived mainly from the Mishnah; and although this evidence is comparatively late, it must be recognised that, in view of the tenacious character of religious uses, much of it must reflect traditional custom. Nothing will show more clearly the liturgical character of the Psalms than a glance, brief though it is, at what is said in the Mishnah about the Psalms in the Temple worship.

During the daily sacrifices—*i.e.* burnt-offering, sin and trespass-offering, peace-offering and drink-offering—the psalm for the day was sung; each day of the week had its special psalm;[3] the singing of the psalm here was subsidiary, the offerings being the central part of the worship. There is no doubt that this usage, like that on the Sabbath, which was more elaborate, is post-exilic; on the other hand, the singing of a psalm during the offering of sacrifice is pre-exilic as well.

According to *Sukkah* iv. 5 a liturgical psalm was, as a rule, divided into three parts; after the singing of each part the priests blew three times on their trumpets, and the people fell down and worshipped;[4] it is impossible to say whether this post-exilic usage reflects earlier tradition; but a psalm long enough to be divided into three sections is an elaboration which suggests later development.

Of the Festival psalms the 'Hallel' was the most important element. The 'Hallel,' meaning 'praise,' is so called on account of the oft-recurring term 'Hallelujah' in these psalms; it consists of Pss. cxiii–cxviii, and is called the 'Egyptian Hallel'[5] to

[1] Pss. xiii and xxviii belong to the similar type.

[2] Each verse begins with a letter of the alphabet which runs through the two psalms.

[3] *Tamid* vii, and the tractate *Sopherim* xviii. 1 (the latter does not belong to the Mishnah).

[4] Cf. also *Tamid* vii. 3.

[5] See Ps. cxiv. 1.

distinguish it from the 'Great Hallel' (Ps. cxxxvi), and from Pss. cxlvi–cxlviii, each of which begins with 'Hallelujah.' The great importance of the 'Hallel' in the Temple worship can be seen by its place during the great Festivals. When the Passover lambs had been slain, two rows of priests were drawn up in the Court of the Priests, in which the great altar stood; they received into gold and silver bowls the blood from the lambs which the head of each family had to offer at this feast. These bowls were passed up to the officiating priest at the great altar; as he received each bowl he emptied it at the base of the altar, and then handed the empty bowl back. The ceremony lasted from the ninth till the eleventh hour (*i.e.* 3–5 p.m.), and during it the 'Hallel' was sung by the Levites. The congregation repeated the first clause of each of the six psalms, and after every other clause or line they shouted 'Hallelujah'; when they came to the last of the six (Ps. cxviii) they repeated not only the first clause, and shouted 'Hallelujah' after each clause, but they also repeated after the Levites the three clauses contained in verses 25, 26:

> Save now, we beseech thee, Yahweh;
> Yahweh, we beseech thee, send us now prosperity.
> Blessed is he that cometh in the name of Yahweh.

The 'Hallel' was repeated in this way until the whole ceremony was completed.

Similarly, at the Feast of Tabernacles, the 'Hallel' was sung after the pouring out by the altar of the water and wine libations;[1] it was sung to the accompaniment of flutes. It was also sung at the Feast of Weeks during the offering of the sacrifices; on this occasion it was accompanied by the playing of a single flute, the reason being that at this feast boys' voices joined in singing the 'Hallel'; the sons of the Levites sang it in unison with their fathers. The part taken by the congregation was the same as at the Feast of Passover. Finally, the 'Hallel' was sung at the Feast of Dedication (*Chanukkah*), and, possibly, at the New Moon festivals, though there is no direct evidence regarding this.

This, of course, is far from exhausting what the Mishnah and the tractate *Sopherim* have to say about the liturgical character of the Psalms; but what we have endeavoured to illustrate is the very large number of psalms used for the festivals, and which are therefore psalms of *praise*. It is to be noted that the four types of psalms to which attention was first drawn were, with one exception, such as were in their origin individualistic; the one exception (if it was an exception) was the praise utterance. We conjecture, therefore, that utterances of petition, supplication, and thanksgiving, which in course of time developed into psalms of these types, were originally used by an individual worshipper,

[1] *Sukkah* iv. 1. Psalms were also sung at this feast during the brilliant ceremony of the Torch dance performed in the Court of the Women.

and that later many of these were adapted to congregational use. In the case of the praise utterance—though one speaks tentatively —the evidence seems to point to their having been from the first of a congregational rather than of an individualistic character. However this may be, the psalms of praise which are now incorporated in the Psalter are markedly congregational.

All the four types of psalms so far considered may be said to have extended, in their origin, back to the earliest times, and in their developed forms to the latest times. There are some other types of psalms of which this cannot be said; but as they, too, were used in divine worship and are therefore liturgical documents, one or two must receive a few words of notice; to deal with all the varieties is out of the question here.[1]

(iv) A type of psalm which at certain times occupied an important place in the Temple Liturgy was what may be termed a Dirge; this type has a long history behind it, and in its origin goes far back into pre-exilic times. It occurs in two forms in the Psalter: the dirge of the individual and the national dirge. The content of the former, and it applies also in part to the latter, consists of the wailing in regard to some untoward occurrence, prayer for divine help to avert the evil, and often some further utterances calculated to give comfort in the time of trouble; in the case of the national dirge, it is almost always some external, political crisis which prompts it. Nothing is more striking than this custom of the individual in the one case, the people as a whole in the other, bringing before God in His sanctuary the trouble or perplexity whereby they are confronted, and making it part of their liturgical worship. In most cases these dirges have been incorporated in psalms which contain other matter, so that in the Psalter as we now have it one cannot often say of a particular psalm that it is a dirge; what is actually the case is that it contains the dirge together with other material. As an example of this, we may quote some words of the dirge of an individual occurring in Ps. xciv. 12–19:

> Who will rise up for me against the evil-doers?
> Who will stand for me against the workers of iniquity?
> Unless Yahweh had been my help,
> My soul had soon dwelt in silence (verses 16, 17).

What has prompted the worshipper to come and pour out his complaint in the sanctuary is not definitely stated, but in general terms is spoken of as ' the days of adversity ' (verse 13).

Regarding national dirges there are many indications in the Old Testament as to the cause of these: war, captivity, pestilence,

[1] For the fullest treatment of the whole subject see Gunkel, *Einleitung in die Psalmen* (Part I, 1928).

drought, famine, locust-plague, etc.;[1] it is also implied, or directly stated, that in consequence a fast was proclaimed, and the people flocked to the sanctuary.[2] As an utterance of the assembled congregation on such an occasion we have, *e.g.*, such words as these:

> Remember not against us the iniquities of our forefathers,
> Let thy tender mercies speedily prevent us;
> For we are brought very low . . . (Ps. lxxix. 8, 9);

the context tells of a national calamity; and the nation is in sore trouble because of Gentile enemies. Other psalms of a similar character are xliv, lxxiv, lxxx, lxxxiii. The manuscript copy of such psalms was either kept in the Temple archives to be used as occasion demanded, or possibly it may have belonged to one of the Temple guild of singers, such as the sons of Asaph,[3] and brought out for the use of the congregation when required.

Of the number of other types of psalms, we select one more; it is a type which is of particular importance and interest because it introduces into the Liturgy one element which seems incongruous: the type of psalm is that in which prophetical influence comes to the fore. To be sure, this influence is to be found in many of the psalms, but in some of them it is more particularly striking, one may say typical. A good example is Ps. lxxxii. 2–4:

> How long will ye judge unjustly,
> And respect the persons of the wicked?
> Judge the oppressed and the fatherless,
> Do justice to the afflicted and destitute;
> Rescue the poor and needy;
> Deliver them out of the hand of the wicked.

A comparison between these words and such passages as Amos v. 14, 15; Isa. iii. 15; Micah vi. 8; Jer. iv. 14, v. 28 and many others, shows that they are of the very essence of prophetic teaching. Priest and prophet often stood in antagonism, but here is an instance of the prophet's words entering, as it were, into the Liturgy, the priestly preserve *par excellence*.

Still more striking are those psalms in which the traditional prophetic depreciation of the *cultus* finds expression. Thus, in the well-known words of Ps. l. 13, 14:

> Will I eat the flesh of bulls,
> Or drink the blood of goats?
> Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving;
> And pay thy vows unto the Most High.

---

[1] See, *e.g.*, 1 Kings viii. 33-40, 44-50; Joel i. 2-20, ii. 1-14.
[2] *E.g.* Joel ii. 15-17.
[3] This is a possible meaning of the title 'Psalm of Asaph.'

See also Ps. xl. 6, and cf. such passages as Amos v. 21, 22; Isa. i. 11–14; Micah vi. 6, 7.

The consideration of other types of psalms would show what a remarkable variety of thoughts and prayers must have filled the minds of the worshippers in the Temple. It is small wonder that the Psalms have played such a leading part in worship for three *millennia*.[1]

[1] Did space permit, there is much of liturgical interest to be noticed in the titles of the Psalms; late as these titles are, it can be shown that they reflect, in a number of cases, ancient traditional use.

Note.—The words from Ps. cxviii. 27, quoted on p. 49, should be rendered, following the Septuagint: 'Marshal the procession with the leafy (branches),' in reference to the palm-branches which were carried during the Feast of Tabernacles; the verse would then run:

> Join the sacred dance,
> Marshal the procession with the leafy (branches).

See, further, Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, pp. 75 f. (1921).

SYNAGOGUE WORSHIP IN THE FIRST CENTURY

By PAUL P. LEVERTOFF

It is a truism to say that Christianity spent its early days within the walls of the Synagogue, and that it only left it when it was forcibly expelled. Yet not only is the study of the Synagogue Liturgy, so far as its origins are concerned, still in its infancy, but even how the institution itself originated, and what causes gave it shape, are questions which cannot be answered with absolute certainty. It is probable, however, that it had its rise in the exigencies of the period that intervened between the fall of the first and the inauguration of the second Temple. The post-exilic Jewish community, especially, endeavoured to make the Law the principle of life not only for the community as such but also for every individual—'This multitude which knoweth not the law are accursed' (John vii. 49). Both knowledge and practice of it were required, and thus eventually developed a kind of parochial or congregational system, for the purpose of the reading and exposition of Scripture on Sabbaths and festivals, and later also on Mondays and Thursdays (market days).

It may seem paradoxical to compare the synagogues with the *Bamoth*, i.e. the local sanctuaries at high places, condemned by the Deuteronomic legislation, but, with the lapse of time and the coming of new conditions, it became necessary to revert to local religious centres. What is more, the Book of Deuteronomy, emphasising as it does the necessity of instruction, can be justly considered one of the main factors in the rise of the Synagogue as an institution. In New Testament times it was firmly established: 'Moses from generations of old hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath' (Acts xv. 21). Palestine, including Jerusalem (notwithstanding the presence of the Temple), was dotted with synagogues. In Rome, too, there were a considerable number; and, in fact, wherever there was a Jewish settlement, at least one synagogue would be found. In consequence of the constant intercourse of the Jewish communities of the Dispersion with Jerusalem, and inasmuch as many Jews often returned there with their families,

several synagogues for these 'foreigners' had arisen in this one city alone (Acts vi. 9).

Exposition of Scripture and preaching must from the beginning have formed the essential parts of the service, particularly on special feast-days and Sabbaths. We have no examples from pre-Christian times of the manner and substance of Synagogue homilies in Palestine, but the Haggadic portions of the early Midrashim,[1] and later collections of Synagogue homilies, contained in the *Pesikta Rabbati*, reflect, to a considerable extent, the type of preaching in the first century. The Hellenistic communities had many patterns of oratorical diction, and a few portions of such discourses have been preserved, such as an oration on the power of reason (the so-called 'Fourth Book of Maccabees') and some fragments in Philo's writings (*e.g.* the sermon on Samson). Acts xiii. 16–41 shows that a 'sermon' could be independent of a Scripture text.

But although the chief purpose of the synagogues was the reading and exposition of Scripture and religious exhortation (Matt. iv. 23; Mark i. 21; Luke iv. 15, 21, vi. 6, xiii. 10; John vi. 59, xviii. 20; Philo, *De Sept.*, 6; Jos. *Apion*, ii. 17), prayers, at first probably in connection with the Lectionary, and on special occasions, must have also been said there (cf. Matt. vi. 5). In fact, even before the Christian era, some more or less fixed prayer-formulas must have been in existence. These were apparently something new in religious history, for, although fixed forms of prayer are found in every more or less developed religion, they are generally more in the nature of magical formulas than of prayers in the modern sense of the term.

Two examples of such prayers are preserved in the Greek text of Daniel: one can be designated a 'eucharistic litany' (Song of the Three Children, 29–68), the other a Litany of Penitence (3–22). We gather that already in the Maccabean period certain liturgical formulas were taken over from the Palestinian into the Hellenistic Synagogue.

Nevertheless, it is very doubtful if we have the material for a complete outline of the Synagogue Liturgy of the time of our Lord. We have to depend on Rabbinical sources, and, valuable as they are, it must be remembered that the Rabbis, especially those of the second and later centuries, whose references, usually casual, to liturgical matters are discussed in Rabbinic literature, were often inclined to project back into 'generations of old' the conditions which really existed in their own time. Besides, even

[1] '"Midrash" was the higher exegesis of Scripture, especially the derivation from it, or confirmation by it, of the rules of the unwritten law. . . . "Haggadah," the non-juristic teachings of Scripture as brought out in the profounder study of its religious, moral, and historical teachings.'—G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i. 319.

according to the earliest traditional literature, the Liturgy, even in its simpler elements, took definite form only by degrees, and, as will be shown later, contained polemical references to Jewish Christians.

That synagogues were sometimes erected by private individuals, even by non-Jews, we know from St. Luke (vii. 5). The names of the benefactors, Gentile as well as Jewish, were often inscribed on the synagogue walls, or at least on those parts of the building towards which they had contributed. Thus a Greek inscription tells of a heathen priestess, Julia Severa, who gave Jews a synagogue (Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i. 649).

According to later Rabbinic legislation, a synagogue was not to be used for any but religious purposes, but in practice what we might call 'socials' seem to have taken place in them, and discussions of communal affairs. In Cæsarea, for instance, there was even a 'revolutionary' synagogue.

On the lintels of the doors of some of the Galilean synagogues were different forms of ornamentation: a seven-branched candlestick, an open flower between two paschal lambs, or vine-leaves with bunches of grapes, or, as in the synagogue of Capernaum, a pot of manna between two representations of Aaron's rod.

Some synagogues were simple halls. The only indispensable article inside would be a movable chest (*'arona, tebuta*) for the scrolls of the Law and the Prophets, which, on fast-days, was taken out and carried in processions. Others were built in a grander style, *e.g.* the great synagogue in Alexandria, which must have been modelled on the pattern of the Jerusalem Temple, to judge from the description of it in Tosephta *Sukkah* iv. 20.

Contrary to what we should expect, there was no special gallery for women in the early synagogues, and, what is more remarkable, women were sometimes asked to read the lessons (Tos. *Meg.* iv. 11). On the other hand, lepers had to sit in a special enclosure (Mishnah *Neg.* xiii. 12).

Another article of furniture deserving mention is the laver in the synagogue court for ceremonial ablutions.

The question has often been asked, What was the initial relationship of the Jewish Christians to the Synagogue? We know, of course, that the synagogues were the scenes of no small portion of our Lord's work. In them were wrought some of His mightiest works of healing (Matt. xii. 9; Mark i. 23; Luke xiii. 10); in them were spoken some of His most glorious recorded words (Lk. iv. 18–27; cf. John vi. 59), and probably many of His sayings, especially as recorded in the first Gospel, may have been connected with the Synagogue Lectionary.[1] That the

[1] See P. P. Levertoff on 'St. Matthew' in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture.*

disciples, even after Pentecost, were still attached to the Temple, is certain (cf. Acts iii. 1, v. 12). That many Christian Jews of the priestly class continued to discharge priestly functions in the Temple is probable.[1] But whether they continued to attend the Synagogue ritual as well is not clear from the New Testament. From Rabbinic sources, however, it can be inferred that, at any rate till the beginning of the second century, Jewish Christians used to take part in the Synagogue services, so that a special enactment (*Takkana*) had to be made concerning one of the most solemn responses in the Liturgy, 'Blessed be the Name of the glory of His Kingdom for ever and ever,' said by the 'Messenger of the congregation' (see later) after the proclamation of the faith in the Divine unity (the *Shema'*). The enactment referred to the manner of recitation. Originally, so it stated, it used to be said quietly, but because of the 'Minim,' in this case the Jewish Christians, who evidently mentioned the Name of Jesus in connection with the Kingdom, it was commanded that it should be said loudly, so that Jewish believers in the Messiahship of Jesus might be detected (*Pes.* 56*a*). There is also a tradition that originally the Decalogue used to be recited after the *Shema'*, but that it was abolished 'because of the Minim,' *i.e.* because Jewish Christians were supposed to claim divine revelation exclusively for the Ten Commandments. This enactment must have taken place in the first century, since Rabbi Nathan, who records it as something that had taken place in the past, lived in the middle of the second century (*Ber.* 12*a*). Again, the so-called *Birkat ha-Minim* (see later, p. 72), which, according to the earliest recensions, was enacted chiefly with the view to driving the Hebrew Christians out of the synagogues, shows that, notwithstanding the spasmodic persecutions to which the Church in Palestine was exposed almost from the beginning (Acts viii. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 14), individual Jewish Christians at least were still attached to the synagogues. This subject deserves much fuller investigation than it has ever received. On the one hand, it would seem that the position of Jewish Christians within the Jewish commonwealth precludes the idea that they made a practice of establishing a special Synagogue for themselves on Jewish soil; on the other hand, as a simple hall was sufficient for synagogal purposes, it is not impossible that from the beginning such an 'upper chamber' as that in which the disciples gathered for prayer after the Ascension (Acts i. 13, 14) constituted for them a synagogue (cf. James ii. 2; Hermas, *Mand.*, xi. 9, 13, 14). This would be regarded by the other Jews as something quite normal, and not as a desertion from national associations and obligations. Moreover, in Jerusalem such

[1] Cf. Harnack, *Mission and Expansion of Christianity*, i. 46.

assemblies would not have attracted much attention, since there were already various synagogues for different Jewish groups.

What we know about the Synagogue organisation is very little indeed. The New Testament speaks of the 'elders of the Synagogue,' of a 'ruler,' and of a 'minister'; we meet the same persons in Rabbinic literature. It can be taken for granted that in Palestine, especially in purely Jewish localities, the communal affairs were under the charge of 'elders' (Hebrew *zekenim*, Greek *presbyteroi*). In the Apostolic age they may have formed a kind of 'presbyterate' in connection with discipline (*e.g.* excommunication, Luke vi. 22; John ix. 22, xii. 42, xvi. 2) and charity. In the New Testament they are often mentioned together with Pharisees and *Scribes*, but according to Rabbinic tradition the *zekenim* as such were scribes, *i.e.* scholars. In fact, 'scribes' and 'elders' are interchangeable terms. We read, for instance, of the 'elders of the house of Shammai and of the house of Hillel' (*Ber.* 11*a*); of the 'elders of the court,' and of the priesthood (*Yoma* 18*b*); of the 'elders of the south'; of the 'commandments of the elders' (*Sab.* 23*a*); of the 'traditions of the elders' (Matt. xv. 2), and of the 'ordination of elders' (Tos. *Sanh.* i. 1). As successors of the 'elders' of Moses (Num. xi. 16),[1] and, as such, transmitters of the oral tradition, like the *zekenim* in Ezra's time (cf. *Pirke Abot* i. 1), the spirit of God was mediated to them (although, of course, not for a particular office in a local synagogue), by the 'laying on of the hands' of three *zekenim*. This rite was called *Semika*, the 'laying on' (of hands), *i.e.* ordination (Tos., *ibid.*).

The 'Ruler' (Hebrew *rosh ha-keneset*, Mishnah *Sota* vii. 7; Greek ἀρχισυνάγωγος, Mark v. 22; Luke viii. 41, xiii. 14; Acts xviii. 8, 17, in the plural) was probably (although there is no reference to this in Rabbinic literature) chosen from among the elders. His (honorary) office was that of Synagogue overseer and director. He had, for example, to decide who should read the lessons, and who should preach (Acts xiii. 15). Although there is no direct reference to the 'ruler' in connection with alms (cf. Matt. vi. 2), yet the collecting and distributing of these

[1] Cf. the same reference to the 70 elders in the prayer at the ordination of a Christian presbyter, in the 'First Church Order' (quoted by Dr. Frere in *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, p. 284): '. . . et gubernet plebem tuam. . . sicuti respexisti super populum electionis tuæ, et præcepisti Moysi, ut elegeret præsbyteros, quos replesti de spiritu tuo. . . .'

It is, however, uncertain whether in the Apostolic Age, when this method of ordaining Rabbis was probably practised, it was in any way based on the conception of the transmission of the Holy Spirit to the ordinands, or whether this idea was projected back by the later Rabbis, who, probably in opposition to the manner of Christian ordination, were ordained merely by nomination. Cf. Bacher, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 1894, p. 122.

(*Pea.* viii. 7) was probably also under his control. His office was not limited to time, but was usually held for life, and was not infrequently hereditary.[1]

The 'Minister' (Hebrew *hazzan ha-keneset*, or simply *hazzan*, *Sota* vii. 7, 8; *Sab.* i. 3; Greek ὑπηρέτης, Luke iv. 20) executed the orders of the 'ruler,' invited the appointed readers, took out the scrolls from the Ark, and put them back again after the reading. He it was who wielded the scourge when punishment had to be meted out in the synagogue (Matt. x. 17, xxiii. 34; Mark xiii. 9; Acts xxii. 19; cf. Mishnah *Makk.* III. 12). He was also the elementary teacher, and probably 'served the tables,' to use a New Testament expression, at the daily distribution of food to the poor (Tos. *Pea.* iv. 10).

The position and status of a 'minister' was certainly higher than that of a 'verger.' This is evident, among other things, from the fact that, according to Rabbinic tradition, at funerals a special 'collect' was recited in his honour, as was done in honour of the ἀρχισυνάγωγος (*p. Ber.* 23*a*).[2]

Apart from the above, there were no other permanently appointed officials for the conduct of the services in the early Synagogue. The collectors and receivers of alms, mentioned above, had nothing to do with public worship as such, and besides, it is not at all certain whether such functions existed before A.D. 70. The 'delegate of the congregation' (Hebrew *Sheliah Zibbur*), i.e. the one who was asked by the 'ruler' to lead in prayer, who probably belonged to a later period, cannot be regarded as an official. The same is true of the 'reader' of the lessons. Neither was the translator (*turgeman*) of the Scriptures into Aramaic and Greek, according to circumstances (*Meg.* iv. 4; Tos. *Meg.* iv. 20 f.), an official in any sense.

According to the Mishnah (*Meg.* vi. 3), ten male persons (boys over thirteen counted as men) were necessary for the invocation, 'Bless ye the Lord, the blessed One,' with its response 'May the Lord, the blessed One, be blessed for ever and ever,' recited before the first benediction of the *Shema'* in the evening and morning services, for the recitation of the 'Eighteen (or seven) benedictions,' for the reading from the Law and the Prophets, and for the recitation of the blessings connected with them, as well as for the Aaronitic blessing, 'When ten men pray together the

[1] The almoners, *Demai* iii. i.; *Kid.* iv. 5 belonged probably to a later period.

[2] There is thus a kind of 'threefold Ministry of the Synagogue,' analogous to that of the Christian Church. The elders, not being specially appointed for a particular synagogue, could be considered as belonging to 'catholic' Israel. The ἀρχισυνάγωγος was the head of the local synagogue, and as such, in a sense, the executive officer of the former, as the Bishop, the ἀρχισυνάγωγος of the local church, was of the original Christian πρεσβύτεροι, the apostles. The ὑπηρέτης would correspond exactly to the deacon, the servant of the Bishop (cf. the rôle of the deacons in the Pastoral Epistles).

Shekina is in their midst' (*Ber.* 6*a*; cf. Matt. xviii. 20). But whether these rules and customs existed in the time of our Lord is not certain. In later times a few unemployed men (*asara batlanim*) were paid for the purpose, so that they might always be present in the synagogue at the services (*Meg.* i. 3).

The part taken by the congregation at prayer consisted (at least after the destruction of the Temple) in saying the responses, the most important of which were the 'Amens' after the benedictions recited by the 'messenger,' the 'reader' and the priest, or priests (*i.e.* Aaronites), if such should happen to be present at the service. In the synagogue of Alexandria, for instance, the 'minister' used to signal with a flag to the congregation, at the conclusion of the reader's doxology, to remind them of the 'Amen' (Tos. *Suk.* iv. 6 f.).

At the recitation of the *Shema'* the congregation sat on the floor; at the 'Prayer' proper they stood up together with the 'messenger.' At morning prayer, except on Sabbaths and festivals, the Tephillin (φυλακτήρια, Matt. xxiii. 5) were worn. There were two of them: one for the arm—a small dice-shaped hollow parchment case, in which lay a small roll of parchment, on which were written the passages Exod. xiii. 9, 10, 16; Deut. vi. 4–9, xi. 13–21; it was fastened, by means of a strap drawn through it, to the upper part of the left arm; and the other for the head, a case of the same kind, but differing from the former by being divided into four compartments, holding four little rolls of parchment, on which were inscribed again the above-mentioned passages. This was fastened by means of a strap to the forehead, just below the hair. In the time of our Lord, the Tephillin were worn all day, and not only during prayer. The same is true of the so-called prayer-shawl (*tallit*, ἱμάτιον), *i.e.* the upper garment with the fringes of hyacinth-blue, or white, wool (*zizith*, Matt. ix. 20, xiv. 36, xxiii. 5; Mark vi. 56; Luke viii. 44; cf. Num. xv. 37 sqq.; Deut. xxii. 12) at its four corners. In the first century it probably resembled the *abayah*, or blanket, worn by the Bedouins for protection from the sun and rain, and which has black stripes at the ends. The finer tallits, however, worn by distinguished persons, were very likely similar to the Roman *pallium*.

The 'messenger of the congregation,' as well as the 'reader' and the translator, had to be particularly careful concerning the kind of garments they wore in the synagogue (Tos. *Meg.* iv. 30). As the tallit had a headgear attached to it, the congregation must have had their heads covered, although Rabbinic legislation has no rubric concerning this point.

There is no mention of singing at the synagogue, but it is probable that those parts of the Liturgy which were connected with the Temple worship, like the recitation of psalms, the

Aaronitic blessing, and that connected with processions on the Feast of Tabernacles, were sung.

In the Old Testament there is no commandment concerning prayer. There are patterns and models of benedictions (*berakoth;* cf. Num. vi. 24; 2 Chron. xxx. 27) as well as of prayers proper (*tephilloth;* cf. Deut. xxvi. 10, 13; Lev. xvi. 21; 1 Kings viii. 22), but they are not set forth as elements of a legally-regulated divine service. Rabbinic tradition ascribes the institution of a definite ritual of Scripture-reading and prayer to the so-called 'men of the great Synagogue' in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. However that may be, the custom of praying three times a day, derived probably from Ps. lv. 18, was most likely introduced in the third century B.C. (cf. Dan. vi. 11, ix. 21). Later, however, there were only two congregational services, morning and afternoon, and full 'liturgical' worship took place only on Sabbaths and festivals. Yet it is uncertain whether an afternoon service took place in the synagogue while the Temple was still in existence.

The earliest and most important eulogies and prayers are considered to be those that group themselves round the so-called *Shema'* and the 'Eighteen benedictions.'

The Shema'.—In obedience to the precept, 'Thou shalt speak of them (the commandments) . . . when thou *liest down* and when thou *risest up*' (Deut. vi. 7), every Jew was obliged to say twice daily the three paragraphs, Deut. vi. 4–9, xi. 13–21, and Num. xv. 37–41. Technically the performance of this duty is called *Keriat shema'* ('the recitation of the *Shema'*'), because of the first word, *shema'*, 'hear,' with which the first paragraph begins, and the sections are individually known by the words with which they begin (*Ber.* ii. 2; *Tamid* v. 1). According to Rabbinic tradition, this 'Creed' of Judaism, together with the benedictions belonging to it (see later), as well as the Decalogue, formed a part of the Temple Liturgy (*Tamid* v. 1), which assumes the use of it at least before A.D. 70, and Josephus regards it as an enactment of Moses (*Ant.*, iv. 8, 13).

But the question is, When exactly before A.D. 70 did it become a liturgical 'Creed'? It is not at all improbable that it owed its inception to an 'enactment' (*takkana*) in opposition to our Lord's teaching about Himself in the Temple and in the synagogues (cf. Mark ii. 7, xiv. 64; John x. 11), especially as similar innovations in the Liturgy actually took place, both in Temple and Synagogue, 'because of the Minim' (see above, p. 63).

As to the benedictions connected with *Shema'*, these are four liturgical pieces which group themselves round it, two of which are to be said, according to the Mishnah, before, and one after, the morning *Shema'*, and two before, and two after, the evening *Shema'* (*Ber.* i. 4).

The *Yotzer*, the first benediction before the *Shema'*, is so called because of its initial word *yotzer* ('who forms'), and, in fact, the whole nucleus of the *Shema'* is often thus designated. In its present form, however, it contains alphabetical acrostics in the style of mediæval liturgical pieces, and cannot, therefore, be considered as belonging to the first century. But even in its shortest, and therefore earliest, form it cannot be said that 'there is a high probability'[1] that it formed a part of the Synagogue liturgy at the beginning of the Christian era, and even earlier; on the contrary, it shows distinct traces of Christian influence.

Its earliest form was probably as follows: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the world, Former of light and Creator of darkness, Maker of peace and Creator of all things; who gives (third person) light in mercy to the earth and to those who live thereon, and in his goodness *renews every day, continually, the work of creation* (lit. the work of " in the beginning," the Rabbinic term for "creation"). Let a new light shine over Zion and thy Messiah's light over us.'

Thus, it deals with creation and Messianic redemption. The first part is directly taken from Isa. xlv. 7 ('evil' being changed into 'all,' *hakol*); the second part contains the genuine Rabbinic expression for 'creation,' not found in pre-Christian Jewish literature (*M'ase bereshit*). But what is of greater significance, it seems to reflect two sayings of our Lord, one in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 45; cf. Luke vi. 36) and the other in the Fourth Gospel, in reference to God's *continuous* work in creation and redemption, even on Sabbath (John v. 10–18).[2]

It is not within the scope of the present study to investigate the Jewish and Christian relationships in the first century, and whether, notwithstanding the severance between Church and Synagogue, reciprocal influences were not only possible but probable. But Jewish Christians of one kind or another continued, as we have seen, to officiate in Synagogue worship as 'messengers of the congregation,' so that eventually certain alterations and modifications had to be made in the Liturgy in order to hasten the breach between them and the other Jews. This is sufficient to prove that, as to certain prayers at least, one may speak not only of 'the Jewish background of the Christian Liturgy,' but also (and perhaps with more justification since, after all, even the earliest Rabbinic literature where the Jewish liturgical material is contained belongs to times subsequent to the second century) of 'the Christian influence on the Jewish Liturgy.'

[1] Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, p. 47.

[2] When on a visit to Rome, in about the year 95, Rabbi Gamaliel II and other Rabbis referred in a discourse to God as keeping His own laws, a 'Min' (Jewish Christian) asked: 'But what about keeping the Sabbath?' Midrash Ex. R. xxx.

The second benediction before the *Shema'* is known by its opening word *Ahabah* (Love), which Dr. Abrahams considered to be 'one of the most beautiful prayers in the liturgies of the world.' The theme of this prayer could be compared with the words of 1 John iv. 19: 'We love, for he first loved us.' Omitting the later interpolations, the benediction runs: 'With everlasting (or "abundant") love hast thou loved us, O Lord our God; with great and exceeding compassion hast thou pitied us. Our Father, our King, for the sake of our fathers who trusted in thee, and to whom thou didst teach the statutes of life, be gracious also unto us, and teach us. Merciful Father, have mercy upon us; enlighten our eyes in the Law and let our hearts cleave unto thy commandments. Give us a single heart to love and fear thy Name. For in thy holy Name we trust; we rejoice and exult in thy salvation. Thou art a God who worketh salvation, and hast chosen us from all peoples and tongues, and hast brought us nigh unto thy great Name for ever[1] in truth; to give thanks unto thee and to proclaim thy unity in love. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast chosen thy people Israel in love.'

For this prayer also it is claimed that it was recited by the priests in the Temple, before the Decalogue and *Shema'* (*Mid.* v. 1). But we are left again in the dark about the exact date of its inauguration, and it is not unlikely that it also contains traces of a polemical character against Jewish Christians, and perhaps especially against St. Paul's teaching. That there is, in fact, a direct reference to St. Paul's teaching and activity in one of the earliest Rabbinical documents has been shown by scholars.[2] The above prayer emphasises, for instance, God's unchangeable love to Israel,[3] the eternal significance of the Law, the divine unity, and cf. with this, for instance, the first ten chapters of Romans, Gal. iv. 21–31, and especially Eph. ii. 4.

The same is true of the concluding benediction, cited in the Mishnah, and known as *Emeth we-Yatzib* ('true and constant'; cf. 1 Tim. i. 15: 'This is a faithful saying'). It is also known as *Geullah* ('Redemption'). It has subsequently been considerably increased, and now contains some alphabetic acrostics in its latter part. For this prayer also great antiquity is claimed by Jewish authors, it having, according to Rabbinic tradition (Mishnah v. 1), been recited by the priests after the *Shema'* in the morning service, in the Temple hall (*lishkat ha-gazit*); but, as we hear nothing concerning a definite date when it first began to be

[1] 'Selah.' This word in a liturgical piece is not, as is sometimes assumed, a sign of antiquity, but in Rabbinical phraseology it has the meaning of 'for ever.'

[2] See G. Kittel, *Rabbinica*, and P. P. Levertoff, *St. Paul in Jewish Thought*.

[3] A 'Min' said to Rabbi Gamaliel: 'You are a people from whom God has withdrawn himself,' and quoted Hos. v. 6 (*Yeb.* 102*b*).

recited, it is not improbable that this prayer also was one of the 'enactments' between the period of the Crucifixion (A.D. 30) and the destruction of the Temple (A.D. 70). Originally it must have run somewhat as follows:

'True and faithful (or "constant"), established and enduring, right and faithful, beloved and precious, desirable and lovely, awful and mighty, well-ordered and *worthy of all acceptation* (*mekubol*; cf. 1 Tim. i. 15), good and beautiful, is this word (*i.e.* the *Shema'*) to us for ever. True it is that the God of eternity (or "the world") is our King, the Rock of Jacob—the shield of our salvation. From generation to generation he endureth, and his Name endureth, and his throne is established, and his Kingdom and Faith (*emmuna* in post-Biblical Hebrew = "Religion") *endure for ever*. His words live and *endure*, they are faithful and desirable for ever and for all eternity, for our fathers and for us, for our children and for our generations, and for all the generations of the seed of Israel, thy servant. For the past and present generations (lit. "upon the first and last ones") it is a good and constant word for ever and ever; it is true and faithful, an established thing *that shall never pass away*. True it is that thou art indeed the Lord our God and the God of our fathers, our King, the King of our fathers, our Redeemer, the Redeemer of our fathers, our Creator, the Rock of our salvation, our Redeemer and Saviour from everlasting; such is thy Name; *there is no God beside thee*.'

The *Hashibenu* is the second prayer prescribed in the Mishnah to be said after the *Shema'* in the evening. Originally it was not intended to be a congregational prayer, and it was probably not connected with the *Shema'* at all, but eventually became a part of the Liturgy.[1] The ending suggests that it was inaugurated after the destruction of Jerusalem. The following form is according to the so-called Palestinian rite:

'Cause us to lie down, O Lord our God, in peace, and raise us up, O our King, to life. Spread over us the tabernacle of thy peace, direct us by thy good counsel, and save us for thy Name's sake. Protect us, and keep from us (every) enemy—pestilence, sword, famine and sorrow. Drive away the adversary (lit. "Satan") from before us and behind us. Shelter us beneath the shadow of thy wings. For thou art a God who is a gracious and merciful King. Keep then our going out and our coming in, unto life and unto peace, from this time forth and for evermore, and spread over us the tabernacle of thy peace. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who spreadest a tabernacle of peace over us and over thy whole people Israel, and over Jerusalem.'

Shemone 'Esreh.—This is the designation given to a group of

[1] Apart from the recitation of the *Shema'*, which is independent of congregational worship, prayer in the evening was not 'obligatory.'

prayers, the keynote of which is praise. They are constructed in regular form and strung together, and end invariably with the formula: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord . . .' etc. Although at first it probably consisted only of six prayers for week-days and seven for Sabbaths and feast-days, and in its final and fixed form, of nineteen, it is generally known under the above name, which means 'eighteen.' It is also called *Tephillah*, i.e. '*the* Prayer'; or *Amidah*, 'standing,' because it is recited standing.

It is extremely difficult to reconstruct the basic text of these benedictions, as the current versions do not represent their earliest form. The following is of Palestinian origin, and probably the earliest of all. The hypothetical dates we assign to the individual benedictions agree on the whole with those given by the Jewish liturgical scholar, Prof. Finkelstein, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. XVI, No. 2.

Benediction I (Pre-Maccabean?):

Blessed art thou, O Lord our God and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the great, mighty, and awful God, the God most high, Possessor of heaven and earth (cf. Gen. xiv. 19), our shield and the shield of our fathers, our trust from generation to generation. Blessed art thou, O Shield of Abraham.

[It is possible that this benediction goes back to pre-Maccabean times, as the appellation of God as the 'Shield of Abraham' is found also in the book of Ecclesiasticus. But what is particularly significant about this recension, and what has not been noticed by liturgists, is that, unlike most other recensions, it does not contain the words, 'and wilt bring a Redeemer to their children's children,' which evidently must have been added later, in opposition to Jewish Christianity, especially as these words are according to the Babylonian rite; and in Babylon, long before Aphraates, the Syrian Christian homilist of the fourth century, the Jews had frequent intercourse with Christians. Josephus speaks of 'innumerable myriads' of Jews in that region (*Ant.*, xi. 5, 2); and, moreover, 'Parthians and Medes and Elamites and dwellers in Mesopotamia,' *i.e.* Jews from those countries, were present in Jerusalem at the first Pentecost (Acts ii. 9), and a considerable number of them, doubtless, became Christians.]

Benediction II (Ante-Sadducean):

Thou art mighty for ever, O Lord; thou quickenest the dead; thou art mighty to save. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who quickenest the dead.

Benediction III (about A.D. 40?):

Thou art holy and awful is thy Name, *and there is no God apart from thee.* Blessed art thou, O Lord, the holy God.

Benediction IV (about A.D. 40?):

O our Father, favour us with knowledge, understanding, and discernment from thy Law. Blessed art thou, O Lord, gracious Giver of knowledge.

Benediction V (about A.D. 40?):

Turn us unto thee, O Lord, and we shall turn; renew our days like unto the days of old. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who delightest in repentance.

Benediction VI (beginning of Christian era?):

Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who dost abundantly forgive.

Benediction VII (after A.D. 70?):

Look upon our afflictions and plead our cause, and redeem us for thy Name's sake. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the redeemer of Israel.

Benediction VIII (beginning of Christian era?):

Heal us, O Lord, from our afflictions, and vouchsafe a healing to our wounds. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Healer of the sick.

Benediction IX (beginning of Christian era?):

Bless this year unto us for our good in all kinds of the produce thereof. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who blessedst the years.

Benediction X (after A.D. 70?):

Sound the great horn for our freedom, and lift up the ensign to gather us. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who gatherest the banished ones of Israel.

Benediction XI (after A.D. 70?):

Restore our judges as at first, and our counsellors as at the beginning, and reign thou alone over us. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who lovest righteousness and judgment.

Benediction XII (A.D. 110–117: chiefly against Jewish Christians; *Ber.* 28*a*):

Let the apostates have no hope, and may the wicked kingdom (Rome) soon be rooted out, and the *Nazareans* and the *Minim* (heretics) perish as in a moment, and be blotted out from the book of life. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who humblest the arrogant.

Benediction XIII (beginning of second century A.D.?):

May thy tender mercies be stirred towards the proselytes of righteousness, and give us a good reward with those who do thy will. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Trust of the righteous.

Benediction XIV (168–165 B.C.?):

Have pity, O Lord our God, on Israel thy people, on Jerusalem thy city, and on Zion the dwelling-place of thy glory, and on thine altar, and on thy Palace, and on the Kingdom of the house of David, the Messiah thy righteousness. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Builder of Jerusalem.

Benediction XV (pre-Maccabean?):

Hear, O Lord our God, our voice and have mercy upon us. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Hearer of prayer.

Benediction XVI (after A.D. 70?):

Be pleased, O Lord, our God (with our prayers); dwell in Zion, and may thy servants worship thee in Jerusalem; have pity and restore thy Shekinah into Zion thy city, and the order of (sacrificial) worship into Jerusalem. Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God, whom alone we fear and worship.

Benediction XVII (pre-Christian?):

We give thanks unto thee; thou art the Lord our God and the God of our fathers; we thank thee for all thy benefits, the grace and loving-kindness with which thou hast rewarded us and which thou hast shown (lit. 'done') to us and to our fathers before us. Blessed art thou, O Lord, whom it is good to thank (or, 'the good God, whom it is meet to thank').

Benediction XVIII (A.D. 40–70?):

Grant peace upon Israel thy people and upon thy city, and upon thine inheritance, and bless us all together (lit. 'as one'). Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Maker of peace.

There was always an aversion among the Rabbis to making prayer amatter of fixed formulas. Some Rabbis, for instance, held that one should include something new in one's prayer every day (*Ber.* 29*b*); and even in the third century A.D. much latitude prevailed as regards personal deviations in phraseology. There are, in any case, conflicting statements in the Talmud concerning the compilation of the *Shemone 'Esreh.* On the one hand, we read that a certain Simeon Ha-Pakoli edited this collection in the academy of R. Gamaliel the second (grandson of Gamaliel I, teacher of St. Paul) at Jabneh; on the other hand, again, it is traced to the 'first wise men,' or even to the 'hundred and twenty elders, and among these a number of prophets' (*Meg.* 17*b*). Neither is there agreement among modern Jewish scholars as to when the bulk of the benedictions received something like the present form; but it is recognised that not only was the benediction directly ordered against 'Nazareans' (Benediction XII), but that also whenever, for instance, the sovereignty of God or the eternal significance of the Law is emphasised in any prayer, it carries an anti-Christian point.

All this shows how difficult it is to visualise an early Synagogue service, especially the manner in which it took place before the destruction of the Temple in the year A.D. 70. *The only certain data* are found in St. Luke (iv. 15–21), and these are, of course, very slight, and only concern Scripture-reading and exhortation. That certain prayers, especially in connection with this reading from the Law and the Prophets, were said, is, however, most probable, and the following benedictions may already have been used in the time of our Lord: The one who was asked to read from the Law would say: 'Bless ye the Lord, the Blessed One.'

The congregation would respond: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, who gavest us the Torah of truth and *plantest eternal life in our midst (John v. 39: 'Search the Scriptures, of which ye think that in them ye have eternal life,' probably refers to this benediction). Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Giver of the Torah.'*

Having read, he would say: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who hast chosen us from among all the nations, and hast given us thy Torah.

'Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Giver of the Torah.'

Before the prophetic lesson the following benedictions were probably also already said, in substance, at any rate, in the time of our Lord.

'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who hast chosen good prophets, and hast found pleasure in their words which were spoken in truth. Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, who hast chosen the Law, and Moses thy servant, and Israel thy people, and the prophets of truth and righteousness.'

'Gladden us, O Lord our God, with the prophet Elijah, thy Servant, and with the Kingdom of the house of David, thy Messiah. May he come soon and gladden our hearts. Suffer not a stranger (Herod?) to sit upon his throne, nor let others any longer inherit his glory; for by thy holy Name thou didst swear unto him (David) that his light should never be quenched. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the Shield of David.'

That psalms, especially on festivals and 'distinguished' Sabbaths, were said or chanted is also probable if, as it is usually assumed, the Synagogue services were meant to be replicas of those of the Temple; and if the present writer's hypothesis, that the *Shema'* and the benedictions connected with it, as a liturgical confession of faith, bear the marks of opposition to the primitive Church soon after the year A.D. 30, is correct—these were added about that period, together with a number of prayers contained in the so-called 'Eighteen benedictions.'

It is not possible to describe here a number of other Synagogue prayers which doubtless belong to later periods, nor to discuss the antiquity or otherwise of the *Kaddish*, of which Dr. Oesterley, following Jewish scholars, thinks 'there is some reason to believe that the identical thoughts in the first paragraph of *Kaddish* and the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer point to a knowledge of it on the part of Christ.' In its shortest form it runs as follows:

'Magnified and hallowed be his great Name in the world which he created according to his will. May he establish his Kingdom in your lifetime and in your days, and in the lifetime of all the house of Israel, speedily and in the near time. And say ye, Amen.'

Jewish scholars, in order to show that not only the two first petitions in the Lord's Prayer, but also the third, are derived from

Jewish prayer formulas, point to a prayer ascribed to Rabbi Elieser ben Hyrkanos (end of first century): 'May thy will be done in heaven above, and give spiritual satisfaction to those who fear thee (here) below, and do what is good in thine eyes.'

Now, as there can be no doubt that according to Rabbinic statements this Rabbi not only had frequent intercourse with Jewish Christians but was, for a time at least, suspected of being attracted by their teaching, it is not improbable that the Rabbi's prayer is itself an echo of the Lord's Prayer.

To sum up: as the original purpose of the Synagogue was not worship but Scripture-reading and exposition, it was probably only after the fall of Jerusalem in the year 70 that it began to be considered as a 'little sanctuary' (based on Ezek. xi. 16; cf. *Meg.* 29*a*) and as a substitute for the Temple. Hence it is also probable that in the time of our Lord there was no fixed Synagogue Liturgy, but that the benedictions before and after the readings from the Law and the Prophets were already formulated, and John v. 39 seems to refer to one of them. That in the provincial synagogues, like those of Galilee, psalms and certain prayers were chanted, especially on feast-days and by those who could not go up to Jerusalem, can also be assumed, but we have no documentary evidence as to the content and wording of these prayers. After the Crucifixion, however, and in opposition to Jewish Christianity, the *Shema'* probably became a 'Creed' proper, both in Temple and Synagogue, and special prayers were formulated in connection with it, to emphasise the Divine Unity, the permanency of the Law, and Israel's prerogatives. The additional prayers, probably those contained in the early recensions of the 'Eighteen benedictions,' were added in the Synagogue from about 70 to 117, but it was not until the middle of the second century that these prayers acquired a definite general binding force.

Further: that until about the year 60 the Jewish Christians, notwithstanding persecutions, continued to take part in Temple worship, can be seen from St. Paul's keen desire to keep the feast at Jerusalem (Acts xx. 16). The services at the Palestinian Christian assemblies were at that time still regarded as supplementary to those at the central Jewish place of worship. But eventually, even before the destruction of the Temple, the early Church must have come to the conviction that the Messiah fulfilled all the types of Jewish sacrifice (cf. the Epistle to the Hebrews). As to the influence of the Synagogue on the Church, there can be no doubt that the earliest Christian meetings and meeting-places were modelled on the pattern of the synagogues, and also probably took over the Synagogue Lectionary, which goes back essentially to pre-Christian times. That some Jewish Christians during the second half of the first century, and even

later, seem to have attended Synagogue services, as witness the Rabbinic enactments against them, does not, however, show that it was a regular practice. Still less is it probable that the 'prayers' referred to in Acts ii. 42 included the 'Eighteen benedictions,' as Oesterley [1] suggests. There is more likelihood that *'if we knew more of the Synagogue services in Palestine as they were before the fall of Jerusalem, we should perhaps find* that these Christian prayers replaced Synagogue prayers, as the Apostles' teaching may be supposed to have replaced that of the scribes.' [2]

The following short outline may be regarded as a more or less normal Synagogue service on a Sabbath morning, at least after the year A.D. 70.

The 'ruler,' summoning the 'minister,' would bid him invite someone among the congregation to recite the *Shema'* and the group of benedictions connected with it.

The person thus invited would come forward and begin, by turning toward the congregation, with the words, 'Bless ye the Lord, the Blessed One,' to which the congregation would respond, 'Blessed be the Lord, the blessed One, for ever and ever.' Then the former would go on to say the *Yotzer* and the *Ahabah*. The congregation all this time would be seated upon the floor with the leader standing in their midst. The elders and other distinguished persons alone had special seats provided for them.

The *Shema'* proper would be said antiphonally. The leader would say: 'Hear, O Israel,' and the congregation respond by repeating that and then continuing to the end. As soon as the congregation got to the word 'One,' the *leader* would respond at once with 'Blessed be the Name of the glory of his Kingdom for ever and ever.'

After this, 'True and firm' was probably said in unison. The *Shema'* ended, the 'ruler,' again summoning the 'minister,' would bid him call upon an appropriate person to lead in reciting the 'Prayer proper,' *i.e.* the 'Eighteen benedictions,' which on a Sabbath were reduced to seven.

At this point the congregation would rise to its feet, and the 'messenger of the congregation' ascend to the platform where stood the Ark of the Law. Standing there, and facing the Ark, he would begin to recite the benedictions, to each of which the congregation would respond with *Amen*.

If it should occur that a priest, or priests, happened to be present at this service, between the 6th and 7th part of the Prayer, he, or they, would 'lift up the hands' to pronounce the Aaronitic blessing, standing beside the 'messenger of the congregation,' their faces turned to the congregation the while.

[1] *Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, p. 127.
[2] Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 44.

[It need not be pointed out that the priests, *i.e.* the Aaronites, were not in any sense Synagogue officials; their only sacerdotal function was 'the raising of the hands.'[1] Moreover, it is problematic whether before the year 70 this 'blessing' was at all a Synagogue function. Rabbinic tradition affirms it for the 'provinces'; to the present writer, however, it seems probable that it was only after the destruction of the Temple that the priests, deprived of other sacerdotal functions, began to exercise this, their prerogative, in the synagogues.][2]

This Liturgy would be followed by the Pentateuch lesson. Originally, when it probably consisted of only a few verses, one person would be asked to be the reader. Later, when longer portions were read, it was divided into seven sections (on Mondays and Thursdays into three), and the like number of persons were invited to read. As Hebrew was not understood by all, the translator (*turgeman*) rendered the reading, verse by verse, into Aramaic.

This was followed by the Prophetic lesson, called the 'Haftora,' 'dismissal,' because this was considered to end the service. This was also read in Hebrew and translated three verses at a time.

If there should be a suitable person, or persons, present, the 'ruler' would ask through the minister: 'If ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on' (Acts xiii. 15).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (1892).
Dembitz, *Jewish Services in Synagogue and Home* (1898).
Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (4th ed. Vol. II, pp. 497–554).
Oesterley and Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue.*
Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwickelung* (1913).
Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (1925).
Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, Eng. trans. (1929).

[1] Technical term for the priestly blessing, cf. Lev. ix. 22.

[2] Not enough attention has been paid to the influence of converted priests on the development of Christian institutions. What if those numerous priests who were 'obedient to the Faith' (Acts vi. 7) were naturally looked to in Christian gatherings to 'give the blessing,' and, later, because of their status, to officiate at the Eucharist, which, at least after the destruction of the Temple, if not earlier, became the Service which summed up the profound thought of the Epistle to the Hebrews on the Sacrifice of Christ as fulfilling the sacrificial Temple worship? These first priests in the Christian Church would thus be Aaronites, and actually form links between the old and the new Covenants.

THE EUCHARIST IN EAST AND WEST

By F. GAVIN

THE words in the Apostles' Creed—'I believe in the Communion of Saints'—may mean three separate things. (1) The conception which most immediately springs to mind is of the Fellowship of Holy Persons. But as the word translated 'Saints' is in Latin and Greek either neuter or masculine, it might also equally well mean (2) the sharing of things which by being offered become holy, and (3) participation in Holy Things. The words are patient of all three meanings, and each several meaning describes an essential note in the long life of the Eucharist in the Church. Fundamental is, of course, the thought of the Holy Fellowship—the 'true Israel,' the Mystical Body of Christ. Within its life go on two kinds of sacrifice—one in which the believers offer up what they would of those things God's bounty has supplied, and dedicating them, give them to be shared by the needy. But in connection with the Eucharist, they receive by giving: what is offered for the actual Eucharistic Service—the elements of bread and wine—becomes means for Holy Communion. They participate in the life once offered by our Lord on Calvary, who by offering make possible this Communion with Him and with one another.

In the pages that follow an attempt will be made to describe and interpret the Eucharistic life of the Church. Beginning with the evidence of the New Testament we shall pass on to consider the beginnings of Liturgies and give special study to the basic rite of Christendom—that found in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus.[1] Thence diverge the two chief types of Liturgies, the Eastern and the Western. We shall consider the ideas and practices concerning the Eucharist, both in the Liturgies and their history and in the Church writers who exercised great influence. We shall then attempt to understand the significance and meaning of the great historical rites of Christen-

[1] I am assuming the validity of the conclusions of E. Schwartz, *Über die pseudoapostolischen Kirchenordnungen* (Strassburg, 1910), and of Dom John Connolly, *The So-Called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents* (Cambridge, 1916), despite the arguments urged against their views by R. Lorentz, *De egyptische Kerkordening en Hippolytus van Rom* (Haarlem, 1929).

dom. In so doing we shall be mindful of the Liturgy and Worship of the Anglican Communion, and in particular we shall note the antecedents of three groups of noteworthy phrases: (1) 'We entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that . . . we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee ourselves, our souls and bodies.' (2) 'Very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people.' (3) 'We humbly beseech thee mercifully to accept our alms and oblations, and to receive these our prayers.' Here are the offering of the Fellowship of believers, the 'alms and oblations,' the 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' given Godwards by the 'members incorporate in the mystical Body' of Christ, and the receiving of His Blessed Body and Blood.

1. *Eucharistic Origins.*

The New Testament comes to us as a portion of the collected religious literature of a Fellowship which claimed to be the True Israel, the 'Israel of God.' It cannot be interpreted apart from the group's life, behaviour and thought. We are not dependent on the documents alone for evidence showing a continuing corporation, developing from, and maintaining that it represented—in spirit, conviction and action—the unbroken social thing called the Church. This corporation is the Society in which the scriptures of the New Testament took their rise. This Society and its usages constitute the larger context of the written word of the New Testament. The best commentary on the latter is its practices and customs, its different views and developing convictions.

In the following brief sketch of the New Testament material we shall depart from the usual practice of dealing only with the analysis of the specially relevant texts. Whatever the Lord's Supper was or meant to the Corinthian Christians, whatever our Lord did and meant on the eve of His Passion, whatever was signified by the 'breaking of the bread'—these all are intimately related to the larger life of the Fellowship. From that Fellowship's behaviour and belief, its usages and convictions, its actions and reflections, we can fill out and interpret the specifically Eucharistic texts. What follows immediately has to do with (1) the Institution, (2) Reflections upon the Eucharist, (3) the Narratives of the Miraculous Feedings, and (4) Aspects of the Life of the Society of Believers in Jesus.

(1) The Accounts of the Institution are four, of which the first in point of time of writing is that of St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xi.

17–30. The occasion of his discussing it was the actual concrete problem of practice in the Corinthian Church. The first point of offence was a breach in the unity of life in the Brotherhood (*vv.* 18–21). Secondly, the Eucharistic Service was connected with a Common Meal, following the example he adduces of the Lord's own action (*v.* 25). The close relationship between a religious observance and the social and economic needs (*vv.* 21–22) is significant: there is not only the sin against the Brotherhood, but also the further one of sacrilege (*vv.* 27–29), and these are intimately related. The results of the latter have been grievous (*v.* 30). The conclusion is: 'when you come together *to eat*, wait for one another. If any be hungry, let him eat at home lest you come together for condemnation' (*vv.* 33–34). The Eucharist is obviously combined with what few of us would deem to be a Church 'Service'; for it must have been something like a congregational supper. Yet, despite its corporate character, the individuals had, or took, a considerable degree of personal initiative.

We deal then with two things: (*a*) the Congregational Supper, at which the poor and hungry should have been succoured, closely bound up with what we term (*b*) the Eucharist—a commemoration of the Last Supper, involving a memorial of that event, a 'showing forth of the Lord's death till he come' (*v.* 26), a wrong—or undiscriminating—participation in which has brought grave consequences: some have become weak, others ill, and several have actually died (*v.* 30). Further light is thrown on the Eucharist proper in the preceding chapter (x. 14–22), and this gains more illumination from x. 1–4. A very brief summary of the statement and inferences shows us: (1) St. Paul thought of an Old Testament baptism and feeding of 'the Fathers' (x. 1–2) corresponding to Christian Baptism and Eucharist. (2) In the Old Covenant there was also 'Spirit-infused food . . . and drink' (x. 4), and the source was the same—Christ (*v.* 4). (3) The Eucharistic Cup and Bread were 'fellowship,' or 'participation' or 'communion' with the Body and Blood of Christ (*v.* 16). (4) The Bread is one, as the Body is one—though Bread and the Body are composed alike of many several parts: the oneness is created by 'sharing' or 'participation' (*v.* 17). (5) The Eucharist is compared to the Jewish (*v.* 18) and heathen (*vv.* 19–20) sacrifices. The sacrificer or 'those who eat of the sacrifice are participants in God' (*v.* 18) in the former case, and with demons in the latter (*v.* 20). There can be no cross-relations between Christians and heathen (*v.* 21). Sharing in the power of deity seems to be *one* end of sacrifice, obtained by eating of what is there offered. (6) By definite implication the Eucharist is properly reckoned a sacrifice, whether from the Jewish or pagan use of the term.

(*b*) The Marcan account is now given, with the Pauline in parallel (common material is italicised):

St. Mark xiv.	I Cor. xi.
22 And as they were eating, *taking bread*, having blessed he *brake* and gave it to them *and said:* Take, *this is my Body.*	23 That the Lord Jesus, in the night in which he was being betrayed, 24 *took bread* and having given thanks *brake and said: This is my Body* (which is broken for you). Do this for my memorial.
23 *Also* taking *the cup*, having given thanks he gave to them, and they all drank of it. 24 And he said to them: *This* is my *blood* of the *Covenant*, poured out for many.	25 Likewise *also the cup* after supping, saying: *This* cup is the New *Covenant* in my *Blood.* Do this as oft as ye drink, for my memorial.
25 Verily say I unto you, that I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God.	26 (For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come.)

The Marcan account, the most primitive that we possess, consists of three parts, a saying over the bread, a saying over the wine, and an unmistakably eschatological reference (in *v.* 25). In it, as well as in St. Paul, 'bless' and 'give thanks' (which are later to become separable and distinctly different things, see below where *Eulogia* and *Eucharist* are distinguished, p. 103) are of the same import. The Marcan account describes the Meal of a Jewish Fellowship, of which our Lord was the head, in the course of which He took bread, recited the customary blessing over it: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, Ruler of the Universe, the One who causeth bread to spring forth from the earth,' brake and gave it, and then said: 'Take, this is my Body.' So also He 'gave thanks' over the cup: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, Ruler of the Universe, he who createth the fruit of the vine.' The Marcan account records no instruction to drink of it, but merely the fact that they did. The words following parallel those over the Broken Bread, and recall Exod. xxiv. 8 (cf. Heb. ix. 20) and Jer. xxxi. 31. Here is explicit the assertion, at least in symbol, of our Lord's self-oblation for His own—the overt and self-conscious act of dedication to sacrifice, of self-immolation and self-surrender to it, the clear statement that it was a vicarious sacrifice. The blood-shedding initiated a New Covenant, of which those partaking were the first members: a new Fellowship was constituted by that act. The third section—with a reminiscence of the Jewish Blessing of the Cup—has a specifically forward look, to the Messianic Banquet where the triumphant Christ would hold fellowship with His own. There is no trace of this in St. Paul's account, where the act of 'showing forth his death till he come' is in no wise correlative to participation in the Messianic Banquet.

(*c*) St. Matthew's account (xxvi. 26–29) seems modelled upon that of St. Mark: the differences are chiefly lexical; the only additions or changes are: the injunction 'Drink ye all of it' (*v.* 27); in *v.* 28 '(my Blood) poured out for many *for* (*the*) *remission of sins*'; *v.* 29 reads '*from now* I shall not drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new *with you* in the Kingdom of *my Father*.' Yet there is good reason to believe that it represents a Church tradition emanating from a different locality. (That it is already a 'Church tradition' is clear from the balanced, well-articulated structure, probably developed into this form from liturgical usage.) There are differences in ideas, but the fundamental sequence is the same as in St. Mark; the Messianic Banquet is, however, linked closely to those present; 'with you . . . in my Father's Kingdom' may represent also a further theological development.

(*d*) The Lucan account (xxii. 15–20) offers extremely difficult textual problems, which cannot be discussed here. One fact emerges, however, that of the divergent texts that have come down to us, one might seem to have only the Eucharistic bread, with which reading may be compared other Lucan passages—*e.g.* xxiv. 30, 35; Acts ii. 42, 46; xx. 11, etc., if indeed the omission of the cup in them is significant. Was there a local tradition of this sort current in one community, in which the usage—represented later by some gnostics (cf. *Clem. Hom.*, 14, 1; *Actus Vercellenses St. Petri*, 5; *Acts of John*, 106–110; *Acts of Thomas*, 27, 29, 49–50, 133, 158, etc.)—was given up in the light of overwhelming and convergent traditions of the other type?

In the Lucan account the eschatological reference—bound up with the anticipated Passover—is like the Marcan-Matthæan, and is reinforced by the words over the cup in *vv.* 17–18. Here, in the shorter text, as given in the margin of the Revised Version, do not appear any suggestions that the cup is our Lord's Blood: the idea of the Messianic Banquet is paramount, and is apart from all reference to the New Covenant or to sacrifice. It is, however, to a resultant text, the tenor of which represents a conflation of all the ideas associated with the Eucharist—Jewish practice, New Covenant, Sacrifice, Messianic Banquet—that the canonisation of the Church attaches, and not to one variant among the different readings, the explanation of which eludes our grasp.

(2) Turning our attention to other passages in the New Testament which have to do with the Eucharist, we find the most important in the discourse in St. John vi. in the Synagogue at Capernaum. It is difficult, if not almost impossible, to sever this section from its inevitably Eucharistic associations and meanings. The two miracles—unique in Johannine composition—which introduce it serve as texts. They are: (1) the increase of the quantity

of natural food, by miraculous means, to satisfy the needs of thousands, and (2) the immediate Presence of Christ with power. The application follows: 'I am the Bread of Life' (*v.* 48). 'Your fathers ate the manna in the desert and died. This is the bread which comes down from heaven, if any one eat he shall not die. I am the Living Bread' (*vv.* 48–51). 'The bread that I shall give is my flesh which I shall give in behalf of the life of the world' (*v.* 51). 'My flesh is truly food and my blood truly drink. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him' (*vv.* 55–56). Such words are not mere metaphor or figures. The point of the mystery is in *v.* 63: 'The Spirit is that which makes alive; the flesh is valueless. The words I spake to you are Spirit and Life.' We meet here with identically the same idea as in St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. 3, 4: the 'Spirit-infused food and drink.' One explanation of the Johannine passage calls attention to the absence of the account of the Institution of the Eucharist in the Passion Narrative where we should expect it, and suggests that the author, knowing the Eucharist as *the* Observance of the Fellowship, yet being unwilling to ascribe the same origin to it as the Synoptists, attaches the institution to an anticipation of the Heavenly Messianic Banquet, which is the true meaning of the Miraculous Feedings in the Gospels. Yet two difficulties offer themselves: (1) the Eucharistic theology is indistinguishable in essence from that of St. Paul, and (2) the use of 'flesh' and 'blood,' 'bread from heaven' and the like securely binds the Eucharist to the whole cycle of sacrifice-ideas. The Passion and the Death of the Cross alone render these terms intelligible, however prominent be the notes of the Messianic Banquet and the Spirit-infused food in the Fourth Gospel.

(3) In the passage just discussed we have one account of a Miraculous Feeding. There are also two groups of Miraculous Feeding stories in the Synoptics: (*a*) of the Five Thousand (St. Mark vi. 38–44; St. Matt. xiv. 17–21; St. Luke ix. 13–17) and (*b*) of the Four Thousand (St. Mark viii. 1–10; St. Matt. xv. 32–39). Two comments may be made upon these, of which the first passage (St. Mark vi. 38–44) may be taken as typical: the extraordinarily Jewish ring to the whole passage, for which detailed Rabbinic parallels can easily be found; the equally extraordinarily Eucharistic ring—*e.g.* 'Taking . . . bread . . . he gave thanks . . . brake . . . gave to the disciples to distribute' (*v.* 41). The purpose of these miracles was to succour the physical needs of people, and to cause them to share in common food with Jesus. Human sympathy, compassion, and awareness of the need prompted the exercise of power. At the same time these common meals were distinctly and emphatically religious in tone throughout: an obscure individual offers his

little, it is surrendered to our Lord, who blesses God for it, breaks, *distributes, and gives orders that nothing be lost. By the act* represented in the Miraculous Feedings, our Lord as host gathers into the circle of His guests more than the group which always companied with Him.

(4) A fourth group of texts from the New Testament illustrate the life of the group of Jesus' followers who later, gathered together in His Name and by His Power, proclaimed the Good News and added members to their Fellowship by including them in the compass of its benefits. The group of those about our Lord had a common purse for common needs and the practice of charity (cf. St. Mark xiv. 3–5; St. Matt. xxvi. 8–9; St. Luke xxii. 35; St. John xii. 6; xiii. 29). The injunctions to the disciples show how gifts were the means not only of sustaining them but also of relieving others' wants. There must have been a sense of common needs and the satisfying of them, even in the group-fellowship of those about our Lord. In the early chapters of Acts we gain a clear picture of the weighty conviction of the need of sharing all with all (cf. Acts iv. 32, 34–37; v. 1–11; vi. 1–6, etc.). The followers of Jesus share not only a common outlook, but increasingly a common life (cf. Acts xi. 29–30). In the picture of the Pauline Church at Corinth we have a society knit together in faith and practice, imposing a discipline and regimen on its members, and in those respects in which we can estimate such characteristics, rapidly acquiring the functions of an omnicompetent social and economic group: excommunication of a grave offender against the moral code (1 Cor. v. 4–6), condemnation of 'fornicators . . . covetous, extortioners, idolaters,' all in one breath (*vv.* 10–11 and vi. 10); prohibition of the carrying of cases between 'brethren' in litigation before heathen judges (vi. 1–8); support of the Apostle (ix. 4, 14); the whole theory of the 'Body' given in chap. xii., and the like. In practice, the collection of alms took place on Sunday (xvi. 1–4). The Pauline injunctions constantly to 'give thanks' for whatever is done (Col. iii. 17; cf. 1 Cor. x. 30–31; Eph. v. 20, etc.) show us how thoroughly the common life was to be caught up into that of religion, in all its aspects. For our purposes it is chiefly important to note the behaviour of the Christian believers bound together into a growingly competent body, in which all interests—social, economic, intellectual—were under the vivid illumination of the Christian Gospel.

A word may be said as to antecedents of the Eucharist in Judaism. The link which binds the Institution to the practice of the Jewish religion is given by the whole narrative in its broader outlines, and specially by the words 'bless,' 'brake' (St. Mark xiv. 22; St. Matt. xxvi. 26); 'gave thanks' (St. Mark xiv. 23; St. Matt. xxvi. 27; 1 Cor. xi. 24). There are

two current customs in contemporary Judaism which have been used to interpret the Last Supper in its original setting: the Passover and the *Kiddush*. The generally held theory of the chronology of the Passion, and the Pauline assimilation of the cycle of Passover ideas to the Passion (cf. 1 Cor. v. 7–8), have until fairly recently led scholars to find the background of the Last Supper in the Jewish Passover. Against this view it may be urged: there was no lamb, nor the use of the liturgical narrative of the Passover; it is 'bread' (*artos*), not 'unleavened bread' (*matsoth ; azyme*), which is used; and there is but one cup, not the four prescribed by the Jewish ritual. The Supper could not have been even an adaptation of the Passover.

The alternative is the custom called the *Kiddush :* a quasi-religious meal on the Eves of Sabbaths and Feasts. The essential elements were 'blessings' recited over the food and drink—bread and wine. The 'blessings' were given in prescribed formulæ, beginning with the unvarying words: 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, King of the Universe.' Each 'blessing' must mention God's Name. Each contained an ascription in a relative clause. The idea in each was to bless God for the thing. No one could eat or drink anything before reciting a blessing over it (*Berakhoth* 35*a*), for it was deemed sacrilege and theft to partake of God's bounty without having blessed Him for it.[1] The act of blessing released the food or drink for human consumption. The eves of festivals were always marked by such a ceremony; especially on the Eve of Sabbath was the *Kiddush* to be observed. Two blessings over the cup were prescribed for the latter, and the Schools of Hillel and Shammai debated which should come first (cf. *Berakhoth* viii. 1, and *Pesaḥim* x. 2). The *Kiddush* could not formerly be celebrated save at a meal (*Pesaḥim* 101*a*), but later it was observed in the synagogue, where in the third century travellers were accommodated, and ate, drank, and slept (see Klein, in *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, ix. 142 ff.). The 'blessing of the bread' and the 'breaking of the bread' seem not to have been solely observed on the Eves of Feasts, but at will in the 'religious groups' or 'fellowships' (*ḥaburoth*) of Rabbis and disciples, or clubs of friends. Usage differed, so that in some circumstances one said Grace for all; at other times, each said his own. The various blessings over the cup and the blessing over the bread were stereotyped at an early date. The cup used at the end of the meal was called 'the cup of blessing' (as in Midrash to Gen. xxi. 8), and there is at least one example of a glass cup found bearing the words 'receive (a) blessing' (λάβε εὐλογίαν). A group of friends who thus held fellowship was called a *ḥaburah*, to which word at least one meaning of

[1] In Tosephta *Berakhoth* vi. 24, the devout Jew is to 'eat his bread reciting a blessing both before and after.'

koinonia in the New Testament corresponds (cf., *e.g.*, in Acts ii. 42, where it is closely associated with 'the breaking of the bread').[1] The *Kiddush* was thus in part the symbol of the fellowship-relation. The host was to be 'remembered' by those at table, and in *Berakhoth* 46*a* such a prayer for the host is given: 'May it be thy will that the host be not put to shame in this world nor confounded in that which is to come.'

But in any case the circumstances of the Last Supper were unique, so that in its case there were both retrospect and prospect. The constant fellowship of our Lord with the disciples in social life, worship or companionship at table thus culminated in a quasi-anticipation of the Messianic Banquet. There is also a quasi-anticipation of the Passover (cf. St. Matt. xxvi. 18–19; St. Luke xxii. 14–16). Mr. Loewe has drawn attention to the fact that if the words 'Do this unto my memorial' (1 Cor. xi. 24, 25; [St. Luke xxii. 19]) be original, they would have peculiar relevance from the background of *Kiddush* and the Passover ritual (*seder*). The commemorations in both are of the Creation of the World (and the Sabbath-rest) and the delivery from Egyptian bondage (and the election of Israel). Were these words authentic —as St. Paul records them—we have a consistent whole in the Institution. The background is Jewish, the ideas with which this unparalleled occurrence operates are Jewish—yet the uniqueness and extraordinary quality of the words 'This is my Body . . . my Blood' are shown in the intimation that a New Order has been initiated in which the memorials of the Creation of all things and of the redemption of the Chosen People are to be relegated to a secondary position: the central place of the sacrifice of our Lord ushers in a New Covenant. As Lietzmann interprets the meaning:[2] 'I am the sacrificial victim whose blood is poured out for you—that is, for the believing folk—to seal a new Covenant with God, and whose Body is slain for you.'[3]

We are not in a position clearly to analyse the significance, meaning and usages of the Jewish sacrificial system as they affected early Christianity. Nor can we say with precision in what respect the idea that alms-giving was a surrogate for sacrifice in the Temple (a widespread belief among Jews after the destruction of the Second Temple) affected Christian practices. But from what can be restored from intimations here and there, and inferred from a phrase, word or custom, the full connotations of which were gradually to fade, it is highly probable

[1] It is possible also that in 1 Cor. i. 9 and x. 16 (*bis*) it may mean 'the fellowship created by His Son,' . . . 'His Blood' etc. All of the Pauline uses of the word at least receive much light from the Jewish background of the term.

[2] *Messe und Herrenmahl*, Bonn, 1926.

[3] P. 221, *op. cit.*; on p. 225 he calls attention to the meaning of 2 Cor. iii. 6, 14 and Gal. iv. 24: 'in both cases it is clear that the "New Covenant" is in divinely enjoined opposition with the Covenant of Sinai.'

that both the sacrificial cultus on the one hand, and the systematic quasi-religious practice of charity on the other, moulded, if they did not largely constitute, the framework as well of early Christian liturgical practice as of ethical conduct and religious behaviour.

We may summarise the New Testament very briefly, putting to one side the more obvious facts. The Synoptic Gospels give us not one single tradition, but possibly three, certainly two different traditions, which are again not identical with those of St. Paul and the Johannine literature. Liturgical practice has had much to do with the form and phraseology of these narratives. We find the Dominical injunction 'Do this' in St. Paul, from whose account it probably found its way into the current text of St. Luke. The two chief ideas in strict relationship with the Eucharist are those of sacrifice and of the Messianic Banquet. So far as concerns the former, as Mr. Spens pointed out in *Essays Catholic and Critical*, it is the Eucharistic Institution which in the Synoptic Gospels uniquely demonstrates the Passion as a self-consciously and deliberately willed sacrifice. The meaning, point, purpose and intent of Good Friday were given in the Last Supper—and there alone.[1] The Messianic Banquet ideas are of a piece with the eschatological teaching, thought and language of our Lord, sustaining their chief presentation in the Fourth Gospel and in the earlier verses of the Lucan narrative. We may not, however, interpret the Eucharist in isolation from other elements of teaching and practice. The Miraculous Feedings have an intimate relation to the Eucharist, both in form and in the acts narrated. In fact, St. John's Eucharistic chapter uses the Feeding of the Five Thousand as its point of departure. The life of the Christian Fellowship, in imitation of that of the band of those who 'companied with Jesus,' grows in organic quality, subsuming all the activities of its members, as it exercises a control over their thoughts and convictions, under the New Life and Law in Jesus. If the Eucharist, as Sacrifice and as Communion, represents one, then the *Agape* or Love Feast (alluded to in Jude 12; 2 Peter ii. 13) represents the other type of Christian religious meal in Fellowship. While the Last Supper uniquely and clearly gave rise to the Eucharist, the Miraculous Feedings, with their clearer suggestion of the anticipated Heavenly Banquet of the Messiah, are the starting-point for the *Agapes*. The former was both Commemorative Sacrifice—or, at least, the Commemoration of the Sacrifice—and Communion with Him. The latter had also the note of sacrifice—the surrender of that which was one's own for dedication by our Lord to common needs. The mood of Thanksgiving governed both. There could be 'Thanks-

[1] Though Mark x. 45, 'to give his life a ransom for many,' implies a great deal.

giving' for all that our Lord was and did,[1] of which the outstanding fact was His Sacrifice. Eucharist and sacrifice were inseparable.

2. *The Eucharist in the Church of the Second and Third Centuries.*

The Eucharist was a regular and constituent observance of the primitive Christian fellowship. Probably, however, the details of its origin were not matters with which the early believer would greatly concern himself: he would do what the Dominical example enjoined, whether that command were by explicit word or by exemplary practice on our Lord's part. We have found that by the date of the redaction of the Gospels various traditions were already current, in all likelihood representing different local customs. The Matthæan account has been rubbed smooth and filled out for use as a liturgical narrative; Mark seems to be the most primitive; the evidence of Luke is much disputed in critical circles, and has been thought to support the possible existence of a Eucharistic observance in which *the* element was bread, and the cup does not appear. In the Pauline account, chronologically the earliest, we have the fullest statement of all, based upon some other than the tradition given by Luke. In St. John we have no account of a Last Supper, but, on the other hand, a full Eucharistic theology, bound up in part with a different cycle of ideas from those of the Covenant-Sacrifice group, and concerned with the Messianic Banquet belief. However, the use of 'Flesh and Blood' and of 'Spirit' links the Johannine tradition to the Pauline: the Spirit as infusing the food of 1 Cor. x. 3, 4, and the 'Spirit' in St. John vi. 63 belong to the same outlook.

What did the earliest Eucharists mean to the believers of the primitive Christian Fellowship? Many meanings were bound up together: the anticipation of the heavenly Messianic Banquet (Johannine); the remembrance of our Lord's Passion, death and self-immolation; the corporate act of the fellowship in, with and by their Lord's Presence among them; the continuation of the custom of our Lord's social intercourse with His followers; receiving by participation His strength, power and life in communion with Him—these and more, severally and together, represented different aspects of the observance of an ordinance varied and enriched in meaning, in different communities of Christians.

Who conducted the Eucharist in the primitive Church? For the earliest period we cannot say with precision. It is clear from 1 Cor. xi. 17–21, 33–34, for example, that the disorders in connection with its celebration at Corinth could easily have

[1] See p. 104 following. Cf. 1 John iii. 16–17, where His Sacrifice and man's are linked.

been ended had there been recognised officials with authority to put a stop to them. In a document of the late first century, 'The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians,' the author draws a sharp distinction between 'clergy' and 'laity' (xl.). The bishop-presbyters are said 'to offer the gifts' (xliv. 4), but the phrase in the Clementine use of the term does not necessarily refer to the Eucharist (cf. xxxv. 12; xxxvi. 1; xli. 1–2; and the quotation of Ps. l. 14, 15 in lii.). From the evidence of a later document, of a still early yet uncertain date, the so-called 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' or *Didache*, the 'prophets' are to offer the Eucharistic Thanks (x. 7). Early in the second century St. Ignatius' Epistles contain many references to the place of the Bishop in the Church. He is the normal celebrant, and only that Eucharist celebrated by him or his delegate is to be accounted valid (or firm; cf. *Smyrn.*, viii. 1). Approximately forty years later St. Justin Martyr in his *First Apology* describes the officiant as the 'President,' who in all likelihood is the Bishop (lxv. 5). From this time on the main lines of the tradition indicate the same theory and practice: the Bishop is the normal celebrant (cf. St. Cyprian, *Ep.* lxiii. 14, *c.* 250), though he may delegate or commission a priest to act for him as officiant. Sporadic variants in practice, here and there hinted at, may be survivals of ancient practice not yet become entirely uniform. In the primitive Church the Eucharist as the act of the Body of Christ, the Church, would naturally be celebrated by its supreme representative, the Bishop, who was the natural and inevitable person to become its leader in the Eucharistic Service.

1. In the *Didache* we have two groups of Eucharistic prayers, and some directions regarding its celebration. The *Didache*—or 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles'—is an important early document for the reason that it was so often drawn upon by later literature. It embodies an older Jewish method of instructing converts to Judaism, supplemented by a few Christian additions (i–vi), and gives the order of procedure to be observed by the community in which it arose, probably a local Jewish-Christian Church. Two views are held regarding its aim: it may be either a 'Church Order'—a practical handbook for a Christian community—or a layman's devotional manual, a kind of 'Treasury of Devotion' of the early second century. In the *Didache* the term 'Eucharist' has become technical and specific. It is explicitly called a 'sacrifice' (xiv. 1), and the term for 'ministry' (xv. 1) is that associated with a priestly ministry, probably by double reference to the Old Testament and to the cycle of ideas represented in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It must be remembered that at this early date in Christian history, and for a considerable time thereafter, the actual words used in the Eucharistic service were still unformulated in a fixed liturgical

shape. The officiant spoke them extempore. As we noted above, in St. Matthew's account of the Institution the phraseology shows evident signs of adaptation to liturgical use. Such a brief narrative of the Institution and the Lord's Prayer together may well have formed the invariable parts of the primitive Eucharistic rite.

The sections on Eucharistic prayers in the *Didache* are built upon the Jewish models, and read as follows:

ix. Concerning the Eucharist:

Thus give ye thanks,—first, over the cup:

1. 'We thank thee, our Father, for the Holy Vine of David thy servant which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy servant: to thee be glory for ever.' (Cf. Ps. lxxx. 8–19; St. Mark xiv. 25.)

2. At the breaking (of bread):

'We thank thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy servant: to thee be glory for ever.'

3. 'As this broken (bread), scattered on the mountains, was gathered together and made into one (cf. 1 Cor. x. 17), so let thy Church be gathered from the ends of the earth into thy Kingdom: for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever.'

Let none eat or drink of your Eucharist save those who are baptised in the Lord's name. For concerning this the Lord said: Give not that which is holy unto the dogs (St. Matt. vii. 6).

x. After being filled then do ye give thanks:

4. 'We thank thee, Holy Father, for thy holy Name which thou hast caused to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge, faith and immortality which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy servant: to thee be glory for ever.' (Cf. Jer. vii. 12; Ezek. xliii. 7; 2 Esdr. vi. 12, etc.)

5. 'Thou, Lord Omnipotent, hast created all things for thy Name's sake, and hast given food and drink to (all) men for their enjoyment, that we should give thanks to thee; but upon *us* hast thou bestowed spiritual food and drink, and eternal life through (Jesus) thy servant. Above all things we thank thee, that thou art mighty: for thine is the power and the glory for ever: to thee be glory for ever.'

6. 'Be mindful, O Lord, of thy Church to deliver it from all evil, and to perfect it in thy love; and do thou gather it from the four winds, sanctified unto thy Kingdom which thou hast prepared for it:

Officiant: May grace come and this world pass away.

Congregation: Hosanna to the God of David!
Officiant: If any be holy, let him come; if he be not, let him repent. Maran atha!
Congregation: Amen.'
Allow the prophets to say Eucharistic thanks as they will.

Each section contains three prayers, each with its doxology, of which the concluding prayer in each section has a fuller form. To each section is appended a rubric. There is parallelism of construction, most apparent by a comparison of 3 and 6, which latter passage is the first of a long series of petitions—types common in all Eucharistic liturgies to come. Behind the form and contents of these prayers lie the Jewish prototypes, and their character is conditioned by this fact: the ideas in the Jewish models are spiritualised and transformed. For example, note the contrast between the food and drink for the body given by God to all men, and the special Spirit-infused food and drink of the believer (see 5). 'God's Name—that is, His Power, His Spirit—has taken up its dwelling in the communicants through the heavenly food,' as Lietzmann writes. In the final dialogue 'Grace' undoubtedly is the analogue to the Word, and means our Lord: the expectation of an imminent return is still vivid to this Christian congregation. Yet the (Pauline) Aramaic words—*maran atha*—have a double significance, (*a*) in the sense of Rev. xxii. 20: 'Even so, come, Lord Jesus,' and (*b*) the recognition of the fact of the sacramental Presence in the Eucharist: in a very true sense 'the Lord *has* come.'

After xiii, where firstlings and other gifts are to be given and the 'prophets' as successors of the Old Testament priests (in default of whom the poor) are to receive them, there follows in xiv the following:

> On the Lord's day of the Lord assemble ye and break bread and celebrate Eucharist, having first confessed your sins, that your sacrifice may be pure. Anyone who has a dispute with his fellow is not to come until they be reconciled, lest your sacrifice be defiled. For it is this which was spoken by the Lord: 'In every place and time offer a pure sacrifice unto me, for I am a great King, saith the Lord, and my name (is) great among the heathen' (Mal. i. 11).

The *Didache* rite is peculiar for giving the cup first, then the bread, as in (1) and (2) (but cf. 1 Cor. x. 16, which has this order), but elsewhere the sequence is 'eat . . . drink of your Eucharist' (3), 'food and drink . . . spiritual food and drink' (5). This may represent different traditions in antecedent and contemporary Jewish practice at the *Kiddush*, or possibly a con-

flation of different Christian traditions. If the prayers represented in ix, x be considered as communicants' preparation and thanksgiving at Communion, they follow the thought of the Marcan account of the Institution (save for the transposition of the order of the elements)—the bread, the wine, and the reference to the Kingdom (St. Mark xiv. 22–25, and St. Matt. xxvi. 26–29). Mark and Matthew both use the verb from which Eucharist is derived of the cup (St. Mark xiv. 23; St. Matt. xxvi. 27), as does *Didache* xiv: 'Break bread and celebrate Eucharist.'

The Eucharistic service of the *Didache* type can be summarised thus: it was held on Sundays, preceded by some sort of confession of sins, regarded as a sacrifice, the baptized only are to partake, and the celebrants[1] are prophets (teachers) and also Bishops. The whole instructions have primarily to do with inducting the newly-baptized into the practices of the Christian religion. This is clear from the connection with the earlier context. Eucharistic belief is greatly developed, for by the Eucharistic elements, contrasted with ordinary food and drink, is conveyed to the faithful life, knowledge, faith, immortality—the very personal power of God Himself. This is achieved through the Spirit-infused food and drink of the Eucharist (cf. 1 Cor. x. 4; St. John vi. 63). The Eucharist is essentially social and corporate, the function of the Church, and the occasion of intercession for the Church.

Two questions present themselves: (1) In what sense is the Eucharist a sacrifice, when no mention is made of 'offering' or 'oblation' to God? (The prayers are emphatically those of thanksgiving, not offering.) (2) How is the Spirit related to the Eucharist?

2. While from St. Ignatius' Epistles we obtain no description of the Eucharist, the scattered references to it suggest the important place it held in the Church of his day. To him the Eucharist 'is the medicinal specific for immortality, the antidote against our dying, but that we should live for ever in Jesus Christ' (Eph. xx. 2). This phrase recalls the close relationship between reception of the Eucharist and immortality in the *Didache*, and

[1] 'Concelebration,' it may be explained, is the name given to the custom of clerics of the higher orders—*i.e.*, priests and bishops—acting together at the altar in the performance of the Eucharist Rite. In the West this ancient practice has largely died out, owing to the custom whereby each priest says his own Mass daily. The Eastern Church still observes the more primitive custom: the clergy assisting actually all participate at the altar in the various detailed acts of the Eucharist, together say the Canon, and receive the Blessed Sacrament. In the Roman Ordinal the newly ordained priest 'concelebrates' with the Bishop who has ordained him, a token of the conservative quality of this portion of the Roman Use. Concelebration bore testimony both to the corporate character of the Eucharist and to the common priesthood of the ordained, evincing in the rite a principle notably obscured in modern practice whether Roman or Anglican.

in all likelihood is a bit of the Antiochene liturgy of the early second century. It appears later in fixed liturgies of wide distribution—as, for example, in that of Serapion of Egypt: 'make all those who partake to receive the specific medicine of life unto the healing of every illness' (Funk, *Didascalia*, II, 13, § 15); in that of Gaul: 'may (the Eucharist) be a medicine to those who receive it' (F. J. Mone, *Lateinische und griechische Messen aus dem zweiten bis sechsten Jahrhundert*, III. 21), and in a Berlin Papyrus, where 'unto a specific medicine for immortality, an antidote of life against all dying but for living in thee through thy beloved servant (child),' etc., is the concluding doxology (quoted by Lietzmann, p. 257, note 2).[1] The Eucharistic cup is for 'union with his Blood' (*Phil.*, iv.). The Eucharist is itself the 'flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, raised up by the Father's kindness' (*Smyrn.*, vii. 1). To Ignatius there is no explicit reference to the Messianic Banquet in the Eucharist, but primarily to the offered and sacrificed body and blood of the Saviour, which in the Eucharist avail for the believer's immortality in our Lord. The larger context of the Ignatius letters draws heavily upon the hierarchic and sacerdotal terminology (cf. *Trall.*, vii. 2; *Rom.*, vii. 3; *Phil.*, iv., etc.).

3. From about the middle of the second century we possess our first description of the Eucharist, in the words of St. Justin (m. 163–7) written 150–155 in his *First Apology*:

> (65) Having ended the prayers we salute one another with a kiss. There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine-and-water; and he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and gives thanks at considerable length for being counted worthy of these things from him. And when he has concluded the prayers and thanksgivings, all the people present express their assent by saying 'Amen.' (This word *Amen* answers in the Hebrew language to 'so be it.') And when the president has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the *Eucharistised* bread and wine-and-water and to those who are absent they carry away a portion.
>
> (66) And this food is called among us *Eucharist*, of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing for the remission of sins, and for regeneration, and who is so living as Christ enjoined. For

[1] Did St. Clement of Alexandria also know it as a liturgical phrase? Cf. *Paed.* II. ii. 2: 'And this it is to "drink the Blood" of Jesus—to partake of the Lord's incorruption.'

not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the word of God, took both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is *Eucharistised* by the prayer of the Word from him, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the Apostles, in the memoirs composed by them—which are called 'Gospels'—have thus delivered that it had been so enjoined on them: that Jesus took bread, and when he had given thanks, said, 'This do ye in remembrance of me; this is my Body'; and that, after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks he said, 'This is my Blood'; and imparted it to them alone. . . .

(67) And we afterwards continually remind each other of these things; and the wealthy among us succour the needy and we always keep together. Over all things which we eat we bless the Creator of all things, through his Son Jesus Christ and through the Holy Ghost.

And on the day called Sunday all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits. Then when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things; then we all rise together and pray, and (as we said before), when we have ceased from our prayer, bread and wine-and-water are offered, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability, and the people assent 'Amen'; and there is a distribution to each and a participation of the *Eucharistised* things, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons.

(And they who are well-to-do and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succours both orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and, in a word, takes care of all in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly.)

Elsewhere St. Justin carefully distinguishes Christian from pagan sacrifices: 'Worshipping as we do the Maker of this Universe and declaring, as we have been taught, that he has no need of streams of blood, and libations, and incense, him we praise to the utmost of our power by the word of prayer and thanksgiving over all things which we offer; as we have been taught that the only honour that is worthy of him is not to consume by fire that which had been brought into being by

him for our sustenance, but to use it for ourselves and the needy, and with gratitude to him to offer thanks by word of mouth, to bring solemnities and hymns, for our creation, for the means of all well-being, for the various qualities of different things, and for the changes of the seasons' (1 *Apol.*, 13).

In these accounts of the Eucharist we have a twofold use of 'offer' and 'oblation'—one, with reference to the gifts brought and dedicated by Christians to be given to the necessitous brethren, and the other with direct reference to the Eucharist itself. Thanksgiving, or Eucharist in the broad sense, was connected with both 'offerings,' but in its special technical sense applied particularly and peculiarly to what we mean by the word. In his *Dialogue with Trypho* Justin finds in the 'offering of fine flour' (cf. Lev. ii. 1 ff.; xiv. 10) a 'type of the bread of the Eucharist, the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed, in remembrance of the suffering he endured for all those who are purified in soul from all iniquity, and in order that at the same time we might give God thanks for having created the world, with all things that are in it, for the sake of man, and for delivering us from the evil in which we were, and for overthrowing utterly the principalities and powers, by him who suffered according to his Will.' (Then follows the quotation of Mal. i. 10–12.) 'He then speaks of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place offer sacrifices to him, *i.e.* the bread of the Eucharist and the cup of the Eucharist' (c. 41).

We are then in a position to define more closely two meanings of the words 'sacrifice,' 'oblation,' 'offering' and their verbs: one in which 'gifts are offered to God, not to be consumed with fire but rather in a common meal or distributed to the poor brethren.' The other has definitely a special allocation to the Eucharist in which gifts of bread and wine are 'offered,' and become the body and blood of Christ.

Behind St. Justin's description we can detect a liturgical usage which is rapidly assuming a fixed form, at least so far as concerns its sequence of ideas. The described rite has the following features:

General sequence.

1. Lections { Prophets, Gospels.
2. Homily and exhortation.
3. Prayer.
4. Offertory:
   (*a*) Gifts for the needy.
   (*b*) The elements for the Eucharist.
5. Eucharistic Prayer, followed by *Amen*.
6. Communion of those present and absent.

The Eucharistic Prayer.

1. Thanksgiving, for creation of world.
2. For redemption from sin and evil.
3. Memorial of Passion and its fruits.
4. Thanks for 'being accounted worthy of these things.'
5. The use of the 'Prayer of His word' ('Word'?).

What is meant by the words 'sacrifice,' 'oblation,' 'offering'? To the ancient world the essence of religion was sacrifice. Men came before God with an offering and oblation. They drew near to the Deity's presence with a gift, which was presented, dedicated and surrendered to Him. In our age it is difficult to restore this sense, taken for granted and everywhere assumed, in which 'worship' was understood. 'Sacrifice' has for most of us become metaphorical and figurative only. In our study of the Old Testament the parts least read and digested are what appear to us dull, irrelevant and incomprehensible—the legislation, for example, given in the Book of Leviticus. But for any fair picture of the early times of Christianity it is necessary for us to bring back into consciousness a vivid awareness of the enormous range and ubiquitous touch of the ideas connected with sacrifice.

The Christians were the 'true Israel,' the 'Israel of God,' [1] so they appropriated as their own history the whole of the Old Testament. 'Barnabas' could write, with what might seem effrontery, that Jews had no right to the Old Testament, but that its relevance, meaning and custody were for Christians only. Two ideas appear in this connection: the fulfilment in Christ and His Mystical Body of all that had been prophesied, or by type prefigured, and in consequence the abrogation of the divinely-devised methods, revealed to man, as to the ways in which he was to approach God. But the New Covenant continued the Old. All that had prevailed in the Old was related as type to the antitype—the New. Sacrificial notions, methods and the like were then not irrelevant, but supremely significant—though the ways and usages in the concrete had passed, the principles remained. Consequently, writers like the author of Hebrews, and many outside the New Testament in the first two centuries, were greatly preoccupied with all matters concerning sacrifice, oblation, offering. Furthermore, these same ideas and their associations were common coinage in the realm of men's religious conceptions in the ancient world. Had Christianity been a religion without sacrifice, it would have been unintelligible. Using the language and ideas universal to men, it could employ sacrificial terminology, everywhere common and current, as a kind of Old Testament of the Gentiles.

But of what kinds were the 'sacrifices' of early Christianity? [2] Obviously there is the association of the word with the instincts and operations of subjective piety and devotion: 'a humble spirit, a broken and contrite heart.' There is the 'sacrifice of praise,' or 'of thanksgiving'—the acts of praising God in word, of taking part in public worship—in the sense these phrases

[1] Gal. vi. 16; Phil. iii. 3; Rom. ii. 29; iii. 29–30; ix. 6 ff.
[2] Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 7, vi. 32, 34.

usually have for us. But this does not exhaust the meaning of the phrase, which had a more deeply sacrificial content to them than we are nowadays aware of. As we have seen, the Eucharistic types of the New Testament broadly considered are two, that of the Covenant—blood-shedding—and that of the Messianic Banquet. These ideas often intermingle, for even in the Johannine tradition 'flesh' and 'blood' connote sacrifice and are unintelligible without some reference to it. Similarly, the eschatological reference of the Marcan-Matthæan Narrative of the Institution relates the Covenant-blood-shedding type to the eschatological Messianic Kingdom. In both there is food and drink, in the reception of which Christ is with His own. In any such festival or commemorative meal, social and corporate in essence, the sacrificial note is not lacking. The viands were brought and offered by some of those who were to partake of them. This act is thought of as a 'sacrifice' or 'oblation,' whether at a congregational or private Religious Supper or at the Eucharist. Every act of every Christian had a Godward reference; so in an inevitable and natural fashion, food and drink, provided by God's bounty, were offered to God before being consumed. This is, in one conspicuous form of the conception, ultimately derived from the notion of 'blessing' in Judaism: to appropriate, without offering to God and blessing Him for it, what God's goodness gives His children, is theft and sacrilege.

So the 'offering' of all things that were needed for man's sustenance became invariably the practical operation of the Apostolic precepts: 'Whatsoever ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God,' follows after: 'If I by grace be a partaker, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?' (1 Cor. x. 30, 31); 'giving thanks always for all things unto God and the Father in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ' (Eph. v. 20); 'Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him' (Col. iii. 17). Constant praise and thanksgiving in and from the believer's heart were truly sacrifice; offering and oblation of the good things needed for man's physical life were also 'sacrifice.'

4. Our best early illustration of this type of Christian 'oblation' or 'sacrifice' can be found in the *Apostolic Tradition* of St. Hippolytus. The text to which his name is ascribed is very likely a compilation, and in part a composition, by St. Hippolytus. There is no doubt that the text represented in this document is very primitive and was deemed of peculiar—if not unique—authority by the early Church.

In it we have extremely interesting evidence of two kinds—one, directly bearing on the Eucharist (see under A below), and the other (see B below), having to do with sacrifices,

oblations, etc. in connection either with semi-sacred meals (*Agapes*) or with other offerings of various sorts. The indubitably *Eucharistic references are as follows:—* [1]

A. (I) *The Eucharistic Canon (from the Service of Consecration* of a Bishop).

Bishop : The Lord be with you.
Congregation : And with thy spirit.
Bishop : Lift up your hearts.
Congregation : We have them to the Lord.
Bishop : Let us give thanks unto the Lord.
Congregation : It is meet and right.

(1) We give thanks unto thee, O God, through thy beloved Son (servant) Jesus Christ, whom in the last times thou didst send unto us to be Saviour, Redeemer and messenger of thy will; [2] who is thine inseparable Word through whom thou hast made all things, and who was well-pleasing unto thee.[3] Him didst thou send from heaven into the womb of the Virgin, and being borne in her womb was incarnate and shown to be thy Son, born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin. He in fulfilment of thy will and preparing for thee an holy people stretched forth his hands when he was suffering that he might deliver from suffering those who believed in thee.

(2) Who when he was being given over to his willing suffering that he might dissolve death, break the chains of the devil, tread hell underfoot, illuminate the righteous, set a bound (to death) and manifest forth the Resurrection, having taken bread, gave thanks unto thee and said: Take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you. Likewise also the cup, saying: This is my blood which is poured out for you. When ye do this ye make my memorial.

(3) Being mindful then of his death and Resurrection we offer to thee the bread and the cup, giving thanks unto thee that thou hast deemed us worthy to stand before thee and act as priest unto thee.

(4) And we beseech thee to send thy Holy Spirit upon the sacrifice of thy (holy) Church,

[1] In what follows—particularly in respect of the Eucharistic Canon—it must be noted that Hippolytus would not prescribe precisely these words. 'It is not . . . necessary for him to recite the same words . . . but according to his own ability' (as in St. Justin Martyr, 1 *Apol.*, 67), 'so each one is to give thanks.' On the text (Latin lacking) see Connolly, pp. 179–80, 64–66. The unique position, however, of these very words suggests that they were either anterior to St. Hippolytus' time and were already hallowed by usage, or that they speedily gained an extraordinary position for themselves (if they were his authorship) almost unparalleled in Christian antiquity.

[2] Dr. Brightman points out that this is a reference to Isaiah ix. 6: 'messenger of (his) counsel.'

[3] Or: 'whom thou hast been pleased to send.'

(5) Which do thou in uniting it[1] give to all the saints who partake for fulfilment of the Holy Spirit unto the strengthening of faith in truth, that we may praise and glorify thee

(6) Through thy Son (servant) Jesus Christ, through whom unto thee be glory and honour,—to the Father and the Son with the Holy Spirit in thy Holy Church, now and for evermore. Amen.

This Canon of Consecration is of pre-eminent importance for all later Christian liturgies, so it may be useful to discuss it somewhat in detail. As a whole, it is to be noted (*a*) that this is what we are accustomed to call the 'Preface'—only there is no *Sanctus*! (*b*) The whole prayer, which steps off from the thought of the third sentence of the dialogue, is governed by the thought of Thanksgiving. The word occurs thrice, at the opening, at the Narrative of the Institution, and the Memorial—in each case with different significance. The verb 'to give thanks' (*eucharistein*) has become by this time a peculiarly Christian—or Jewish-Christian—term. Compare the following rubric from the First Communion of the Newly Baptized. 'Then let the oblation be offered by the deacons to the Bishop and let him *Eucharistise* the bread into the antitype of the Body of Christ; the mixed cup as the likeness of the blood shed for all who believed in Him.' (*c*) The prayer may for convenience be divided into the following parts, as numbered in the text above:

(1) Thanksgiving and praise for the Incarnation.
(2) Narrative of the Institution.
(3) Memorial and Oblation.
(4) Invocation.
(5) Intercession.
(6) Concluding doxology.

(*d*) The content of section (1) is a rehearsal of the work of the Incarnate Lord as the 'beloved Son (or "servant")' of the Father—an archaism which suggests the ancient character of the prayer—who was both Saviour and Revealer of God's will. This will had as its primary purpose the acquisition of a Holy People, and the thought of the Church is thus fundamental, the Divine Society called out of the world constituted of believers in Him, which is to 'make this memorial' continually, as possessing a true priesthood acceptable to God (3), offering the sacrifice well-pleasing to Him (4), and being filled with the Spirit, showing forth faith so as to praise and glorify God properly. No mention is made of the Old Covenant or the Former People, but the whole thought of the prayer has to do with the Pauline 'true Israel,' 'the Israel of God,' the Christian Fellowship.

[1] Original text doubtless corrupt.

(2) His Incarnate Work culminated in the Passion, and Death of the Cross, which was voluntary and free, and had a sixfold purpose: the dissolution of death itself, the breaking of the devil's hold on man, the conquest of hell, the illumination of the righteous, the delimitation of the province of death, and the manifestation of the Resurrection. The iterated emphasis on freely-willed obedience is significant: it is God's Will which is paramount and supreme, yet in one Man a unique example has been given to all men of the free acceptance and fulfilment of that Will. The climax of His Incarnate work is in the Institution of the Eucharist, with its commemoration of the Body broken and the Blood shed, in sacrifice for men, and its injunction to 'make the memorial.' (3) This now the Church does, 'having in memory His Death and Resurrection' (the summary of the first and last of the purposes enumerated in (2)), (*a*) offering, and (*b*) giving thanks for God's condescension in deigning to give man a priesthood acceptable to Him (again the note of obedience to God's Will). (4) The Invocation of the Holy Spirit, and Intercession (5) is a prayer that God send His Holy Spirit upon the oblation of the Holy Church, 'gathering it together into one, to give to all saints who receive for fulfilment of the Holy Spirit unto the strengthening of faith, in truth,' that the Church may praise and glorify God, etc. The content of this prayer is a petition for the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the offered elements, with a view to the union of the believers into one (is this a reminiscence of the liturgy reflected in the *Didache?*) and their reception of the Holy Spirit through Communion, for strengthening of their faith that the Church may adequately praise and glorify God. The exact meaning behind this Epiklesis is not to be stated with precision. It may, as Lietzmann urges, rest upon the idea of sacrifice in which the power of the Deity was conceived to come down into the offerings laid on the altar; in which case, he argues, 'all of the thoughts here apparent devolve from the conception of sacrifice and have no possible origin in the Words of Institution.' But what meaning have the Words of Institution except in terms of sacrifice? The Invocation may also mean that the Holy Spirit, the Divine Agent effecting the Incarnation, once more is to indwell material substance, as in the Conception of our Lord of the Virgin, which view finds a certain plausibility in relation to the sequence of the prayer as a whole: while the entire prayer is addressed to God the Father, (1), (2) and (3) have to do with the Second Person, so it is meet that (4) would have reference to the Holy Spirit. Certain Pauline passages (*e.g.* 1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. viii. 15) are relevant. In fact, Lietzmann finds the chief features—the unfolding of the story of the Incarnation (1) (2) in terse statements (cf. Phil. ii. 5–11; 1 Tim. iii. 16; and also 1 Peter iii. 18–22) and the cluster of sacrificial

ideas (3) (4)—to be both derived from St. Paul's thought (cf. 1 Cor. x. 16–21; xi. 23–31). (6) The doxology is characteristically Hippolytan in that it binds the Church into close juxtaposition with the Trinity. Connolly finds 'two features' in the 'doxologies which are certainly early and genuine.' They are: 'through thy *child* (servant?) Jesus' and 'in the Holy Church.' There are four occurrences in the doxologies and one at the Communion of the newly baptized (in the Latin fragments), and one in the doxology to the Bishop's Consecration Prayer. Did this early use derive from Eph. iii. 21? The interpretation of the whole of the Liturgy by the thought that the Church is a Divine Society, in intimate relation to the Godhead itself, is of great significance for every aspect of the Eucharistic rite.

(II) Other important Eucharistic references of the *Apostolic Tradition* are:

> . . . Grant unto this thy servant whom thou hast chosen for the episcopate, to feed thy holy flock, and to exercise the High-priesthood before thee, without blame to serve thee night and day, unceasingly to propitiate thy countenance and to offer the gifts of thy Holy Church; (endued) with the high priestly spirit to have power to forgive sins according to thy command, confer orders according to thy precept, and to loose every bond according to the authority thou didst give unto the Apostles, and to be well-pleasing unto thee in meekness and cleanness of heart, offering to thee the 'odour of a sweet savour,' through thy Child (servant?) Jesus Christ, through whom to thee be glory and might and honour, to the Father and Son with the Holy Spirit in thy Holy Church, now and for ever and ever. Amen.
>
> (Excerpt from the Bishop's consecration prayer.)

Here the whole conception of the Episcopate is controlled by the Old Testament, and supplemented by the New. It is frankly and unreservedly of the type called 'sacerdotal,' and in this respect is in no sense out of harmony with the rest of the Church Order. 'Offering the gifts of thy Holy Church,' 'the odour of a sweet savour,' and the like, have connotations of an indubitably priestly quality difficult for us to reproduce.

(III) Mention has already been made of the curious use of *Eucharistise* in a rubric at the First Communion of the newly baptized (see under A (I) above, p. 99).

(IV) Some minor scattered references have relevance to Eucharistic doctrine and practice: the baptized is to bring nothing into the baptismal water other than 'the vessel which each will bring for the Eucharist.' Each believer apparently received the Eucharist daily at home, for the Christians are

exhorted in these words: 'Let all the faithful when they wake up and have arisen, before they betake themselves to their work, pray to God. Let each of the faithful also, before he taste aught else, take care to receive the Eucharist. Let him take care lest an unbeliever taste of the Eucharist, or lest a mouse or other animal eat of it, or lest any of it fall and perish. It is the Body of Christ to be eaten by the Faithful and not to be despised.'

The implications of this Eucharistic teaching are clear. Whether the bread and wine become the antitypes of the Body and Blood of Christ (or are simply His 'Body and Blood') by virtue of the Spirit's coming down on them (as seems to be the inference from the text of the Canon) or by virtue of the Eucharistic prayer ('then the Bishop *Eucharistises them into* the antitype,' etc.) is of importance for future liturgical development, but for our purpose is significant for the theological conviction explicitly embodied. The Eucharist is not only the culmination and centre of the cult, but the daily sustenance of the individual in his intimate and personal religious life.

B. Closely connected with the Eucharist are a number of other usages and practices:

(I) The 'offering' of first-fruits by lay folk who present them to the 'Bishop, who will offer, bless and name him who offered' in the words: 'We give thanks to thee, O God, and offer thee these first-fruits which thou hast given us to enjoy.' There is a list of the fruits and comestibles which may be so 'blessed,' and of flowers (lilies and roses only) that can be 'offered.' Among the food-stuffs are oil, cheese and olives. Immediately after the Canon of Consecration given above occurs this rubric: 'Whoever offers oil, let him (sc. the bishop) give thanks in like manner as for the oblation of bread and wine (not, however, in the same words, but with the same purport): "That thou, O God, in sanctifying this, grant to those who use it,"' etc. The general rule regarding such offerings is: 'in all things which are received' (a possible mistake of the Latin from the Greek: 'offered') 'let them give thanks to God receiving it to his glory' (cf. Eph. v. 20; Col. iii. 17).

(II) The customs connected with Christian meals. For one small section we possess an interesting Greek fragment: 'A Bishop may not fast save when all the people do, for whenever one wishes to *offer* he may not refuse him. He who breaks the bread must partake.' This is very ancient, derived immediately from Jewish practice, and suggests that simple eating and drinking, on the part of individuals outside of public services, was bound up with religious observance. This appears most clearly in connection with the *Agape*—or 'Lord's Supper'—customs, which are of several kinds. The Latin text shows us a Congregational Supper in a private house, at which the guests

are to 'remember' the host, behave seemly, and are either to consume the food in the host's presence or to take it home (which are separate and distinct customs). 'Each is to hasten to receive the *Eulogia*' from the cleric; while catechumens each 'offer' their own cup and receive 'exorcised' bread (not 'blessed' bread = the *Eulogia*), they may not recline with the believers. No layman can 'make *Eulogia*,' which meant to 'give thanks' over the 'offered' bread. The *Eulogia* is sharply distinct from the Eucharist, and also from the exorcised bread of the unbaptized catechumen. The Ethiopic text tells us about a true Supper of the Congregation at which lamps are brought in. The service begins with the salutation 'The Lord be with you,' etc., but the Bishop 'shall not say: "Lift up your heart," because that shall be said at the oblation.' The prayer of the Deacon at the Lamp-lighting begins with 'We give thee thanks, O God . . . because Thou hast enlightened us by the revealing of the incorruptible light.' The Deacon 'holds the mingled cup of the Presphora,' to be 'offered by the Bishop,' who also blesses bread, and both are distributed. 'As they are eating their supper, those who are believers shall take a little bread from the hand of the Bishop before they partake of their own bread, for it is *Eulogia* and not *Eucharist* as the Body of our Lord.'

In the *Apostolic Tradition* we have our fullest account both of the Eucharist and of the religious meals (the *Agape*, 'Love Feast') of the early Church. The dominant thought is that of Thanksgiving, and both alike are interpenetrated with the constant iteration of the terms 'sacrifice,' 'oblation,' 'offering.' The words are used in two connections: with the meals of the Christians, and with the Eucharist proper. 'Eulogia' is the blessed bread of the former, and 'Eucharist' of the latter. For both a cleric is needed. The Eucharistic Thanksgiving is the model for all prayers of thanksgiving and all dedications of things offered. It is emphatically of the 'sacerdotal' type, so far as the function of the celebrant is concerned. As to structure, it reviews in summary outline the chief points of God's creative, redemptive and sanctifying activity with relation to men. It is the story of salvation, culminating in an oblation of that which becomes the Body and Blood of Christ. But 'sacrifice,' 'oblation,' 'offerings' also refer to what we would term saying grace at meals, and to the acts of dedicating first-fruits, foods and drink, oil and flowers, to God, which are then to be used by the Faithful. Two meanings of sacrifice, then, are current in the *Apostolic Tradition*. The Eucharistic rite is, however, distinctly the rehearsal of the drama of redemption, rising to its climax in the Memorial of the Institution and the Invocation of the Holy Spirit—in other words, the Consecration of the Eucharist.

Securely rooted in Christian antiquity and maintaining

throughout the whole scope of the history of Christian thinking are two chief conceptions and estimates of our Lord. They may be symbolised by the two verbs *be* and *do*. To the first category belong all those views of His Person and work which assert that He was both Revealer and Revelation: it was His *character* which in its self-manifestation is the essence of His Revelation. What He *was*—Light, Truth, etc.; what He showed forth—illumination, revelation, teaching; what errors He corrected, and fullness of verity He made known, since He was the Truth—all these ideas link together in this aspect of Christian conviction. The other view fastens upon what He *did* rather than what He *was*. It deals with His achievements, with the innovatory, the injected power given to men, the personal force which itself altered human history, the new might that entered humanity in the Incarnation, the victory wrought on the Cross—with all its ineffable consequences in heaven and on earth. Revelation and Redemption, Light and Life, Truth and Power—these pairs of words relate and contrast the two groups of conceptions. Epiphany on the one hand, and Death and Resurrection on the other, might offer themselves as symbols of the two categories.

It may be suggestive—or possibly unjustifiably imaginative—to trace in the two types of Eucharistic Liturgies the dominance of these conceptions. Essentially the Eastern Liturgy loved to dwell upon the Mystery Revealed—the Incarnation as Revelation, Epiphany, Manifestation—from our Lord's Birth, till his Death and Resurrection, with special reference to the Holy Spirit, the Illuminator and Agent of Revelation. The Western Liturgy, on the contrary, in its fundamental features lays stress upon the achievement of the Sacrifice on the Cross, and the 'showing forth' of that work 'till He come.' Here then we have two different but not necessarily contrasting evaluations of our Lord's Person and work, enshrined in the Liturgies of East and West. If the primitive quality of the Eastern Liturgy was Mystery-Revealed, that of the West was Sacrifice-Commemorated. These distinct impressions are stamped into the fibre of the two types as well of Christological theory as of Eucharistic Liturgy. If the East emphasises the culmination of the great drama of Redemption in the Resurrection, the West was more preoccupied with the Sacrifice of the Cross: Easter and Good Friday answer to the spirit of the two Liturgies. Even further, the former sees the Mystery of Redemption as God-directed, and culminates in the blinding fact: 'God raised Him from the dead.' The West concentrates on the fact 'He offered Himself for us.'

Yet we find a practically even balance kept between these two groups of complementary ideas in the Hippolytan Canon from which both Eastern and Western Liturgies sprang:

'. . . who fulfilling thy will and acquiring for thee an Holy People, stretched forth his hands when he was suffering, that he might deliver from suffering those who believed in thee, who when he was being given over, to a freely-willed Passion, that he might dissolve death and break the devil's chains and tread hell underfoot and illuminate the righteous and fix a bound (for death) and show forth the Resurrection (taking bread, etc.).'

Both ideas are here present in germ: that of the Mystery-manifested, and of the Sacrifice-achieved. As in other respects, so in this, the Hippolytan Liturgy would seem to be the point of departure for subsequent Eucharistic development. If both ideas of the Eucharistic Consecration and Consummation, the one Eastern ('send thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of thy Holy Church') and the other Western ('Let the Bishop *Eucharistise* the bread into the antitype of the Body of Christ'), seem to derive from Hippolytus, the larger terms of all later liturgical development are also set by it.

5. From St. Irenæus we gain confirmation of the association of sacrifices and oblations with the Eucharist. The two are intimately related, though distinct and different. Chapter xvii of Book IV of his treatise *Against Heresies* contains a discussion of the Levitical sacrifices, which God 'did not appoint for his own sake or as requiring such service.' They were for the sake of man, from whom God demands contrition, obedience and reform. He quotes groups of the Old Testament prophetic indictments of sacrifices, of which Isaiah lviii. 6 ff. is peculiarly significant: 'Loose every band of wickedness . . . deal thy bread to the hungry willingly; . . . if thou hast seen the naked, cover him and do not despise those of thy own seed.' 'From all these it is evident that God did not seek sacrifices and holocausts from them, but faith, and obedience, and righteousness, because of their salvation. . . . As God said by Hosea: "I desire mercy rather than sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings" (vi. 6)' (§ 4).

'Again, giving directions to the disciples to offer to God the first-fruits of his own created things—not as if he stood in need of them, but that they might be themselves neither unfruitful nor ungrateful—he took that created thing, bread, and gave thanks and said, "This is my Body." And the cup likewise, which is part of that creation to which we belong, he confessed to be his blood, and taught the new oblation of the New Covenant; which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offers throughout all the world to God, who gives us the means of subsistence, the first-fruits of his own gifts in the New Testament, concerning which beforehand Malachi, among the Twelve Prophets, thus spoke beforehand' (here follows the familiar quotation of Mal. i. 10, 11)—'indicating in the plainest manner

by these words that the Former People shall indeed cease to make offerings to God, but that in every place sacrifice shall be offered to him, and that a pure one' (iv. 17, 5). 'The oblation of the Church, therefore, which the Lord gave instructions to be offered throughout the world, is accounted with God a pure sacrifice, and is acceptable with him, not that he stands in need of a sacrifice from us, but that he who offers is himself glorified in what he offers if his gift be accepted' (iv. 18. 1; here he quotes St. Matt. v. 23, 24). 'We are bound, therefore, to offer to God the first-fruits of his creation, as Moses also says: "Thou shalt not appear in the presence of the Lord empty" (Deut. xvi. 16)' (*ibid.*). 'Now the class of oblations in general has not been set aside; for there were both oblations there (among the Jews), and there are oblations here (among the Christians). Sacrifices there were among the People: sacrifices there are, too, in the Church: but the species has alone been changed, since oblation is now made not by slaves but by free men. The Jews had the tithes of their goods consecrated to him, but those who have received liberty set aside all their possessions for the Lord's purposes, bestowing joyfully and freely not the less valuable portions of their property' (iv. 18. 2). 'Now the Church alone offers the pure Oblation to the Creator, offering to him, with the giving of thanks, the things from his Creation' (*ibid.* § 4). Then turning his attention to the vain offerings of heretics he says: 'Our opinion is in accordance with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn establishes our opinion. For we offer to him his own, proclaiming consistently the fellowship, confessing the union of flesh and Spirit. For as the bread which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but the Eucharist . . . so our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity' (*ibid.* § 5). In summary, he says: 'Now we make offering to him, not as though he stood in need of it, but rendering thanks for his gift, and thus sanctifying what has been created. For even as God does not need our possessions, so do we need to offer something to God; as Solomon says, "He that hath pity on the poor, lendeth unto the Lord" (Prov. xix. 17). For God, who stands in need of nothing, takes our good works to himself for this purpose, that he may grant us a recompense of his own good things' (here follows St. Matt. xxv. 34, etc.). . . . 'It is therefore his will that we too should offer a gift at the altar, frequently and without intermission' (*ibid.* § 6).

At the risk of being prolix these passages have been quoted to show how in Irenæus the two types of 'sacrifice' are clearly put forward: here we have the usage of 'sacrifices'—first-fruits, food, drink, etc.—made by the believers and offered as oblations

at the altar, destined for the poor and needy; we have also the Eucharistic Sacrifice, which is not only the climax, focus and unique moment of offering by man to God, but is also much more: the Eucharist 'consisting of two realities, an earthly and a heavenly,' is 'the body of the Lord and his Blood' by which the flesh is nourished (iv. 18. 5). 'Receiving the Invocation of God it is no longer common bread,' while there is no suggestion that such a change is effected at the other type of Oblation. Right motive and proper subjective attitude are vastly important, in both cases (cf. iv. 18, §§ 3, 4). The sanctions for the two types are to be found in God's will for man, for man's own good. For the former we have implicit deductions from both Law and Prophets of the Old Testament: the Levitical precepts are as true in principle as ever they were, but the species has changed; and the Prophetical emphasis is perennially valid. For the latter type we have the explicit Dominical injunction.

Law and Prophets are of abiding import, for God is the author of both. Founded in the need of man to give expression to his gratitude, oblations and offerings are overt acts whereby he recognises and acknowledges his indebtedness to God. Only such sacrifices are not fruitless or purposeless: God has no need of them, but man has—in a twofold sense, as giver and as recipient. The culmination of this type of oblation is the Eucharist, as dramatic thanksgiving for sustenance and offering to God of that which God has given. There is now the interaction of the second cycle of ideas: as bread and wine are for nourishment of the body, so after invocation of God's Spirit their oblation becomes the means both of forgiveness of sins and of eternal life. Of the act of offering gifts at the Eucharist Wetter writes:[1] 'Every Sunday when the congregation assembled for its celebration, this offering took place as introduction to the Eucharistic meal. . . . The rich could give more; the poor, less. The former could exert their power to care for the needs of the whole congregation and thus elicit their gratitude. The latter could scarcely give at every celebration, but were fed at the expense of their fellow-members. . . . The Christian Offering satisfied all cravings and demands that had been bound up with the old sacrifices, but without denying to the hungry masses their needed sustenance. On the contrary, the needy were sated at the Christian feasts, and it seems to me highly likely that it was for this reason that the new religion gained such headway among the masses during the time of the Emperors. It is no wonder then that sacrifice came to take so pre-eminent a place in Christian worship, that it was lavishly embodied in liturgy, and more and more came to be enriched by prayers, hymns and the like.'

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 102.

3. *Sources of Early Eucharistic Practice and Belief.*

By the end of the second century the whole course of the future development of the Eucharist was set in the various Eucharistic customs that had arisen and gained sanction. Having reviewed the chief sources that remain we may at this point stop to consider what strands went into the making of the complex whole which was the liturgical use of the Church of the year 200. That this is a turning-point in the history of the Eucharist is clear from the fact, noted by Lietzmann, that the Eucharistic rite set down in the Hippolytan *Apostolic Tradition* is 'the model of all Liturgies known to us from its day until now. The Antiochene Liturgy of the fourth century is based upon it, of which we have a normative formulation in the eighth (and second) book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. From the Antiochene form evolved the Byzantine Liturgy, in the two redactions—the earlier (that of St. Basil) and the later (that of St. Chrysostom). . . . From the same Antiochene root grew the normative Liturgy of St. James (Jerusalem) . . . which in turn furnished the standard for most of the Syrian Liturgies. . . . Even the so-called Nestorian Liturgy has undoubted affiliations with the Antiochene type. . . . A careful investigation and testing of the primitive text of the Roman Canon shows that the old Hippolytan text was its foundation also.' [1] Peculiar significance therefore attaches to the Eucharist of the second century, of which the chief representative, accredited and standardised by the Church, was that of the Hippolytan type.

The chief sources for the Eucharistic rite and customs were three: the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; the needs of piety and religion, pragmatic and traditional; and the exigencies of the economic and social situation of the Fellowship, the corporate brotherhood of believers which constituted the Mystical Body of Christ. For the Eucharistic theology of this earlier period we have as the chief contributing factors, four: the biblical idea of God and of man's relations to Him; the nascent Christology and its growing development; the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; the conception of the Church.

Let us consider more closely the correlation of the factors which produced the Eucharistic rite and customs of the period. The Old Testament exercised a profound influence, both the Law and the Prophets. Our Lord was the fulfilment of both, but 'fulfilment' did not mean abrogation of principle, though it might well mean the rise of new practice. The principles of the objective overt 'sacrifice' still prevailed. To God were still due the first-fruits, tithes, offerings to the Levites, and the like, in the transformed character which these injunctions

[1] *Messe und Herrenmahl*, pp. 261–62.

of the Old sustained in the New Covenant. 'Sacrifice' and 'oblation,' whether corporate or private, had not passed away, though they had changed their form. Ethically, the message of Old Testament Revelation was preserved as of permanent validity, though ethical sanction had been necessarily raised to a new level by virtue of the Incarnation. The emphasis of the Prophets on the close bond between religion—as sacrifice, worship—and ethics, as moral righteousness in the relation between man and man, was strongly reiterated, and became the practical criterion by which to insist on rightness of life, conduct and motive. Revelation, as the whole process, beginning with Creation and carried through the vicissitudes of God's dealing with the Former Chosen People up to His final election of a New Chosen People in His Incarnate Son, is the pregnant source for one of the two great liturgical types which resulted in the time subsequent to the year 200: the Eucharistic rite as primarily the 'Mystery.' From the New Testament derived the Dominical sanction for the Eucharist properly so called, and the whole interpretation whereby Christians understood and expounded the 'Scriptures,' for to the earliest Christian this meant what we call the Old Testament.

Religion and piety swayed men's lives, and corporate as well as private worship was shot through with the spirit of thanksgiving—the never-ceasing note of the early Christian devotional life. The one word 'Eucharist' fitly described the mood and quality of Christian devotion. Not only for its foundations, but also for a further step—long after the break with Judaism—in the development of its worship, the Christian Church levied on Jewish practice. Psalms, hymns, prayers, intercessions, instructions and Bible reading—all these, constituting the substance of the gradually developing liturgical framework of worship, received their chief significance and culminated in the Eucharist itself. Pauline phrases such as thanksgiving and praise had undoubtedly more specific Eucharistic association for the early Christian than they have for us. Christian worship was primarily objective: men came together to give and to offer something to God, in connection with which God gave something to them. The Eucharist, whether as the great moment of the cult, or as the chief Food of the individual, constituted the essential thing in the regimen of Christian living and conduct, as well as the empowering motive of action. About the Eucharist, in short, clustered all expression of prayer and praise, of intercession and petition, of thanksgiving and dependence; at the Eucharistic service the Gospel was expounded, Christian ideals of belief and conduct were explained, exhortation and instruction given.

This was not all. The economic and social needs of the

day were pressing. Men dwelt in a time and world of uncertainty. Psychologically, one may trace the mood of insecurity and its attendant fears throughout the literature of the period. While gnostic 'mysteries' claimed to deliver their adherents from both their fears and their overwhelming sense of insecurity, Christians had a new way of coping with the same need. Poverty and economic ills, social maladjustments and moral enervation in the face of a hopeless future—these constituted the objective elements which determined the state of mind of the unprivileged classes, the sombre background of darkness on which was silhouetted in sharp light the luminous joyousness of the fellowship of believing brethren in Christ. Succouring the needy, assisting the distressed, caring for the helpless and wronged were not thought of as by-products of Christianity. This type of social activity was of the very stuff not only of the Church's actions but of the Church's worship. 'Gifts,' 'offerings' and 'oblations' were carried to the very altar itself. Men were not to give tithes of their goods—their all, little or much, belonged to God, and to God's redeemed children. Opportunity and ability meant privilege and duty. 'From all according to their abilities, to each according to his need' would not unfitly describe the behaviour of the Brotherhood.

'Sacrifice' has therefore a new meaning and an intensely practical aim. God stands in no need of what we can give, but man has grievous need of what God gives, whether directly or indirectly. So the oblations of the faithful were no mere alms, benevolences or charity: they were the very stuff of religious worship. The Bible gave precept and example, inculcated this in theory and practice—and the Fellowship made of the social need and economic pressure the very means whereby to translate its Eucharistic spirit into terms which no one could fail to comprehend. Sacrifices were not pointless destruction and immolation of things of value, but dedication to practical use for the needy children of that which the less needy gave first to Him and then to them. In fact, it is often difficult, as we have seen, to disentangle the Love-Feast or *Agape* from the Eucharist, in practice. In the Corinthian Church they came together. The Eucharist was instituted at a meal. It is difficult to be sure when early writers use the verb *to love* whether they mean (*a*) the disposition of good-will and mind and heart, (*b*) religious eating and drinking together, the poor at the expense of the rich, or (*c*) the sacrament of the Eucharist!

When we attempt to analyse the Eucharistic theology of this early period of the Church the problem is by no means easy. There is, first of all, the wealth of different traditions, the diversity of observances. There is also the question as to the sources of the theological ideas involved. Certain facts are,

however, abundantly clear: all worship was God-centred. All Eucharistic prayers—true to their ultimately Jewish origins—were directly to God, as Father and as Creator. As Creator He is thanked for His bounty to men, and is offered His own gifts: man gives to God of what God has given to man. He is all-righteous and all-loving, compassionate and forgiving, and also just and true. Men are created by Him and belong to Him. Yet, of their own act, by sin they have forfeited His love and merited His wrath. But the Love which created also redeems men. Sin had to be dealt with by one whose power was greater than man's, as His Love was immeasurably greater. So He sent His Son, born of woman, conceived by the Holy Ghost, who took on Himself our nature, lived a perfect human life of obedience, and in full, free and voluntary obedience to the Father's will lay down His life on the Cross, having first said over Bread and Wine the words: 'This is my Body' . . . 'my Blood.' Him the Father raised from the dead, and exalted into heaven, whence He sent His Spirit down to quicken and sanctify the mystical Brotherhood of those who believe, and believing belong to His Body by the initiation of Baptism. The Mystical Body of Christ contains and evinces His Power and Presence through the indwelling Spirit—in the whole and in each member. As He offered Himself on earth as man, so His Body offers itself: as He obeyed the Father and gave Him thanks, so it obeys and gives Him thanks.

So when Justin writes, 'we continually remind each other of these things,' he is suggesting one great aspect of the Eucharistic service, in which as a whole the grand panorama of God's dealing with man is unfolded, culminating in the climax and crisis of the Incarnation, Epiphany, Passion, Death and Resurrection. When he continues: 'the wealthy . . . succour the needy; . . over all things which we eat we bless the Creator,' 'him we praise . . . by prayer and thanksgiving over all which we eat,' he indicates a second aspect of the Eucharist. When he writes (in connection with Mal. i. 10–12), 'those Gentiles who in every place offer sacrifice to him, *i.e.* the Bread of the Eucharist and the Cup of the Eucharist,' he suggests the third aspect of the Eucharist, the sacrifice in which the *Eucharistised* bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ, as the antitypes of these His Incarnate manifestations. The Eucharist is the 'mystery,' or dramatic representation, or symbol, and it is 'sacrifice' in two senses.

The doctrines of the Holy Spirit and of the Church were both constituent and essential factors in the theology assumed by the early Church in its Eucharist. The Holy Spirit it was who 'spake by the Prophets,' who was the Revealer and the Guide of the whole scheme of Creation, Redemption, Sanctification. He moved on

the waters of chaotic creation; He was the Agent of the Incarnation; He was the omnipresent soul of the Church and its members individually. It is not clear how the Holy Spirit came to be related to the Eucharist. Was it because the Lord was conceived of Him by the Virgin Mary that it was inevitable that the Spirit's agency in the Eucharist came to be so significant? Or was it because the Spirit's Presence was the vital and outstanding fact of Christian experience in the early Church? Certainly it is natural to suppose that the Spirit should be closely related to the Eucharist in its aspect as the Drama of Redemption; it is equally natural to associate His Presence with the acceptance of the offerings and oblations—as well as the source of the inspiration moving men to offer; but it is not clear how His Presence is related to the act of *Eucharistising* the Bread and Wine, save as He be thought of in connection with the Incarnation and Mission of our Lord. Above all, as the Hippolytan doxology phrases it, the idea of the Church had no subsidiary place in Eucharistic theology: 'To thee be glory and honour, to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit *in thy Holy Church.*' So in the 'tradition' of the summary creed at Baptism to the candidate: 'I believe in one God the Father Almighty, and in his only Son, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and one Baptism, *in the Holy Church.* Amen.' The Eucharist is implicitly the act of the body of Christ. Its clergy and officiants were ministers *of the Body*, representatives of the priesthood of all its members. The Church offered. It is not as if the clergy offered on behalf of the members of the Church, as it were, detached from them. The offerings were made by some of the members for all.

So far, in estimating the sources of practice and of belief alike, little mention has been made of Communion in setting down the characteristic elements of the Eucharist. This may appear to be an unjustifiable omission, but is justified by our evidence. The early Christians were wont to communicate at every opportunity when the liturgy was celebrated. On other days they received at home. They were so little given to the outlook which we of the modern world easily acquire of religion as directed primarily to us, as man-centred, that there is little preoccupation with the fruits of the Eucharist. The Real Presence is, of course, assumed throughout: Christ in the Eucharist meets and feeds His own. We have abundant evidence of a lively appreciation and awareness of the Gift given by God, in the earliest rite we possess—that of the *Didache.* It is Ignatius who quotes a possibly liturgical phrase, the Eucharist as 'the medicine specific for immortality, the antidote that we should not die,' etc. Here is the eschatological reference of the Eucharist: non-dying is itself a gift of God through the Eucharist; but the

early Christians seem to have been singularly little concerned with what this aspect of the Eucharist—as Holy Communion—meant. Again, we need to remember the difference in outlook between them and us: they were infinitely more concerned about God than about themselves, far more preoccupied about doing His Will than given to speculating how much they received, in the Eucharist. The mood of gratitude and thanksgiving was, as we have seen, everywhere apparent, but not as primarily personal or as individual. Both as regards a God-centred piety, and as regards a wide, catholic, corporate and social awareness, their sensitivenesses were utterly other than those of our modern world. It is mankind, and particularly the redeemed among men *as a whole*, for whom each Christian with all others of the Body spoke in expressing (in the symbolic drama of revelation and manifestation, in the sacrifices of oblation, in the Offering which becomes the Body and Blood of Christ) the Thanksgiving of all men to God the Creator and Father. Communion, in short, was not *the* moment of the early Eucharist: it was a corollary, an inevitable consequence of God's Will for man.

Communion received its meaning from sacrifice, with which it was inextricably connected. Christianity was a religion essentially of sacrifice. Christian worship was essentially sacrificial. All sacrifice was Eucharistic. The Eucharist was the culmination of all sacrifice.

4. *The Development of Eucharistic Theology and Rites.*

To understand the course of the development of the Eucharist it is necessary to turn our attention not only to the rites in which it was celebrated, but also to the ideas and terms used of it. 'The application to the Eucharist of *antitype* as a substantive is first met with . . . in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus.'[1] The original of the passage, of which we possess the Latin,[2] gives 'example' and 'likeness' as equivalents. As we have seen, the relationship between these Elements and the actual Body of Christ—under the natural conditions of His Incarnation and its present state of ascended glory—was not thought out by St. Hippolytus. The Reserved Element 'is the Body of Christ which is to be eaten by the Faithful and not to be despised.' This same term appears in the cycle of related documents, as, *e.g.*, in *Didascalia Apostolorum* vi. 22 (Connolly's edition, pp. 252–3), in the *Apostolic Constitution* (v. 14, § 7; vii. 25, § 4) and the Liturgy of St. Basil (cf. Brightman, *Lits. E. and W.*, p. 329). The word 'likeness' appears in Serapion's Liturgy: 'We have offered this Bread, the *likeness* of the Body

[1] Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Oxford, 1929, p. li.

[2] In Hauler, *Didascaliæ apostolorum fragmenta veronensia latina*, Leipzig, 1900, p. 112; for another instance, p. 118 end. See under II. 4, A (i), above, p. 98.

of the Only-Begotten. This bread is the likeness of his holy Body, for the Lord Jesus Christ in the night in which he was betrayed (etc.).' 'Wherefore we making the *likeness* of his death have offered unto thee bread.' It also appears in the Mozarabic Liturgies (Migne, *P. L.* 85: 1269, 790). Lietzmann equates 'likeness' with 'antitype' or 'symbol,' as meaning 'copy' or 'picture,' [1] coming nearly to mean counterpart. It is not the bread and wine themselves, but what happens to them, which makes them the 'likeness' of His death: this may be the case in two senses—in the offering of them for dedication, or in the change they sustain whereby they become Body and Blood.

For the early West, Tertullian, a contemporary of St. Hippolytus, was of great importance. 'The belief of the Church of his day with reference to the Eucharist is thoroughly realistic. This is as clear from the terminology in general as from preaching and actual practice in particular, as it is from the way in which the Eucharistic Oblation is spoken of. Tertullian is himself convinced of the Real Presence of the Flesh and Blood of Jesus. Yet he thinks of the bread and wine as essentially unchanged, that they are in contrast to the mode of our Lord's manifestation in history, and that the Eucharist is more a power of salvation than a saving Person.' [2] The '*figure* of his Body' as he used the term is to be understood with reference to his polemic against Marcionite dualism. Tertullian approached the incidental discussion of the Eucharist primarily from the personal and subjective point of view. While he coined much of the terminology with regard to the Eucharist—figure, represent, sacrament, and the like—he never set himself either to explore their full significance or to relate them to a wider context.

In the second great African, St. Cyprian, who regarded Tertullian as his master, the latter's thought constituted his point of departure. While Tertullian thought of the Eucharist in terms of gracious power conveyed (this view is that called 'dynamic'), Cyprian approaches it in terms of personal relationship. The Tertullianic terminology is sharpened: Tertullian's terms, 'figure,' 'memorial,' have as their correlative in Cyprian's use, 'the likeness of the sacrifice'; similarly for Tertullian's 'represent (the Blood of Christ)' Cyprian uses 'show'; for Tertullian's '*calling* the bread his Body' Cyprian has 'he *said* that the wine was his Blood.' The Eucharistic Elements are the visible forms, or the manifestation of the invisible power of the grace of Christ, and Cyprian identified them with the Body and Blood. He attached much importance to the notion of priest-

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 190.

[2] K. Adam, *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin* (Paderborn, 1908), p. 24. The summary following is much indebted to this brilliant Essay.

hood in the Church; the 'priest exercises the place of Christ,' and so the Eucharist is the self-Oblation of Christ, 'a true and full sacrifice.'

In the Eastern Fathers of the fourth century, who were so deeply engaged in the Christological controversies of the Conciliar Period, Eucharistic theology was controlled by the development of the doctrine of our Lord, with which it displayed a parallel, if somewhat later, growth. To St. Basil and St. Gregory Nazianzen, the reception of the Eucharist Elements meant immediate participation in the Spirit of God. The affirmation of the Presence of Christ's Body and Blood is realistic and direct, yet these are still conceived as essentially typical, concrete moments of the emergence into time of the unchanging and eternal Spirit. To St. Hilary of Poitiers, the Eucharistic *caro* (Flesh) is the physical medium of union with the Eternal Nature of the Word of God, the necessary link which establishes and sustains the connection. In the most illustrious exponent of the School of Antioch, John Chrysostom, the Eucharistic Flesh is the very body of the Christ, identical with the body He bore on earth at Bethlehem and Calvary, and therefore is not *means* (as it seemed to be to others of the Eastern Fathers), but the *end* of the act of Communion.

The most important of the Western Fathers succeeded to his brilliant predecessors of the African tradition, yet in immeasurable ways went beyond all whom he followed—Augustine of Hippo. No other Christian since the days of St. Paul so profoundly affected the West. He inherited much, and of his inherited riches he transmitted some and transformed other elements. His Eucharistic teaching is of so varied a quality that he is appealed to as the father both of Protestant and Catholic Eucharistic beliefs. For him the Eucharist was not so much 'an act as a mystical action, a process more than a prayer.' Following Tertullian and St. Cyprian he believed in the objective Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, which was the offering, the heart of Christian worship. When he thinks of the Eucharist there are two phases of his ideas. In the former, the Elements are *figuræ*—the means of manifestation of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, in contrast to the latter themselves. The actual essence of the Eucharist is the Spirit of which the Eucharistic 'Body' is its vehicle; as means it is transitory and ephemeral (as compared with the Eternity of the Spirit); yet while mediating the presence of the Spirit, it is much more than a mere symbol. Only in the second phase of his thought and teaching (in his controversy with the Pelagian heretics), after becoming acquainted with St. John Chrysostom, Augustine 'broke the bonds of Platonism, and ascribed to the Eucharistic Flesh an independent objective

value apart from the *res sacramenti*, the Spirit.' [1] In general, St. Augustine's interests were subjective, both ethical and religious; his thoughts about the Eucharist are always as related to men. While his earlier views might be called *symbolic*, his later ideas belong to the *metabolic* category. To the earlier Augustine the symbolism of the Eucharist might be described as both didactic and effective (for at one time he thought that it was the faith of the recipient which gave the value to the Elements); and to the later, who had become a realist and metabolist, the *Flesh* itself brings life. The 'symbol' becomes what it represents, sustaining in itself a genuine and essential change.

Two contemporaries, one Eastern and the other Western, slightly earlier than the great African Father, share similar views of the Eucharistic Mystery—St. Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394) and St. Ambrose of Milan (d. 397). The former is outspokenly a realist and metabolist. 'The bread sanctified by the Word of God we believed to be transmuted (or transmade, μεταποιεῖσθαι) into the Body of God the Word.'

'So man by a sort of union with that which is of immortality becomes a sharer in incorruption. These things are achieved by the power of the Blessing to that end, transelementing the nature of the things which appear' (*Oratio catechetica*, 37). St. Ambrose writing *On the Faith* to Gratian says: 'And whenever we receive the Sacrament(s) which are transfigured through the mystery of holy prayer into flesh and blood, we show forth the Lord's death.' [2] 'We have seen the High Priest coming to us, we have seen and heard him offering his Blood for us. We follow as we are able, we priests in offering the sacrifice for the people. Though we be weak in merit, yet are we ennobled by virtue of the sacrifice (we offer), for, although Christ is not seen to be offered, yet he is himself offered on earth when the Body of Christ is offered. Nay, he is shown forth among us as himself offering, whose word makes holy the sacrifice which is offered.' [3] 'Let us be assured that this is not what nature formed, but what the Blessing consecrated, for the latter has a far greater effect than the former, for nature itself is changed by the Benediction.' [4] It is the very words of Christ which effect the consecration: 'his word makes this sacrament.' 'Before it is consecrated, it is bread. When the words of Christ shall have been added, it is the Body of Christ. . . . Therefore behold in how varied a fashion the word of Christ is potent to convert all things.' [5] In these two Fathers of the late fourth century we have witnesses for East and West alike that the bread and wine are conceived to be transformed, transelemented, trans-

[1] Cf. Adam, *op. cit.*, p. 163.
[2] iv. 10. 124.
[3] *Enarrationes in xii Psalmos davidicos*, 38.
[4] *De Mysteriis* (?), ix. 50.
[5] *De Sacramentis*, iv. 5. 23. ('Ambrosian,' if not by St. Ambrose.)

muted, into the Body and Blood of Christ through the prayer of the priest.

The Liturgies of the fourth century are practically normative for all subsequent Church usage, for one of the great turning-points in the Church's history took place when the attitude of the Emperor changed towards Christianity. With the adoption of Christianity by the State there were wrought gradually great changes in the worship of the Church. The picture of Church life as revealed by a third-century book like the *Didascalia* is little like that of a century later. The author of the *Didascalia* could compare and contrast the Old with the New Dispensation: 'Instead of the sacrifices which then were, offer ye new prayers and petitions and Giving of Thanks.' [1] The two-foldedness of the Sacrifice is rapidly disappearing in the fourth century. The *Agape* is secularised, and ultimately detached from the Eucharist entirely.[2] The permission which in the Hippolytan rite allowed deacons to bless the cup and bread at the *Agape* is by the 25th Canon of Laodicea not to be extended to subdeacons. Soon afterwards freedom of choice in offering is denied to the folk at large: only bread and wine and flowers can be offered at the altar. Probably economic and social changes had made unnecessary the place which the almost universal practice of 'offering' as a 'sacrifice' food and drink for the sustenance of the poor and needy had previously occupied in Christian life. Traces, however, remain in later Liturgies, enough to show how widespread had been the custom. Another canon of Laodicea (No. 28) forbids the 'Celebration of so-called *Agapes* on Sundays or in the Church, and eating in the House of God.' One primitive element has disappeared from the worship of the Church, and with its passing there was great loss: the active share of the layman in the combined act of worship—the Eucharist as offering of food and drink, and the Eucharist as the Body and Blood of Christ—could ill be spared; the degradation of social life and fellowship from its former quasi-religious level to one which might become purely secular; the growing lack of sensitiveness to the needs of the poor on the part of well-to-do people who constituted so great a number of the enlarged Church of post-persecution days; the growing evil of infrequent Communion co-operating with the disposition more and more to hand over to the clergy all active worship and to encourage passive attendance and constitute inactive presence the rôle of the layman—all these had their share in building up the classic Liturgies of the fourth century.

Other factors are equally important. Heresy made necessary a more rigorous liturgical formalism and precision. In the *Codex ecclesiæ Africanæ*, Canon 103, 'on the prayers recited at the

[1] Connolly's edition, pp. 86–87.

[2] Cf. St. Cyprian in *Ep.* lxiii. 16.

altar,' reads: 'It was decided that such prayers, prefaces, commendations, laying on of hands as should be approved in Synod should be in use by all, and that others contrary to the faith should not be substituted, but only those said which should have been gathered by the more wise.' Liturgical freedom had *still a large area of manœuvre, though the process of uniformity had begun. Heresy necessitated theological statement. No* more important principle regarding Eucharistic development can be asserted than that Eucharistic doctrine kept pace with Christological theory. Finally, it is to be observed that a certain sterilisation set in among schismatic and separated churches. Their 'orthodoxy'—or what they claimed as such—usually meant unchangingness, for most of these communions justified their schism as a protest against the innovations, novelties and developments of the Great Church. So we often find archaic usages in the Liturgies of the Separated Churches which vanished from those of the larger whole.

When Christianity became popular the observance of religion became tepid. Worldliness came in, for conviction and earnest adherence to the principles of Christianity were not the only motives for membership in the Church. Wealth followed imperial patronage, and the Church's fabrics, libraries, and institutions were enriched by endowments and the resources of lavish expenditure. Magnificence and splendour characterised public worship, and the fine art of cultivating the sense of awe and drama evinced itself in Liturgy.

The basic Liturgy is that which we know as associated with the name of Hippolytus. East and West are alike in debt to it. Enlarged and interpolated it forms the core of the Antiochene Liturgy of the 8th Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Significant changes have, however, taken place. The summary of the details which we can put together from the study given above of the second-century Liturgy constitutes the outline of the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Yet much had been added from Jewish practice. What we are accustomed to call the Preface is really the Ante-*Sanctus*. This is in the *Apostolic Constitutions* Liturgy a recital of God's dealings with men in the Old Covenant, culminating in the *Sanctus*—all this came from Judaism. Then follows the enlarged Hippolytan Canon, with some changes. After the Memorial or *Anamnesis* comes the Invocation or Epiklesis. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* viii God is asked 'to send his Holy Spirit upon this Oblation . . . and to *show* (?) [*sic*] this bread (to be) the Body of thy Christ and the Cup his Blood.' This had been preceded by a prayer to God to 'look favourably upon these gifts,' embodying, like other prayers, in all likelihood a bit of the Jewish Temple Liturgy. From a Liturgy of this type is derived the Liturgy of St. Basil, and that ascribed to St. John

Chrysostom. In each case the significant prayer given above based upon Hippolytus has been subjected to further change: St. Basil has 'that the All-holy Spirit come upon us and upon these gifts lying here, and bless, hallow and *show* this bread to be verily the Precious Body of our Lord.' In St. Chrysostom: 'Send thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts . . . and *make* this bread the precious Body of thy Christ, *changing* it by thy Holy Spirit.' These several changes reflect theological development, with which the Liturgy slowly came to accommodate itself. In this instance the several stages are marked by distinguishable views of the Eucharistic Presence: Hippolytus is apparently dynamic; *Apostolic Constitutions* viii sees in the Eucharist primarily a Mystery revealed; St. Basil's Liturgy intensifies and develops this conception; St. Chrysostom's Liturgy is frankly and outspokenly metabolist.

Similarly in the West the Liturgy has had a history more complex and varied than in the East. If theological reflection finds ultimately its embodiment in the formulated Liturgy, the Liturgy itself is a monument of theological conviction. Guardini has described the Liturgy as 'prayed truth.' In the West the two great influences on the Liturgy were that directly or indirectly due to St. Ambrose, 'the chief authority on the Eucharist doctrines of the Early Middle Ages,' and that of Augustinian ideas—more sporadic and intermittent, but not without signal if often negative effect. Western Liturgies of the early period fall into three groups, the Gallican, Mozarabic and Roman. In none of them appears great evidence of theological reflection, for 'the sacraments did not occupy the central place in the field of theological interest' in this early period. Yet the Gallican and Mozarabic Liturgies stand apart from the old Roman as being dominated by implicit and occasionally explicit Ambrosian thought. St. Ambrose, as we have seen, employed the word 'figure' (of the Body) for the Eucharistic Elements. The term has a long history: it may mean 'means of manifestation' (as in Tertullian); in St. Ambrose it refers to the outward and external element in contrast to the inner and spiritual Element (the 'verity'), and from the standpoint of the sacramental subject it is 'likeness'—a term to be found in Hippolytus. The Gallican Liturgy is instinct with a strongly realistic quality, and emphasised a 'change' in the elements (terms like 'change,' 'convert' and the like, from St. Ambrose) plus the distinctive and specific 'transform.' The 'change in the Offered Elements into the Body and Blood of Christ is nowhere else so unequivocally expressed.' In the Mozarabic Liturgy the 'transforming' is explicitly effected by the inpouring of the Holy Spirit, and the added term 'transfigure' (Ambrosian) is employed. The Bread is the 'figure' of the Body, and is to

the Body as container to content. Both of these Liturgies betray a wider ancestry and closer connection with those of the East than does the primitive Roman Liturgy.[1]

The Roman Liturgy originally possessed no trace of what in the other Western and all Eastern forms has been named the 'Eucharistic Mystery'—the unfolding and recital of the great drama of God and Man, in its several phases of Creation, Redemption, Sanctification. On the contrary, it was singularly rich in the emphasis on the Eucharistic Offering—the oblations of the people, dedicated to God, for the good of His children and the benefit of the givers' souls and bodies. Theologically it is strongly symbolic: the 'gift' (*munus*) becomes sacrament, as in St. Augustine: 'element becomes sacrament.'[2] Correlative terms to those given for the other Western Liturgies are 'sanctify,' 'consecrate,' 'bless.' 'Dynamic symbolism' describes its general theological quality.

But the complex history of the Roman Liturgy makes it difficult to trace with the same definiteness that we can use of the Oriental Liturgies the exact course of its development. For the Liturgy took final form in the East much earlier than it did in the West. Liturgical variation was much freer in the West, and 'free liturgical composition prevailed in the West up into the Merovingian period. . . . The ideal seemed at times to be to supply for each Sunday and Feast day its own Liturgy. This effort, while not entirely suppressed, confined itself in Rome to the formulation of an unvarying fixed kernel of prayers of which the core was the consecration. But exactly when this Canon of the Mass was stabilised we do not know. Its present form dates from the sixth century. . . . Careful examination of the text shows that its basis was the ancient Hippolytan Liturgy' (Lietzmann, p. 262). In the Carolingian period the two groups of Western Liturgies—Ambrosian, Mozarabic and Gallican, and the Roman—influenced each other. Ambrosian ideas came over into the Roman, while Roman usages and prayers were injected into the Gallican. 'The Roman Liturgy curbed the metabolism of the old Gallican Liturgies.' In the writers of the Carolingian period Augustinian ideas began to affect Eucharistic theology. In such men as Augustine of Hippo and the Venerable Bede there could be new combinations of practice and teaching. 'In Bede we have the first example of co-operation between the realism of his Liturgy and the tendency towards dynamic spiritualism of St. Augustine.' In another Englishman, Alcuin—whose theology was frankly metabolist—not only does 'transform' come into

[1] See J. Geiselmann, *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik*, Paderborn, 1926, pp. 1–33.

[2] Cf. G. P. Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, II, Göttingen, 1922, p. 30; Geiselmann, p. 34.

the Roman Liturgy, but the phrase 'consecrate into the substance of the Body' appears. The line of the development in the Roman Liturgy may be shown by the following:

'consecrate into the sacrament of the Body' (Bede);
" " Body' (Angoulême Sacramentary);
" " substance of the Body' (Alcuin);
= change substance (so Amaalar of Metz, 850).[1]

The mixed Roman-Carolingian Liturgy in its conflated form was to become normative in the West. Theories as to the Consecration included the curious type called 'consecration by contact' or immixture, to which the prayer after the Fraction in the Roman Rite is an interesting testimony. More Gallican material came to be taken up into the Roman Rite, and a parallel conflation of ideas took place—'metabolism and Augustinian dynamism together controlled the theological thinking of the Carolingian era.' This new combination really gave the victory to the Ambrosian realism and metabolism. Phrases of early origin were susceptible of the new meaning: 'may the sacraments achieve in us that which they contain, so that what we now bear in likeness we may lay hold of in truth' had in its earliest use a different sense from that it received when the conversion theology had been injected to interpret it. So dominant had this outlook become that in the mediæval controversies about the Eucharist, the transubstantiation theory could be thought to have been original and its opponents (who followed in the main the earlier views of St. Augustine and the theology of the primitive Roman Liturgy) denounced as heretics by the affirmation of the dogma of transubstantiation.

It is perhaps not necessary to point out that, despite the theology of the Early Roman Liturgy, the entire absence of the element of the Eucharistic Mystery and the sole importance of the ideas connected with Eucharistic Offering made easy the transformation of the rite into a purely Eucharistic sacrificial type. All that had to do with the offering of the elements could be retained, to serve as a prelude to *the* Sacrifice—that of the Body and Blood of Christ, into which bread and wine were transmuted and changed. Bread and wine are no longer 'offered' in the old sense. *The* Offering is of Christ's Body and Blood to the Father.

Liturgical development is not only the result of theological advance, reflecting controversies and their solution, but is sensitive as well to the general facts of Church history. In the East the Christian Emperors took order for all questions within their domain. In his legislation (*Nov.* 137:6, of March 26, 565) Justinian ruled that the Eucharist must be audibly celebrated.

[1] Cf. Geiselmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 35–60.

The pomp and circumstance befitting the Emperor must be exceeded in the worship of the Lord of Emperors. So elaboration and accretions to the Eastern Liturgies went on apace. Incense had begun to be used in the fourth century. Special vestments, evolved from the better quality of secular clothing, had become established. Here is the description of the Eastern Liturgies of the sixth century, given by Dr. Kidd:

'Three types of Liturgy were in use in the Eastern part of the Empire of Justinian. The Alexandrian prevailed in Egypt and Abyssinia, and is contained in the texts known as the *St. Mark*, *The Coptic St. Cyril*, and *The Twelve Apostles*. Its outstanding features are that the Great Intercession is made in the course of the Preface; and that the cue from which the celebrant proceeds with the Thanksgiving, after the congregation has broken in with the *Sanctus*, is given by its word "full." The West-Syrian rite prevailed in Antioch, Jerusalem and Cyprus, and is now contained in the texts of *the Greek* and *the Syriac St. James*. Here the distinctive features are that the Great Intercession occurs between the Invocation and the Lord's Prayer; and that the cue for the resumption of the Thanksgiving by the celebrant, after the *Sanctus*, is given by the word "Holy" in that hymn. A third type of Liturgy is derived from that of Syria or Antioch, and is known as the Byzantine Rite. It is found in the exarchates of Pontus, Asia, Thrace and Illyricum. . . . It is now represented in the three orthodox Liturgies of *St. Basil*, *St. Chrysostom* and *the Presanctified*. . . .

'As celebrated in the sixth century, the Byzantine Liturgy enshrined an imposing worship. Outside the church sat the beggars, asking for alms as the faithful entered. Inside appeared the *ambo* or pulpit, in the nave, from which the lessons were read, the anthems sung, and the sermon preached; the altar supported on columns, and surmounted by a canopy or *ciborium*; and behind it, facing west, the Bishop's throne surrounded by the *synthronos* or seats of the Presbyters, who could thus readily celebrate with the Bishop. The sanctuary, with its altar and *synthronos*, was separated from the nave by a light screen and veil: which afterwards developed into a solid "iconostasis" pierced only by the "holy doors."

'The service began with the Mass of the Catechumens. It was introduced, not by the long preparation of the elements in the *Prothesis* which developed later, but by the Little Entrance, at which—to the music of the *Trisagion* [1]—the Deacons carried in the Gospels attended by incense. Next, after the mutual

[1] 'Holy God, Holy (and) Mighty One, Holy Immortal One, have mercy upon us.' It dates from the first half of the fifth century, is found in the Gallican Rite of the West before and after the Gospel, and in the Roman Rite in the Reproaches of Good Friday and the *Preces* of Prime.

salutation of celebrant and people, came the three lessons, all from the *ambo :* the Prophecy, or lesson from the Old Testament, and the Epistle—both recited by a Reader; and the Gospel—by a Deacon, all standing. After it, the salutation again and a homily. Then the Catechumens and others were dismissed, and the doors closed, before the Mass of the Faithful could begin. It opened with the Deacon's Litany and the Prayer of the Faithful: during which the Elements were being prepared in the *Prothesis.* Then, after celebrant and people had saluted each other, they were brought in at the Great Entrance, while the anthem " King of Glory " was sung, and, after 574, the Cherubic Hymn. Another salutation and the Kiss of Peace was succeeded by the Offertory; and this by the Creed introduced at Constantinople, 511, by the Patriarch Timothy; and then the Diptychs of the dead and of the living were recited by the Deacon. Now opened the culminating portion of the service in the *Anaphora,* or offering of the great sacrifice. . . . The *Anaphora* begins with the Grace, the *Sursum Corda,* Preface or preliminary recitation of Thanksgiving by the celebrant, who was interrupted by the *Sanctus* of the people. Then he resumed with the recitation of the Institution, the *Anamnesis* in remembrance of Good Friday, Easter and Ascension, the Epiclesis or Invocation of the Holy Spirit, reminiscent of Pentecost, followed by the Great Intercession, Salutation and Lord's Prayer. Thus the consecration was complete, and the sacrifice pleaded. The preparation of the Elements for distribution came next by the Fraction and the Elevation of Holy Things for Holy People. Communion was then given into the hand of the communicant. And the service ended with a thanksgiving: while, if any of the consecrated elements remained, they had to be consumed by the children present.' [1]

For the seventh century we can trace the development of the Byzantine Liturgy from the Trullan Canons and the *Mystagogia* of St. Maximus the Confessor (662) The framework is unchanged from that of the early St. Basil and St. Chrysostom. Joints of meat for the clergy, grapes, milk and honey can no longer be offered.[2] At the end of the service a hymn of Sergius (d. 638) was added in 624. No ' love feasts ' are to be held in churches.[3] Since that time the most noteworthy changes have been the transfer of the Preparation of the Elements from the middle to the beginning of the Liturgy, and this has become an ornate and elaborate sequence of prayers, dialogue and symbolic acts; the iconostasis or solid screen, behind which the Liturgy is largely transacted; the elaboration of the text and ritual, by a steady increment of variable parts. Substantially the Liturgy

[1] B. J. Kidd, *The Churches of Eastern Christendom,* pp. 70–72.
[2] Trullan Canons, Nos. 99, 28, 57. [3] *Ibid.,* c. 74.

of the East is that of Justinian's days, which in turn is that of St. Basil's revision of the Antiochene Liturgy similar to that of the 8th Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

Parallel developments of the Liturgy were taking place in the West. The primitive Roman rite represented what we possess in the Hippolytan Liturgy. 'The Hippolytan text as it lies before us is the unabbreviated ancient Roman formula,' according to Lietzmann.[1] Duchesne, in his *Origins of Christian Worship*, the late Dr. Fortescue in his book on *The Roman Mass*, and the late H. E. Bishop in *Liturgia Historica*, have studied the questions, which are far from being conclusively solved, regarding the Roman rite's earlier history. For descriptions of the rite in St. Gregory's day, the reader can be referred to these books. In East and West alike frequent Communion had become exceptional. The idea of the Eucharist as the impetratory Sacrifice of our Lord's Body and Blood, for the living and dead, has become overwhelmingly predominant. By the early Middle Ages there had arisen in the West the 'low' Mass—one said by a priest with a server or other person acting for the people, as congregation, to answer the responses. Church architecture changes: chantry chapels are built, where private masses on 'foundations' can be offered with special remembrance of the people for whom they are 'offered.' The ancient usages of the Liturgy as the service of all the people, in which all had both an active and essential part, have been gradually altered—whether by abrogation, transformation or sterilisation—in keeping with a growing policy of regimented uniformity under the pressure of the Roman See. The language is symbolic of the worship. The dead tongue suggests the mystery which invests the rite, so much of which is transacted secretly or in a whisper. At the 4th Lateran Council of 1215 transubstantiation was defined as a dogma, yearly confession and Easter Communion were made of universal obligation, and the beginnings of the cultus of the Blessed Sacrament connected with elevation and exposition appear about that date. Before this time East and West had been sharply sundered into antagonism and opposition, which passed from disputes to disdain, from that measure of felt likeness which maintained some mutual understanding, through assertion and exaggeration of differences, into ignorance of each other.

The Eastern Liturgies underwent few modifications. Nothing corresponding to a Low Mass has ever made its appearance in the East, except in the churches in communion with the Pope of Rome. The language used is always professedly vernacular, but in an archaic form little in touch with actual living speech since the Middle Ages. The whole preparation of the Elements—

[1] *Messe und Herrenmahl*, p. 167.

earlier a part of the Offertory in the centre of the Eucharistic rite—was shifted to the beginning of the service, and has become elaborated and developed to an amazing degree. Save for the introduction of the Creed in the East (early sixth century, followed a few centuries later by its incorporation into the Western Masses for Feasts) and the addition of hymns and proses, the Eastern Liturgies have remained practically unchanged in the course of centuries. The Orthodox Church has always maintained the popular and public character of its worship. No small boy in a preparatory school can fail to understand what is going on in church. The dominant note of mystery is always sustained; yet the Eucharist is not only the Mystery—the representation of the whole drama of God-manward action—but also Sacrifice, the 'Unbloody' Oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ to the Father. The pragmatic West is inclined to lop off from the rite what is not relevant to the worshipping community. The conservative East is disposed to add to what is inherited. Both Liturgies have changed. In one sense both are alike conservative. In the West the Roman Liturgy has become less distinctively 'Roman,' absorbing, transmitting and undergoing transformation in the process of taking over, non-Roman elements, and so has conserved—within the limits of a selective instinct rather less than Catholic in the large sense—much of the whole tradition of the West. It is the repository of what was deemed valuable to convey to further generations of the Faithful.

In the East this same conservative instinct means the rigid preservation of all that has been, plus some innovatory elements reluctantly admitted. The changes in the Western Liturgy are chiefly omissions and abbreviations in the interests of practical exigency. Those of the East are like the successive rings the years bring to the growth of a tree: even the 'Liturgy of the Catechumens' has been preserved in Eastern use, though it has for the space of nearly fourteen centuries lost all practical relevance.

What does the Eucharist mean to-day to the worshipper? As the centre of all worship, the signal and significant corporate act of the Body of Christ, as the means of thanksgiving and intercession, as the service at which pre-eminently the Word of God in Scripture is heard and expounded, its meaning is of so diversified and rich a character that its analysis becomes extremely difficult. Let us compare, first of all, the two types—roughly of Rome and Constantinople—in a general fashion and contrast them. The structure of the Latin Eucharistic rite of the West is admirably dramatic. It is constituted of parts related to a whole, and sweeps, in a sequence of related ideas, to a climax: instruction, offering, intercession, thanksgiving, all leading to the

crisis of the Consecration and Communion. So soon as is feasible the service comes to its end after the *dénouement* has been achieved. It is not so in the East. One steps off, as it were, into a realm of timelessness, or rather one is lifted up into a level of experience different from that of this world. Dramatic crises follow one upon the other—that of the Offertory and the preparation of the Elements, the litanies with their respective terminations of praise, the Little Entrance, and the climax of the Gospel, the Great Entrance with the Eucharistic gifts as yet unconsecrated, the half-veiled, half-revealed mystery of the transactions of the priest behind the screen, the *Sursum Corda*, *Sanctus;* and then the actual moment of the Invocation of the Holy Spirit finds the worshipper rapt in the sense of awe, mystery, revelation—so caught up out of this that he is unaware of a conscious entrance into that world. The Eucharist of the West takes place in the openness of the seen altar where every act—though not all the words—is perceived. The East shrouds the service with a veil of mystery. The West is thoroughly aware of the sacrifice—the Passion and Death of the Saviour. The East cannot withhold the note of triumphant joy, in all seasons of the year, at the astounding fact of the Resurrection. If to the West the Incarnation means so largely the life of suffering, to the East it means the lifting up of all in Christ's Mystical Body in union with His Resurrection. In the West the Eucharist can be used individually, intimately, privately. In the East the whole emphasis is everywhere corporate: the angels and saints, particularly the Mother of God, the living and the departed, are at each point within the conscious realm of the believer's cognisance.

With the Reformation in the West came a new and fresh assertion of the place of the individual in the Body. While within Protestantism this principle often operated in the direction of too great individualism, within the Latin Church it was not entirely without the same effect. Since the sixteenth century, as to a large extent before, the Roman Catholic has been able to 'hear' or 'assist at' Mass in various ways. He can use the opportunity to meditate on the mysteries of the Rosary, to pray in his own words, to follow the service itself in his private prayers, or to occupy himself with other private or corporate acts of devotion. None of these, in practice, *needs* to be articulated with the ideas, acts and transactions of priest and server, or celebrant ministers and choir, in the sanctuary. The worshipper can share in the fruits of that in which he may not have to co-operate save in will, and possibly in posture. Communion may also be a private matter, entirely dissociated from the act of corporate worship of the Eucharist. 'Assisting at Mass' can be done frequently without any necessary

reference to Communion, for the two great elements of the Eucharist—sacrifice and sacrament—are sundered in practice, though not in theory. But the worshipper brings his needs, his problems, his requests and his gratitude to God to be presented as by acts of faith and adoration he unites himself in spirit and intention with what is going on at the altar.

In recent years there has been a movement within Roman Catholicism to recover what has been to a large degree lost in practice: the sense of corporateness, the intelligent participation in the Liturgy, and the attuning of the worshippers, severally and as a whole, with the sequence and progress of the social act of the Eucharistic Liturgy. To this end an active co-operation on the part of the people has in many churches on the Continent been encouraged. Instead of the responses being made by the server or ministers, they are recited together by the congregation —in the vernacular if they do not know enough Latin to reply in that tongue. The private devotions of the people are being systematically aligned with the substance of the cycles of praise, instruction, petition, and the like of the rite itself—as well the fixed parts as the varying 'propers' for the different Masses. Cheap manuals and adequate and attractive translations with pertinent points for brief meditation and regular training of the young in their use, constitute the popular, while theological essays and studies, re-considerations of neglected aspects of latent belief, constitute the more fundamental, aspects of the process of progressive reclamation.

The Eucharist is after all the offering by His Mystical Body of the sacramental Body of Christ. The Body offers the Body. So in Catholic tradition there is grave need constantly to reaffirm the 'priesthood of all believers,' and to recover for the laity that which is their right. So many factors have gone into the situation within modern Roman Catholicism—the use of a dead language for the Liturgy, the continually increasing allocation of functions and office to the priesthood, in its narrower sense, and the abiding consequences of the Reformation, with their ineffaceable marks upon the spirit, mind and operation of the Latin Church—that the programme set by the leaders of the Liturgical Movement might seem to daunt all but the most valiant souls. To those who have recovered afresh a new realisation of worship, the Mass has come to mean more than ever it did before. No longer an act in which participation by the worshipper is confined to a passive consent in will and mind, the Mass becomes the corporate function of the whole Body of Christ—eternal realities meeting in time, claiming the whole of man's powers and activities, the graciousness of outflowing love of God meeting the grateful co-operation of man's love for Him, in the sublime act of ineffable potency—the

Eucharist. Alive in memory, understanding and will—yet in all these functions of his spiritual being in tune with those immediately about him; co-operating with voice and posture, one with the great throng of those about the Lamb, united with all others everywhere engaged in the great act of worship—the worshipper shares as he gives, participates as he offers, at his most active he receives abundantly, together with all his fellows, from the great outpouring of the sacrificed Life now risen in its fullness to new levels.

To the Eastern Orthodox the Eucharist is the pre-eminent occasion of worship. As a child he learned the responses, the rhythm of the melodies, the words of the variable chants, the code of behaviour, the associations of significant acts, gestures, words and inner spirit. He needs no book from which to follow the Liturgy. Its rich variation of occasional parts appropriate to the different feasts of the year is extraordinarily familiar. At every point in the Liturgy he is intelligently co-operating and aware of what is going on. He shares not only in will, but in understanding and, as often as not, in act: the choir normally leads, but has no prerogative to usurp, the singing. It is all in a language he knows—not that of everyday speech, but so nearly vernacular that common schooling and habituation suffice amply to make its words fully intelligible. He hears Epistle and Gospel sung—slowly, impressively, not infrequently, gloriously: it is God's word in man's speech, proclaimed with superb adjuncts of memorial, gesture and voice. From his baptism until he reached 'years of discretion' his mother brought him to frequent Communion. But as he grew older, reception of the Sacrament involved much more: careful self-examination, a fortnight's preparation of soul and body, confession. So the adult does not communicate frequently. The Eucharistic Liturgy is public, social and corporate. The worshippers are in intimate relation to mystery: they pray, sing and stand so close to that which elicits awe that mystical union with God in the whole family of the Holy Saints is readily achieved. Each event of the worshipper's life is associated with the Eucharist: significant days of civil or political importance; the Great Feasts of the Church year, and its four fasting periods; personal and individual events —his name-day, anniversaries of his family, and the like. The Eastern Liturgy in practice is perhaps unique for the rare combination and balance of opposites: intimacy and awe; the individual and the social; intelligibility and mystery; the supernatural and the natural; the life of this world and that of Heaven. As one unit in the great succession, one worshipper of the untold millions, one person in the present world caught up into the life of Heaven, the Eastern Christian feels always the corporate Mystery of Redemption, Death and Resurrection, and

of union of time and eternity, human and divine, in the ineffable consummation—the Liturgy of the Eucharist.

Toward the latter part of the eleventh century—not a generation after the Conquest—there had arisen in England what was destined to persist up to the Reformation as the most important variant of the Roman Use. The 'Use of Sarum'—with its different arrangements of the Sunday and Feastday 'Proper' or variable portions, its different ordering of Sundays (after Trinity and not after Pentecost), and its smaller differences in detail—was ascribed to St. Osmund of Salisbury (d. 1099), the nephew of William the Conqueror and Bishop of the new See founded by the consolidation of Ramsbury and Sherborne. The Sarum Use (the word *Sarum* being the Latin for Salisbury) in the centuries preceding the Reformation was the most outstanding of five several Uses, of which Hereford, Bangor, York, and Lincoln constituted the others. Even St. Paul's, London—possibly the whole of the pre-Reformation Diocese of London—had its own Use down to the eve of Agincourt, the time when both Church (as is shown by the publication of Lyndwood's *Provinciale*) and State (in the later struggles of the Hundred Years' War) were passing through severe struggles. The 'Uses' here mentioned—Salisbury, Hereford, York, Bangor, Lincoln, and London—were all variations of the general Western Rite, so far as concerned the Eucharist; but each, notably that of Sarum, maintained a homogeneous and consistent scheme for the whole prayer and devotional rule as well. The popularity of the Sarum Rite for the Eucharist as well as the Office, if not for the ritual acts connected with its celebration, is shown by the numerous reprints it had in the half-century preceding the Reformation, at which time the desire for uniformity swept away this diversity of custom. The Reformation position can be best judged from the section *Concerning the Service of the Church*: 'Whereas there hath been great diversity in saying and singing in Churches within this Realm; some following *Salisbury* Use, some *Hereford* Use, and some the Use of *Bangor*, some of *York*, some of *Lincoln*; now from henceforth all the whole Realm shall have but one Use' (see J. H. Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, 1899, p. 102).

THE HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER DOWN TO 1662

By F. E. BRIGHTMAN and K. D. MACKENZIE

I

MEDIAEVAL SERVICE BOOKS

The original title of what for short we call 'The Book of Common Prayer' or 'The Prayer Book' was '*THE booke of the common prayer and administracion of the Sacramentes and other rites and ceremonies of the Churche: after the vse of the Churche of England.*'[1] Thus the contents of the book are threefold: (1) 'the common prayer,' what in the Preface is named 'the common prayers in the Churche, commonly called diuine seruice,' or, in the first Act of Uniformity, 'common prayer commonly called the seruice of the Church,' *i.e.* the choir-office of the canonical hours, here reduced to two, Mattins and Evensong; and together with this may be included 'The Litany and Suffrages,' which from the first was called 'the common prayer of procession'; (2) the 'administracion of the sacramentes'—Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Matrimony, and the Unction of the Sick—all except Ordination, for which as yet no new provision was made; and (3) 'other rites and ceremonies of the Churche,' viz. the Churching of Women, the Visitation of the Sick, Burial of the Dead, and the penitential office for Ash Wednesday.

There are two points especially to be noted in this title.

1. '*THE booke.*' It is true that since the Psalms and Lessons of the Divine Service were not included, another book was needed, viz. the Bible; and since Ordination was not provided for, a third book was necessary. But hitherto there had been no single book so comprehensive as the new one. During the later Middle Ages the rites of the Church had been contained in five books: the Breviary, the Missal, the Manual, the Pontifical, and the Processional. The *Breviary*, otherwise called Portiforium or Portuis, provided the whole service of the eight canonical hours for every day of the year, together with the service of the

[1] In 1552 'the' before 'common,' and 'of the Churche,' were omitted. The first of these has not been replaced; the second was restored in 1661.

Blessed Virgin Mary and of the Dead. The *Missal* or Mass Book contained the *Ordo* and the Canon of the Mass, *i.e.* the framework and unchanging formulæ, and the 'Prayer of Consecration'; the *Temporale*—the variable formulæ for the year from Advent till the last Sunday after Pentecost, or, in England, Trinity, together with the immovable feasts from Christmas to Epiphany, and also the characteristic ceremonies of Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and the eves of Easter and Pentecost; and the *Sanctorale*, the variables of Saints' days and other immovable feasts. The *Manual*, otherwise called Ritual or Agenda or Sacerdotal, was the parish priest's book, containing the administration of Baptism, the Solemnization of Matrimony, the Visitation of the Sick and Dying—in which last were included Penance, Communion, and Extreme Unction—the Offices of the Dead, and various benedictions. The *Pontifical* provided for all the ministrations in which the bishop was celebrant, like Confirmation, Ordination, clothing of monks and nuns, consecration and benediction of persons and places and things. The *Processional* supplied the anthems, etc. sung in procession on Sundays and festivals and some other days, and the Rogations of April 25 and the three days before the Ascension. These books contained the text of the rites and at first had little or nothing in the way of directions or rubrics. These were supplied by such books as the 'Consuetudinary' and the 'Ordinal.' In the *Consuetudinary* were codified the customs of the church to which it belonged, among them the ceremonial rules and the part to be taken by the several ministers or groups of ministers in the execution of Divine Service and Mass and incidental rites associated with these. The *Ordinal*, or, as it was called in England in its latest form in the fifteenth century, the 'Directorium' or 'Pie' (*pica*), described how the parts of the service were to be fitted together, and in particular how things were to be adjusted when, in the thirty-five different situations due to the variation in the date of Easter, a movable and an immovable feast 'occurred' or 'concurred,' *i.e.* fell on the same day or on two successive days, resulting in 'the number and hardness of the rules of the Pie' referred to in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer. In the end the Consuetudinary was broken up and its directions inserted in Breviary and Missal at the points to which they applied, and the Pie was also divided into sections which were intercalated at convenient points.

But this system of books began to displace in part an older system only in the eleventh century. Whereas in the newer system each of the books contained a whole office or series of offices as celebrated under all circumstances, in the older system the several books contained only those parts of the several offices which appertained to a single minister or group of like ministers.

Thus the *Sacramentary* provided the prayers of the priest, whether presbyter or bishop, for all the sacraments and for the other rites. The *Lectionary* or 'Comes,' containing the Epistles and Lessons of the Mass, was the subdeacon's book, the *Gospel* or 'Textus' the deacon's, the *Cantatorium* or Gradual (Grail) supplied the text and music of the parts of the Mass sung by the choir. For the Divine Service were required the *Psalter*, containing the Psalms and Canticles; the *Antiphonary* and the *Responsorial*, containing the antiphons and responds; the Lesson-books for use at Mattins, viz. the *Bibliotheca* or Bible for the scriptural lessons, the *Legenda Sanctorum* for the lives of the saints, and the *Homiliary* containing the lessons from the writings of the Fathers: and the bond between all these books was the *Ordo*, which supplied the place of rubrics.

It is unnecessary for the present purpose to do more than mention some other books of later origin and lesser importance, like the *Hymnary*, the *Sequential*, the *Troper*, the *Collectar*, or the *Benedictional*.

Apart from the Bible and the Psalter, the most important of these books, and the most comprehensive, was the Sacramentary, and something must be said of its history. The most convenient date at which to begin is the last quarter of the eighth century, when there was and had long been great variety of liturgical usage in the Frankish kingdom, some churches using the old Gallican rite in various local texts, some a form of the Roman rite, and others a mixture of the two. Charlemagne, being anxious to put an end to this diversity and to secure the uniform observance of the Roman rite, applied to the pope, Hadrian I, for an authentic copy of the Roman Sacramentary. It might seem that Hadrian was not greatly interested in Charlemagne's project, since the copy he sent was a very inadequate one, containing as it did only the masses of the 'stations,' *i.e.* of the days on which the pope celebrated solemnly for the whole City in one or other of the basilicas, and a few other masses, Ordinations, and a number of occasional prayers.[1] Consequently it made no provision for the Sundays between Christmas and Epiphany, for those after Epiphany and after the octave of Easter, and for those between the octave of Pentecost and Advent. Though this book is described in its title and in Hadrian's covering letter as 'The Book of the Sacraments published by St. Gregory the Great,' it is now commonly called the 'Sacramentary of Hadrian' (*Hadrianum*), not only because, so far as it goes, it has been brought up to date by the addition of post-Gregorian masses—like those for Thursdays in Lent, for the Nativity and the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and for the feast of St. Gregory himself,—but also by reason of its very incompleteness. For a complete Sacra-

[1] In H. A. Wilson, *The Gregorian Sacramentary*, H.B.S., 1915, pp. 1–143.

mentary from which Hadrian's, apart from its post-Gregorian elements, is only an extract has now been recognised in a MS. at Padua copied from an exemplar written before the year 682.[1] The *Hadrianum* was obviously insufficient for the purposes of the Frankish or of any church; and consequently a supplement was compiled and added to it—the work, it is generally supposed, of Alcuin—supplying its deficiencies.[2] To this supplement the compiler prefixed a preface, explaining what he had done and the purpose of his work. After a while this preface was omitted by the copyists, and later the supplement was broken up and its items inserted at their appropriate places in the *Hadrianum*. This composite but unified book is what is commonly known as the 'Gregorian Sacramentary' (*Gregorianum*),[3] and for the most part is the source of the essential prayers of the later Missals, Pontificals, and Rituals.

But at the moment when the *Hadrianum* was received in Frankland there was already known, and in use there, another and older type of Roman Sacramentary, which came to be called the 'Gelasian' (*Gelasianum*), being rightly or wrongly supposed to be the work of the pope Gelasius I (492–496). This book, which is known from only a single MS. of the first half of the eighth century,[4] is a Roman book which has been modified, on the one hand by the elimination of nearly everything of merely local Roman interest, and on the other by certain Gallican insertions; while it is also so far Gregorianised that its canon of the Mass is in the Gregorian form. Certain names in the Kalendar seem to indicate that it reached Gaul, not directly from Rome, but by way of South Italy, where perhaps the deromanising modifications had already been made.[5]

Another type of Sacramentary is mainly a combination of the Gelasian and the Gregorian.[6] This type, not being purely Gregorian, was reckoned as Gelasian, and to-day it is commonly known as 'Gelasian of the eighth century'; but it is better called 'Mixed,' not only because it is rather a Gregorian book modified by Gelasian insertions and substitutions than a Gregorianised Gelasian, but also because it contains an appreciable amount of matter derived from a source or sources other than either Gelasian or Gregorian. The Sunday masses of the Frankish supplement, not represented in the *Hadrianum*, are

[1] Printed in K. Mohlberg, *Die älteste erreichbare Gestalt des Liber Sacramentorum der römischen Kirche* (Cod. Pad. D.) 47, fol. 11r–100r. Münster in Westf., 1927.

[2] Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 145 ff. A different supplement is found in the 9th cent. 'Sacramentary of St. Thierry' (Leroquais, *Les Sacramentaires et les Missels manuscrits des bibliothèques publics de France*, Paris, 1924, i., p. 23).

[3] *E.g.* Ménard's *D. Gregorii Liber Sacramentorum*, Paris, 1642.

[4] H. A. Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, Oxford, 1894, pp. 1–315.

[5] W. H. Frere, *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy* (Alcuin Club Collections), Oxford, 1930, pp. 42 ff.

[6] Analysed in Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 317 ff.

apparently derived from the mixed Sacramentary, since, while they generally reproduce the masses of the older and complete *Gregorianum*, on twelve of the Sundays after Pentecost they adopt the non-Gregorian elements of the corresponding masses of the mixed Sacramentary.

Lastly, there is the collection of purely Roman material, made apparently in the sixth century, contained in a MS. of the early seventh century belonging to the Chapter Library of Verona, and known as the 'Leonine' (*Leonianum*),[1] a name given to it by its first editor, who conjectured that it was the work of the pope St. Leo the Great (440–461). It is not strictly a Sacramentary, but rather a somewhat carelessly arranged accumulation of material out of which a Sacramentary might be compiled. The MS. has unfortunately lost twenty-four leaves at the beginning, and what remains of it covers the year only from April 22 to Dec. 28. Besides an immense number of Saints'-day masses, fifteen masses, which are perhaps intended for unoccupied Sundays, and a large number of masses for various occasions and intentions, it provides only for Ascension, Pentecost, the summer, autumn and winter Embertides and Christmas; it contains also the prayers of Ordination and the Veiling of Virgins. A large proportion of this material reappears in the later Sacramentaries and service-books, and through them some eight Leonine prayers passed into the Book of Common Prayer.[2]

The new system of books was formed by combining and arranging in due order what belonged to each day of the week and the year in Psalter, Lesson books, Antiphonary and Responsorial, and adding the collect of the day from the Sacramentary, to form the Breviary; by dividing out from the Sacramentary all that pertained to the Mass, and similarly combining the prayers of each day with the corresponding parts of the Gradual, the Lectionary, and the Gospel, to form the Missal; while those parts of the Sacramentary which concerned the bishop alone went to form the Pontifical; and the rest belonged to the Ritual. The Processional was a later book, not older perhaps than the latter part of the thirteenth century, and was compiled by selection out of the Antiphonary and the Responsorial; and sometimes it was not a separate book but was included in the Manual,[3] as it is now in the Roman Ritual; and sometimes again the cues of its items were inserted in the Missal before the

[1] In C. L. Feltoe, *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, Cambridge, 1896.

[2] Collects of St. Jo. Ev., Easter iii., Trinity v., ix., xiii., xiv., xxiv., and Ord. of Priests, 'Almighty God, giver of all good things.' Among the 'Additions' to the Book of Common Prayer 'proposed in 1928' the Collect of the 2nd Sunday after Christmas is a feeble paraphrase of a Leonine Collect (Feltoe p. 159), and the last but one of the Occasional Prayers (not the work of the revisers) is a fine abbreviation of another (*ib.*, p. 126).

[3] Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, iii. 27, 'Vt parochiani,' note f.

Mass of the day to which each of them belonged.[1] This new system was no doubt primarily intended for the convenience of clerics celebrating the Low Mass, and reciting the Breviary in private, and ministering in large areas; and the Sacramentary ceased to be reproduced after the beginning of the thirteenth century. But otherwise, for Solemn Mass and Divine Service in choir, the old books continued to be copied and to be in use, and after the middle of the fifteenth century they were printed; so that they are enumerated in mediæval lists of things which parishioners are required to provide;[2] and in England, when in 1549 the old ritual books were required to be called in and destroyed, the list of them includes, not only Missals, Breviaries, Manuals, Processionals and Ordinals, but also Antiphoners, Grayles, Legends;[3] but not Pontificals, since, as we shall see, they were still required.

2. '*after the vse of the Churche of England.*' Hitherto there had been no such Use. As in the rest of Western Europe, so in England, there had been several Uses. The Preface of 'The Book of the Common Prayer' mentions five varieties of Divine Service—those of Salisbury, Hereford, Bangor, York, Lincoln—and this list was not exhaustive. Theoretically each church was supposed to follow the use of the metropolitan church of its province;[4] but this was only theory, and in practice each diocese and at least the greater churches within the diocese might have their own Use, so that by the middle of the sixteenth century there were something like 200 Missals, which it had been thought worth while to print with the names of the dioceses or provinces to which they appertained, and it is probable that these did not fully represent the extent of the existing diversity. These 'Uses' were not different rites or liturgical types, but only implied differences of detail, whether of word or action, in the observance of the Roman rite. In all the structure and the text were approximately the same; but here and there at any point different formulæ, or formulæ differently placed, might occur. In Breviaries, *e.g.*, while the distribution of the Psalter was everywhere the same, there was considerable variety in the non-scriptural lessons of Mattins; and a characteristic difference between Missals is found in the selection of the private prayers of the celebrant, added after the ninth century, in the sacristy, at the foot of the altar, and at the Offertory and the Communion.[5] If England was exceptional, it was in the wide adoption of the

[1] *E.g.* in J. W. Legg *The Sarum Missal*, Oxford, 1916.
[2] Procter and Frere, *New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 43.
[3] See below, pp. 168 sq.
[4] Gratian, *Decretum*, I, xii. 13; Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, ii. 3. e.
[5] For differences of Use in the thirteenth cent. see Durandus, *Rationale*, passim; for varieties in the Missals, J. W. Legg, *Missale Westmonasteriense*, iii. (H.B.S., 1897).

Use of Sarum. This use was organised and codified in a Consuetudinary and an Ordinal early in the thirteenth century by, or at the instance of, Richard le Poer, dean and afterwards bishop, who transferred his seat from Old Sarum to New Sarum and began the building of the present cathedral church of Salisbury. In the middle of the fourteenth century the books were revised in consequence of changes in the dignity of some feasts and the adoption of new ones, and this revision resulted in what was called the 'New Use of Sarum.'[1] But from the first the Use had affected other dioceses, and in course of time it was so widely adopted, in whole or in part, that in 1457 it could be said that the Ordinal of Salisbury was used by almost all the churches of England, Wales, and Ireland, and of many other places as well.[2] This wide acceptance is illustrated by the large number of editions of the Sarum books which were printed, as contrasted with the fewness of those of the York and Hereford books; while the Bangor and Lincoln Uses were never printed.[3] By reason probably of the suppression of the monasteries and the secularisation of the monastic cathedral chapters and the consequent cessation of the public use of the Monastic Breviary, in 1543 the Convocation of Canterbury imposed the Sarum Breviary on the whole province.[4]

The sort of uniformity then demanded by Acts of Uniformity, or even by the less rigid requirements of the Bull *Quo primum* of Pius IV in 1570, was unknown to the Middle Ages. At the same time it is obvious that, unless he were very familiar with the books, no one passing from the area of one Use to that of another would be conscious of anything unexpected in what he heard in church, while he might well notice differences in what he saw, just as to-day a stranger in Lyons can scarcely fail to notice much that is unfamiliar in the local ceremonial which still survives.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, 5th ed., Paris (1925), ch. V (Eng. trans., *Christian Worship*, London, S.P.C.K., 1919).

Wordsworth and Littlehales, *The Old Service Books of the English Church*, London (1904).

Swete, *Church Services and Service-books before the Reformation* (revised by Maclean), London, S.P.C.K. (1930).

Frere, *The Use of Sarum*, Cambridge (1898, 1901).

Wordsworth, 'Sarum Use' in Ollard and Crosse, *Dictionary of English Church History*, London (1912).

Maskell, W., *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ* (3 vols. 2nd ed. Oxford, 1882).

[1] Frere, *Use of Sarum*, ii. p. x.

[2] The Bull of Calixtus III in A. R. Malden, *The Canonisation of St. Osmund*, Salisb., 1901, p. 223; Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, ii. 3. e.

[3] For statistics of Sarum and York editions see Wordsworth and Littlehales, *Old Service Books of the English Church*, p. 13. Only one edition each of the Hereford Breviary and Missal was issued.

[4] Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 861.

II

LITURGICAL REFORM ON THE CONTINENT

1. In the sixteenth century there was widespread dissatisfaction with the liturgical books and desire for the reform of them.

a. One form of this dissatisfaction can be dismissed in a few words. Leo X and the humanists of the Roman Court affected to be offended by the 'barbarism,' as they called it, of the Latinity of the Church, and it was proposed to recast the books in the language of the Augustan age. The metrical hymns of the Breviary were so rewritten and were published in 1525 with a letter of Clement VII approving them and permitting their use. As literary compositions they were excellent, and many of them were irreproachable; but the pagan allusions and phrasing of others made them intolerable. The design went no further; and nothing is heard of it after the sack of the City in 1527.[1]

b. A much more serious, widespread, and effectual dissatisfaction was felt with the matter of the books. Synod after synod up to the time of that of Trent, which secured the revised Breviary of 1568 and the Missal of 1570, asked for reform of the books and especially of the Breviary, and several bishops issued revised Breviaries for their own dioceses.[2] Two schemes of reform had the papal approval. Of one of these—the attempt of Carafa, bishop of Chieti, and General of the Theatine Order, afterwards Pope Paul IV, to revise the Breviary and the Missal for his Order—little is known;[3] and nothing came of it, unless it influenced the revision of Pius V. Much more important was the outcome of Clement VII's commission to Francisco de Quiñones, General of the Franciscans, Cardinal of S. Croce, viz. the *Breviarium Romanum nuper reformatum*,[4] published in 1535 with a letter addressed to Clement's successor, Paul III, and a letter of Paul himself allowing seculars to use it on obtaining a licence from the Holy See. In the preface, after defining what he conceives to be the original purpose of the Divine Office, Quiñones sets out the grounds of the current dissatisfaction with the Breviary: that the Scriptural lessons have been so much shortened that a book of the Bible is scarcely begun before it is done with; that practically only a few of the Psalms are recited, the rest being crowded out by the continual repetition of the festal Psalms; the illiterate and ill-chosen legends of the saints, wanting at

[1] P. Batiffol, *Histoire du Bréviaire Romain*, ch. v.

[2] J. W. Legg, 'Some local forms of Divine Service . . . in the sixteenth century' in *Transactions of St. Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, vol. v.

[3] See Batiffol, *op. cit.*, pp. 231 ff.

[4] J. W. Legg, *Breviarium Romanum a Francisco Cardinali Quignonio editum*, Cambridge, 1888.

once in authority and seriousness; and the difficulty of the complicated rules for adjusting the service to the varying date of Easter, so that it takes as long to find what is to be said as to say it when found. Other grounds for criticism are indicated by the measures he has taken for reform, which he goes on to describe. The result is that all antiphons, chapters, responds, *preces*, many of the hymns, and other things 'which impede the reading of the Sacred Scripture' are suppressed; the Psalter is so distributed that the whole of it is to be recited, without repetition except of *Venite*, every week, three Psalms being assigned to each office, and one of the Old Testament canticles serving as the third Psalm at Lauds. Mattins, preceded by *Pater noster*, the *Confiteor*, and Absolution, is always of one nocturn only, with three lessons from Old Testament and New Testament read in course. Only Passion, Holy and Easter weeks have proper second lessons, and festivals proper third lessons, which on Christmas and Easter day are derived from patristic homilies, on Saints' days from the lives of the Saints. *Te Deum* is used daily except in Advent and Lent, when *Miserere* takes its place; *Quicunque vult* is confined to Sundays, the Apostles' Creed being substituted on week-days. The supplementary Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary is abolished, but on all unoccupied Saturdays the whole Service is of the Blessed Virgin Mary; the reconstructed Office of the Dead is confined to Nov. 2, and the Penitential Psalms and the Litany are said only on Ash Wednesday and Fridays in Lent.

The new Breviary was immediately criticised sharply, and consequently a revised edition appeared a year later [1] in which the chief changes were that an antiphon is restored to each group of Psalms, or of Psalms and canticles; the third lesson at Mattins on Sundays and on all days in Advent and Lent is taken from a patristic homily; and Mattins and Lauds of the Office of the Dead are to be said on certain Fridays in Lent, and responds are restored to its Mattins.

This Breviary was widely used by seculars and by some regulars, and in some churches in Spain it was used in choir, while it influenced some of the new diocesan breviaries already mentioned. More than a hundred editions appeared in the next thirty years; but it was formally abolished by Pius V in the Bull *Quod a nobis* in 1568, and with the issue of his new breviary in the same year it ceased to have any use or significance, until apparently it suggested some of the new features of the Breviary of Pius X in 1912.

2. The continental Reformation gave rise to a variety of service-books.

Before noticing any of these, it will be well, for reasons that will appear further on, to recall a feature of mediæval and later

[1] J. W. Legg, *The Second Recension of the Quignon Breviary*, H.B.S., London, 1908, 1912.

usage which from the ninth century onwards was developed on this side of the Alps and the Pyrenees, viz. the vernacular office attached to the sermon in the High Mass of Sundays and festivals, and called the 'Prone' (*pronaus*). This consisted of all or some of these items: bidding of intercessions for living and dead, the several biddings being followed by at least a silent *Pater noster* and a collect said aloud by the preacher; a general confession and absolution; the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Decalogue, each with exposition and admonition; and notification of the feasts and fasts of the ensuing week, banns of marriage and ordination, and so on. All was left as far as possible to the free improvisation of the preacher; but after a while models were suggested by individual writers and local forms tended to be more or less stereotyped, like those to be found in diocesan Rituals of France and Germany from the sixteenth century onwards.[1] In England perhaps the Confession and Absolution never formed part of the Prone. The intercession—the 'Bidding of the Bedes' or 'Bidding Prayer'—has been the most conspicuous and constant feature, though now it survives only in the old Universities and sporadically elsewhere. As on the Continent, so here, the teaching of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer to the people, for which the Prone was the opportunity, has been repeatedly enforced from the Council of Cloveshoe (747) onwards; while Peckham's constitution *Ignorantia sacerdotum* (1281) required also the inculcation of the Decalogue along with other things included in the continental Prones.[2] The notifications have been so habitual that in 1549 it was unnecessary to direct them and they are only alluded to in the direction that banns of marriage 'must be asked in the service time . . . after the accustomed manner,' *i.e.*, as was made explicit in 1661, before the sermon in the mass.[3]

There are four types of ritual produced by the continental Reformation, proceeding respectively from Wittenberg, Strassburg and Geneva, Zürich, and Cologne. In all of these it may be said at the outset, and once for all, 'every thing,' in Luther's words, 'that signifies oblation' is 'repudiated,' as well as all prayer for the dead.

a. For Wittenberg Luther issued a series of 'booklets' from 1523 onwards. In 1523 he published an Order of Baptism (*Taufbüchlein*),[4] which is practically only a German version of the Latin Order, with one prayer (*Deus patrum*) entirely recast, except for the final clauses. Three years later the Order was

[1] See Migne, *Rituel des Rituels*, i. cols. 1–590.
[2] Wilkins, *Concilia*, ii. p. 54.
[3] See further, Brightman, *The English Rite*, App. i.
[4] *Kleine Texte*, Liturgische Texte IV, 'Martin Luthers Von Ordnung Gottesdiensts, Taufbüchlein, Formula Missae et Communionis,' Bonn, 1909.

revised, the exorcisms being reduced to one, and the incidenta ceremonies—salt, spittle, unction, the white garment, and the torch—being omitted. In 1523 there appeared also the *Formula Missae et Communionis*,[1] prescribing a reformed Latin Mass, in which the traditional form is retained as far as the Creed and the sermon, after which the offertory is reduced to the setting forth of the bread and the cup (which Luther 'inclines' to use unmixed) without prayers: *Dominus vobiscum*, *Sursum corda*, etc., and the first half of the Preface are followed by the Institution sung by the celebrant, and the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*, with the elevation; *Pater noster* with its prelude; *Pax Domini*; communion in both kinds accompanied by *Agnus Dei* and the *Communio*; and lastly *Quod ore sumpsimus* and a benediction, either in the traditional form or in that of Num. vi. 24–26. For Divine Service, the Day Hours remain, with lessons and exposition in German. In 1526 Luther issued *Mass and Order of Divine Service in German* (*Deudsche Messe und ordnung Gottis diensts*).[2] Here metrical hymns are substituted for Introit, Gradual, and *Agnus Dei*; *Gloria in excelsis* is omitted; the Apostles' takes the place of the Nicene Creed; after the sermon follows the intercession, or a paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, belonging to the Prone, with an exhortation to communicants in place of Confession and Absolution; then, *Sursum corda* and Preface being omitted, the recital of the Institution from 1 Cor. xi, the Lord's Prayer, communion and final thanksgiving. For Divine Service, while Vespers, with a sermon after *Magnificat*, is retained on Sundays and festivals, in the morning the service consists of Psalms, a sermon on the Epistle, an anthem, *Te Deum* or *Benedictus*, the Lord's Prayer and a Collect; while on weekdays there is a similar service in a mixture of Latin and German, morning and evening, intended chiefly for schoolboys. In 1529, in view of the Turkish peril, Luther issued a Litany, first in Latin, afterwards in German, being the Roman Litany modified by the omission of the invocations of the saints and of twelve of the petitions, the addition of twenty-five new petitions, and a new series of Collects, of which the first is that of the Mass *Pro tribulatione cordis*, later adopted as the first collect of the English Litany. Luther's Litany is an admirable work, which need not fear comparison with what it was intended to displace. What has been said is enough to indicate the character of Luther's rites and it is needless to describe the Solemnization of Matrimony (*Traubüchlein*) of 1534 and the Ordination rite (*Formula ordinandorum ministrorum verbi*) of about 1537. But the two Catechisms, the 'Greater' and the 'Short,' of 1529,[3] in the form of instruction by means of question and answer on the four topics, the Commandments, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the

[1] *Kleine Texte*, Liturgische Texte IV, Bonn, 1909. [2] *Ibid.*, V.
[3] Wace and Buchheim, *Luther's Primary Works*, pp. 1 ff.

Sacraments (Baptism and the Eucharist), with instruction on private confession, are to be noted, because they seem to have suggested the form taken by subsequent catechisms and manuals of popular instruction, like Calvin's Catechism (1535), the *Encheiridion* of Cologne (1538), the 'Bishops' Book' and the 'King's Book' (1537 and 1543), and the Catechism of the Council of Trent (1566).

Luther's ritual measures were intended at the outset for Wittenberg alone; but by the visitation of 1527, promoted by the Duke John Frederick, they were extended to the whole of Ernestine Saxony. The other Protestant princes also undertook the ecclesiastical reorganisation of their territories by means of visitations, the results of which were embodied in Church Orders (*Kirchenordnungen*) defining the doctrine, discipline and ritual of the several areas. In general Luther's rites were adopted; but some Orders were more conservative; some followed the *Formula Missae*, others the *German Mass;* very generally a large didactic and hortatory element was introduced; provision was made for ministrations not provided for by Luther—Confirmation by prayer and imposition of hands after instruction; Visitation of the Sick, and their Communion, generally after consecration in the sick-chamber; and the Burial of the Dead, in which a new feature was the use of 'In the midst of life' (*Media vita*), in Luther's metrical version; and the service to be used when none intend to communicate, which is sometimes the Mass as far as the sermon, followed by the Litany.

b. At Strassburg the Mass was first celebrated in German in Holy Week, 1524, after the following order:[1] Confession with 1 Tim. i. 15, St. Mark ix. 24 as an absolution; Introit, *Kyrie, Gloria in excelsis*, Epistle, Alleluia, Gospel, Sermon, and Nicene Creed; the setting forth of the elements, without prayer, but with an admonition to self-oblation (Rom. xii. 1) suggested by *Orate fratres*; *Dominus vobiscum*, *Sursum corda*, etc., Preface, *Sanctus* and *Benedictus;* a Canon consisting of intercesssion followed by commemoration of redemption and prayer for its fruits, *Qui pridie* and elevation of the chalice, and thanksgiving for forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Eucharist; the Lord's Prayer with a *Libera nos*; *Agnus Dei;* Communion preceded by *Domine Jesu Christe Fili Dei* and followed by a hymn and *Quod ore sumpsimus* and the Blessing. So far the traditional structure and much of the contents of the Mass in a German version are followed with considerable closeness; but almost immediately alteration began, and before the end of the year Bucer and his fellow-divines describe[2] the service as consisting of Confession and Absolution, Psalm or Hymn, a short Prayer, Epistle with exposition, Deca-

[1] F. Hubert, *Die Strassburger liturgischen Ordnungen*, Göttingen, 1900, pp. 57ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. lxix.

logue or other song, Gospel, Sermon, Creed, Intercession with *prayer for grace and commemoration of the Passion (no doubt, as in the subsequent service-books, concluding with the Lord's* Prayer), Exhortation, the Institution (no longer in the form of *Qui pridie* addressed to God, but in that of a lesson from the Gospels or 1 Cor. xi. addressed to the people), Communion, Hymn or Psalm, short Prayer and Blessing. Further, within a few years the Epistle has vanished, and a Psalm or Hymn may take the place of the Creed.[1]

On his expulsion from Geneva in 1538 Calvin became chaplain of the French Reformed congregation in Strassburg, and adopted the local reformed rite with some modifications: (1) he divided the Decalogue in two, substituting i–iv for the first Psalm, and keeping only v–x after the Prayer; (2) since he was only allowed to celebrate the Lord's Supper once a month, he placed the Lord's Prayer (in paraphrase) immediately after the intercessory paragraph of the German, and added the rest of this prayer rafte the Lord's Prayer only when the Lord's Supper was celebrated; (3) he placed the Creed or alternative Psalm, not after the Sermon, but after the paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer, and then on Sundays, when the Lord's Supper was not celebrated, finished the service with a Psalm and Blessing. The order thus becomes: Confession and Absolution, Decalogue i–iv, Prayer, Decalogue v–x, Prayer, Lesson and Sermon, Intercession [and further Prayer], Lord's Prayer, Creed or Psalm, [Exhortation followed by reading of the Institution, Communion, and Thanksgiving], Psalm, and Blessing—the bracketed items being omitted when there was no celebration of the Lord's Supper.[2]

When Calvin was recalled to Geneva in 1541 he found in use there a rite compiled by Farel and published at Neufchatel in 1533—*La maniere et fasson quon tient . . . a la sainte cene*, etc.[3] Here the ordinary service is a Prayer, the Lord's Prayer, Lesson, and Sermon, followed by the Decalogue, Confession and Absolution, Creed, Intercession, and Dismissal—obviously only the Sermon with its text and Prone. At the celebration of the Lord's Supper, a long exhortation is followed by Confession, Lord's Prayer, and Creed; a second exhortation and the recital of the Institution; an instruction, warning and invitation; Communion; a final exhortation to thansgiving, and a Blessing. Calvin set these forms aside and substituted his own Strassburg service, modified by the omission of the Absolution (at the desire of the Genevese, but against his own wish), the substitution of a Psalm for Decalogue i–iv, and the omission of Decalogue v–x and

[1] F. Hubert, *Die Strassburger liturgischen Ordnungen*, Göttingen, 1900, p. 97.
[2] P. Brully, *La manyere de faire prières aux églises francoyses*, 1542.
[3] J. G. Baum, *Première Liturgie des églises reformées de France*, Strassburg, 1859.

of the alternative to the Creed;[1] and this became the type of Calvinistic usage everwhere. It will be noticed that, although derived ultimately from the Mass, Calvin's Strassburg service, apart from what belongs only to the Lord's Supper, consists essentially of the items of the Prone—Confession and Absolution, Decalogue, Intercession, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed; and the same is true of the Genevan scheme except that the Decalogue has disappeared.

c. At Zürich in 1523 Zwingli proposed a reform of the Mass.[2] He would have the Epistle and Gospel read in German, Sequences suppressed and the music generally restrained, and the Offertory omitted: he supplies a new Canon in Renaissance Latin,[3] with the *Pater noster* within it and the recital of the Institution after it, followed by an Invitation and the Communion, a Thanksgiving, *Nunc dimittis* and Blessing. But this was only provisional, going only as far as the Council was as yet prepared to go. The characteristic and permanent German rite appeared in *Action oder Bruch des Nachtmals* of 1525,[4] in which, after a sermon and the preparation of a table set below the choir and furnished with a cloth and unleavened bread on wooden platters and wine in wooden cups, the Pastor makes the invocation, *In the Name*, etc., and recites a Collect while the congregation kneels. A minister reads the Epistle (1 Cor. xi. 20–29), and *Gloria in excelsis* is recited antiphonally by the ministers, the deacon reads the Gospel (St. John vi. 47–63) and the ministers recite the Apostles' Creed, again antiphonally. The Pastor then invites the congregation 'to the worthy celebration of the Supper,' and the Lord's Prayer is said kneeling. The Pastor prays that all may obediently and in faith give thanks for the benefit of redemption and live as becomes the children of God and thereby instruct the unbelieving, and then recites the record of the Institution from 1 Cor. xi. The ministers, after themselves communicating, carry round the sacrament to the sitting congregation, each of whom breaks off a particle of the bread and gives a part of it to his neighbour and then partakes of the cup; and meanwhile St. John xiii. ff. is read. When all have communicated, they kneel and Ps. cxiii is said antiphonally by the ministers: the Pastor makes a final exhortation, says a short thanksgiving and dismisses the congregation. This rite is only to be used four times a year. At other times, the service once more is only the Sermon with its Prone—Bidding Prayer, Lord's Prayer before the Sermon, Commemoration of those departed in the preceding week, and Confession and Absolution; while it is further required that with

[1] B. J. Kidd, *Documents of the Continental Reformation*, p. 615.

[2] In the *De canone missae epicheiresis:* see J. Smend, *Die evangelischen deutschen Messen*, Göttingen, 1896, p. 202. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[4] A. L. Richter, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen*, Weimar, 1846, i. p. 136; Kidd, *Documents*, p. 444.

the Sermon the people shall be instructed in the Creed, the Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer.[1]

d. The Diet of Regensburg in 1541 required the prelates of the Empire to promote within their several jurisdictions a Christian ordering and reformation for the better administration of ecclesiastical affairs, and Hermann von Wied, archbishop-elector of Cologne, who had by this time taken the side of the Reformation, interpreting the decree in his own sense, invited Martin Bucer from Strassburg, and Philip Melanchthon from Wittenberg, with other divines, to effect the reformation of his diocese. The outcome of their proposals was a Church Order, which was accepted by the lay estates of the Landtag at Bonn in 1543 and published under the title *Einfaltigs bedencken warauff ein Christliche . . . Reformation . . . anzurichten seye*, corrected and improved in a new edition in 1544, and with further changes issued in Latin in 1545 as *Simplex ac pia deliberatio*, etc.[2] Its ritual, which was the work of Bucer, is for the most part a combination of formulæ derived partly from various Lutheran Orders and partly from Strassburg, either directly or through the Order of Cassel (1539), which was either Bucer's work or largely influenced by him. It is marked throughout by the copiousness of its didactic and hortatory features. By way of illustration, Baptism, Confirmation and the Lord's Supper may be noticed. (1) The Order of Baptism is in two parts, used respectively on two successive days. On the first day, after a long exhortation, expanded from the Saxon and Brandenburg Orders, the renunciations and confession of faith are made in answer to a long catechism, and are followed by a further exhortation, signing with the cross, an exorcism and two of Luther's prayers, and the Gospel (St. Mark x. 13–16), with a short exposition, the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, a Psalm and a concluding Collect. On the next day, after the Creed in the Mass, there follow an Epistle and a Gospel, and a long intercessory prayer (Cassel), the Baptism, another prayer from Luther's Order and a hymn. (2) Before Confirmation by prayer and the imposition of hands, the candidates are examined in a long catechism expanded from that of Cassel; the people are bidden to pray for them and their prayers are summed up in a long Collect (Cassel); and after the Confirmation a hymn follows. (3) The Mass begins with the Strassburg Confession, one or other of the five 'comfortable words' from the later edition of the Strassburg Mass, and a new Absolution; after which the traditional order is followed from the Introit to the

[1] Richter, i. pp. 136, 171. J. C. Werndly, *Liturgia Tigurina or the Book of Common Prayers*, London, 1693, is a translation of the whole Zürich rite of that date.

[2] Richter, ii. p. 30. An English translation was published in 1547, and in a new ed. in 1548 with the title *A Simple and Religious Consultatiō*, etc.

Sermon, Alleluia and the Sequence being alternatives, and followed by a German hymn; after the Sermon follows the Strassburg Intercession; during the Creed, alms are collected; *Dominus vobiscum*, *Sursum corda*, etc. introduce a fixed Preface, reminiscent of Eastern forms, and *Sanctus* and *Benedictus* are sung in Latin and German, followed by the Institution in the Lutheran form, the Lord's Prayer, and *Pax Domini*; *Agnus Dei* and hymns accompany the Communion, which is followed by a Thanksgiving, either that of Brandenburg-Nürnberg or that of Luther's German Mass, and the Aaronic Blessing.

Hermann's projected reformation came to nothing. The chapter of Cologne protested and published a detailed criticism of the Order in *Christliche und katholische Gegenberichtung*, which also appeared in Latin as *Antididagma seu christianæ et catholicæ religionis . . . propugnatio;* and little use was made of the Order. Herrmann himself was suspended and forced to resign (1547).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Batiffol, *Histoire du Bréviaire Romain*, 3rd ed., Paris (1911), Eng. trans., London (1912).

Y. Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic*, London, S.P.C.K. (1930).

III

THE REIGN OF HENRY VIII

In the reign of Henry VIII, while no large measures of liturgical reconstruction were undertaken, some changes were effected, and some proposals and experiments were made which produced no practical result for the present.

1. Hitherto, as we have seen,[1] the Bidding of the Bedes had not been a fixed formula, but churches had their own customary forms or the preacher improvised at his pleasure. But in 1534, by way of advertising his new title and enforcing the recognition of it, Henry 'tuned the pulpits' by dictating a fixed form for general use, in which the King is named, no longer after the spiritualty as head of the temporalty, but before the spiritualty as 'being immediately next under God the only supreme head of this catholick church of England' or, in a revised form issued in 1536, 'supreme head immediately under God of the spiritualty and temporalty of the same church.'[2]

2. It was widely felt in this period that the traditional ceremonies were not understood, or were misunderstood, by the people. The Council of Cologne in 1536, for example, enacted

[1] Pp. 138 f.

[2] Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. 783, 808.

that the people should be instructed in the meaning of the ceremonies, and the *Encheiridion*,[1] issued by its authority to assist the clergy in their teaching, included expositions of the ceremonies incidental to the administration of the sacraments; and the *Rituale Romanum* of 1584 required the priest at the administration of the sacraments to expound the ceremonies as well as 'the virtue, use and utility' of the sacraments themselves. So in England, the 9th of the *Ten Articles*[2] of 1536 deals with rites and ceremonies and explains holy water, holy bread, the lights of Candlemas, the ashes of Ash Wednesday, etc., which are not to be cast away but to be continued, to put us in remembrance of the spiritual things they signify, while none of them has power to remit sin.[3] This article is repeated in the exposition of the 4th Commandment in the *Institution of a Christian man* ('The Bishops' Book') of 1537.[4] In the following year, Henry, embarrassed by his political and ecclesiastical difficulties, was negotiating an alliance with the Protestant princes of Germany, and envoys were sent to England to attempt to reach a doctrinal agreement on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. Such agreement as could be reached was formulated in the *Thirteen Articles*,[5] two of which (v and xi) are concerned with rites and ceremonies, and lay down the principles which should govern all 'traditions' and observances of human institution—'stated feasts, fasts, prayers and the like'—which are as necessary to the order of the Church as laws are to that of the State, but need not be the same everywhere: they are not in themselves worship, but only expressions of 'the fear of God, faith, love, and obedience,' which are the true worship; and if they do not conduce to true worship, or are contrary to the Word of God, or involve sin, or obscure the glory and benefits of Christ, they ought to be abolished. It is all obvious enough; the difficulty lies in the practical application of it, and over the application their conference broke down. The Germans demanded the abolition of private masses and the restoration of the chalice to the people. To this the King and the majority of the bishops would not consent and negotiations came to an end. The articles were not printed, and their only importance is that they contributed to the *Articles of Religion*, and among them to the 34th 'Of the Traditions of the Church,' and to the discourse 'Of Ceremonies' in the Book of Common Prayer. In 1540 two commissions of bishops were appointed, one to deal with doctrine, the other with ceremonies.[6] The work of the first issued in

[1] Above, p. 141. [2] Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith*, pp. 15 f.
[3] Cf. Chaucer, *Parson's Tale*, 385 ff.
[4] Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith*, p. 147.
[5] Cranmer, *Miscellaneous Writings* (Parker Soc. 1846), pp. 472 ff.
[6] Dixon, *Hist. of Ch. of Engl.*, ii. p. 233.

A necessary doctrine and erudition of any Christian man ('The King's Book'), 1543, an emended edition of the 'Bishops' Book,' and here the same treatment of ceremonies is repeated under the 4th Commandment.[1] The work of the other commission is probably represented by the *Ceremonies to be used in the Church*, commonly called the 'Rationale,'[2] which was not published at the time and led to no result. Here again most of the 9th of the *Ten Articles* is reproduced, but the scope is enlarged to cover the traditional ceremonies generally, which, 'all abuses and superstitions taken away,' are 'with all reverent obedience to be observed.' The document treats especially of Baptism—and here it is largely dependent on the *Encheiridion* of Cologne—and of the Mass, and only cursorily of some other rites.

3. In February 1542–3 the Convocation of Canterbury ordered that on 'every Sunday and holy day throughout the year the curate of every parish church, after the *Te Deum* and *Magnificat*, should openly read to the people one chapter of the New Testament in English without exposition, and when the New Testament was read over, then to begin the Old.'[3] This had been made possible by the issue of an authorised version of the Bible.[4] In 1534 the Convocation of Canterbury had petitioned the King for an authorised English translation; but nothing had been done, when in 1537 a version appeared purporting to be the work of 'Thomas Matthew,' but in fact compiled by John Rogers from Tyndal's and Coverdale's versions of the Old Testament, and Tyndal's of the New. Cranmer recognised this as the best translation hitherto made and urged Thomas Cromwell to obtain the royal licence for its use.[5] This was granted, but Coverdale was commissioned to revise the translation, and his revision appeared as *The Byble in Englyshe* in 1539, and is known as the 'Great Bible,' or, in later editions, to which Cranmer added a preface, as 'Cranmer's Bible.'[6] This became, and in respect of the Psalter and of some incidental quotations remains, the liturgical text of the Holy Scriptures.

4. In 1544 Henry was at war with both Scotland and France. Accordingly, as was usual in such emergencies, he required processions to be made throughout the realm. In a letter to Cranmer on June 18[7] he recalls 'the miserable state of all Christendom,' 'plagued' as it is 'with most cruel wars,' the remedy for which exceeds human power; recourse must be had, therefore, to the only source of help. Hence he is resolved

[1] Lloyd, *Formularies of Faith*, p. 310. Also, with introduction by T. A. Lacey *The King's Book* (S.P.C.K. 1932).
[2] C. S. Cobb, *The Rationale of Ceremonial*, Alcuin Club Collections, xviii, 1910.
[3] Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. p. 863. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 770, 776.
[5] Cranmer, *Miscell. Writings*, p. 344.
[6] A. W. Pollard, *Records of the English Bible*, ch. i.
[7] Cranmer, *Miscell. Writings*, p. 494 (of course written by Cranmer himself).

to have general processions in every parish and church; but since hitherto the people, partly for lack of instruction, partly because they do not understand the prayers, have come very slackly to processions, he has 'set forth certain godly prayers and suffrages in our native English tongue' (the work, of course, of Cranmer himself), and sends them along with the letter to the Archbishop. These 'godly prayers' had already been twice printed in May under the title *An exhortation unto prayer . . . to be read to the people afore processyons. Also a Letanie with the suffrages to be said or song in the tyme of the said processyons.* In the composition of the 'Litany and Suffrages' Cranmer used the Sarum Processional, Luther's Litany, and the Orthodox Greek Liturgy. Of the Litany the invocations—those of the saints being reduced to three, of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the Angels, and of the Saints generally without individual names—and the deprecations are from the Sarum Litany with incidental additions, some of them from Luther; of the petitions only five are of Sarum, ten are in whole or in part from Luther, one and a part of a second from the Greek, and the rest are original, except the last (for repentance, etc.), which is from some other Latin source. Of the Suffrages, the Lord's Prayer and the Collect (from the Mass *Pro tribulatione cordis*, translated immediately from Luther) are no doubt to be said before the rood; the Anthem (Ps. xliv. 26, 1, 26, *Gloria*—the first anthem of the Sarum Rogation) and the verses 'in time of war' (also from the Sarum Rogation), to be sung during the entry into the choir; and finally, four of the Rogation prayers, the collect of Rogation Monday, and the so-called 'Prayer of Chrysostome' from the Greek, to be said at the east end of the choir. The whole is a superb work and a magnificent opening of the career of English as a liturgical language. At the same time, while the massing of several petitions in a single verse is admirable from a literary point of view, from the practical and devotional point of view, if the Litany is not sung slowly, the rapid transition from one petition to another makes an unduly severe demand on the alertness of the attention. The King's letter had required that the supplication be 'not for a month or two observed and after slenderly considered,' but that the people be so instructed and exhorted that they will gladly frequent it. But apparently after a year the observance had become slack once more; for in August 1545 a new mandate was issued requiring that 'the said processions be kept continually on the accustomed days'—that is, on Wednesdays and Fridays.[1]

5. Meanwhile Henry and Cranmer were projecting a complete English *Processional*. On October 7, 1544, Cranmer writes to the King that 'according to your highness commandment' he has translated certain processions to be used upon festival

[1] Cranmer, *Miscell. Writings*, p. 495.

days: in some of the Latin processions he has altered divers words, some he has lengthened or shortened, some he has omitted, and for others he has substituted what he thinks better matter for the purpose; the result he refers to Henry's judgment and correction and asks that he will have some solemn and devout music made for it, like that of the Litany, not 'full of notes but, as near as may be, for every syllable a note,' as in *Venite*, the Canticles, Psalms and Versicles, *Gloria in excelsis*, etc. The music of *Salve festa dies* he thinks 'sober and distinct enough,' and he has attempted a verse-translation to fit the music 'for a proof, to see how English would do in song'; but since his verses lack 'grace and facility' he would have the King 'cause some other to make them again . . . in more pleasant English and phrase.'[1] But here the matter ended and nothing more is heard for the present of an English Processional: on the contrary, about a year later a royal injunction required that processions in English, *i.e.* the Litany and Suffrages, should be sung in every parish church throughout England on every Sunday and festival, and none other,[2] and thus the *Processional* was set aside. But the design was not quite wholly abandoned; for among 'Certayne notes' at the end of the Book of 1549 is one to the effect that on Christmas, Easter, and Ascension days, Whitsunday, and Trinity Sunday, instead of the Litany 'mayebe vsed any parte of holye scripture hereafter to be certaynly limited and appoynted,' which, had the intention ever been carried out, would evidently have been in the shape of anthems proper to each day, like those of the procession before the Mattins of Easter Day.

6. Two projects of Henry's last year, 1546, also came to nothing. (*a*) The King was 'moved' by Cranmer and other bishops to inhibit the wake and all-night bell-ringing of All Hallows' Eve, the covering of images in Lent, and kneeling to the rood on Palm Sunday. Henry consented and Cranmer drafted for the royal signature identical letters to himself and the Archbishop of York, inhibiting these observances, and also the veneration of the Cross on Good Friday.[3] But meanwhile Stephen Gardiner of Winchester, who was at the Imperial Court negotiating an alliance between Charles V, Francis I, and Henry, wrote that if any further innovations were made the negotiations would break down. Whereupon Henry was 'now otherwise resolved' and did not sign the letters. (*b*) In the next reign Cranmer related to his secretary how that, after a banquet at Hampton Court, Henry, leaning on his own arm and that of the ambassador of the French King, to Cranmer's astonishment, disclosed that the subject of his negotiations with the Frenchman was the

[1] Cranmer, *Miscell. Writings*, p. 412.
[2] *Wriothesley's Chronicle* (Camden Soc.), i. p. 161.
[3] Cranmer, *Miscell. Writings*, pp. 415 ff.

common resolve of himself and Francis within six months not only utterly to 'extirp the bishop of Rome and his usurped power out of both their realms,' but also 'to change the Mass into a Communion,' and to induce the Emperor to do the same or else to break with him; and Henry 'willed' the Archbishop 'to pen a form thereof to be sent to the French King to consider of';[1] but the death of both princes forestalled the execution of a design which would have put an end to private masses, and so anticipated the rule of 1549 and the aspiration of the Council of Trent,[2] that there should be communicants at every mass.

7. In February 1541–2 Cranmer in Convocation had raised the question of correcting and emending the portuaries and missals,[3] and a year later he announced that it was the King's will that all mass-books, antiphoners and portuises be newly examined and castigated from all mention of the pope's name, all apocryphas and superstitious formulæ, and the names of all saints not mentioned in Scripture and other authentical doctors, and almost in the words of Quiñones, 'the services should be made out of the Scriptures and other authentic doctors.'[4] A committee of two bishops and six of the Lower House of Convocation was appointed to deal with the matter—with no apparent result. But in the course of the next five years, two schemes of a reformed Breviary were drawn up and are contained in a MS. for the most part in the handwriting of Ralph Morice, Cranmer's secretary, with corrections and additions in Cranmer's own hand. The earlier of the two schemes, probably written between 1543 and 1547, includes all the Hours from Mattins to Compline, wholly in Latin. The matter is derived almost entirely from the Sarum Breviary, but the structure is that of the second edition of Quiñones, with these exceptions: it retains the *preces* (i.e. *Pater noster* with versicles and responses) at Prime, None, and Compline, on certain days has a 4th Lesson at Mattins, omits all *memoriæ* at Lauds and Vespers, the Penitential Psalms and the Office of the Dead. Lauds and Vespers have a Lesson in place of the *capitulum* and all Lessons are from Holy Scripture, the commemorations of the saints, except on the three days after Christmas, being confined to the reading of their histories in place of the Martyrology after Prime.[5] In the later scheme, which may be later than the death of Henry VIII, in order to avoid unnecessary repetition and because in practice the eight offices were already recited in two groups, so that 'we are accustomed to come together for prayer only twice a day,' the Divine Service is reduced to Mattins and Evensong. A *Præfatio* is largely a paraphrase of that of Quiñones, and a canon prescribes a monthly

[1] Cranmer, *Miscell. Writings*, p. 415, note 5.
[2] Session xxii. 6.
[3] Wilkins, *Concilia*, iii. p. 861.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 863.
[5] J. W. Legg, *Cranmer's Liturgical Projects*, H.B.S., London, 1915, pp. 115–53.

in place of a weekly recitation of the Psalter, and the reading of the Old Testament and the Apocalypse once a year, and of the rest of the New Testament thrice. Both offices begin with the Lord's Prayer aloud in English, followed by *Domine labia* at Mattins and *Deus in adiutorium* at Evensong, with *Gloria Patri* and *Alleluia*, or *Laus tibi* from Septuagesima to Easter: then, at Mattins, hymn, three Psalms, Lord's Prayer in English, three Lessons, and *Te Deum;* and on Sundays, great festivals and saints' days, a fourth Lesson and *Benedictus: (Venite* is not said daily, but only in the ordinary course of the *Psalter*) : at Evensong, hymn, three Psalms, Lord's Prayer in English, two Lessons, and *Magnificat;* and both offices end with the Collect of the day and *Benedicamus* with its response. All Lessons are to be in English and to be read from the pulpit.[1]

Thus a long step has been taken in anticipation of the Book of 1549, in which the Preface and the rules for the recitation of the Psalter and the reading of Holy Scripture are translated from Cranmer's second scheme, while the *preces* are those of the first scheme, derived, not from the Breviary, but from the shorter form found in the Bidding of the Bedes for the living, with *Da pacem* from Lauds of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and *Cor novum* from Prime.

IV

THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI

Henry VIII died and Edward VI succeeded on Jan. 28, 1546–7. With a king a precocious boy brought up in the 'new learning' and hailed by Cranmer at his coronation as a 'second Josiah,' 'to see God truly worshipped,'[2] and with Somerset as Protector, already recognised as 'well disposed to pious doctrine,'[3] and a Council of whom the majority were either disciples of the new learning or without definite convictions,[4] Cranmer and the reform-party were free to promote the changes they desired with the consent and co-operation of the Government; and accordingly new measures soon followed.

In July appeared *Certain Sermons or Homilies, appoynted by the Kynges Maiestie to be declared and redde, by all Parsones, Vicars, or Curates, every Sōday in their Churches, where thei haue cures*, i.e. the 'First Book of Homilies,' consisting of twelve sermons, four of them by Cranmer, the rest by various authors. Such a publication had been proposed in Convocation, with Henry's approval, in 1542, and some at least of the homilies had been

[1] J. W. Legg, *Cranmer's Liturgical Projects*, H.B.S., London, 1915, pp. 3–22.
[2] Cranmer, *Misc. Writings*, p. 127.
[3] *Original Letters*, p. 256.
[4] A. F. Pollard, *England under Protector Somerset*, p. 21.

written and presented to the Upper House of Convocation; but Henry had changed his mind, and once more nothing had happened for the present.

In August was issued a series of royal *Injunctions* [1] and a general visitation of the kingdom was planned, to be carried out by visitors armed with articles of inquiry, who were also to distribute the Injunctions and the Book of Homilies. Of these Injunctions, the 22nd requires that the Epistle and Gospel be read in English at the high mass and repeats the direction of 1543, that on Sundays and other holy days an English Lesson be read after *Te Deum* and *Magnificat;* by the 29th, under the plea that strife has arisen 'by reason of fond courtesy and challenging of places in procession,' and in order that the people 'may the more quietly hear that which is said or sung,' it is ordered that the Litany be recited before the high mass no longer in procession, but by priests and choir kneeling in the midst of the church; the 33rd requires that one of the Homilies be used every Sunday; the 37th orders that Prime and Hours, *i.e.* all the Hours but Mattins, Lauds, and Vespers, be omitted when there is a sermon; and the whole concludes with 'The form of bidding the common-prayers,' *i.e.* the Bidding of the Bedes, a modification of that of 1536, which had already appeared in 1540 or later in the preceding reign.

These measures were taken by the Council without reference to Parliament or Convocation, which did not meet till November. In Parliament two Bills were then introduced, the one providing for the restraint and punishment of revilers of the Sacrament of the Altar, the other for communion of the people in both kinds. In the course of their passage through the Upper House the two Bills were combined into one, which was passed by the Lords on Dec. 10, ten bishops voting for it and five against, while eleven were absent; and it was finally passed by the Commons on Dec. 17. Meanwhile on Nov. 25 the Lower House of Convocation had somewhat informally given its assent to communion in both kinds.[2]

After the prorogation of Parliament on Dec. 24 the Council resumed its arbitrary proceedings.

In the 5th of the Homilies Cranmer had denounced holy bread, holy water, palms, candles, etc., as 'papisticall superstitions and abuses'; and now, in Jan. 1547–8, the Council prohibited the use of candles, ashes, and palms at Candlemas, on Ash Wednesday, and Palm Sunday, the veneration of the Cross on Good Friday, holy bread, and holy water.[3]

[1] Cardwell, *Documentary Annals*, i. pp. 4 ff.

[2] Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, p. 322; Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 74 f.; Wilson, *The Order of the Communion*, pp. vii. ff.

[3] Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, i. pp. 35, 38.

In March appeared *The Order of the Communion*,[1] being a form in English for communicating the people in both kinds, to be used in the Latin Mass after the priest's communion, put forth, according to the royal proclamation prefixed to the book, in order to avoid 'any vnsemely and vngodly diuersitie' in carrying out the provisions of the statute. A letter of the Council to the bishops, requiring them to enforce the use of the *Order*, says that it was 'agreed upon' 'after long conference together' by 'sundry of his majesty's most grave and well learned prelates and other learned men in the Scripture.'[2] Who these were is unknown, but no doubt Cranmer had a chief hand in the compilation; and the tenor of the Act of 1547 and certain coincidences of language between it and the *Order* suggest that the book was in some sort of existence before the Bill was drafted. The *Order* consists of an exhortation, notifying on what day communion would be given, with instruction how to prepare for it, to be recited at least one day before the communion; an exhortation, warning, and invitation at the time of communion; a General Confession, about half of which is derived from that of Hermann von Wied's Cologne Order, but avoids all that is characteristic of it; the general Absolution of the Breviary and the Missal, with the opening clauses of Hermann's Absolution prefixed; four 'Comfortable Words' (Zech. i. 13), being St. Matt. xi. 28 and three of Hermann's alternative verses, themselves derived from the later editions of the Strassburg rite; the prayer 'We do not presume,' every clause of which is a quotation, though the combination is original; the traditional words of administration, with 'which was geuen for the' and 'which was shed for the' inserted; and a blessing expanded from Phil. iv. 7. There is no suggestion in the *Order* that communion shall be given at every mass, even on Sundays and other holy days; but soon after it came into use there were already churches in which it was used at all masses;[3] in which, in other words, private masses were no longer said.

At the end of 1547 or the beginning of the next year questions on the Mass were circulated among the bishops, the ninth of which asked 'whether in the Mass it were convenient to use such speech as the people may understand'; and the answers were almost all of them in the negative, and Cranmer himself only assents with the reservation 'except in certain secret mysteries, whereof I doubt.'[4] As early as April 1547 Compline had been sung in English in the King's chapel; and in the Mass at the opening of Parliament in November *Gloria in excelsis*, *Credo*,

[1] H. A. Wilson, *The Order of the Communion*, 1548, H.B.S., London, 1908.
[2] Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, i. p. 61.
[3] Wilson, pp. xx, 29.
[4] Cranmer, *Misc. Writings*, p. 151.

and *Agnus Dei* were in English. So, as we have seen, was the *Order of the Communion*, and by May 1548 vernacular Mattins, Mass, and Evensong were in use at St. Paul's and other London churches.[1] Of the text of these services nothing is known except from some manuscript choir-books; and possibly a translation of the canon of the Mass made by Coverdale was intended for a practical purpose, or at any rate was so used.[2] As a result of these innovations, which the Government attempted to check, but apparently without success,[3] 'divers and sundry forms and fashions have been used in the Cathedral and Parish Churches of England and Wales, aswell concerning the Mattens, or Morning Prayer, and the Evensong, as also concerning the holy Communion, commonly called the Masse, with divers and sundry Rites and Ceremonies concerning the same, and in the administration of other Sacraments in the Church. And as the doers and executors of the said Rites and Ceremonies, in other form than of late years they have been used, were pleased therewith; so other not using the same Rites and Ceremonies, were thereby greatly offended.'[4]

In the proclamation prefixed to the *Order of the Communion* Edward is made to exhort his 'loving subiectes' 'with suche obedience and conformitie to receaue thys oure ordinaunce, and most godly direction, that we may be encouraged from time to tyme, further to trauell for the reformation and setting furthe of suche godly orders, as maye bee moste to godes glory, the edifiying of our subiectes, and for the aduauncemente of true religion. Whiche thing, wee (by the healpe of God) mooste earnestly entend to bring to effecte'; and a rubric requires the *Order* to be used 'without the variying of any other Rite or Ceremony in the Masse (until, other order shalbe prouided).' The design so far disclosed issued a year later in the 'First Book of Edward VI.' Of the history of the compilation of the Book little is known. According to a proclamation of Sept. 23, 1548, the King is 'minding to see very shortly one uniform order throughout the realm,' 'for which cause at this time certain bishops and notable learned men, by his highness' commandment are congregate.'[5] This company, generally referred to as 'the Windsor Commission,' according to the most probable account, consisted of Cranmer with six bishops and six divines, 'some favouring the old, some the new learning,'[6] who were assembled at Chertsey Abbey before Sept. 9 and removed to Windsor about

[1] Gasquet and Bishop, *op. cit.*, p. 58; Wriothesley, *Chron.*, i. p. 187, ii. p. 2.

[2] Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, 1563, vol. vi, pp. 362 ff. (ed. 1870); reprinted in *The Anglican Missal* (1921).

[3] See the proclamation of Feb. 6, 1548; Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, i. p. 34, and the letter to preachers, May 13, *ibid.*, p. 51.

[4] Act of Uniformity, 1549; Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, p. 358. Cf. *Orig. Lett.*, p 470. [5] Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, i. p. 59. [6] Cranmer, *Misc. Writings*, p. 450.

Sept. 22.[1] It is not to be supposed that the 'commissioners' were the authors of the Book, but rather that it had already been drafted by Cranmer, with whatever assistance, and in fact had possibly provided the 'Mass, Mattins, and Evensong and all divine service' already in use in the King's chapel; which had been adopted in Oxford at Christ Church, and had been (June 4) urged by Somerset on Magdalen College; of which also Somerset on Sept. 4 had sent a copy to Cambridge and required it to be used in the University.[2] The business of the company must have been rather to discuss, criticise, or emend. The result was submitted to a meeting of bishops in October or November and there assented to.[3] The Bill embodying the Book was read in the House of Lords on Dec. 14, and on the 15th began a four-days' debate on the Mass and the Book,[4] in the course of which it emerged that at the meeting just mentioned some bishops had rather acquiesced in the book than positively approved of it, and this only on the understanding that 'many things that are wanted in' it 'should be treated of afterwards'; while one bishop asserted that in one respect the Book had been altered after it had been assented to.[5] On Dec. 19 it was read in the Lower House and on Jan. 7 the Bill of Uniformity appeared in the Lords, where it was passed at the third reading on Jan. 15, ten of the bishops present voting for it, and eight, with three temporal peers, against it, while of the four bishops who voted by proxy, two were certainly in favour of the Bill, one against it, and it remains doubtful which way the fourth voted. The Bill had been finally passed by both Houses by Jan. 21, and received the royal assent on March 14, 1548–9. This First Act of Uniformity (2 & 3 Ed. VI c. 1)[6] required that the Book should come into exclusive use at latest on Whitsunday, June 9, and imposed severe penalties on those of the clergy who failed to use it. The official records of Convocation for this period were incomplete, and what there was of them perished in the great fire of 1666; but other evidence, if it is to be trusted, suggests that in some form or other the Book received the assent of Convocation.[7]

[1] The best discussion of this matter is that of W. Page, 'The first Book of Common Prayer and the Windsor Commission' in *Church Quarterly Review*, xcviii, April 1924.

[2] Wilson, *The Order of the Communion*, p. xx: *Magdalen College*, p. 88.

[3] Gasquet and Bishop, pp. 177 f.

[4] For the report of this debate see *ibid.*, pp. 397 ff.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 163 ff., 404 f. [6] Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, p. 358.

[7] See Procter and Frere, pp. 50 ff.; Dixon, iii. pp. 5 ff.; Gasquet and Bishop, ch. x. Procter and Frere's conclusion is that 'the Prayer Book was held to have the assent of the bishops by their votes in the House of Lords, and was further submitted to the Lower Houses of Convocation, and won the assent of the clergy generally through their representatives there.'

Dixon, however, sums up: 'Even if the first Prayer Book had been submitted to the Convocation of Canterbury . . . it would still have lacked the consent

The contents and sources of *THE booke of the common prayer and administracion of the Sacramentes and other rites and ceremonies of the Churche: after the vse of the Churche of England* may be described summarily as follows.

(1) The Preface is mostly translated from that of Cranmer's second Breviary scheme, which itself reproduces a large part of that of Quiñones. Except, therefore, for the last paragraph referring to the solution of doubts which may arise concerning the understanding and execution of the 'thynges conteygned in this booke,' the Preface is concerned only with the Divine Service, the recitation of which in a note following is made obligatory only on ecclesiastics who 'serue the congregacion.' The orders how the Psalms and how the rest of Holy Scripture is appointed to be read are also translated from Cranmer's second scheme. The Calendar, with the tables of Psalms and Lessons, follows. The Calendar contains no commemorations except those of the New Testament saints and All Saints, for which proper service is provided in the Book. The table of Lessons follows the civil, not the ecclesiastical, year, Genesis, St. Matthew, and Romans all beginning on Jan. 2. The Divine Service of Mattins and Evensong is a simplification of Cranmer's second scheme. Both offices are constructed on the same plan, except that Mattins has *Venite* before the Psalms of the day. Both open with the Lord's Prayer said by the officiant, no longer silently, but aloud, and the traditional introduction: then Psalms, Lesson, Canticle, Lesson, Canticle, *Preces* and three Collects. Mattins represents the old Mattins, Lauds, and Prime, deriving *Venite* and *Te Deum* from Mattins, *Benedictus* and the Collect of the day from Lauds, the Creed *Quicunque vult* (on six great festivals) from Prime, *Preces* from Lauds and Prime, the second Collect from Lauds of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the third Collect from Prime: Evensong is derived from Vespers and Compline, taking *Magnificat* and the Collect of the Day from Vespers, *Nunc Dimittis*, the Creed, and the third Collect from Compline, *Preces* from Vespers, and the second Collect from Vespers of the Blessed Virgin.

(2) The second section concerns 'The Supper of the Lorde, and the holy Communion, commonly called the Masse.' It begins with the Introits, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, to which are added references for the proper Psalms and Lessons of those days to which any are assigned. The Introits are now whole Psalms, appropriate ones being chosen for festivals and for Ash Wednesday, the first two Sundays in Lent, Good Friday, and Easter Even,

---

of the northern province. But it may be concluded that the first Book was not submitted to either Convocation.'

Gasquet and Bishop also conclude: 'There can remain very little doubt that the Book was never submitted to Convocation at all.'

and, for the Sundays not included among these, short Psalms in the order of their occurrence in the Psalter. The Collects, Epistles, and Gospels of the *Temporale* are for the most part those of the Sarum Missal, only nine of the Collects being new, while of the Epistles and Gospels, some are lengthened or shortened, and a few Epistles and two Gospels are changed. Before the Mass of Easter Day is set the procession before Mattins from the Processional, but little changed. In the *Sanctorale* fourteen of the Collects are new, replacing Collects which are generally rather jejune and monotonous petitions for the help of the merits and intercessions of the saints. The structure of the Mass—at which the priest is to wear a plain alb with a vestment (chasuble, stole, and maniple) [1] or cope, and the other ministers albs and tunacles—remains unchanged; but of the private prayers of the ministers, all that remain are the Lord's Prayer and Collect to be said during the singing of the Introit, while those at the Offertory, at the Communion, and at the end disappear, along with the Gradual and Alleluia or Tract and all allusion to incense or hand-washing. The Sermon, which in England in recent centuries commonly followed the *Offertorium*, now follows the Creed, and, if in it the people have not been exhorted 'to the worthy receyuing of the holy sacrament,' is itself followed by the exhortation from the *Order of the Communion*. While the 'Sentences,' which no longer, like the old *Offertoria*, relate to the day or season, but to almsgiving, are being sung, the people offer alms in a chest placed in the choir, and those intending to communicate remain in the choir. The priest takes so much as is required of bread, in the form of unleavened wafers thicker than heretofore and without print, and wine mixed with water, and sets them on the altar, laying the bread on the corporal or the paten. Then after 'The Lord be with you,' 'Lift up your hearts,' etc., follows the Preface, for which five propers are provided, those of Christmas and Pentecost new compositions, the language of which largely comes from the *Necessary Doctrine*. The structure of the Canon is unaltered, except that one prayer is differently placed. *Te igitur* and *Memento* are represented by the more detailed prayer 'for the whole state of Christes churche,' in which some suggestions are adopted from Hermann's prayer after the Sermon 'for all estates of men and necessities of the Church': *Communicantes* by the commemoration of the saints, especially the Blessed Virgin Mary, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs; after which follows the prayer for the dead, being *Memento etiam* removed from its former place and combined with the conclusion of the collect of the Mass 'Of the Five

[1] For this interpretation of 'vestment' see Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, ed. 2, pp. 72–75. But some authorities hold that the rubric enjoins the Lutheran practice of wearing the chasuble without stole or maniple.

Wounds.' *Hanc igitur* is replaced by a commemoration of our Lord's one oblation of Himself and His institution of the Eucharist as 'a perpetual memory' of it. For the beginning of *Quam oblationem* is substituted, in accord with a well-known interpretation of the paragraph, an invocation 'with thy holy spirite and worde vouchsafe to bl✠esse and sanc✠tifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne,' while the end of the paragraph is retained in the form 'that they maye be' (not 'become') 'vnto vs the bodye and bloud of thy moste derely beloued sonne.' *Qui pridie quam pateretur* becomes 'Who in the same nyghte that he was betrayed' (1 Cor. xi. 23), and all the non-scriptural additions to the record of the Institution are removed, and elevation is forbidden. The following paragraph corresponds to *Vnde et memores* and *Supra quæ:* 'Wherefore, O Lorde and heauenly father, accordyng to the Institucion of thy derely beloued sonne, our sauioure Iesu Christe, we thy humble seruantes doe celebrate, and make here before thy diuine Maiestie, with these thy holy giftes, the memoriall whiche thy sonne hath willed vs to make: hauing in remembraunce his blessed passion, mightie resurreccion, and glorious ascencion, renderynge vnto thee moste heartye thankes, for the innumerable benefites procured vnto vs by thesame, entyerely desyringe,' continuing as in the present Book down to 'benefites of his passion.' One current interpretation of *Supplices te* understood 'these things' (*hæc*) to mean the mystical body on earth, and the prayer to ask that it may be united to the body on high. The corresponding paragraph of the English is, therefore, the self-oblation of the Church, 'oure selfe, oure soules, and bodyes' (Rom. xii. 1), ending like the Latin, that 'whosoeuer shalbee partakers of this holy Communion, maye woorthely receiue the most precious body and bloude of thy sonne Iesus Christe: and bee fulfilled with thy grace and heauenly benediction,' with the addition 'and made one bodye with thy sonne Iesu Christ, that he maye dwell in them, and they in hym.' *Nobis quoque peccatoribus* is replaced by the familiar 'And although we be vnworthy' down to 'duetie and seruice,' after which is inserted another current interpretation of *Supplices te* which makes 'these things' to be the prayers of the Church: 'and commaunde these our prayers and supplicacions, by the ministerye of thy holy Angels, to be brought vp into thy holy Tabernacle before the syght of thy diuine maiestie'; and, with the Latin, the canon ends with the clause 'not waying our merites, but pardoning our offences,' and the doxology. The Communion then begins with the Lord's Prayer, preceded by a somewhat shortened prologue, and still said by the priest alone, except for the last clause, which as before is a response of the people. There is no *Libera nos.* Fraction and Commixture are omitted; but one of the final

rubrics requires that each wafer shall be divided into at least two parts. 'The Peace of the Lord' is followed by a new feature, a sort of invitation compiled from 1 Cor. v. 7, 8, Heb. x. 10, 1 Pet. ii. 24, and S. John i. 29. Then comes the *Order of the Communion* from 'You that do truely' down to the administration of the chalice, with little change except in the opening lines of the Absolution, which now take the shape they have retained ever since. During the Communion the *Agnus Dei* is sung; and after the communion is sung or said one of a series of verses from the New Testament, 'called the post-Communion.' Since wafers had come into use, and consequently the Fraction, which the *Agnus* was originally intended to cover, took no appreciable time, the *Agnus* was sung during the priest's communion, and in the absence of other communicants, the *Communio*, the proper anthem meant to be sung during the communion of the people, followed the priest's communion, and therefore already by the thirteenth century was often called 'postcommunio.'[1] The English 'post-Communion,' therefore, corresponds to the old *Communio*. This finished, there follows the *Post-communion* proper, no longer a collect varying with the day, but a fixed prayer of thanksgiving, which has remained as the last prayer in subsequent revisions of the Order of Holy Communion. The whole Mass concludes with a Blessing, a combination of that of the *Order of the Communion* with a current traditional form. Though the final benediction was in use on the Continent by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries,[2] and became a constant feature of the German Church Orders of the sixteenth century, it had not been common in England, though according to the *Rationale* it was 'sometimes' given.[3] After the blessing are a number of rubrics: allowing the omission of *Gloria in excelsis*, Creed, Homily, and Exhortation on week-days and at celebrations for the sick: requiring that on Wednesdays and Fridays the Litany shall be used, and that on these days and other days when the people are accustomed to come to church, if there are no communicants, the priest shall vest in alb or surplice and cope, and say all of the Mass up to the Offertory, adding one or two of eight collects here provided, and the blessing; requiring some to communicate with the priest at every mass; regulating the character of the bread, and arranging that each of the households of the parish in turn shall at the Offertory every Sunday offer the cost of the bread and wine and send one of its members or a substitute to com-

[1] Durandus, *Rationale*, iv. 56: cf. St. Thomas Aq., *Summa* III. lxxxiii. 4 c., 'cantus post communionem.' Gasquet and Bishop's (p. 214) 'This is a change of name' is therefore uncalled for; nor is it true that 'This prayer [*Postcommunio*] is discarded in the new service,' except that it is fixed instead of being variable.

[2] Bernold of Constance, *Micrologus*, 21; Durandus, *Rationale*, iv. 59.

[3] Ed. Cobb, p. 28, where see the editor's note.

municate, in order that the priest may not be prevented from celebrating; requiring everyone to resort to his parish church for divine service and then to communicate once a year at least and 'receive all other sacraments and rites' appointed in the Book, on pain of excommunication or such other punishment as the ecclesiastical judge shall inflict; and lastly directing that the people receive the Sacrament of Christ's body in their mouths, not in their hands.

The Litany, which in some impressions is printed, not here, but after the Commination, is so far altered from that of 1544 that the invocations of the saints and three of the final prayers are omitted. It is only expressly directed to be used on Wednesdays and Fridays, but in 'Certayne notes' at the end of the Book its use is implied on Sundays and Festivals.

'The Administracion of Publyke Baptism' consists of the 'Order for making a catechumen' and the 'Rite of Baptising' of the *Manual*. The former is greatly simplified. The first three prayers, and the exorcism of the salt and its administration, are omitted, and the office begins, as it still does, with a short bidding, partly taken from the Albertine-Saxon *Order* of 1540, followed by Luther's recast of the prayer *Deus patrum* which retains only the final clauses of the original. The signing with the cross on brow and breast is accompanied by a formula combining suggestions from Hermann, the *Encheiridion* of Cologne, and the *Rationale*. The exorcisms are reduced to one, composed of clauses collected from the several Latin exorcisms, and only one of the accompanying prayers, 'Almighty and immortal God,' is retained. The Gospel is not, as hitherto in England, from St. Mat. xix, but from St. Mark x, adopted through the Hermann or the Albertine-Saxon *Order* and Luther from mediæval German use. 'Effeta' and the touch with spittle (St. Mark vii. 31 f.) are omitted. Though it is not noticed in the Latin *Manual*, it appears from the *Rationale* that in practice the priest at this point exhorted those present to pray for the infant before the recitation of the *Pater noster*, etc.; accordingly, there follows the address, 'Frendes you hear in this Gospell,' largely translated in part from the Albertine-Saxon *Order*, in part from the Latin of Hermann, and ending with the invitation to say the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, which follow, with the thanksgiving and prayer, 'Almightie and euerlasting God, heauenly father,' an original composition in Hermann. The signing of the right hand is omitted, and the priest immediately leads the catechumen into the church, reciting as he goes a new formula. The 'Rite of Baptising' opens with the admonition 'Welbeloued frendes, ye haue brought,' translated from the Albertine-Saxon *Order*, as a prelude to the renunciations and the Confession of Faith; after which the Sarum *Order* is followed closely, with only the following changes. The renunci-

ation of the ' pomps ' of the devil is expanded into that of ' the vayne pompe and glorye of the worlde ' from the *Encheiridion* of Cologne, and all its ' couetous desyres ' from Hermann, and the third renunciation of the flesh is quite original. The unction with oil is omitted. The second paragraph of the Creed is recited, interrogatively, not in the abbreviated form of the Latin, but completely. The traditional permission to use aspersion instead of immersion is added.[1] The ' whyte vesture, commonly called the Chrysome,' is put on before instead of after the unction with chrism; and the delivery of the torch is omitted. The charge to the godparents and the following rubric cover the same ground as those of the Sarum *Manual*, but are fuller in their directions for the education of the child, and here a few lines are borrowed from Hermann. The order ' Of them that be baptised in priuate houses in tyme of necessitie ' sets out at length what is only prescribed in general terms in the Sarum *Manual;* but whereas the *Manual* directs that, if the child survives, all that has been omitted shall be supplied, the English Office, fitly it might seem, omits the whole of the admission of the catechumen except the Gospel with the following address, the Lord's Prayer and the Creed; and then proceeds immediately to the renunciations and confession of faith, and the clothing with the chrysom, omits the unction, and finishes with Hermann's ' Almightie and euerlasting God, heauenly father,' which had been omitted after the recitation of the Creed. All that precedes the Gospel—the direction to curates to warn their people not to baptise their children at home ' without great cause and necessitie,' and to instruct them in such case to say the Lord's Prayer and then to baptise with the right formula, and not to doubt the sufficiency of their action; and, when the child is brought to church, to inquire into the circumstance of such baptism, and if they are found satisfactory, formally to certify its validity—is translated from the Albertine-Saxon *Order*. The rubric at the end of the Office is from the same source; but whereas, if the evidence of the witnesses leaves room for doubt as to what was said and done, the German rubric requires the child to be baptised absolutely, the English, in accord with traditional practice, prescribes the use of the conditional formula. The ' Blessing of the Font ' which in the *Manual* is placed immediately before the ' Rite of Baptising,' follows here in the new Book, to be used before any baptism after the water has been changed; and this is to be done once a month at least. Except the first half of the final collect, which comes from the Roman consecration, the whole of the text is translated or paraphrased from the Mozarabic or old Spanish Liturgy, which had been printed for the use of those churches of Spain which still observed the ancient rite, by Car-

[1] Durandus, *Rationale*, VI. lxxxiii. 12; Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, iii. 24, note *c*.

dinal Ximenes, archbishop of Toledo, in 1500.[1] 'Confirmation wherin is conteined a Cathechisme for children' opens with a note to the effect that it is thought good that none hereafter shall be confirmed unless they can say the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the ten Commandments in English, and can answer the questions of the Catechism following: and this for three reasons. First (in language largely borrowed from Hermann), that they being of age to have learned what was promised for them in Baptism, they may themselves openly before the Church ratify the promises and undertake to fulfil them. Secondly, since confirmation is conferred that they may receive strength and defence against temptation, it is meet that it be conferred when children are of age that they begin to be in danger of falling into the temptations of the flesh, the world, and the devil. And thirdly, because it is 'agreable to the vsage of the churche in tymes past, wherby it was ordayned that confirmacion shoulde be ministered to them that were of perfecte age,' that they might be able openly to profess their faith and promise obedience. This, of course, is a mistake, but a mistake which, if, as it seems, it arose from a misunderstanding of 'ut ieiuni ad confirmationem veniant perfectæ ætatis,' quoted by the canonists from a Council of Orleans,[2] had already been made 250 years before in the *Rationale* of Durandus, with which no doubt the compilers of the Book were familiar.[3] The Catechism is exceptional in omitting any treatment of the Sacraments, and in leaving so much, through its extreme conciseness, to be developed by the catechist. When it is most fully developed, in the exposition of the Commandments, nearly every word comes from the *Necessary Doctrine*. In 'Confirmacion' the only changes of any importance are that the sacrament is conferred by imposition of the hand and signing on the brow without unction, that the relative formulæ are modified in consequence, and that part of Hermann's Confirmation prayer is substituted for the collect *Deus qui apostolis*. Rubrics are added requiring that curates shall catechise before evensong on some Sunday or holy day at least once in six weeks; that parents and school teachers shall send their children, servants, and apprentices to be catechised; and that on notice of confirmation being given by the bishop, curates shall bring or send in writing the names of the children who can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Commandments, and signify how many of them can say the Catechism; and a final rubric directs that none shall be admitted to communion until they are confirmed.[4]

[1] Migne, *P.L.*, lxxxv. cols. 464 ff.

[2] Burchard, *Collect. can.*, iv. 60; Ivo, *Decretum*, i. 254; Gratian, *Decretum*, III. v. 6.

[3] *Rationale*, VI. lxxxiv. 8.

[4] The corresponding Sarum rubric and Peckham's constitution *Confirmationis* (Lyndwood, i. 6) make exception of those who are in the article of death or have been reasonably hindered from receiving Confirmation.

'The Forme of Solemnization of Matrimonie' is that of Sarum with the following alterations. Into the opening address to the people is interpolated a passage on the institution and dignity of marriage and the three causes of its institution, which, though it only repeats the ordinary mediæval treatment of the subject,[1] is perhaps derived immediately from the *Encheiridion* of Cologne (f. 200); while the clauses concerning the temper in which marriage should be taken in hand are from Tobit vi. 17 and Hermann. The challenge to the parties, 'I require and charge you,' for which the Sarum rubric only gives a general direction, is mostly that of the York *Manual*. The ring, which is now to be placed on the left hand, not the right, is not blessed, but the two blessings of it are combined in a single prayer for the parties, said after the imposition of the ring. Then follows, what was new in England, 'Those whome God hath joyned,' etc., and the declaration of the accomplished marriage, 'Forasmuche as N. and N.,' etc., derived through Hermann from Luther. The former of these occurred in some continental *Rituals*, and it is likely that it was in the *Ritual* which Luther used, as it was in that of Cologne.[2] The short blessing, Ps. lxviii. 28–30, *preces*, and collect, following the imposition of the ring, are omitted, and the Espousals, which have been 'made,' not as heretofore at the door, but in the body of the church, end as heretofore with the blessing 'God the father bless you ✠' etc. For the procession into the choir, Ps. lxvii. is provided as an alternative to Ps. cxxviii; the first two collects following the *preces* are combined into one, 'O God of Abraham,' and the rest omitted; and the Nuptial Benediction, *i.e.* the two prayers 'O merciful lorde' and 'O God whiche by thy mightie power,' follows here and not after the Lord's Prayer and the Fraction in the Mass; and there is no allusion to the venerable ceremony of the pallium, held over the bridegroom and the bride. The first of these prayers is a combination of the substantial part of its original Latin, with the final clauses of that of the second; and the second itself is so far changed that it relates both to the man and the woman, and not, as hitherto, to the woman alone. The final blessing is one of the collects omitted, as already noted, after the *preces* at the beginning of the Nuptials. The Mass follows, apparently that of the day, not as hitherto that of the Holy Trinity, and a sermon is to be preached after the Gospel on 'thoffice of man and wyfe' 'according to holy scripture'; failing which a series of selections from the Epistles of St. Paul and St. Peter is supplied to serve as a homily.

In 'The Order for the visitacion of the sicke, and the Communion of the same,' whereas the Sarum rubric directs that the priest and his ministers shall recite the seven penitential Psalms,

[1] See Chaucer, *The Parson's Tale*, 'De luxuria' and 'Remedia c. luxuriam.'
[2] See *Encheiridion*, f. 212.

with the antiphon, 'Remember not, Lord,' etc. on the way to the sick person's house, the English provides that only the last of the penitentials, Ps. cxliii, with the antiphon, shall be used in the sick-room.[1] The Sarum *preces* follow, with two of the collects. The exhortation with the following rubrics, which still remain unaltered, except by the adjustment of the quotations from Heb. xii. 6–10 to the text of the A.V., reproduce the topics of the Sarum exhortation—Patience, Faith, Charity, and (omitting Hope) Repentance. But the first few lines of the Latin are expanded into a discourse of some length on the reasons for suffering patiently, in which some use is made of the Homily 'On the fear of death' and of Hermann's chapter 'Of the cross and afflictions'; the curiously incomplete paraphrase of the Creed is replaced by the interrogative baptismal creed; the topic of Charity, including alms, restitution, and forgiveness, and, what is a new item, the duty of making a will and declaring debts for 'the quietnesse of his executours'—this and the requirement of 'a speciall confession' if the sick have any grave matter on his conscience, are treated of, no longer in the form of a prescribed exhortation, but in rubrical directions. The Absolution, which is also to be used in all private confessions, opens, like that of the *Order of the Communion*, with the first clauses of Hermann's form, and proceeds with the more essential clauses of the Sarum absolution, followed by one of the Sarum prayers, 'O most mercifull God,' the ancient absolution at the time of death, already found in the Gelasian Sacramentary and the Frankish supplement;[2] and Ps. lxxi with the antiphon 'O Saviour of the world' with which the Sarum Office of extreme unction opens; and a new and stately benediction. Unction is to be administered if the sick person desire it; but the form is drastically simplified. In place of seven applications of the oil with the sign of the cross to as many parts of the body, each accompanied by a Psalm and a formula, there is now to be a single application, still cross-wise, either on brow or breast, with a single longer formula, partly compiled of fragments from the opening prayer and the closing benediction and prayer, and the first of the Psalms (xiii) of the Latin.

The preliminary rubrics of 'The Communion of the sicke' reproduce in substance and sometimes in wording those of the Lutheran *Order* of Electoral Brandenburg (1540). They remain practically unchanged in the present Book of Common Prayer, except that after the words 'to communicate with him' a paragraph has been omitted directing that, if, on the day on which the sick desires to communicate, there is a celebration in church, the priest shall reserve so much of both kinds 'as shall serue the

[1] The York *Manual* has Ps. li. in the same place.

[2] *Gelas. Sacr.*, i. 39 (Wilson, p. 66); *Gregorian Sacr.* (Wilson, p. 208).

sicke person, and so many as shall Communicate with him (if there be any),' and as soon as is convenient after the celebration shall go, and, after saying the Confession, the Absolution and the Comfortable words, shall communicate first the people present and then the sick person, and conclude with the thanksgiving. The order of 'The Celebracion of the holy Communion for the sicke' at home is: Ps. cxvii. for Introit, the *Kyries*, each once 'without any more repeticion'; the Sarum memorial Collect 'for a sick person very near to death'; Heb. xii. 5 for Epistle, and St. John v. 24 for Gospel; 'The Lord be with you' and 'Lifte up your hearts, etc., *Vnto the ende of the Cannon.*' Further rubrics direct that the priest and the people present shall communicate before the sick; that the sick shall always desire some of his household or his neighbours to communicate with him, so modifying Hermann's direction that both relatives and neighbours assist and communicate; and that if there are several sick persons to be communicated on the same day, the priest shall reserve at the first celebration and so communicate the rest. The rubric concerning the sufficiency of spiritual communion for those who are prevented by any just impediment from receiving the sacrament does not suggest that 'lack of Company to receive with him' is such an impediment.

The obsequies of the Sarum *Manual*, including the 'Commendation of Souls,' the 'Service (Vespers, Mattins, and Lauds) of the Dead,' the Mass, and the 'Burial of the Dead,' form an immensely long process, covering every moment and every movement from the house of the departed to the grave, and involving, along with much else, the recitation of something like fifty Psalms, and *preces*, i.e., *Kyrieleison*, etc., *Pater noster*, versicles, and a Collect, seven times repeated. With admirable insight into the essential structure of the whole, the compilers of the Book of 1549 produced an office of great simplicity, sufficient, and of reasonable length, consisting of the Procession, the Burial, an Office of the Dead, and the Mass. (1) The Office begins at the 'Churche style,' the lychgate, and three anthems are provided for the procession to the church or the grave, the first (St. John xi. 25 f.) being the antiphon to *Benedictus* in the Lauds of the Dead, the second (Job xix. 25 ff.) the first responsory of the Mattins. (2) At the grave while the body is being prepared for burial—and, as appears from the next rubric, is being laid in the grave—are said or sung 'Manne that is borne,' being the opening of the 5th Lesson, Job xiv. 1–6, of the Mattins of the Dead; and 'In the midst of life.' This use of *Media vita*, hitherto the antiphon to *Nunc dimittis* in the Sarum Compline of the third and fourth weeks in Lent, is borrowed from the Lutheran *Church Orders*, in several of which and in Hermann it or Luther's metrical version of it, 'Mitten wir im leben sein,' is sung at or on the way to the

grave. The priest then begins the filling in of the grave by casting earth on the body, while saying the Sarum commendation and adding 'in sure and certayne hope,' etc., and Phil. iii. 21. Meanwhile the grave is being filled in, and the anthem 'I heard a voice' (Apoc. xiv. 13, the antiphon to *Magnificat* in the Vespers of the Dead) is added, evidently to allow time for the filling-in to be finished. Two prayers follow—one of commendation, the other of thanksgiving, with petitions for the happy resurrection both of the dead and of ourselves—which seem to be original. (3) The Office of the Dead, to be used either before or after the burial, consists of three Psalms: cxvi. (in the Latin Psalter cxiv. and cxv, from the Vespers of the Dead and the Commendation of Souls respectively), cxxxix. (from the Commendation), and cxlvi. (from Vespers); a Lesson, 1 Cor. xv. 20–58, of which Hermann suggests 20–28 or 50–58, as a Lesson at the grave; 'Lord, have mercy,' etc., 'Our Father,' and versicles and responses, from the Sarum 'Burial of the Dead,' and a collect combining clauses from three of the prayers of the 'Burial of the Dead' with the conclusion of the collect of the Mass 'Of the Five Wounds.' (4) 'For the celebracion of the holy communion when there is a Burial of the Dead' the Introit is Ps. xlii; the Collect is a new one, of the same character as the two Collects following the burial; the Epistle, that of the Sarum Mass when the body is present, 1 Thess. iv. 13–18, and the Gospel that of the Mass for the dead on Tuesdays, St. John vi. 37–40.

'The Ordre of the purificacion of weomen,' apart from the curiously ungrammatical invitation at the opening, is translated from the Sarum *Order*, omitting the second Psalm (cxxviii). The aspersion with holy water is, of course, wanting; and since the Office is to be said, not before the church door, but 'nygh vnto the quier doore,' the priest does not lead the woman into the church with the formula 'Enter into the temple of God,' etc.

The direction that the woman shall return the chrysom comes from the charge to the godparents at baptism; the 'other offerings' are only 'accustomed' and are not mentioned in the *Manual;* and the suggestion that the woman communicate 'if there be a communion' is new.

What is headed 'The first daie of Lente commonly called Ashwednisdaye' is the penitential office of Ash Wednesday in the Sarum *Missal*. The long discourse, including the commination, which in form is quite new, takes the place of the sermon there provided for; the seven penitential Psalms are reduced to one, *Miserere*, and the office proceeds unaltered down to the end of the first Collect. The second Collect is woven together out of extracts from the following prayers; and the Anthem, 'Turne thou vs,' is compiled from Jer. xxxi. 18,

Joel ii. 12, 17, Hab. iii. 2, and the first antiphon sung during the distribution of the ashes.

The dissertation 'Of Ceremonies Why some be abolished and some retayned,' which as we have seen [1] owes something to the 'Thirteen Articles' of 1538, follows here: and the Book ends with 'Certayne notes for the more playne explicacion and decent ministracion of thinges, conteyned in thys book,' three of them regulating the vestments of the clergy elsewhere than at the altar and of bishops in all ministrations; another leaving the use or disuse of 'kneeling, crossing, holding vp of handes, knocking vpon the brest, and other gestures' to the prompting of 'euery mans deuocyon'; and another allowing the use of any passage of Holy Scripture 'hereafter to be certaynly limited and appoynted' instead of the Litany on five great feasts.[2]

The Book was issued early in March and was due to come into use three weeks after it was received and at latest on Whitsunday, June 9. In the choir of St. Paul's and in several other churches in London and elsewhere [3] it was adopted at once, at the beginning of Lent; and if there was any justification for Somerset's assertion, made in a letter to Reginald Pole on June 5, that 'a form and rite of service' has been 'published and divulged to as great a quiet as ever was in England and as gladly received of all parts,' [4] it must have been widely adopted in the intervening three months. At the same time it may be suspected that it was received by many rather as an instalment of further changes to come than as a final settlement. On the other hand, three weeks after Pentecost a royal letter to Edmund Bonner, bishop of London, complains that the Book 'remaineth in many places of this our realm either not known at all, or not used, or at least, if it be used, very seldom, and that in such light and irreverent sort, as the people in many places either have heard nothing, or if they hear, they neither understand, nor have that spiritual delectation in the same, that to good Christians appertaineth.' The blame is laid on the bishops, and Bonner is commanded to see to it that in his own diocese 'the curates do their duties more often and in more reverend sort and the people be' induced by the advice and example of the bishop and his officers 'to come with oftener and more devotion' to Common Prayer and Communion.[5] It was soon reported that some of the clergy were continuing to use the customary incidental ceremonies and gestures at the altar and elsewhere. A new visitation was therefore projected and articles were drawn up revoking some of the *Injunctions* of 1547, among the rest that which sanctioned the two altar-

[1] P. 146. [2] See p. 149 above. [3] *Wriothesley's Chron.*, ii. p. 8.
[4] Pocock, *Troubles connected with the Prayer Book of 1549*, p. x.
[5] Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, i. pp. 67 f.

lights, and forbidding any to 'counterfeit the popish Mass' by observing such ceremonies—some of which were only customary and unrecognised by the *Missals*, while others of them were expressly allowed by the Book itself—and inhibiting the celebration of more than one mass on other days than Christmas and Easter.[1] Meanwhile, although the Book was used in the choir of St. Paul's, in the chapels votive masses, like those of the Apostles and the Blessed Virgin Mary, had been continued under the style of 'the Apostles' communion' and 'our Lady's communion,' and Bonner had been ordered by a royal letter to put them down.[2] From a later letter it appears that the bishop himself 'seldom or never' celebrated at St. Paul's on festivals, as had been his custom, and he is required to resume his custom;[3] and on Sunday, Aug. 18, he 'dyd the offes at Powlles both at the processyon and the comunione dyscretly and sadly.'[4] Stephen Gardiner of Winchester had been in the Tower since 1547 and did not see the Book till it was brought to him in the middle of 1550 and his consent to it demanded, when he replied that 'having deliberately seen' it, 'although I would not have made it so my self, yet I find such things in it as satisfieth my Conscience, and therefore I will both execute it my self, and also see other my Parishioners to do it.'[5] So much for those who accepted the Book either willingly or with reluctance, making the best they could of it. On the other hand, there were those who received it with denunciation and resistance. On the one side Hooper, Somerset's chaplain, afterwards bishop of Gloucester, flatly refused to 'communicate with the church in the administration of the supper' . . . 'if it be not corrected.'[6] On the other hand, the rebellions of 1549, which were only put down by Somerset's foreign mercenaries, if at bottom agrarian, were partly occasioned by the situation created by the new Book. This is specially true of the rising in Devon and Cornwall, the first programme of which demanded the restoration of the old rites and an indiscriminate return to the conditions of the latter years of Henry VIII.[7]

When at the end of the year Somerset fell and went to the Tower, it was expected in some quarters that a return to the old rites would follow, 'as though the setting forth of the said Book [of Common Prayer] had been the only act of the said duke.'[8] Consequently an order was issued on Christmas Day for the bringing in, defacement and abolition of the old ritual books, 'the keping wherof shold be a let to the usage of the

[1] Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, i. pp. 63 ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 65 f.
[3] Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, ed. Pratt, v. p. 729.
[4] *Grey Friars' Chronicle*, p. 62.
[5] *Edward VI's Journal*, June 14, 1550.
[6] *Original Letters*, p. 79.
[7] Dixon, iii. pp. 56 ff.
[8] Hooper, *Orig. Letters*, xxxvi. In modern English, 'of the said duke alone.'

said Boke of Commenne Prayers,'[1] and this was afterwards confirmed by an Act of Parliament (3 & 4 Ed. VI. c. 10):[2] and further, complaint is made that 'dyvers frowarde and obstinate persons do refuse to pay towards the fyndinge of bredde and wyne for the holy communion, according to the order prescribed in the saide boke': it is required that they be admonished and that if they refuse compliance they be punished by suspension, excommunication and other censures of the Church.

It has already been mentioned that the Pontificals are omitted from the list of books to be destroyed, partly perhaps because they were not the property of churches but of individual bishops, but certainly also because they were still needed for the rites of Ordination which were not provided for in the new Book. This omission was now to be supplied. An Act of Parliament (3 & 4 Ed. VI. c. 12)[3] was passed on Jan. 31, 1549–50, which empowered the King to appoint six bishops and six others to prepare 'a form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and other ministers of the Church.' Since the work of the commission was done in a week, it is obvious that the new rites had already been compiled, no doubt again by Cranmer; and they were published in March.

In the new rites the clause 'and other ministers of the Church' is ignored, and the ordinations are confined to those of bishops, priests and deacons. For these the structure of the traditional forms is preserved with considerable simplification. In the old Roman rite, after the proclamation of their election, before the gospel of the Mass the Archdeacon presented those to be ordained deacon and presbyter, and when the Pope had called for the prayers of the people, the Litany was recited, followed by a collect. Then the ordinations were conferred by a solemn prayer and the imposition of hands, the ordained were clothed in their characteristic vestments, and one of the new deacons sang the Gospel. In the consecration of bishops the procedure was the same, except that they were vested in dalmatic, chasuble and shoes before being presented. The Gallican procedure was essentially the same; but in addition, during the prayer and imposition of hands on a bishop two bishops held the Book of the Gospels open on his head, and after the ordination the hands of bishops and presbyters were anointed. In the course of the Middle Ages the rites became complicated: the Roman and Gallican forms were conflated, so that the essential Gallican prayer followed the Roman, and the imposition of the Gospels

[1] Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, i. pp. 73 ff.
[2] Gibson, *Cod. Jur. Eccl. Angl.*, xi. 1. p. 264. Ed. 1761.
[3] Gibson, iv. 2, p. 100.

and the unction were adopted generally. The 'tradition of the instruments,' which formerly belonged only to the Gallican ordination of the minor orders, was extended to presbyters and deacons. Thus presbyters received the paten and chalice, deacons the Gospels; subdeacons, deacons and priests were clothed by the bishop in their characteristic vestments, each delivered with a verbal formula, and bishops were invested with staff, ring and mitre. Further, the imposition of hands on deacons and priests became detached from the prayer, and a second imposition with *Accipe spiritum sanctum* (St. John xx. 22) was added in the case of priests. *Veni creator* was also inserted at some point in the ordination of bishops and priests.

The principal differences between the old rite and the new are as follows: (1) Hitherto priests and deacons had been ordained in the course of the Mass of the Ember Vigil, which had no reference to ordinations: now there is provided a proper Introit for priests and bishops, a Collect for deacons and priests, and an Epistle and a Gospel for all three. (2) Hitherto only bishops had been scrutinised in a series of questions: now such scrutiny is extended to priests and deacons. (3) The long exhortation addressed to candidates for the priesthood seems to be a new feature in England. (Such exhortations are not unknown, however, elsewhere: *e.g.* in the *Pontificale secundum usum ecclesiæ Romanæ*, Venice, 1520, ff. 22–25, there are admonitions before ordination for all orders up to deacon, and for the priesthood there is one before ordination and another at the end of the Mass; and a second series is added for use after each ordination.) (4) In the Pontificals the imposition of hands on deacons and priests is detached from the ordination prayer, and in the case of priests is repeated with *Accipe spiritum sanctum:* in the new rite, for deacons the imposition remains in the same relative position with a new imperative formula, *Take thou authority*, etc., and the prayer is, unhappily, transferred to the end of the Mass; for priests, the imposition of hands with 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' etc., follows immediately the prayer, which is a new composition. A consequence of the complication of the mediæval rite had been uncertainty as to what was the essential form and matter of ordination, and it is obvious that the compilers of the English rite followed one of the several views, viz. that the essential form for the priesthood was *Accipe spiritum sanctum.* Indeed, they so exclusively concentrated the action on this that the Prayer is rather for the Church in general than for the ordinands in particular. The diaconate is also conferred by an imperative formula. (5) Unctions and vestings and the delivery of mitre and ring to the bishop are omitted, and priests receive neither wine nor paten, only the chalice with the bread and the Bible.

A large contribution to the new English rite was made by

the *De ordinatione legitima ministrorum ecclesiæ* of Martin Butzer (Bucer) [1] of Strassburg. Driven out by the enforcement of the Interim of Augsburg (1548), he came to England and was the guest of Cranmer in the spring and summer of 1549, and no doubt wrote his work at Cranmer's desire in view of the contemplated English forms of Ordination. The work supplies a single form for what Bucer calls 'the three orders of presbyters,' only suggesting that the procedure be more 'lengthy and weighty' in the ordination of bishops than of priests, and of priests than of deacons. Bucer's order suggested the Introits, Epistles and Gospels of the ordination of priests and of bishops, three of the questions in the scrutiny of deacons, and three in that of bishops, the allocution to priests and the Prayer of their ordination; but unfortunately the English order omits the impressive clause praying for the gift to them of the Holy Ghost, and also the first half of the Prayer for the consecration of bishops.

It is probable that the Book of 1549 was never satisfactory to Cranmer; that he regarded it as a temporary compromise, and only waited for further innovations. In these years 'Reformed' opinions, originating in Switzerland and Southern Germany, were being diffused in England. There was an influx of continental refugees from the pressure which culminated in the Interim of 1548. From Strassburg Peter Martyr was welcomed in 1548 and Bucer in 1549, and both were made Regius Professors of Divinity, the one in Oxford, the other in Cambridge. There came also Valérand Pullain, a successor of Calvin in the pastorate of the French Reformed community in Strassburg, along with his congregation, and John Laski from Emden in Friesland with his congregation. Englishmen who had been living abroad returned, Coverdale from the Rhenish Palatinate, Hooper from Zürich, and both these were made bishops. The relaxation of the censorship made possible a flood of books and pamphlets written in England, most of them treating of the Eucharist and the Mass, and most of them scurrilous, besides the importation of foreign 'reformed' works. Besides Hermann's *Consultation*, three other Service books were published in England: Pullain's *Liturgia Sacra*, 1551, the rite of the French congregation of Strassburg, derived by Calvin with some little modification from the contemporary German rite of Strassburg; Laski's *Forma et ratio tota ecclesiastici Ministerij*, in some respects at least derived from Guilbert Farel's *La manière et fasson*, 1533, in use at Geneva before Calvin's final settlement there in 1541; and *The form of common prayer used in the churches of Geneva*, 1550, being a translation by W. Huycke of Calvin's Genevan rite, *La forme des prières et chantz ecclésiastiques*, 1542.

[1] *Scripta Anglicana*, pp. 238 ff.

Further, the leading bishops of the old learning, Bonner of London, Gardiner of Winchester, Day of Chichester, Heath of Worcester, Tunstall of Durham, were being deprived by the Council.

As early as 1548, Ferrar, bishop of St. Davids, two months after his consecration by the bishops of the 'Windsor Commission' at Chertsey, preached at Paul's Cross 'not in hys abbet of a byshoppe, but lyke a prest, and he spake agayne all maner of thynges of the churche and the sacrament of the auter, and vestmentts, coppes, alterres, with alle other thynges.'[1] . . . In the Lent of 1550 Hooper, preaching before the King, expressed his no doubt representative criticisms of the Book of 1549: he would have the magistrate 'shut up the partition called the chancel,' and 'turn the altars into tables'; 'the memory of the dead' should be left out; 'sitting' at communion 'were best'; the priest 'should give the bread, and not thrust it into the receiver's mouth: for the breaking of the bread hath a great mystery in it of the passion of Christ . . . therefore let the minister break the round bread' (as he is in fact directed to do in the Book): in Baptism whatever is added to 'pure water,' 'oil, salt, cross, lights, and such other,' should be 'abolished': in the Ordinal he 'wonders' at the 'oath by saints,' at the requirement that the candidates wear albs; and asks 'where and of whom and when they have learned that he that is called to the ministry of God's word should hold the bread and chalice in one hand and the book in the other.'[2] In the summer Ridley was carrying things with a high hand, and in spite of the Book ordered the destruction of altars throughout the diocese of London. In this he was supported by Northumberland and the Council, who then proceeded to order the same throughout the kingdom. In this year too Bucer was invited to express his judgment on the Book of Common Prayer, and in response he wrote his *Censura super libro sacrorum, seu ordinationis Ecclesiæ atque ministerii ecclesiastici in regno Angliæ*,[3] which he presented to Thomas Goodrich, bishop of Ely, on Jan. 5, 1551. The *Censura* is a review of the whole Book, and while this expresses a keen appreciation of its merits as a whole, it criticises it in detail. It appears from this that revision has been already in some sort begun, since he implores that some alterations which appear in the Book of 1552 shall not be made. Some of the criticisms are merely prosaic and of no importance. For the rest: Bucer would further limit the number of holy days; he deprecates the position of the officiant at Divine

[1] *Grey Friars' Chronicle of London*, p. 57.

[2] *Early Writings of John Hooper*, Parker Society, pp. 440, 479, 488, 491, 533 ff. Cf. *Orig. Letters*, i. p. 51.

[3] *Scripta Anglicana*, Basel, 1577, pp. 456 ff.

Service 'in the quire': as to the Mass, it is to be noticed that he makes no criticism of the structure of it in general, nor of the canon in particular; but he would abolish the vestments and the gestures allowed by 'Certayne notes' at the end of the Book; he would have the Confession and 'We do not presume' said by the people with or after the priest; he would eliminate the idea of consecration and consequently also the direction that only 'so much bread and wine' should be set forth at the Offertory 'as shall suffice for' the communicants, the invocation of the Holy Spirit and Word, the sign of the cross and the taking of the paten and chalice into the priest's hands; he deprecates the exclusive use of wafer bread, the delivery of the Sacrament into the mouth of the communicant, the presence of non-communicants at the Mass, the use of two Masses at Christmas and Easter,[1] and of the 'half-mass' when none have signified their intention to communicate, and the permission for a household whose turn it is to 'offer' for the charges of the Communion and to provide a communicant to send a substitute to offer and communicate in its stead. In Baptism he would not have the rite begun at the church door, and would eliminate the exorcism, the benediction of the font, the unction and the chrysom; he would have the catechism enlarged and more frequent catechising, and would impose new conditions for admission to Confirmation; he desires the abolition of the unction of the sick and prayers for the departed at their burial, the substitution of maledictions against violators of the decalogue for the existing series in the Commination, and its use four times a year; he would have more strict inquiries concerning candidates for ordination. For many of the passages which he dislikes he suggests a new text. Peter Martyr also wrote a criticism on the basis of an inadequate Latin version of the Book, but on learning more of it from the *Censura* he adopted Bucer's criticisms, but added a further objection to communicating the sick in the reserved sacrament without a repetition of 'the words' (of Institution) in the sick person's presence;[2] and also he made a further report to Cranmer which is no longer extant.

In a letter to Bucer dated Jan. 10, 1550–1, Peter Martyr expresses his satisfaction that both of them had had an opportunity of admonishing the bishops and relates that he had been told by Cranmer that at a meeting of the bishops it had been decided that many changes should be made, and further he is cheered by hearing from Cheke that if the bishops will not make the

[1] His dislike of this provision is based on the fact that it implies that there will be more communicants on these days than on others, whereas properly all should communicate every Sunday.

[2] Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, App. lxi.

desirable changes the King will do it himself![1] Nothing is known of this process of revision except that the King caused the 'ordre of commõ seruice, entituled, The boke of commõ prayer, to be faythfully & godly perused, explaned, & made fully perfect'[2] by 'a great many bishops and others of the best learned within this realm appointed' (of course by Northumberland and the Council) 'for that purpose,' and that Cranmer, Ridley and Peter Martyr were among them.[3] It is true that the Dean of Gloucester has contended[4] that the well-known letter of Guest's,[5] commonly supposed to refer to the revision of 1559, really belongs to that of 1551. If this is so, then it follows that some important person or persons were anxious to restore some ceremonies that had vanished and to retain some things which it was proposed to abolish: also that at some stage the draft book required that those not intending to communicate should be dismissed[6] before the Creed, and either was silent as to kneeling at Communion or explicitly allowed either standing or kneeling (not sitting) according 'to every man's choice.'

Parliament met on Jan. 23, 1551–2.[7]

Convocation also met on the following day. Heylin states that he can find no record of their proceedings, but it is thought by Procter and Frere[8] that the debates which he assigns to the meeting of the previous year belong in truth to the assembly of 1552. These debates, however, were only concerned with questions of the Calendar and of the words of administration of the Communion, and in any case it is certain that the Lower House never gave any sanction to the liturgical changes which were now enacted.[9]

Parliament, however, made little difficulty about passing the statute which made the new Book part of the law of the land. Aldrich and Thirlby voted against it, as they had done against the former Book: but the natural leaders of opposition, Gardiner, Bonner, Heath, Day, Tunstall, were all in prison, and the Second Act of Uniformity had passed through both Houses by April 14.[10]

[1] Strype, *Memorials of Cranmer*, App. lxi.
[2] Act of Uniformity, 5 & 6 Edw. VI. cap. i.
[3] Cranmer's Letter of Oct. 7, 1552: Gee, *Elizabethan Prayer Book*, p. 225.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 40 ff. [5] *Ibid.*, pp. 215 ff.
[6] Bucer notes (*Censura*, 27) that in 1550 some priests 'dismissed' the non-communicants after the sermon.
[7] [At this point Dr. Brightman's work was interrupted by his death on March 31, 1932. What follows is by the Rev. K. D. Mackenzie, who also corrected the proofs of Dr. Brightman's MS.—Ed.]
[8] P. 286. [9] Dixon, iv. p. 73.
[10] Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, No. lxxi.

It describes the Book of 1549 as 'a verye Godlye ordre . . . agreable to the woorde of God and the Primatiue Churche, verye coumfortable to all good people,' but complains that 'a greate noumbre of people in diverse parts of this Realme . . . doe wilfully, and damnablye before almightie God, absteyn and refuse to come to theyr parishe Churches.' If this can be assumed to be honest and coherent, it would seem that the recusants referred to are rather the 'reformed' extremists than those of the old learning, since almost all the alterations made in the Second Book are entirely in the 'reformed' direction But if the main motive of the Book was to reconcile extremists in one direction, it certainly appears that there was also a deliberate motive of making impossible the position of conservatives like Gardiner. The very things which seemed to him to make the First Book tolerable are made to disappear in the Second. Such are the statement that 'the whole body of our sauioure Jesu Christe' is received in each fragment of the Sacrament; the close association of intercession for the Church with the actual memorial of Christ's death; and the prayer that the bread and wine 'maye be vnto vs the bodye and bloud' of Christ.

The spirit of the new Book is indicated by a significant change of title. While the First Book was styled the 'booke of the common prayer and administracion of the Sacramentes, and other rites and ceremonies of the Churche: after the use of the Churche of England,' the Second drops the allusion to 'the Churche' and claims no more than to regulate such administration 'in the Churche of England.'

For the rest, the effect of the revision may be summarised as follows:—The recitation of the Divine Service is now made obligatory on all priests and deacons (preaching and study being no longer an excuse). The titles of the offices are changed to 'Morning' and 'Evening Prayer.' They are to be recited no longer necessarily in choir, but where they may best be heard. The Introduction to these services appears for the first time. The Alleluia and procession at Easter are omitted, the latter reappearing in the form of a substitute for *Venite*. Psalms alternative to the Gospel canticles are inserted. 'The Lorde be wyth you,' and 'Let vs praye' appear in a novel place before 'Lord, haue mercy,' instead of before the Collect.

The Communion Service has a new title, 'The Order for the administracion of the Lordes Supper or holye Communion'; and the word 'Masse' disappears. 'Table' is substituted for 'Altar'; and it is to stand 'in the bodye of the Churche, or in the chauncell.' The celebrant (still called 'the Priest') is to stand 'at the north-syde.' The Introit, 'Glory be to thee,' before the Gospel, *Osanna*, *Benedictus*, 'the peace of the Lorde,' 'Christ

our Pascal lãbe,' *Agnus Dei* and the post-communion sentences are omitted. Nothing is now to be sung except the Epistle, the Gospel, the Creed, and the *Gloria in excelsis*. The ninefold 'Lord, haue mercie' is expanded and appears as a series of responses after each of the Ten Commandments, which are now to be rehearsed before the Collects. *Gloria in excelsis* is transferred to the end of the service. Unleavened wafers are no longer required. A new exhortation is added containing a rebuke to those who assist without communicating, which is described as being an even greater fault than that of being altogether absent. But by far the most serious change, and one which entirely altered the whole tone of the rite, was the breaking up of the canon in such a way as to obscure its character as one continuous act of memorial, springing from the Preface and *Sanctus* and culminating with the Lord's Prayer and Communion. The Prayer for the Church, somewhat altered by the omission of all mention both of the saints and the rest of the departed, is now brought to a position immediately after the almsgiving (which is all that is left of the ancient offertory):[1] then follow the Exhortations with Confession, Absolution and Comfortable Words: the connection between the Preface and the Consecration is obliterated by the insertion of 'We doe not presume' between the *Sanctus* and the Prayer of Consecration: Communion now is to come immediately after Consecration, and the latter part of the canon (reduced by the omission of the *anamnesis*, of the petitions no longer appropriate after Communion, and of the final petition for the acceptance of our prayers 'by the ministerye of the holy angels') is postponed till after the Communion, where it now appears, strangely, as an alternative to the thanksgiving. The Lord's Prayer also is to be said after, instead of before, Communion. In the actual Prayer of Consecration the invocation of the Holy Spirit, the crossings and manual acts, are all removed. The words of administration of both kinds, now described as 'the bread' and 'the cuppe,' are entirely altered, the second part of the words as they stand in the 1661 Book being substituted for the first, which had been the 1549 formula and was almost a direct inheritance from the Sarum rite. The species of bread is now delivered into the hand, no longer into the mouth, and communion is required of the laity three times, instead of once, in the year. The first Mass of Christmas and the second of Easter are omitted. Daily Mass seems to be no longer expected,

[1] All mention of the preparation of the gifts is omitted. Nothing is said about the adding of water to the chalice because nothing is said about the contents of the chalice at all. If any alteration was intended, a direction for it might be expected among the final rubrics, where an alteration in the character of the bread is actually commanded.

even in Cathedrals; though the rubric governing the use of the Proper Prefaces no doubt implies the possibility of a Communion on days for which no special Epistle and Gospel is provided. Whereas in the 1549 Book the first half of the service was to be said on Wednesdays and Fridays (if there were none to communicate with the priest), now the same regulation is transferred to holy days.

In baptism the rite is no longer begun at the church door, so that the distinction between the making of a catechumen and the actual Baptism disappears: the Exorcism, the recitation of *Pater* and Creed, the Benediction of the water, the chrysom, and the unction are all abolished; the signing with the cross is postponed till after Baptism; [1] and, apart from exhortations, the service ends with the Lord's Prayer and a thanksgiving. The minister is instructed to command that the children be brought to Confirmation as soon as they are sufficiently instructed. In Confirmation the sign of the cross, which in 1549 accompanied the imposition of hands, is omitted, and a prayer is substituted for 'I signe thee with the signe of the crosse, and lay my hand vpon thee.' At the Burial of the Dead no part of the service is now to be said in church (although, apparently, if there are singing clerks the body may be conducted by them and the priest unto, but not into, the church): the Office of the Dead (see (3), p. 166) is now to be said at the grave, but without the psalms and *preces*. All prayers for the dead disappear; so also does the Mass, except indeed that 'The Collect' remains, but without any indication of the use to be made of it. 'The Purificacion of Women' becomes 'The Thankes geving of Women after Childe Birth, commonly called The Churchynge of Women.' The order for the return of the chrysom naturally disappears. The title 'A commination' now appears for the first time as the description of the Ash Wednesday service of 1549, but the service is now to be used 'dyuers tymes in the yere.' 'Certayne notes' disappear, their place being taken by the rubric, now printed before Morning Prayer, forbidding the use of Alb, Vestment or Cope. In the Ordinations, the vestments and the tradition of the chalice to priests and of the staff to bishops are suppressed, and in the consecration of bishops the Bible is to be 'delivered' to the new bishop, and no longer laid upon his neck. The form of the oaths is changed to avoid invoking

[1] There were numerous crossings in the Sarum rite. Of these the 1549 rite retained the first only, which belonged to the admission of the candidate to the status of a catechumen. The post-baptismal crossing in the Sarum rite was accompanied with chrismation, as though it were a kind of anticipation of Confirmation; but the 1552 Book, omitting the chrismation, associated the crossing with the novel idea of receiving the child 'into the congregacion of Christes flocke.'

the help of the saints and of the Gospel.[1] Signing with the cross, except after Baptism, and *The Lord be with you*, except in Morning and Evening Prayer, and Confirmation, are eliminated.

It will be seen that many of these alterations are the result of Bucer's criticisms, or at least in harmony with them. But of the outstanding features of the new Book, the dislocation of the canon and the new words of administration, the one had no foundation in the *Censura* and the other was definitely deprecated, and about one-third of Bucer's criticisms are ignored.

The penitential introduction to Morning and Evening Prayer may have been suggested by a somewhat similar arrangement in Pullain's *Liturgia sacra* or Laski's *Forma et ratio*.

The use of the Decalogue in the Mass has a longer and more interesting history. There was a traditional class of hymns with *Kyrieleison* as a refrain. Following such a tradition Luther made the Ten Commandments into a metrical paraphrase (*Dys synd die heylgen zehn gebet*) with the refrain *Kyrioleys* after each, and Coverdale translated it into English. There was thus a suggestion already near at hand for a means of retaining the traditional Kyrie while neutralising the apparent vanity of its repetitions. But there was also, as we have seen,[2] a tradition, especially in England, connecting the Decalogue with Mass, not indeed as part of the rite, but as one element of the vernacular and informal office called the Prone. The German Lutheran *Kirchenordnungen* and the French and Swiss Reformed services all look as though they were suggested by this office. It was therefore not unnatural that they should include the Decalogue, nor that Cranmer, under the double influence of English tradition and the contemporary practice of highly respected foreign reformers, should have hit upon the idea of combining the Decalogue with *Kyrieleison* as a regular portion of the new rite.[3]

As we have seen, the new Book had no ecclesiastical authority. But in the form in which it was finally published it had not even the authority of Parliament. It was discovered through the violent propaganda of John Knox that the direction to kneel for the reception of Communion was in fact an innovation! The Book of 1549 had made no mention of posture, though, of course, kneeling was taken for granted. The extreme party among the reformers made an uproar, and at Berwick-on-Tweed at Knox's behest the practice of sitting was actually introduced.[4] The Council, under the pretext of having discovered printer's

[1] The earlier form of the oath was one of the stumbling-blocks which made Hooper scruple to accept episcopal consecration (*Original Letters*, p. 81). Micronius states that at his second appearance before the Council on July 20, 1550, in consequence of Hooper's arguments the young King struck out the incriminated words with his own hand (*ibid.*, p. 566 f.).

[2] P. 139. [3] See Brightman, *The English Rite*, pp. clv. ff.

[4] *Original Letters*, p. 591.

errors, suspended the publication of the Book (Sept. 27, 1552) and directed Cranmer to reconsider the question. Cranmer (Oct. 7) expressed himself as ready to obey the Royal command in the matter, but protested vigorously against the alteration of what had been settled by Parliament with the King's assent, and argued against the contention of Knox and his associates.[1] Time was pressing; and the upshot was that on Oct. 27, five days before the Book was to come into use, Goodrich, bishop of Ely and Lord Chancellor, was ordered by the Council 'to have joined unto the Book of Common Prayer lately set forth a certain declaration signed by the King's Majesty' 'touching the kneeling at the receiving of the Communion.'[2] This is the so-called 'Black rubric,' which declared that by the requirement to kneel 'it is not mente . . . that any adoracion is doone, or oughte to bee doone, eyther vnto the Sacramentall bread or wyne, there bodelye receyued, or vnto anye reall and essenciall presence there beeyng of Chrystes naturall fleshe and bloude.'

V

THE REIGN OF MARY

Edward VI died on July 6, 1553. He was buried by Cranmer with the English rite on Aug. 8, while at the same time Gardiner celebrated a Requiem Mass of the Latin rite in the presence of the Queen and the Council. For a few months the two rites subsisted side by side, until Dec. 20, when by Mary's first Act of Repeal (passed in the autumn) such divine service and administration of the sacraments as were most commonly used 'in the last year' of Henry VIII were to be restored. The effect of this was to revert in all things to the traditional order, except that the Dedication festival of all churches would be kept on the first Sunday in October, an English lesson would be read at Mattins and Evensong on Sundays and holydays, and the English Litany would remain in use. On March 4, 1553–4, the Processional was restored and the English Litany therefore abolished by implication.

For the history of the continuation of the English rite we must cross the Channel to Frankfort, where was assembled the largest body of English refugees. The authorities were willing to permit the English congregation to share a church with the French Protestants provided they would change their rite so as to bring it into closer conformity with the French service. On this understanding John Knox undertook the pastoral charge of the congregation, and proceeded to conduct services which seem to have had strangely little resemblance to anything in the Book of Common Prayer. The rite consisted of a new form of confession,

[1] *State Papers of Edw. VI: Domestic XV:* No. 15. [2] Dixon, iii. p. 483.

a metrical psalm, a prayer for the assistance of the Holy Spirit, the sermon, a 'generall praier,' the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, another metrical psalm, and a blessing. Such a service proved too much for many even of the refugees; and a period of controversy ensued. In the course of it Knox and others sent off to the great Calvin a satirical account of the 'huge volume of ceremonies,' as the 1552 Book appeared to be in the eyes of the English extremists, 'to elicit,' as Procter and Frere say, 'the expression of his disapproval.'[1] His patronising reply describing the Anglican customs as *tolerabiles ineptiæ* must have disappointed the objectors; [2] and in spite of the magistrates siding with Knox and ordering the English congregation to conform to the French Order, the Prayer Book party proved the stronger and the extremists and their followers retired to the more congenial atmosphere of Reformed Switzerland.

VI

THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH

Elizabeth succeeded to the throne on Nov. 17, 1558. The liturgical situation was a tangled one. The normal religious authority, Convocation, was strongly conservative. Yet it is safe to say that the general body of the Church was far more anxious for reform than ever before. The Queen herself had every reason to fear Papalism, but it is almost impossible to discover her real convictions in matters of doctrine. Whatever these may have been her policy is clear. It was that of uniting as many as possible of her subjects in liturgical worship, of suppressing the expression of religious opinion, and of claiming to the utmost that supremacy in matters ecclesiastical which had been so freely exercised during the last three reigns. It is this policy of the Queen which explains the history of the Prayer Book during this reign. At first she held her hand. Then she decided to ignore Convocation. Having once secured the restoration of the 1552 Prayer Book (with certain modifications), she supervised the administration of it by the bishops in such a way as to leave no room for revolutionary Puritanism to develop.

For the first six months of the new reign all preaching was forbidden by the royal Proclamation of Dec. 27. The Latin rite remained in possession, except that the Epistle and Gospel, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer and the Creed might be

[1] See *A Brieff discours off the troubles begonne at Franckford . . . M.D. LXXV.* Reprinted 1846. Pp. 44 ff. (ed. 1907).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 51. To Knox himself such things as 'crossing in baptism, kneeling at the Lord's Table, mummulling and singing of the Litany' were 'diabolical inventions.' Letter to Anna Lock. *Calendar of State Papers: Foreign: Eliz.*, 504.

said in English, and the English Litany used. The Litany was to be in the form used in the Queen's chapel, which was practically identical with that of 1552. The only differences of any importance were the curious prefixing of the Confession from the Communion Service with the pronouns in the singular, the omission of the suffrage against 'the tyranny of the Byshop of Rome and all hys detestable enormities,' and the restoration of one of the final collects of the form of 1549. The Litany had been reissued in the late reign in almost the same form and was therefore actually a legal formulary, apart from any use of prerogative. The Latin Mass continued to be said even in the Queen's chapel. But on Christmas Day the Queen had sent a message to Bishop Oglethorpe, requiring him to refrain from the Elevation. The bishop refused, and the Queen left the chapel after the Gospel. At the Coronation on Jan. 15 the Mass seems to have been sung by the Dean of the Chapel Royal because of the refusal of the bishops to accept the Queen's directions in this matter.[1]

About Christmas time a certain State paper was prepared, described in one of the two manuscripts in which it survives as 'the Device for the alteration of religion.'[2] It is there suggested that a group of divines (Bill, Parker, May, Cox, Whitehead, Grindal and Pilkington) should meet and draw up 'a plat or book' for this purpose. If Guest's letter[3] does refer, as Strype[4] who discovered it supposes, to the suggestions of this body, it looks as though they must have had before them a proposal to restore the Book of 1549, for the greater part of his justification of 'the order taken in the new service' reads like a criticism of that Book: indeed he actually mentions 'the first book.'[5] The suggestions which Guest defends go even further in the Puritan direction than the Book of 1552: crosses and images are condemned; none but the communicants may say the Creed; it is lawful to receive Communion either standing or kneeling. Who then can have been responsible for suggesting the restoration of the Book of 1549? Certainly none of the commissioners of 1559 (if that be not too formal a designation of the group named in the 'Device'). They were all on the Protestant side. Could it have been the Queen herself? Dr. Gee says No: she 'was the consistent friend of those who upheld the Book of 1552 during all the months through which it was under dis-

[1] So Procter and Frere, referring to *State Papers; Spanish*, I. 6.
[2] Printed in Gee, *op. cit.*, pp. 195 ff.
[3] See p. 174. Printed in Gee, pp. 215 ff.
[4] Strype, *Annals*, I. 83.
[5] As MacColl points out (*The Royal Commission and the Ornaments Rubric*, p. 260), this is strong evidence against the theory that he is referring to the discussions of 1552; for there was then no second Book in existence, which makes the expression 'first book' meaningless.

cussion.' But, as MacColl points out,[1] *according to Sandys she was in favour of the conspicuous use of the crucifix, and very nearly deposed him from his see owing to the incautious vehemence of his language in opposition to it.* So also, in spite of the 1552 rubric, she deliberately issued an injunction for wafer bread.[2] In the following January she also insisted on 'candles' in her own chapel, and 'the golden vestments of the Papacy.'[3] It is not, therefore, intrinsically improbable that she may have urged the restoration of the 1549 rite. If, however, as Dr. Gee maintains, the letter, which bears no date, really refers to the revision of 1552, we have no evidence that this commission ever met at all. All that can be said is that the 'Device' recommends the appointment of a group of divines specified by name, and that we have evidence that most of them were in London in February. Apart from Guest's letter we should suppose, both from their known opinions and from the subsequent course of events, that they would be likely to recommend the restoration of the Book of 1552.[4]

On Feb. 15 a 'Bill for Order of Service and Ministers in the Church' was presented to Parliament, and another Bill for a Prayer Book on the following day, but both were either withdrawn or postponed.[5]

In March an attempt was made to annex a Bill for the re-establishment of the 1552 Book to the former of Elizabeth's Supremacy Bills (containing, it was said,[6] the title 'Supreme Head'), but this seems to have been defeated in the House of Lords, which was just induced to assent to the Supremacy but refused the Prayer Book. About the same time Convocation began to bestir itself, and on the passing of the Supremacy Act (March 22) it drew up an *articulus cleri* under five headings, affirming the traditional doctrine of the Eucharist, the authority of the Pope, and the reservation, *jure Divino*, to ecclesiastics 'of handling and defining concerning the things belonging to faith, sacraments, and discipline ecclesiastical.'[7] Easter Day fell on March 26, and on March 22 the Queen (relying apparently on the new Act)[8] issued a Proclamation authorising the reception of Communion in both kinds.[9]

On April 18 a new Uniformity Bill was introduced into the Commons. It was passed in three days by them, but met with a stormy reception in the House of Lords. Nine

[1] MacColl, *op. cit.*, pp. 244 ff. See also chapters i, vi, vii.
[2] See pp. 183 f. [3] *Zürich Letters*, i. 63.
[4] Gee, *Elizabethan Prayer Book*, pp. 1–78.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 80, citing for this and subsequent transactions the *Journals* of the Lords and Commons, 'supplemented by d'Ewes, who wrote about 1620 and had access to some particulars which . . . cannot now be traced.'
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 100. [7] Strype, *Annals*, i. 56.
[8] But Gee points out that it had not yet received her own formal Royal assent.
[9] Dyson's *Proclamations*, f. 5; printed by Gee, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

bishops voted against it, and the remainder absented themselves. It was finally passed by a majority of three. The Act did not profess to introduce a new book. It simply restored the Book 'authorized by Parliament in the . . . fifth and sixth year of the reign of King Edward the sixth, with one alteration or addition of certein lessons to be used on every Sunday in the year, and the form of the Letany altered, and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the sacrament to the communicants.' The Act further provided that 'such ornaments of the church, and of the Ministers thereof, shall be retained, and be in vse, as was in this church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the sixth, vntil other order shall be therein taken, by authority of the Queens Maiesty, with the advice of her Commissioners appointed and authorized vnder the great seal of England, for causes ecclesiasticall or of the Metropolitane of this Realm'; and empowered the Queen, if needful, 'by the like advice' 'to ordain and publish such further Ceremonies or Rites, as may be most for the advancement of Gods glory, the edifying of his Church, and the due reverence of Christs holy Mysteries and Sacraments.'[1]

The Book was accordingly issued with proper First Lessons for all Sundays; the suffrage against the Pope was omitted; and the words of administration from the Book of 1549 were prefixed to those of 1552. Further, the 1552 rubric as to vesture is altered in conformity with the provision of the Act: proper Lessons are provided for holy days as well as Sundays: the Litany resembles that used in the Royal Chapel rather than that of 1552;[2] the Declaration on kneeling is omitted (quite properly, in view of its origin). The Ordinal was printed as a separate volume.

In the summer the Queen issued a series of fifty-five *Injunctions*,[3] about half of which are a repetition of those issued in 1547.[4] Among the new ones are (*a*) an exception to the prohibition of processions, permitting 'the perambulation of the circuits of parishes' at Rogationtide, and providing a rite for it;[5] (*b*) the requirement of plainsong in all parts of the service if it were sung, but with a permission to use, before or after Mattins and Evensong, 'a hymn or such like song' in figured music, so long as the meaning of the words be not obscured; (*c*) the requirement of

[1] 1 Eliz. c. 2. See *The English Rite*, pp. 9 ff.

[2] Strangely enough it reverts to the precedent of 1544 and 1552 in having no *Amen* to the first Collect. The Confession (see p. 181) is also omitted.

[3] Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, '. pp. 178 ff.; Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, lxxviii, pp. 417 ff.

[4] See p. 152.

[5] 'The curate . . . at certain convenient places shall admonish the people to give thanks to God . . . with the saying of the 103rd Psalm. At which time also the same minister shall inculcate these or such sentences: "Cursed be he, which translateth the bounds and doles of his neighbour."' *Doc. Ann.*, i. pp. 187 f.

wafer-bread 'somewhat bigger in compass' than the traditional 'singing-cakes.'

Such, on paper, was the 'Elizabethan Settlement.' But the extreme reforming party, and especially the returned exiles, would have none of it, so far as the ceremonial regulations were concerned. The bishops were left with the practical question of how much they could actually insist on with any prospect of being obeyed. The vestments were the principal difficulty, and in 1560 they drew up, chiefly it would seem for their own guidance in the administration of their dioceses, certain *Interpretations and further considerations*,[1] as an appendix to the *Injunctions*, allowing a compromise on this point. All that they would actually require was the use of the cope at 'the ministration of the Lord's Supper, and the surplice at other ministrations.' The Rogationtide procession was now to include Ps. civ and the Litany, together with a homily by Parker as the stational sermon.

In the same year, upon the petition of the Universities, the Book of Common Prayer was published, with considerable variations, in Latin.[2] The Latin book was also needed, apparently, for the Irish Church, for the priests in that country did not understand English, and there was no Irish printing-press.[3]

On Jan. 22, 1560–1, the Queen, as empowered by the Act of 1559, directed Parker and others, as ecclesiastical commissioners, to reform the Table of Lessons, and to issue a new Calendar embodying their amendments. As a result a few changes were actually made in the lectionary, and the appearance of the Calendar was greatly altered by the insertion of fifty-nine additional black-letter feasts (in addition to the four which had been added in 1552), as well as *O Sapientia* and the vigils.

Meanwhile the difficulties about ceremonial proved to have been by no means settled. In 1562 six articles were submitted to the Lower House of Convocation to abolish all feasts except Sundays and the feasts of our Lord, organs, the cross in Baptism, compulsory kneeling at Communion, all vestments except the surplice, and the facing of the minister away from the people. They were thrown out by a majority of one vote.[4] The liturgical situation was one of utter confusion. An anonymous document dated Feb. 14, 1564–5, said to be Grindal's summary of the state of affairs in his own diocese of London, asserts: 'Some say the service and prayers in the chancel, others in the body of the church: some say the same in a seat made in the church, some in the pulpit with their faces to the people; some keep precisely to the order of the book, others intermeddle psalms in metre; some say in a surplice, others without a surplice.' The furniture

[1] Strype, *Annals*, I. i. ch. xvii.
[2] See further p. 559.
[3] See Stat. 2, Eliz. c. 2 (Ir.), quoted by Procter and Frere, p. 108.
[4] Cardwell, *Conf.*, p. 117.

and position of 'the Table' show a like variety. 'Administration of the Communion is done . . . by some with unleavened bread, some with leavened; some receive kneeling, others standing, others sitting; some sign with the sign of the cross, others not.' [1] It was to remedy such state of affairs that the Queen, some three weeks before the date of this document, had written an urgent letter to the bishops demanding that they should enforce uniformity. They obediently drew up a series of Articles; but apparently they were not to the Queen's mind, and she refused to sanction them. Finally, they were issued as a provincial order by Parker on his own authority as Metropolitan of the Province of Canterbury, under the title, *Aduertisments partly for due order in the publique administration of common prayers and vsinge the holy Sacramentes, and partly for the apparell of all persons ecclesiasticall, by vertue of the Queenes maiesties letters, commaunding the same, the xxv. day of January.* These advertisements mark a further stage of compromise. It is now only required that 'in the ministration of the Holy Communion in collegiate and cathedral churches, the principal minister shall use a cope with gospeller and epistoler agreeably.' In other churches the minister 'shall wear a comely surplice.' The Rogation rite is still to be used, as ordered in the *Interpretations*.[2] Officially, the Book of Common Prayer has no further history during the rest of Elizabeth's reign. Three attempts were made in Parliament to change the character of the Book on the lines of the Articles of 1562,[3] but all were suppressed by the authority of the Crown. Later in the reign opposition took the form of mere ignoring of the directions of the Book and occasionally of publishing private and unofficial editions in which *Mattins*, *Evensong*, and *Priest* are changed for words less obnoxious to Puritan eyes.[4]

In 1568, at the instance of Parker, a new translation of the Bible was made, 'the Bishops' Bible'; and the Convocation of Canterbury enacted a canon in 1571 ordering all churchwardens to obtain a copy for their churches.[5] Henceforward the new version was used for the lessons at Divine Service, but not for the other liturgical texts.

VII

THE REIGN OF JAMES I

On his way to England in April 1603, James I received a petition, commonly known as the Millenary Petition from the fact that it professed to proceed from 'more than a thousand' of

[1] British Museum, *Lansdowne MSS.*, 8, f. 16. Quoted by Gee.
[2] Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, i. pp. 287 ff.
[3] See p. 184. [4] See Procter and Frere, pp. 111 ff., 133 ff.
[5] Cardwell, *Synodalia*, i. p. 123.

his 'subjects and ministers.' In it they acquainted the King, amongst other grievances, with the 'burden of human rites and ceremonies' which oppressed them. Their petition, so far as it regarded the Church service, was as follows:—'that the cross in Baptism, interrogatories ministered to infants, confirmation, as superfluous, may be taken away: baptism not to be ministered by women, and so explained: the cap and surplice not urged: that examination may go before the Communion: that it be ministered with a sermon: that divers terms of "priests" and "absolution" and some other used, with the ring in marriage, and other such like in the Book, may be corrected: the longsomeness of service abridged: Church songs and music moderated to better edification: that the Lord's Day be not profaned: the rest upon Holy Days not so strictly urged: that there may be an uniformity of doctrine prescribed: no popish opinion to be any more taught or defended: no ministers charged to teach their people to bow at the name of Jesus: that the canonical Scripture only be read in the Church.'[1] James consented to a conference to be held in his presence between representatives of the aggrieved and of those responsible for the order of the Church.

The conference was held at Hampton Court on Jan. 14, 16, and 18, 1603–4. On the first day the King addressed the Council with certain bishops and other members of the clergy, and a discussion took place on 'Absolution,' Confirmation, and the private administration of Baptism by lay persons. As to the last, it was agreed that Baptism in private houses should be allowed, but that lay persons should not administer it. On the second day the King met the Puritans, and the discussion centred round the Prayer Book ceremonial. It was agreed that there should be a uniform translation of the Bible, and one form of Catechism throughout the realm; and that the Apocrypha should continue to be read, but not as Scripture. On the third day the ecclesiastics returned and presented to the King the results of their deliberations on the previous day. They had agreed that the rubric should provide an alternative description of the absolution—'or remission of sins,' and that a lawful minister should be present at private Baptism. The King directed that it should be prescribed that such Baptism should be administered by 'the curate or lawful minister present.' Then the Puritans were called in and the meagre results of the conference announced to them. They promised obedience to the King's declared will.[2]

The King, under the authority conferred on the Crown by the Act of Uniformity of 1559, directed his commissioners 'to take some care and payns' as to 'certeyne thinges' which 'require

[1] Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, lxxxviii, pp. 508 ff.
[2] Cardwell, *Conferences*, pp. 138 ff.

some declaration and enlargement by way of explanation.' They drew up the proposed amendments and submitted them to the King, who returned them on Feb. 9 with his approval, and ordered the Archbishop of Canterbury to have the Book reprinted in the amended text, and take order that the Book be procured and observed in every parish church.[1] On March 5 he issued a proclamation enforcing the use of it. It was printed on March 25.

The following are the more important changes. The title of the absolution in Divine Service is expanded, as had been resolved: the title of Confirmation is also enlarged to explain that it is the laying on of hands upon the baptised (this was to satisfy the King himself; the Puritans had wished for the abolition of Confirmation): in private Baptism a 'lawful minister' is insisted on: the final section of the Catechism is added (Cosin asserts that this was written by Overall, but internal evidence seems to prove that the author was Overall's predecessor as Dean of St. Paul's, Alexander Nowell); a suffrage and a prayer for the Queen and the Royal Family are added to the Litany, and six occasional thanksgivings are added to the Occasional Prayers.

All these changes were implicitly authorised by Convocation in the canon of 1604 requiring churchwardens to procure copies of the new Book.

Mention must be made of a literary event of the reign of James I, which was destined to influence the later history of the Prayer Book.

One of the complaints of the Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference related to the imperfection of the translations taken from the Great Bible which still appeared in the text of the Book, viz. in the Psalter, Epistles, Gospels, 'Sentences' before Divine Service, 'Comfortable Words,' and the processional anthems at the Burial of the Dead. (The Lessons, as we have seen,[2] were read from the Bishops' Bible.) The King very willingly ordered a new translation to be made, and the result was the 'Authorised Version' of 1611.

This reign also saw the beginning of the ill-starred attempts to provide a revised Prayer Book for Scotland. In spite of the restoration of a real Episcopate in 1610, the only Book in use in the Scottish Church until 1617 was Knox's *Book of Common Order*. In that year the King introduced the English Book into the royal chapel at Holyrood, and also demanded the general restoration of kneeling at Communion, private Baptism and Communion, four holy-days, corresponding to Christmas, Good Friday, Easter and Whitsunday, and an episcopal blessing of children. The demands were unpopular with the clergy, but were pushed through the General Assembly and the Parliament.[3]

[1] Cardwell, *Synodalia*, i. pp. 210, 292.
[2] See p. 185.
[3] Procter and Frere, p. 144.

The Assembly had already (in 1616) accepted the King's desire that a new Prayer Book should be compiled and, after a first attempt which does not concern our present purpose, a draft was submitted to the King by the Archbishop of St. Andrews in 1619. It was in form a Puritanised edition of the English Book, and it is noteworthy that it contained, as the English Book did not, rubrics ordering the manual acts at the Consecration.[1] This Book was never printed or published, but in the following year an Ordinal was adopted and printed, founded on the English Ordinal, but ignoring the diaconate.[2]

VIII

THE REIGN OF CHARLES I

No authoritative change took place during this reign in the text of the Prayer Book, so far as the English Church was concerned; yet it is a period of some importance to the history of the Book.

In Scotland the attempt to insist on liturgical worship by royal command was continued to its disastrous end. The King in 1629 instructed Laud to communicate with the Scottish bishops in the matter. Maxwell, Bishop of Ross, their representative, produced the Book of 1619. Laud, as was natural, disapproved. He recommended the English Book, and brought the King to his own opinion in the matter. The Scottish bishops, however, were anxious to have a book of their own, and finally Charles instructed a committee of them to prepare a book, 'as near as can be' to the English model, and submit it to the criticism of Laud, Juxon and Wren. The new book was for the most part the work of Maxwell and Wedderburn of Dunblane, but Laud was now willing to co-operate to the best of his power. The result was surprising. The very bishops who had suggested the bare and Puritanical order of 1619 and declined the Book of 1559 now produced a solemn and dignified rite, remarkably similar to the Book of 1549. Their first attempt indeed was rejected by Laud and his colleagues, and Laud himself took the next step by sending to Scotland 'certain notes to be considered of.' The final form of the Book was not reached until 1636, and in 1637 *The booke of Common Prayer, and Administration Of The Sacraments. And other parts of divine Service for the use of the Church of Scotland* was published.[3]

Its chief characteristics as contrasted with the Book of 1559 are the following. The Authorised Version is adopted throughout,

[1] Hall, *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ*, Vol. I, p. xix.
[2] Reprinted in the *Miscellany of the Wodrow Society*, Edinburgh, 1844, pp. 597 ff.
[3] Procter and Frere, pp. 146 ff.

even for the Psalms; the use of the Apocrypha is reduced to a minimum; the prayers for the King, the Royal Family and the clergy, the prayer of St. Chrysostom and the grace are to be used at Divine Service whenever the Litany is not appointed to be said; a prayer for Embertides, adapted from the Ordinal, is provided; Easter Even is given a proper Collect; the Collect for the King precedes the Collect of the day at the Eucharist; at the offertory the priest is directed to present the alms and place the oblations upon the Holy Table; in the prayer for the Church, the commemoration of the saints and the special clause commending to the Divine goodness the 'congregation here assembled in thy name to celebrate the commemoration' of the death of Christ are restored, approximately, as in 1549; in the prayer of consecration the priest is directed to take the Patten into his hands, and to lay his hand upon the vessel or vessels containing the wine; the Invocation of the Holy Spirit is reinserted; immediately after the consecration follows the prayer of oblation, with the *anamnesis* of 1549 and the clause from the same rite praying for a worthy communion, and then the Lord's Prayer with the introduction *As our Saviour Christ*, etc.; the prayer *We do not presume* appears once more in its natural place immediately before Communion; the words of administration are those of 1549, followed by *Amen;* the Commination is ordered to be used on Ash Wednesday. The Book itself contains no Ordinal. An Ordinal is said to have been published in 1636, but no copy of it is known to exist.[1]

In spite of its excellence the Book was a complete failure. An attempt was made to impose it by Royal authority; but the attempt merely produced rioting, and the Book never came into general use.

The work of Laud and his collaborators, however, was not completely wasted. Not only did a few important rubrics find their way into the next revision, but the 1549 type of liturgy was rescued from oblivion and had its effect not only on the present Scottish rite, but also on those of the American Church and of the Church of the Province of South Africa.

A notable ceremonial change was also made under Laud's influence in England. The rubric of 1552 (still printed in our present Book) had allowed the Holy Table at the time of Communion to stand either in the body of the church or in the chancel. Elizabeth, by the authority given to her by the Act of Uniformity, directed that when not in use it should stand in the place of the former high altar, and at Communion time should be set within the chancel. By Laud's directions, however, it was no longer to be moved for the service, but to remain permanently at the East end of the church 'altarwise.'[2] Conse-

[1] Procter and Frere, p. 150.

[2] Hutton, *William Laud*, pp. 16, 73–78. *Lambeth Judgment*, pp. 19 ff.

quently, the rubric ordering the priest to stand 'at the North side of the Table' became difficult, if not impossible, to obey.[1] It appears from the answer of the bishops to the Puritans at the Savoy Conference that at that date at all events their intention was to adopt the Eastward position. 'When' the minister 'speaks to' the people, they said, 'it is . . . convenient that he turn to them. When he speaks for them to God, it is fit that they should all turn another way.'[2] But it seems probable that under Laud the celebrant faced South except for the actual consecration. Thus Andrewes in a note inserted in his own Prayer Book speaks of the Ministers 'the one at the one end, the other at the other, representing the two Cherubims at the Mercy-seat.'[3]

On Jan. 3, 1644–5, the Long Parliament proscribed the Book of Common Prayer, and ordered in its stead the use of the Directory, a manual of the same type as the Scottish Book of Common Order.[4] On Nov. 13 the King issued a proclamation enjoining the Book of Common Prayer and inhibiting the Directory; but during the troubled years, as is well known, the Prayer Book could only be used by stealth. Some of the clergy contrived to make such alterations in their rite as would not expose them to judicial penalties and yet would not altogether destroy the character of the worship of the Church.[5] Jeremy Taylor actually composed a new rite from Catholic sources so as to maintain the traditional liturgical tone while avoiding the words of the penalised Book.[6]

IX

THE RESTORATION OF CHARLES II

In the *Declaration of Breda*, dated April 14, 1660, the King declared 'a liberty to tender consciences,' and undertook to consent to an Act of Parliament devised to secure it.[7] On May 4 a deputation of Puritans was received by him at the Hague, and

[1] See *Lambeth Judgment*, p. 44. Dr. Dearmer, however, maintains that the retention of 'North side' at subsequent revisions was deliberate, and that the phrase was then intended to signify the *sinistrum cornu*. He points out that at Low Mass before the Reformation, if the priest vested at the altar (which had not yet become an episcopal privilege), this was precisely the place at which (facing East, of course) he would say the Lord's Prayer and the preliminary Collect. *The Parson's Handbook* (ed. 1907), p. 355 ff.

[2] Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 353.

[3] *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*, Andrewes' Minor Works, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, p. 150.

[4] Hall, *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ*, Vol. III. Procter and Frere, pp. 158 ff.

[5] See Sanderson, *Nine Cases of Conscience: Occasionally determined.*

[6] W. Jacobson, *Fragmentary Illustrations of the History of the Book of Common Prayer.*

[7] Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, cxiv.

in various private audiences urged him to refrain from the use of the Book of Common Prayer in his private chapel, and to instruct his chaplains not to wear the surplice.[1] Meanwhile the Book had actually been restored in England in some places, and on May 10 the Church service was read before the House of Lords.[2] On the King's return an agitation was promoted to gain complete relief for the Puritan grievances. 'Divers pamphlets were published against the Book of Common-prayer, the old objections mustred up, with the addition of some new ones.'[3] The King ordered the Puritans to submit their complaints in writing. The result was an address in which they accepted the lawfulness of a liturgy, provided that it be 'agreeable to the Word of God . . . neither too tedious in the whole, nor composed of too short prayers, unmeet repetitions or responsals; not to be dissonant from the liturgies of other reformed churches; nor too rigorously imposed'; provided also that the minister be allowed to use his own gifts for prayer. They asked, however, that either a new form might be drawn up, or that the old form should be revised and issued with 'an addition or insertion of some other varying forms in Scripture phrase to be used at the minister's choice.' In particular they urged the abolition of compulsory kneeling at Communion and observance of holy-days of merely human institution, and the abolition of the surplice, the cross in Baptism and bowing at the name of Jesus. They also asked for the disuse of 'erecting altars, bowing towards them, and such like.'[4]

The nine surviving bishops made a very moderate reply, considering the temper of the times. In regard to the request for a liturgy like that of other reformed churches, however, they remark that 'the nearer both their forms and ours come to the liturgy of the ancient Greek and Latin Churches, the less are they liable to the objections of the common enemy.' They would insist on strict conformity, and point out that in practice full liberty is given for the exercise of individual gifts of prayer 'before and after sermon.' They offer no objection, however, to a revision. They desire the continuance of compulsory kneeling at Communion and of the observance of holy-days, but are prepared to leave to the decision of the King the question of compulsion in respect of surplice, cross and bow.[5]

On Oct. 25 the King issued a *Declaration concerning ecclesiastical affairs*, undertaking to appoint a commission consisting of 'learned divines of both persuasions' to revise the Book of Common Prayer, and provide alternative forms to be used at the minister's

[1] Clarendon, *History*, xvi. 234.
[2] Whitelocke, *Memorials*, p. 703.
[3] Preface to B.C.P., 1661.
[4] Cardwell, *Conferences*, pp. 252, 277 ff.
[5] *Documents relating to the Act of Uniformity*, 1662, No. VII. Procter and Frere, pp. 163 ff.

discretion. Meanwhile the Puritan clergy were to be dispensed from using such parts of the Book as they took exception to.[1] Accordingly, on March 25, 1661, he issued Letters Patent appointing twelve bishops and twelve Puritan divines (with nine assessors on each side to fill up such gaps as might be caused by occasional absentees) and authorising them to meet during the next four months to 'advise upon and review' the Book of Common Prayer, to compare it with the most ancient liturgies, to consider objections raised against it, and finally to make such alterations as they should agree to be 'needful or expedient,' 'avoiding, as much as may be, all unnecessary alterations.'[2]

The Conference met at the Savoy on April 15. Sheldon, on behalf of the bishops, asked for the complaints and the proposals of the Puritans to be submitted in writing. On May 4 a committee of the Puritans presented their *Exceptions against the Book of Common Prayer*. They asked amongst other things that the materials of the liturgy might 'consist of nothing doubtful or questioned among pious, learned, and orthodox persons'; that as the first reformers varied as little as possible 'from the Romish forms before in use,' so the present liturgy should be 'so composed as to' attract 'all those who in the substantials of the Protestant religion are of the same persuasions with ourselves'; that alternation between minister and people should be omitted, 'the holy Scriptures . . . intimating the people's part in public prayer to be only with silence and reverence to attend thereunto, and to declare their consent in the close by saying, *Amen*'; that the Litany be changed into one solemn prayer; that no countenance be given to observance of the Lenten fast; that the observance of Saints' days and their vigils be given up; that the exercise of the gift of prayer should not be excluded from any part of public worship, and that part of the liturgy might be omitted at the discretion of the minister; that the Authorised Version be used; that 'Minister,' and 'Lord's-day' be substituted for 'Priest' or 'Curate,' and 'Sunday'; that nothing should be called an 'Epistle' unless it were actually taken from an Epistle; that no phrase should be used implying that all within the communion of the Church were in a state of grace, '(which, had ecclesiastical discipline been . . . executed . . . might be better supposed)'; that one long prayer should be substituted for many short Collects; that the surplice, the cross in Baptism, and kneeling at Communion should be abolished; that longer notice should be given of intention to communicate; that the confession before Communion should be made by the minister alone. They complained that the manner of consecrating was not explicit and that no direction was given for the Fraction; they asked for the

[1] Cardwell, *Conferences*, pp. 286 ff.
[2] *Ibid.*, 298 ff. Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, cxv pp. 588 ff.

re-insertion of the 'Black Rubric,' and for the placing of the Font in a conspicuous position; they objected to the Baptism of children whose parents were unbelievers, unbaptised, excommunicate or notorious sinners, and to the statement in the Catechism of 1604 that children performed Repentance and Faith by their sureties; they objected also to the statement that baptised children have all things necessary to their salvation; they asked that the form of Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick should be precatory.[1]

A few days later Baxter produced 'the Savoy Liturgy,'[2] a compromise between the Anglican and Genevan types. No notice was taken of this; but the bishops, in reply[3] to the *Exceptions*, professed themselves ready to make seventeen concessions, of which the following are the most important: the Epistles and Gospels to follow the Authorised Version; 'For the Epistle' to be used as a heading when the Lesson is not from an Epistle; the Psalms to be corrected from the Great Bible; communicants to give notice 'at least some time the day before'; the confession before Communion to be recited by one of the ministers, the people saying it after him (hitherto the rubric had allowed it to be said by one of the communicants or by the priest, and had directed that he should say it alone in the name of the communicants); the manual acts to be used at the Consecration; the position of the font to be referred to the Ordinary, if it stood where the people could not hear; in the Catechism, 'Yes, they do perform them' to be changed to 'Because they promise them both'; the rubric stating that baptised children 'have all things necessary for their salvation' to be amended; 'or be ready and desirous to be confirmed' to be added to the rubric after Confirmation; in Matrimony, 'I thee honour' to be substituted for 'I thee worship'; in the Burial of the Dead, 'sure and certain' to be omitted before 'hope of the resurrection.'

Convocation had met on May 8. Two joint committees of the two Houses were appointed to draw up forms of service for May 29 and Jan. 30, and another joint committee to compile an order for the Baptism of Adults. This last was completed and received the approval of Convocation before the adjournment.[4]

Meanwhile the Commons had already passed an Act of Uniformity annexing to it the Book of 1604, and continued impatiently to urge the Lords to greater expedition.

During the autumn the bishops, or some of them, were occupied in drawing up a draft for a revised Book, and the result of their labours is preserved in the 'Durham Book,' which is a printed copy of the Book of 1604 with numerous amendments written by the hands of Cosin and Sancroft. These include fourteen

[1] Cardwell, *Conferences*, pp. 303 ff.
[2] P. Hall, *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ*, Vol. IV.
[3] Cardwell, *Conferences*, pp. 335 ff.
[4] Cardwell, *Synodalia*, pp. 340 ff.

out of the seventeen of the bishops' concessions at the Savoy, and eight others which were not granted there.

Parliament met again on Nov. 20, and Convocation on the next day. A committee of bishops was appointed to revise the Common Prayer, but it is obvious that they had anticipated the appointment, for the 'first part' of the Book had already been revised and examined in the Upper House by Nov. 23, the 'second part' by Nov. 27; and the Psalms and the Ordinal were dealt with on Nov. 28 and 29. During the next fortnight the new Preface, the Calendar, the Prayers to be used at Sea and the General Thanksgiving were successively agreed upon. After discussion in the Lower House and the consideration by the Upper House of amendments suggested by the Lower, the whole revision was completed by Dec. 18, and subscribed on Dec. 20.

On Feb. 25, 1661–2, after a debate on the subject in the Privy Council, the King sent the new Book to the House of Lords, recommending that it be annexed to the delayed Uniformity Bill. This was done, and the Bill, with the Book, received the royal assent on May 19. The Book was to come into use before the following St. Bartholomew's Day. Printed copies of the Act and of the Book, duly attested and sealed, were by the provisions of the Act to be procured by the Chapters of every cathedral and collegiate church; copies were also to be delivered to each of the Courts at Westminster and to the Tower of London.

According to the new Preface the objects of the revision were: (1) 'the better direction of them that are to officiate'; (2) elucidation, by (*a*) removal of archaisms, (*b*) explanation of what was ambiguous or 'liable to misconstruction,' and (*c*) 'a more perfect rendering' of Holy Scripture; and (3) the provision of certain 'convenient' additions.

Following this scheme, we may describe the chief alterations as follows:

(1) The rubrics are throughout more explicit, and in particular there are directions for the placing of the alms and also, 'when there is a Communion,' of the bread and wine upon the Holy Table, for a second consecration when necessary, for the veiling of 'what remaineth of the consecrated Elements,' and for the reverent consumption of it ('if any remain') by the priest and other communicants 'immediately after the blessing.'[1]

The Collect for the ensuing day is to be said at the First Evensong, and a memorial of the season throughout Advent and Lent.

Quicunque vult is now for the first time ordered to be *substituted* for the Apostles' Creed. This is an authorisation of a custom which seems to have sprung up spontaneously.[2]

(2) (*a*) In addition to obvious linguistic modernising, we may

[1] On the question of Reservation see pp. 589 ff.

[2] Wren, *Particular Orders*, vi. Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.*, ii. p. 202.

notice the explanations now attached to the titles of Sundays and Festivals.

(*b*) The distinction between the orders of priest and bishop is now clearly mentioned at the moment of Ordination by the insertion of the words 'for the Office, and work of a priest (*or* bishop), in the Church of God, now committed vnto thee by the imposition of our hands.' So also the promise that no lesson shall be inaccurately described as 'the Epistle' is redeemed.

(*c*) All Scriptures are now from the Authorised Version except the Psalter, the Offertory Sentences, and the 'Comfortable Words.' In the manuscript 'Book Annexed' to the Act of Uniformity it is clear that the Psalter has been collated with the Great Bible, as the bishops promised, and also some of the Epistles and Gospels, and an indication is given wherever any words do not represent anything in the Hebrew or the Greek. These indications do not, however, appear in the Sealed Books or any other printed copies.

(3) The principal additions are as follows. The final prayers of the Jacobean Litany now added to Mattins and Evensong; new occasional prayers and thanksgivings; a new Collect for the Third Sunday in Advent; a Proper for a Sixth Sunday after Epiphany; a Collect (altered from the Scottish Book of 1637) for Easter Even; a Lesson 'For the Epistle' on Candlemas Day; a commemoration of the departed in the 'Prayer for the Church Militant' (deliberately refusing any distinction between the saints and other departed servants of God); a benediction of the water of Baptism (omitted since 1549); an Order for the Baptism of Adults; a renewal of vows at Confirmation; two alternative psalms at the Burial of the Dead; Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea; a new and alternative version of *Veni creator*.

Other alterations which do not seem to fit into the scheme of the Preface are as follows. The addition of descriptions to the names in the Calendar; the addition of the doxology to the Lord's Prayer on certain occasions; the breaking up of the *Gloria* into versicle and response at the beginning of Mattins and Evensong and at the Litany;[1] the addition of *Amen* to the collects, which has had the effect in most cases of eliminating the traditional full ending 'who liveth and reigneth,' etc. The 'Black Rubric' from the Prayer Book of 1552 is again inserted, but in a far less objectionable form. In its older form it had declared 'that it is not mente . . . that any adoracion is doone, or oughte to bee doone . . . unto any reall and essenciall presence there beeying of Chrystes naturall fleshe and bloude.' The new form substitutes 'any Corporal Presence of Christ's Naturall Flesh

[1] In Mattins and in the Commination the word *Answer* is inserted before *As it was in the beginning*. Presumably this is an indication that the revisers intended to continue the traditional custom of singing the *Gloria* in two parts antiphonally at the end of a psalm.

and Blood.'[1] There is a rubric justifying the use of the cross in Baptism.

The Passions on Palm Sunday and Good Friday are now cut in half by the assignment of the first chapter as a lesson at Mattins, and the story of the Burial is omitted on Tuesday, Thursday and Friday. A further change is made in the rubric regulating the order of service on days when there is no Communion. In 1549 'table prayers' had been assigned to Wednesdays and Fridays, in the absence of communicants. In 1552 holy-days had been substituted. From 1661 the rubric has read thus: 'Upon the Sundaies, and other Holy dayes (if there be no Communion) shall be said . . .' It had evidently been found that the statutory number of communicants did not send in their names every Sunday; but this is the first rubrical recognition of the possibility of the liturgy not being completed on a Sunday.

The 'State Services' are not strictly a part of the Prayer Book, but the direction to print them appears at the end of the Book Annexed. A special service for the day of the Sovereign's accession had been used ever since the reign of Elizabeth, and is recognised by Canon II of 1640. A new form was put out by James II.[2] It was revised and greatly improved in 1901. The service for Nov. 5 was revised as soon as Convocation had finished with the Prayer Book and, together with those for Jan. 30 and May 29, was sanctioned by Convocation and put forth under the authority of the Crown in 1662.[3]

Thus at last the Church of England was provided with a Service book initiated and authorised by Convocation.[4] The revision, moreover, in spite of the speed with which it was accomplished, was astonishingly thorough. It would be difficult to point to any oversights. On the other hand, it is equally difficult to feel any great enthusiasm for the resultant English rite. The Caroline divines were fond of invoking liturgical precedents, but their knowledge of ancient liturgies was very imperfect, and they do not seem to have had much appreciation of liturgical form. In the Holy Communion service no suggestion seems to have been made for the reassembling of the scattered members of the *anaphora*. The march of the liturgy is interrupted, as it has been since 1552, by the insertion of *We do not presume* between the giving of thanks and the act of consecration; the ceremonial Fraction,

[1] It is possible that the 'Black Rubric' was, as on the previous occasion (see p. 179), inserted by the Privy Council. But if so, there can be no doubt that the insertion was afterwards authorised by Convocation, or by those who had a right to act in its name. Nothing is more remarkable than the scrupulous regard shown by the Houses of Parliament for the exclusive right of the spiritualty to make even verbal amendments in the text of the Book.

[2] It is obvious that no such service would be required during the reign of Charles II, inasmuch as Jan. 30, the day of his *de jure* accession, was otherwise provided for.

[3] Procter and Frere, pp. 645 ff.

[4] Yet, strangely, not imposed by Canon, but only by Act of Parliament.

now ordered for the first time in the reformed rite,[1] seems to be misplaced, so that 'breaking' comes before 'blessing'; the strange arrangement is retained by which the latter part of the Canon, delayed until after Communion, is made alternative to a thanksgiving; and the *anamnesis* of the saving acts of Christ, the most primitive of all liturgical features, is still missing. The end of the service is still overloaded by the transference to this point of the *Gloria in excelsis*, as though a further climax were possible after the act of Communion. No attempt has been made to reduce the long and wearisome exhortations which disfigure both the liturgy and the Baptismal rite. The mind of the Anglican Communion has been permanently confused by the prefixing of a renewal of vows to Confirmation and by the conversion of a rubric into a turgid exhortation which speaks of 'confirming' the baptismal promises. Finally, the service for the Burial of the Dead has no recognisable liturgical form at all. Yet all the time the revisers had ready to hand two most admirable rites, those of 1549 and 1637, a judicious blending of which would have enabled them to avoid the blemishes here reviewed.[2]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brightman, *The English Rite* (1915).
Procter and Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer* (Revised ed., 3rd impression, 1905).
J. H. Blunt, *Annotated Edition of the Book of Common Prayer* (Revised ed., 1895).
Gasquet and Bishop, *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer.*
H. Gee, *Elizabethan Prayer-Book* (1902).
A. Sparrow, *Rationale.*
J. Foxe, *Acts and Monuments* (new ed., 8 vols., 1837).
M. Bucer, *Scripta Anglicana* (1577).
G. Burnet, *History of the Reformation* (ed. Pocock, 1865).
E. Cardwell, *Documentary Annals.*
—— *Synodalia.*
—— *History of Conferences about the Book of Common Prayer.*
Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica* (2nd ed., 1876).
R. W. Dixon, *History of the Church of England from 1529 to 1570.* 6 vols.
W. H. Frere, Vol. V of *History of the English Church.*
Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents* (3 vols., 1871).
Documents relating to the Act of Uniformity of 1662 (1862).
P. Hall, *Reliquiæ Liturgicæ* (1847).
Keeling, *Liturgiæ Britannicæ* (1851).
J. Dowden, *Annotated Scottish Communion Office* (1884).
Report to Convocation on the Ornaments of the Church and its Ministers, 1908.
Anglo-Catholic Library (for works of Andrewes, Laud and others).
Parker Society Publications (Liturgical texts and other documents).

[1] The Fraction ordered in the 1549 Book was a breaking of each particle before communicating the people.

[2] Attention may be drawn to the fact that in the Book of 1637 the Prayer for the Church stands in the same place as in those of 1559 and 1661. Thus the extreme length of the combined Canon and Intercessions of 1549 and of the present Scottish rite is avoided.

PART II

THE PRAYER-BOOK SERVICES: THEIR SOURCES AND RATIONALE

THE CALENDAR

By THE EDITOR

THE purpose of the liturgical year is to lead the faithful to conform themselves ever more completely, by prayer, sacrament, and obedience, to the life of God revealed in the flesh. The year circles round two poles, one movable and the other fixed, namely, Easter and Christmas with their dependent feasts and periods of preparation. Its secondary purpose is to make the Communion of Saints a reality, as we recall those mighty ones in the order of grace who have reflected in their lives and deaths somewhat of the Light of the World. As the Anglican Communion recovers its Catholic heritage, the Calendar becomes of increasing importance, so that a somewhat lengthy treatment of the subject is here demanded.

I

The Jewish Calendar.

The Jews had three great feasts: (i) Passover, a primitive festival of nomads, was celebrated on the night of the full moon (*i.e.* the 14th, the months being lunar) of the month (originally Abib, afterwards Nisan) nearest the Spring equinox; the sacrifice of a lamb was the chief feature. When the Hebrews settled in Canaan, the Passover coalesced with the agricultural spring festival of unleavened bread, the first-fruits of barley harvest. It was traditionally associated with the flight from Egypt. (ii) Pentecost, the Feast of Weeks, fell on the fiftieth day after Passover and marked the completion of wheat harvest. (iii) The Feast of the Ingathering (Tabernacles) closed the agricultural year with the harvesting of the vine and olive crop in September. Of these feasts Passover and Pentecost passed over into the Christian Church; Tabernacles left no mark. The association of Passover with the deliverance of Israel from bondage and with the killing and eating of the Paschal Lamb had a great influence on Christian theology, as is seen as early as 1 Cor. v. 7: 'Our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ.'

A nomadic tribe, normally travelling by night, attached great importance to the moon, and so we find the New Moon a day

of importance so late as the first century A.D. (Col. ii. 16). Associated with the New Moon in early times was the Sabbath (cf. 2 Kings iv. 23),[1] and the (Hebrew) week of which it formed a part.[2]

The Gentile Calendar.

The Jews were widely spread in the Roman Empire and their observance of the week made it generally known. Another strong influence was the planetary week,[3] part of an international system of astrology by which all time was apportioned to the sway of the heavenly bodies. Which was the more potent in establishing the ultimate universal triumph of the week is doubtful; evidently each played its part. The Jewish observance of one day in seven as holy is reflected in the Christian Lord's Day—apart from this a *weekly* commemoration of the Resurrection would hardly have arisen. But it is noteworthy that the names of the days of the week in Western Europe are nearly all of pagan origin.

The Earliest Christian Age.

Jewish Christians naturally observed their own festivals for a time, adding the Christian days. A survival of the primitive custom appears in Eusebius' description of the more orthodox section of the Ebionites: 'They observed the Sabbath and the other Jewish customs . . . yet, on the other hand, each Lord's Day they celebrated rites similar to ours, in memory of the Saviour's resurrection' (*H.E.*, iii. 27). St. Paul vindicated the right of Gentile converts to ignore the Sabbath (Col. ii. 16). A curiously exact anticipation of later custom, if we are not reading too much into it, is found in Acts xx. 7–11. The Apostle meets the congregation at Troas 'upon the first day of the week,' *i.e.* after sunset on Saturday. His exhortation lasts till midnight and after. He then 'breaks the bread'; probably a meal follows, and then social intercourse until dawn. We already have in germ the anticipation of a festival, a vigil, and an early celebration of the Eucharist. 'The Lord's Day' (Apoc. i. 10) was an early name for the first day of the week, and 1 Cor. xvi. 2 shows that Christians met regularly on that day.

[1] The origin of the Sabbath is obscure. The two most interesting theories are that which connects it with the Kenites, the wandering clan of smiths, and Meinhold's view that it was originally a full-moon festival. The theory of Babylonian origin is now generally abandoned. According to Babylonian records on the 1st, 14th, 19th, 21st and 28th days of at least some months certain things were forbidden to the king. Not much can be based upon this.

[2] The Hebrew week as a fourth part of the lunar month may have originated independently of the planetary week.

[3] The seven days were allotted to the sun, moon, and five planets.

II

We pass on to the early centuries of Church history, dividing the subject into (i) the year; (ii) the week; (iii) Easter and the movable commemorations depending on it; (iv) Christmas and Epiphany, with their dependent feasts; (v) the Martyrologies.

(i) *The year* has been reckoned in various ways. The Jewish New Year begins at the end of September, during the pause before Palestinian agricultural work restarts. There was also the system, connected with the Mosaic law, by which the year began with the month March–April—'this month shall be unto you the beginning of months' (Ex. xii. 2). The Roman Calendar in the first century began with January 1. The Church apparently shrank from following the heathen custom, and after a time December 25 was reckoned as beginning the year. Subsequently March 25 supplanted December 25. In the England of Bede's time, December 25 began the year. The Normans introduced March 25, which held the field until 1752.[1] By the side of the calendrical year is the liturgical year, beginning with Advent.

The division of the year into twelve months comes, as the names show, from the older Roman Calendar. The numbering of the days of the month consecutively is traced in the sixth century and began to prevail generally in the fourteenth.

(ii) *The Week.* With the virtual disappearance of Jewish Christianity, Sunday was observed in conscious opposition to the Jewish Sabbath instead of as a supplement to it. A few well-known passages may be cited. 'No longer *sabbatising* but living according to the Lord's Day' (Ignatius, *Magn.*, 9). 'The present Sabbaths are not acceptable to me . . . We celebrate joyfully the eighth day, in which Jesus also rose from the dead' (Barnabas, xv. 8, 9). 'We all hold our common meeting on the day of the Sun,' the day of the Creation and of the Resurrection (Justin, *Apol.*, i. 67). A less-known passage is that in the Ethiopic Didascalia (ii. 47), which calls Sunday 'the Christian Sabbath.'

Saturday in the fourth century had become a day of liturgical observance in the East. In the West, especially at Rome, it tended to become a fast day, by prolongation of the Friday fast.[2] Wednesday and Friday were fast days, having been

[1] The year of the Orthodox Eastern Church, in so far as it is distinguished from the civil year, begins on the Sunday before Septuagesima, or on September 1, the day assigned to the creation of the world, which was for a long time the beginning of the civil (and Church) year. The East Syrians begin on October 1.

[2] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, pp. 230 ff. Note that *Sabbatum* has survived in Western service books. See Tertullian, *Apol.*, 16, *Ad Nat.*, 13, for the Gentile associations of Saturday and Sunday. Cf. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, iv. 95, for the Sabbath as a fast day among the Jews.

chosen at an early date to distinguish Christian practice from Jewish. Compare *Didache*, 8: 'Let not your fasts be with the hypocrites, for they fast on Monday and Thursday, but do you fast on Wednesday and Friday.' Although no other cause for Sunday observance than the Resurrection need be sought, it is worth noting that the association of days of the week with heathen divinities would have made almost every day unsuitable for the Gentile Christians' weekly festival, except Sunday, which as the day of light was given a Christian meaning. So Clement of Alexandria remarks that Wednesday and Friday are called after Hermes and Aphrodite.[1]

(iii) *Easter*, with its Passover origin, connects us with the Jewish Church. Its original signification is somewhat obscure. The word Pascha is derived from the Aramaic word for Passover. The form assumed in Syriac suggests a root meaning 'rejoicing,' while the Greek writers connect it with πάσχω, 'suffer.' This ambiguity of interpretation reflects the usage of the Church. Before the fourth century the word probably stood for the festival of the Resurrection with the fast immediately preceding. Sometimes it was extended to cover Holy Week, or the forty days of Lent, just as Pentecost was used of the whole season from Easter to Whitsunday. Among the East Syrians Pascha means Maundy Thursday.

There were two views regarding the date of Easter. The larger part of the Church, laying stress on the Resurrection, kept the festival always on a Sunday. In the Province of Asia the Jewish date of the killing of the Paschal Lamb, Nisan 14, was followed. The tradition was traced back to 'Philip, one of the twelve Apostles . . . and John . . . who leaned back on the Lord's breast.' So we learn from Polycrates, who is corroborated by Irenæus (Eus. *H.E.*, v. 23, 24). The Asian custom is connected with the account in the Fourth Gospel, according to which our Lord's death coincided with the killing of the Paschal Lamb on Nisan 14 (*i.e.* the day which began at 6 p.m. on Thursday and included the Last Supper; John xix. 31, 36). The Gospel uses 'glory' to describe the Crucifixion, xii. 23–33, and is clearly the ultimate source of the joint commemoration of the Death and the Resurrection. The Sunday commemoration of the Pascha goes back to the ideas which underlie 1 Cor. v. 7, 8; xv. 20.

The Asian Christians were called Quartodecimans, observers of (Nisan) 14. So far back as Pope Xystus I (*c.* 115) the divergence was noted. At that period it was tolerated, but about 190 Pope Victor excommunicated the Asians for their practice, calling forth strong protests from Irenæus and other bishops.

[1] *Strom.*, vii. 12. One fasts from covetousness and voluptuousness on those days. Note the French names *mercredi* and *vendredi*, from Mercury and Venus.

The Council of Nicæa decided against the Quartodecimans, whose influence was henceforward confined to a few communities.

The Christians at first followed the Jewish reckoning of Passover. But the lunar Calendar of the Jews needed frequent rectification by the insertion of an intercalary spring month, which was decided empirically, regard being paid to the state of the crops in Palestine. Reluctance to follow Jewish guidance and the growing alienation of the two religions would lead the Christians to develop rules of their own. Hippolytus in 222 drew up a Rule for finding Easter, which is inscribed on his statue in the Lateran Museum.[1] Using the best science of the day, it made Easter fall on the first full moon after the vernal equinox. This pioneer effort was full of errors; later the Church of Alexandria was regarded as the authority for settling the date. The Church of Rome in the sixth century adopted the Alexandrian computation, revising it from time to time according to requirements. The dispute between the Celtic Churches and the Roman missionaries in the seventh century was due to the long isolation of the British Isles, during which the Celts had no opportunity of keeping in touch with the Roman revisions.

In recent years a demand has sprung up for a fixed Easter. Sentimental attachment to the Paschal full moon diminishes when it is realised that the ecclesiastical full moon of the Gregorian Calendar is not identical with the astronomical full moon and may be three days later than it. The practical reasons for reform are the dislocation of school terms by the present system, the desire in Northern lands to have milder weather for the first holiday of the year, and, in Great Britain, the importance of having only one Easter holiday in the financial year, which ends on April 5. In 1926 a League of Nations Committee reported in favour of fixing Easter on the Sunday following the second Saturday in April. A measure authorising adhesion to the reform on the part of the Government of the day when opportunity should arise passed the British Parliament in 1928.[2] But the popular demand for a change is only half-hearted and the present system may have a long life yet; in any case considerable expense would be incurred by the Church in revising service books and long notice would have to be given.

It was convenient to start from Easter. We now take the movable dates governed by Easter.

Lent. In the ante-Nicene Church there was a considerable variety of custom. The fast before Easter lasted one, two, or more days. It was specially connected with the preparation for

[1] Discovered in 1551. See Lawlor-Oulton, *Eusebius*, ii. 210.

[2] The Church of England, speaking through the Convocations and the Assembly, approved the change, provided the consent of the principal Christian communions had first been obtained.

the Easter baptisms. The Nicene Council (Can. v.) refers to it in general terms, merely as a season before which synods shall be held. In the fourth century the progress of Lenten observance can be traced in the Festal Letters of Athanasius, who, *c.* 340, urges a fast of forty days. Considerable divergence prevailed in the fifth century, as Sozomen attests (*H.E.*, vii. 19). Episcopal Lent Pastorals go back to the letters of the Bishops of Alexandria announcing the date of Easter sent on January 6, the news of which was passed on to their dioceses by the bishops.

Septuagesima, etc. Quinquagesima is the 50th day before Easter, Sexagesima and Septuagesima being formed by incorrect analogy. These Sundays were given special masses at Rome about the seventh century. Constantinople also set these three Sundays apart, designating Septuagesima and the preceding Sunday by the subjects of the Gospels, Sexagesima by the name Carnival (οἱ ἀπόκρεω, late Lat. 'carnelevamen,' solace of the flesh); in the week following no meat may be eaten. After Quinquagesima (cheese-fast Sunday) the great fast, including cheese and eggs, begins.

Ash Wednesday ('dies cinerum') and the three following days were added in the seventh century to make up the number of forty week-days. Their liturgical names are feria iv, feria v, feria vi, et sabbatum, in capite jejunii ('at the beginning of the fast'). At Milan Lent still begins on the Sunday following these days,[1] and in the Breviary the Lent Antiphons and Chapters begin on the Sunday.

Mid-Lent Sunday (the fourth) is known as Refreshment Sunday, from the Feeding of the Five Thousand in the Gospel, and perhaps from the phrase in the Collect, 'may mercifully be relieved,' the Latin 'respiremus' meaning literally 'may have a breathing time, or refreshment.' In England various customs are associated with this Sunday, also called 'Mothering Sunday,' a title which Wheatly (1710) apparently considers to be a popular corruption of 'Midlenting Sunday.'[2] On this Sunday the Pope, wearing rose-coloured vestments, blesses a golden rose, symbolical of the joy of the Church, and sends it to some favoured person; in 1923 the Queen of Spain.

[1] In St. J. Hope and Atchley's *An Introduction to English Liturgical Colours*, the recommended use, based on that of mediæval England, is not to begin 'Lenten White' until the Sunday.

[2] The wafers still baked in Hampshire seem to be a survival of *pain bénit*. Possibly pre-Christian elements are to be found in some of the Mothering Sunday customs. For one mediæval usage cf. Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People*, p. 121: 'The people of the chapelries were required on several of the great festivals of the Church to communicate at the mother church, and on one or more of these festivals to visit the mother church in procession with flags flying.' Apparently after the Reformation the idea of an offering was transferred to literal mothers. But the subject is obscure and needs a critical investigation.

Passion Sunday ('Dominica in Passione Domini') is the title of the fifth Sunday, but Passion Week is an incorrect phrase.

Palm Sunday gets its name from the Procession of Palms, which came to the West *c.* 800 from Jerusalem, where it is found towards the end of the fourth century; see the Pilgrimage of Etheria (Silvia).

Maundy Thursday[1] ('feria v in cœna domini') was from early times a day of peculiar solemnity as commemorating the institution of the Eucharist, in spite of Thursday's being an a-liturgical day owing to its association with Jupiter. It was marked by ceremonial bathing of candidates for Baptism. The evening Eucharist found in some places, and finally forbidden by the Trullan Council in 692, was perhaps in origin an early Eucharist of Friday, regarded as beginning at sunset on Thursday, but its popularity was due to the desire of imitating the circumstances of the Last Supper, which also influenced the ritual.

Good Friday ('Parasceve,' *i.e.* preparation). In the primitive Church the special feature of this day was the fast in preparation for Baptism, which took place before the Easter Eucharist. The fast is mentioned as early as the *Didache* and included others besides the candidates and the baptiser. It is not clear whether an original Friday fast was extended to include Saturday, or *vice versa*. The reason for fasting, referred to by Tertullian, that the Bridegroom is taken away, suggests the former. But in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (v. 18) the minimum requirement is the observance of the Saturday fast, and the mystical reason is given apparently as an afterthought. Probably, therefore, Good Friday originated in a backward extension of the preparation for Baptism, though the associations of the day must have been present to some extent from the first.

There was no celebration of the Eucharist on this day, but by the eighth century the Mass of the Presanctified is attested at Rome. It was simply a common participation by the faithful of the previously consecrated elements, similar to that practised by solitaries, and by the faithful during the persecutions. The non-eucharistic services which have become associated with the day—a mimetic representation of our Lord's experiences in the Way of the Cross, the Veneration of the Cross, and even a Three Hours' Service of readings, hymns and preaching—were all observed in the fourth century at Jerusalem, where Etheria saw them. There was also a service resembling Tenebræ on the earlier days of the week.[2]

[1] The title (from '*mandatum* novum do vobis' of John xiii. 34, sung in connection with the feet-washing) has been restored in the Scottish, American and English 1928 Books.

[2] Good Friday is not technically a day on which church-going is obligatory in the Roman Catholic Church, though it is a fast of obligation.

Easter Even ('the great sabbath,' 'the holy sabbath') had originally no special services, but it gradually received the ceremonies and attendant rites of the Easter vigil, especially the Baptismal Service. The Easter Mass then was at midnight, preceded by the vigil services, as in the Eastern Church to-day. In the modern Roman rite the first Mass of Easter is said on the morning of Easter Even.

Easter Week. Following the lead of the Jewish Passover, the early Church observed the Octave of Easter. Jerusalem in the fourth century had stations[1] for each day, and on the Sunday commemorated Christ's appearance to St. Thomas. According to the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 33), slaves were to have respite from labour 'all the great week [*i.e.* Holy Week], and that which follows it,' in order to have leisure for instruction—an interesting proof of the primitive character of Easter holidays. The newly-baptised wore their white robes for a week, so that the Sunday in the West came to be called 'Dominica in albis' (depositis). '*Low* Sunday' is derived from 'Laudes,' the first word of the old Sequence.

Rogation Days. The observance of the three days before the Ascension originated about 470 with Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne, who ordered litanies to be said out of doors at a time of earthquake. It spread through Gaul and to England, and later, about 800, reached Rome. Litanies of the type still used in the Eastern Liturgies are found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 10, 13). That out-of-door litanies were so popular in the West was doubtless due to their meeting the needs supplied in pre-Christian times by processions round the fields in which the crops were growing. (See on April 25 below.) St. Isidore of Seville (d. 636) says that we fast after Ascension Day and before Pentecost, the days in which the Bridegroom is taken away.

The Ascension (Holy Thursday, in old English usage) is first traced in the latter part of the fourth century. St. Augustine, *c.* 400, speaks of it as universally observed. Seeing that at Constantinople and elsewhere it was celebrated outside the city, it seems probable that Jerusalem was the place of origin. There, we learn from Etheria, the faithful went in pilgrimage to Bethany, continuing the dramatic representations of Holy Week.

Pentecost (Whitsunday in English, *i.e.* White Sunday, from its associations with the white robes of Baptism) meant the fifty days after Easter, or the concluding day of the period. From the beginning of the fourth century the latter sense began to prevail. Very elaborate ceremonial was practised at Jerusalem in that

[1] The technical meaning of this word is the 'solemn services held [at Rome] at different churches when the Pope celebrated, supported by the twenty-five parish priests and their people' (Frere, *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy*, i. 17).

century. Pentecost was a great feast as early as Tertullian's time (*De Bapt.*, 19).

Whitsun Week.[1] The octave is very early. 'After you have kept the festival of Pentecost, keep one week more festival, and, after that, fast' (*Apost. Const.* v. 20).

Trinity Sunday is thought to owe its origin to the reception of heretics on the Sunday following Pentecost, which would give it a kind of 'Orthodoxy Sunday' character. But the first attaching of the idea to the Sunday was at Liége in the tenth century. Pope John XXII enjoined the universal observance of the festival in 1334. Its special popularity in England was due to its association with Thomas of Canterbury, who was consecrated on the Octave of Pentecost. The English (Sarum) reckoning of Sundays after Trinity, instead of after Pentecost, is also followed by the Lutherans; so too by the ancient Carmelite Rite and the Dominicans.[2]

Corpus Christi falls on the 60th day after Easter, Thursday after Trinity Sunday, the first free Thursday after the cycle of festivals is over. It was first observed in the diocese of Liége in 1247, and was made of general obligation by Urban IV in 1264. The English 1928 Book provides Collect, Epistle and Gospel for 'Thanksgiving for the Institution of Holy Communion,' and by a rubric, 'The Proper Preface of Maundy Thursday may be used,' shows that the commemoration will fall on a day other than Maundy Thursday. The Scottish Book does likewise, and adds a rubric forbidding the use of the service on a Sunday.[3]

(iv) *Christmas and Epiphany.* These are the two characteristic feasts of the Incarnation, in West and East. The dates go back to immemorial antiquity. Dec. 25 was significant as the winter solstice. It was celebrated as the birthday of Mithras and of Sol Invictus. In the form of the feast Kikellia it can be traced at Alexandria back to 239 B.C. A parallel festival at Alexandria on January 6 celebrated the birthday of Osiris. Two thousand years before Christ a reformed Calendar was introduced; at that time the winter solstice fell on January 6 of the Julian Calendar. By the fourth century B.C., owing to the inaccuracy of the Calendar, the solstice was on December 25. It is thought

[1] The Prayer Book speaks of 'Monday in Whitsun Week,' of which 'Whitmonday' is a popular abbreviation. Whitsun Monday, *i.e.* Whitsunday Monday, is not used.

[2] See A. A. King, *Notes on the Catholic Liturgies*, pp. 78, 90.

[3] The Roman Communion has two other movable greater feasts of our Lord. The Sacred Heart falls on the Friday following the octave of Corpus Christi; first observed in 1685, it was made of universal obligation by Pius IX in 1856. In 1925 Pius XI instituted the feast of Christ the King, on the last Sunday of October. Its purpose is to teach the dominion of Christ in the world, exercised through His Church, as against the encroachments of the lay secular State.

that a Hellenistic festival may have been introduced soon after the founding of Alexandria, by the side of the national Egyptian festival which adhered to the traditional date. The feast of the Dedication (1 Macc. iv. 56; John x. 22) was on Chislev (approximately December 25). The winter solstice was therefore marked out by immemorial usage as appropriate for a religious feast.[1]

The earliest evidence for Epiphany is in Clement of Alexandria, who tells us (*Strom.*, i. 21) that the followers of Basilides spent the night of January 5/6 as a vigil and the day itself as a festival of our Lord's baptism. This fits in with the conception of Baptism as illumination, and with the pagan celebration of the day as the birthday of a god.[2] By about 300 Epiphany had established itself among the orthodox of the East. It was the festival both of the birth and of the baptism of our Lord, as Cassian tells us.[3] The traditional association of the day with the marriage feast at Cana[4] may be connected with the feast of Dionysus, identified with Osiris and also with Aeon, on January 5/6, our Lord being thought of as giving the true wine in contrast with the falsehoods of paganism.

Epiphany reached the West in the second half of the fourth century, perhaps appearing in Gaul first. Augustine at the beginning of the fifth century says it is observed throughout the world, except by the Donatists. For a time at Rome it seems to have competed with December 25 for the place of honour. The difficulty was solved by making January 6 pre-eminently a commemoration of the visit of the Magi, a peculiarly Western meaning of the feast.[5]

The choice of December 25 in the West was doubtless due to the pagan associations of the day, and to the wise desire of the Church to direct the habits of the people into Christian channels. But probably the well-known theory of Hippolytus was a contributing factor. This writer concluded that the Crucifixion took place on March 25 of 29 A.D.; also that the Annunciation was on that day, an exact number of years having elapsed since the Incarnation. Christ's birth therefore was on December 25 (March 25 was also considered to have been the date of the

[1] Summarised from the writer's discussion in *New Testament Problems*, pp. 2–5; see also p. 90.

[2] In Alexandria at first Osiris, later Aeon, the (new) age; see Epiphanius, *Panarion*, li. 22.

[3] *Coll.* x. 2. So also Epiphanius and Etheria.

[4] Cf. the second lesson at Evensong and the Gospel for the Second Sunday after Epiphany.

[5] See Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, pp. 75–80. The Proper Preface of Epiphany in the Roman Mass is of the Incarnation: 'Quia cum Unigenitus tuus in substantia nostræ mortalitatis apparuit, nova nos immortalitatis suæ luce reparavit'; the prayers refer to the Magi. The name 'Theophania' in the old Roman Calendar shows the Eastern origin of the feast.

Creation). The Philocalian Calendar, representing the usage at Rome in 336,[1] refers to Christmas under December 25: 'Natus Christus in Betleem Judæae,' and probably implies some liturgical observance. In 386 Chrysostom declared that Christmas had been introduced at Antioch fewer than ten years previously. Eventually the double celebration made its way in the East, though the Armenians still keep January 6 only.

Advent as a preparation for Christmas seems to have originated in Gaul in the sixth century. Thus Cæsarius of Arles, *c.* 542, urged the faithful to prepare for their Christmas Communion for some days before ('ante plures dies'). Later the period from November 11 to December 24 was known as the Lent ('quadragesima') of St. Martin. The length of the preparatory period varied; two, three, or even six Sundays[2] are attested. The four Sundays now observed date from Gregory the Great; however, for some time to come the liturgical year began on the vigil of Christmas. In the East preparation for Christmas begins on November 15.[3]

(v) *Martyrologies.*[4] The prototype of the Christian martyrs is the great cloud of witnesses (or martyrs) mentioned in Heb. xii. 1, where the special reference is to the heroes of the Maccabæan rising. Then first perhaps in the history of the world a community organised as a church resisted unto blood, from motives primarily religious, an attempt to make its manner of life conform to that prescribed by a centralising State.[5] The Seven Brethren of 2 Macc. vii. alone among pre-New Testament heroes have passed into the Calendar of the Western Church (Aug. 1).[6] The Church, then, found the framework of its martyr-concept ready made. The concept itself grew out of the *imitatio Christi*, the desire for identification with our Lord in His Passion and Crucifixion. The example of St. Stephen and the teaching

[1] See below.

[2] So still in the Ambrosian and Mozarabic Calendars.

[3] For January 1, February 2, March 25 see below.

[4] A martyrology was originally a calendar in which days to be observed, predominantly entombments of martyrs, were entered. In the early Middle Ages it had acquired its modern sense of a list of martyrs, etc., with brief descriptions of their lives and deaths, for reading aloud.

[5] See C. G. Montefiore, *Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings*, pp. 30 ff., for the later Jewish teaching about martyrdom. Christianity developed an exultation in martyrdom foreign to Rabbinic teaching, which regarded it as a sad necessity. One must suffer for the cause, *lishmah*, not for the sake of reward, which, however, would come. Great veneration was felt for the martyrs of the Hadrianic persecution, of whom Aqiba was the most eminent. 'Where the public Sanctification, or the open Profanation, of God's name is concerned, a man must be prepared to give his life. Where that is not in question, a man may rightly violate every injunction of the Law in order to save his life'—except as regards idolatry, unchastity and murder (p. 231).

[6] The prayers of this day in the Roman Missal treat their intercession as being on an equal footing with those of Christian martyrs.

of St. Paul about union with Christ in His death, added to the continual influence of the Passion-narratives of the Gospels, contributed to form a flame-like intensity of spirit unequalled in human history.

A few passages from the *Acta Martyrum* will illustrate the prevailing ideas. Christ suffers and triumphs in His martyrs (Epistle of Church of Vienne and Lyons [1]). The martyr goes straight to God (*ib.*), entering heaven 'by the shortest way' (Passion of Procopius). The intercession of the martyrs is powerful (Potamiæna, Eus. *H.E.*, vi. 5). In the Acts of Maximus we read of 'the grace of Christ which will save me eternally through the prayers of all the saints' [who have prevailed in martyrdom]. The Church on earth has 'fellowship with the holy martyrs, and through them with the Lord Jesus Christ' (Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas). The earthly remains of the martyrs are revered. The bones are laid in a suitable place (Martyrdom of Polycarp; Acts of Justin and his Companions). They are 'carefully guarded to the glory of Christ and the praise of His martyrs' (Acts of Carpus, Papylus and Agathonice). The place is visited on the anniversary of the martyrdom, or birthday (into eternal life) as it is called. Other martyrs' bodies are moved to be near that of a famous martyr, such as Cyprian (Acts of Maximilian). The pagans tried to hinder the cult, in the case of the martyrs of Vienne and Lyons, by burning the bodies to ashes, which were cast into the Rhône. Martyrdoms often took place on festival days; for example, that of Polycarp, and later that of Pionius on the same day, so that in some cases Saints' days perpetuated a heathen festival.

If we now return to 2 Maccabees, we shall see how naturally these ideas arose out of Judaism. Chap. vii is essentially a martyrology. The sufferings were endured at a heathen feast (compare vi. 7 with vii. 42). Fellowship with the departed is very close. Judas offers sacrifice for the slain—'holy and godly was the thought'—'that they might be released from their sin' (xii. 43–45). Onias the high priest is seen in vision 'with outstretched hands invoking blessing on the whole body of the Jews,' and Jeremiah appears with 'exceeding glory . . . he who prayeth much for the people and the holy city' (xv. 12–14). Prophets being held in such veneration, their sepulchres were probably built long before the time of our Lord (see Matt. xxiii. 29).

If the martyr, about to enter the immediate presence of His Lord, was asked to intercede for those on earth, it was an easy step to transfer his prerogative to the confessor, a martyr (witness), though not actually unto death. When persecutions

[1] Cf. also the *Quo Vadis?* legend according to the more probable interpretation.

ceased, the ascetics, like the martyrs and confessors termed 'athletes,' succeeded to the estimation in which these had been held and were reckoned 'friends of God' in a special sense.[1]

The Western Calendar, a modified form of which has survived in the English Prayer Book, goes back to the local list of the Church of Rome. It is convenient to start from 354 and work first backwards, then forwards. In that year Philocalus put forth a Calendar, which incorporated two lists important for our purpose: (*a*) the 'depositiones' (burial days) of the Popes from Lucius (255–257) to Silvester (314–337), ten in number; and (*b*) the 'depositiones' of twenty-five martyrs. The January entries will show what the document is like.[2]

These lists formed a conspectus of shrines in the cemeteries round about Rome, where anniversaries were kept. Thus St. Agnes was commemorated at the Cemetery on the Via Nomentana. The word 'natăle,' or 'natalis (dies),'[3] was extended to cover any day of remembrance, such as the anniversary of a bishop's accession to the episcopate. The date of the first bishop in the Philocalian list is significant. Interest in the official character of the Roman bishops seems to have begun about 240 under Fabian, and there is an element of uncertainty in earlier episcopates. The official commemoration of the accession of the popes began towards the end of the third century, and brought with it the festival of the Chair of Peter on February 22,[4] which supplanted the pagan feast of Caristia with its cult of the dead.

Omitting many interesting problems we confine ourselves to two questions: (*a*) the feast of SS. Peter and Paul and (*b*) the days following Christmas.

(*a*) The Philocalian entry for June 29 is: 'III Kal. Jul. Petri in Catacumbas et Pauli Ostense Tusco et Basso cons.' ('Peter at the catacombs and Paul on the Ostian Way in the Consulate of

[1] While this is the distinction between martyrs and confessors, the second-century sense of 'martyr,' one who undergoes examination in a court and confesses the faith consistently, persisted for a long time.

[2] See H. Lietzmann, *Die drei ältesten Martyrologien*. (This section is based mainly on his book *Petrus und Paulus in Rom*, and article supplementing it in *Harvard Theological Review*, April 1923, and on W. H. Frere, *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy*, I. The Calendar.)

[Depositio Episcoporum]	III	Idus Januarias	Miltiadis in Callisti.
	XVIII	Kal. Feb.	Marcellini in Priscillæ.
[Depositio Martyrum]	XIII	Kal. Feb.	Fabiani in Callisti et Sebastiani in Catacumbas.
	XII	Kal. Feb.	Agnetis in Nomentana.

[3] Properly of martyrs.

[4] This festival disappeared at Rome but persisted in Gaul, where, to avoid Lent, it was transferred to January 18. In the ninth century it returned to Rome on that date and, its origin being forgotten, was taken to commemorate the giving of the keys to St. Peter.

Tuscus and Bassus,' *i.e.* 258.) This states that in 354 St. Peter was commemorated 'at the Catacombs,' *i.e.* St. Sebastian on the Appian Way, and St. Paul on the Ostian Way. This is puzzling, and it is suggested[1] that the original text of the source was: 'Petri in Vaticano, Pauli vero in Via Ostensi, utriusque in Catacumbas.' Now about 200 the graves of the Apostles were shown on the Vatican and the Ostian Way. It appears that the bodies were taken in 258, during the Valerian persecution, for safety to the Catacomb of St. Sebastian. The cult will have begun then, for there were no liturgical martyrs' festivals before 250, and in the original resting-places there was no room for gatherings for worship. When churches were built under Constantine and the bodies were restored to their old resting-places, June 29 was taken as the day of martyrdom. The divergent dates found elsewhere (see below) suggest that the day (or days) of death was unknown, and that June 29 commemorates some historical fact, such as the initiation of the liturgical festival.

(*b*) The liturgical year in the Philocalian Calendar begins on December 25, as also in the oldest Syriac Martyrology, based on the Greek one of Asia Minor. Gregory of Nyssa, in his Sermon in Praise of Basil, gives a list of festivals beginning with Christmas. He agrees with the Syriac in putting Stephen on December 26. As early as the Epistle of the Church of Vienne and Lyons he appears as the 'perfect martyr,' the prototype of all that followed (Eus. *H.E.*, v. 2), and so fittingly begins the year. The Eastern (Syriac) Martyrology gives 'John and James the apostles in Jerusalem' on the 27th; Gregory gives Peter, James, John and Paul for this and the following days.[2] The Carthaginian Martyrology (*c.* 500) has 'John the Baptist and James the Apostle, whom Herod killed'—correcting the apparent error of the Eastern list. On December 28 the Eastern gives Paul and Peter, in this order, apparently a Western pair following the Eastern pair John and James, and ascribes this entry to Rome. So if June 29 was known, it was evidently taken as a local custom. The Carthaginian Martyrology substitutes the Holy Innocents. The West having already adopted June 29 for Peter and Paul, December 28 was unacceptable.[3]

The original Calendars were purely local. Before long famous commemorations were added from other Churches.

[1] So Lietzmann. G. La Piana, who in *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, Jan. 1921, controverts some of Lietzmann's conclusions, agrees with this reconstruction of the text.

[2] Basil followed on Jan. 1, being thus assimilated to the Apostles.

[3] Clearly there is abundant opportunity of error in the development of the tradition here summarised, and the evidence afforded by the Martyrologies for the early death of John the son of Zebedee is very precarious. The tradition supposed to be found in Papias may have arisen from the ambiguity of the word 'martyr.'

All the names on the Philocalian list are Roman except Cyprian, and Perpetua and Felicitas, from Africa. Other Churches were readier to accept Roman names. The most important Martyrologies for our purpose are:

(*a*) *Hieronymian*, drawn up *c.* 450 and revised in France *c.* 600.

(*b*) *Leonine*,[1] sixth century, a Roman book. April 14 is the first feast of the year, the earlier part being missing.

(*c*) *Gelasian*, used in France in the eighth century. The Roman original is probably seventh century.

(*d*) *Gregorian*, from the mass-book of the Carolingian Empire, based on a copy of the Sacramentary ascribed to Gregory the Great, sent by Pope Hadrian to Charlemagne between 784 and 791.[2]

The Martyrology ascribed to Bede shows the English usage in the eighth century. By the tenth century the main Roman commemorations had spread throughout the West, supplemented everywhere by local names. Lietzmann's list of the common stock in the early Calendars, *i.e.* before the sixth century, of Rome, Gaul, Spain and Africa is worth quoting.[3] (The martyrs asterisked are in the Canon of the Mass.)

Dec. 25, Nat. Dom.; 26, S. Stefani; 27, S. Johannis Apostoli; 28, SS. Innocentium; January 6, Epiphania; 21, S. Agnetis*; June 24, S. Johannis Bapt.; 29, SS. Petri et Pauli; Aug. 6, S. Xyst.*; 10, S. Laurenti*; 13, S. Hippolyti; Sept. 14, S. Cypriani*; Nov. 23, S. Clementis.*[4]

III

We now reach the Calendar of the English Prayer Book. It is based on that of the Sarum Use, the Breviary of which was made obligatory for the Province of Canterbury in 1542. The stages by which the 1662 Calendar was built up were as follows:[5]

Before 1549. In 1532 the Commons petitioned that holy-days, especially in harvest-time, might be diminished in number. Convocation in 1536 curtailed their observance as public holidays considerably. Small liturgical changes were made about this time, including the removal of the festivals of Thomas of Canterbury.[6] Cranmer's drafts for a revised Calendar show how his

[1] *I.e.* the Calendar reconstructed from the Sacramentary.

[2] See a very clear account of these books in Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, chap. v.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 62.

[4] For the Calendar of the Eastern Orthodox Church see Dowden, *The Church Year and Kalendar*, chap. x.

[5] See Procter and Frere, pp. 334–41; V. Staley, *The Liturgical Year*; Dowden, *The Church Year and Calendar*, pp. 149–53. Broadly speaking, the holy-days in the 1662 Calendar are those feasts which had nine lessons in the Sarum books (Staley, *Liturgical Studies*, p. 27).

[6] This was of great political significance and preluded the coming humiliation of the Church by the civil power.

mind was moving during this period; they include some strange aberrations.

The 1549 *Book*. All commemorations were swept away except those which appear as Red-Letter Days in the 1662 Calendar, to which Mary Magdalene was added.

The 1552 *Book* inserted George, Lammas, Lawrence and Clement as Black-Letter Days, omitted Mary Magdalene, and, perhaps by a printer's error, Barnabas, though providing a Collect, Epistle and Gospel for his day.

The 1559 *Book* restored Barnabas. The Latin edition issued by authority in 1560 had many Black-Letter Saints. In 1561 a Calendar was published in English, the work of Commissioners acting upon a Royal Letter. It contained the Commemorations of 1662, excepting Enurchus added in 1604, and Bede and Alban added in 1662. These 1561 additions were incorporated in the later issues of the Elizabethan Book.

The 1662 *Book*. The sources of the new matter in the Calendar are the *Preces Privatæ* of 1564 and Bishop Cosin's *Collection of Private Devotions* (1627).

The Red-Letter Days were intended for liturgical observance. Since the Black-Letter entries were first made in 1552 it is reasonable to suppose that the traditional explanation is correct. This is given by Wheatly (1710). He says that the dates were restored from motives of secular convenience. The Courts of Justice used them for reckoning; trades would have been displeased had they lost their tutelary saint; for example, Crispin, patron of Shoemakers. The patronal festival of a church had a wake or fair associated with it, and for convenience' sake the date was given; history books referred to periods as Lammastide or Martinmas, and it was well that such references should not become unintelligible. It is objected that *O Sapientia* on December 16 is of purely liturgical interest and is sufficient to refute Wheatly. But it is unlikely that anyone in the seventeenth century wished to retain this entry for its liturgical value. The bishops' answer to the Puritans in 1661 shows their motives. The names were left not to be kept as holy-days, but for secular purposes and for the preservation of their memories. So little interest was taken in Christian antiquity that even exceptionally well-informed writers some fifty years later, such as Wheatly and Nicholls, remembered only the secular motive.

The 1662 Book had three additional Red-Letter Commemorations, on January 30, May 29, and November 5, of King Charles Martyr, Charles II's birth and restoration, and 'Papists' Conspiracy.' Annexed to the Book were the special services for these days, approved by Convocation and added to the Prayer Book by royal mandate issued at the beginning of each reign. In 1859 Queen Victoria cancelled the order she had issued and an

Act of Parliament was passed repealing the religious observance of these days. The services henceforward were no longer annexed to the Prayer Book and the printers omitted the corresponding entries in the Calendar. The loss of Charles I has caused pain to many. But it is hard to see what other course could have been followed. No one wished to retain Papists' Conspiracy in the Calendar, but to have omitted it and retained Charles I would have been at least as arbitrary an act as that of which the printers were accused. Further, the legalised religious observance having lapsed, there was no authority for printing January 30 as a Red-Letter Day, and the making of a new Black-Letter Day was not a matter for the printers to decide.[1]

We now proceed to examine the Anglican Calendars in detail, including fully authorised revisions and the proposed English Book of 1928. The Irish and American Books can be omitted from the survey, since from both of them Black-Letter Days are excluded. The Red-Letter Days are as in 1662, except that both add The Transfiguration, Irish adds St. Patrick, and American Independence Day (July 4). Of the rest, the Canadian revisers worked upon an early stage of the English revision [2] and used the suggestions of Bishop John Wordsworth [3] and Dr. Frere,[4] so that the result closely resembles that of the English 1928 Book. The Scottish revisers aimed at including the great saints of the universal Church, local saints (including Irish), with special consideration for those to whom churches are dedicated, and familiar figures like Cuthbert and Benedict. The English Book of 1928 contains a revised Calendar, additional to that of 1662, the principles of which have never been authoritatively explained. It was intended to be provisional only and the subject, it was hoped, would be referred to a special Commission.[5]

[1] On the other side it is argued that the 1859 Act merely removed the legal sanction of the services, and their status as extra services approved by Convocation remained; in any case the printers had no authority to alter the Calendar.

[2] Report No. 481 of Convocation of Canterbury.

[3] In *The Ministry of Grace.* [4] In *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform.*

[5] In 1923, after a number of haphazard resolutions had been brought forward in the House of Clergy of the Church Assembly, the inclusion of William Laud was proposed, but rejected on the ground that more time was required for consideration of the principles involved. In 1924 the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury requested the Archbishop 'to appoint a Commission to make an historical investigation of the Beatification and Canonisation of Saints; the grounds of their selection, and the methods of procedure for their inclusion in the Calendar.' The Upper House postponed consideration of this request until Prayer Book Revision should be completed. In 1925 the House of Clergy in the Assembly reaffirmed the above resolution, adding the following resolutions: 'That an authority be appointed which shall judicially investigate and report on the claims of each name proposed for addition to the Calendar.

'That the Calendar may be followed, if it be thought desirable, by a list

The problem has assumed importance only in recent years, with the rapid increase in number of the churches in which the Eucharist is celebrated daily. The fact that the subject must come to the front again before long justifies what may seem a rather disproportionate amount of space allotted to it here.[1]

The notes are arranged as follows:

The description of the day is given as in the facsimile edition of the Book Annexed, but abbreviations are amplified and spelling is modernised. Saints not in the 1662 Calendar appear as in the English 1928 Book, in cases where their description in the Scottish or Canadian Books is different. E is used for the 1662 Book; P = the Prayer Book as proposed in 1928; S = Scottish; C = Canadian. Sar. following the first group of capitals signifies that the commemoration is found in the Sarum Use—the Breviary and Missal are not distinguished. Next comes a brief summary of the Saint's life, the date of death coming here and not as part of the official designation. Finally, in most cases a little information is given about the cult, if only by giving the number of dedications in England, with the abbreviation Ded. The number in brackets signifies nineteenth-century dedications.[2]

JANUARY

1. **Circumcision of our Lord.** E.P.S.C. Sar. At first the Octave of Christmas. The Collect in the Roman Rite is of the B.V.M. and the Incarnation, with no reference to the Circumcision. SS. Ambrose and Augustine refer to the day as a fast, observed as a protest against heathen licence. In Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries it is called 'Octava Domini.' The

---

of saints and worthies, drawn up in Calendrical form, but not intended for liturgical observance.

'That provision for the liturgical commemoration of local Saints, not already included in the Prayer Book Calendar, and to whom churches have been dedicated, may be made for local or diocesan use, under the direction of the Ordinary.'

In 1931 the matter was taken up again by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury.

[1] The S. African Calendar is so far only provisional; see p. 243.

[2] The figures are taken from F. Arnold-Forster's *Studies in Church Dedications*, 3 vols., 1899. In so vast an undertaking mistakes are inevitable and it was quite impossible for her to trace the original dedication in every case. But the broad outlines of her study are reliable. The figures given suggest a criterion by which to judge additions to the Calendar. If a Saint was not popular in the Middle Ages and did not commend himself to nineteenth-century church-builders as likely to interest parishioners, we may infer that the appeal of a restored commemoration will not be strong. The inclusion of twentieth-century dedications would not alter the figures appreciably. Miss Arnold-Forster confined her studies to England, excluding Wales, the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands.

name Circumcision first appears in the seventh century in Gaul. The Armenian Church observes the feast on January 13. A collect for 'New Year's Day' is found in the 1928 Book.

6. **Epiphany of Our Lord.** E.P.S.C. See p. 209.

8. Lucian, Priest and Martyr. E. Sar. (Breviary adds 'and his companions'). M. at Nicomedia, *c.* 311 (Eus. *H.E.*, ix. 6); perhaps Lucian, m. at Beauvais, *c.* 290 (?), was intended. Dedications in England 1.

11. David, King of Scotland and Confessor.[1] S. Son of Malcolm Canmore and Q. Margaret; founded bishoprics and monasteries; d. 1153.

13. Hilary, Bishop and Confessor. E.P.S.C. Sar. Bp. of Poitiers; supported Athanasius; d. 368. In early Mart.[2] Pius IX (d. 1878) made Doctor of the Church. On the 14th in present Roman Calendar. Ded. 3 (o).[3]

13. Kentigern or Mungo, Bishop of Glasgow. S. (Red-Letter). Given pet name of Mungo by his mother; educated by Serf at Culross; Apostle of Britons of Strathclyde; fixed residence where Glasgow now stands; visited Wales; d. *c.* 603.

17. Antony of Egypt, Abbot. P.S. Sar. Founder of organised monasticism; d. 356. Early Mart. Ded. o.

18. Prisca, Roman Virgin and Martyr. E. Sar. Martyred 270 (?). If = Prisca of the Catacomb of Priscilla, an important though obscure figure in Christian tradition; cf. Rom. xvi. 3, Acts xviii. 2. Early Mart. Ded. o.

19. Wulfstan, Bishop of Worcester. P.S. Sar. Consecrated 1062; submitted to William I; helped to suppress slave trade at Bristol; d. 1095. Canonised 1203, relics translated 1218; shrine destroyed at Reformation and relics buried near high altar. Ded. 1 (o).

20. Fabian, Bishop of Rome and Martyr. E.P.S. Sar. Victim of Decian persecution, 250. In Philocalian list, with Sebastian. Relics brought from papal crypt in cemetery of Callistus to 'basilica ad Catacumbas.' Epitaph (probably not authentic) discovered in 1915 in St. Sebastian. Ded. 1 (o) (with Sebastian).

21. Agnes, Roman Virgin and Martyr. E.P.S.C. Sar. (where she has an octave).[4] Child martyr, *c.* 304. In Philo-

[1] The Scottish Calendar adds Confessor in almost every case where the Saint was not martyred. Dedications of the purely Scottish Saints are not given. They may be assumed not to exist in England. S. in such cases means Scottish, not Sarum.

[2] This is used to mean any of the Calendars enumerated on p. 215, excluding the Philocalian Calendar, and Syriac and Carthaginian Calendars, printed by Lietzmann, which are specified when necessary.

[3] The figure includes all dedications given by Arnold-Forster, double and alternative as well as ordinary, and so elsewhere.

[4] Or rather, secondary festival. In the early Roman Calendar the 21st was *de passione*, the 28th *de nativitate*.

calian list, where we find feast celebrated in catacomb on Via Nomentana. Said to be buried in *prædiolum* of her family, the crypt dug for them being the nucleus of the Cemetery of St. Agnes. The Church of St. Agnes outside the walls goes back to the time of Constantine. At this church lambs are blessed each year, whose wool is used to weave the pallium of an Archbishop. Ambrose, Prudentius and Jerome wrote in praise of her. Perhaps the first Saint to receive a symbol—a lamb. Ded. 11 (7).

22. Vincent, Spanish Deacon and Martyr. E.P.S.C. Sar. Martyred at Valencia, *c.* 304. In Carthaginian and early Mart. Cult came to Rome by the sixth century independently of any church dedicated to him. Relics said to be at Saragossa. Ded. 5 (0).

24. St. Timothy. S. The body is said to have been brought to Constantinople. Ded. 1 (1).

25. **Conversion of St. Paul.** E.P.S.C. Sar. Peculiar to the West. Originally a feast of the Gallican Church, which kept St. Peter on January 8. In some early Mart. In Hier. Mart. is feast of 'translatio,' *i.e.* of the Apostle's relics to Rome; December 12 is the 'inventio,' identification of the body in the catacombs. In a ninth-century Mart. appears as 'translatio et conversio.' For Ded. see June 29.[1]

26. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna and Martyr. P.S.C. Sar.[2] Martyred *c.* 155. The outstanding figure in the development of the martyr-cult. The actual date was February 23. See *Mart. Polyc.*, 21. Ded. 1 (1).

27. John Chrysostom, Bishop of Constantinople and Doctor. P.S.C. One of the greatest preachers and commentators of all time. d. 407. Ded. 5 (5).

30. Beheading of King Charles I. [E.]S. d. 1649. After long debates in Scotland, insertion carried in 1928 in this form. Omitted finally in English 1928 Book, presumably for political reasons. Charles saved the Church of England by his fidelity to its Constitution, and may be held to have the status of a local Saint made by popular acclamation. Ded. 5 (0).

February

1. Bride, Abbess of Kildare. S. Sar. (an exception to the rule of not having Scottish and Irish Saints); d. 523. Early Mart. Very popular in Ireland, in form Bridget characteristic girl's name. Ded. 21 (2).

[1] Note the frequent occurrence of the 24th and 25th for important days. March 25 and December 25 having been fixed, the same period of the month seemed suitable for other commemorations.

[2] Calendars of 1530, 1546. For this and similar notes see C. Wordsworth's edition of the Sarum Breviary.

1, Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, Martyr. C. See December 17.

2. **Purification of Mary the Blessed Virgin.** E.P.S. (adds 'or Candlemas') C. Sar. Observed at Jerusalem, at the time of Etheria's visit, on February 14, *i.e.* forty days after the Eastern feast of the Nativity, as it still is by the Armenians; a feast of our Lord, not of the B.V.M. Justinian ordered its observance on February 2 in 542. In later form of Gregorian tradition. Its Eastern origin is shown in the title 'Hypapante,'[1] which as late as Usuard (*c.* 875) is the sole title. For the Candlemas ceremonies see p. 732. The service in the Roman missal scarcely refers to the purification of the B.V.M.

3. Blasius, Armenian Bishop and Martyr. E. Sar. Nothing certain is known. In ninth-century Mart. A popular mediæval Saint, patron of wool-combers. Ded. 4 (0).

3. Anskar of Sweden, Bishop. P. Brought up in monastery of Corbie; missionary to Denmark; first bishop of Hamburg; made two missionary journeys to Sweden; d. 864. Ded. 0.

5. Agatha, a Sicilian Virgin and Martyr. E. Sar. Said to have been martyred 251. Cult established by fifth or sixth century; liturgical observance perhaps began when Gregory restored the Church of St. Agatha in the Subura to Catholicism, *c.* 591. Ded. 6 (2).

6. St. Titus. S. His head is said to have been taken by the Venetians from Crete to Venice, where it is preserved in St. Mark's. Ded. 1(1).

11. Finnian, Bishop of Moville and Confessor. S. Teacher of Columba; said to have gone to Lucca and returned to Ireland; d. *c.* 579. Lucca claims to possess his bones, under the name of Frigidianus (Frediano).

14. Valentine, Bishop and Martyr. E.C. Sar. Said to have been a bishop in Umbria; d. *c.* 270. Three Valentines are commemorated in Mart. Cosin described him as 'a Priest of Rome.' Birds begin to pair on Valentine's day, according to Chaucer. The traditional English day for lovers to interchange gifts and tokens. 'Valentines,' obsolete in England, still flourish in America. Ded. 0.

17. Finan, Bishop of Lindisfarne and Confessor. S. A monk of Iona who went to Northumbria; d. 661. Ded. 0.

18. Colman, Bishop of Lindisfarne and Confessor. S. Succeeded Finan; d. 676. Ded. 0.

24. **St. Matthias, Apostle and Martyr.**[2] E.P.S.C. Sar. In some forms of Gregorian Sacramentary. In the Sarum Calendar

[1] Meeting with Simeon and Anna.

[2] 'St.' is here added to all the Red-Letter Saints, though in the Book Annexed it is given or withheld arbitrarily.

the day is 'vi Kal. Martii,' or (as we say) five days before March 1. The 1549 Book gave 28 days to February, so that Matthias fell on the 24th; the 1552 allowed for leap-year and gave 29, making it the 25th. The 1662 Book put it on the 24th. In 1683 Abp. Sancroft ordered that it should always be kept on the 24th, whether leap-year or no, the almanac makers having been accustomed to put it on the 25th in leap-year. The Roman Calendar maintains the traditional rule. The Eastern Church keeps this feast on Aug. 9. Ded. 20 (19).[1]

March

1. David, Archbishop of Menevia. E.P.S.C. Sar. Archbishop (an anachronism), in S.W. Wales, of the modern St. David's, sixth century. The patron Saint of Wales. His cult was urged in the Middle Ages in protest against the encroachments of the see of Canterbury. Ded. 30 (7).

1. Marnan or Ernin, Bishop and Confessor. S. Marnan is probably the Irish Ernin, Apostle of Banffshire and missionary to the Picts; d. *c.* 625.

2. Cedde, or Chad, Bishop of Lichfield. E.P.S.C. Sar. (Ceddae, *sic*). Not to be confused with Cedd of Lindisfarne, who was never canonised. d. 672. His relics, formerly at Lichfield, were rescued at the Reformation and are now at St. Chad's (R.C.) Cathedral, Birmingham. Ded. 44 (11).

6. Baldred, Confessor. S. Hermit on the Bass Rock. Crossed to the mainland for missionary labours; local Saint of E. Lothian; d. 608.

7. Perpetua, Mauritanian Martyr. E.P.S.C. (P.S. add 'and her companions, Carthaginian Martyrs'; C. adds 'and Felicitas').[2] Sar. Martyred at Carthage 203. The tomb was seen in the fifth century by a bishop whose account is extant. The inscription was discovered in 1907 in the Basilica Majorum at Carthage. It runs thus: 'Here are the martyrs Saturus, Saturninus, Revocatus, Secundulus, Felicitas,[2] Perpetua, who suffered on the Nones of March.'[3] In the Philocalian list. Ded. 0.

8. Thomas of Aquinum, Doctor. S. d. 1274. Canonised by John XXII in 1323; declared Doctor of the Church by Pius V in 1567.

10. Kessog, Bishop and Confessor. S. Evangelised West

[1] Note the comparative absence of early Saints belonging to the general Calendar of the Church about this time of year. The tendency was to avoid Lent.

[2] Felicitas in the Roman Canon is probably the Roman matron commemorated on November 23.

[3] A photograph is given in E. C. Owen, *Some Authentic Acts of Early Martyrs.*

Perthshire; d. *c.* 700; remains said to rest in Cemetery at bridge of Callander.

12. Gregorius Magnus. Bishop of Rome and Confessor. E.P.S.C. (P.S.C. add 'Doctor'). Sar. One of the greatest of all popes, held in veneration by the English-speaking races for taking the initiative in evangelising their forefathers. d. 604.[1] Canonised by popular acclamation immediately. Cult began in eighth century. Ded. 32 (1).

17. Patrick, of Ireland, Bishop. P.S. (Red-Letter) C. Sar. Apostle of Ireland; d. 461. Follows SS. Peter and Paul in the Canon of the Stowe Missal. Ded. 10 (2).

18. Edward, King of the West Saxons. E. Sar. Murdered at Corfe Castle, 978. Called 'Saint' in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Martyr in Sarum Use. See June 20. Ded. 4 (0).

18. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem and Confessor. S. Best known by his Catechetical Lectures; d. 386. Ded. 0.

19. St. Joseph. S. (adds 'Spouse of the B.V.M.') C. Sar.[2] The great attention given to him in the Apocryphal Gospels is not reflected in a cultus before the seventh century among the Copts. In a ninth-century Mart. (Reichenau). Sixtus IV formally sanctioned the cult and fixed the date (1480). In 1870 Pius IX proclaimed Joseph 'Patron of the Universal Church' and made the feast a double of the first class, but without an octave because of Lent. Pius X made 'The Solemnity of St. Joseph,' on the Wednesday following the Second Sunday after Easter, a double [3] of the first class with octave. The traditional time of commemoration in the East is the neighbourhood of Christmas. Ded. 0.

20. Cuthbert, Bishop of Lindisfarne. P.S.C. Sar. The most beloved of Northumbrian Saints; d. 687. His body after many

[1] Gregory died on March 11 and was buried on the 12th. In the Philocalian list the burial ('depositio') is commemorated. It would often coincide with the day of death.

[2] Calendars of 1530, 1546.

[3] The occurrence of this technical word is a convenient place for an explanatory note. In the early Roman Church, when the peace of the Church prevailed, the weeks of Easter and Pentecost were given up to churchgoing. Important festivals, *e.g.* St. Agnes and St. Laurence, which fell in working times, had an additional celebration, after Jewish analogies, a week later to enable the faithful who had missed the actual day to observe them. In the thirteenth century there were simple feasts, double feasts with octaves, feasts with added solemnity but no octaves ('semi-doubles'), and, with difficulty to be distinguished from these last, feasts with nine lessons. In 1298 Boniface VIII made the principal feasts of Apostles and Evangelists, and those of the four Latin Doctors, into doubles. And the greatest feasts of all had a rank of their own—'totum duplex.' At present there are in the Roman Calendar six classes—doubles of the 1st class, doubles of the 2nd class, greater doubles, doubles, semi-doubles, simples; 'double' means that the Antiphon is doubled. When the revision of the Vulgate is finished, a revision of the Missal and the Breviary is promised, carrying with it a reform of the Calendar, which will doubtless be in the direction of simplification.

wanderings[1] reached Durham on Aug. 29, 1104. The coffin was opened in 1827.[2] In Bedan Mart. Ded. 92 (20).

21. Benedict, Abbot. E.P.S.C. Sar. The father of Western monasticism, Abbot of Monte Cassino; d. *c.* 540, probably on March 25, the feast being antedated to avoid the Annunciation. Relics transferred to Fleury on July 11, 623. Lanfranc abolished March 21 at Canterbury in favour of July 11. Ded. 18 (3).

25. **Annunciation of [Virgin] Mary.** E.P.S.C. Sar. The date goes back to Hippolytus (p. 205). Liturgical observance established by the end of the seventh century (Council in Trullo for East [692], Council of Toledo for West [? 694]). Cf. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. lxx: 'We begin therefore our ecclesiastical year with the glorious annunciation of his birth by angelical embassage.'

April

1. Gilbert, Bishop of Caithness and Confessor. S. d. 1245.

3. Richard, Bishop of Chichester. E.P.C. Sar. d. 1253. Buried in his Cathedral. Canonised 1262; the latest saint in the 1662 Calendar. Ded. 3 (1).

4. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan. E.P.S.C. Sar. Doctor of the Church. Baptised Augustine; resisted Theodosius; d. April 4, 397. Buried with bodies of Gervasius and Protasius; relics found 1864. Commemorated in the Roman Calendar on Dec. 7, the anniversary of his consecration, to avoid Lent and Easter week. Ded. 6 (5).

11. Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome and Doctor. P.S. Famous for his 'Tome,' defining the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation; d. Nov. 10, 461. April 11 is probably the date of translating the relics to St. Peter's. East keeps on Feb. 18. Proclaimed 'Doctor Ecclesiæ' in 1754. Ded. 0.

13. Justin, Martyr. S. Author of 'Apology,' martyred at Rome *c.* 167. In early Mart. Roman Calendar April 14. East keeps on June 1, which see. Ded. 0.

16. Magnus, Earl of Caithness and Orkney, Martyr. S. d. *c.* 1116. Bones found about 1773 in a pillar in Kirkwall Cathedral are thought to be his. Ded. 3 (0).

17. Donnan, Abbot and Martyr. S. Founded monastery at Eigg, 40 m. N. of Iona; murdered by pirates *c.* 617, with 52 monks, on Sunday, April 17, as he was celebrating the Eucharist.

19. Alphege, Archbishop of Canterbury. E.P.S.C. Sar. Martyred by the Danes, 1012. Translated by Cnut in 1023

[1] Cf. Bede, *H.E.*, iv. 28.

[2] Photographs of the relics are to be found in G. F. Browne's *The Venerable Bede*. The description in Dickens' *Edwin Drood* of Durdles the cathedral stonemason and the way he dealt with the tombs of 'the old 'uns' presumably does not entirely caricature the period.

from St. Paul's to Canterbury. In 1078 Lanfranc recognised his canonisation. Ded. 6 (1).

20. Serf, Bishop and Confessor. S. Lived at Culross; d *c.* 500; but very obscure.

21. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury and Doctor. P.S.C. Great theologian; withstood William II; d. 1109. Proclaimed Doctor in 1720. Ded. 3 (3).

21. Maelrubha, Abbot of Applecross and Bangor, Confessor. S. Came from Bangor in Ireland to Applecross in Ross-shire; d. March 21, 722, his commemoration day in Ireland, August 27, being the original Scottish day.

23. George, Martyr. E.P.S.C. Sar. Probably a soldier who died for the faith *c.* 303. Became famous at once. In Greg. Sacramentary. A marvellous growth of legend became associated with his name in the East, where he is 'Megalomartys' (great martyr). The Eastern, and in particular Palestinian, myth of the dragon-slayer was attached to his name.[1] The Crusaders brought the developed cult to the West, and from the thirteenth century George has been the patron Saint of England. Ded. 205 (58).

25. **St. Mark, Evangelist and Martyr.** E.P.S.C. Sar. The (late) Acts of Mark give this as date of martyrdom. In early Mart., but four other dates given. The great litany procession in the Latin Rite on this day is anterior to the commemoration of St. Mark, being a Christianisation of the Robigalia, a feast in honour of Robigo, who averted mildew from the crops. Relics said to be in Venice. Ded. 124 (114).

30. Catherine of Siena, Virgin. P.S. An ecstatic and mystic; largely contributed to the return of the Pope from Avignon to Rome; d. 1380. Canonised 1461; relics at Siena. The latest Saint in any Anglican Calendar, but see Jan. 30. Ded. 0.

MAY

1. **St. Philip and St. James, Apostles and Martyrs.** E.P.S.C. Sar The dedication festival of the Church of the Apostles at Rome rebuilt under Pelagius I (d. 561), when, if not earlier, it was dedicated to these two Saints, whose relics were deposited in the church. In the East St. James, 'the brother of God,' is commemorated on Oct. 23, St. Philip on Nov. 14. Bede identified James with James 'Domini frater.' Ded. Philip 72 (40); James 33 (7).

2. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria and Doctor. P.S.C.

[1] From time immemorial April 23 has been a spring feast in Palestine, marking the end of the winter rains; see Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, i. 294.

Sar.[1] d. May 2, 373. Early Mart. In East, Jan. 18; Bede gives Dec. 20. Ded. 1 (1).

3. Invention of the Cross. E. Sar. The feast came to Gaul apparently first in the West, in the seventh century, from the East, see Sept. 14. The date is purely Western, and 'seems to have been occasioned by the legend of the invention of the cross, in which a certain Judas-Cyriacus figured.'[2] It falls on the day following the octave of Easter when Easter is on the latest possible date, April 25, and is valuable as a witness to the triumph of the Cross.

4. Monnica, Matron. P.S. Mother of St. Augustine of Hippo; d. 387. Her cult began to spread in the thirteenth century, and in 1430 her relics were brought from Ostia to Rome. Ded. 0.

6. St. John Evangelist, ante Portam Latinam. E.P.S.C. Sar. A church was built at the Latin Gate of Rome to commemorate the escape of St. John from the boiling oil. The date is probably that of its dedication when rebuilt at the end of the seventh century.

9. Gregory of Nazianzus. S.C. A Doctor of the Church, associated with Basil; d. *c.* 390. Ded. 0.

19. Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury. E.P.S.C. Sar. Monastic reformer; Abbot of Glastonbury, and statesman; d. 988. Revered as a Saint at once; date fixed by Cnut 1029; most popular English Saint until overshadowed by Thomas of Canterbury; relics found 1508. Ded. 24 (2).

25. Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne. P.S. Sar. Scholar, poet, and builder; d. 709. Miracles were attributed to him before and after his death. Ded. 4 (0).

26. Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury. E.P.S.C. Sar. Sent by Gregory to evangelise the English; landed 597; d. on May 26, 605. In Roman Calendar on May 28. He was buried by the side of the Roman road outside the city, 'an English Appian Way.' The body was taken to the Church of St. Augustine's Abbey, where probably, 'in the field around the ruins of the Abbey,' it still reposes.[3] Ded. 59 (30).

27. Venerable Bede, Presbyter. E.P.S.C. Sar.[4] Of Jarrow. Historian of early England and its Church; d. May 26, 735. Bones transferred to Durham Cathedral 1020, scattered in 1541, but the tomb with inscription remains. Local cult in North, not much known in South. In 1899 Leo XIII proclaimed him a Doctor and extended his cult (as St. Bede the Venerable) to the whole world. Ded. 3 (3).

[1] Calendars of 1530, 1546.
[2] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 275.
[3] Stanley, *Historical Memorials of Canterbury* (Everyman ed.), pp. 36, 40.
[4] Calendars of 1530, 1546.

JUNE

1. Nicomede, Roman Priest and Martyr. E. Sar. Nicomedes in the Roman Calendar is on Sept. 15. Nothing is known of him. Date is that of dedication of a church at Rome rebuilt at end of seventh century. In Greg. Sacr. Ded. o.

1. Justin Martyr. C. See April 13.

5. Boniface, Bishop of Mentz and Martyr. E.P.S.C. Sar. Born at Crediton; 'the Apostle of Germany'; d. 755. Cult probably first in England. In 1874 Pius IX extended his cult to the whole world. Ded. 6 (1).

9. Columba, Abbot of Iona. P.S. (Red-Letter) C. Came from Ireland, founded monastery of Iona, a main source of Scottish and Northumbrian Christianity; d. 597. Ded. 13 (5).

10. Margaret, Queen of Scotland. C. See Nov. 16.

11. **St. Barnabas, Apostle and Martyr.** E.P.S.C. Sar. Tomb discovered at Salamis in Cyprus in 478. In Bedan Calendar, so observance is at least eighth century. Ded. 75 (62).

12. Ternan, Bishop and Confessor. S. Bishop among the Picts in Kincardineshire; d. *c.* 455.

14. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia and Doctor. P.S.C. Sar. (exception to the rule of not having Eastern saints). Theologian; organiser of monasticism, and many-sided man; d. Jan. 1, 379. June 14 is supposed date of his consecration to the episcopate. Ded. 3 (1).

17. Alban, Martyr. E. See 22nd.

20. Translation of Edward, King of the West Saxons. E. Sar. Of his body, in 980, from Wareham to Shaftesbury. In Jan. 1931 a leaden casket was discovered on the site of Shaftesbury Abbey, containing relics which may be those of St. Edward. His tomb discovered in 1860 was empty. See March 18.

20. Fillan, Abbot and Confessor. S. Irish missionary who laboured in Perthshire (Strathfillan); d. *c.* 750.

22. Alban, Martyr. P.S.C. Sar. d. *c.* 304. Venerated in England since the fifth century. The date in the 1662 Calendar (17th) was apparently taken from the Calendar in the *Preces Privatæ* of 1564. Ded. 26 (15).

24. **Nativity of John Baptist.** E.P.S.C. Sar. The day was recognised by the time of St. Augustine of Hippo. It was derived from Luke i. 36, John's birth being six months before our Lord's, when Dec. 25 had been fixed. Jan. 7 is associated with the Baptist in the East, and June 24 is of Western origin. As Dec. 25 is viii. Kal. Jan., so June 24 is viii. Kal. Jul. Ded. 603 (106).

25. Moluag, Bishop of Lismore and Confessor. S. An Irish missionary among the Picts of the W. Highlands. Lismore

is an island on Loch Linnhe. d. *c.* 592. His pastoral staff is preserved by the Dukes of Argyll.

28. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons and Doctor. P.S.C. Wrote *Against the Heresies*, the first systematic doctrinal book of the Church. d. *c.* 202. Ded. 0.

29. **St. Peter, Apostle and Martyr.** E.P.S.C. Sar. See p. 213. Ded. 1302 (180). Of these, 375 are double dedications.[1]

JULY.

2. Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary. E.P.S.C. Sar. Commemorates her visit to Elizabeth, the occasion of the Magnificat. Instituted by Urban VI in 1389. The first day after the Octave of St. John Baptist.

4. Translation of Martin, Bishop and Confessor. E. Sar. By Perpetuus, Bishop of Tours, to a basilica built over the resting-place of his body, *c.* 470, on this day. See Nov. 11.

6. Palladius, Bishop and Confessor. S. A missionary sent from Rome to Ireland, said to have laboured in Scotland; d. *c.* 450.

15. Swithun, Bishop of Winchester, translated. E.P.S.C. Sar. d. *c.* 862. Canonised by popular acclamation; body removed into the Cathedral from outside it in 971. Ded. 60 (2).

20. Margaret, Virgin and Martyr at Antioch. E.P.S.C. Sar. Said to have been martyred *c.* 278 at Antioch in Pisidia. The Eastern Church honours as Marina on July 13. Her body is said to be at Monte Fiascone in Tuscany. Was invoked by women in childbirth. Ded. 274 (23), but see Nov. 16.

22. St. Mary Magdalen. E.P. (Red-Letter) S.C. Sar. The first witness of the Resurrection. In early Mart., but no mass in Roman use till thirteenth century. Red-Letter in 1549 Book, omitted in 1552, restored as Black-Letter in 1561. In 1662 was put on the 21st by an error promptly corrected. Ded. 212 (28).

25. **St. James, Apostle and Martyr.** E.P.S.C. Sar. Martyred at Easter (Acts xii. 2, 3), at which time, *e.g.* April 12 or 30, there are commemorations in the East. The Western date is perhaps connected with the translation of relics or is deliberately put four months after March 25. In Gregorian Sacr., but not in Leonine or Gelasian. One of the first of the lesser known Apostles to be commemorated. The legend is that his body was taken to N.W. Spain, where it was discovered in the ninth century. Ded. 618 (185).

[1] This illustrates the limitations of Miss Arnold-Forster's work. The original double dedications must have been far more numerous. See G. F. Browne's Essay, 'The Cultus of St. Peter and St. Paul,' in *The Importance of Women in Anglo-Saxon Times, and Other Addresses*, p. 59. An investigation of the original dedications of 433 churches in Kent revealed 61 dedicated to SS. Peter and Paul, 1 to St. Peter alone, 1 to St. Paul alone,

26. Anne, Mother to the Blessed Virgin Mary. E.P.S.C. Sar. Her story is found in the *Protevangelium Jacobi*. Her cult in the East begins in the fourth century. In 550 Justinian built a church in her name in Constantinople. The cult made its way slowly in the West, greatly helped by *The Golden Legend* in the thirteenth century. The feast became popular in England in the fourteenth century through Anne of Bohemia. In 1378 Urban IV fixed the date on July 26. In 1570 Pius V removed the name from the Calendar, but his successor Gregory XIII restored it in 1584. The 25th is the day in the East, marking perhaps the dedication of the first church in her honour, or the arrival of relics at Constantinople in the eight century. The Western date was presumably fixed to avoid clashing with St. James. Ded. 81 (30).[1]

29. Olaf (Olave), King and Martyr. S. Took Christianity to Norway; killed by rebels 1030. Declared a Saint in 1031; relics at Trondhjem. The commemoration recalls the time when the Church of Norway had jurisdiction over a large part of the British Isles. Ded. 14 (1).

August

1. Lammas Day. E.P.S.C. Sar. (of St. Peter ad Vincula). A local English feast, Loaf-mass, of the offering of first-fruits of harvest. The Commemoration of the Seven Maccabees on this day was general, perhaps universal, before the fifth century; see *e.g.* the Syriac Mart. It still survives in the Roman Use. The main commemoration, St. Peter ad Vincula, marks the Dedication of the Basilica of the Apostles at Rome, rebuilt *c.* 435, where the Apostle's chain (at Jerusalem) was preserved.

5. Oswald, King of Northumbria and Martyr. P.S.C. Sar. Forwarded Aidan's work; slain by Penda at Maserfield (? Oswestry) on Aug. 5, 642. His head was placed in Cuthbert's coffin in 875, where it was found at Durham in 1827. On Aug. 9 in local Roman Calendar. Ded. 72 (6).

6. Transfiguration of our Lord. E.P.S.C. (Red-Letter in last three). Sar. An Eastern feast, mentioned in a hymn ascribed to John Damascene. Of partial observance in West before it was enjoined by Calixtus III in 1457 in thanksgiving for a victory over the Turks at Belgrade.

7. Name of Jesus. E.P.S.C. Sar. A local English date. In fifteenth century kept generally with Transfiguration. In 1530 an office was granted to the Franciscans on Jan. 14. Innocent XIII in 1721 fixed on 2nd Sunday after Epiphany. Pius X

[1] There are a number of eighteenth-century dedications suggested by Queen Anne.

changed to the 2nd Sunday after Christmas, if there is one otherwise Jan. 2.

10. Laurence, Archdeacon of Rome and Martyr. E.P.S.C. Sar. In Carthaginian Calendar and other early Eastern and Western lists. Died a few days after Xystus (Aug. 6, 258). The torture of a Roman citizen made a deep impression. In the present Roman Calendar there is a vigil; also an octave. Ded. 243 (6).

15. Falling Asleep of the Blessed Virgin Mary. S. Sar. The story of a bodily Assumption is first met in Egypt in Coptic texts.[1] Jesus took the soul of His mother to heaven on Tobi 20. On Mesore (August) 15 the Apostles assembled, and on the morrow saw Jesus with Mary in a chariot, the body being no longer in the tomb. Epiphanius (*Haer.*, 78) is the first to suggest anything marvellous about her death. In the East the festival is said to have been founded by the Emperor Maurice *c.* 600; it was called 'dormitio' or 'pausatio,' to give the Latin phrases. In Gelasian Sacr.; at beginning of eighth century called 'dormitio' in Bede; 'assumptio' in Greg. Sacr.

20. Bernard of Clairvaux, Abbot. P.S. Sar.[2] Theologian, mystic, and hymn-writer; d. and canonised 1153. Ded. o.

24. **St. Bartholomew, Apostle and Martyr.** E.P.S.C. Sar. One of a group of less well-known Apostles added in the Mixed Sacramentaries. The East joins with Barnabas on June 11. Rome keeps locally on Aug. 25, said to be the date of finding the relics. These were transferred from the Lipari Islands to Beneventum in 809, thence in 983 to Rome. Ded. 199 (34).

25. Ebba, Abbess of Coldingham. S. A sister of Oswald; gave her name to Ebchester and St. Abb's Head; d. 683. Relics placed in shrine of St. Cuthbert at Durham in twelfth century. Ded. 4 (0).

28. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, Confessor and Doctor. E.P.S.C. Sar. d. 430. Body taken to Sardinia, thence to Pavia, where it is preserved. Ded. 1 (1).

29. Beheading of St. John Baptist. E.P.S.C. Sar. His body was said to have been buried in Samaria, and the tomb violated in 362. In Gelasian, not in Leonine, Sacr.

31. Aidan, Bishop of Lindisfarne. P.S.C. Sent at Oswald's request from Iona to evangelise Northumbria; d. 651. Buried at Lindisfarne. Ded. 13 (12).

September

1. Giles, Abbot and Confessor. E.P.S.C. Sar. An abbot in Provence; d. *c.* 720. His cult reached Italy in the tenth century. Relics at Toulouse. Ded. 156 (0).

[1] M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 194–227.
[2] One Calendar.

7. Enurchus, Bishop of Orleans. E. Added in 1604, probably to mark Q. Elizabeth's birthday as a holiday, as it had been during her reign. Evurtius is said to have died *c.* 340. The Calendar of the York Breviary (edit. 1524) had Euurci, from which probably came the form Enurchus in the *Preces Privatæ* of 1564, the source of the 1604 addition. The printers have altered it to Evurtius. Ded. 0.

8. Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. E.P.S.C. Sar. Said by Durandus to have been founded by Sergius I in 695. From Greek sources into Gelasian Sacr. Ded. to St. Mary 2469 (197).

9. Boisil, Prior of Melrose and Confessor. S. Teacher of Cuthbert. d. *c.* 664. St. Boswell's in Roxburghshire is called after him. Relics transferred to shrine of St. Cuthbert.

9. Kiaran, Abbot of Clonmacnoise and Confessor. S. Much esteemed by Columba, who introduced his fame into Scotland; d. 549.

13. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage and Martyr. So in P.S. Sar. (with Cornelius) on 14th. d. Sept. 14, 258. In Philocalian and Carth. lists. The former has 'Romæ celebratur in Callisti.' With Cornelius in Greg. Sacr., and in Roman Missal on 16th, avoiding Octave of Nativity of B.V.M. The 13th avoids Holy Cross Day. See 26th. Ded. 4 (4).

14. Holy Cross Day. E.P.S.C. Sar. The anniversary of the dedication of the two churches built by Constantine at Jerusalem in 335, on the sites of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, to commemorate the discovery of the true Cross by his mother Helena, 'the Invention of the Cross.' It was celebrated with great splendour in the time of Etheria. In 614 Heraclius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, was carried into captivity by the Persians, taking with him a part of the Cross. In 628 he returned with it. The old festival was henceforward celebrated with double honour as being also the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, under which name it appears in the early Gelasian Sacr. and in the Sarum Calendar. In the *Preces Privatæ* of 1564 it is termed 'Exalt. Cr.,' and this is doubtless intended by the entry in the Prayer Book Calendar. Ded. (Holy Cross and Holy Rood) 107 (5). See May 3.

16. Ninian, Bishop in Galloway. P.S. (Red-Letter) C. The first name in Scottish ecclesiastical history. Bishop at Candida Casa in Wigtonshire. His tomb was illustrious in Bede's time. Ded. 3 (0).

17. Lambert, Bishop and Martyr. E. Sar. Bishop of Maestricht; murdered *c.* 709. Regarded as Apostle of Brabant. Cult established by nii.th century. Ded. 2 (0).

19. Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury. P.S.C. Born in Cilicia; came to England as Archbishop in 669; d. 690. Ded. 0.

21. **St. Matthew, Apostle, Evangelist and Martyr.** E.P.S.C. Sar.

Not in Gregorian or Gelasian Sacramentary, among group of Apostles brought into Mixed Sacramentaries. Relics at Salerno. The East commemorates on Nov. 16. Ded. 134 (100).

23. Adamnan, Abbot of Iona and Confessor. S. Introduced Roman rules at Iona; d. 704.

25. Finnbarr, Bishop of Caithness and Sutherland. S. Apostle of Caithness; gave his name to Barra in the Outer Hebrides, where he is still venerated by the (R.C.) fishermen; has been identified by some with the Finnbarr who founded the see of Cork. But all is obscure, including the date.

26. Cyprian, Archbishop of Carthage and Martyr. E.C. Sar. (Cipriani et Justinæ). Cyprian was a magician of Antioch converted by Justina, who from early times was confused with Cyprian of Carthage. He was commemorated with Justina on the 26th in the Sarum Calendar, Cyprian of Carthage being commemorated with Cornelius on the 14th; see 13th. Cyprian and Justina are coupled in the *Preces Privatæ*, so this Cyprian is perhaps intended by the 1604 entry. The description was added in 1662, but the date was not changed. This magician of Antioch is said to be the origin of the Faust-legend.

29. **St. Michael and All Angels.** E.P.S.C. Sar. The dedication festival of a Basilica of St. Michael, now vanished, in the suburbs of Rome; it is referred to in the Leonine Sacramentary, and the entry in the present Roman Calendar, 'Dedicatio S. Michaelis Archangeli,' testifies to the origin. The feast of the Apparition of St. Michael on May 8 is traced to his appearance *c.* 493 at Monte Gargano in Apulia. The chief celebration of the Angels in the East is on Nov. 8. The feast of Sept. 29 was especially popular in England during the Middle Ages. Paul V (d. 1621) instituted the festival of the Guardian Angels on Oct. 2, the first free day after Sept. 29. The Prayer Book addition, in 1662, of 'and All Angels' was doubtless taken from Cosin's *Private Devotions*, where it may have been suggested by the new Roman feast. Ded. 779 (95).

30. Jerome, Priest, Confessor, and Doctor. E.P.S.C. Sar. Made the Latin translation of the Bible known as the Vulgate; d. Sept. 30, 420; buried at Bethlehem. Ded. 1 (0).

October

1. Remigius, Bishop of Rhemes. E.P.S.C. Sar. Baptised Clovis; d. Jan. 13, *c.* 530. Translated 1049. Ded. 5 (0).

4. Francis of Assisi. P.S. Sar.[1] d. Oct. 3, 1226; buried Oct. 4.[2] Ded. 1 (1).

[1] Some calendars.

[2] Illustrates the continuance of fixing the feast on the 'depositio,' not the death, of the Saint.

6. Faith, Virgin and Martyr. E.P. Sar. Martyred at Agen in Aquitaine, *c.* 304. Ded. 26 (3).

9. Denys, Areopagite, Bishop and Martyr. E.P.S.C. Sar. (Breviary adds, 'and his companions'). The cult is traced at least to the eighth century. The third-century Apostle of N. France, Dionysius the Areopagite of Acts xvii. 34, and pseudo-Dionysius, the mystical writer, were identified. Ded. 41 (2).

10. Paulinus, Archbishop of York. C. A great missionary in the Northumbrian kingdom of Edwin; d. Oct. 10, 644. Ded. 6 (1).

11. Kenneth or Canice, Abbot and Confessor. S. Went from near Londonderry to Scotland; gave name to Kilkenny; d. 600. Ded. 0 (but many in Scotland).

13. Translation of King Edward Confessor. E.P.S.C. Sar. King of England 1042–1066; d. Jan. 5. Buried in Westminster Abbey; relics translated Oct. 13, 1163. The relics brought from Toulouse to Westminster Cathedral in 1901 were not accepted as genuine. Ded. 17 (2).

13. Congan, Confessor. S. Founder of churches in W. Scotland; d. *c.* 735 and buried at Iona.

17. Etheldreda, Virgin. E.P.S.C. Sar. A queen (nominally) married first to an East Anglian prince, then to Egfrid of Northumbria, founder and abbess of a religious house at Ely; d. 679. Translated Oct. 17, 695, to Ely. A hand is venerated at the Church of St. Etheldreda, Ely Place, London. Ded. 11 (1).

18. **St. Luke, Evangelist.** E.P.S.C. Sar. An addition in the Mixed Sacramentaries. Probably a translation is commemorated. 'He was buried at Constantinople, to which city, in the twentieth year of Constantius [357], his bones together with the remains of Andrew the apostle were transferred' (Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, 7). Ded. 154 (123).

25. Crispin, Martyr. E.P. (adds 'and Crispinian'). Sar. (with Crispinian). Martyrs at Soissons, third century. Cult traced in sixth century; relics taken to Rome. The Battle of Agincourt was fought on this day, 1415. Cf. Shakespeare, *King Henry the Fifth*, IV. iii.—'And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by . . . But we in it shall be remembered'—a good illustration of one motive which led to the restoration of Black-Letter entries. Ded. 1 (1).

26. Alfred, King of the West Saxons. P. d. 899. No precedent for including in a Calendar of Saints.[1] Ded. 0.

28. **St. Simon and St. Jude, Apostles and Martyrs.** E.P.S.C. Sar. Among the group of Apostles brought into the Mixed Sacramentaries. Said to have been martyred on July 1, 47; relics in St.

[1] The proposed insertion of Alfred may be put by the side of the commemoration of Charles I as showing a desire for (quasi-) canonisation on the part of the post-Reformation Church of England. Alfred's name would be valuable as witnessing to the sanctity of the lay and married life.

Peter's, Rome. Ded. 9 old double commemorations; nineteenth century: St. Simon 10, St. Jude 35.

NOVEMBER

1. **All Saints.** E.P.S.C. Sar. Antioch in Chrysostom's time celebrated 'All Martyrs' on the 1st Sunday after Pentecost; so at Rome for a short time. According to one tradition the Western feast goes back to the dedication of the Pantheon at Rome as a Christian Church on May 13, 608 (?), when bones of martyrs were brought there from the Catacombs and it was called 'Ad Martyres,' later 'Sancta Maria ad Martyres'; the commemoration was transferred to Nov. 1 by Gregory VII (d. 1085).[1] Another view[2] traces the observance in England, found in the Bedan Martyrology, to the dedication of the Chapel of All Saints in St. Peter's, Rome, by Gregory III (d. 741). Ded. 1389 (161).

2. Commemoration of All Souls. P.S. Sar. ('commemoratio omnium defunctorum'). Many different days had been considered appropriate. This date began to prevail *c.* 1000 and was accepted throughout the West by the thirteenth century. Ded. 22 (18).

6. Leonard, Confessor. E.P.S. Sar. Founder and Abbot of Monastery of Noblac near Limoges; d. *c.* 559. Cult not traced earlier than eleventh century. Ded. 177 (5).

8. Saints, Martyrs, and Doctors of the Church of England. P.S. (which has 'of Scotland, England, Wales, and Ireland'). Sixtus IV (d. 1484) added an Octave to All Saints.

8. Gervadius or Gerardine, Confessor. S. Apostle of Moray; d. *c.* 934.

11. Martin, Bishop and Confessor. E.P.S.C. Sar. A soldier who became Bishop of Tours; d. *c.* 397, buried on Nov. 11. Miracles ascribed to him before and after death. Introduction into Calendar was comparatively late (Greg. Sacramentary). Relics destroyed in 1562. Ded. 174 (9).

12. Machar, Bishop and Confessor. S. Accompanied Columba to Iona; preached at Aberdeen; d. *c.* 600.

13. Britius, Bishop. E. Sar. Bishop of Tours, successor of Martin; d. 444. Ded. 1 (0).

13. Devenic, Confessor. S. Apostle of Kincardineshire; d. *c.* 600.

15. Machutus, Bishop. E. Sar. A Welshman who became Bishop of Aleth in Brittany; d. *c.* 564. The see was moved to St. Malo, which is called after him. Ded. 0.

15. Fergus, Bishop and Confessor. S. A Bishop in Ireland;

[1] So *Liturgia* (Paris, 1930), p. 643. Schuster, *The Sacramentary*, says Gregory IV (d. 844) was responsible.

[2] Dr. Frere's.

his relics were at Glamis, then taken to Scone. Also said to have been buried where Glasgow Cathedral now stands.

16. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln. P. See 17th.

16. Margaret, Queen of Scotland. S. (Red Letter.) Born in Hungary, this Saxon Princess was brought to England in the reign of Edward the Confessor. Soon after 1066 the Saxon Royal Family fled to Scotland, where in 1070 Margaret married Malcolm Canmore. d. Nov. 16, 1093, after an heroic life in which she instigated her husband to make many reforms. Canonised *c.* 1250. Her relics were translated to Dunfermline on June 19 of that year. Churches of St. Margaret, the dedication feast of which was on either of these days, will have been dedicated to St. Margaret of Scotland; they are mostly in E. Anglia. In 1693 Innocent XII moved her day to June 10, at the instance of James II of England, that being the birthday of his son, 'the old Chevalier.'

17. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln. E.S.C. Sar. Of Avalon in Burgundy, brought to England by Henry II to inaugurate the Carthusian monastery of Witham; made Bishop of Lincoln in 1186; d. Nov. 16, 1220, when away from home, during Compline.[1] Buried at Lincoln Nov. 24. Ded. 3 (2).

17. Hilda, Abbess of Whitby. P. Ruled over a double monastery, of men [2] and women; d. Nov. 17, 680. Her fame in the Middle Ages seems to have been almost entirely in the North of England. Ded. 20 (5).

18. Hilda, Abbess of Whitby. S.C. See 17th.

20. Edmund, King and Martyr. E.P.S.C. Sar. King of East Anglia; murdered by the Danes on Nov. 20, 870. Ded. 64 (6).

22. Cecilia, Virgin and Martyr. E.P.S.C. Sar. Said to have been martyred at Rome *c.* 230. In Canon of the Mass, and early Mart. Name of an ancient parish church (*titulus*) at Rome. Her supposed tomb was found in the Catacomb of Callistus by Paschalis I in 821; the relics were brought to St. Cecilia in Trastevere. The patron saint of music. Ded. 4 (1).

23. Clement I, Bishop of Rome and Martyr. E.P.S.C. Sar. Presumed author of the Epistle to the Corinthians bearing his name. Said to have been martyred *c.* 100. The Philocalian list is silent about him, as about other second-century popes. His martyrdom was first celebrated in the fourth century. The day is perhaps the dedication festival of his *titulus*. His relics (perhaps belonging to another Clement) were brought from Chersonesus in the Crimea by Cyril and Methodius in 868. Ded. 58 (20).[3]

[1] Cf. R. M. Woolley, *St. Hugh of Lincoln.*

[2] The men in such cases served the women, either as priests or doing hard manual labour.

[3] Felicitas (a Roman matron) and her sons have also been commemorated on Nov. 23 since the fifth century.

25. Catherine, Virgin and Martyr. E.P.S.C. Sar. Said to have been martyred at Alexandria *c.* 307. A 'great martyr' in the East, though not in the ancient Eastern Calendar. Her tomb is in the monastery of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai. The Western cult began in the tenth century. Ded. 84 (23).

30. **St. Andrew, Apostle and Martyr.** E.P.S.C. Sar. All texts of the Martyrdom of the Apostle give Nov. 30 as the date. Carthaginian Mart. gives Nov. 29. His relics were deposited in the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople in 357. In the thirteenth century the French brought them to Amalfi. Relics were also brought to Kilrymont in Scotland, which was accordingly called St. Andrews. Ded. 733 (107).

December

4. Clement of Alexandria, Doctor. P.S. With Origen[1] (who for more than one reason is excluded from the Calendar) the typical representative of the Alexandrian School of Theology; d. *c.* 210. Ded. 0.

6. Nicolas, Bishop of Myra in Lycia. E.P.S.C. Sar. There probably was a Bishop of this name *c.* 300. The ancient 'Soter' (Saviour) legend came to be attached to him and he became the favourite popular Saint of the East. In the tenth century the cult came to the West, and in 1087 his bones are said to have been brought to Bari. Ded. 435 (9).

8. Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. E.P.S.C. Sar. The date was deduced from that of the Nativity on Sept. 8. The festival has been thought to have originated in England before 1066.[2] Abolished at Canterbury by Lanfranc, it was reintroduced into England in the twelfth century. Since 1854 it has been 'The Immaculate Conception' in the Roman Catholic Church.[3]

13. Lucy, Virgin and Martyr. E. Sar. Said to have been martyred at Syracuse *c.* 303. In early Mart. and Canon of Mass. Ded. 2 (0).

14. Drostan, Abbot of Deer. S. Nephew of Columba; preached in Aberdeenshire; d. *c.* 600.

16. O Sapientia. E.P.S.C. Sar. (Breviary: 'hic incipit O

[1] During the debates on the revision of the English Prayer Book, an influential petition was presented to the Convocations, desiring the inclusion of Origen in the Calendar. But it would presumably be beyond the competence of a local Church to make a new Saint of the universal Church, as Origen would have to be, if he were recognised as a Saint at all.

[2] By E. Bishop, quoted by V. Staley, *The Liturgical Year*, p. 110.

[3] J. Schuster, *The Sacramentary*, iii. 300, says that the use of the office 'Conceptionis Immaculatæ Virginis Mariæ' was ordered for the city of Rome by Sixtus IV in 1477.

Sapientia '). The first of the Greater Antiphons to the Magnificat, seven in number, sung on Dec. 16 to 23 (St. Thomas' Day having its own).[1]

17. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch and Martyr in Rome. P.S. Martyred at Rome *c.* 110. The body was taken back to Antioch and buried in a cemetery outside the walls. In the fifth century it was transferred to the Temple of Fortune, which was converted into a church dedicated to him. Oct. 17 is the date in the Syriac Mart. Dec. 20 is given in the (late) texts of the Martyrdom. The Roman Martyrology gives Feb. 1 for the martyrdom and Dec. 17 for the translation. See Feb. 1 for Canadian Prayer Book. Ded. 1 (1).

21. **St. Thomas, Apostle and Martyr.** E.P.S.C. Sar. There may be some historical fact behind the legend of his visit to India. In early Mart. July 3 was the original Western date (of the translation); Oct. 6 is the Eastern date. Ded. 154 (102).

25. **Christmas Day.** E.P.S.C. Sar. See pp. 209–11.

26. **St. Stephen, the First Martyr.** E.P.S.C. Sar. Ded. 130 (81); see p. 214.

27. **St. John, Apostle and Evangelist.** E.P.S.C. Sar. Ded. 581 (390); see p. 214.

28. **Innocents' Day.** E.P.S.C. Sar. Ded. 16 (11); see p. 214.

29. Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury. C. Sar. Murdered by the (supposed) order of Henry II, 1170. Canonised 1173; translated July 7. Ded. 79 (1).

31. Silvester, Bishop of Rome. E. Sar. The bishop under whom Constantine became a Christian; d. Dec. 31, 335. The Philocalian entry is 'Silvestri in Priscillæ.' One of the earliest Confessor-cults. An *ex-voto* silver crown of the fifth century has been found with the inscription 'Sancto Silvestrio ancilla sua votum solvit.' Ded. 1 (0).[2]

It remains to note a few additional days kept in the Anglican Communion.

Ember Days.[3] The ancient Romans had sacrifices, for a blessing on agriculture, in June and about Sept. 25 and Dec. 25. Some time before the time of Leo I (d. 461) these had been transformed into Christian celebrations. The primitive Wednesday fast has been preserved in connection with them as well as the Friday one, the latter being prolonged into Saturday.[4] Leo saw in these fasts a continuation of the Jewish custom referred to

[1] A unique reference to a liturgical addition, which has been taken to suggest that 'enrichment' was a possibility in the minds of some of the Reformers, see p. 216. In the form of the hymn 'O come, O come, Emmanuel' the Antiphons are very familiar.

[2] The English 1928 Book recognises 'New Year's Eve.'

[3] 'Periodical' days, from Old English *ymb* 'about' and *ryne* 'course'; or possibly a corruption of 'quatuor tempora.'

[4] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 233.

in Zech. viii. 19.[1] In the Leonine Sacramentary there are masses for the fasts of the 4th, 7th, and 10th months—June, September, and December;[2] the part previous to April is missing. The fasts of these months were ordered by the Council of Cloveshoe (747); the Lenten Ember fast is perhaps passed over because in any case the time was one of fasting. The exact days now observed—Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday following the 1st Sunday in Lent, Pentecost, Sept. 14 and Dec. 13—were apparently fixed about 1100. From early times Ordinations were held in mbertide.[3]

Dedication Festival. This is actually earlier than the liturgical observance of Saints' Days, for in many cases the latter was determined by the former. It arose simultaneously with the custom of dedicating churches. In 335 the church of 'The Great Martyrium' (built over Calvary) was completed and consecrated. 'Since that period the anniversary of the consecration has been celebrated with great pomp . . . the festival continues eight days' (Sozomen, *H.E.*, ii. 26). The precedent of the dedication of Solomon's Temple was followed (1 Kings viii. 65, 66). The dedication festivals of the ancient Roman churches are very important, and those of St. John Lateran (Nov. 9) and the Basilicas of St. Peter and of St. Paul (Nov. 18) are in the general Roman Calendar. Gregory I ordered that the heathen festivals connected with temples in England be converted into dedication festivals (Bede, *H.E.*, i. 30). The present village feasts in some cases go back to Saxon times. In 1536 Henry VIII, with the assent of Convocation, fixed the first Sunday in October as the universal date of the festival. The Scottish and American Books provide Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the festival; so does the English 1928 Book, with the rubric, 'If the day of Consecration be not known, the Feast may be observed on the first Sunday in October,' and allows for an Octave.

The Patronal Feast of a Church is mentioned in the 1928 English and Scottish Books. It is of less liturgical importance than the dedication festival.

Octaves have been already mentioned several times. Probably Easter was the first festival to receive an Octave, but Old Testament examples would suggest it naturally. The rubrics governing the Proper Prefaces in the 1662 Book show that the principle of the Octave was not forgotten by the Reformers.

Thanksgiving for Harvest is a natural human custom which the

[1] The fasts of the 4th, 5th, 7th, and 10th months.

[2] The Church year then began in March.

[3] Preferably on the December Ember Saturday (Duchesne, p. 353). Ordinations were 'formerly' confined to the Ember Seasons (*Liturgia*, p. 623). A study of the Ember Masses in the Roman Missal with their primitive features is instructive.

Hebrews consecrated in their feasts of Pentecost and Tabernacles. In mediæval England Lammas Day was a kind of Harvest Festival, corresponding, however, rather to Passover.[1] From 1796 onwards prayers for abundant harvests were put out by authority from time to time, and in 1847 a complete form was issued 'by Her Majesty's special command.' In the decade 1850–60 the custom became general, especially in country districts, where a service was held on a week-day before the 'Harvest Home.' In 1862 the Convocation of Canterbury issued a form of service, which was, however, not given legal authorisation.[2] The American Prayer Book of 1789 prescribed a form to be used on the first Thursday in November, or other day fixed by civil authority. 'Thanksgiving Day' is a great national festival in America, with its appropriate customs. All the Anglican revisions recognise the Harvest Thanksgiving.[3]

IV

Finally, we ask, what is a Saint? Latin Christendom is quite definite in its answer. The Church puts her seal upon the popular devotion to martyrs and Saints inherited from the early centuries, but now regulates these matters with great care. The Pope began to canonise names formally about 1000, but local canonisation continued for some time. The present procedure is as follows. When a case is introduced before the Congregation of Sacred Rites, the Pope issues a decree by which the person becomes 'Venerable.' If the case is successful the person is beatified. This means that a limited cult is permitted, in particular localities or by particular Orders. The name may not be inscribed in Calendars, nor may images be put in churches, unless by special permission. Miracles (in the person's lifetime or after his death) and heroic sanctity are required in proof of the claim. For canonisation, proof of miracles wrought since beatification is necessary; it is thereby shown that the Saint has passed from Purgatory to Heaven and possesses the power of prevailing intercession on behalf of those who invoke him. The canonised Saint is a Saint of the universal Church.[4]

[1] See p. 229. [2] See p. 786.

[3] Summarised from an excellent article in *The Prayer Book Dictionary*. The English 1928 and Scottish Books give Collect, Epistle and Gospel for 'Thanksgiving for the Institution of Holy Baptism,' but it is improbable that this will ever become a commemoration on a fixed day. The Accession Service, on the Accession Day of the reigning monarch, is unfortunately now little used.

[4] The forms of a legal trial are observed. The opposition to beatification or canonisation is represented by an 'advocatus diaboli.' According to H. Mulert, *Konfessionskunde*, p. 298, there were over 10,000 Saints by the sixteenth century, and from 1500 to 1903 there were 113 canonisations and 547 beatifications. The Pope may dispense with evidence for miracles.

Fr. Delehaye, however, gives a rather different account of the matter, opposing the view that canonisation consists of a definition that the faithful departed one enjoys the heavenly vision. The Church lays no stress on miracles worked during life. After death, they play an important part in the procedure; the Church accepts them 'as a providential indication before encouraging the faithful to have recourse to the prayers of God's servant.' [1]

The Orthodox Eastern Church makes no distinction between beatification and canonisation. Theory and practice alike are less definite than in the West, as is shown by the inclusion of Old Testament names in the Calendar.[2]

The Œcumenical Patriarch in 1931 wrote a Letter to the Patriarch of Rumania, describing the practice of the Church in the following terms: [3] 'In accordance with our tradition the following general principles are followed in the recognition and placing amongst the Choir of Saints of the Church, of persons glorified by God.

'1. The verification of the elements of holiness must be made by a Synod, composed of all the Metropolitans, Archbishops, Bishops, and official clergy of the particular church.

'2. This verification is superfluous in the case of those holy persons whom the general consciousness of the Church—of both shepherds and flock—has for long ages recognised and celebrated as such. Of such holy persons who have been tacitly recognised up till now as sanctified and glorified by God, a merely formal recognition is given by the Church in accordance as we have said above.

'3. At the proclamation there is a proper ecclesiastical procedure of which the enclosed copy of the procedure in the consecration of St. Gerasimos the Younger—which took place under the blessed Patriarch Cyril Lucaris at the beginning of the seventeenth century—may serve as an example.

'4. The Deed of Proclamation is solemnly signed in the church, the proper ecclesiastical ceremony being as follows:—

'The whole Synod having come down into the Church and the Book of the Gospels being placed in the centre, the following troparia are sung:—"Blessed art thou, O Christ our God," "When He (the Holy Spirit) descended," then the Deed of Proclamation is signed by all the members of the General Synod

[1] *Sanctus*, p. 252. On p. 259 he says: 'This cult does not belong to the essence of religion. It is a thriving branch grafted naturally on to a venerable tree-trunk.' Sometimes it grows so as to impoverish the sap of the tree.

[2] However, O.T. Saints are commemorated among the Uniates, and by the Carmelites, and the Roman Martyrology includes Elisha on June 14 and Elijah on July 20; cf. also the Maccabees on August 1.

[3] See *The Christian East*, 1931, pp. 88, 89.

who are present and immediately after are sung the troparia "Holy martyrs who fought well," "The tortures of the saints which they suffered for Thee," "The blood of Thy martyrs throughout the world."

'5. At a convenient time a special and suitable Office, within the framework of the hymnology and ceremonial of the Orthodox Churches, is naturally composed for the most noteworthy of the canonised saints, for use in the churches.

'6. Of equal necessity is the translation of the relics, if such are preserved, and their anointing with Holy Chrism. At the translation of the relics it is customary to have vigil services and solemn liturgies.'

The Canonical Committee to whom the subject was referred, and whose Report accompanied the Letter, referred also to the Russian Synod of 1547, which 'lays most stress on the examination in Synod of the genuineness of the miracles, on the life and on the right faith; the Bishop of the place where those who were proposed as Saints had distinguished themselves, being deputed as principal examiner.'

No such processes of Saint-making as those in vogue at Rome are thinkable in the Anglican Communion at present. The theology which lies behind them is accepted by very few Anglicans, and in any case no centralised machinery exists. However saintly an Anglican Christian may be, if he lives in the nineteenth or twentieth century he can never attain the honour that might have been his had he lived in the Middle Ages. Some people feel that this is a reproach to Anglicanism, which does not 'produce Saints.' It is therefore a matter of some importance that the principles upon which additions to the Calendar might be made should be discussed.

The book which has had most influence upon Anglican revisions is Bishop John Wordsworth's *The Ministry of Grace*, in which he lays down the following principles which should govern the revision of the Calendar—(i) Points in the mystery of redemption which may have been omitted should be brought out. (ii) Commemorations calculated to foster true Catholicity should be introduced. (iii) The special blessings of the Anglican part of the Church should be borne in mind. (iv) Commemorations of little importance should be omitted.

The writer would express himself rather differently.

(i) Now that the Transfiguration and St. Mary Magdalen [1] are generally observed, there seems no need to emphasise any further neglected aspects of the mystery of Redemption. As regards Biblical Saints, a Calendar that includes St. Anne, known to us only from the Apocryphal Gospels, and excludes St.

[1] The first witness of the Resurrection.

Joseph, is surely defective. A commemoration of St. Paul's martyrdom, for which June 30 would naturally be chosen, is badly needed. Instead of introducing Timothy, Titus and Silas, perhaps one of their dates might be allotted to 'St. Paul and his Companions.'

(ii) A certain number of commemorations should be deliberately chosen with a view to widening the knowledge and sympathies of English Church people. France is already well represented, though St. Joan of Arc would be welcomed. Anskar was presumably added to the 1928 Calendar in order to direct attention to the Church of Sweden. The principle might be extended to the inclusion of Olaf of Norway, Willibrord of Holland, Elizabeth of Hungary, etc.

(iii) The 1662 Calendar has been criticised for containing a disproportionate number of martyrs from the ante-Nicene days of the Church of Rome. But these commemorations should be treated with great reverence. In particular, the Calendar brought to England by St. Augustine is very precious. Further, the Catacombs are an abiding witness to the primitive fervour of the Church, and martyrs connected with them have a value for teaching purposes not possessed by some other Saints who might seem of more intrinsic importance.

(iv) The missionaries who brought the faith to England are men of renown never to be forgotten. Roman and Celtic names should be retained or inserted in fairly equal proportions. In some districts, especially in the West and North, the traditional names of early Saints and missionaries are embarrassingly numerous. Diocesan Supplements would meet this difficulty.

(v) The principle of including those Saints made familiar by Church dedications should not be forgotten.[1]

(vi) It is much to be desired that one name given at Baptism should be that of a Saint, and for English Church people a full and varied Calendar found in the Prayer Book is the natural place in which too look for a suitable name. Other things being equal, preference should be given to those Saints whose names are likely to be taken for this purpose and whose lives contain lessons intelligible to young people. Thus the numerous Joans should be encouraged to love St. Joan of Arc, and the Margarets' attention should be turned towards St. Margaret of Scotland rather than to her obscure namesake of Antioch.

(vii) Grave difficulty arises in connection with post-Reformation Saints of the Roman obedience. Names like those of Teresa, Francis Xavier, Francis de Sales, and Vincent de Paul are much honoured by Anglicans and it is doubtful if any principle would be sacrified by their inclusion. If post-Reforma-

[1] Note the following English dedications: Botolph 62, Edith 16, Helen 117; the only numerous ones not represented in the foregoing lists.

tion Saints are ruled out, the Prayer Book Calendar would gain greatly by the inclusion of the saintly men who lost their lives under Henry VIII. The Carthusians and Sir Thomas More, for example, are among the glories of England. They were sacrificed because of their resistance to a theory of the omnipotent State which Anglicans should repudiate as fully as Roman Catholics. They could be classed as pre-Reformation Saints, since no final break with the Papacy had taken place. If this suggestion is thought too controversial, they might be included with Cranmer,[1] Ridley, Latimer, and other English men and women who died for their faith in Christ and for freedom of conscience in the sixteenth century, the day being observed as one of mingled joy and penitence.

(viii) Lastly, a list of distinctively Anglican Saints is required. Without any suggestion of formal canonisation, it is within the powers of a local church to frame a roll-call of its own members whose heroism and sanctity deserve permanent record, one which could be used for teaching purposes and, in commemoration only, and optionally, at the altar. In such a list we might put George Herbert, Bishop Andrewes, Charles I, Bishop Ken, John Wesley, Bishop Wilson, Charles Simeon, Henry Martyn, and Bishop Patteson, making a first and tentative selection.[2] At least fifty years should elapse after anyone's death before considering his or her name. The list would vary in each province; the South African one, for instance, would differ substantially from the Indian.[3] Such a roll-call of local Saints would be a first step towards an Anglican Breviary.

[1] That Cranmer was a poor creature seems to be the usual verdict now. But the unexpected strength he showed in his last moments and the incomparable services he rendered to English-speaking Christianity by his liturgical work make it impossible to ignore him in such a commemoration.

[2] The absence of laymen, except Charles, and laywomen, illustrates the difficulty of making such a list. Christina Rossetti has nearly every qualification except joy.

[3] The provisional S. African Calendar (1932) contains the following entries in the Calendar not found in the lists discussed above:

JANUARY: 4 Titus; 12. Benedict Biscop. FEBRUARY: 4. Gilbert of Sempringham; 20. African Missionaries and Martyrs. APRIL: 24. Wilfrid. MAY: 30. Joan of Arc. JUNE: 2. Martyrs of Lyons. JULY: 5. Vladimir; 30. Mary and Martha of Bethany; 31. Germanus and Lupus. AUGUST: 4. Dominic. OCTOBER: 11. Philip the Deacon; 19. Frideswide. NOVEMBER: 7. Willibrord; 19. Elizabeth of Hungary. DECEMBER: 3. Birinus. Some of these seem more suited to a local English list.

In a list of Names that may be commemorated are: Jan. 10. William Laud; Feb. 27. George Herbert; March 19. Thomas Ken, 29. John Keble; April 6. William Law, 11. George Augustus Selwyn; May 13. The Martyrs of Uganda; June 18. Bernard Mizeki; July 29. William Wilberforce; Sept. 1. Robert Gray; 20. John Coleridge Patteson; Oct. 16. Henry Martyn, 25. Alfred the Great, 29. James Hannington; Nov. 13. Charles Simeon; Dec. 1. Nicholas Ferrar.

AUTHORITIES.—The chief sources used in this compilation are the relevant articles in *The Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (especially those by Henry Bradshaw), *The Dictionary of Christian Biography, The Catholic Encyclopædia, The Dictionary of English Church History, Liturgia* (Paris, 1930), *The Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, The Prayer Book Dictionary* (especially articles by Bp. A. J. Maclean) and *The Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* (an article on 'The Calendar' by Bp. Maclean, which is the best short summary in English of the early evidence); Duchesne, *Christian Worship;* Bp. J. Dowden, *The Church Year and Calendar;* Bp. J. Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace;* Bp. W. H. Frere, *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy;* V. Staley, *The Liturgical Year;* and H. Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom.* The Very Rev. J. W. Harper, Dean of St. Andrews, most kindly lent a MS. book containing full details of the Scottish Saints and of the discussions which led to their selection. J. M. Mackinlay, *Ancient Church Dedications in Scotland: non-Scriptural Dedications,* is the standard book on this subject. Bp. Maclean gave valuable help in correcting the proofs.

FASTING AND ABSTINENCE

By A. J. MACLEAN

THE object of this article is to give a summary of the history of Christian fasting and abstinence in ancient and modern times, and to suggest their proper place in Church life and practice of to-day. But here, as in all ecclesiastical investigations, it should be borne in mind that customs have varied greatly in different parts of the Christian world in all ages. A custom may be ancient but far from universal; or it may have been at one time practically universal, yet not necessarily suited to all ages. With this caution we may now consider the history of the practice in question.

It should be noted at the outset that the words 'fasting' and 'abstinence' were in England originally interchangeable, and that the present practice in the Roman Church, which forbids meat on days of abstinence, but does not restrict the quantity of food to be eaten, while it restricts the quantity also on fasting days, is comparatively modern. English Roman Catholics did not observe the difference till the end of the eighteenth century.

1. **The Weekly Fasts.**—These were on Wednesday and Friday of each week, and are mentioned, probably in the beginning of the second century, in the *Didache* or *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles;* and later in that century by Tertullian, who calls them 'station-days,' or (because they ended soon after midday) 'semi-fasts.' In some parts of the West each Saturday also was fasted; but later, Friday was in the West, as a normal rule, the only weekly fast. See further below, § 12.

2. **The Seasonal Fasts.**—These seem to have originated with the fast before Easter. Late in the second century Irenæus speaks of this as an ancient custom. It was a rigid fast, at first for two days only; but it was soon extended, though as a less rigid fast, so as to include, first the six days before Easter, and later the forty days of 'Lent,' or in some places even a longer period. In this connection we must note the custom of fasting before baptism, by the candidates and others; this is mentioned in Acts ix. 9, 18 f.; in the second century by Justin Martyr and Tertullian; early in the third century by Hippolytus in his

Apostolic Tradition;[1] and often elsewhere. The principal day for baptism was Easter, very early in the morning, so that the pre-baptismal fast coincided with the pre-Paschal fast. Indeed, it may be thought that the former was the origin of the latter. For here a curious variety of early custom is noticeable. A sick person was allowed to fast on one day only, namely, on the Saturday (not Good Friday); and in connection with this we must remember the strange fact that in some places the Death and Resurrection of our Lord were commemorated on the same day.

When the fast was prolonged, there was considerable variety in the number of weeks fasted, and in the mode of fasting. A further difference was that the so-called 'forty days' fasting in Lent—which did not include Sundays—formerly began in the West on the Monday after Quadragesima, the first Sunday in Lent; but in the seventh century four fasting days were prefixed so as to complete the number forty, and the fast began on Ash Wednesday. But in the East it began on the day after Quinquagesima. Even the Lenten fast of forty days had some connection with baptism. For on the fortieth day before Easter the candidates for baptism were enrolled, and thenceforth they were called 'competentes' or 'qualified.'

Some other seasonal fasts remain to this day. That of the Four Seasons (*Ember Days*) is Western, and is the sole relic of the old weekly fasts of three days, which in some places included Saturday. The Ember Days originally had no reference to ordination; the custom of ordaining at that time arose from the fact that they were already fasts. The *Rogation Days Fast* before Ascension Day seems to date from the fifth century, and was Western only. A fast after, or even before, *Pentecost* is mentioned in the fourth century. *Advent*, as a season of fasting, is mentioned in the fifth century; but it soon became, in the West, merely a solemn time for prayer, as at present, without compulsory fasting. Eastern Christians have some other, but minor, seasonal fasts; for these see below, § 10.

3. **Vigils** are single fasting days before certain festivals; but *as fasts* they are purely Western. For their use in modern times see below, §§ 6 f., 9. A vigil was originally a night service (mentioned as early as Tertullian) before a great festival, or even before every Sunday, or before martyrs' days. This idea of a

[1] This work was originally written in Greek, and is now known in an old Latin translation and in some later Oriental versions. We owe to Dom Connolly and Professor Schwartz the discovery of at any rate the very high probability that this manual is (with some added details, at least in the case of the Oriental versions) the work of the great Hippolytus of Portus, near Rome. It represents to us, therefore, in the main, Roman customs of that early period. This enables us to carry back the evidence for many customs for a century.

vigil is kept up in the Orthodox Eastern Church, where an 'all-night vigil' is observed on the eve of a festival when the Great Vespers and the Great Mattins are conjoined. Such are the nights before the Nativity of St. Mary (September 8), the 'Presentation of the Mother of God' (November 21), the Presentation of our Lord in the Temple (February 2), the Annunciation (March 25), the Procession of the Cross (August 1), the Transfiguration (August 6), and the 'Repose of the Blessed Virgin Mary' (August 15).

But in the West vigils developed into a fast kept on the day before certain feasts. In the Roman and Sarum kalendars the vigil-fasts are those before Christmas, Easter, Ascension Pentecost, Epiphany, St. Matthias, St. John Baptist, St. Peter and St. Paul, St. James, St. Laurence, the Assumption, St Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Simon and St. Jude (not Sarum), All Saints, St. Andrew and St. Thomas. Late editions of the Sarum kalendar add Annunciation, Nativity of St. Mary, Michaelmas, and (perhaps) Circumcision; for these see Procter and Wordsworth, *Sarum Breviary*, Vol. I.

4. **Fasting before Ordination** is mentioned in Acts xiv. 23, where the plural 'fastings' (in the Greek) seems to imply that there was fasting at each place where the Apostles 'appointed' presbyters. We may compare Acts xiii. 2, where, however, it is not probable, or at any rate not certain, that an ordination proper is meant. In early Church history no great stress seems to have been laid on this fast; but we find in some of the ancient Church Orders, which contain regulations for, and forms of, worship, directions for a bishop to fast *after* his 'ordination' (consecration). The Copts similarly prescribe a fast of forty days after ordination for a newly-made priest, and a vigil to be kept by a bishop on the night before his ordination.

5. **Fasting in England after the Reformation** is emphasised in Acts of Parliament, in Episcopal directions, and in the Homilies. An Act of Parliament of 1548 orders abstinence from flesh meat on 'all days formerly accounted fasting days,' and gives as a reason that it is 'for the better subduing of the body to the soul and the flesh to the spirit'; and curiously enough adds that it is also for the preservation of the breed of cattle, the encouragement of mariners, and the increase of shipping.[1] This Act mentions all Fridays *and Saturdays*, Lent, Ember Days, and Vigils. An Act of 1552 similarly names Vigils, Lent, Fridays and Saturdays, 'or any other day appointed to be kept as a fasting day'; but 'no other even or day shall be commanded to be fasted.' Acts

[1] Hooker, at the beginning of his disquisition on Fasting, makes the remark that in his day all parties agreed to public fasts on extraordinary occasions 'as the temporal state of the land doth require the same, for the maintenance of sea-faring men and preservation of cattle' (*Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. 72).

of Parliament of Elizabeth's reign also mention the preservation of cattle and the encouragement of fisheries as reasons for fasting; and James I re-enacted the former Acts. The Homilies of 1562 enjoin fasting, and allow two meals on a fast day. Royal Proclamations in 1559–61 forbade butchers to sell meat in Lent. Licences to eat flesh in Lent are, however, found in the period 1564–1650. Generally, sick people were excused; and in 1650 Jeremy Taylor in his *Holy Living* (iv. 5. 14) says that fasting is not to be made 'an instrument of scruple, or become an enemy to our health'; sick and aged people, travellers, the poor, and little children are excused.

6. **The English Prayer Book of 1662.**—The 'Days of Fasting or Abstinence' (in one place 'Fasting and Abstinence') are the Forty Days of Lent, the Ember Days, the Rogation Days, and all Fridays except Christmas Day. Each of the 'Evens or Vigils' in the Tables of this book is 'a Vigil or Fast Day'; namely, those of Christmas, the Purification (an addition to the Sarum list), the Annunciation, Easter Day, Ascension Day, Pentecost, St. Matthias, St. John Baptist, St. Peter, St. James, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Simon and St. Jude (an addition to the Sarum list, from the Roman), St. Andrew, St. Thomas, All Saints. [The list omits St. Laurence and the Assumption.] If any of these feasts fall on a Monday, the 'Vigil or Fast day' is to be kept on the Saturday just before.

There were no Tables of this nature in the English Prayer Books before 1662; fasting was based on ancient custom, and to a certain extent on Statutes, for which see above, § 5.

7. **Recent Anglican Revisions of the Prayer Book.**—(*a*) *English* (1928). In this book the phrase 'fasting or abstinence' remains unchanged. Friday ceases to be a fast also when the Epiphany falls on that day of the week, and in the Octaves of Christmas, Easter and the Ascension. The Vigil fasts are reduced to five, namely, those of Christmas, Pentecost, St. John Baptist, All Saints and St. Andrew. Easter Eve is not mentioned as a Vigil, presumably because it is included in the Forty Days of Lent. The 'Greater Fasts and Days of Abstinence' are Ash Wednesday and the week-days of Holy Week.

(*b*) *Scottish* (1929). The list is identical with the revised English list except that the Advent Ember Week is noted as the days after the Third Sunday in Advent instead of after December 13—St. Lucy not being included in the new Scottish and English Kalendars; and except that the only Vigils prescribed are those of Christmas, Easter Day, and Pentecost. The 'Greater Fasts' are Ash Wednesday and Monday to Saturday before Easter, as in the new English book.

(*c*) *Irish and Canadian.* These have the old English list, unaltered.

(*d*) *American* (1929). Two fasts, Ash Wednesday and Good Friday, are specially mentioned. On other days 'the Church requires such a measure of abstinence as is more especially suited to extraordinary acts and exercises of devotion,' namely, the Forty Days of Lent, Ember Days, and all Fridays except Christmas Day and the Epiphany, 'or any Friday which may intervene between these feasts.'

(*e*) *South African* (1929). The following Tables dealing with Fasting or Abstinence have been authorised by the Episcopal Synod for experimental use, and are to be printed. They will be presented to the Provincial Synod, with or without further revision, in 1934. If they are then passed, they will need ratification by the Provincial Synod of 1939 before being finally authorised as Alternatives to the Book of Common Prayer:—

From the Kalendar.

(iii) Table of Days of Fasting (that is, days on which no meat is taken, and the quantity of food is lessened): Ash Wednesday, all Fridays in Lent, Friday in the September Ember Week, and the Vigil of St. Andrew.

(iv) Table of Days of Abstinence (that is, days of self-denial, either by abstinence from meat, or by some other form of self-discipline): all Fridays in the year, except Christmas Day, the Epiphany, and the Fridays in the Octaves of Christmas, Easter and the Ascension; the Forty Days of Lent; the Vigils of Whitsunday and of Christmas Day.

[The South African Church appears to be the first province of the Anglican Communion that has officially made a distinction between 'fasting' and 'abstinence.']

8. **The Mission Field.**—It is generally felt that rules and customs in the matter of fasting which are usual or suitable in Europe are not always applicable in their entirety to all countries of the world, whether in extremely hot or in extremely cold regions. From questions put to missionaries in many parts of the world it would appear that individual missionary bishops have issued special directions on the subject to their dioceses, but as far as the present writer knows, no official provincial action has been taken, except in South Africa.

9. **The Roman Communion.**—We may here note the present Roman regulations on the subject of Fasting and Abstinence. In England and Wales the Fasting Days are the week-days of Lent, except the afternoon of Holy Saturday; the Ember Days; and the Vigils of Pentecost, the Assumption, All Saints and Christmas. Abstinence Days are all Fridays except Holy Days of Obligation and December 26; Wednesdays in Lent; Ember Saturday in Lent; Ember Wednesdays; and the Vigils of the

Assumption, All Saints and Christmas. [From *The Catholic Directory.*]

On abstinence days flesh meat is forbidden. On fasting days only one meal, with a collation, is allowed to those who are bound to fast. Abstinence and fasting together mean a stricter standard than either separately. *The Catholic Encyclopædia* gives the following list of those who are exempted from the obligation: those under 21 or over 60 years of age, the sick, the delicate, those to whom fasting involves loss of sleep or severe headaches, those engaged in hard or protracted labour, mental as well as physical. [The Bishops frequently give general dispensations from fasting when an epidemic, such as influenza, is raging.] The one meal of a fast day is usually taken at or about midday; it may be split up into two parts, with an interval not exceeding two hours. The quantity is not limited. The collation in the evening is limited to eight ounces of solid food. At the present time tea or coffee with a little bread is allowed in the morning. Liquids may be drunk apart from meals if they are without food values; milk or broth are not permitted. Altogether the rules, alarming at first sight, pay due regard to human infirmities, and present little difficulty to healthy people; they are less irksome than the régimes frequently imposed by doctors, which indeed might often be made unnecessary if the neglected practice of fasting and abstinence were to come into favour among Anglicans.

But the difference between the method of minute regulation shown in the above paragraph, and that of leaving much to individual consciences, as is the Anglican practice, is very noteworthy.

10. **Modern Eastern Practice.**—(*a*) Among the *Orthodox Easterns* the Advent Fast begins on November 15 and lasts till Christmas Eve. Before Lent comes the 'Week of Cheese Fare' (beginning with Sexagesima), when cheese and eggs are permitted on Wednesday and Friday, as well as on other days. The 'Fast of the Holy and Great Quadragesima, which continueth till the Day of Holy Pascha' begins on the Monday after Quinquagesima. In addition to these fasts, and to the weekly fasts of Wednesday and Friday, the 'Fast of the Mother of God,' from August 1 to 14 inclusive, is observed.

(*b*) *The Separated Churches of the East*, the Copts, Abyssinians, Armenians, West Syrians ('Jacobites') and East Syrians ('Nestorians' or 'Assyrians'), observe very strict and frequent fasts. Of these Churches two may be taken as examples.

(*c*) *The Armenians.* Wednesdays and Fridays are fasts, except (by dispensation) in the Octave of Epiphany (the Armenian Christmas), in Eastertide, and the weeks after Pentecost and 'Assumption Sunday.' The Lenten fast lasts for 48 consecutive days, from Shrove Monday to Holy Saturday, except (according

to some) the Sundays. Also there are ten weeks of abstinence in the year, in each week five or six days, especially the week of 'Arajavor,' the tenth before Easter; then only vegetable food is allowed, also honey, but no animal food; milk and fish are allowed only on the eve of the five great festivals and after the Eucharist of the day. Altogether there are about 160 days of abstinence in the year. At the present time there is on fast days abstinence from all food from early morning till midday, though this is not binding on all (Ormanian, *Church of Armenia*, p. 179). Dr. Neale (*Holy Eastern Church*, pp. 795 f.) mentions as fasts seven days before the Epiphany (Christmas), the Transfiguration, the Assumption, the Exaltation of the Cross, and the 'first Sunday of the Second Pentecost,' and three days before Whitsunday; and says that on fast days, strictly, only one meal, at sunset, is allowed; flesh meat, milk, butter, and eggs being forbidden.

(*d*) *East Syrians.* The weekly fasts of Wednesday and Friday, even if Christmas falls on one of these days, are strictly observed; but in practice meat may be eaten after evening prayers. The 'Little Fast,' or Advent, begins on December 1; formerly this was voluntary, except for monks, but now it is generally observed. The 'Great Fast,' or Lent, lasts for fifty days before Easter, beginning on the Monday, or on the Sunday (see below, § 11). The 'Fast of St. Mary,' August 1 to 14, is generally kept; and other 'Rogations' are often observed as fasts, especially the three days 'of the Ninevites,' in memory of the preaching of Jonah, which fall twenty days before Lent, and are strictly and generally kept, as they are also by the Armenians. In the fasts no meat, fish, milk, butter or eggs are allowed; and, in strictness (except on Sundays), nothing is eaten or drunk until midday.

11. **Non-fasting Days.**—Here it must be noticed that Sundays and all days of Eastertide (till Pentecost) are explicitly excepted from fasting in ancient Church authorities, Eastern and Western. This exception, however, did not apply to the Western Rogation Days. And in some Separated Churches of the East at the present day the people fast on the Sundays, as well as on the week-days, of Lent and Advent; though this seems to be a comparatively modern custom, adopted for convenience only, so that flesh meat should not be kept over from the Sundays and eaten on the week-days of the fast. Although this is the practice, for example, of the East Syrians, it is forbidden by their Book of Canon Law.

Great stress was laid on the fact that the Lord's Day is a day of rejoicing, not of gloom; and therefore from early times fasting was strictly forbidden on it. In the same way kneeling, which was taken as a symbol of sorrow (for standing was in most places the normal attitude of prayer, as it still is in the East), was forbidden on Sundays and also in Eastertide (fifty days); as, for

example, by the Œcumenical Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325 (Canon 20).

12. **A General Survey.**—The rules for fasting became stricter after the earliest ages. Our Lord gave no regulations on the subject, for it was His practice to enunciate general principles, and to leave the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to make rules for carrying them out. Thus Jesus foretold that the disciples would fast when the Bridegroom was taken away from them, and there left the matter (Mark ii. 19 f.; Matt. ix. 15; Luke v. 34 f.). The Church early applied this saying in particular to the fast of Good Friday and Easter Eve. The stricter Jews in the first century of our era were in the habit of practising voluntary fasts, besides the one obligatory fast of the Day of Atonement, and in each week had two fast days (Luke xviii. 12), namely, Monday and Thursday. For the Christian weekly fasts Wednesday and Friday seem to have been originally chosen so as to make a distinction between Christians and Jews; this is implied in the *Didache* (§ 8), though various symbolical reasons were afterwards found for the choice of these days, of which one was that the Jews made their conspiracy against our Lord on Wednesday, and Friday was the day of the Crucifixion.

The East made stricter rules for fasting than the West; and it may be noticed that the Separated Oriental Churches formulated quite as strict rules on the subject after the fifth century as the Orthodox Easterns did; which shows that we cannot safely argue that a custom which is common to bodies which have separated from each other must necessarily be older than the separation. Indeed, it may be thought that there was a certain rivalry between the various Oriental Churches in making strict rules for fasting.

From the Reformation onwards it may be said that in England, except for early Acts of Parliament, Proclamations, and so forth, much more was left to the individual conscience in the matter of observing fast days than had formerly been the case. The fast days were fixed in the 1662 revision of the Prayer Book, but the manner of observing them was left very much to custom. That they were largely observed, at least by the more earnest Churchmen, there is much evidence to prove. But we do not find that, as time went on, there were definite rules laid down, such as those of the sixteenth century mentioned above (§ 5).

Reasons for the diversity of custom in fasting may be found in the differences of manner of life in various countries of the world, differences largely due to climate. Further, hours of meals on ordinary days are and have been constantly changing in different parts of the world. In many Eastern countries, for example, it is no hardship, quite apart from fasting, to eat nothing before midday. In the north of Europe the hours and number of

meals in the day are quite different from those of a few hundred years ago. Such a diversity of ordinary practice suggests that one fixed rule of fasting for all countries and all ages is not, and never has been, practicable. But that some kind of self-denial in food at certain times is valuable for the spiritual welfare of Christians—not to speak of their physical welfare—is very largely recognised; and it may be regretted that so great a measure of laxity in the matter has for long been prevalent. At the same time it must always be remembered that rules of fasting are matters of ecclesiastical precept, not of divine law.

13. **The Fast before Communion.**—This custom differs from the other fasts already mentioned (except that before baptism) in having its primary motive in reverence rather than in self-discipline. It has, indeed, its analogy in the fast before baptism, described above, § 2, but in respect of motive the analogy is perhaps not quite close. The object of the notes which follow is to state the facts about this custom as they appear from a perusal of the history.

(*a*) *In the Early Church.* As a custom, the fast is mentioned at the end of the second century by Tertullian; he is speaking of private reservation of the Sacrament in houses, which was then and for some time afterwards permitted; and he says that the Sacrament was partaken of before other food. As a *rule*, the fast before Communion is first mentioned, early in the third century, by Hippolytus in his *Apostolic Tradition* (above, § 2), in the Latin version as well as in the somewhat later Oriental (Sahidic and Ethiopic) versions; and in the fourth century by other ancient Church Orders which are derived from that work. But it may be noticed that the form of the rule is that the Eucharist is to be received by the faithful before they eat other food. It has, indeed, been suggested by Dr. P. Dearmer (*The Truth about Fasting*, London, 1928) that, as some of these Church Orders hold that the Eucharist is a preservative or antidote against evil, the meaning is that before every meal the Christian is to eat a morsel of the Eucharistic species; but it is not easy to see how this interpretation can be got out of the words. In the so-called *Canons of Hippolytus*, a Church Order based on the *Apostolic Tradition*, but a good deal later in date, perhaps of the end of the fourth century, the rule is of the later form, that no one is to taste anything before receiving the mysteries, 'especially on the days of the sacred fast.' These last words suggest that there were at least some exceptions, or that the rule was not quite universal.

The rule is insisted on, in the fourth, and early in the fifth, century, by Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzus, Augustine, and others. Gregory says (*Orat.*, xl. 30) that 'we celebrate [the Eucharist] in houses of prayer and before food.' Augustine says that 'it seemed good to the Holy Ghost that for the honour of so

great a Sacrament the body of the Lord should enter into the mouth of a Christian before other foods, for so is the custom kept throughout the world.' This last passage shows at least that the fast before Communion was the common custom of Augustine's age, even if we hold that he exaggerates the universality and antiquity of it.

The rule became very rigid in West and East alike, though there were some exceptions; and it is still held firmly by the great majority of Christians in the world. But it is recognised by all that it is an ecclesiastical precept only.

It may be remarked, in passing, that there is found some trace of fasting *after* Communion. There is evidence of this in the ninth century; the fast lasted for two or three hours.

(*b*) *Post-Reformation usage in England.* There seems to have been no canonical or statutory prescription of fasting before Communion. But as a custom it is frequently attested in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Jeremy Taylor, for example, states that it is a custom of the Christian Church, and derived to us from great antiquity. 'Let us' (he says) 'do the honour to it that it be the first food we eat, and the first beverage we drink that day, unless it be in the case of sickness or other great necessity' (*Holy Living*, iv. 10. 9). The requirement of pre-baptismal fasting (above, § 2), repeated in the first rubric of the 1662 service for adult baptism, may be regarded as throwing light upon the attitude of the English Reformers towards Fasting Communion.

The English Prayer Book as proposed in 1928 adds a new rubric before the Communion Service: 'It is an ancient and laudable custom of the Church to receive this Holy Sacrament fasting. Yet for the avoidance of all scruple it is hereby declared that such preparation may be used or not used, according to every man's conscience in the sight of God.'

(*c*) *Regulations on this subject in the Roman Communion.* A learned Roman Catholic friend has sent the following notes:—

Communicants. The rubrics of the Missal contain the following regulations: 'If anyone has not kept fast from midnight, though he has taken only water or other drink or food even as a medicine, and in however small a quantity, he cannot communicate or celebrate.' This continues to be the law of the Church, and is of grave obligation. Being, however, a positive ecclesiastical law, it admits of exceptions. Thus, when in danger of death, from whatever cause, one may receive Holy Communion not fasting. This also may be done if it is not possible to abstain from Communion without grave scandal, or serious loss of reputation; or when the Blessed Sacrament is in danger of being profaned; or in order to complete the Sacrifice of the Mass, left unfinished by

another priest from sudden illness; or, probably, in order to consecrate the Viaticum for a dying person who would otherwise be deprived of it.

With regard to the sick who are not in danger of death, the Decree of Pius X, December 7, 1906, has now been incorporated in the Codex, of which Canon 858, § 2, is as follows: 'The sick who already for a month have been confined to bed, without certain hope of immediate recovery, may, under the direction of a prudent confessor, receive the most holy Eucharist, once or twice in the week, even though they may have taken medicine, or liquid nourishment.'

The celebration of Mass. The extraordinary relaxations with regard to fasting, granted to chaplains during the War, have been withdrawn, and the general law of the Church still binds all priests. It is stated thus in the Codex, Canon 808: 'A priest is not allowed to celebrate Mass unless he has preserved the natural fast from midnight.' However, a Decree of the Congregation of the Holy Office dated March 22, 1923, grants a special relaxation for priests who have to say two Masses, or may have to say Mass at a late hour in the forenoon; but the privilege is very much restricted. The Decree may be thus summarised:—(i) The dispensation must be secured for each individual priest by his bishop, from Rome; (ii) the dispensation can be granted only to a priest to whom, whether from reasons of health or excessive labour, the natural fast would involve grave injury; (iii) the Mass must be required for the spiritual good of the faithful, and not said merely for the private devotion or utility of the priest; (iv) the nourishment allowed must be of a liquid nature, exclusive of anything of an intoxicating nature. By virtue of this dispensation, and under the above conditions, a priest may say Mass after having taken liquid nourishment.

It may be mentioned that certain relaxations in this matter of fasting may be enjoyed by missionaries, or certain of the faithful, but these are personal privileges, in no way connected with the official discipline of the Church.

(*d*) *Regulations on this subject in the Orthodox Eastern Church.* A learned Orthodox Archbishop gives the following information as to relaxations of the strict rule of Fasting Communion, allowed in certain cases. (i) The Fast before Communion is not held binding in the case of very young children; the general age for its being held binding is six. [It will be remembered that among the Orthodox infants receive Holy Communion.] (ii) It is not held binding in the case of danger of death. (iii) In the case of the extremely aged, the very infirm, and those who are dangerously ill, it may be relaxed by the priest confessor. (iv) In no case can the individual decide for himself. (v) No other relaxations

than the above are permitted. (vi) Where relaxation is permitted the food taken must be of the lightest kind, liquid food, a few grapes, or the like.

[It should be added that these relaxations among the Orthodox are a matter of custom or œcumenical 'common law,' and are not regulated by œcumenical canon.]

(*e*) *Regulations on this subject in the Armenian Church.* A learned Armenian bishop gives the following information. The law of fasting is observed in this Church; the fast begins at midnight. It may be relaxed in the case of danger of death, and of the sick and the aged, and of little children; also 'in cases of conscience.' The fast can be dispensed with by a priest; but, except in very special cases, it is considered better not to communicate unless the fast is observed.

[It is not quite certain what is meant by 'cases of conscience.' Probably it would be, for example, that if a person had to walk very far to reach the church, or if a priest found that he could not carry through the long fast and be able to preach and sing adequately, then such a person might take such food, presumably liquid only, as he decided (with his priest's advice, or in an emergency on his own decision) to be necessary.]

(*f*) *Regulations on this subject in the Coptic, Abyssinian, East Syrian and West Syrian Churches.* In these Churches the rule of Fasting Communion is strictly laid down. The East Syrian Canon Law, for example, decrees that no clerk who takes any part in the services of the Eucharist, Baptism or Ordination is to eat or drink anything beforehand. No rule is laid down in this book of Canon Law for laymen, but the custom stringently binds all.

References for many of the facts recorded in this article may be found in the following works, among others:—W. Smith and S. Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (London, 1875, 1880), Articles 'Fasting' (W. E. Scudamore), 'Communion, Holy' (S. Cheetham), etc.; J. Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, Article 'Fasting, Christian,' by the present writer, v. 765 ff. (Edinburgh, 1912). For Post-Reformation usage in England, in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, part iii (ed. V. Staley, London, 1904). For Oriental Churches, G. V. Shann, *Euchology* (Kidderminster, 1891); A. J. Butler, *The Ancient Coptic Church of Egypt*, Oxford, 1884; M. Ormanian, *Church of Armenia* (London, 1912); T. E. Dowling, *The Armenian Church* (London, 1910); A. J. Maclean and W. H. Browne, *The Catholicos of the East and his People* (London, 1892).

THE CHOIR OFFICES

By E. C. RATCLIFF

1. HISTORY

The Origins of the Offices and their Development.

THE question of the origins of the Choir Offices, or Daily Services, is difficult and obscure. We find them an accomplished fact in the second half of the fourth century, but lack of evidence leaves us without certain knowledge of the steps by which they became so. It is sometimes suggested that the origins of the Offices are to be traced to the observance by the Apostles and first Christians of the Jewish hours of prayer, as recorded or indicated in the Acts of the Apostles. This, however, is a mistake, because such observances were in no sense public acts of worship on the part of the Church; they were the private prayers of one or more individuals. Apart from the Eucharist, we know little or nothing of the public worship of the early Church. Concerning private prayer, on the other hand, the early literature gives us definite information. The *Didache*, for example, directs the saying of the Lord's Prayer three times daily. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian and St. Cyprian assume or recommend the observance of the third, sixth, and ninth hours. Origen recommends prayer during the night; Tertullian assumes it on certain special occasions. Morning and evening prayer are taken for granted. There is, it will be noticed, a significant correspondence between the times of private prayer observed at least by the more devout in the early Church and the times of the public services of later days. Following this clue, the great French scholar Mgr. Duchesne supposed that the Offices originated in the transformation by the ascetics in the fourth century of the private observances of the hours of prayer into public services in church. That the transformation was effected is incontestable; but was Duchesne right in thinking it to be solely the work of the ascetics? Since he wrote there has been a re-estimation of the evidence. Thanks to the learned investigations of Dom Connolly we now know that an important document, once believed to be secondary and to belong at the earliest to the

late fourth century, is actually primary and belongs to the early third century. This is the so-called *Egyptian Church Order*, now generally recognised to be the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus of Rome, who died in 235. As a third-century document, it is a new factor in the situation, and its emergence as such calls for a reconsideration of Duchesne's theory.[1]

The *Apostolic Tradition* was written in view of a particular situation that had arisen in the Roman Church. It was designed as a manual of direction in Christian practice for the converts who were then entering the Church in considerable numbers; and it was intended also perhaps as a safeguard against the supposed errors and slackness of the Latin group of Roman Christians and their bishop. Hippolytus, its author, apparently presided over a group of Greek-speaking Christians who, though resident in Rome, derived their traditions from some Greek centre, probably Antioch or its neighbourhood. The *Apostolic Tradition*, therefore, may be taken with certainty as representing only Hippolytus's own group at Rome.[2] But it is not the less important for that, because it attained a great publicity and popularity, principally in the East; it was translated into several languages, and its provisions were incorporated in or influenced a number of the 'Church Orders,' manuals like itself for guidance of the life of local churches and their members. In the matter of prayer, Hippolytus issues explicit injunctions. Every Christian is commanded to pray on rising in the morning; at the third and sixth hours, because of their association with our Lord's Passion; at the ninth hour; on going to bed; and in the middle of the night, on account of our Lord's words in Matt. xxv. 6, 13, Nothing is said about evening prayer. Directions are, however. given for the conduct of the 'supper of the congregation' in the evening: when the lamps are brought in,[3] the bishop is to say a thanksgiving which is closely related, both in matter and form, to the hymn 'Cheerful light' quoted by St. Basil as already ancient in his day and still sung at Greek Vespers.[4] Injunctions are given also for daily assemblies in church for instruction, and for reading the Scriptures at home when the instruction had to be

[1] Mgr. Duchesne published extracts from *Ap. Tr.* in the last edition of *Christian Worship*, but did not discuss the bearing of the work on the Offices.

[2] Dom Connolly regards it as generally representative of Roman use. The question, however, depends upon the view taken of the constitution of, and situation in, the Roman Christian Community at this time: whether it was a corporate unity, or whether any of the groups, of which it appears to have been constituted in the immediately preceding period, still maintained an existence. See G. La Piana, 'The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century,' *Harvard Theological Review*, July 1925.

[3] The passage about the lamps occurs only in the Ethiopic version: but it is found also, though without the thanksgiving, in dependent documents, and may, therefore, be considered as integral to the original, but now lost, Greek of *Ap. Tr.*

[4] Tr. in *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, No. 18. See St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 73.

abandoned; but there is as yet no trace of Offices. Prayer, 'which is the duty of all,' is still private.

Yet, although this is so, Hippolytus's outlook is noticeably different from that of the earlier writers. Regimen has replaced recommendation; and the importance of the *Apostolic Tradition* lies in the fact of its wide acceptance and the consequent diffusion of the changed outlook. In its systematisation of daily private prayer and in the imposition of its system as obligatory, the *Apostolic Tradition* gave a new direction to the movement of Christian life and ideal of practice, and originated a process of which the logical conclusion was a liturgical system of daily public prayer. Common prayer at stated times in church is the next step to obligatory private prayer at the same times at home, and the step is easier when the custom is already established of resorting daily to church for instructions. There is, also, but a short distance between direction to say prayers, and direction as to what prayers to say. A study of the documents dependent upon the *Apostolic Tradition* shows that the step was taken and the distance covered. We cannot, however, trace the details of the process. In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the last of these documents (*c.* 375–400), we see the process complete. There are two principal daily public services, at morning and evening, for which psalms and prayers are alike prescribed, and at the other hours of prayer there are services in church. The evidence of contemporary writers shows that practice followed precept. The daily Offices are settled institutions. The *Apostolic Tradition* and the Church Orders in stereotyping the old tradition, therefore, make the chief contribution to what was in effect the settlement of a new tradition in the matter of worship and of Church life in general; and the movement which they inspired and guided was a movement of 'secular' laity and clergy, as distinct from the ascetics. That the ascetics played their part in developing the Offices is indisputable; but that the Offices were their creation, as Mgr. Duchesne supposed, a fresh reading of the evidence does not seem to suggest.

We have, as might be expected, fuller information about public worship in the latter half of the fourth century than in the period preceding. Much of this is derived from ascetic sources. In his *Longer Rules* St. Basil the Great outlines a scheme of daily prayers for the ascetics of Pontus and Cappadocia.[1] There are eight Offices in all, viz. at midnight, before dawn, at dawn, at the third, sixth and ninth hours, at evening and at the beginning of the night. Prayer at these hours was obligatory, as in the earlier period, on those who could not pray with the community. It has been questioned whether the last Office was recited in common

[1] *L.R.* xxxvii. See W. K. Lowther Clarke, *The Ascetic Works of St. Basil*, S.P.C.K., 1925, pp. 206–9.

as a public service, or whether it was a private devotion observed by each individual on retiring to bed. Basil's language does not suggest that it was different from the other Offices, the communal character of which is beyond doubt. Its observance, together with that of the dawn Office, appears to have been restricted to the communities who lived by Basil's *Rules*. In John Cassian's *Institutes of the Cœnobites* we have accounts of the customs of the ascetics in Egypt and Palestine. The Egyptian monks met twice a day for common worship, before daybreak and at evening. There were no other services, because it was the duty of ascetics to live in a state of prayer. The ascetics of Palestine observed a daily cycle of at least six Offices, viz. the Vigil or night Office, a morning Office said almost immediately after the Vigil, the Offices of the third, sixth and ninth hours, and the *Lucernare* or evening Office. An extra morning Office was added at Bethlehem, during Cassian's sojourn there (*c.* 388). It would seem to correspond to Basil's dawn Office, but Cassian betrays no knowledge of this, and speaks of the Bethlehem service as an innovation. Its use was not everywhere adopted; nevertheless Cassian thinks of the daily Offices as being seven in number, and as being therefore a literal fulfilment of the Psalmist's vow, 'Seven times a day will I praise thee.' Cassian gives us but few details about the services; Psalms cxlviii–cl were said at the first morning Office, and other psalms seem to have been chosen on account of appropriate references to morning and evening. Cassian's information is confirmed and supplemented by another document of interest and value. This is the *Peregrinatio Etheriæ*, a diary kept by a Spanish lady, Etheria by name, of her pilgrimage to the Holy Places of Palestine and the East (*c.* 385). Etheria describes the Holy Week and festival services at Jerusalem and Bethlehem. The cycle of Offices is that of Cassian, without, of course, the extra morning Office; and the ninth hour is a special observance proper to Lent. Although there was a general attendance of 'secular' laity and ascetics at all these services, Etheria gives us to understand that the morning Office and *Lucernare* had an importance above the rest and were better attended. In the morning the bishop, after the Psalms are sung, says 'a prayer for all, mentioning the names of those whom he wishes to commemorate'; in the evening the commemoration is made by a deacon, *Kyrie eleison* being sung as a response after each name, and the bishop then prays for all as in the morning. Both Offices conclude with the blessing and dismissal of the faithful by the bishop. Etheria notes, as something new, that on festivals and in Holy Week the Psalms and lessons from Scripture are appropriate to the day and place. This scheme of daily services, it will have been noticed, is that contemplated in *Apostolic Constitutions;* and Etheria is definite that they are as much the

services of the ' secular ' laity as of the ascetics. We find, then, at Jerusalem already at the end of the fourth century the breviary cycle of daily Offices almost complete, and the beginnings of the observance of the liturgical year.

This same system obtained also at Constantinople. There it was subsequently amplified by the incorporation of Basil's two Offices of dawn, or the First Hour, and of the beginning of the night, or the Service After Dinner (ἀπόδειπνον). These eight Offices, elaborated in the monasteries during the Byzantine period and attaining their finished state about the tenth century, form the framework of the Byzantine Daily Service, and are the foundation of the *Horologion*, or daily Hour-book, of the Greek Orthodox Church at the present day.

The Offices at Rome and the Formation of the Breviary.

Evidence for the history of the Offices at Rome before the sixth century is slight. The only public Office during the fourth century was the Station Vigil kept in connection with the Station Mass. The hours were observed in private. When the cycle of public Offices was first established at Rome we do not know. The Roman clergy were conservative and opposed themselves to institutions associated with the ascetics. There is, however, a clear indication of the existence of a Roman Office in the first quarter of the sixth century. In his *Rule*, composed about 530, St. Benedict frames a definite and detailed scheme of Offices, which is also the earliest known in the West and is the foundation of the Monastic Breviary. Benedict is silent as to his sources, but residence at Rome had acquainted him with its liturgical customs, and he makes some reference to these in his *Rule*. The inference, in part supported by a passage in a trustworthy document of the seventh–eighth century,[1] is that Benedict's scheme is a rearrangement, and an adaptation to monastic needs, of the system in use at Rome; and that it retained the basic principle of that system, viz. the weekly recitation of the Psalter. In Benedict's time the Roman cycle was identical with that which Etheria had found in Jerusalem, and not improbably had been influenced by Jerusalem in its beginnings. The six services were called Vigil or Mattins, Lauds, Terce, Sext, None, and Vespers. Terce, Sext and None, however, were said only on Sundays and certain other occasions. To this scheme Benedict, apparently following Basil's *Rules*, added two other Offices, viz. Prime, corresponding to the dawn Office, and Compline (*completorium*, i.e. the completion of the day), corresponding to the Office at the beginning of the night, and characterised by the same Psalm, xci. Benedict provided also for the daily recitation of Terce, Sext and None. He further

[1] I.e. *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, which contains material of an earlier date.

added *ambrosiani*, hymns either composed by St. Ambrose or in his style, to be sung at the Offices. From Benedict's *Rule*, then, and from various later notices as to changes, we can form some general idea of the character of the Roman Office at this period. Lauds and Vespers were the two principal services of the cycle. Lauds began always at dawn. It had its appointed psalms for each day, an Old Testament canticle, a lesson, and a Gospel canticle. The psalms always included cxlviii–cl, which from the frequent occurrence in them of the word *Laudate* gave its name to the Office. Vespers was the service of nightfall; it had its psalms, a lesson, and if the Roman custom were in this respect identical with the Milanese as recorded by Honorius of Autun, also a Gospel canticle. Both Lauds and Vespers concluded with prayers introduced by *Kyrie eleison*, and probably beginning with the Lord's Prayer, as in Benedict's *Rule*. The proper Collects were still confined to the Mass. It is reasonable to conjecture, however, that the morning and evening prayers of the *Leonine Sacramentary* were intended for recitation at these Offices. There seems to have been some freedom in the conduct of the Vigil. If it had not come to an end before the hour appointed for Lauds, it could be terminated without the full number of psalms and lessons being said. There are indications that the number of psalms was twenty-four for Sundays and twelve for week-days. About the scheme of lessons, presumably drawn only from the books of the Bible read in course, we know nothing certain. The arrangement of the Psalter distributed i–cix (Vul. cviii) over the Vigils for the week, with certain exceptions, and cx (Vul. cix) to cxlvii, excluding cxix and certain other psalms over Vespers. Ps. cxix was assigned to Terce, Sext and None. The remaining psalms were said at Lauds. This scheme of Offices did not include commemorations of Saints. At this period the Saints whose anniversaries were celebrated by the Roman Church were for the most part Roman martyrs who were buried in one or other of the local cemeteries. Saints' festivals were accordingly few, and their services were not integral to the scheme of Offices. Services in commemoration of these Saints were held on their anniversaries at their cemetery churches; psalms and lessons suitable to the occasion were said, and the lessons included the *Acts* of the martyr. When contrasted with the Benedictine system, the Roman appears to be non-monastic or 'secular.' It is not a cycle which divides the day into so many periods, each beginning with a corporate act of prayer and praise, and which thus effects an alternation of worship and work in a common life; it is a cycle in which the Offices are the metamorphosis of the private devotions of clergy and people into public services, and in which the distribution of the Psalter is an illustration of the Roman genius

for simplicity, order and the practical sense which provides against confusion and ineffectuality.

During the next three centuries the Roman system underwent some development. Its use also became widely extended, and this led finally to important modifications. One factor in the development was the regulative and co-ordinative work, musical as well as liturgical, of St. Gregory the Great, who was himself a monk. Another was the influence of the convents of monks who were attached to the basilicas, first to St. Peter's and later to the others, with the responsibility of maintaining the Offices. The monks recited the Roman Offices; but they introduced into the Roman cycle the two monastic offices of Prime and Compline, and further made Terce, Sext and None daily observances. It was doubtless also due to them that expositions of Scripture and homilies came to be included among the lessons at Mattins. During this period the commemorations of the Saints were transferred from the cemeteries to the City, and were celebrated in the churches to which their relics had been translated or with which their names were in some way associated. But their Offices remained additional to those of the day, which was not pretermitted because of them. This is the origin of the *officium duplex*, or double Office. In course of time, certain commemorations were fused with the Office of the day. These were minor festivals. Greater commemorations retained, or when introduced had assigned to them, each a complete Office proper to itself, *i.e.* were ' double ' festivals. During these centuries, also, the prestige of the Roman *Schola Cantorum* led to the diffusion of the Roman chant north of the Alps. As might be expected, it came to England with the Roman Mission to Kent. Thence it spread to other centres. From Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* we learn that Augustine's colleague, Paulinus, on moving from York to Rochester left behind him a deacon, James, ' who was extraordinarily skilled in singing . . . and began to teach many to sing the ecclesiastical chant according to the custom of the Romans or Cantuarians.' With the coming of Theodore as Archbishop of Canterbury in 669, ' they began,' says Bede, ' in all the churches of the English to learn the ecclesiastical chant, which hitherto had been known only in Kent.' In 680, Benedict Biscop brought back to his monastery at Wearmouth no less a person than John, the arch-chanter of St. Peter's in Rome. John taught the singers of the monastery ' the manner of singing and reading aloud, and wrote down what was necessary for the celebration of festivals throughout the course of the year.' John's pupils, however, were not confined to the monks of Wearmouth; they were drawn ' from almost all the monasteries of the same province,' and many other places expressed a desire to learn the Roman chant. The introduction of the music led naturally to

the introduction of the texts to which it belonged, and the Roman Offices became the use of the Anglo-Saxon Church. The Roman music was adopted also in the Frankish dominions. The Roman zeal of the English missionaries brought the Frankish Court into relations with the Roman See, and inevitably aroused interest in Roman modes of worship. Chrodegang of Metz, returning from an embassy to the Pope in 753, introduced the Roman chant and with it certain Roman liturgical customs. Others followed his example. The movement proceeded apace, but the Roman service-books did not wholly supplant the Frankish. Roman material was combined with non-Roman, and new service-books were drawn up. Frankish interest in liturgical matters produced modifications and abbreviations in the Roman Offices which eventually were accepted at Rome. This result was facilitated by the changed conditions of the Papal Court. Constant absence from Rome, travelling, and growth of business made the performance of the old Roman Offices increasingly inconvenient. Moreover, the number of books required for the Offices made it impossible for the clergy to fulfil their obligation of saying them when not in choir. Attempts were made to collect the psalms, lessons, rubrics, etc. into one book; this is the earliest form of the Breviary. The Offices, however, were too long, and their abridgment in view of changed conditions was inevitable. In the first half of the twelfth century we hear of a new, as opposed to the old, Office. This was the *modernum officium* used by the Pope and the Curia in the Papal Chapel. The Modern Office was characterised by the two contrary tendencies of abbreviation and amplification. It abbreviated lessons, and probably suppressed certain responds and antiphons. On the other hand, it introduced new festivals into the Kalendar, some of non-Roman local observance, *e.g.* St. Martin of Tours, and others of more general interest, *e.g.* the Feast of the Trinity; it attached octaves to festivals which it classed as of first rank; it adopted the hymns of the Monastic Office; and it added the Offices of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the Dead as supplementary observances to the canonical Office, together with Memorials of the Cross, of the Blessed Virgin and All Saints, and of St. Peter and St. Paul at Vespers and Lauds on most days of the year. The fifteen gradual Psalms, the seven penitential Psalms, and other Psalms were likewise prescribed for recitation at particular times. The comparative shortness of the new Office, as contrasted with the old, commended it to the Franciscans, whose work and manner of life demanded shorter services and a portable service-book. The Rule of 1223 adopted it for Franciscan use. The Franciscans soon found, however, that they required an Office yet shorter than that of the Curia, and one more in accord with their own devotional temper and practices. With the approval of Pope

Gregory IX, therefore, their general, Haymo of Faversham, and his colleagues undertook a revision of the *Breviarium Romanæ Curiæ*. Their revision was marked by the same two contrary features remarked above. The Scripture lessons were further reduced, and longer expositions and homilies were replaced by short passages from other sources. At the same time the number of festivals was considerably increased, and those of double rank augmented. The double Office was still maintained in the Roman basilicas. The Franciscans, however, did not celebrate it among themselves. They said only the Office of the festival and pretermitted that of the day. They also introduced a new fashion in observing octaves. The celebration of an octave had originally been a commemoration of the festival in the Office of the eighth day. The Franciscans not only raised the eighth day to the rank of a double; they gave the same rank to the six intervening days, so making double festivals last for a week. In this way the old Office of the day or season fell largely into disuse, and the recitation of the Breviary Office became a succession of festival observances. Not a few of these were marred by the introduction of lessons from spurious and mythical Acts, Lives and Passions of the saints, such as were condemned, complains a fourteenth-century liturgist, by the Decree of Pope Gelasius I. Among Franciscan amplifications, we may note also the addition of the four Anthems of the Blessed Virgin to Compline, and the practice of saying both the Lord's Prayer before and after each Office and also *Ave Maria* at the beginning and end of the Offices of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The revised Breviary was authorised for the use of the Franciscans by Pope Gregory IX in 1241. It was adopted by the Papal Curia; and in 1277 Pope Nicholas III, himself a Franciscan, imposed its use upon most of the churches of Rome. The Franciscans had already carried it throughout Western Europe. Thus it became the core of the Offices of the Sarum Use and of the other mediæval non-monastic uses of the two English provinces.

The new Office retained the Roman distribution of the Psalter, and most of the old antiphons, prayers and responds, but it was nevertheless, as Dom Baudot has said, 'a veritable revolution in liturgy.' It was no less a revolution in worship, because it was based upon the principle that the Offices were pre-eminently the concern of the clergy. There was now little general attendance except at Mattins, sung before Mass, and 'Even-song,'[1] on Sundays and festivals. With the advance of the Middle Ages, the interest of the laity had been concentrating upon the votive Offices of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the Dead, a translation of which into English formed an important division of the *Prymer*, the layman's

[1] So *The Vision concerning Piers the Plowman*. For pre-Reformation Sunday Services see Chr. Wordsworth, *Notes on Mediæval Services in England*.

book of prayers. It was almost as much owing to this comparatively new devotional interest, as to ignorance of Latin, that the Offices ceased to be in practice, if not in theory, the common prayer of the Christian people.

The English Reform of the Offices and the Book of Common Prayer.

At the beginning of the sixteenth century there was general dissatisfaction with prevailing liturgical arrangements. In the case of the Offices, objection was made, first to their complication and to the rules pertaining to them, and next to the diversity of Uses. The multiplication of feasts had rendered nugatory the ancient plan of the Offices. The too frequent repetition of the same psalms impeded the regular weekly recitation of the Psalter, and the continuous reading of Scripture was interrupted by lessons taken from Lives of Saints and other ecclesiastical sources. The first reform of importance was the Breviary drawn up by Cardinal Quiñones at the instance of Pope Clement VII and published in 1535. Quiñones' aim, as set out in his Preface, was the redistribution of the Psalter over the week, provision for the continuous reading of most of the books of the Bible, and simplification. The last was secured by the abolition of antiphons, short chapters, *i.e.* the verse to which the lessons at all services but Mattins had been reduced, and responds. Quiñones' Breviary was intended to serve the convenience of the clergy, and not for public use. It was opposed, however, as being too radical in tendency, and although Quiñones issued a second edition with antiphons restored, it was suppressed in 1558. It had, nevertheless, helped to prepare the way for the reform of the Breviary by Pope Pius V, who with his Breviary of 1568 and Missal of 1570 established all but uniformity within the Roman Church.

Quiñones' reform had proceeded on the assumption that the Offices belonged to the clergy alone. Among the Lutherans a different tradition was in process of formation; the Latin Offices had been replaced by services in the vernacular, in which the people could take part. In England it was for some time uncertain which direction reform would pursue. The first step inclined in the Lutheran direction. In 1543 it was ordered that a chapter of the New Testament in English should be read every Sunday and holy-day at Mattins and Vespers. In the following year the first English Litany was issued. The Offices, however, continued in Latin; and at first it appears that a revision of these was considered. A MS., mostly in Cranmer's handwriting and containing two schemes of revision, is preserved in the British Museum. The first of these schemes reduces the services to two, Mattins and Evensong; it arranges the Psalter over the month; abolishes non-scriptural lessons and provides for the Bible to be read over once in the year; and also abolishes antiphons and responds,

although retaining hymns. There were to be three lessons at Mattins and two at Evensong. *Te Deum* and *Benedictus* were to be sung at Mattins, and *Magnificat* at Evensong; *Nunc Dimittis* was omitted. This scheme recalls Quiñones' first Breviary, and the Preface prefixed to it is often verbally reminiscent of Quiñones' Preface. The second scheme is of the type of Quiñones' second Breviary: the cycle of eight services is retained, and Sarum material is used. What led Cranmer to abandon his Latin projects we do not know for certain. As long as Henry VIII lived, the possibilities of revision were limited in a conservative direction, but that king's death in 1547 removed from Cranmer all check and restriction on thought and inclination. Accordingly, Cranmer could, and did, associate himself with the party that favoured the German reforms. This association finally determined the direction of English liturgical reform. That reform took the shape of a new book of services in the English language and was published in 1549 as *The Book of Common Prayer*.

The Choir Offices of the first Prayer Book are two in number, Mattins and Evensong, and are identical in structure. The structure is simple, as can be seen from the following table:

MATTINS.		EVENSONG.
	Lord's Prayer.	
O Lord, open thou my lips, etc.	O God, make speed to save me, etc.	
	Gloria Patri . . . Alleluia.	
Psalm xcv.		
	Psalms of the day.	
	Old Testament Lesson.	
Te Deum or *Benedicite.*		*Magnificat.*
	New Testament Lesson.	
Benedictus.		*Nunc Dimittis.*
	Lord, have mercy upon us, etc.	
	Creed, Lord's Prayer, Suffrages.	
	The Lord be with you, etc.	
	Let us pray.	
	i. The Collect of the day.	
ii. Collect for peace.		ii. Collect: O God, from whom all holy desires.
iii. Collect for grace.		iii. Collect for aid against all perils.

The above scheme has marked affinities with the first Latin scheme of Cranmer's MS. There is also a close relation between the Preface of the MS. and that of the Prayer Book of 1549. The latter calls for attention as it explains the principle of the new Offices, and indicates their purpose and significance. According to the Preface the original purpose of the Choir Offices or 'common

prayers' as established by 'the ancient Fathers' is 'great advancement of godliness' among clergy and laity. The principal means to this end being a daily reading or hearing of the Bible, the Fathers ordained that the Bible should be read over once in the year at the daily Offices. Edification, therefore, is the set purpose of the new Offices. It is to be secured by a restoration of the ancient 'continual course of the reading of Scripture' and by the use of such language as the people 'might understand and have profit by hearing the same.' As edification is ministered only by 'the pure word of God' and by 'that which is grounded upon' it (*i.e.* the Apocrypha), non-scriptural and non-Apocryphal lessons are excluded, together with antiphons, responds and invitatories, which interrupt the reading of Scripture, both psalms and lessons. Finally, the interests of edification require that the Use of the new book shall become the uniform Use of the whole realm.

In his Latin Preface Cranmer had written of his projected Breviary that it was 'an order not newly devised by us but rather the old order delivered by the Fathers (if you shall consider their purpose aright) which we have restored, as far as we could, to its ancient and primitive use and excellence.' Of the English Offices he says, 'Here you have an order for prayer (as touching the reading of holy scripture) much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old fathers, and a great deal more profitable and commodious than that which of late was used.' He does not claim that it is a restoration of the old order, and the differences between the old and the new are more than a change of liturgical language and a simplification of the structure of services. The emphasis on edification and on the necessity of it is the assertion of what, at the time, seemed to be a new principle in public worship. It was the founding of a new tradition which has survived in English religion to our own time and which in its overshadowing of worship by edification has had unfortunate effects. This emphasis on edification and on Scripture-reading as the means of it is, of course, to be understood in the light of the conditions from which the sixteenth-century Church of England was emerging, and of the new interest in the Bible and in the new ideas of its inspiration, authority and universal accessibility, and of knowledge of it as a necessity for salvation. To this new principle, as much as to any desire to return to antiquity, is attributable the place assigned in public worship to the people, and the popularity of the new Offices, increasingly at the expense of Communion, among those who accepted Reformed ideas. The intention and spirit of the new Offices are summed up, not by the verse, 'Seven times a day do I praise thee,' but by 'Thy word is a lantern unto my feet.' The Offices, as occasions of the ministering of the Word of God, became by a process natural

within Reformed circles, the central religious observances of English Church life.

Such a result appears not to have been contemplated or desired by the earlier Reformers. It was, however, to some extent assisted by the revisions of 1552 and 1661. In 1552 the introduction, consisting of the opening sentences, exhortation and confession, was added. At the same time certain psalms were provided as alternatives to *Benedictus*, *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*. These canticles were disliked by the extreme Reformed party on account of their use in the old services, and the alternative psalms served perhaps to give a more definitely Reformed character to the Offices. In 1661 the anthem, the four last prayers, and the 'Grace' were added, and it was made possible to say the Occasional Prayers, which in the previous edition of the Prayer Book were attached to the Litany, at Mattins and Evensong. It is possible that, although lacking rubrical authority, this practice was not new in 1661. The effect of these additions was to make the Offices perform the function originally assigned by the Reformers to the Litany. The Litany was the principal form of general intercession, but it was unpopular with the Puritans, who termed its petitions and responses 'short cuts and shreddings, which may be better called wishes than prayers.' A further and undesigned effect of the additions was to bring the Offices into line with the earlier Eastern tradition as represented by the early morning and evening services at Jerusalem in the time of Etheria.

Each of the attempts at Prayer Book revision subsequent to 1661 would have affected the Offices conformably with the aims and principles of the revisers. The proposed revision of 1689 was at once a gesture of conciliation towards Nonconformity and a concession to Low Church feeling. The proposals with regard to the Offices were few, but indicated an absence of a sense of form and of liturgical tradition. A new versicle and response drawn from Psalm cxix were thrust between those with which the Offices open. Psalms were substituted for *Benedicite* and *Nunc Dimittis*, Psalm viii was inserted before *Magnificat*,[1] and most of the prayers were expanded or altered. The main structure, however, remained unchanged. The revision of 1927–28, on the other hand, was intended both to meet new needs and to make use of liturgical knowledge for improvement and enrichment. Had this revision been sanctioned by Parliament, it would have opened a new chapter in the history of the Offices. In respect of these, its principal feature was the permissive use of a considerable number of variations. Certain of these were revolutionary. By its provision of a table of psalms for all Sundays and the greater holy-days, it would have enabled the separation of the Offices of

[1] The Psalm was doubtless intended to be an alternative to *Magnificat*, but there is no explicit direction to this effect.

these days from those of other days, and so have interrupted that continuity which is fundamental to the Offices. By its permission to omit not only the introduction, including the first Lord's Prayer, but also all that follows the second canticle at either service, when that service is immediately succeeded by another, it would have made it possible to reduce the status of either Office to that of a mere preliminary. *Such violation of the integrity* of Offices is objectionable in its disregard of their rationale. On the other hand, the provision of a shorter alternative introduction and the sanction of the reduction of the prayers to one out of the three Collects if desired are both reasonable and respectful of history. The chief fault of this revision of the Offices lay in its principal feature, viz. the provision of many variations. A modicum of variation, so limited as not to affect the general character of services, is defensible. The revisers of 1927–28, however, proposed variations so numerous and of such a character that they not only abandoned the old principle of uniformity of Use, but they also introduced a new principle of multiformity of Office.

2. THE CONTENTS

The Title.

In 1549 the old names *Mattins* and *Evensong* were used. *Morning Prayer* and *Evening Prayer* came into use in 1552. The old names, however, are retained in the Tables of Proper Lessons and Proper Psalms.

The Introduction.

In 1549 the Offices began with the Lord's Prayer said aloud by the priest. This was a continuation of the custom, which may be traced back to the ninth century, of beginning the Latin Offices with the Lord's Prayer as a private devotion. In the later Middle Ages *Ave Maria* was said in addition. The doxology was not attached to the Lord's Prayer in the English Prayer Book before 1662: it appeared first in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, from which the English practice appears to be derived. The direction for the people to say the Prayer with the priest belongs also to 1661.

The authorship of the exhortation, confession and absolution is unknown. A confession without exhortation and an absolution were said among the prayers at Sarum Prime and Compline. The present introduction, however, seems to be inspired by continental Reformed practice.

The revision of 1927–28 proposed a new arrangement of opening sentences, and alternative forms of exhortation, confession and absolution. The eleven sentences of 1552 and 1662

were intended to introduce the confession and absolution with scriptural thoughts of penitence and assurance of forgiveness. The last revision provided twenty-seven sentences, of which eight belonged to the original number, the rest being chosen on account of their suitability for seasons, festivals, Saints' days and other special occasions. This disregard of the purpose of the sentences breaks the unity of the introduction. The function of the new sentences would have been better performed by invitatories. The alternative confession is a modern and undistinguished composition. The alternative absolution is based on the form used at Prime and Compline in the Sarum Breviary.

The Versicles, Responses, and Gloria Patri.

The versicles and responses are drawn respectively from Ps. li. 15 and Ps. lxx. 1. St. Benedict directed that at the beginning of the Vigil Ps. lxx. 1 and the *Gloria Patri* should be said, followed by Ps. li. 15, repeated three times. They were probably sung by all together, and not yet as versicles and responses. The Roman and Sarum Breviaries placed Ps. li. 15 before Ps. lxx. 1, and treated both as versicles and responses. *Gloria Patri* continued to be sung by all, and was followed, except from Septuagesima to Easter Day, by *Alleluia*. Except Compline, the other Offices began immediately with Ps. lxx. 1 and the *Gloria* and *Alleluia*. This beginning passed to the Prayer Book of 1549. At Mattins, however, Ps. li. 15 was said before 'O God, make speed to save me.' The *Gloria* was said by the priest alone, followed by 'Praise ye the Lord,' and, from Easter to Trinity Sunday, also by *Alleluia*. In 1552 the singular of the versicles and their responses was changed into plural, and the Mattins versicle, 'O Lord, open thou our lips,' and its response were prefixed to Evening Prayer. *Alleluia*, perhaps as being a reduplication of 'Praise ye the Lord,' was removed. The Prayer Book of 1661, following the Scottish Book of 1637, divided the *Gloria* into a versicle and response, and added 'The Lord's name be praised' as an answer to 'Praise ye the Lord.'

Gloria Patri as a concluding doxology to each psalm was in use in Gaul, according to Cassian, at the end of the fourth century. It was similarly used in Rome by the fifth century, and this use of it is presupposed by St. Benedict in his *Rule*. The Greek form of the doxology is 'Glory to Father and Son and Holy Spirit, now and always and for ever and ever.' This is almost identical with the form prescribed in the pseudonymous fourth or early fifth century document *De Virginitate*. Trinitarian doxologies, however, appear to be older than the fourth century. Their form, also, was not fixed, and it was therefore possible for the Arians to use forms capable of unorthodox interpretations, such as 'Glory to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit.' For this reason,

the form of doxology became a test of orthodoxy, and the present forms were stereotyped among the orthodox in East and West. The purpose of the doxology is to turn the Psalms and canticles of the Old Testament into Christian hymns, by affirming belief in the God who, though only fully revealed in Trinity to the Church of the New Testament, is nevertheless truly known by the Church of the Old.

The Invitatory Psalm.

St. Benedict prescribes the daily recitation of Ps. xcv with an antiphon before the hymn and psalms for the day at the Vigil. The Vigil is the first of the eight daily services, and Ps. xcv therefore comes appropriately at its beginning as an invitation to worship and to listen to the Divine Voice. There is little doubt that this is an original Benedictine feature of the Vigil, and was not borrowed from Rome. It was, however, adopted at Rome, whence it passed to the Sarum Breviary, and thence to the Book of Common Prayer. In the Roman and Sarum Breviaries it is the only psalm said with its antiphon in the ancient manner, *i.e.* the antiphon is sung in whole or part after the second, fourth, seventh, ninth, and eleventh verses and after the doxology. The antiphons, because they belonged to the *psalmus invitatorius*, themselves came to be termed invitatories; hence the 1549 rubric, 'Then shall be said . . . without any invitatory . . . Psalm xcv.'

The proposed revision of 1927–28 restored the invitatory, and provided ten forms, to be sung as antiphons before the psalm and after the doxology, on certain festivals and Sundays. As setting the tone of the service, this was an enrichment; and a complete set of invitatories for permissive use throughout the year might well have been provided. On the other hand, the revision allows only the first seven verses of Ps. xcv to be recited. This is presumably due to objections, made on sentimental grounds, to the stern language of the remaining verses. It should be noted, however, that the 'invitation' is as much in 'To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts,' as in 'O come, let us sing unto the Lord'; and it is to be hoped that in future revisions this mutilation will not be repeated.

On Easter Day and throughout the Octave, Ps. xcv. is omitted, and the 'Easter Anthems' are sung.

The Easter Anthems consist of 1 Cor. v. 7–8, Rom. vi. 9–11, and 1 Cor. xv. 20–22 with *Gloria Patri* at their conclusion. Their origin may be traced to the service at the 'Sepulchre' on Easter morning. The Sarum *Processionale* directs that before Mattins the Blessed Sacrament and the Cross, which had been placed in the sepulchre on Maundy Thursday and Good Friday respectively, shall be removed and placed, the first on the high altar,

and the second on a side altar, '*cum magna veneratione*.' After this has been done, 'Christ, being raised from the dead' is sung as an antiphon, followed by its verse, a versicle and response are said, and a Collect recited. The service concludes with an adoration of the Cross. In the Prayer Book of 1549, this service, with a different versicle and response and with Rom. vi. 11 and 1 Cor. xv. 20–22 added to the original antiphon, in place of the verse, was prefixed to Mattins, without, of course, the accompaniment of the old ceremonies. The service was abolished, and the anthems were directed to be said in place of *Venite*, in 1552. 'Christ our Passover' and *Gloria Patri* were not added until 1662.

The Hymn Te Deum and the Canticles.

Hymns in ancient times were rhythmical, but not metrical and rhyming, compositions. Such hymns have been in use in Christian worship from the earliest days. Traces of them are to be found in the New Testament, *e.g.* 1 Tim. iii. 16, 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16, Rev. xv. 3, 4, etc.; and as examples of early Christian hymns still in use we have *Gloria in excelsis* and 'Cheerful Light.' Canticles are scriptural hymns as distinct from psalms. In addition to *Benedicite*, *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, and *Nunc Dimittis*, the Roman and Sarum Breviaries prescribe *Audite cœli* (Deut. xxxii), *Cantemus Domino* (Exod. xv), the Song of Isaiah (Isa. xii), *Domine audivi* (Habakkuk iii), the Song of Hezekiah (Isa. xxxviii. 10–20), and the Song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 1–10). The Monastic Breviary, and the French diocesan Breviaries issued in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, are rich in canticles.

(i) *Te Deum.*—The Breviaries ascribe this hymn to St. Augustine and St. Ambrose, but there is no foundation for the ascription. Dom Morin's attribution of it to Niceta, Bishop of Remesiana in Dacia, and a contemporary of St. Jerome, is now generally accepted. The hymn is parallel in structure with *Gloria in excelsis*, which may have influenced it. In its original form it ended at ver. 21. The Rule of Cæsarius of Arles, written about 500, orders that certain specified psalms, and '*Te Deum laudamus*, *Gloria in excelsis Deo* and the *capitellum*' shall be said at the end of the Morning Office. This is the earliest known reference to the liturgical use of *Te Deum*. The *capitellum* was a verse, usually chosen from a psalm, and recited as an antiphon or prayer, in the form of versicle and response, at the conclusion of a hymn. Verses 22 to 29 consist of the *capitellum* belonging to *Te Deum* (*vv.* 22, 23) fused with *capitella* belonging originally to *Gloria in excelsis* (*vv.* 24–27), to which have been added two further verses at a later date. As these *capitella* were sung always with the hymn,

they were eventually taken to be part of it; and in this form *Te Deum* found its way into the Western service-books. St. Benedict prescribed its use on Sundays and festivals at the Vigil, and the Roman and Sarum Breviaries direct a like use, except during Advent and Lent. The Prayer Book of 1549 appointed it to be said 'daily throughout the year except in Lent.' In 1552 the exception was removed; it has not since been restored.

In the 1549 and subsequent Prayer Books, *Te Deum* is printed without any division. In the Accession Service, drawn up in 1901, it is divided into three sections. The proposed Prayer Book of 1927–28 printed it in four sections in Morning Prayer, while retaining the tripartite division in the Accession Service. The quadripartite division cannot be justified. Verses 1–13 are a single address to the Trinity, and verses 14 to 21 are an address to the Son. The balance of the hymn is destroyed if the first section be divided into two parts as in the proposed Prayer Book. The point is not without importance if the arrangement of the hymn is to serve as a guide to musical settings.

(ii) *Benedicite.*—This canticle, known as the 'Song of the Three Children,' is taken from the Greek addition to Daniel iii. It is sung daily at Greek Lauds and seems to have been so used since the latter half of the fourth century. In the sixth century it was used at Rome on Sundays and festivals at Lauds; it retained this position in the Breviaries. The Prayer Book of 1549 appointed it as the alternative to *Te Deum* during Lent. The restriction to Lent was removed in 1552. The Breviaries shortened the canticle by omitting the second half of each verse, 'praise him and magnify him for ever,' except at the beginning of each of the three divisions and at the close of the last. The Prayer Book, however, printed the canticle in full. The revision of 1927–28 proposed a shortening similar to that of the Breviaries; as relieving the monotony of the canticle, this is an improvement. In the Breviaries the canticle has a doxology proper to itself, 'Let us bless the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost: let us praise and exalt him for ever. Blessed art thou, O Lord, in the firmament of heaven: praised and exalted above all for ever.' Although this doxology continues the characteristic form of the canticle, it was rejected in 1549 in favour of the *Gloria Patri.* The Scottish Prayer Book of 1929 has restored it as a permissible alternative to the *Gloria Patri.* The 1927-28 revision, however, ignored the point. A more careful revision in the future will doubtless restore the proper doxology.

With a view perhaps to making suitable provision for Lent, the 1927–28 revision proposed Ps. li as an alternative to *Te Deum* and *Benedicite;* when Ps. li had already been said, Ps. xl might be substituted. The length and monotonous form of

Benedicite do not commend it for frequent use to modern congregations, and its character and liturgical associations are rather festival than Lenten. An alternative, therefore, had much to recommend it; but, in view of the large number of canticles from which a choice could have been made, the alternative proposed is lame. The Scottish Prayer Book of 1929, following the American, has provided the canticle *Benedictus es*, also taken from the Greek addition to Daniel iii. In the Irish Book of 1926, *Urbs fortitudinis* (Isa. xxvi. 1–8) is used. Either of these, or such other canticles as the Song of Isaiah (Isa. xii) or *Miserere plebi tuæ* (Ecclus. xxxvi. 12–17) would have been suitable in the English Book.

(iii) *Benedictus, Magnificat, and Nunc Dimittis.*—These are the Breviary canticles for Lauds, Vespers and Compline respectively. When they first came to be employed at these services we do not know. It is certain, however, that in the time of St. Benedict, Compline was not a Roman service, and the Monastic Compline lacks the *Nunc Dimittis*. The Monastic service was added to the Roman secular cycle, and *Nunc Dimittis* had become part of it by the eighth century.

In the Sarum Breviary these three canticles were preceded by metrical hymns proper to the service and the season, known as Office Hymns. Cranmer retained certain of these in his first scheme for a revised Latin Office. His confessed inability to write English verses probably accounts for the absence of hymns, with the exception of his bad translation of *Veni Creator*, in the Prayer Book. Translations of them are now to be found in several collections, and a rubric in the proposed Prayer Book of 1927–28 would have made their restoration possible.

The Creed, the Suffrages, and the Collects.

In the Prayer Book of 1549, *Benedictus* at Mattins and *Nunc Dimittis* at Evensong were followed immediately by the suffrages and the Collects. The Creed and the Lord's Prayer were said at the beginning of the suffrages; they were said, privately, among the suffrages at Sarum Prime and Compline. The suffrages in the Prayer Book are composed of versicles and responses mostly taken from the series of suffrages used at the Sarum services. With the exception of the last versicle and response, the suffrages in the Prayer Book Offices are those prescribed at the conclusion of certain Offices in Cranmer's second Latin scheme. They are followed by the ancient salutation, 'The Lord be with you,' and its response, the invitation 'Let us pray,' and the Collects. In 1552 this arrangement was altered. As the Creed is not a prayer, it was placed by itself immediately after the canticle;

and, as the suffrages are no less prayers than the Collects, the salutation and invitation were put immediately before 'Lord, have mercy upon us,' as an introduction to the prayers. This is a more orderly arrangement than that of 1549, and has the advantage of restoring the Lord's Prayer to its old position of importance. Suffrages were no part of the old Roman Offices. They were added to the Roman Offices when the latter were adopted by the Franks, and then were accepted at Rome. In the fuller forms in which they were used in certain Gallican Churches, they provided complete series of intercessions, comparable with those of the Litany.

The Apostles' Creed was not recited at Prime and Compline before the eighth century, and was probably not in general use much before the ninth. In its present form it is first found about 750. It is an expansion of the old Roman Baptismal Creed. It is omitted when the Athanasian Creed is appointed to be said (see p. 281); and it might reasonably be omitted on week-days except such as are Saints' days. The use of the proper Collect at the Offices is no older than the eighth century. Its recitation was originally confined to Lauds and Vespers on festivals, Sundays and Station days.

The proper Collect at Lauds and Vespers was followed by Memorials. These consisted of a Collect, either of a Saint or with some particular intention, preceded by an antiphon, a versicle and a response. The second Collect at each Office belongs to a Sarum Memorial of Peace: both prayers occur in the *Gelasian Sacramentary*. The third Collect at Mattins is the ferial Collect for Sarum Prime; it is a variant of the prayer for Prime in Alcuin's Sacramentary. The third Collect at Evensong belongs to Sarum Compline, and is taken from the *Gelasian Sacramentary*.

The Anthem and Final Prayers.

Although the anthem was not sanctioned by rubric until 1662, it had been in use since Queen Elizabeth's time and was covered by her Injunctions of 1559. It is a continuation of the practice of singing the Anthems of the Blessed Virgin at the end of Compline.

The Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 directs that at Morning Prayer, when the Litany is not appointed to be said, and always at Evensong, the third Collect shall be followed by 'the Prayer for the King's Majesty, with the rest of the prayers following at the end of the Litany, and the Benediction.' This usage was imitated by the revisers of 1662. The Prayer for the King is an abbreviation of a prayer found in a book of devotions published in 1545. In its present form it first appears as the Prayer for the Queen in 1559. The Prayer for the Royal Family, usually attributed to

Archbishop Whitgift, was added to the prayers at the end of the Litany in 1604. The Prayer for the Clergy and People is derived from the *Gelasian Sacramentary;* it was said at the end of the Rogation Litany in pre-Reformation days, and was retained in the first English Litany of 1544. The Prayer of St. Chrysostom belongs, as its name implies, to the Byzantine Liturgy, but is wrongly ascribed to the saint; the authorship is unknown. No conclusion other than the third Collect was prescribed for the Offices before 1662. The Benediction, or 'Grace,' is to be found at the end of certain Offices in some of the French Breviaries. Three additional permissive endings to the Offices were proposed by the revisers of 1927–28.

The Occasional Prayers.

The Occasional Prayers were first collected into their present position in 1661. In 1549 they were represented by the two prayers 'For rain' and 'For fair weather' printed with the Collects at the end of the Mass. In 1552 these were transferred to the end of the Litany, and the prayers 'In time of dearth,' 'In time of war' and 'In the time of any common plague' were added. Special Collects, secrets and post-communions with these intentions had been provided in the Sarum Missal. The new English prayers were not translations of these, and the occasion of their use is an indication of the change of view as to the Eucharist being pre-eminently the occasion of special intercession. With the exception of the Gregorian Collect, 'O God, whose nature and property is ever to have mercy,' said at the end of the Sarum Litany and introduced into the English Litany in 1559, the remaining prayers belong to the revision of 1662. The fine 'Prayer for the High Court of Parliament' is thought to have been written by Laud. The 'Prayer for all conditions of men,' probably written by Peter Gunning, Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, and afterwards Bishop of Ely, was intended in its original and longer form to supersede the Litany. The Litany, however, was retained, and the present shorter form of the prayer was provided for use when the Litany was not said after Morning Prayer. Hitherto the only prayer of general intercession had been that in the Communion Service. Thanksgivings, corresponding with the prayers at the end of the Litany, were first provided by order of King James I in 1604; in 1662 they were supplemented by the 'General Thanksgiving' and by that 'For restoring public peace at home.'

In the proposed revision of 1927–28, the section of Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings was considerably enlarged both by the transference to it of prayers following the third Collect at Morning and Evening Prayer and taken from other services in

the Prayer Book, and also by the addition of new forms. The section as proposed consists of forty-five prayers distributed under thirty-two headings. Thirteen of the prayers belong to the Prayer Book of 1662. Of the remainder, only five, says Dr. Brightman, 'represent anything that can be called really new.' These are the prayers for the British Empire, for the Church Assembly, for the League of Nations, for Sunday Schools, and for Industrial Peace. Dr. Brightman has criticised the new prayers as a whole as being 'inferior . . . in strength, in variety, in quality of expression' to the older prayers. The reason of this inferiority is not far to seek. The original compositions appear to have been written without regard to the *cursus*.[1] The sources of several of the others are private, and however adequate to their purpose private prayers may be, they invariably fall short, in diction, expression and range, of what is requisite for liturgical use. In justice to the revisers, however, it should be noted that they have included such prayers of first rank as Bishop Cotton's Missionary Prayer, and the Collect 'Remember, O Lord, what thou hast wrought in us,' etc. In a collection obviously intended to be all-comprehensive, there are some curious omissions. Although there is a prayer for the Church Assembly, there is none for the Church!

A useful study of this section of the proposed Prayer Book has recently been written by Mr. Milner-White, entitled *The Occasional Prayers in the 1928 Book Reconsidered* (S.P.C.K., 1929). He criticises the collection as one who has constantly used the new prayers in church. He finds the collection to be lacking in provision for modern need and the prayers to be wanting in distinction of form and expression. He makes suggestions for supplying the unprovided needs, for improving the proposed prayers where they can be improved, and for replacing them when they cannot. Certain of Mr. Milner-White's suggestions will command general agreement, *e.g.* his introduction, and adaptation for public use, of Laud's prayer for the Catholic Church, and his provision of an intercession 'For the Servants of the Crown and Country,' with Bishop John Wordsworth's Collect for St. George's Day as the prayer. His preference for Laud's prayer for the State to the intercession for the British Empire will be generally shared; but few will prefer his mangled version of it to Laud's fine original. The necessity of some of Mr. Milner-White's needs, however, and the rightness of some of his provisions, may be questioned. Should the well-to-do, for instance, be singled out as special objects of prayerful solicitude, as in the intercession 'For the right use of Possessions,' unless we ask also that those not burdened with the responsibilities of the wealthy may be moved to discharge their own? This ground is better

[1] See p. 808.

covered, though in undistinguished language, by the new Irish Prayer 'For Christian Citizenship.' But Mr. Milner-White claims no more than to make suggestions. The usefulness of his book is considerable, and his detailed and irrefutable criticisms have made it impossible for this section of the proposed Prayer Book to re-appear in a future revision without drastic amendment and alteration.

Rubrics Relating to the Offices.

Two sets of rubrics or directions relating to the Offices call for notice.

(i) The rubric preceding Mattins in 1549 directed the priest to say that service, and presumably Evensong as well, 'in the quire.' This continuation of mediæval custom was disliked by the Reformed extremists as 'anti-christian.' In 1552 the rubric was altered; it read, 'The Morning and Evening Prayer shall be used in such place of the Church, Chapel, or Chancel, and the Minister shall so turn him, as the people may best hear. And, if there be any controversy therein, the matter shall be referred to the Ordinary.' The rubric of 1559 directed merely that the Offices should be read 'in the accustomed place.' This rubric was left unchanged in 1662. The Elizabethan rubric refers to the choir, since that was 'the accustomed place' in Mary's reign. The present rubric is of wider interpretation. Certain of the Elizabethan bishops ordered a reading-pew to be set up outside the Chancel, and this became the accustomed place of the minister at the Offices. The Canons of 1603 require that the minister's seat shall be 'in such place of every church . . . so as the people may be most edified.'

(ii) The existing Prayer Book imposes a double obligation with regard to the recitation of the Offices. They are to be said daily by all priests and deacons, unless hindered by sickness or some other urgent cause; and the parish-priest 'that ministereth in every Parish Church or Chapel, being at home and not being otherwise reasonably hindered,' is to say them in the church, and to cause a bell to be rung a convenient time before he begins, 'that the people may come to hear God's Word, and to pray with him.' The Prayer Book of 1549 imposed the obligation of recitation only upon such clergy as 'serve the congregation.' The general obligation dates from 1552. The rubric of 1552, however, allowed preaching and the study of divinity as reasons for non-compliance. This was altered to sickness in 1662. Perhaps owing to the Catholic ancestry of this obligation, it has been ignored by the Puritans and their successors.

Permission has also been given since 1549 for the use of any language, in the private recitation of the Offices, known to the person reciting them.

The Athanasian Creed

Quicunque vult is neither Athanasian nor a creed. It is structurally different from the regular creed which arose out of the triple baptismal formula. 'This difference of structure,' Professor C. H. Turner has pointed out, 'corresponds to a difference of intention.' *Quicunque* is rather exclusive than inclusive, a summary of orthodoxy rather than a profession of faith. The question of its origin and date has been the subject of controversy and continues undecided. Dr. Burn at one time thought that the external evidence pointed to Lerins in Gaul as its place of origin. He argued that it was known to and quoted by members of the school of Lerins—Cæsarius of Arles, Avitus of Vienne, Vincent of Lerins and others. As he could not trace it earlier than this, he was disposed to regard Honoratus, abbot of Lerins, who was known to have given expositions of the Creed, as the author of *Quicunque*. Dr. Burn found confirmation of his theory in the internal evidence. He thought it clear that the author was acquainted with and in some measure dependent upon St. Augustine's treatise *De Trinitate*, published in 416. Further, he noted that *Quicunque* defines orthodoxy as against Priscillianism, Arianism and Apollinarianism, while it is silent about Nestorianism and Monophysitism. Dr. Burn found it difficult to suppose that the author would have ignored these heresies had they been in existence. He therefore dated *Quicunque* between 416 and 431, a period which coincides with the activity of Honoratus of Lerins. Later, however, Dr. Burn changed his mind, and inclined to the theory advanced by the German scholar, Dr. Brewer. Dr. Brewer ascribed *Quicunque* to St. Ambrose. He found support for his view in the many close parallels between the clauses of *Quicunque* and passages in authentic writings by St. Ambrose. This ascription derives additional strength from the fact that a Rescript of Theodosius, of 384, appears to be dependent on *Quicunque*, that *Quicunque* is known to certain other writers of the period, *e.g.* Faustinus and Philastrius of Brescia, and that in a letter to Valentinian, Ambrose himself alludes to a '*grande carmen*,' composed by himself, which he describes as a '*confessio Trinitatis*.' Finally, it can be argued that the author of *Quicunque* knew and had in mind certain phrases of the circular letter of the second Council of Constantinople held in 382: so that the seventh or eighth year of St. Ambrose's episcopate can be maintained as a possible *terminus a quo*. Dom Morin, on the other hand, began by agreeing with Dr. Burn in looking to Gaul as the place of origin of *Quicunque*, although he favoured Cæsarius of Arles as author, rather than Honoratus of Lerins. Some time afterwards, how-

ever, he rejected this view, and argued that internal evidence points to Spanish authorship of A.D. 550–580. He then thought that only Priscillianism and Arianism were objects of attack; what were considered to be references to Apollinarianism appeared, when rightly understood, as references to Arianism. External evidence was adduced in support of this theory. It was pointed out that the first undoubted quotation from *Quicunque* comes from Spain. Also, the earliest extant MS. of it, written at Bobbio [1] about 700, includes several Spanish works and was apparently copied from a Spanish MS.; this is true of other early MSS. Priscillianism and Arianism were strong enough in mid-sixth-century Spain to provoke an orthodox movement against them. One of the principal figures in this movement, if not the principal, was Martin, Bishop of Braga (580), who composed a Rule of Faith exposing Priscillianist and Arian errors. Dom Morin connected *Quicunque* with the movement, and proposed Martin as the author. Commenting on Dom Morin's theory and assuming it to be correct, Mr. Edmund Bishop pointed out that the damnatory clauses exhibit the characteristic spirit of Spanish orthodoxy in the sixth and seventh centuries. The attribution to St. Athanasius was explained by Spanish interest in St. Athanasius' anti-Arian polemic. Since that time, however, Dom Morin has retracted his Spanish theory, and has shown himself disposed to revert to the authorship of Cæsarius of Arles. This brief sketch of opinions and change of opinions is enough to indicate the complexity of the problems raised by *Quicunque* and of the difficulty attending attempts at their solution.[2]

Quicunque enjoyed great popularity during the Middle Ages. It was regarded as authoritative, particularly in Frankish territory, by the late eighth and ninth centuries. Its popularity led to its adoption into the Gallican Offices. Thence it came to Rome, and became a feature of the Modern Office. The Latin Offices treated it as a canticle. The Sarum Breviary appointed it for daily use, with its own antiphons, at Prime. The Prayer Book of 1549 printed it after Evensong, and directed its use on the six greater festivals 'immediately after *Benedictus*' at Mattins. There is no rubric directing the omission of the Apostles' Creed; presumably, therefore, *Quicunque* was an additional canticle. The revision of 1552 added seven Saints' days to the list of occasions on which *Quicunque* was said; otherwise the rubric remained unaltered. The Apostles' Creed was put immediately after *Benedictus* in 1552, but we are not told whether *Quicunque* was additional or alternative to it. The

[1] An Irish monastery in N. Italy, and a centre of anti-Arian propaganda among the Lombards.

[2] For a detailed account see chap. xvii of F. J. Badcock's *History of the Creeds*, S.P.C.K., 1930.

present rubric making the latter alternative to the former on thirteen festivals was inserted in 1661.

The damnatory clauses of *Quicunque* have been the cause of complaint; and for some time its translation and use have been under discussion. The proposed Prayer Book of 1927–28 revised the translation. Its rendering is closer to the Latin, and in *v.* 27 it has restored the older text.[1] The directions as to use are changed. In addition to the thirteen festivals, *Quicunque* may be said whole or in part on two additional days; but its use on all fifteen days is now made optional. This is unsatisfactory, and would cause friction in parishes where it was wanted and not conceded, or *vice versa*. Some clear and definite direction is desirable. The arrangement of the rubrics relating to *Quicunque* is irritating, also. Half of them stands at the head of the old translation, the other half follows the new. These defects need to be remedied at the next revision.

The Litany

A Litany is a form of prayer in which fixed responses are made by the people to short biddings or petitions said or sung by deacon, priest, or cantors. The Liturgy in *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii, and the allusions of St. John Chrysostom are our earliest evidence for litanies, and point to their origination at Antioch in the second half of the fourth century. The Antiochene Litany consisted of biddings recited by a deacon on behalf of the Church, the clergy, the people, the sick, travellers, etc., and the supplication *Kyrie eleison* as the people's response to each bidding; *e.g.* Deacon: 'Let us pray for them that travel by water and by land,' People: '*Kyrie eleison.*' This type of prayer came early to Constantinople, and became a feature of the Liturgy and Offices; its adoption in other Greek and Eastern liturgies is considerably later and may be taken as an example of 'Constantinopolitanising.' Of the beginnings of the Litany at Rome we know nothing. The earliest surviving example is the '*Deprecatio* which Pope Gelasius appointed to be sung on behalf of the Church throughout the world.' It is preserved by Alcuin in his *Officia per ferias*, but competent scholars are agreed that there is no reason to doubt the attribution. The *Deprecatio* therefore belongs to the fifth century. On what occasions it was used, Alcuin does not record; and we are not told whether it was said by the Pope himself or by deacons or priests. Its subsequent history also is obscure. It is probable that some litany like it was sung in the Mass on festivals at Rome in the time of Gregory the Great. It lies behind a

[1] *I.e.* 'The Trinity is to be worshipped in Unity, and the Unity in Trinity' instead of 'The Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped.' The translation as well as the text is here corrected.

number of other litany forms, *e.g.* that said in the Milanese Mass on the first Sunday of Lent, and that called 'The *Deprecatio* of St. Martin on behalf of the people' in the Stowe Missal. It would appear, in short, that the *Deprecatio Gelasii* settled, if it did not actually originate, the form and style of litanies in Latin.

It will have been noted that the designation of the earliest Latin Litany is not *litania*, but *deprecatio*, 'intercession.' The term *litania* had a diversity of significance. It could be used of any penitential observance, whether prayer or otherwise. It could be used also of a procession, and not necessarily of a penitential procession. Eventually, however, it came to be used of processions which were the occasion of penitential supplications, and particularly of those connected with April 25 and the three days preceding Ascension Day, known as the Rogations. Responsorial prayer of the litany type is peculiarly suited to processions, and it is not surprising that litanies came to be the main constituent of Rogation devotions, and that by this means intercession was added to the original element of penitence. In the Sarum *Processionale* we have the form of the Rogation Litany which was used throughout the Province of Canterbury on the eve of the Reformation, and which Cranmer took as the foundation of his work on the first English Litany of 1544. This is sometimes called the Litany of the Saints. It may be divided into six sections: (i) The introductory *Kyrie eleison* and invocation of the Persons of the Trinity. (ii) The invocations of the saints with the response *Ora pro nobis*. (iii) The deprecations, or supplications for deliverance, *e.g.* 'From all evil,' with the response, 'Deliver us, O Lord.' (iv) The obsecrations, or appeals for deliverance by virtue of events in Christ's redemptive life, *e.g.* 'By thy nativity,' with the same response. (v) The intercessions. (vi) A concluding invocation of Christ as Lamb of God. Immediately following the Litany and treated as one with it were the Lord's Prayer, several *capitella* of Gallican form reduplicating the intercessions, and a set of final prayers. With the exception of the intercessions, the Litany of the Saints has little in common with the Gelasian *Deprecatio;* and the intercessions themselves are cast in a form different from those of the *Deprecatio*. The ultimate source of the Litany has been indicated by Mr. Edmund Bishop. It is a Greek Litany which came to England from Rome during the pontificate of Sergius I (687–701). Sergius was a Greek-speaking Pope whose family belonged to the district of Antioch. He introduced, or emphasised, two cults, that of the Cross, and that of Christ as Lamb of God; and the Greek Litany, in addition to the invocation of the latter at its close, has as its only obsecration, 'By thy cross, Deliver us, O Lord.' An early Latin version of this Litany is extant, and sixteen out of its seventeen petitions reappear in the Sarum Litany. A still earlier version, though

invoking different saints, occurs in the Stowe Missal. In short, therefore, this Greek Litany is the foundation of the Rogation Litany of the Saints, which is indeed only an expansion of it. The expansion is most to be observed in the case of the intercessions. The Greek Litany has but one petition in the form of an intercession, 'That thou wouldst grant peace,' with the response, 'We beseech thee hear us'; the Sarum Litany has seventeen with the same response. The subjects of the latter are those of the *Deprecatio Gelasii*. Their form and style have, however, been made to accord with those of the one Greek intercession. The use of the Sarum Litany was not confined to Rogations or processions. It was sung on Holy Saturday, and at Ordinations of deacons and priests; and it was said kneeling after Terce daily in Lent. On Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent it was sung in procession as a separate service.

Of the Greek Litany itself, it should be noted that its character, unlike that of the Gelasian *Deprecatio*, is private rather than liturgical. It was not originally intended for recitation at public services. Its style and form are reminiscent of the supplications of the pagan soldiers of Licinius and Constantine, recorded respectively by Lactantius and Eusebius. This is one of the normal styles and forms of pagan religious address. We need not, therefore, conclude with some scholars that the Christian Litany is borrowed from pagan usage; but it is nevertheless reasonable to think it an adaptation to a new purpose of a form which was traditionally associated with prayer and devotion, and which in the directness and simplicity of its address was intrinsically appropriate to that purpose. The directness and simplicity of the Greek Litany may account for its popularity and diffusion. From England it went to Ireland, where it was incorporated into at least one liturgical book (the Stowe Missal). Thence it passed to Germany and Gaul, and was there expanded. Finally it came to Rome with other Gallican and Frankish additions and found its way into the Roman Liturgy.

Although the Latin service-books were still in use when the first English Litany was published, the latter was no mere translation of the Sarum Litany. Cranmer had access to Luther's Litany of 1529 and to the diaconal Litany of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, and the influence of both of these is traceable in his work. The structure of the Latin Litany is largely preserved, but there are great changes. The ancient introductory *Kyrie eleison* is abolished. The invocations of the Saints are reduced to three, one in particular of 'Saint Mary, mother of God,' etc., the other two in general of 'All holy angels and archangels,' etc., and 'All holy patriarchs and prophets, apostles,' etc., respectively. For his deprecations, Cranmer selected petitions from various sources, and arranged them in groups each under one response. The last

deprecation reads, 'From all sedition and privy-conspiracy; from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome, and all his detestable enormities; from all false doctrine and heresy; from hardness of heart, and contempt of thy word and commandment.' The obsecrations have been formed by a similar process. The intercessions, though following the ancient form, have in most cases been enlarged. Lutheran influence is most clearly discernible in the intercessions. The old Litany originally ended with the invocation 'O Lamb of God,' etc., and 'O Christ, hear us.' The English version of *Kyrie eleison*, 'Lord, have mercy upon us,' and the Lord's Prayer, which follow, represent an early addition to the Litany. The next versicle, answer, and Collect were taken from the corresponding section of the Lutheran Litany. The Collect 'O God, merciful Father, that despisest not the sighing of a contrite heart,' etc., occurs in the Sarum-Missal in the Mass 'for tribulation of heart.' Probably by a mistake the final *Amen* was omitted from the English translation. The omission blurs the distinction between this section and the next, beginning with the words 'O Lord, arise, help us and deliver us for thy Name's sake,' and continuing down to the Collect 'We humbly beseech thee, O Father, mercifully to look upon our infirmities; and for the glory of thy Name's sake, turn from us all those evils that we most righteously have deserved. Through, etc.' This section is one of special intercession in time of war, and was adapted from the corresponding Sarum intercession. The Collect has been altered so as to avoid a reference to the intercession of the saints. There is a curious dislocation at the beginning of the section. The words 'O Lord, arise,' etc., are an antiphon to Ps. xliv. 1, and should be said before the verse and after *Gloria Patri*. They have, however, been inserted before *Gloria Patri* in a variant translation. The Litany ended with a series of five Collects. Three of these were translations of Sarum prayers, one was new, and the last was the 'Prayer of St. Chrysostom.'

The differences between the English and Latin Litanies are no less striking than their resemblances. Most marked is the difference between the two sets of deprecations and obsecrations. The Latin Litany assigns one of each of these to one response, an arrangement which has been retained in the admirable 'Litany for the Sick and Dying' in the proposed Service of the Visitation of the Sick of 1927–28. Cranmer in combining several in one petition, though doubtless he secured brevity and convenience in recitation, at the same time destroyed a conciseness which was of the essence of the parent form and a mark of its origin and antiquity. The Litany of 1544 is substantially that of the 1549 and subsequent Prayer Books. A number of modifications have been made, but only three are of importance. The first is the removal in 1549 of

the three clauses invoking the Saints. The second is the rearrangement of the final prayers, made also in 1549; the new prayer of 1544 was grafted on to the Collect, 'We humbly beseech thee, O Father, mercifully to look upon our infirmities,' and the rest with the exception of 'St. Chrysostom' disappeared. The third is the withdrawal in 1559 of the clause relating to 'the bishop of Rome,' first removed by Queen Mary, and the addition of the Benediction or 'Grace.' The addition, in 1552, 1559 and 1604, of the Occasional and other Prayers, which modify neither the character nor the structure of the Litany, has already been noted.

The textual alterations proposed by the revisers of 1927–28 are fewer in number than would have been justifiable, but are improvements. Three intercessions are added; one for ordinands to be said in the Ember Weeks, another for the work of the Church throughout the world, and the third for the forces of the King. The antiphon 'O Lord, arise, help us' is supplied after the *Gloria Patri* at the beginning of the war intercession; but, oddly, the variant is retained between the verse of the psalm and its *Gloria*. The clausula 'Through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen*,' which was accidentally omitted in 1661, is happily restored to the prayer 'O God, merciful Father.' There are several rubrics affecting both the use and structural arrangement of the Litany. The war intercession and the section preceding it are joined together under the heading 'A Supplication' and are made of optional use. Their place may be taken, if desired, by any of the Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings. This is a decided improvement, as more fully restoring the intercessory character of the Litany. When the Litany is sung or said immediately before the Communion Service, it may be ended with 'Lord, have mercy upon us,' etc. This arrangement also commends itself on practical grounds. Permission was also proposed for the minister to say, at his discretion, after the opening invocations, 'such of the suffrages as he thinks convenient, provided that some are drawn from each section' of deprecations, obsecrations and intercessions, 'and that all are concluded by *Son of God, we beseech thee to hear us, etc.*' The purpose of this was obviously to give the Litany as great a flexibility as possible and also to sanction the utmost abbreviation where necessary. Loose sanctions of this description are, however, difficult and dangerous. The same purpose has been accomplished in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1929 by the provision of two additional shorter litanies. The first is an abbreviation of the Litany proper. The second is a new Litany of Greek form with the usual opening invocations, followed by fourteen biddings, to which 'Lord, have mercy' is the response. The versicle 'Lord, hear our prayer,' and the answer, 'And let our cry come unto thee,' may be substituted for 'Lord, have mercy.' The Litany ends with Dr. Bright's translation of the fine Gelasian prayer *Deus incommutabilis virtus*. The whole is

brief and yet complete; and its simplicity suits it to occasions when the rotundities of the Litany proper are out of place. The Scottish Church may justly be envied this beautiful devotion. The new Scottish Litany proper also deserves consideration. It has been improved not only by the addition of new intercessions, but by the restoration to their original form of the opening invocations and responses, thereby giving them such lightness as an introduction should have. When at some future date a fresh revision of the English Litany is undertaken, it is much to be desired that careful attention be paid to the three litanies in the new Scottish Prayer Book.

It remains to note in conclusion that the use of the Litany on Sundays, Wednesdays, and Fridays was to have been made optional, and its use on Rogation Days was to have been compulsorily restored. The restoration is to be commended. Permission was also proposed for its use upon any day at the discretion of the minister. This permission scarcely requires comment. One of the alleged advantages of the use of a fixed Liturgy was protection from the discretion of the minister. In this and in similar provisions, and above all in their sanction of extemporaneous prayer after the conclusion of the Offices or of any other service, the revisers of 1927–28 would have opened the door to all the confusions of ministerial idiosyncrasy and experiment from which the fixed Liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer at its last revision was intended as a safeguard. That the confusions would have been supported or desired by Parochial Church Councils is neither a recommendation nor a mitigation of an evil. Here as in other respects the plan of the new Book was revealed as different from that of the old. The principle of one Use for the whole realm was to have been exchanged for that of *Quot ecclesiæ tot liturgiæ.*

The Psalter

The oldest translation of the Psalter used in Christian worship is the Greek of the Septuagint. This version of the Old Testament was made in Egypt during the third and second centuries B.C.; and we are probably right in supposing that 'the rest of the books' of the Canon mentioned by Jesus the son of Sirach in 130 B.C. as translated from Hebrew into Greek included the Psalter.[1] Owing to scribal errors, and textual corruptions and alterations, the LXX has not been transmitted to us in precisely its original form. On the whole, however, it represents a Hebrew text older and often different, both verbally and in the arrangement of its sections, from that which we now have. The LXX Psalms, like the Hebrew, number one hundred and fifty.[2]

[1] See the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus.

[2] Ps. cli is stated, in its title, to be 'outside the number.'

In certain cases, on the other hand, they are differently divided and numbered. The Hebrew Pss. ix and x form the LXX Ps. ix. Again, the Hebrew Pss. cxiv and cxv form the LXX Ps. cxiii. But the Hebrew Pss. cxvi and cxlvii become respectively the LXX Pss. cxiv and cxv and Pss. cxlvi and cxlvii. It will be seen from this that in between Pss. xi and cxiii and Pss. cxvii and cxlvi, the LXX numbering falls one behind the Hebrew. Besides these differences of arrangement, there are also, of course, differences of text. As examples of the latter may be cited the two well-known cases of Ps. ii. 12 and Ps. cx. 3. In the former, for 'Kiss the son' the LXX reads 'Lay hold of instruction'; in the latter, where the difficult Hebrew appears to mean 'Thy people are freewill offerings in the day of thy strength, in holy adornments from the womb of dawn: thou hast the dew of thy birth,' the LXX reads, 'With thee is the beginning in the day of thy power, in the splendour of thy saints: from the womb before the daystar I begat thee.'

The Hebrew language was not widely known in antiquity; and the classical world, in so far as it wished to acquaint itself with the Hebrew Scriptures, had to rely on the LXX. The LXX, therefore, acquired something of the status of an 'authorised version.' As such it was inherited by the early Church. Most of the quotations in the New Testament are derived from it, and it was regularly used in Christian Greek writing. Its use is continued by the Greek Orthodox Church at the present day for the lessons and psalms of the Liturgy and Offices. Ignorance of Hebrew and the special position of the LXX led naturally to the use of the latter in the formation of the Old Latin versions. The earliest Latin Psalter of the Roman Church was but a translation of the Psalms of the LXX, exhibiting all the characteristic differences of that version from the Hebrew. This Psalter, known from the version of which it was part as the *Itala*, twice underwent revision at the hands of St. Jerome. The first revision, called the Roman, became the use of the Roman Church at the order of Pope Damasus in 383, and was widely adopted in Italy and outside. The second, called the Gallican from its spread in Gaul following upon its adoption by Gregory of Tours at the end of the sixth century, eventually ousted the Roman, and is the Psalter of the *Vulgate*. By the sixteenth century it had long been in almost general use, the churches in Rome, however, retaining the older Psalter. At the Council of Trent, Pope Pius V prescribed the Gallican Psalter for all Breviaries, and restricted the use of the Roman to the Basilica of St. Peter. This arrangement continues to our own time.

In England, the Gallican Psalter had begun to displace the Roman in the ninth century, and later became the Psalter of the Sarum and other English mediæval Breviaries. From it are taken the initial words of each Psalm prefixed to the English equivalent

in the Prayer Book. The Prayer Book Psalter, however, is not a translation of the Gallican. It 'followeth the Division of the Hebrews and the Translation of the great English Bible, set forth and used in the time of King Henry the Eighth and Edward the Sixth.' The *Great Bible* of 1539 was the first authoritative English version. It was a revision, made by Miles Coverdale, of the version known as *Matthew's Bible* published two years earlier. *Matthew's Bible* was neither a new nor an independent translation; it was a compilation from the versions of Tyndale and Coverdale. The Psalms were taken from Coverdale's Bible of 1535. The Psalter of the *Great Bible*, therefore, is Coverdale's own revision of his earlier work. The title-page of his *Biblia* of 1535 states that he made his translation out of 'Douche (*i.e.* German) and Latyn,' and in the 'Epistle unto the Kinges highnesse' with which he prefaces the book, he says that he drew upon 'fyve sundry interpreters.' Among these were the *Zürich Bible*, Luther's version and the *Vulgate*. In revising his Psalter for the *Great Bible*, Coverdale consulted yet another 'interpreter,' viz: Sebastian Münster, whose Latin version appeared in 1534–35. The 1540 edition of the *Great Bible* exhibited a further revision of the Psalter, consisting of a number of small corrections and improvements. These point to some understanding of Hebrew on the part of the reviser, but although Coverdale seems to have been acquainted with the language, it is uncertain whether the work was his. The corrected version of 1540 appeared in subsequent editions of the *Great Bible*, and came into regular use in church with the Prayer Book of 1549. 'The Psalter, or Psalms of David pointed[1] as they are to be sung or said in Churches,' however, was not printed as a constituent part of the Prayer Book until 1662.

The Prayer Book Psalter is too well known for its characteristics and merits to require indication or comment. No less second-hand than the Psalter of the Breviary, it has nevertheless survived several attempts to replace it with the Authorised or some other more accurate version. The great majority of those who have used it since its first publication have desired not so much a correct translation of the ancient Hebrew, as a rendering, in fine but simple language, of what they believed to be a spiritual song-book for their present use. This the Prayer Book Psalter has been, and its melodious and sincere English has made it a religious classic, and has so imprinted it on the minds and memories of successive generations that no other version has taken, or could take, its place. All the same, it has certain defects which hinder the fulfilment of its purpose. Not only are its translation and its form sometimes faulty; its diction is at times so archaic or obscure

[1] *I.e.* punctuated for corporate liturgical recitation. The verse was divided between the two sides of the choir, and the colon marks the division.

as to be unintelligible, and its text has been corrupted by unauthorised alterations in the press. There has for some time been general agreement that these defects could be remedied without damage to its character. In 1913, a Resolution of the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation requested the Archbishop to take steps 'in order to secure the revision of passages in the Psalter in which the language is specially obscure or misleading.' The Archbishop, after consultation with the Archbishop of York, appointed a Committee to draw up proposals for revision within these terms. The Committee presented its Report in 1916. It had adhered strictly to its instructions. Its basic principle was to propose 'no change in the text which did not present itself to us as necessary towards intelligent devotional use of the verse or passage in question.' The main changes were concerned with (i) such passages as are in their present form unintelligible, *e.g.* Ps. xlv. 6, which is re-translated 'Thy arrows are very sharp in the heart of the king's enemies: and the people shall be subdued unto thee'; (ii) passages which, though they make good sense, are mistranslated or are misleading on account of archaic or too liberal renderings, *e.g.* Ps. xvi. 2, Ps. xviii. 18, and Ps. lxxx. 1, which become respectively 'O my soul, thou hast said unto the Lord: Thou art my God, I have no good like unto thee,' 'They came upon me in the day of my trouble: but the Lord was my upholder,' and 'Hear, O thou Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock'; (iii) passages which are obscure on account of the use of obsolete words or faulty punctuation, *e.g.* Ps. xlviii. 12 and Ps. vi. 6, which become 'Mark well her bulwarks, consider her houses,' and 'I am weary of my groaning: every night wash I my bed, and water my couch with my tears'; and (iv) obscurities of general sense, whether affecting single phrases or whole verses or passages, *e.g.* Ps. ii. 12 and Ps. l. 8, which are changed to 'Honour the Son,' and 'I will not reprove thee because of thy sacrifices: as for thy burnt-offerings, they are alway before me.' The re-division and re-pointing of certain verses were also recommended as making for convenience in recitation, and the Report concluded with a list of passages, the use of which in Christian worship, in the opinion of the Committee, 'does not tend to edification,' and the omission of which was suggested for consideration. The Report was admittedly conservative. The Committee considered its conservatism justified, not only because of its instructions, but also because it held that continuity of use of the Psalter carried with it continuity of understanding, and that therefore only the minimum of alteration was necessary and desirable. This point of view, however, was not universally shared. The proposals were generally criticised for not being thorough. The then Bishops of Gloucester and Truro, who were asked by the Canterbury Upper House to consider the proposals,

reported that twenty-eight passages requiring alteration had been passed over by the Committee, that the meaning of twenty-three of the suggested alterations was not clear, and that a further sixteen alterations were unnecessary. In the proposed Prayer Book of 1927–28, the Report was represented only by the permission to omit 'such Psalms or portions of Psalms as are enclosed within brackets,' among these being most of those passages suggested for omission by the Committee as, in its opinion, not tending to edification. The work of the Committee nevertheless has not been wholly wasted. The Psalters in the recently revised Irish and American Prayer Books have benefited much from the Report and proposals of the Committee, and also from the criticisms of the bishops.

Since 1916 two noteworthy essays in Psalter revision have been published. The first, by the late Canon N. Dalton, is printed in *The Book of Common Prayer: An edition containing proposals and suggestions*, edited by him in 1920.[1] Canon Dalton often reverts to the earlier version of Coverdale, but his revision is in effect a new translation. Not infrequently the infelicity of his renderings exceeds that of the current version. He advances three suggestions for making the Psalter more intelligible to the 'ordinary worshipper': (i) that there should be prefixed to each Psalm a few words of explanation of its point or character; (ii) that the fivefold division of the Psalter and duplicates of Psalms should be indicated; and (iii) that the acrostic or alphabetical form of certain Psalms should be shown. The first of these suggestions is defensible. The third has at times led Canon Dalton into such curiosities of phrasing that his version could hardly bewilder the ordinary worshipper less than that now in use. The second essay is *A Liturgical Psalter arranged for use in the Services of the Church*,[2] by the Bishop of Truro. The principle of Dr. Frere's work is selective. In 1912 it was agreed by the Canterbury Lower House that Proper Psalms should be provided for all Sundays of the year, for the greater Festivals and certain other occasions. A Table of such Psalms was incorporated in the Proposed Prayer Book of 1927–28. The Psalms were so allotted that the greater part of the Psalter was to be recited on Sundays and certain holy-days throughout the year. Five whole Psalms, for the most part of an 'Imprecatory' nature, were omitted; and, as has been noted above, permission was given for the omission of passages of a similar kind in certain other Psalms. Dr. Frere not unreasonably describes the resultant as a 'bowdlerised Book of Psalms.' The method of selection, he thinks, should be positive instead of negative, and should aim at retaining only what is 'devotionally profitable' rather than

[1] And recently reprinted in *The Psalms: a suggested revision of the Prayer Book Version, and Twelve Old Testament Canticles*. Cambridge University Press, 1931.

[2] Mowbray, 1925.

at omitting the contrary. Dr. Frere's omissions are therefore considerable; they include fourteen whole Psalms, and all such passages as seem to demand of the ordinary worshipper too great a knowledge of Old Testament history, religion and outlook. Dealing with the question of translation, Dr. Frere lays it down as a principle that a satisfactory revision must take into account not only the sense and structure of the original Hebrew poem, but also the requirements of the Anglican chant. Careful attention to the last has made his version superior for singing in church to Canon Dalton's, but sometimes at the cost of the omission of a member of a verse. If Dr. Frere's Psalter is not to be described as bowdlerised, it may yet fairly be said to be attenuated. In spite of much that invites criticism and question, however, these two books have use and value, not solely because they advance interesting and sometimes opposite suggestions for the improvement and revision of the Prayer Book Psalter, but also and perhaps mainly because they are a reminder that the matter of improvement or revision cannot be shelved or indefinitely postponed.

The Choir Offices, the Occasional Prayers and the Litany in the American, Scottish, Irish and Canadian Prayer Books

1. *The American Prayer Book.*

The history of the genesis of the American Prayer Book is outlined elsewhere (see p. 793). The main characteristic differences between the American Offices of 1789 and those of the English Prayer Book can be indicated briefly. The Absolution was renamed 'the Declaration of Absolution, or Remission of Sins,' and the form of absolution in the Communion Service was authorised as an alternative. The versicle 'O God, make speed to save us,' was omitted together with its response. The last two verses of *Venite* were omitted, verses 9 and 13 of Psalm xcvi being substituted for them. The use of *Gloria Patri* at the end of Psalms and Canticles was made optional, except at the end of the portions of the Psalms appointed for the Office; in the latter case, however, it could be replaced by *Gloria in excelsis*. *Benedictus* was reduced to the first four verses. *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis* were discarded, their alternatives, Psalms xcviii and lxvii, taking their place. Psalms xcii, verses 1–4, and ciii, verses 1–4, 20–22 were introduced as respective alternatives to these. *Quicunque vult* was omitted. Permission was given for the use of the Nicene Creed instead of the Apostles'; and the clause 'He descended into Hell' could be omitted or could be replaced by 'He went into the place of departed spirits.' The suffrages were reduced to two, viz. the first and the last; and permission was given for the omission of all

prayers after that for the President, when the Litany was to follow. The use of the Litany after Evening Prayer was sanctioned. The several English petitions for the civil authorities were reduced to one on behalf of 'all Christian rulers and magistrates'; the omission of all from 'O Christ, hear us,' to the prayer 'We humbly beseech thee, O Father,' was sanctioned; and the General Thanksgiving was introduced at the conclusion. Several new Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings were provided. The 'Prayer for all Conditions of men' and the General Thanksgiving were removed from the number of the latter, and placed among the concluding prayers of the Offices. A composite psalm to be said in place of *Venite* was appointed for Thanksgiving Day Selections of Psalms were also provided; any one of these might be recited instead of the Psalms for the Day.

The Offices, therefore, though retaining their former structure, acquired a new and distinctive character in the first official American Prayer Book. This character has been modified, but not destroyed, by the two subsequent revisions; the American Offices remain one stage further removed from the mediæval Latin services than the English Offices.

At the revision of 1892, the remainder of *Benedictus* was restored, but the reduced form was sanctioned for use at discretion, except on the Sundays of Advent. *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis* were also restored, the two sets of psalms continuing as alternatives; and the full complement of suffrages was restored to Evening Prayer. A number of Proper Sentences for Festivals were provided for use in addition to those already existing. The number of Festivals and Occasions for which Proper Psalms were appointed was increased. Further Occasional Prayers were also provided.

The principal features of the last revision in 1929 were the provision of Invitatories almost identical with those proposed in England in 1927-28; the introduction of *Benedictus es* as an alternative Canticle to *Te Deum* and *Benedicite :* the restriction of the use of *Gloria in excelsis* (outside the Communion Service) to Evening Prayer; and the omission of the Proper Collect when the Communion Service is to follow. A Table of Psalms, similar to the proposed English Table and additional to the existing selections now expanded and regrouped under such headings as 'Godliness,' 'Intercession,' etc., was provided, together with a number of new Occasional Prayers.

The daily recitation of the Offices is nowhere prescribed in any of the American Prayer Books.

2. *The Scottish Prayer Book.*

The Choir Offices in the 1929 Book closely resemble those in the proposed English Book. The alternative General Confession

and Absolution are the traditional 'We confess to God Almighty . . . Almighty God have mercy . . . life everlasting.' *Te Deum* is printed with a three-fold division. *Benedictus es* is given as an alternative Canticle. There are no alternatives at Evensong to *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*. *Quicunque vult* is termed 'A Confession of the Christian Faith' and is obligatory on Trinity Sunday only. Three Litanies are given: (*a*) That of 1662 appears with slight alterations; (*b*) it is also printed in an abbreviated form, half its original length; (*c*) a brief Litany of Greek type is a new feature. The Occasional Prayers differ in important particulars from those in the English revision. A Bidding Prayer is added.

3. *The Irish Prayer Book.*

The Irish revision of 1869 affected the Offices to no great extent. Psalm cxlviii was provided as an additional alternative to *Te Deum*. The second of the Collects at the end of the Communion Service was made an alternative to the Third Collect at Evening Prayer under the heading 'for Grace and Protection.' A new 'Prayer for the Chief Governour or governours of Ireland' was introduced after the 'Prayer for the Royal Family.' The recitation of *Quicunque vult* was discontinued, but it was stated in the Preface that 'this Church has not withdrawn its witness . . . to the truth of the Articles of the Christian Faith therein contained.' Several new Occasional Prayers and one Thanksgiving were added.

The revision of 1927 has dealt with the form rather than the matter of the Offices. If the Litany and Communion Service follow immediately upon Morning Prayer, 'the Minister after *Te Deum Laudamus* may proceed to the Litany, first saying, Let us pray.' One lesson only is to be read, and the intercessions from 'That it may please thee to guard and bless,' etc., to 'That it may please thee to give to all nations,' etc., are to be omitted from the Litany. If the Communion Service alone follows Morning Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, the lesser Litany and the Lord's Prayer may be omitted, but the Second and Third Collects must be said. An abbreviation of the Offices is sanctioned for weekdays, except they be certain of the greater holy-days, on which the Offices must be said complete. Proper psalms are provided for optional use on Sundays and holy-days. The Litany, when used as a separate service, may be prefaced by a hymn and lesson; and permission is given to omit all that follows the Lord's Prayer, and to substitute one or more of the Occasional Prayers, provided that the 'Prayer of St. Chrysostom' and the Benediction be always said in conclusion.

The direction for daily recitation of the Offices, removed in 1869, was not restored in 1927.

4. *The Canadian Prayer Book.*

The Canadian Prayer Book of 1922 followed the American Book of 1892 in providing Proper Sentences for Festivals. With the exception of permission to shorten the Exhortation at Evening Prayer, and the addition of new prayers for the civil authorities, the Canadian Offices are substantially those of the English Prayer Book. The distinctive feature of the Canadian revision is the provision of Proper Anthems, in place of *Venite*, for Christmas Day, Good Friday, Ascension Day and Whitsunday. *Quicunque vult*, in a slightly emended translation, may be said on any day at Morning Prayer, no particular days being specified. The Offices may be shortened on week-days; and the Litany, when not said as a separate service, may be shortened by the omission of all after the Lord's Prayer, except the last prayer and the Benediction. Proper psalms are appointed for certain holy-days and special occasions, for which the English Book makes no provision; and sixteen Selections of Psalms are provided for use on the 31st day of the month or 'on any other day for sufficient cause with the approval of the Ordinary.' Many new Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings are also provided.

THE LECTIONARY

By THE EDITOR

Here we are concerned with the Lessons at Morning and Evening Prayer, the reading of Scripture lections at the Eucharist being treated elsewhere.[1] These originated in the Bible Readings at the Vigil Services of the early Church. They were developed in the Hours services of the monasteries; thus in the fourth century Cassian writes: 'adding [to the psalms] two lessons, one from the Old Testament, the other from the New' (*Inst.*, ii. 6). In mediæval England Mattins (Nocturns) was the only service with regular lections. These were read from three sources—the Bible, the Fathers, and the Lives of the Saints. The volume containing the Scripture Lessons was called the *Lectionarius;* the course followed the ecclesiastical year. But, as the 1549 Preface explained, 'this godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers hath been so altered, broken and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories, Legends, Responds, Verses, vain repetitions,' that only three or four chapters of a book would be read and the rest omitted.

The evils of the prevailing system were generally recognised, and Pope Clement VII ordered Cardinal Quignon to revise the Roman Breviary. His revision was issued in 1535 and largely influenced Cranmer's scheme, which after three successive drafts appeared in its final form in the 1549 Prayer Book.[2] Aiming at the utmost simplicity, Cranmer followed the civil year, with a very few exceptions for important Holy Days; even Good Friday had no Second Lessons, and Easter Day no First Lesson for Evensong. The Old Testament and the Apocrypha were read through consecutively and almost in their entirety, though by way of exception Isaiah was assigned to the Advent period. Almost invariably each Lesson consisted of one chapter. The Gospels and the Acts were read at Mattins, the Epistles at Evensong. Proper Lessons, when appointed, were printed with the Collect, etc. Thus St. Stephen's Day has: 'At Mattins. The second Lesson. Acts vi, vii. Stephen full of faith and

[1] P. 313.

[2] In 1541 Convocation had ordered the reading of a chapter of the New Testament on Sundays and Holy Days, in English, after the *Te Deum* and the *Magnificat;* when the New Testament was finished, the Old was to be started.

power (unto) and when XL years.' Introit, Collect, Epistle and Gospel follow. The section ends with: 'The second Lesson at Evensong, Act. vii. And when XL years were expired, there appeared unto Moses, (unto) Stephen full of the Holy Ghost, etc.' In 1559 a Table giving Proper First Lessons for each Sunday in the ecclesiastical year was introduced. With minor alterations in 1604 and 1662 (as there had been also in 1552) this system lasted until the latter half of the nineteenth century. We may imagine John Keble reading the whole of St. Luke iii to his village congregation when Feb. 20 fell on a Sunday, or reading Philemon at Evensong when Maundy Thursday was March 29, without losing his intense appreciation of the Prayer Book's setting forth of the Christian Year.

Cranmer's 1549 Lectionary was almost entirely based on the civil year, and subsequent modifications of it left the principle practically intact. The 1922 Lectionary is based on the ecclesiastical year. Between the two, in conception as well as in time, comes that of 1871, which in the ordinary English Prayer Book has replaced the 1662 Lectionary, as the phrasing of the 1928 Book shows clearly—'The Calendar (1662) with the Table of Lessons (1871).' Its history is instructive as illustrating nineteenth-century procedure. The Lectionary was one of a number of subjects considered by a Royal Commission appointed in 1867 to deal with Prayer Book matters. This Commission entrusted the revision of the Lectionary to a Committee of nine, of which Bishop Samuel Wilberforce was chairman. The Committee, after submitting their draft to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England and Ireland, and to others, reported to the Royal Commission, which, after negotiations, accepted their Report on June 24, 1869. The Convocations had not been consulted, but the several Houses approved the change in the Prayer Book, praying the Sovereign in an Address to the Crown 'to direct that the measures necessary to give legal effect to the said Report should be taken thereupon.' In 1871 an Act of Parliament was passed legalising the use of the new Lectionary as from January 1, 1872, the 1662 Lectionary remaining legal until the end of 1878.

This New, now generally called the Old, Lectionary was, as we have said, a compromise between the civil and ecclesiastical years as regards its framework. Proper First Lessons were provided for all Sundays, but Second Lessons, with six exceptions, remained those prescribed for the day of the month. All Holy Days were given proper First Lessons, and all except nine proper Second Lessons. Two—SS. Philip and James and St. James the Great—had proper Second Lessons for Mattins but not for Evensong. In other directions improvements were introduced: chapters were divided freely, Lessons shortened, and alternative

First Lessons provided for Sunday Evensong. But the result was unsatisfactory. The reader had, as a rule, to consult two different Tables in order to ascertain the Sunday Lessons; the opportunity of giving teaching appropriate to the seasons in the Second Lessons was missed; the daily course was interrupted about 80 times in a year, by Sundays and fixed Holy Days; and certain important chapters, such as St. John iii and St. Luke xv, might not be heard on a Sunday for four or five years.

One is not surprised, therefore, to find a desire for further reform expressed before long. In 1915 a Joint Committee of the two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury was appointed to consider the matter. Representatives of the Convocation of York co-operated, and a Report was presented in 1917, which with slight amendments was accepted by all four Houses. Subsequently it was submitted to the newly-formed Church Assembly, and after further modifications in detail came back to the Convocations in the form of an Annex to a Measure. This Measure was approved by the four Houses of Convocation, who agreed 'that the Measure in the form proposed by the House of Bishops shall be so laid before the Assembly.' In June 1922 the Assembly finally approved the 'Revised Tables of Lessons Measure, 1922,' for submission to Parliament, and the Measure presently received the royal assent. On Advent Sunday of that year the new Lectionary became an authorised alternative to that of 1871. Since 1917 it had been widely adopted for experimental use, and the general approval it had received doubtless conduced to its smooth passage through the various stages towards authorisation. So the first instalment of Prayer Book revision was successfully accomplished. It is worth noting that it was not formally promulgated by the Convocations subsequent to its being passed by Parliament and before the royal assent.

The 1922 Lectionary returns to pre-Reformation custom in that it is entirely based on the ecclesiastical year; this, it may be noted, with its movable Easter, makes a completely satisfactory solution of all problems impossible. Other changes are the provision of Proper Second Lessons for all Sundays, of alternative Lessons for most Sundays, and of Proper Lessons for the First Evensongs of Holy Days. Reversing the tendency of 1871, when Lessons from the Apocrypha were reduced in number, the Revisers considerably increased the occasions when it may be read. Forty-eight of these occur in the variable weeks at the end of the Trinity season. Altogether, in a favourable year, if every alternative Apocrypha Lesson is chosen, it is possible to read from the Apocrypha on 127 occasions.

Some explanations of the principles on which Lessons are chosen may be useful.

Sunday First Lessons.—Isaiah is begun in Advent, and Genesis

in Septuagesima, in accordance with ancient custom. The Historical Books are read on Sundays I–XIV after Trinity. Then follow Daniel, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The less familiar portions of the Old Testament, and the Apocrypha, are generally drawn upon for alternative Lessons.

Sunday Second Lessons.—The Report of the Joint Committee stated: 'We have endeavoured (1) to exclude as few passages of the New Testament as might be from the possibility of being read in church on Sunday; (2) to give variety for successive years and for congregations differing in character.' As a rule, alternative Lessons are provided, the first from the Gospels, the second from the other books. With two exceptions, Septuagesima and the Sunday before Advent, when the Lectionary provides Lessons from the Gospels for both Mattins and Evensong, one of such Lessons must always be read.

Week Days.—The Book of Acts is read between Easter and Pentecost, in accordance with a custom attested as early as the fourth century. Between Trinity Sunday and Trinity XI a continuous narrative of the life of our Lord is read, drawn from the Synoptic Gospels. The Fourth Gospel is not used for this purpose but is read for a second time in its entirety. The order of books read follows the conclusions of nineteenth-century English scholarship. Thus 2 Peter comes last of the Catholic Epistles, preceded by Jude, with which it is closely connected. St. Mark as the earliest Gospel is read first. The Pauline Epistles occur in this order: Thessalonians, Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, 1 Timothy, Titus, 2 Timothy. The whole New Testament is utilised except parts of the Revelation.[1]

Holy Days.—One example may suffice to show how the Revisers dealt with the problem of finding appropriate Lessons. In the 1871 Lectionary for St. Luke's Day, First Lessons only were appointed, Isaiah lv and Ecclesiasticus xxxviii. 1–15. Four more had to be found. *First Evensong.* First Lesson: Isaiah lv is retained, as teaching the abundance of divine forgiveness, which is the main theme of the material peculiar to St. Luke. Second Lesson: Luke i. 1–4, which describes the sources, method and purpose of St. Luke's Gospel. *Mattins.* First Lesson: Isaiah lxi. 1–6, the passage given by the Evangelist as read by Christ, as a kind of programme of His mission, in the synagogue at Nazareth. Second Lesson: Acts xvi. 6–18 is chosen as the most striking of the '-ve-passages' of the Acts, marking the moment when the Evangelist became an eye-witness of the events he describes. *Second Evensong.* First Lesson: Ecclesiasticus xxxviii. 1–14 is retained as appropriate to the festival of

[1] The original intention was to exclude 1 Cor. vii. 25–40, xi. 2–16, as has been done in the Irish and Canadian Revisions.

Luke *the physician*. Second Lesson: Col. iv. 14 is chosen since it refers to St. Luke. The other passage from the Epistles in which he is mentioned—2 Timothy iv. 5—has been used as the Epistle of the day.

The Canadian Prayer Book (1922) incorporated the new English Lectionary, the Revision Committee having sacrificed its own less thorough draft, which was experimentally used in Canada in the years 1915 and following, in order to secure uniformity with the Mother Church. The slight differences which will be noticed are due to the Canadian Church's adoption of the English Lectionary as first drafted and to its avoidance of Lessons from the Apocrypha on Sundays, and on week-days unless alternatives are provided. The procedure accounts for the untidy appearance of, *e.g.*, the Lessons of the Third Sunday in Lent, when Genesis xxxvii or xl is prescribed for the morning, xxxix or xlii for the evening; one reader might choose xl in the morning, another reader choosing xxxix at night.

The Irish Prayer Book (1927) has a Lectionary virtually identical with the English one of 1922, except for the modifications necessitated by the elimination of the Apocrypha.

The Scottish Lectionary (1929) follows the ecclesiastical year. The week-day course has some features in common with the English system, but is an independent compilation. The following peculiarities may be noted. In Advent, Morning and Evening, the Second Lessons are taken from Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude, Revelation i–x, 1 Timothy (Ember Days), Revelation xi–xxii. St. Matthew comes first of the Gospels. Job begins the New Year, followed by Proverbs, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus. The Sunday Lessons are arranged in a three-years' course, so that regular worshippers may hear a large part of the Bible.

The Lectionary of the American Prayer Book of 1789 is thus described:[1] 'The table of Daily Lessons was nearly the same as that prepared by Bishop White for the Proposed Book; the table of Sunday Lessons, two for each service, was new; it began Isaiah in Advent, read other prophets from Septuagesima to Whitsunday (except on Easter and the Sunday following), began Genesis on Trinity Sunday, and then read the historical books and Proverbs till the end of the year, while the New Testament Lessons were selected with reference to the Church's season.' The 1892 Book contained revised Tables, but the double framework of the civil and ecclesiastical years remained. The present Book (1929) follows the ecclesiastical year, has a separate series of Sunday Lessons, and gives no alternatives. The principle of the Sunday course is hard to follow. The Isaiah Lessons in Advent are interrupted by the story of Samson (Judges xvi).

[1] Procter and Frere, *A New History of the B.C.P.*, p. 246.

On Sundays after Epiphany, Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Nehemiah, Jonah and Daniel are used. Septuagesima has Joshua vi in the morning, Lamentations i in the evening. Lent alternates between Genesis and the historical books.

The problem faced by framers of an Anglican Lectionary is very perplexing. On the one hand, they must consider the edification of the laity who attend Morning and Evening Prayer on Sunday; on the other hand, they have to provide a kind of Breviary for clerics who are bound to recite the Daily Office. Ultimately, one imagines, it may be found best to revert to the principle of separate Tables for Sundays and week-days, the latter being designed as a Breviary for the clergy apart from the public offices of Sunday Morning and Evening Prayer. And the existence of a class of worshippers who hear the Liturgical Epistle and Gospel, and frequently the Evensong Lessons, but never those of Mattins, will have to be taken into consideration.

Finally, it may be asked what version of the Bible may be used. Until recently no one thought of any other than the Authorised Version. Nowadays, with the passing of the desire for uniformity, no objection is likely to be raised to the Revised; indeed by many congregations the change would not be noticed. The matter is left open by the recent revisions. However, the substantial changes in the text of many Epistles and Gospels in the new English and Scottish Books suggest that the Authorised Version no longer occupies an unchallenged position. The Epistle for Palm Sunday in the English 1928 Book is instructive. The Revised Version is followed in the crucial phrases, but its literal translations of aorists and participles are rejected. This method of treatment suggests that the ideal is a Corrected Authorised Version, that is to say, the traditional Bible of the English-speaking race with such changes only as are needed to remove serious misconceptions.[1]

[1] Considerable use has been made of Bp. Chase's pamphlet *The New Lectionary* (S.P.C.K., 1922). As Chairman of the Committee which drew up the Lectionary he wrote with unique authority.

THE HOLY COMMUNION SERVICE

By J. H. SRAWLEY

Introduction.

THE Communion Service of the Book of Common Prayer bears upon the face of it the marks of a long development, in which we can trace the contribution of different phases of English religious life, as each sought to give expression to its own ideals of Eucharistic worship and to adapt or modify to its own needs the forms which it had inherited from the past. Its ultimate basis is the old Roman rite in the form which it had taken in the Sarum Use. Of this rite the service in the First English Prayer Book of 1549 was a free rendering. It retained much of the old Order, with considerable omissions in detail, and it was skilfully adapted so as to guard against some of the later developments of mediæval Eucharistic doctrine, and to emphasise aspects of Eucharistic thought to which attention was being drawn in the period of the Reformation. It preserved greater continuity of form with the old Roman rite than does any existing English Use, while exhibiting the influence of such continental projects for liturgical reform as the *Pia Deliberatio* compiled for Archbishop Hermann of Cologne. It is marked by something of the sobriety and restraint which are to be found in the pure Roman rite of the earlier period, before the admixture of later elements. The only debt which it appears to owe to Eastern sources, apart from one or two isolated phrases, is the words 'bless and sanctify' in the Invocation, and the direct reference to the work of the Holy Spirit, though this latter (as Dr. Brightman has pointed out) lay near to hand in the interpretation placed upon the Invocation by some Western commentators, and in some of the prayers of the Roman Missal.

The more drastic revision of the service in 1552, under the influence of the advanced reforming party, has left an enduring mark upon the English rite, and given to it a more distinctive character, with its own contribution to Eucharistic thought and belief. This was followed by the later revisions of 1559 and 1661, which represent a *via media* between the two earlier revisions, and are an attempt in some directions to restore the balance. Before the revision of 1661 the ill-fated Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 marks an attempt to approximate more nearly to the

pattern of 1549, and the revisers of 1661 were indebted for some minor details, chiefly verbal and rubrical changes, to this Scottish revision.

But the history of the Eucharistic service in the Anglican Communion does not end with the revision of 1661. In Scotland the work of revision received a fresh inspiration, and took a new direction, as a result of the intercourse between the Scottish and the English Non-Jurors, whose efforts to arrive at a Concordat with the Eastern Church led them to a fuller study of the Eastern rites. One outcome of this was the Non-Juror's Liturgy of 1718, which marks a definite break with the Western tradition, and is modelled, so far as the sequence and rationale of the Prayer of Consecration are concerned, on Eastern forms, which, in the belief of its compilers, represented an older and more primitive tradition than that which was found in the Roman rite and in the English Book of Common Prayer. A similar contention underlay the work of Bishop Rattray, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem*, published, after his death, in 1744. These new influences found expression in the Scottish Liturgy of 1764.

The consecration, by Scottish bishops, of Samuel Seabury as Bishop of Connecticut in 1783 was followed on his return to America by proposals for the revision of the English Prayer Book, and the result was the American Liturgy of 1789, which represents a revision of the English service on the lines of the Scottish Liturgy of 1764, though in some respects it adheres more closely to the English order. The subsequent revisions of the Scottish and American Prayer Books[1] have not affected the general character of these rites, which, as compared with the English rite of 1661, follow in the Canon more closely the structure and sequence of the Eastern liturgies.

The Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland, revised in 1877, retains the English service of Holy Communion without any substantial change, as does the recent revision of the Canadian Prayer Book (1922). On the other hand, the Church of the Province of South Africa put forth in 1920 *An alternative Form of the Order for the Administration of Holy Communion* 'for use, where allowed by the Bishop.' This is largely influenced by the Scottish Liturgy, though it has distinctive features of its own. The alternative English Order of 1928, which formed part of the proposed schedule of additions and deviations from the Book of Common Prayer,[2] similarly follows in some degree the Eastern model.

[1] The American Prayer Book was revised in 1892, and the Scottish Prayer Book in 1911. Further revisions of both have only recently (1929) reached their final stages of authorisation.

[2] Hereafter referred to as the English Alternative Order (1928).

In the following Commentary the attempt will be made to exhibit the structure and rationale of the liturgy of 1661, while reference will be made to the parallel developments in other rites of the Anglican Communion.

The Title.

The title 'The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion' is due to the Prayer Book of 1552. In the Prayer Book of 1549 it ran, 'The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass.' Similarly in the German Church Orders of the Reformation period, side by side with the retention of the term 'Mass,' we find given as alternatives, or in addition, the title 'Communion' or 'Supper,' as in Luther's *Formula Missæ et Communionis* (1523), and 'the Mass or Supper' in the Prussian Order (1544) and the Halle Order of 1526. Elsewhere (Nordlingen, 1525) we find 'Eucharistia sive Cæna Domini.' The title 'Lord's Supper,' however, gradually prevailed, though in Sweden the Sunday service is still called 'High Mass' (*Högmässa*), whether it includes a celebration of the Eucharist or not, the actual celebration being described as 'the Communion (or Supper) Mass.' The term 'Mass' is also in use among the Lutherans of Denmark and Norway. In itself the word *missa* has no doctrinal significance, being only a form of *missio* (=dismissal), as in the phrase at the conclusion of the Latin Mass, *Ite, missa est.* It is used in the fourth-century *Pilgrimage of Etheria* in connection with the 'dismissals' at the offices, vigil services, and the liturgy. As the 'dismissal' of the catechumens marked the beginning of that portion of the liturgy at which only the faithful could be present, the term *missa* came to be applied to the liturgy proper (*i.e.* the celebration of the Eucharist). The earliest example of this later sense is found in Ambrose (*Ep.* xx. 4). It thus passed into the Western service-books where we find the phrase *Ordo Missæ* used of the framework and unvarying formulæ, while *Missa* is used to denote the group of variable formulæ proper to the day, which are to be inserted into the *Ordo.*

The dislike of the term, which, in spite of Luther's vehement language about the old form of service, developed more rapidly in England than among the Lutheran reformers, was part of the protest against the practices and conceptions with which the old order of things seemed bound up, and especially against the practice of 'private masses' and masses in which none but the priest communicated, and against later mediæval conceptions of the sacrifice of the Mass. Here, as so often in the English Prayer Book, the object was to get back to scriptural terms and to emphasise essential features of the rite which had come to be obscured.

The title 'Lord's Supper,' based on 1 Cor. xi. 20,[1] recalls the original institution of the rite, which St. Paul recounts in that passage, whereas the alternative title, 'Holy Communion,' is based on St. Paul's language in 1 Cor. x. 16. The title 'Lord's Supper' is found occasionally in Eastern and Western Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries.

The corresponding title in the Greek rites is 'the Divine Liturgy' (ἡ Θεία λειτουργία), a term taken over by the Christian Church from the Greek version of the Old Testament,[2] where it is used to describe the service of priests and Levites in the Temple, and in Christian usage the word came to be applied generally to the ministry of bishops, priests and deacons, and then pre-eminently to the celebration of the Eucharist, though later it was extended to other Offices as well, and is so used in the Book of Common Prayer (cf. the opening words of the 1661 Preface to the Prayer Book).

The title 'Eucharist' or 'thank-offering,' derived from our Lord's 'giving of thanks' at the Last Supper (Mark xiv. 23, Matt. xxvi. 27, 1 Cor. xi. 24), is a title common to East and West, and is used continuously from the second century onwards. As the central prayer of the rite was the thanksgiving for the blessings of Creation and of Redemption through Christ, the whole service was regarded as the Christian 'thank-offering' or 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.' As an actual title for the form of service, however, the term 'Eucharist' is found as an alternative to 'Lord's Supper' apparently only in the German Church Order of Nordlingen (1525).

The Rubrics preceding the Service.

The first rubric is inserted for the convenience of the parish priest, in order that he may make adequate provision, and also as preparatory to the next two rubrics, which are disciplinary in character and intended as a safeguard against unworthy communicants. Intending communicants are to 'signify their names to the Curate' (*i.e.* the parish priest who has the cure of souls) 'at least some time the day before.' The direction in 1549 and 1552, 'over night; or else in the morning, afore the beginning of Mattins or immediately after,' implies an interval between the two services, the older practice being that Morning Prayer was said at six or seven, the Communion Service follow-

[1] The question whether in 1 Cor. xi. 20 the term 'Lord's Supper' is applied to the Eucharist alone or to th: combined Agape and Eucharist has given rise to much discussion. Mgr. Batiffol, in his *Études d'histoire et de théol. pos.*, 1^re^ *série* (1906), makes out a strong case for the former of the two alternatives.

[2] For the various uses of the word and its cognate verb in the New Testament see Acts xiii. 2 ('*ministering* to the Lord'): Phil. ii. 17 ('the sacrifice and *service* of your faith'): 2 Cor. ix. 12 ('the administration of this *service*'): Heb. viii. 6 ('a more excellent *ministry*').

ing later between nine and ten. The change of the rubric in 1661 was intended to bring it into accord with the general practice of the time when one service followed immediately on the other. Similar directions are given in Hermann's *Pia Deliberatio*, where, however, the further direction is given that none are to be admitted to Communion who have not previously presented themselves to the pastor and made confession of their sins and received absolution.

The second and third rubrics instruct the parish priest as to his dealing with those who are 'open and notorious evil livers,' or who have done wrong to their neighbours, whereby the congregation are offended, or who entertain malice or hatred. They are to be warned against presenting themselves, until they have repented and made amendment, or, in the case of those at variance, have sought reconciliation. The right of the parish priest to repel offenders is recognised, but the additional clause added to the rubric in 1661 indicates that such repulsion is provisional, and that a report is to be made on each case within fourteen days to the Ordinary (*i.e.* the Bishop, who possesses ordinary as contrasted with delegated jurisdiction), and the Ordinary is directed to proceed against the offender according to the Canon. The rubrics imply a system of ecclesiastical discipline which goes back to the early ages of the Church, and which is recognised in the Canons of 1603 (see esp. Canons 26, 109, 113). The parish priest's right of repulsion was, however, safeguarded from early times against arbitrary and hasty action. Thus St. Augustine (*Serm.* 351, *de utilitate agendæ pœnitentiæ*) says: 'We cannot repel anyone from communion . . . unless he has voluntarily confessed, or has been convicted by some secular or ecclesiastical judgment,' and the same principle was embodied in the laws of Justinian. This restricted interpretation was placed upon the rubric by Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Cosin, and Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man.

Whatever difficulties, legal and of other kinds, are involved in the literal observance of the above rubrics, they remain an expression of the mind of the Church as to the standard required of its members, and the duty of the parish priest to warn and admonish offenders and seek to bring them to repentance.

The fourth rubric deals with the vesting of the holy Table, its place in the church, and the position of the priest at the beginning of the service. It was inserted in 1552, the corresponding rubric in 1549 merely directing that 'the Priest standing humbly afore the middle of the Altar, shall say the Lord's Prayer.' The disuse of the word 'altar' was doubtless a result of the agitation begun by Bishop Hooper 'to take away the false persuasion of the people, which they have of sacrifice, to be done upon the altars.' But the word itself was used, without disparagement, by Cranmer,

Ridley, and Latimer, and has been retained in the Coronation rite. The Convocation of 1640, in defence of the placing of the holy Table where the Altar had stood, affirmed that 'this situation of the Holy Table doth not imply that it is or ought to be esteemed a true and proper Altar whereon Christ is again really sacrificed: but it is and may be called an Altar by us in that sense in which the primitive Church called it an Altar, and in no other.' The terms 'altar,' 'table,' 'holy table' have all been used at various periods. In the first three centuries of the Church 'altar' is more common, though 'table' is found in a letter of Dionysius of Alexandria in close connection with a reference to Communion. The Eastern liturgies use both 'altar' and 'holy table,' and 'altar' is also used of the sanctuary. In the prayers of the Roman Sacramentaries, along with the more common term 'altar,' we find 'Lord's Table' or 'thy Table,' the one, as Wheatly says, 'having respect to the oblation of the Eucharist, the other to the participation.' The term 'Lord's Table' is of course suggested by 1 Cor. x. 21. The Scottish Liturgy alone among the rites of the Anglican Communion (except the English Coronation rite) has restored the word 'altar' in the Communion Service itself, and then only in the rubric before the Prayer of Humble Access, the terms 'holy Table' and 'Lord's Table' being used elsewhere. The old English phrase 'God's board' occurs in the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, but disappeared in 1661, though it has been restored in the opening rubric of the English Alternative Order of 1928.

The direction that 'the Table at the Communion time' shall have 'a fair white linen cloth upon it' is repeated in Canon 82 of 1604, which also enjoins that the Table shall be covered 'in time of Divine Service with a carpet of silk or other decent stuff.'

The further direction that the Table 'at the Communion time' shall stand 'in the Body of the Church, or in the Chancel, where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said,' was another innovation in 1552. With the removal of the altars, and the substitution of movable tables, the practice arose of bringing the Table into the Chancel or body of the church. The reason given for this in the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth (1559) is that the congregation might better hear the service and more conveniently communicate, and the further direction is given that at other times than 'Communion time' the Table should be set in the place where the altar had stood (cf. Canon 82 of 1604). The inconvenience of this arrangement led in many cases to the holy Table remaining permanently in the body of the church, while in the cathedrals it would rarely be removed from the east end. The neglect and irreverence resulting from the existing practice led to the measures taken by Archbishop Laud and other bishops for the permanent placing of the holy Table

altar-wise under the eastern wall of the Chancel and the fencing of it with a rail, at which communicants might receive the Sacrament.

In 1661, though the bishops appear to have wished to secure by rubric the new position of the holy Table, they deemed it wiser to leave the existing rubric as it stands, and later custom has secured the ends which they had in view.

The position of the priest, 'standing at the North-side of the Table,' is explained by the position of the holy Table contemplated in the rubric of 1552. When brought down into the Chancel or body of the church it was set 'table-wise,' *i.e.* with the ends east and west, instead of north and south as in the old 'altar-wise' position, and the priest ministered on the north side. The object of this change was to emphasise the idea of the 'communion feast,' and to associate priest and people as familiarly and closely as possible. It stressed in an extreme form one aspect of the rite, to the exclusion of the other aspect, in which the priest leads the worshippers in offering the great 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' to God.

But when the holy Table was permanently removed to the east end and placed 'altar-wise,' the sides faced east and west, and exact compliance with the rubric became impossible. Hence a divergence of custom arose.

(1) The Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, which had directed the holy Table to be placed 'at the uppermost part of the Chancel or Church,' amended the rubric so as to read 'at the north side or end.' A further rubric directed that 'during the time of consecration' the Presbyter should stand 'at such part of the holy Table where he may with the more ease and decency use both his hands,' which implies (and, as we learn from the charges against Laud, was understood to imply) a position on the west side of the holy Table facing eastwards. The corresponding rubric in the Prayer Book of 1661 (which supplemented the direction in the rubric of 1552 that the priest 'standing up shall say') directs that when 'the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people . . . he shall say.' This again is ambiguous, and has been variously interpreted. There is evidence during the century following 1661 that the practice of standing at the north part of the front of the holy Table, facing eastwards, was not uncommon.[1]

(2) The more general position, which Andrewes, and Laud after him, adopted, was at the north end, and this position gradually became general until modern times, when the eastward

[1] For the evidence see *The Bishop of Lincoln's Case* (ed. Roscoe, 1891), pp. 118 f.: Scudamore, *Not. Euch.* (2nd ed.), pp. 164 f., 190 f.

position was revived. The legality of this latter position was recognised by the Lincoln Judgment (1890). The principle underlying it is that which the revisers of 1661 stated in reply to the Puritan desire that the minister should turn to the people in all his ministrations: 'When he speaks *to* them, as in Lessons, Absolution, and Benediction, it is convenient that he turn to them. When he speaks *for* them to God, it is fit that they should *all* turn another way, as the ancient Church ever did.'[1]

* * * * * *

The service falls roughly into three divisions: I. The Preparation; II. The Eucharistic prayer (with its Preface) and the Communion; III. The Thanksgiving.

The Preparation extends to the end of the Comfortable Words, and includes (*a*) the general preparation of the congregation; (*b*) the Offertory and Prayer for the Church; (*c*) the more immediate preparation of the communicants.

The first of these subdivisions (*a*), which a rubric at the end of the service directs for use (together with the Prayer for the Church, one or more Collects, and the Blessing) on Sundays and other Holy Days when there is no communion, fills the place occupied by the *Missa Catechumenorum* of early Eastern and Western rites. This latter service contained lessons from Scripture, psalms, Sermon (or Homily), and Prayers for the various classes who were not permitted to remain for the Eucharist. On the use of this service on non-liturgical days see pp. 330, 737 f.

The Prayer Book of 1549 followed more closely than the later revisions the traditional Roman and Sarum Use, in that it retained the Introit psalm, the ninefold *Kyrie*, and the *Gloria in Excelsis*. The omission of the Introit, the transposition of the *Gloria in Excelsis* to the post-communion, and the introduction of the Commandments, with the *Kyries* as a refrain, were due to the revision of 1552, and are a peculiar feature of the English Prayer Book, from which they have passed into subsequent forms of the Anglican rite. These features impart to this introductory portion of the service a penitential and subjective character, whereas in the older rite the use of psalmody (of which the Introit and the Gradual are a much-reduced form) and the singing of the *Gloria in Excelsis* introduced the element of worship at an earlier stage in the service. In this respect the earlier Lutheran rites and the present Swedish service follow more closely the older forms. The Prayer Book service thus begins on a low note, and the element of praise and thanksgiving (apart from the confession of faith in the Creed) is held back until the *Sursum*

[1] The rubric has been amended in various ways in later revisions. The Scottish (since 1911) has 'standing at the Holy Table': the South African, 'standing at the Table': the American, 'standing reverently before the Holy Table': English Alternative Order (1928), 'standing at God's Board.'

corda and Preface, and is then resumed once more in the post-communion and *Gloria in Excelsis* at the end.

The Lord's Prayer and the Collect for Purity.

The use of the Lord's Prayer and the Collect are elements derived from the preparatory prayers of the priest in the Sarum rite, said by him in the Sacristy while vesting. The repetition by the priest alone of the Lord's Prayer, including the Amen, is a survival of this earlier use. In the first printed copy of 1662 and in the Sealed Books the Amen is in text type, whereas the Amen following the Collect for purity is in rubric type. This suggests, as Dr. Brightman has shown, that the traditional practice was meant to be followed, and that the general rubric found in the Prayer Book Order of Morning Prayer that the people should repeat the prayer with the minister does not apply here. A further indication is the absence of such direction here, while in all the other six instances where the Prayer is ordered (in the Daily Offices, Litany, and Holy Communion) the direction is given in spite of the general rubric in the Order of Morning Prayer. But while the traditional practice is retained, the intention plainly is that priest and people should alike share in the preparation. The same reason explains the omission of the mutual confession of priest and ministers, which found a place in the old *præparatio missæ*, and the substitution, at a later stage, of the General Confession made in the name of all those who are minded to receive the Holy Communion.

The Commandments.

The rehearsal of the Ten Commandments, introduced in 1552, finds no parallel in the pre-reformation service, though order had been given periodically since the thirteenth century that they should be taught and expounded to the people. There is, however, a parallel use in several German Church Orders, where they form part of a group of devotions, including the Lord's Prayer, Creed, Decalogue, General Confession and Absolution, corresponding to the traditional Prone,[1] and following the Sermon. In the Reformed Sunday Service of Strassburg (1539), which Calvin adopted for the use of his Congregation, the same traditional elements are found, though the Decalogue (in a metrical version) occurs before the Sermon.

The use of *Kyrie eleison* as a refrain was a feature of a certain class of hymns, and is found in Luther's metrical paraphrase of the Decalogue, an English translation of which was included by Coverdale in his *Goostly Psalmes*.

The response, 'Lord have mercy upon us and incline our hearts to keep this law,' is an adaptation and expansion (possibly suggested by Deut. v. 29) of the *Kyrie eleison* which found

[1] On the Prone, see p. 317.

a place here in the Roman rite. Edmund Bishop has discussed the origin of this form of prayer, which appears first in Christian worship in Greek-speaking lands in the course of the fourth century.[1] Thence it passed to Italy as a popular and simple form of devotion some time in the fifth century. Its use in the Mass at Rome is attested by Pope Gregory the Great in a letter of the year 598. The Greek custom of singing it as a response to the Deacon's Litany is, however, different from that of the West, where it was sung, with the alternating form *Christe eleison*, by the clerks, in earlier days with the response of the people. From this use originated the ninefold *Kyrie*, retained in the direction of the Prayer Book of 1549 in the form 'iii. Lord have mercy upon us. iii. Christ have mercy upon us. iii. Lord have mercy upon us.' The variation in the response to the Tenth Commandment, 'write all these thy laws in our hearts, we beseech thee,' is based upon Jer. xxxi. 31 (cf. Heb. viii. 8–12, x. 15–17). In order to indicate the sense in which the Church recites the Commandments and wishes them to be applied, the Scottish Liturgy of 1637 amended the rubric preceding them as follows: 'the people . . . asking God mercy for the transgression of every duty therein; either according to the letter, or to the mystical importance of the said commandment'; and this form, with slight changes, has been adopted in later revisions (Scottish, South African, English Alternative Order, 1928).

The Scottish Liturgy of 1764 provided as an alternative to the Decalogue the 'Summary of the Law' (found in our Lord's words Mark xii. 29–31, Matt. xxii. 40), the object being to state the positive, and not merely the negative, side of the Christian rule of life.[2] A similar provision is found in later Anglican revisions (Scottish, South African, English Alternative Order, 1928), and in the American Prayer Book (where it is supplementary to the Decalogue).

Another provision found in some of these later revisions (South African, American, English Alternative Order (1928)) allows the Commandments to be recited in a shorter form (without the comments and explanations added in Exod. xx, many of which apply to the temporary conditions of early Jewish life). This shorter form, which appears to have been the traditional form, is found in the Catechism of 1549, in *The Institution of a Christian Man* (1537), and *The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition* of 1543.[3]

[1] *Liturgica Historica*, pp. 116f. For Old Testament parallels to the *Kyrie* cf. Isa. xxxiii. 2; Ps. cxxii. (cxxⁱⁱ.) 3 in the LXX.

[2] The 'Summary' is found still earlier in the Non-Jurors' rite of 1718, where it is substituted for the Decalogue.

[3] A comparison of the versions given in Exod. xx and Deut. v. suggests that the Decalogue originally existed in a simpler form, and that it has been expanded in varying ways in the different versions. Cf. also the summaries in Mark x. 19, Rom. xiii. 9.

The shorter form concentrates attention on the permanent message of the Commandments. The additions to this shorter form made in 1552 are derived from the Great Bible.

Permission is further given in the Scottish Liturgy, the South African, and the English Alternative Order of 1928 (in the two latter, on other days than Sundays) for the use of the Kyries in the form 'Lord, have mercy upon us, *Christ, have mercy* . . . , Lord, have mercy . . .' in place of (or in addition to, Scottish and South African) the Commandments or 'Summary.' Lastly, in the English Alternative Order of 1928 a return is made to the earlier and simpler form of the *Kyries*, 'Lord, have mercy, *Christ, have mercy*, Lord, have mercy,' (or 'Kyrie eleison, *Christe eleison*, Kyrie eleison,') thus restoring what Bishop Dowden has called 'the large indefiniteness of the original,' in which the prayer is not restricted to the particular congregation, but embraces the whole range of the Divine mercy.

The Collects and Lessons.

The Collect of the day represents the first of the three prayers, varying with the season or day, which were a feature of the Roman rite, the other two being the prayer used over the offerings (*super oblata* or *secreta*), and the post-communion (*ad complendum* or *post communio*). The rubric in 1549 and 1552 ran: 'Then shall follow the Collect of the day, with one of these two Collects following, for the King,' the prayer for the King being said as a 'memorial,' subsidiary to the Collect for the day. The transposition of the order of the two Collects was an unfortunate following of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, the object being either to avoid the inconvenience of turning the leaves of the book twice before the Epistle, or to place the Collect for the day immediately before the Epistle. The two prayers for the King are derived from the Prayer Book of 1549. In view of the changed position of the Prayer for the Church in 1552 and the inclusion of it in the part of the service appointed to be said when there is no Communion, the prayer for the King here has been omitted in the South African Liturgy and the English Alternative Order of 1928. In the Irish Prayer Book permission is given for its omission if the King has been prayed for in any service used along with the Communion service. The prayer has also been omitted in the Scottish Liturgy since 1911.

In the Prayer Book of 1549 the bidding 'Let us pray,' before the Collect, was preceded by the mutual salutation, 'The Lord be with you,' 'And with thy spirit,' which is found in the older service at certain fixed points (Collect, Gospel, Offertory, *Sursum corda*, and post-communion). It marked the transition to a new division of the service, and helped to renew the association of priest and people in the act of worship in which they were engaged.

In the drastic simplification of the service in 1552 it disappeared, though it was retained here in some of the German Church Orders, and has been restored in the Scottish (1911) and South African Liturgies, and in the English Alternative Order of 1928.

The lessons from Scripture were one of the elements derived from the Synagogue service. Originally the lessons were more numerous, and survivals of this more extended use of Scripture are found in some Eastern rites (Syrian, Coptic, Abyssinian, Nestorian). In the latter part of the fourth century, however, the lessons were becoming normally restricted to three, Old Testament, Epistle, and Gospel, and these are still retained in the Armenian rite. In the West the Old Testament lesson (or 'prophecy') survives in the Ambrosian and Roman rites on certain special days (*e.g.* in the Roman rite on some of the Ember Days and certain days in Lent), and in the Mozarabic on all days.

The use of the term 'Epistle' was objected to by the Puritans at the Savoy Conference on the ground that lessons from the Old Testament and other parts of Scripture found a place among the selected portions, and to this objection was due the cumbrous alternative form inserted in 1661, 'The portion of Scripture appointed for the Epistle.'[1]

The use of psalmody between the lessons, both in East and West, goes back to early days, and this element in a reduced form was represented in the mediæval service by the Gradual, or respond, sung before the Gospel, and followed by the Alleluia except from Septuagesima to Easter Eve and on Ember Days and Vigils, when it was followed by the Tract. The florid elaboration and secular character of much of the music connected with these in later mediæval times (of which Erasmus complains in his *Adnotationes* [*sub* 1 Cor. xiv. 19]), and the possibility that ordinary choirs could not and did not sing the Gradual,[2] explain the omission of the Gradual in 1549 and the wording of the rubric '*immediately after* the Epistle ended, the Priest . . . shall say' (altered in 1661 to 'Then shall be read the Gospel, saying'). Luther in his Latin Mass was prepared to retain the Gradual, if kept within due limits, and in his German Mass provided for a metrical hymn to be sung between the Epistle and the Gospel. Similar directions are found in other German Church Orders of the Reformation period.

The omission of the old response to the announcement of the Gospel, 'Glory be to thee, O Lord,' in 1552 is difficult to explain.

[1] The latest American revision omits this, while the English Alternative Order of 1928 substitutes 'the Lesson,' a title found in *Ordo Romanus* I and always in the Roman rite. The corresponding titles in the Eastern rites are 'The Prophet' (for Old Testament), 'The Apostle' (for St. Paul).

[2] Brightman (*Eng. Rite*, I. civ) points out that at present they are often not sung, except by skilled choirs.

It was retained in 1549, and Cosin, who says that it was still used in his time, sought to restore it at the revision of 1661, but without result. The tradition of saying it has, however, survived. The response after the reading of the Gospel, 'Thanks be to thee, O Lord,' which has become customary in many churches, is derived from the Scottish Book of 1637, and has found a place in the revised South African Liturgy. In the Scottish Book of 1764 and later revisions it appears with the addition 'for this thy glorious Gospel.' The latest American revision and the English Alternative Order of 1928 have the form 'Praise be to thee, O Christ,' which is also the Roman form prescribed to be said by the server at low masses. In the English missals no directions are given for the response after the Gospel.

The direction that the people shall stand up at the reading of the Gospel was inserted at Cosin's suggestion in 1661. It is the only surviving custom actually enjoined in the Prayer Book which recalls the ceremonial pomp with which the reading of the Gospel was once invested, though in actual practice in a number of churches much of the old ceremonial in this connection has been revived.

The Creed.

The ministry of the word is followed by the public confession of faith. 'Because we believe Christ as the Divine truth, when the Gospel has been read, the Creed is sung, in which the people show their assent by faith to the Doctrine of Christ' (Thomas Aquinas). The recitation of the Creed is not, however, an early feature in Eastern or Western rites. It began at Antioch in the fifth century, and thence spread to Alexandria and Constantinople. The Emperor Justinian ordered it to be sung in all churches. Its introduction in the Western Liturgy was due to the Third Council of Toledo in 589,[1] which ordered its use, in order to confirm the nation in its conversion to Catholicism. Thence it spread to Gaul and Britain. It was only adopted by the Roman Church early in the eleventh century. The earliest reference to its use in the Liturgy speaks of the Creed as 'the Creed of the 318 Fathers.' If the words are taken literally they would imply that it was the original Nicene Creed. But no trace can be found in the Greek liturgies of any other Creed than that of Constantinople, and it is more likely that this is meant (see C. H. Turner, *History and Use of Creeds*, Ch. Hist. Society, 1906, pp. 50 f.). The Creed appears to be a revised form of the Creed of Jerusalem, modified by the insertion of clauses from the Nicene Creed and new clauses dealing with the Holy Spirit. If Dr. Hort's suggestion be accepted, that it was submitted, as

[1] This Council ordered the use of the Creed 'before the Lord's Prayer,' a place which it still occupies in the Mozarabic rite.

a proof of his orthodoxy, by Cyril of Jerusalem to the Council of Constantinople, it is possible to see how the Creed thus approved came to be represented as 'the Creed of the 150 Fathers who met at Constantinople.' So it is described in the Definition of the Council of Chalcedon (451). Dr. C. H. Turner suggested that at some time between 381 and 451 it had come to be adopted as the local Creed of the Church of Constantinople, and was regarded as 'a legitimate and necessary expansion' of the shorter Creed; 'in other words, the Constantinopolitan is the completed form of the Nicene Creed' (Turner, *l.c.*, p. 53).

In the Prayer Book text of the Creed there are certain variations from the original text, some of which are common to the Western liturgical forms, while others are peculiar to the Prayer Book. Among the former are: (1) the insertion of 'God of God,' which is due to assimilation with the text of the Nicene Creed; (2) the omission of 'in' before 'one Catholick and Apostolic Church,' which has no support from the original Greek text; (3) the addition of the words 'and the Son,' after 'proceeding from the Father,' in the clause about the Holy Spirit. This addition, made either at the Council of Toledo (589) or shortly after, was one of the great occasions of controversy between the Eastern and Western Churches.

Among variations peculiar to the Prayer Book are: (1) 'begotten of *his* Father,' in place of '*the* Father'; (2) the omission of 'holy' in the clause about the Church. This latter omission was probably due, as Bp. Dowden (*Workmanship of Prayer Book*, pp. 104f.) suggests, to the influence of some contemporary editions of the Acts of the Councils which the revisers had consulted. There is a similar omission in several MSS. of an early Latin collection of Canons (Burn, *Facsimiles of Creeds*, H.B.S., p. 17 and Plate xii). In any case the re-insertion of the word 'holy' is desirable, and it has been effected in the latest revision of the Scottish liturgy, in the South African liturgy, and in the English Alternative Order (1928).

In one other clause the Prayer Book rendering is capable of improvement. 'The Lord and Giver of Life' as applied to the Holy Spirit is ambiguous. The title 'Lord' is one attribute (2 Cor. iii. 17, 18); 'the Giver of Life' is a second and further attribute (St. John vi. 63). Hence the English Alternative Order (1928) reads, 'The Lord, The giver of life,' and so also the South African and Scottish (1929) liturgies. The Canadian and American forms are 'the Lord, and Giver of life.'

In the Eastern and Western Churches the Creed was not recited until catechumens and other classes excluded from Communion had been dismissed and the Mass of the Faithful had begun. Following these earlier precedents and in view of the needs of a missionary Church, the South African Liturgy rightly provides

that where unbaptised persons or penitents are present, the Sermon may follow immediately upon the Gospel, and after the Sermon such persons shall be dismissed with prayer and blessing before the Creed is recited.

When the dismissal of catechumens became obsolete, the old distinction between the *missa catechumenorum* and the *missa fidelium* gradually disappeared, and the Creed was placed after the Gospel, and the Sermon followed. This was, according to Durandus,[1] the position in the thirteenth century, and it is followed in the Lutheran Church Orders and the Book of Common Prayer. In the Missal of Pope Pius V (1570), however, the Sermon precedes the Creed, and this is the present Roman use.

While the Apostles' Creed and the *Quicunque vult* are purely Western in origin and general use, the Creed used in the Liturgy expresses our unity with Christians of both East and West. The addition in the West of the words 'and the Son' in the clause on the Procession of the Holy Spirit, though made an occasion of controversy in ages past, represents a difference largely of phraseology rather than of underlying doctrine, the Easterns preferring to speak of the Holy Spirit as proceeding 'from the Father through the Son.'

The Prayer Book of 1549 directs that the *Gloria in excelsis*, the Creed, the Homily, and the Exhortation 'Dearly beloved' may be omitted on 'work-days,' and the English Alternative Order of 1928 similarly permits the omission of the Creed on days other than Sundays and Holy Days. In the mediæval use the *Gloria in excelsis* and the Creed were prescribed for feasts, and were both festal features. The American Prayer Book allows the use of either the Nicene or the Apostles' Creed at Morning Prayer and Holy Communion, and also the omission of the Creed in the latter service, if it has been said immediately before in Morning Prayer, but orders the Nicene Creed to be sung on the five great festivals.

The Sermon or Homily.

The normal place of the Sermon in early times was immediately after the Scripture lessons. Of this we have evidence in the account of the Eucharist by Justin Martyr about the middle of the second century, and it was the general custom in the Churches of East and West in the fourth century and the following period. The duty of frequent preaching was enforced by Canons of the English Church before the Norman Conquest, but later on, owing to the ignorance of many of the clergy, preaching became rare and fresh injunctions were needed. The Constitutions of Archbishop Peckham in 1281 enjoin the parish priest once in each quarter to instruct the people in the Creed, the Command-

[1] *Rationale*, IV. 26.

ments of the Law and the Gospel, good works, the sins to be avoided, the Christian virtues, and the Sacraments.

The decay of preaching at the time of the Reformation was one of the abuses most frequently denounced by Latimer and other English reformers, and the insertion of the rubric in 1549, 'After the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon or Homily,' together with the later rubric in the same book permitting the omission of the Homily on 'work-days,'[1] was intended to secure that a Sermon or Homily should be a regular feature of the service on Sundays and Holy Days.

The reference in the rubric to 'one of the Homilies already set forth, or hereafter to be set forth, by authority' is repeated from the Prayer Book of 1552. It refers to the first book of Homilies published in 1547 (to which a second book was added in 1563). That the Homilies were subject to change is implied in the form of the rubric. The publication of homilies for the use of preachers goes back a long way and books of homilies and expositions of the Epistles and Gospels (or Postils, as they were called) in English had been published during the reigns of Henry VII and Henry VIII (see Scudamore, *Not. Euch.*, 2nd ed., pp. 290 ff.).

Attached to the Sermon in mediæval times was a group of devotions in the vernacular, together with various instructions and notices, the whole being known collectively as 'the Prone.'[2] In 1408 Archbishop Arundel, while reaffirming the constitution of Archbishop Peckham referred to above, ordered the 'customary prayers' to be said along with the instruction given by the priest, and Lyndwood, commenting on this, says that these prayers were commonly said in parish churches on Sundays after the Offertory. There is other evidence (*e.g.* Chaucer, *Prol.*, 710 f.) that the Sermon was preached in this place in mediæval times. These 'customary prayers' filled the gap made in the Roman rite by the loss of the intercessions which are found in other early rites.[3] Though these 'customary prayers' were originally said after the Sermon, in England (as in France) they had come to be said before the Sermon and were known as the 'Bidding of the Bedes.' Of this custom the only survivals in the present English use are the Bidding Prayer and the various notices which the rubric orders to be given out before the Sermon.

The Bidding Prayer, though now commonly divorced from its original connection with the Eucharist and reserved for special occasions, was ordered by Canon 55 of 1603 to be said 'by all preachers before their Sermons.' A relic of its earlier connection

[1] This permission was omitted in 1552 and later books.

[2] See the full discussion in Brightman, *English Rite*, II. Appendix i.

[3] The *Orationes solemnes* of Good Friday are the original Roman intercession, and the *Oremus* which remains in the Roman rite before the Offertory, without any prayers following, marks their place.

with the 'Bidding of the Bedes,' of which the form was not fixed, is found in the direction of the above Canon that prayer shall be made 'in this form or to this effect.'[1]

The rubric directing what notices are to be published in church was expanded to its present form in 1661 and was placed before, instead of after, the Sermon, where it had stood in 1552. In the text of the Prayer Book of 1661 the notices include, in addition to Holy Days, fasting days, and the notice of Communion, the publication of Banns of Matrimony. The omission of the reference to publication of Banns in later Prayer Books, and the alteration of the corresponding rubric in the Marriage Service, were unauthorised changes made by the printers, and were due to a misunderstanding of the Marriage Act, 26 George II. ch. 33, which provided for the reading of Banns at the Evening Service, if there be no Morning Service, and the words 'immediately after the Second Lesson' were intended to apply only to the Evening Service.

The Briefs referred to are letters from the Bishop or the Crown, the latter commonly being for the purpose of authorising collections for charitable purposes. The Citations are notices to appear before an Ecclesiastical Court. The declaration of sentences of excommunication, a relic of the penitential discipline of the Church, had been enjoined in Canon 65 of 1603.

The Offertory.

With the rubrics following the Sermon the service enters upon a further stage. In the earliest forms of the rite outside the New Testament the people's offering finds a prominent place. Clement of Rome (*Ad Cor.* 44) speaks of the 'offering of the gifts' as one of the functions of the leaders of the Church, and Cyprian (*De Op. et Eleem.*, 15) reproves those who come to Church 'without a sacrifice.' These offerings were made in kind, and included not only the bread and wine from which the elements of the Sacrament were taken, but also gifts for the relief of the needy and support of the clergy. Underlying this practice was the conception of the Eucharist as the Church's thank-offering for the blessings of Creation and Redemption. The gifts of the earth, redeemed in their use by the new Christian outlook, were offered as first-fruits to God as an act of homage and acknowledgment of His dominion and of the fact that all that we have comes from Him. In this form the people's offering in the time of Mass

[1] In the latest American revision a rubric before the Sermon says: 'Here, or immediately after the Creed, may be said the Bidding Prayer, or other authorised prayers and intercessions.' Similarly the Alternative English Order of 1928, after mentioning various notices, adds, 'and Bidding of Prayers may be made.'

survived for many centuries in the West.[1] This early Eucharistic conception is very clearly indicated in the prayers of the Roman Canon. During the people's offering the Offertory Chant (originally a whole psalm with antiphon) was sung, and at the end, after the washing of hands, the Collect known as *Secreta* (or *Super oblata*) was said.

During the course of the Middle Ages offerings in kind were commuted for occasional offerings of money, and the Offertory was expanded by the introduction of the private prayers of the priest, and by the censing of the oblations. This lesser, or first oblation, is found in the older rites of both East and West, but in the prayers connected with it we find a tendency to confuse it with the later oblation, in which there is commemorated and represented the Sacrifice of the Cross. Language of this preparatory character is found in the Greek rites, and also in some of the *Secreta* prayers of the Roman rite, where, side by side with the earlier Eucharistic language, we find such phrases as 'this sacrifice of *propitiation* and praise.' To this cause was due the denunciation of the Offertory, no less than the Canon of the Mass, by the reformers both in England and abroad. For Luther both alike 'stink of oblation' and seemed to impair the virtue of the one Sacrifice of the Cross. This explains the drastic treatment of the Offertory by Luther in his Latin and German Mass, and by the compilers of the Prayer Book of 1549. In this latter the following changes were made:

(1) The Offertorium (or Offertory Chant) was retained in the form of sentences of Scripture to be sung while the people offer, or one of them to be said by the 'Minister' before the offering. The Western *Offertoria* had consisted of sentences of Scripture, suited to the day or season, but having usually little or no relation to the actual offering. In 1549 they were selected with the object of emphasising (*a*) the duty of almsgiving, (*b*) the maintenance of the clergy, (*c*) the relief of the poor.

(2) The private prayers of the priest, and the prayers said over the offerings (*Secreta* or *Super oblata*), were omitted, together with the hand-washing (*Lavabo*) and the censings; and the preparation of the elements and their setting upon the altar were done without prayer or further ceremony.

(3) The prayer for the Church (which in 1549 formed the introductory part of the Canon) contained no reference to the 'alms and oblations.'

In 1552 the tendency of these changes was carried still further,

[1] It still survives at Milan, where the offering of bread and wine is made by the *Vecchioni*, a body of old men and women maintained by the Church. A relic of the same custom is found in Brasenose College Chapel, Oxford, where two members of the foundation present the bread and wine at the Offertory.

and the close identification of the Offertory with the giving of alms, which has become common in popular language, was further promoted. The term 'Offertory' was dropped, and in the prayer for the Church, which now followed at this point (instead of forming part of the Canon), the words 'to accept our alms and' were inserted before 'to receive these our prayers.' Finally, all directions for the preparation and disposition of the elements were omitted.

The revived study of the Fathers and the liturgies in the seventeenth century directed attention once more to the significance of the people's offering in earlier ages. One result of this was that in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637 the alms are directed to be 'humbly presented before the Lord' and 'set upon the holy table.' And similarly 'the Presbyter shall then *offer up* and place the bread and wine . . . upon the Lord's Table.' In both cases the object is to emphasise the fact that the offerings are really offerings to God. Hitherto (both in 1549 and 1552) the alms had been placed in the poor men's box, which by the Injunctions of 1547 was to be set up near the high altar. But whereas formerly the people went up and made their offering, in 1552 the churchwardens, or others appointed by them, are now directed to 'gather the devotions of the people' and put them in the box.

The revisers of 1661 re-inserted the term 'Offertory' (without replacing the direction of 1549 that the Sentences might be sung), and also added the substance of both the above rubrics of the Scottish Liturgy. The alms and the bread and wine are to be set on the Lord's Table by the priest, but only in the case of the alms is he directed 'humbly to present' them, though in the Durham Book a suggestion had been made to add the words 'offer up and' before 'place upon the Table' in the rubric about the disposition of the bread and wine.

The addition in 1661 of the words 'and oblations' after 'alms' in the Prayer for the Church has been thought to refer to the oblations of bread and wine, and it was so interpreted by Simon Patrick, Bishop of Ely (1667) and by Wheatly (1722). But Bishop Dowden (*Further Studies in Prayer Book*, pp. 176 f.) has made out a strong case for the view that the 'oblations' refer to money offerings for the maintenance of the clergy, corresponding to the 'other devotions of the people' referred to in the rubric following the Sentences, a rubric which takes the place of the earlier rubric of 1549 and 1552 dealing with 'the due and accustomed offerings to the clergy.' But though this seems to be the historical meaning of 'oblations' in the Prayer for the Church, we find a number of Anglican writers, even before the revision of 1661, insisting that the bread and wine set upon the Lord's Table form part of the oblations of the people. Hamon

L'Estrange, in his *Alliance of Divine Offices* (published in 1659), mentions first among the 'sacrifices and oblations' in the Eucharist 'the bringing of our gifts to the altar, that is, the species and elements of the sacred symbols, and withal some overplus according to our abilities, for the relief of the poor.' While Wheatly (*Rational Illustration*, ed. 1846, p. 238) emphasises the offering of the bread and wine to God 'as an acknowledgment of his sovereignty over his creatures, and that from henceforth they might become properly and peculiarly his,' L'Estrange (*Alliance*, ed. 1659, p. 187) brings out the sacrificial character of the alms offered at Holy Communion. 'This eleemosynary offering is a sacrifice so called (Phil. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 6), and declared to be "well pleasing to God" . . . though extended to the poor: these have a warrant of Attorney from God himself to receive our Alms. . . . So that when we come together to break bread, in the Scripture notion, that is, to communicate, we must break it to the hungry, to God himself, in his poor members.'

A few other points connected with the Offertory call for notice.

(1) The Offertory Sentences, apart from some slight verbal alterations, remained unchanged in the revisions of 1552 and 1661. They are taken from the Great Bible, but with some variations In the other Anglican forms (Scottish, American, Canadian, South African) additional Sentences have been added, emphasising in some cases the duty of almsgiving,[1] in others the missionary responsibility of the Church,[2] in others again the Eucharistic character of the offering in its various aspects.[3] The English Alternative Order of 1928 follows similar lines. The South African Liturgy provides also special Offertory Sentences for the Church's seasons. This is an adaptation of the older Western custom.

(2) The Scottish and American forms follow the Scottish Liturgy of 1637 in inserting the word 'offer' (Scottish 'offer up') in the rubric directing the priest to place the bread and wine upon the holy Table. A feature of the Scottish Liturgy (since 1912) and of the South African Liturgy is the addition of a verbal offering of the elements, which in the former case is directed to be made in words taken from 1 Chron. xxix. 10–17,[4] while in the South African Liturgy it takes the form of a prayer modelled upon that which is found in the English Coronation rite, when the Archbishop presents the King's offering of bread and wine for the Communion. Such express prayers, however, in

[1] Acts xx. 35; Matt. xxv. 40; Eph. v. 2. [2] Rom. x. 14, 15; Luke x. 2.
[3] Ps. xcvi. 8, cxvi. 15, 16; Gen. iv. 3, 4, xiv. 18; Deut. xvi. 16, 17; 1 Chron. xxix. 11–14; Rom. xii. 1.
[4] In earlier forms of the Scottish Liturgy the words were connected with the presentation of the alms.

connection with the presentation of the offerings are not an original or essential feature of the rite. They found no place in the earlier Roman rite, in which, as Martène says (*De Ant. Eccl. Rit.*, I. c. iv. Art. VI. n. xvi), 'they used to perform the whole of that action in silence, considering that the prayers contained in the Canon were sufficient, as indeed they are.'[1] Similar evidence for the East is found in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions in the last quarter of the fourth century.

(3) The direction in 1549 that in the preparation of the chalice there should be added to the wine 'a little pure and clean water' was omitted in 1552, along with all directions as to the preparation of the elements. A rubric was inserted in 1661 in part to supply the deficiency by directing the priest to 'place upon the Table so much bread and wine as he shall think convenient.' In the Scottish Liturgy (since 1912) and in the English Alternative Order of 1928 the 'mixed chalice' is recognised as a traditional custom of the Church. It arose from the practice of diluting wine with water, which was common in antiquity. Only later do we find attempts to give it various symbolical meanings. It was retained in 1549 as being a general practice of the Church, and though not essential, it is one of the marks of continuity with the long-established and well-nigh universal practice of the Church.

The Intercession or Prayer for the Church.

Intercession, an expression of the fellowship of all the faithful in Christ, has always found a place in the Eucharist, which is the Sacrament of unity, and a witness to the Communion of Saints. Originally, all intercessions for others than the actual worshippers appear to have been offered outside and before the central Eucharistic prayer (the Anaphora or Canon). That is the position of the Deacon's Litany at the beginning of the Mass of the faithful in the Greek rites; and the Gallican and Mozarabic rites, as well as the East Syrian Liturgy of Adai and Mari, witness to a similar order. In the Roman rite the *Oremus* before the Offertory is a relic of this place of the intercession in the older Roman rite, and the *Orationes solemnes* of Good Friday are the original Roman intercession offered at this place.

But in the Greek West Syrian and Byzantine rites (and their dependents) a further intercession is found at the close of the Anaphora. In the Egyptian rites there is an intercession within the Anaphora before the *Sanctus*, while in the Roman rite there is a prayer for the Church and worshippers and a commemoration

[1] The *Secreta* (or *Super oblata*) prayers in the Roman Mass have a different purpose. They are preparatory to the Eucharistic prayer, and are preceded by an invitation (*Orate fratres*), which was originally followed by prayer offered in silence by the faithful, and of such prayer they formed the conclusion.

of saints before, and a prayer for the departed (*Memento etiam*) after the recital of the institution, though the *Memento* of the departed does not appear to have been a regular or essential part of the public Sunday Mass at Rome in the earlier period.

Corresponding to this development of the 'Great Intercession' at the close of the Anaphora there is an underlying difference of conception. In the earlier forms the Intercession is closely associated with the Offertory. The gifts and prayers are the offering of the worshippers, presented in union with the intercession of Christ 'the High Priest of our offerings' (Clement of Rome), as an expression of gratitude and love, and the consecration of the gifts is the Divine response, in which 'heavenly things' are given in exchange for 'earthly' (*Leonine Sacramentary*, ed. Feltoe, p. 10). This earlier conception appears also to underlie the language of the Egyptian Liturgy of St. Mark and of the Roman Canon, when studied in its historical setting, and apart from later interpretations. The other development brings the intercessions into connection with the moments following consecration, and pleads the sacrifice of Christ, here sacramentally represented and set forth. Its background is the picture of the Lamb 'standing as slain' in the midst of the worshipping hosts (Rev. v. 6, 9; xiii. 8). That is the idea which finds expression in the Greek Fathers, Cyril of Jerusalem and Chrysostom, and it explains the place of the Intercession at the close of the Anaphora in the West Syrian and Byzantine rites.

In the older rites of East and West the Intercession included prayers for the living and the dead, and a commemoration of saints.

In the first English Prayer Book of 1549 the Prayer for the Church formed the introduction to the central Eucharistic Prayer (or Canon), and in order and contents followed the corresponding portion of the Roman Canon (*Te igitur*, *Memento*, and *Communicantes*). It also contained the substance of the *Memento etiam* (a prayer for the departed). But the old language was freely adapted and paraphrased, and all words suggestive of 'oblation' and 'sacrifice' were omitted. The commemoration of the saints was in general terms and included patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs, and a special reference to the 'blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord and God,' all reference to their merits and intercessions being omitted. The prayer for the departed closely followed the earlier portion of the *Memento etiam*, but for the words 'Grant . . . a place of refreshment, light and peace' there were substituted the words 'Grant unto them . . . thy mercy, and everlasting peace.' The prayer passes at its close into a petition that 'we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may

altogether be set at his right hand and hear his most joyful voice: Come, ye blessed. . . .' (Matt. xxv. 34).

To this prayer was prefixed an introduction based upon 1 Tim. ii. 1, recalling the injunction 'to make prayers and supplications and to give thanks for all men.'

In 1552 the prayer was transferred to its present position, largely because of Gardiner's reference to it in his controversy with Cranmer, and his approval of it as consistent with the Catholic doctrine. His words are:

> Now when we have Christ's body thus present in the celebration of the holy supper . . . then have we Christ's body recommended unto us as our sacrifice, and a sacrifice propitiatory for all the sins of the world, being the only sacrifice of Christ's Church. . . . So the Church at the same supper . . . join themselves with their head Christ, presenting and offering him, as one by whom, for whom, and in whom, all that by God's grace man can do, is available and acceptable. . . . Whereupon this persuasion hath been duly conceived, which is also in the book of common prayer in the celebration of the holy supper retained, that it is very profitable at that time, when the memory of Christ's death is solemnised, to remember with prayer all estates of the Church and to recommend them to God (Cranmer's *Works*, Parker Soc., pp. 83 f.).

In placing the prayer in its present position the revisers of 1552 may have had in mind the fact that in parish churches the 'Bidding of Bedes' was after the Offertory (see above, p. 317). The prayer itself, however, was considerably altered. Before the words 'receive these our prayers' a petition for the acceptance of the alms was inserted. A petition 'for all Christian Kings, Princes and Governors' was added before the prayer for the King, and in place of the prayer for 'this congregation which is here assembled in thy name, to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of thy Son,' there were added to the earlier petition 'to all thy people give thy heavenly grace,' the further words, 'and especially to this congregation here present.'

The most drastic changes, however, were the omission of the prayer for the departed and the commemoration of saints, while to the bidding 'Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church' were added the words 'militant here in earth,' which thus restricted the prayer to the living.

These omissions were partly due to the criticisms of Bucer, who took exception to such prayers on the ground that when prayer is made for the departed that God will grant them His mercy and eternal peace, the vulgar, without exception, take it to mean that the departed still want that peace. But this omission and the

omission of the commemoration of saints were further due to the reaction against the crude conceptions of Purgatory (see *e.g.* Sir Thomas More, *Supplication of Souls*) and the extravagances of the mediæval cult of the saints, a reaction which failed to distinguish between these later developments and the earlier and simpler forms in which the natural Christian instinct had recognised the unbroken fellowship in Christ of the living and the departed, and the continued communion of the latter in the One Body of Christ. Hence, as Wheatly says (*Rational Illustration*, p. 243), 'whilst they were praying for the Catholic Church, they thought it not improper to add a petition on behalf of the larger and better part of it which had gone before them, that they might all together attain a blessed and glorious resurrection and be brought at last to a perfect fruition of happiness in heaven. By this means they testified their love and respect to the dead, declared their belief in the communion of saints, and kept up in themselves a lively sense of the soul's immortality.'

In 1661 a proposal to delete the words 'militant here in earth' failed to win acceptance, but there was added the short commemoration of the departed which finds a place in the present Prayer Book. At the same time the words 'and oblations' were added to the prayer for the acceptance of the alms. On the meaning of this addition see above, pp. 320 ff.

The prayer, as it stands, includes petitions for the universal Church; 'for all Christian Kings, Princes, and Governors,' for the reigning monarch and all in authority; for Bishops, Curates, and people, and for the sick and suffering. It contains no separate commemoration of saints, but only a general commemoration of the departed, without explicit prayer for them, though, as Wheatly (*Rational Illustration*, p. 244) says, 'were it not for the restriction of the words *militant here in earth*, they might be supposed to be implied in our present form, when we beg of God that *we* WITH THEM *may be* partakers of his heavenly kingdom.'

The history of this prayer in the other forms of the rite in the Anglican Communion may be briefly summarised.

(1) The prayer is retained in the position which it has occupied since 1552, except in the Scottish Liturgy, where, under the influence of the study of Eastern rites, it was in 1764 transferred to the close of the Prayer of Consecration. For the ideas associated with this position of the Intercession see above, pp. 322 f.

(2) With the exception of the Irish Prayer Book of 1877 and the Canadian Prayer Book of 1922, the latter of which has only a few slight verbal changes, later revisions have tended to fill out the somewhat meagre recognition of the communion of saints in the prayer of 1661 by more explicit prayer for the departed and by a fuller commemoration of saints. The Scottish Liturgy since

1764, the South African Liturgy of 1920, the English Alternative Order of 1928, and the American revision of 1929 have all omitted the words 'militant here in earth' in the bidding, and have inserted explicit prayers for the departed in the following forms:

Scottish (1929): 'We commend to thy gracious keeping, O Lord, all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear, beseeching thee to grant them everlasting light and peace.'

South African: 'We commend . . . to grant them mercy, light and peace both now and at the day of resurrection.'

English Alternative Order (1928): 'We commend . . . to grant them everlasting light and peace.'

American (1929): 'We also bless thy holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear; beseeching thee to grant them continual growth in thy love and service.'

A commemoration of saints had already been restored in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, in the form, 'And we yield unto thee *most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy saints*, who have been the choice vessels of thy grace, and the lights of the world in their several generations: most humbly beseeching thee, that we may have grace to follow the *example* of their *stedfastness in thy faith*, and obedience to *thy holy commandments, that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which are of the mystical body of thy Son, may be set* at *his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice, Come ye blessed . . .*' (Matt. xxv. 34). The words in italics show the indebtedness of this prayer to the language of the Prayer Book of 1549. The latest Scottish revision (1929) has a few verbal changes, and provides for a fuller commemoration on certain days by allowing the insertion after 'generations' of the words (taken from the 1549 Book) 'and chiefly in the Blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs, beseeching thee to give us grace . . .'

The South African form follows more closely the 1549 prayer, but with a different conclusion, praying 'that we, rejoicing in the Communion of the Saints, and following the good examples of those who have served thee here, may be partakers with them of thy heavenly kingdom.' The English Alternative Order of 1928 follows fairly closely the Scottish form so far as the words 'several generations,' and then concludes 'that rejoicing in their fellowship, and following their good examples, we may be partakers with them of thy heavenly kingdom.'

The Exhortations.

The prayer for the Church is followed by a series of formularies dealing with the more immediate preparation of the communicants (Invitation, Confession and Absolution, and Comfort-

able Words). But before these are placed three Exhortations, the first two of which are alternatives, appointed to be used on days 'when the Minister giveth warning for the Celebration of the Holy Communion' (which he is to do on the Sunday or some Holy Day immediately preceding), and to be read after the Sermon or Homily. The third is to be used at the time of the celebration, when the communicants have been 'conveniently placed for the receiving of the Holy Sacrament,' *i.e.* before the Invitation which follows. The Exhortations, like those found elsewhere in the Prayer Book, are intended to supply the lack of oral instruction and are one of the features of the Reformation period. Some of the phraseology seems to show reminiscences of Hermann's *Pia deliberatio* (see Brightman, *Eng. Rite* I. lxxiv f.). They have undergone considerable changes in wording and in order of arrangement during the successive revisions of the Prayer Book. The first and third are derived from the Order of Communion of 1548; the second was added in 1552 and has been attributed to Peter Martyr. Its use is directed, as an alternative to the first Exhortation, when the people are 'negligent to come to the Holy Communion.' In its original form it contained a clause which rebuked those who 'stand by as gazers and lookers on them that do communicate,' and they are bidden, rather than that they should so do, to 'depart hence, and give place to them that be godly disposed.' This was omitted in 1661.

The first Exhortation is a call to self-examination (see below, p. 333) and repentance, and to the right disposition befitting the worthy reception of the Sacrament. Where 'full trust in God's mercy and a quiet conscience' cannot by these means be secured, it is urged that resort be had to the minister of the parish, 'or some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word,' that he may open his grief, and by the ministry of God's word 'receive the benefit of absolution, with ghostly counsel and advice.' These directions are intended to secure full notice of celebrations, proper preparation on the part of communicants, and opportunity to resort to the minister for counsel and absolution.

The third Exhortation, which immediately precedes the shorter Invitation ('Ye that do truly'), covers much of the ground of the first, laying stress upon the benefits of worthy reception, the dangers of unworthy reception, and the duty of humble and hearty thanksgiving for the redemption through Christ.

In practice these Exhortations are rarely used, and later revisions of the service in the various branches of the Anglican Communion, while relaxing the requirements of the rubrics of 1661, have endeavoured to secure some use of them at stated intervals, or at least before the great festivals.

Note on Non-communicating Attendance.

The Eucharist in early days was at once the Church's 'thank-offering' for the blessings of Creation and Redemption, and a communion feast, which was for the faithful the bond of union with Christ and one another. Hence reception was a normal and constant feature of the rite. As fervour declined, and the conversion of the Empire brought into the Church a multitude of nominal converts, communion became more rare. During the fourth century we find disciplinary regulations attempting to deal with the neglect of communion and to repress the habit of not remaining for prayer and Holy Communion (Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, can. 2; Ap. Canons, 8 and 9), while Chrysostom condemns alike the habit of leaving church before the mysteries begin (*De Incompr. Nat. Dei, Hom.* iii. 6) and of remaining without communicating, as penitents in the last stage of discipline were allowed to do (*In Eph. Hom.*, iii. 4, 5). The custom of some churches, however, appears to have left it to the individual conscience to determine whether to receive or abstain when present at the service (see, *e.g.*, Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, i. 1); and Waterland (*Doctr. of Eucharist*, p. 378) interprets the canons referred to above as applying to habitual non-communicants. But these attempts to enforce regular communion proved ineffective, and with the influx of the barbarians, admitted often to the Church *en masse*, we find ecclesiastical canons in France recognising the presence of non-communicants, and enjoining them to stay till the bishop's blessing before the Communion, while requiring all to communicate at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide (Council of Agde, A.D. 506, can. 47 and 18; Orleans, A.D. 511, can. 26). The position was similar in Eastern Christendom, where attendance at the Liturgy, with infrequent communion on the part of the laity, became customary.

Two developments gave a positive direction to the devotions of those who attended throughout, while not communicating.

(1) Emphasis came to be laid on the moments following consecration, as specially suitable for intercession, in view of the special, though external, relation (involved in the sacramental action) to the Divine Victim present in the Church's midst. Indications of this appear in Cyril of Jerusalem and Chrysostom in the East, while Cæsarius of Arles, in the sixth century, similarly emphasises the value of being present at the consecration of the Lord's Body and Blood and of the opportunities of prayer for themselves and others afforded to those who remain throughout (Migne, *P.L.*, xxxviii. 2276 f.).

(2) A second development was the concentration during the Middle Ages in the West upon the worship of Jesus in the Sacrament during the moments following consecration. In the

East, still earlier, we find reverence paid to the gifts (as yet unconsecrated), when they are brought from the *prothesis* to the altar with lights and incense at the Great Entrance, while the Cherubic Hymn is sung, in which Christ is acclaimed as 'King of kings.'[1]

This concentration of devotion on special aspects of the Eucharistic mystery helped to put still further in the background the conception of the rite as a communion feast, in days when communion was a very occasional accompaniment of the rite for most of those who attended mass.

The practice of private masses, and the popular conception that each mass was a distinct offering for sin, explain the reaction of thought at the time of the Reformation. In that period a desire was shown by all parties for a revival of communion. The Council of Trent expressed a wish that at each mass the faithful who are present should communicate not only spiritually but sacramentally, though it approved those masses in which the priest alone communicates sacramentally, and distinguishes between the Eucharist as a Sacrament and as a Sacrifice.

Among the Reformers we find two tendencies :

(1) In the *Pia Deliberatio* of Hermann it is urged that those who are not evil livers, yet receive not the Sacrament, or seldom receive it, should be warned that it is a duty of a Christian man 'to be often partaker of the Lord's board and so to feed and strengthen his faith, and witness the same unto the congregation to the edification of many.' But it goes on to plead that as this custom is so much out of use, through common ignorance, men must be called back gently to its observance. 'For there be not a few, which though they cannot thoroughly understand the mystery, and the perfect use of Sacraments, yet have such faith in Christ, that they can pray with the congregation, and be somewhat edified in faith through holy doctrine and exhortations, that be wont to be used about the holy supper and the ministration thereof, yea and they may be taught and moved little by little to a perfecter knowledge . . . and an oftener use of the Sacraments, even by this that they be present at the holy supper.' Such men, he urges, should not be driven away from the holy action of the supper while there is any hope that they will go

[1] Cf. St. James (Br. 41) and St. Chrysostom (Br. 379). According to some later interpretations this reverence is attributed to the fact that the elements prepared for consecration become antitypes of Christ's body and blood (John of Damascus, 2nd Council of Nicæa), and may be honoured with the 'reverence' (*προσκύνησις*) which the 2nd Council of Nicæa assigns to the ikons, as distinct from the 'worship' (*λατρεία*) rendered at the Entrance in the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified (so Cabasilas and the Catechism of Nicholas Bulgaris). According to some of the mystical commentators the Great Entrance symbolises our Lord's entry into Jerusalem in preparation for His Passion (Catechism of Nicholas Bulgaris).

forward 'in the study and communion of Christ' (Eng. trans., 1548).

(2) The English Reformers made it their first aim to restrict private masses, while endeavouring to secure that on Sundays there should always be some to communicate with the priest (see rubrics at the end of the service in the Prayer Book of 1549). But on Wednesdays and Fridays, if there were no communicants, the priest was to say all things at the altar, until after the Offertory, and the same order was to be used on all other days, when people were accustomed to assemble in church to pray and none were disposed to communicate. This provision of an alternative service when none were prepared to communicate was suggested by some of the Lutheran Church Orders (Brightman, I. cxii), but had a precedent in the *missa sicca* (cf. Wickham Legg, *Three Chapters in Recent Liturgical Research*, pp. 14 f.), and still earlier in the use of the *missa catechumenorum* on Station days at Alexandria in the fifth century (Socrates, *H.E.*, v. 22).[1] Bucer, however, still found fault with the 1549 Prayer Book because it allowed non-communicants to remain in church,[2] and in 1552 the Exhortation, which, in a modified form, is the second Exhortation of the Prayer Book of 1661, was inserted. In this, those who were unwilling to communicate were spoken of as 'gazers and lookers-on' and were bidden, rather than that they should so do, to 'depart hence . . . but ponder from whom they depart.' The provision that where there were no communicants, the first part of the service to the end of the Prayer for the Church Militant should be said, was now explicitly extended to Holy Days, and restrictions were added as to the number of communicants necessary to permit of a celebration. The failure of these measures to encourage more frequent communion was demonstrated in the revision of 1661, when Sunday was added to the list of days on which, if there were no communicants, the first part only of the service was to be said. By this time non-communicating attendance had become a thing of the past, and the clauses in the Exhortation of 1552, warning non-communicants to depart, were found unnecessary and were omitted.

The decline of communion and the infrequency of opportunities for communion, which had resulted in the displacement of the Eucharist from a central position in the worship of the

[1] The practice of Rome may have been similar, and indications of the same practice appear in Etheria's account of the services at Jerusalem on Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent.

[2] The direction at the Offertory in the Prayer Book of 1549 that those who were not minded to receive the Holy Communion were to 'depart out of the Quire' must be taken in connection with the direction about 'offering to the poor men's box,' which was set up near the high altar (see p. 320). Those who wished to communicate remained in the choir; the rest withdrew to the body of the church.

English Church, were features which engaged serious attention in the Church revival of the nineteenth century. One result of that revival has been a large increase in the number of communions[1] and in opportunities for communion. Another feature has been the encouragement of the presence of others than communicants throughout the service, in the hope that it would help them to appreciate and use the Sacrament, and also lead to a fuller understanding of the Godward aspect of worship and the reality of the Divine Presence with men. It has been pointed out that, with the omission of the warning clauses in the Exhortation of 1552, there is nothing in the Prayer Book to forbid such attendance, though the Service itself (as is the case with the Roman Canon of the Mass) leads up to and presupposes the communion of the worshippers. It has been urged that the 'continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ' in the Eucharist and the union of the Church's offering with the intercession of its great High Priest (a conception familiar from the hymns of Charles Wesley and Canon Bright) are aspects of the service which justify its use for the purposes of worship, offering, and intercession apart from communion. But the form in which practical expression has been given to this idea is open to criticism. The separation of the Sunday Eucharistic worship into two distinct services, one for Communion early in the day, and another for worship and oblation (without communicants) at a later hour, is a compromise with which, however expedient it may be as an attempt to meet various stages of religious development and the conditions of modern life, many are beginning to feel that they ought not to rest content as a final solution. It may reasonably be urged that at the later service there are present a large number of regular communicants who have made their communion at an earlier hour and who welcome these further opportunities of meditation and worship, and that such attendance may be a help to those who are preparing for Confirmation and Communion, or to others who are not ready for more than rare communions, and who (as Hermann says) 'may be moved little by little to a perfecter knowledge and an oftener use of the Sacraments.' In this connection it may be noted that among the Presbyterians of Scotland, according to Dr. J. H. Wotherspoon,[2] the older practice was that 'during both consecration and dispensation, the church was open and frequented by a reverent multitude; as is the case in the North of Scotland still, where only a handful may communicate, but the church be crowded, largely by non-communicants, who are

[1] In the Roman Church the Decree of Pope Pius X (1905) 'On daily Communion' marks an important stage in the encouragement of more frequent Communion.

[2] *Religious Values in the Sacraments*, 1928, p. 253 ff.

nevertheless devout worshippers and in some sense possibly participants.' And he adds the comment: 'The ideal no doubt is that—the Celebration being in use as the normal worship of the Lord's Day—all communicants should be present and all communicate. But we are far from the ideal: it is a question of what is best in our imperfect conditions. . . . As things are I should hesitate to think that it is spiritually profitable or advisable or a matter of duty for every member of the Church to communicate as frequently as the Church ought to celebrate the Eucharist, or to advise a communicant to absent himself from worship unless he intends to communicate.'

But whatever be the justification for the attendance of others than communicants at a celebration in which provision is made for the communion of the people, a different problem arises when the Sunday Eucharistic worship is divided up into two distinct services, one for communion, the other for worship (without communicants). The danger of this is that it tends to keep asunder the two ideas of communion and offering which are closely connected and interdependent.[1] The purpose of the Sacrament is not merely the reception of spiritual food. Nor is it merely the commemoration and pleading of Christ's sacrifice apart from the effort to identify ourselves with Him by sharing with Him the spirit of His self-offering to the Father. It is this latter aspect which is emphasised in the Prayer of Oblation in the Prayer Book of 1661. If we are to preserve the true proportions of Eucharistic worship, we need to recover the meaning for worship and life of St. Paul's words 'in Christ' and 'the Body of Christ.' The Eucharist is the expression of the unity of the faithful in the One Body of Christ and of the offering of the members in and through the Head.

Again, the danger of much mediæval Eucharistic devotion (in spite of the beauty of some of the forms in which it is expressed, *e.g.* in the *Lay Folk's Mass Book*) was due to the fact that it was directed too exclusively to Jesus in His human nature, whereas the whole structure of the liturgies shows that worship is directed to the Father (or the Trinity) in and through the Son.[2] The ideal parish Eucharist will be one in which worship finds its consummation in our union and communion with Christ and our self-oblation in Him to the God and Father of all. The whole problem is bound up with other problems, the hour of the Sunday worship, and the fast before Communion, but it demands

[1] The connection between 'communion' and 'sacrifice' is emphasised in Dom Laporta, *Piété eucharistique* (Louvain, 1929). He also criticises the tendency to regard the Communion too exclusively as 'une visite' or as 'une simple nourriture,' which may therefore equally well be received outside mass as in the course of mass.

[2] Cf. the direction of the Councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397) that all prayer at the altar should be directed to the Father.

the thoughtful consideration of those who have the ordering of Sunday worship, if the different aspects of Eucharistic worship are to be presented in their proper perspective and relationship.

The Invitation, the Confession and Absolution, and the Comfortable Words.

The desire for the revival of Communion in the period of the Reformation was accompanied by an equally strong desire to guard against unworthy reception, and forms of preparation for Communion are a feature of many of the contemporary Lutheran Church Orders. Archbishop Hermann in the *Pia Deliberatio* directs that intending communicants shall present themselves beforehand to the pastor, and make confession of their sins and receive absolution. In the form of service prescribed by him there is found, however, a new feature. In the mediæval service the *Confiteor*, etc., were said at the foot of the altar as the private devotion of the priest and ministers during the Introit. But there was no general confession for the congregation, as Communion was rare and was generally preceded by private confession to the priest.[1] In the form of service provided by Hermann there is a preparatory office for the day before Communion and also a Confession, Comfortable Word, and Absolution to be said by the priest at the altar, before the Introit, in the name of the whole congregation and in the vernacular. From this source were derived the general scheme and some of the language of the English *Order of Communion* of 1548, which was intended as a form of preparation for communicants to be inserted into the Latin Mass after the priest's communion. From this form, with some slight changes of wording, the Invitation, Confession and Absolution, and the Comfortable Words passed into the Prayer Book of 1549, where they precede, instead of following, the priest's communion. They were followed by our present Prayer of Humble Access. With the rearrangement of the service in 1552 they were placed immediately before the Preface, with the exception of the Prayer of Humble Access, which was inserted after the *Sanctus*.

The Invitation is a further reminder of the requirements of repentance, charity, obedience and faith for all who would receive this Sacrament. It concludes with a bidding to make humble confession to Almighty God. The *Order of Communion* (1548) added, ' and to his holy Church, here gathered together in his name,' and these words, with the substitution of ' before this congregation ' for ' to his holy Church ' in 1552, remained until 1661. To the words ' Draw near ' were added in 1661 the words

[1] Forms of confession and absolution for communicants were, however, not unknown in England. See H. A. Wilson, *Order of Communion*, 1548 (H.B.S.), p. xv.

'with faith,'[1] an addition which, while it supplements the teaching of the Invitation, also corrects the mistaken opinion (see L'Estrange, *op. cit.*, p. 213) that the words 'draw near' were an invitation to communicants to enter the quire. At the same revision the rubric ordering the communicants to be 'conveniently placed' was inserted before the third Exhortation.

The form of Confession contains much that is found in Hermann's form, though omitting his reference to original sin. But the old *Confiteor* is the source of the words 'in thought, word and deed' though the further words *mea culpa* are unrepresented in the English version.

The Absolution in the *Order of Communion* began, like that of Hermann, with the words 'Our blessed Lord hath left power to his Church (congregation, H.) to absolve penitent sinners,' but was altered to its present form in 1549. The actual absolution, 'Have mercy,' etc., is closely modelled on the forms used with the old *Confiteor* in the Mass and at Prime and Compline.

The English Alternative Order (1928) provides a shorter Invitation, Confession and Absolution, which may be used on week-days.

In Hermann the Comfortable Words are alternatives, and one of them precedes the Absolution, as providing the Scripture warrant for the declaration of forgiveness. Of the sentences of Scripture selected three are taken from Hermann (John iii. 16, 1 Tim. i. 15, 1 John ii. 1).

The direction in 1549, that the General Confession is to be made, in 'the name of all them that are minded to receive the holy Communion, either by one of them or else by one of the ministers, or by the Priest himself, all kneeling,' has been variously modified in subsequent revisions (Scottish, 1637, 'by the Presbyter himself, or the Deacon'; Scottish, 1764, 'by the people, along with the Presbyter, he first kneeling down'; American, 1929, 'by the Priest and all . . . humbly kneeling'). The alteration in 1661, which directs the recitation to be made by 'one of the Ministers,' was due to Puritan objections, and words were added which made it clear that he, as well as the people, was to kneel and that all were to say the Confession. That the priest was intended to kneel here was the contention of L'Estrange (*Alliance*, p. 214), writing before the revision of 1661. 'During the whole time of the Priest his officiating at the Communion, setting aside in the very instant of his receiving, you find him but twice upon his knees, whereof this is the first; at all other times, and parts of the service, he is ordered to stand . . . because it is not part of the former oblations, but an humble confession of his own and the Congregation's transgressions.'

[1] L'Estrange (*Alliance*, p. 214) compares the invitation in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, 'With fear of God and faith draw near.'

The Scottish Liturgy since 1764 has restored the whole of these preparatory devotions, together with the Prayer of Humble Access, to the place which they occupied in 1549, immediately before the Communion. See further, p. 333.

The Preface and Sanctus.

The preparation of the communicants is followed by the Preface, or introduction to the Eucharistic prayer, which forms in the liturgies of East and West the central feature of the rite, and which in turn leads up to the Communion of the faithful. The dialogue with which the Preface is introduced is one of the oldest parts of the Liturgy, and is in substance the same in all rites. It is found in two of the oldest sources, the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (A.D. 220–230) and in Cyprian, *De Orat.*, 31 (*c.* A.D. 252). The opening words, 'Lift up your hearts,' and the response, 'We lift them up unto the Lord,' recall Lam. iii. 41, though the actual parallels in wording are less clear in the Greek and Latin forms than in our English version,[1] which is closer to Hermann's German version of the *Pia Deliberatio*.

In the older rites the dialogue is introduced by a salutation, either an adaptation of 2 Cor. xiii 14 (Syrian and Byzantine) or 'The Lord be with you' (Egyptian and Roman), with the response, 'And with thy spirit.' This latter form was retained in 1549, but in 1552 was omitted here and at other points in the service where it had occurred.

The English form of the Preface is a free adaptation of the Latin form, sometimes rather loosely rendered. 'Our Lord God' represents 'the Lord our God.' 'It is very meet' represents the Latin 'Verily is it meet,' the word 'very,' as Dr. Brightman pointed out to me, being possibly chosen for the sake of the rhythm (it is found in Chaucer and as late as 1593 in the sense of 'verily'). The rendering 'O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God,' differs from the usual Roman punctuation of the Latin, 'Holy Lord, Almighty Father, Everlasting God,' which is also the punctuation found in the MS. used by Legg in his *Sarum Missal*. On the other hand, there is some ancient precedent for the Prayer Book version in the fifth-century *De Sacramentis* (iv. 21) and in the *Leonine Sacramentary* (Feltoe, p. 70),[2] and the same punctuation is found in Hermann's German version of the *Pia Deliberatio* (the Latin text gives the usual form), while the Strassburg German Mass

[1] The Latin *Habemus ad Dominum* looks like a rendering of the Greek. The Mozarabic *Levemus ad Dominum* is parallel to the form in Hermann and the Prayer Book and agrees with Lam. iii. 41.

[2] For Gallican examples of 'holy Father, Almighty, everlasting God' without 'Lord' see Neale and Forbes, *Anc. Liturgies of Gallican Church*, pp. 3, 143, 197.

of 1524 has 'O Lord, holy almighty Father, eternal God.' Dr. Brightman, to whom I owe these references, suspected that the punctuation in the Prayer Book was deliberately chosen to secure a fine rhythm. The phrase 'Holy Father' in this connection recalls St. John xvii. 11. For 'salutary' of the Latin Canon the Prayer Book has 'our bounden duty,' which finds a parallel in the Greek and Syriac St. James.

The English Preface, like the original Latin form, is a framework, into which, according to the system of variable Prefaces found in the Western rites, special commemorations suitable to various days are inserted. In the Roman and Sarum Uses there were ten such Proper Prefaces, including, in addition to those found in the Prayer Book, provision for Epiphany and throughout the Octave, Ash Wednesday and week-days in Lent, feasts of Apostles and Evangelists, the two feasts of the Holy Cross, and all feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The Christmas Preface was appointed for the whole Octave, the Purification, and Corpus Christi and throughout the Octave; the Easter Preface was to be used throughout the Octave and on all Sundays until Ascension Day; and the Trinity Preface on all Sundays until Advent.

While Hermann in the *Pia Deliberatio* has a single fixed Preface, commemorating (after the manner of the Eastern rites) the creation, fall and redemption of man, and leading up to the *Sanctus*, the Prayer Book of 1549 followed more closely traditional lines, and retained Proper Prefaces for Christmas, Easter, Ascension Day, Whitsunday, and Trinity, but made no provision for the Octaves. This oversight was remedied in 1552, when the present direction was inserted.[1]

As compared with Eastern forms this introductory part of the Eucharistic prayer seems meagre and incomplete. In the older Eastern rites the thanksgiving takes a wider range and includes the whole scope of God's revelation in creation and history, leading up to the story of redemption. Apart from the reference in the *Sanctus*, 'Heaven and earth are full of thy glory,' this element is lacking alike in the Roman and in the derived English forms. In this latter the absence of any provision for filling in the framework of the Preface on other days than the five feasts for which Proper Prefaces are supplied has still further impoverished this part of the service. To meet this need the latest revisions of the rite have extended the use of the existing Prefaces and provided for additional days and seasons. A Proper Preface for Epiphany (and its Octave) is found in all these revisions (Canadian, South African, Scottish, American, English Alterna-

[1] The reduction of the number of Proper Prefaces may have been influenced by the Saxon Church Order of 1539, which retains the five Prefaces found in the Prayer Book, but includes also one for the Epiphany.

tive Order, 1928); while provision is made in various ways in most of them for the Purification and Annunciation, Maundy Thursday, Transfiguration, Feasts of Apostles and Evangelists and St. John Baptist, All Saints, and for the Dedication of a Church. The Scottish Liturgy of 1929 goes further and provides for Advent, Ash Wednesday and Lent, Passion Sunday and days following, and for the Consecration of Bishops. The South African Liturgy also makes provision for Sundays for which no Proper Preface is appointed by directing the use of a slightly varied form of the Trinity Preface, thus following the traditional Sarum and Roman Use, while the English Alternative Order (1928) provides a new Preface, based upon a *Missa votiva omnimoda* in the Mozarabic rite (Lesly, p. 442) for use on ordinary Sundays.

Of the existing Prefaces in the Prayer Book, those for Easter, Ascension Day, and Trinity are more or less free renderings of the old Prefaces, while those for Christmas and Whitsunday are new compositions, showing parallels with the language of the *Necessary Doctrine* of 1543 (Brightman, *Eng. Rite*, ii. 684, 686). The Whitsunday Preface with its doubtful interpretation of the 'tongues' of Pentecost as 'the gift of divers languages' has been altered in various ways in recent revisions. The Canadian and Scottish (1929) versions simply substitute 'tongues' for 'divers languages'; the American (1929) omits the clause 'with a sudden . . . fiery tongues' and the reference to 'the gift of divers languages,' while the South African Liturgy and the English Alternative Order (1928) substitute a modified form of the Sarum Preface for the opening clauses, and conclude with the words 'whereby we have been brought . . .' from the form of 1661.

The Proper Preface for Trinity Sunday is addressed to the Holy Trinity, whereas the old Latin Preface on which it is based is addressed to the Father. This fact explains the direction of the Prayer Book that on Trinity Sunday the words 'Holy Father' in the common framework of the Preface are to be omitted.

The *Sanctus* (called in *Ordo Romanus I* the 'Angelic hymn,' though the title is more usually applied to the *Gloria in excelsis*) is based on Isa. vi. 3 (cf. Rev. iv. 8). This feature of the Liturgy has clear attestation from the fourth century onwards and is found in all the liturgies of East and West. Though it is absent from the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (A.D. 220–230), there is a possible allusion to it in the *Acts of Perpetua* (Africa, A.D. 202–3). To the *Sanctus* there is attached in all rites, except the Egyptian, the *Hosanna* and *Benedictus qui venit* (based upon Mark xi. 9–10; cf. Matt. xxi. 9; John xii. 13). In the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, *Benedictus qui venit* occurs as part of the response of the people to the *Sancta sanctis*, and welcomes the coming forth of

the Sacrament for Communion. In this sense it is repeated in the Byzantine rite before the Communion of the people in the form 'Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord. God is the Lord, and hath appeared unto us' (Ps. cxviii. 26 f.). In addition to this use of it as welcoming the coming of Christ in the Sacrament, in some Eastern rites (Syr.-Jacobite, Armenian, Nestorian) it is given a further reference ('Blessed is he that *came* and cometh'), and serves to introduce the commemoration of the Incarnation and Redemption which follows. The Stowe Missal, indeed, paraphrases it in this sense ('blessed is he who came from heaven that he might have his conversation on earth and was made man that' etc.:[1] ed. Warner, *H.B.S.*, ii. 10). The *Benedictus* was retained in Luther's Latin Mass (1523), where the *Sanctus* follows the recital of the institution, and by Hermann in the *Pia Deliberatio*. In the Roman rite the form was 'Hosanna in the highest. Blessed . . . Lord. Hosanna in the highest.' In 1549 the second *Hosanna* was paraphrased in the form 'Glory to thee, O Lord in the highest,' and in 1552, when the first *Hosanna* and the *Benedictus* were omitted, this clause remained appended to the *Sanctus* in the altered form, 'Glory be to thee, O Lord most high.' The Scottish Liturgy (1929) and the English Alternative Order of 1928 have restored the permissive use of the *Benedictus* followed by 'Hosanna in the highest,' without, however, changing the paraphrase of the earlier Hosanna.

In 1549 direction was given that the clerks should sing the *Sanctus*, but in 1552 this was omitted, and no direction given that others should join with the priest in the saying or singing of it. Though in the musical settings of Merbecke and others provision was made for the singing of the *Sanctus* only, the custom arose that the people repeated the whole section beginning 'Therefore with Angels,' and this derived some support from the rubric of 1661, which says, 'After each of which Prefaces shall immediately be sung or said, Therefore . . .' In the latest Scottish and American revisions directions are given that the people are to join in the *Sanctus* only.

The Prayer of Humble Access.

'The nearer we approach to these holy mysteries, the greater reverence we ought to express. And therefore, lest our exultations should savour of too much confidence, we now allay them with this act of humility, which the Priest offers up in the name of all them that receive the Communion' (Wheatly, *Rat. Illustr.*, p. 253).

This finely conceived prayer is entitled, in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, 'Collect of humble access to the holy communion.'

[1] Dr. Brightman pointed out to me that this is really a Gallican *post sanctus*: cf. *Miss. Goth.* 482, 537; *Mozarab. Lib. Sacr.* 115.

It is derived from the *Order of Communion* of 1548, which adds 'in these holy mysteries' after 'drink his blood,' and transposes the order of the last two clauses, placing the clause 'that we may dwell' before 'that our sinful bodies. . . .' In this form it appears in the Prayer Book of 1549, the present form dating from 1552. The opening words recall the language of the Liturgy of St. Basil (before the Invocation), 'not because of our righteousnesses . . . but because of thy mercies and compassions, which thou hast shed richly upon us, we draw near with boldness to thy holy altar' (Brightman, *Litt. E. and W.*, 329; cf. St. James, *ib.* 46). The ultimate source is Dan. ix. 18. The following sentence is based on the words of the Syro-Phœnician woman (Mark vii. 28). The words 'whose property is always to have mercy' are the opening words of a Gregorian Collect, of which use has been made elsewhere in the Prayer Book ('O God, whose nature and property' in Occasional Prayers). The distinction implied in the words 'our . . . bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed by his . . . blood' is found also in the forms of administration in the *Order of Communion* of 1548. (It also appears in a prayer in the Syrian Jacobite liturgy; Brightman, *Litt. E. and W.*, 102.) The idea was developed by mediæval writers on the basis of Lev. xvii. 11. But in view of the changes made in the forms of administration in 1549, when the words 'body and soul' were inserted in both forms, the verbal distinction here must not be pressed. The concluding words of the prayer are an application of John vi. 56.

It has been suggested that the clause 'Grant us *so* to eat the flesh . . . that our sinful bodies may be made clean . . .' implies the possibility of partaking of Christ's flesh and blood otherwise than to the soul's health, and that the doctrine implied is that Christ's body and blood are truly proffered to all communicants, though only those who partake worthily are spiritually partakers of Christ. Such an interpretation of the prayer is a possible one, especially in its original form (*Order of Communion*, 1548, and Prayer Book of 1549), in which the words 'in these holy mysteries' were added after 'drink his blood,' while in the prayer of oblation in 1549 there was found the petition (omitted in 1552), 'that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy communion may *worthily* receive the most precious body and blood.' Both Cranmer and Ridley admitted that in a sense evil men may eat 'the body of Christ,' but only sacramentally, while the good eat it sacramentally and spiritually, where by 'sacramentally' Cranmer explains that he means 'figuratively,' *i.e.* they eat the sacrament of the body. Bishop Dowden, however (*Further Studies*, pp. 239 f.), contends that such an interpretation of 'so' when separated from 'that' is not necessary, and that there

are other passages in the Prayer Book (*e.g.* the second post-communion prayer) where it is inapplicable, and that in the present prayer the meaning may simply be 'eat, so that our sinful bodies. . . .'

The original position of the Prayer of Humble Access was immediately before the Communion, but owing to the contention of Gardiner that this prayer, said kneeling, taught the adoration of Christ's flesh in the Sacrament, it was removed to its present position in 1552. This abrupt breaking off of the thanksgiving after the *Sanctus* seriously impairs the unity and sequence of the Eucharistic prayer. It may be urged, however, that the alternation of praise and penitence is not in itself open to criticism, and is indeed psychologically sound. The vision of God and the angelical hymn in Isaiah vi. 1–3 are followed by the sense of awe and abasement ('Woe is me! . . because I am a man of unclean lips'). The sense at once of attraction and awe is a feature of religious experience in contact with divine holiness. Again, this position of the prayer keeps the thought of the approaching Communion in mind, an aspect on which, as we have seen, stress was laid by the Reformers. Probably the position of the prayer would be less open to criticism if more adequate provision had been made both in the Preface and in the Prayer of Consecration for the element of thanksgiving. It is the over-emphasis of the penitential and subjective side of worship which is most open to criticism in the English service, though here again it must be borne in mind that the elements of praise and thanksgiving are resumed in the post-communion prayers and in the *Gloria in excelsis*, where, however, they are no longer connected directly with the 'giving of thanks' at the Institution or the central Eucharistic prayer which is based upon it. See further p. 355. In the Roman rite there is an abrupt transition from the *Sanctus* to the Canon, and there are no such links connecting them as are found in the Eastern rites. Scudamore (*Not. Euch.*, 2nd. ed., p. 535) quotes from a Corbie MS. and other sources examples of prayers of a similar penitential character to be said by the celebrant privately before entering on the Canon. Though these may not be quoted as liturgical precedents, they illustrate the sequence of ideas exhibited in this position of the Prayer of Humble Access.

Of the alternative positions suggested for the prayer in recent revisions, the most satisfactory is that which places it immediately before Communion (so Scottish Liturgy since 1637, South African, American (1929)). The position given to it in the English Alternative Order of 1928, while restoring it to its place among the other preparatory devotions, destroys the very suitable transition from the Comfortable Words to the Preface, the value of which has been proved by long usage.

The Prayer of Consecration.

The title of this prayer was derived from the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, and the introductory rubric in which it is found owes some of its wording to the same source. The rubric was inserted in 1661. For its directions as to the position of the priest see pp. 308 f.

The prayer was originally part of the much longer prayer which in the 1549 Book took the place of the old Latin Canon, of which it was a free adaptation with considerable modifications. It included (1) the prayer for the Church; (2) the present prayer of consecration, with some variations; (3) the memorial and Oblation.

In 1552 the prayer for the Church was transferred to an earlier part of the service (see p. 324), while the Oblation, much abbreviated, became one of the alternative post-communion prayers.

With these changes we may compare the parallel developments in the *Pia Deliberatio* of Hermann, in which, after the singing of the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*, the priest recites the narrative of the institution; for, says Hermann, 'the whole substance of this Sacrament is contained in these words. And it consisteth altogether in the true understanding and faith of these words that the Sacrament be wholesomely administered and received' (E. tr. 1548). The Lord's Prayer and the salutation 'The peace of the Lord' followed, and these in turn were followed by the Communion. The English prayer in its present form has both points of contact with and points of divergence from this Lutheran form. Like the latter, it throws emphasis upon the actual words of our Lord at the institution, which it connects even more closely than Hermann did with the communion of priest and people, without the intervention of the Lord's Prayer and 'The peace of the Lord,' which Hermann had retained. But unlike the Lutheran Order it follows more closely traditional lines, in that it is a prayer, and not merely a narrative, the prayer being addressed to the Father, and, after a preamble commemorating the one perfect sacrifice of Christ, asking that all who receive 'these thy creatures of bread and wine' may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood. The prayer concludes with the recital of the institution, which 'asserts before man and pleads before God the authority of our Lord for that holy action in which we are engaged' (Scudamore). The ending of the prayer is abrupt, and in 1552 it lacked even the Amen, which was only reinserted in 1661.

The preamble of the prayer resumes the commemoration of God's creative and redeeming work which began with the Preface, but was interrupted by the Prayer of Humble Access. In

language which recalls phrases in the *Antididagma* (the reply of the Chapter of Cologne to Hermann's work) it speaks of Christ's 'full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction' for the sins of the whole world, and of the 'perpetual memory' of His death instituted by Him in the Gospel.

This preamble is much fuller than the corresponding part of the Roman Canon, where the transition from the *Sanctus* to the Canon is abruptly made. It finds a nearer parallel in the Eastern rites, where the commemoration of redemption follows the *Sanctus* and leads up to the recital of the institution. The emphasis on the one sufficient sacrifice of Christ (inserted in 1549) was intended to safeguard the unique character of the sacrifice of the Cross in face of later mediæval conceptions of the sacrifice of the mass.

The Invocation ('Hear us . . .') is a weakened form of the Invocation of 1549, which took the place of the *Quam oblationem* of the old Canon, and ran as follows: '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.' The prayer in this form was a combination of Western and Eastern views of consecration. While retaining the Western position of the invocation before the recital of the institution, instead of after as in the Eastern rites, it included, in the Eastern manner, a reference to the Holy Spirit as the agent (the words 'bless and sanctify' appear to come from the Liturgy of St. Basil); but it also includes a further reference to the 'word,' by which Cranmer appears to have meant the words of institution, the recital of which, according to the Western view, constituted the 'form' of the Sacrament. The changed wording of the Invocation in 1552 was due to the criticisms of Bucer, who objected to all blessing or consecration of inanimate things. In the present form there is no mention of the agent of consecration, and in this respect it finds a parallel in the reserved language of the old Canon and in many Gallican and Mozarabic prayers where the invocation is addressed simply to God,[1] though in others we find explicit reference to the Holy Spirit's agency. While the Eastern form is an explicit recognition of the work of the Holy Spirit as the agent in this as in all operations of grace, the Western form represents an attitude of mind which finds it 'more reverent not to lift up the veil. It is enough that God works behind. He will do His own work in His own all-sufficient way' (Scudamore).

A second feature of the prayer is that it is not an explicit prayer

[1] Cf., *e.g.*, a Mozarabic *post pridie* prayer in Lesly, p. 9. 'Take thou these offerings to be blessed by thee, and do thou grant the gifts of thy blessing.'

for the sanctification of the elements, but a prayer for the gift of the Sacrament to those who receive. It avoids the expression of any particular theory of consecration either by the operation of the Holy Spirit or by the word of Christ, and considered in itself, apart from the language of other prayers in the service, it is patient of a receptionist view of the Sacrament. The language of the corresponding prayer in 1549 ('that they may be unto us') was similarly interpreted by Cranmer as meaning that 'in the godly using of them they be unto the receivers Christ's body and blood,' though Gardiner interpreted them to mean that they cannot be this, 'unless God worketh it, and make them so to be.'

The recital of the institution, like the corresponding form in the Lutheran Brandenburg-Nürnberg Order of 1533, is really a harmony of the four New Testament accounts. In 1549 the words 'blessed and' preceded the words 'given thanks.' But the word 'bless' in this connection was disliked by the more advanced Reformers, who preferred to treat the words as a synonym of 'give thanks,'[1] and it was accordingly omitted in 1552.

The direction for the manual acts in 1549 merely instructed the priest to take the bread and the cup into his hands. This was omitted in 1552, but restored in 1661 in a form suggested by the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, which also directed that he was to 'lay his hand upon so much, be it in chalice or flagons, as he intends to consecrate' (no corresponding direction is given with regard to the bread). The further direction to 'break the bread' first appears in 1661. The purpose of these actions is partly to reproduce the very actions, no less than the words, of the Lord at the institution, and partly to indicate what is being mentioned. The taking of the paten and the cup into the hands is of the former kind, the laying of the hand upon the bread and the chalice falls under the second heading.

The fraction of the bread at the words 'he brake it' is found in only two Eastern rites, the Coptic and the Abyssinian (Brightman, *Litt. E. and W.*, 177, 233). Some mediæval Missals instruct the priest to make a 'show of breaking' at these words, while the Sarum and York Missals instruct him to 'touch the Host.' But the custom which prevailed generally in East and West was that the fraction took place at a later stage, before or at the end of the Lord's Prayer, which preceded the Communion, thus reproducing more nearly the action of the Lord in breaking the bread in preparation for distribution. To this fraction a mystical

[1] In the accounts of the Last Supper the words εὐλογεῖν and εὐχαριστεῖν are practically synonyms. It is God who is 'blessed' and to whom thanksgiving is offered. The words are interpreted as synonyms by Ridley in his *Brief Declaration* (ed. Moule, p. 98) and by Becon (Parker Soc., iii. 269).

interpretation was given by some mediæval writers, though others see in it simply a solemn imitation of the action of the Lord (Scudamore, pp. 606 f.).

The laying of the hand upon the bread and the cup takes the place of the crossings, which in the older rite denoted the act of blessing or were indicative of what was being blessed or consecrated. In 1549 the only crossings retained were at the words 'bless and sanctify' before 'these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine.'

The elevation of the Host and chalice was retained by Luther in his Latin and German Mass, '*propter infirmos*,' but was expressly forbidden by rubric in 1549. The rubric disappeared in 1552, probably because the custom had ceased.

The prayer, as we have seen, concludes abruptly after the recital of the institution, and contains no explicit assertion at this stage of the Godward aspect of the rite as the Church's memorial sacrifice, which commemorates and pleads the One Sacrifice, such as is found in the older rites and in the Prayer Book of 1549. This feature of the prayer led many of the Anglican divines of the seventeenth century (Overall, Laud, Cosin) to wish to restore the order of the prayers as found in 1549. This was effected in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, but similar proposals by Cosin (*Particulars*, No. 61) in 1661 failed to win acceptance.

Taking the service as a whole, however, as it was rearranged in 1552, it may be urged that the idea underlying this rearrangement is that the Consecration prayer is not so much ended with the recital of the institution (the Amen was absent in 1552), as resumed after the Communion, with the Lord's Prayer and Prayer of Oblation. In this latter the worshippers, who have cemented their union with Christ in the act of Communion, ask God to accept their 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' and pleading Christ's death as the ground of 'remission of sins and all other benefits of his Passion,' offer themselves as a living sacrifice to Him. The effect of this rearrangement of the prayer is, however, weakened by the unfortunate compromise which allowed the second of the post-communion prayers to be used as an alternative to the Prayer of Oblation, for in this second prayer there is no reference to the Church's 'sacrifice of praise.'

The Consecration Prayer in other Forms of the Anglican Rite.

A certain degree of dissatisfaction with the Consecration prayer of 1552, and a preference for the form of 1549, find expression in a series of Anglican divines during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The breaking up and distribution of the different

elements of the original prayer of 1549, the lack of any clear and explicit blessing upon the elements, and the absence of any formal expression in the central Eucharistic prayer of the Godward aspect of the rite as the Church's memorial of the sacrifice of Christ [1] seemed to them a departure from the general tenor of such prayers in the ancient liturgies of the Church. The first attempt to give practical form to these views was the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, which adopted the Consecration prayer of 1549 with slight modification. In this the prayer for the Church was left in the position which it occupied in 1552, but the memorial and oblation, in the same form as that of 1549, were attached to the recital of the institution, and were followed by the Lord's Prayer (with its old introduction, as in 1549), and the Prayer of Humble Access, the result being to restore the continuity of the Eucharistic prayer from the *Sursum corda* onwards.

The next step in the history was the Non-jurors' Liturgy of 1718. In this the service was largely rewritten on the lines of the liturgies of the Apostolic Constitutions and St. James. It followed the Eastern order (thanksgiving for redemption, recital of institution, memorial and oblation, invocation, prayer for the Church, Lord's Prayer) in place of the order of 1549, in which the sequence was: prayer for the Church, commemoration of redemption, invocation, recital of institution, memorial and oblation, Lord's Prayer.

The influence of the Non-jurors' Liturgy, as well as of Bishop Rattray's *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* (1744), was apparent in the Scottish Liturgy of 1764, in which the Eastern order, as described above, was definitely adopted. The actual wording of the prayer, however, followed fairly closely that of 1549, the more important changes being: (1) the new introduction, 'All glory be to thee,' which resumes the note of thanksgiving, taking up the concluding words of the *Sanctus;* (2) the addition of the words 'which we now offer unto thee' after the words 'with these thy gifts' in the oblation; (3) the substitution in the Invocation of the words 'that they may *become* the body' for the words found in 1549, 'that they may *be unto us* the body.'

The later revisions of the Scottish Liturgy in 1912 and 1929 have made few changes in the form of the prayer of 1764. In 1929 the introduction was further expanded by the addition of 'and thanksgiving' after 'All glory.' The only other important changes were: (1) the addition of the words 'and looking for his coming again with power and great glory' after the commemoration of the resurrection and ascension, a feature borrowed from

[1] The only words which might suggest this aspect are those in which Christ is said to have commanded us 'to continue a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.'

the Eastern rites, and suggested by St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xi. 26; (2) the still closer assimilation of the Invocation to Eastern forms, so that it now reads: 'We . . . beseech thee . . . to hear us, and to send thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that, being blessed and hallowed by his life-giving power, they may become the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son, to the end that all who shall receive the same may be sanctified both in body and soul, and preserved unto everlasting life.'

The orderly sequence of the Scottish rite gives to it a clearness and definiteness which have an attraction for many minds. The thanksgiving offered to God in the Preface, with its brief commemoration of creation in the *Sanctus*, is carried on by the opening words of the prayer, 'All glory and thanksgiving,' to the theme of redemption, which in turn leads up to the recital of the institution. Then, in obedience to the command 'Do this in remembrance of me,' there follows the solemn commemoration of the sacrificial death of Christ 'with these thy gifts,' now solemnly set apart by the manual acts and words of institution as representative symbols of the Body and the Blood of Christ, and offered as such to God, that in answer to the prayer of the Church, 'being blessed and hallowed' by the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit, they may be returned to the worshippers as the Body and Blood of His Son, and that receiving the same they may be sanctified and preserved unto life eternal. Nor is the death of Christ isolated from all that followed it. In the words following the Oblation, the resurrection and ascension, the mission of the Spirit, and the hope of the Second Coming all find a place, and thanksgiving is again offered for the 'innumerable benefits' procured for us by the redemptive work of Christ. The whole of this action embraced in the Eucharistic prayer constitutes the Church's 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' which God is asked to accept, the worshippers pleading the merits of Christ's death as the ground of forgiveness of sins, and 'all other benefits of His Passion,' and at the same time identifying themselves in spirit and purpose with His sacrifice by offering themselves as a living sacrifice to God. (On the position of the prayer for the Church in the Scottish Liturgy see p. 325.)

As compared with the English Consecration prayer that of the Scottish Liturgy comes at an earlier stage of the service, and is separated from the Communion by the interposition not only of the prayer for the Church, but also of the devotions preparatory to Communion, which in the English service are placed before the Preface. What the Scottish Liturgy gains in clearness of sequence and fullness of expression it loses to some extent through its length and a certain redundancy, which impose a strain on the attention. The English prayer, on the other hand, by its very

brevity and restraint gains in concentration by focussing attention upon the sacrifice of the Cross and upon Christ's own words, which are followed immediately by the Communion of priest and people. It is only after this, and in virtue of the culmination of the whole action in the communion of the faithful, that God is asked to accept 'this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' and the oblation of ourselves as a living sacrifice to Him.

On the other hand, it may be urged that by postponing all mention of the 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' until after the Communion, and still more by making the prayer of Oblation alternative to the Thanksgiving, the English form tends to make this element subsidiary and an afterthought. A further criticism is that by its concentration on the death of Christ alone, without any commemoration of the resurrection and ascension, the prayer lacks fullness and balance in its presentation of the work of redemption.

The Consecration prayer of the American Church is a more conservative revision of the English prayer on the lines of the Scottish Liturgies of 1637 and 1764. It retains the prayer for the Church at the place where it is found in the Prayer Book of 1552, and it was not until the recent revision of 1929 that the prayer of Humble Access was removed from its position after the *Sanctus* and placed before the Communion. The Invocation, which is in the same position as the Scottish Invocation of 1764, is a shortened and weakened form of the Scottish Invocation of 1637, though it contains a petition for the blessing of the oblation. 'Vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that we receiving them . . . may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.' But in other respects the prayer follows closely the sequence and language of the Scottish form of 1764. In the latest revision (1929) the Lord's Prayer, with its introduction, has been placed immediately after the prayer of Consecration.

The South African Liturgy of 1920 and the English Alternative Order of 1928 are on lines similar to the Scottish and American forms, but have distinctive features of their own.

(1) Both restore the memorial of the death, resurrection, and ascension (the South African adds the Second Coming) to the position which they occupy in the older liturgies, before the Oblation (instead of after as in 1549, and the Scottish and American rites), though the transposition in 1549 was probably a mere matter of style.

(2) The Invocation in the English Alternative Order occupies the same position as in the Scottish and American, but it has borrowed elements from both the Prayer Book of 1549 and from the Scottish Liturgy. The words 'With thy Holy Spirit

vouchsafe to bless and sanctify . . . these thy gifts ' are reminiscent of 1549, but the addition of ' both us and ' before ' these thy gifts ' is derived from the Scottish form, which, however, follows more closely the Eastern rites in praying first in general terms for the descent of the Holy Spirit ' upon us and upon these thy gifts,' and then prays simply for the blessing and hallowing of the gifts. The English form retains the restrictive words (found in the Roman Canon and the Prayer Book of 1549), ' that they may *be unto us* the Body and the Blood,' whereas the Scottish form is again nearer to the Eastern Liturgies in its more unqualified phrasing ' that they may *become* the Body and the Blood.' In both forms there follows a prayer for the communicants, the English form of which is an impoverished version of that found in the Scottish Liturgy.

(3) The South African Liturgy has two special features. It retains the prayer of 1552 (' Hear us ') in its original position, but adds after the Oblation a further prayer, ' We . . . beseech thee to pour thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts, that all we who are partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood . . . and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.' This double prayer finds some sort of parallel in the Liturgy of St. Mark, and a still closer parallel in some Mozarabic forms (see, *e.g.*, Lesly, pp. 5, 229). It creates a certain redundancy and ambiguity, which has exposed it to criticism, though it has been urged that the latter of the two prayers is a petition, after consecration, for the effusion of the Holy Spirit upon the worshippers and the sacramental gifts, that reception of the Sacrament may be fruitful in blessing.

The other feature is the wording of the Oblation, which is derived from the Roman Canon and is as follows: ' We offer here unto thy Divine Majesty this holy Bread of eternal life and this Cup of everlasting salvation.' This takes the place of the words (derived from the Prayer Book of 1549) in the Scottish, American and English Alternative Orders: ' We . . . celebrate . . . before thy Divine Majesty with these thy holy gifts the memorial which thy Son hath commanded (or " willed " English Alternative Order) us to make.' The South African form emphasises the sacramental character and purpose of the Oblation as the food of the faithful, and leads on to the petition for the sending of the Holy Spirit upon the worshippers and the gifts, that the blessings of Communion may follow on worthy reception.

The following Table presents the characteristics of each of the four Consecration prayers which have been reviewed, the divergences from the Prayer Book of 1661 alone being noted.

Scottish (1929).	American (1929).	South African.	English Alternative Order. (1928.)
[*Sanctus. Benedictus.*]	[*Sanctus.*]	[*Sanctus.*]	[*Sanctus. Benedictus* (permissive).]
All glory and thanksgiving be to thee, Almighty God . . .	All glory be to thee . . .	All glory and thanksgiving be to thee . . .	All glory be to thee . . .
for that thou . . . didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer . . .	for that thou . . . didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer. . . .	for that thou . . . didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon him and to suffer . . .	for that thou . . . didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer . . .
who, by his own oblation of himself once offered, made a full . . .	who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full . . .	who (by his one oblation of himself once offered) made a full . . .	who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full . . .
a perpetual memorial of that his precious death and sacrifice . . .	a perpetual memory of that his precious death and sacrifice . . .	a perpetual memory of that his precious death . . .	a perpetual memory of that his precious death . . .
		Hear us, O merciful Father . . . may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood:	
For in the night that . . .	For in the night in which . . .	who, in the same night that . . .	Who, in the same night that . . .
in remembrance of me.	in remembrance of me.	in remembrance of me.	in remembrance of me.
Wherefore, O Lord, and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty with these thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion, and precious death, his mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, and looking for his coming again with power and great glory.	Wherefore . . . [as in Scottish] procured unto us by the same.	Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance his blessed passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, do render unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same; and, looking for his coming again with power and great glory, we offer here unto thy Divine Majesty this holy Bread of eternal life and this Cup of everlasting salvation; and we humbly beseech thee to pour thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts, that all we who are partakers of this holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.	Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the precious death and passion of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, according to his holy institution, do celebrate, and set forth before thy Divine Majesty with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which he hath willed us to make, rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which he hath procured unto us.
And we thine unworthy servants beseech thee, most merciful Father, to hear us, and to send thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that, being blessed and hallowed by his life-giving power, they may become the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved	And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance		Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify both us and these thy gifts of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, to the end that we, receiving the same, may be strengthened and refreshed both in body and soul.

Scottish (1929).	American (1929).	South African.	English Alternative Order. (1928.)
Son, to the end that all who shall receive the same may be sanctified both in body and soul, and preserved unto everlasting life.	of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.		
And we earnestly desire . . . this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving . . . all other benefits of his passion. And here we humbly offer and present . . . living sacrifice unto thee, beseeching thee that all we who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with him, that he may dwell in us and we in him.	And we earnestly desire . . . this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving . . . all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present . . . living sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that we, and all others who shall be . . . (as in Scottish) thy Son Jesus Christ, be filled with thy grace . . . and made one body . . . (as in Scottish) . . . we in him.	And we entirely desire . . . this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving . . . all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present . . . living sacrifice unto thee.	And we entirely desire . . . this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving . . . all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present . . . living sacrifice unto thee: humbly beseeching thee, that all we, who are partakers of this Holy Communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.
And although . . . world without end. *Amen.*	And although . . . world without end. *Amen.*	And although . . . world without end. *Amen.*	And although . . . world without end. *Amen.*
[Prayer for the Church. As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say, Our Father. The peace of the Lord be with you all; *Answer.* And with thy spirit. *Presbyter.* Brethren, let us love one another, for love is of God. Ye that do truly . . . Confession. Absolution. Comfortable Words. Prayer of Humble Access. Agnus Dei. Communion.]	[And now, as our Saviour Christ hath taught us, we are bold to say, Our Father. Prayer of Humble Access. Communion.]	[As our Saviour Jesus Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say: Our Father. Prayer of Humble Access. Communion.]	[As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say, Our Father. *Then may the Priest say*: The peace of God be alway with you: *Answer.* And with thy spirit. Communion.]

The Communion.

The structure of the English Communion Service was influenced by the desire of the Reformers to make Communion the prominent aspect of the rite. The concentration, in the prayer of Consecration, upon the Lord's words of institution, followed immediately by the act of reception, is one indication of this. This extreme simplification of the older rite involved, in addition to the changes in the order of the prayers, the omission of the devotions and

ceremonies which in the older rite had intervened between the Canon and the Communion. They included the Lord's Prayer, with its embolism (*Libera nos*), the Fraction, the Commixture (or placing of part of the Host into the chalice), the Kiss of Peace, and the *Agnus Dei*. Of these the Prayer Book of 1549 retained only the Lord's Prayer, the salutation (or benediction) 'The peace of the Lord be always with you,' and the response 'And with thy spirit' (which are a relic of the formularies connected with the Kiss of Peace), and lastly the singing of *Agnus Dei* during the Communion. No directions were given in 1549 for the Fraction, though it is referred to in the rubric at the end of the service in reference to the character of the bread to be used. In this respect the Prayer Book of 1549 followed on the lines of contemporary Lutheran Church Orders. In Luther's Latin Mass of 1523, and in Hermann's *Pia Deliberatio*, the *Pax Domini* and the *Agnus Dei* find a place, as they still do in the modern Swedish rite.

In the Prayer Book of 1552 the Lord's Prayer was included among the post-communion prayers and the other directions were omitted.

The Scottish Liturgy of 1929 has restored 'The peace of the Lord' with its response, and has added a short exhortation by the Presbyter, 'Brethren, let us love one another, for love is of God,' thus emphasising the unity and fellowship of the faithful, of which the Kiss of Peace in the older liturgies was an expression. 'The peace of God' with the response is also found in the English Alternative Order of 1928. But though the Kiss of Peace and the formularies connected with it have disappeared from the English Prayer Book, the ideas suggested by it are emphasised in the Invitation, 'Ye that . . . are in love and charity with your neighbours . . . draw near,' and the words 'The peace of God . . .' in the final Blessing are reminiscent of the thought expressed in the old *Pax Domini*.

In the rubric about the administration, the direction 'in' ('into' 1661) 'their hands' was added in 1552. A rubric in the Prayer Book of 1549 retained the mediæval custom of delivering to the people 'the Sacrament of Christ's Body in their mouths,' and justified it on the ground that 'they many times conveyed the same secretly away, and diversely abused it to superstition.' The change was made at Bucer's suggestion, and it was a restoration of the earlier universal custom of the Church.

The direction that communicants are to receive kneeling was a further insertion made in 1552, no direction being given in 1549. It was aimed at the practice of sitting during reception (which had come in among the advanced reformers), and it was defended against objections in the 'Declaration on Kneeling,' which was added by the authority of the Council before the book

was published. The earlier custom was to receive standing, and this is still the custom in the Greek Church. In England, however, the custom of kneeling had prevailed for some centuries. No express direction is given as to the posture of the celebrant during reception. In the seventeenth century the Visitation articles of several bishops show that they understood the rubric to apply to the celebrant as well as to the people, but though Cosin in his *Particulars* (No. 58) had proposed to insert a direction to that effect, the bishops in 1661, following the Scottish rubric of 1637 (with the substitution of 'meekly' for 'humbly'), contented themselves with expanding the rubric of 1552, so that it reads 'all meekly kneeling.'

The words of administration assumed their present form in 1559. They are a combination of the two separate forms of 1549 and 1552. The first part of each is derived from the Prayer Book of 1549, itself based upon that found in the *Order of Communion* of 1548 (see p. 333). It is a slightly expanded version of the Sarum form for the communion of the sick (Maskell, *Mon. Rit. Eccl. Angl.*, i. 114). In early times the forms of administration were quite simple, 'The Body of Christ,' 'The Blood of Christ.' By the time of Gregory the Great the Western form had already been expanded into a benediction, 'The Body of Christ preserve thy soul.'

The latter part of the present words is the form which was substituted in 1552 for that of the First Prayer Book. It was due to the desire of the extreme reforming party to avoid any identification of the elements with the Body and Blood of Christ, and it bears some resemblance to a form put forth by the Polish reformer, John Laski (Brightman, *Eng. Rite*, I. lxii). Considered in itself it lends support to a Zwinglian interpretation, though such interpretation of the service as a whole in the Prayer Book of 1552 is excluded by the language of the prayer of Humble Access and by the Thanksgiving after Communion. The form in Hermann's *Pia Deliberatio*, 'Take, eat to thy health the body of the Lord,' 'Take and drink to thy health the blood of the Lord,' resembles the opening words, though the rest strikes a different note, and the resemblance may be due to independent use of the New Testament in both cases.

The union since 1559 of the two forms emphasises at once the 'given-ness' of the Sacrament and the need of conscious reception through faith (Barry, *Teachers' Prayer Book*).

The restoration of Communion in both kinds and the separate administration of them were both provided for in the *Order of Communion* (1548), and represented a return to earlier and scriptural practice. The Eastern Church has retained Communion in both kinds, but administers them to the people by intinction, *i.e.* the species of bread is placed in the chalice, and

the two species are thus administered conjointly with a spoon (λαβίς).[1]

The Scottish Liturgy since 1637 has restored the ancient practice of the Church, by which *Amen* is said by the communicant in response to the words of administration.

The provision for the consecration of additional bread and wine was inserted in 1661. The *Order of Communion* of 1548 made provision only for the consecration of a second or third chalice, and authorised for this purpose the use of the words 'Likewise after supper . . .' This was based upon the Sarum *cautelæ*, which were intended to deal with cases of accident or carelessness. Corresponding directions are given in the Roman Missal. The earlier practice in the West had been to consecrate the 'ministerial chalice' by pouring the contents of the consecrated chalice into a larger chalice filled with common wine, and from this to communicate the people by a reed (*Ordo Romanus*, I). Another custom was to consecrate additional wine by pouring it into the consecrated chalice before the latter was empty (Mabillon, *Comm. in Ordo Rom.*, cviii).

The directions of the *Order of Communion* of 1548 were omitted in the Prayer Book of 1549, which had required notice to be given by intending communicants. But in spite of this direction, it was found necessary to guard against the use of unconsecrated elements for Communion, and Canon 21 of 1604 enjoins that 'first the words of Institution shall be rehearsed, when the said Bread and Wine be present upon the Communion Table.' From this Canon were derived the rubrics in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637 and the Prayer Book of 1661.

This following by the English Prayer Book of the mediæval precedents for consecration by the words of Institution alone has exposed it to the charge of teaching 'consecration by a formula.' Scudamore, however, suggests that the framers of the English rubric considered that the prayer of Consecration embraces in its intention any subsequent consecration, in virtue of the petition, 'Grant that we receiving . . .'

The Scottish Liturgy of 1764, which is here followed by the American Prayer Book, directs, in the case of a second consecration of either kind, the use of the whole of the consecratory form, including Institution, Oblation and Invocation, though in the Scottish revision of 1929 the form includes only the Institution and Invocation. But in each case the consecration is in both kinds. The English Alternative Order (1928) permits the consecration of either bread or wine with the words of Institution appropriate to each, but adds in both cases the Invocation.

The singing of *Agnus Dei* 'in the Communion time' was ordered

[1] The practice of intinction fell into disrepute in the Western Church and was wholly condemned in England by a Synod at Westminster in 1175.

in 1549, and sentences of Scripture, 'to be said or sung, every day one' after the Communion, were also provided. These latter represent the *Communio*, a survival of the psalm sung during Communion, which is mentioned and justified by St. Augustine as a custom coming into vogue in his time in Africa, and is found still earlier in the East, Psalm xxxiii (xxxiv) being used at Jerusalem in the time of Cyril and also in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions.

The *Agnus Dei* was introduced as a form of Eucharistic devotion,[1] to be sung while the Fraction was proceeding. But with the decline of Communion the Fraction was only that of the single Host, and so the singing of the *Agnus Dei* overlapped the Communion of the priest, and the *Communio* followed. Hence arose the title *post-communio* which was already so used in the thirteenth century (Durandus), and explains the term 'post-communion' applied to it in the Prayer Book of 1549.

The restoration of *Agnus Dei* was included in the changes proposed in the Durham Book in 1661, but the suggestion was not accepted. The singing of it, however, has become common in recent times and was recognised as legitimate by the Lincoln Judgment, on the ground that as a hymn it has the same position as other hymns during Divine Service. It has been restored in the Scottish Liturgy of 1929.

The rubric about the disposal of the consecrated elements after Communion was inserted in 1661. It first appears in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, though without the word 'reverently,' which, as Scudamore says, shows that the purpose of the rubric is to guard against irreverence. The 'fair linen cloth' with which the sacrament is to be covered, and to which the Scottish Liturgy of 1637 gives the alternative name of 'corporal,' is the second corporal (for which in modern times is often substituted the stiff Pall) or the Chalice veil, the other being that which is spread upon the holy table.

The Thanksgiving.

In the Prayer Book of 1549 after the Communion the service comes speedily to an end, with a thanksgiving and the Blessing. This followed the traditional use. In the oldest form of the Roman Mass there is only a Collect, followed at once by the dismissal (*Ite, missa est*, 'Depart, there is a dismissal'). The variable post-communion Collect (*post-communio* or *ad complendum*) was generally a prayer for grace and perseverance. A second prayer (*ad populum* or *super populum*) is sometimes found in the Roman service books, though in the Gregorian Sacramentary this is mostly limited to the time between Septuagesima

[1] The earliest recorded instance of its use at Rome is connected with the name of the Greek-speaking Pope Sergius (687–701).

and Easter, and in the present Roman Missal is found only on week-days in Lent.

This older order of prayer is characteristic of the restraint of the old Roman Liturgy. The idea underlying it is that the climax of the service is reached in the act of Communion, and that anything beyond a short prayer for grace and perseverance is of the nature of an anti-climax. But as Communion declined, and the people present at mass were mainly non-communicants, it became customary to add a blessing. This was originally given by the bishop as he went out, and then later the practice was extended to priests. This final blessing is not found in English Missals before the Reformation, though it appears in the edition of the Roman Missal printed in 1474. On the other hand, the Eastern rites contain a blessing (or Prayer of Inclination) before the dismissal.

In contrast with these forms, the English Order drawn up in 1552 marks a striking and original development in the English rite. The Communion leads on to fresh acts not only of thanksgiving but of adoration. The note sounded in the *Sursum corda* is taken up again in the Lord's Prayer (to which the doxology is added), the Thanksgiving, and the *Gloria in excelsis*, which is now transferred from its older place at the beginning of the service to this point. Those who have shared the blessings of the heavenly feast join in the worship of Him that sitteth upon the throne and of the Lamb. Interesting parallels to this development have been adduced from Zwingli's Zürich Liturgy and other reformed rites, in which, though the presence of Christ is dissociated from the elements, the worship of the Lamb 'present to the contemplation of faith' finds a place (Lockton, *Treatment of the Remains in the Eucharist*, ch. xiii. 'The worship of the Lamb').

This concluding section of the service is introduced by the Lord's Prayer. In the Eastern and Western Liturgies the Lord's Prayer precedes the Communion, and from the time of Tertullian and Cyprian the clause 'Give us this day our daily bread' was used as a prayer for spiritual sustenance with special reference to the Eucharist. The transference of the prayer to its present position in 1552 marked a break with this older and general tradition, though it has been defended on the ground that, when the communicants have been hallowed and blest by union with Christ in the Sacrament, they can then most fitly exercise the right of children and address God as 'Our Father' in the prayer which Christ has taught them. In most of the later revisions of the English rite (Scottish since 1637; American (1929); South African; English Alternative Order (1928)) the prayer has been restored to its traditional place before Communion with the old introduction, 'As our Saviour Christ,' etc.

The doxology at the close of the Lord's Prayer is only found

in four places in the English Prayer Book, the other three being after the Absolution at Morning and Evening Prayer, in the Thanksgiving of Women after Childbirth, and in the Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea. It was added in the first three places in 1661, when the Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea were also inserted in the Prayer Book. The addition may have been made in deference to the request of the Presbyterian divines (Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 314), though it had already appeared in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, where, however, the Lord's Prayer precedes the Communion. In the English Prayer Book the doxology has a special appropriateness, in that the prayer forms part of the thanksgiving after Communion. At the same time it needs to be remembered that the doxology forms no part of the original text of the Lord's Prayer, but is a liturgical addition first found in the *Didache* (the date of which has been assigned to various periods between A.D. 100–160). It finds a place in most of the Eastern liturgies, though it is not found in any Latin service book.

Lastly, it may be noticed that the Prayer Book directs the people to join with the priest in the Lord's Prayer, 'repeating after him every petition.' In the Prayer Book of 1549 (following the Latin rite) the priest said the prayer, the people only repeating the last clause and the Amen. The present direction, dating from 1552, is in accord with the Eastern and Gallican usage.

The former of the two alternative prayers which follow the Lord's Prayer consists of an abbreviated form of the Oblation which in the Prayer Book of 1549 followed without a break the recital of the institution. In that form it was an adaptation of the language of the old canon to a conception of the Eucharistic sacrifice which was intended to correct the abuses of later mediæval religion. It represented it as a commemoration of our Lord's Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, as a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for the blessings of redemption, and as the offering of the Church in the persons of its members, the 'reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice' of 'ourselves, our souls and bodies.' It concluded with a prayer (based on the *Supplices te* of the Latin Canon) that God would 'command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of thy holy Angels, to be brought up into thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of thy divine majesty, not weighing our merits but pardoning our offences.'

In the prayer as rearranged and curtailed in 1552 the actual verbal expression of the commemorative Oblation ('We do celebrate and make . . . before thy divine majesty the memorial ') has been omitted, together with the commemoration of the 'blessed passion, mighty resurrection and glorious ascension,' and some other phrases which were unsuitable to its

position as a post-communion prayer. But in its present form it still emphasises, like the form of 1549, the two aspects of the Eucharistic offering as a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' and as the self-oblation of the worshippers. The term 'sacrifice of praise' (Heb. xiii. 15; Lev. vii. 12, etc.) is found constantly in a Eucharistic sense in the prayers of the Latin sacramentaries, and occurs in the Roman Canon in the *Memento Domine*. The sense in which Cranmer interpreted it is shown in his answer to Bishop Gardiner's book (Parker Society, p. 346) where he says: 'Another kind of sacrifice there is which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God, and to show ourselves thankful unto him. And therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving. The first kind of sacrifice Christ offered to God for us: the second kind we ourselves offer to God by Christ. By the first kind of sacrifice Christ offered also us unto his Father; and by the second we offer ourselves and all that we have unto him and his Father.' The position of the prayer after, instead of before, Communion, emphasises the fact that it is in and through communion with Christ the Head that the Church, the mystical Body of Christ, offers itself to the Father. The idea is common in the writings of St. Augustine. 'If you have received well, you are what you have received. . . . He willed that we ourselves should be his sacrifice.'[1]

The prayer retains many of the reminiscences of the language of the Latin Canon which Cranmer had worked into the original prayer of 1549. The words 'We thy humble servants . . . desire thy fatherly goodness . . . to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' recall the words *supplices rogamus . . . uti accepta habeas* and *sacrificium laudis* of the old Canon; the clause 'all we who are partakers of this holy Communion may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction' is partly a paraphrase and partly a rendering of the corresponding clause in the *Supplices te;* the words 'accept this our bounden duty and service' are an echo of *hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ . . . quæsumus ut . . . accipias;* lastly, the words 'not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences' reproduce the words of the *Nobis quoque.*

The second of the two alternative prayers was composed in 1549, though a few verbal changes have been made in the revisions of 1552 and 1661. In the book of 1549 it was the only post-communion prayer, and was preceded by the salutation 'The Lord be with you,' etc. The opening words are an adapta-

[1] *Serm.* 227. Prof. Burkitt (*Eucharist and Sacrifice*, p. 22) says of this prayer in the book of 1552: 'Cranmer turned the Mass into a Communion, but the words of his Office show that in so doing he was not abolishing the Sacrifice, but only transforming it.'

tion of the Sarum prayer said by the priest after his communion, though it exhibits some parallels to Hermann's form. The prayer dwells upon two aspects of the sacrament as (*a*) the gift of spiritual food, (*b*) the pledge of incorporation in the mystical body of Christ, 'which is the blessed company of all faithful people' (an idea based on 1 Cor. x. 17, and finding parallels in Eastern and Western liturgical prayers).[1] It concludes with a prayer for continuance in that holy fellowship and for perseverance in good works.

The *Gloria in excelsis* is a Greek hymn which is found (with the title 'morning hymn') among the Canticles at the end of the Psalter in the Codex Alexandrinus (fifth century). It appears in a manipulated form in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (vii. 47) in the last quarter of the fourth century, and is alluded to in the treatise *De Virginitate*, a work of uncertain authorship, attributed to Athanasius. How much earlier than this the hymn was composed the evidence does not enable us to say. It has been used for centuries in the daily office of the Eastern Church, and was appointed for use at Mattins in the Rule of Cæsarius of Arles († A.D. 542). Its use in the Mass is peculiar to the West. Two traditions as to its use in the West are found in the *Liber Pontificalis*. According to one its introduction into the Roman rite was due to Pope Telesphorus († 139), who appointed it to be used at Mass on Christmas night. The other asserts that Pope Symmachus (498–514) ordered its use on every Lord's Day and on feasts of martyrs. To the earlier statement little credence can be given, though it is possible that it may refer simply to the opening words (Luke ii. 14) and not to the whole hymn.[2] The words of Luke ii. 14 find a place in some Eastern liturgies, and the Nestorian Liturgy of Adai and Mari begins with these words. The tradition about Pope Symmachus rests on surer ground, as it is probably the evidence of a contemporary (Duchesne), and agrees with the Gregorian Sacramentary, which directs the hymn to be used, if the bishop be present, on the Lord's Day and on festivals, though priests may only use it at Easter. This restriction on its use by priests had been removed by the twelfth century, if not before (Scudamore). In the Missal it was omitted in Advent and from Septuagesima to Easter Eve. The Prayer Book of 1549 permitted its omission on work-days (cf.

[1] A Western example is the prayer 'We beseech thee . . . that we may be numbered amongst the members of him of whose body and blood we are partakers' (*Leonine Sacr.*, ed. Feltoe, p. 142; Gregorian, ed. Wilson, p. 38; Gelasian, ed. Wilson, p. 18). For the East cf. St. Mark, 'By the participation of thy . . . body and . . . blood . . . unite us to the most blessed company of those who have been well-pleasing to thee' (Brightman, *L.E.W.*, 142, 21–22; for St. Basil see *ibid.*, 406, 14–22).

[2] See the discussion of this evidence of the *Liber Pontificalis* by Gibson in *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. xxi. (Oct. 1885), pp. 9 f.

p. 316), and the same permission has been restored in the English Alternative Order (1928).

Among the more important variations of the text of the hymn the following may be noted:

(1) For 'God on high' the Scottish Liturgy (since 1764), following the Greek version, reads 'God in the highest' (cf. Luke ii. 14).

(2) 'Goodwill towards men' replaces the rendering of the Vulgate and Latin service books, 'to men of good will.' The text of Luke ii. 14 presents both variants, but in any case it is God's good pleasure or good purpose in redemption which is meant.

(3) The Codex Alexandrinus reads, 'O Lord, the only begotten Son Jesus Christ, *and the Holy Ghost*,' thus making the section a full commemoration of the Trinity, while the second part of the hymn opens with an address to the Son. The same addition is found in some Irish sources, in the offices of the Greek Church, and in the Church Order of Zürich (1529). With this addition the hymn falls into three divisions: (1) hymn to the Trinity, (2) hymn to Christ, (3) final ascription of praise to the Trinity. The Scottish Liturgy (since 1764) has adopted this addition, and gives the following rendering of this portion of the hymn. 'We give thanks to thee . . . God the Father Almighty; and to thee, O God, the only begotten Son Jesu Christ; and to thee, O God, the Holy Ghost.'

(4) The additional clause, 'Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us,' was inserted in 1552. Its origin is uncertain, though a repetition of the words 'have mercy upon us' is found in the Codex Alexandrinus, and, as Dr. Brightman suggests, the words may have occurred in some text available to the revisers of the Prayer Book. The clause has been omitted in the Scottish Liturgy since 1755, and in the American Prayer Book of 1929. But the addition, as Scudamore says, 'adds much to the solemn deprecatory character' of the hymn, whatever its origin.

The traditional position of the *Gloria in excelsis* after the Kyries at the beginning of the Mass was retained by Luther in his Latin Mass, by Hermann in the *Pia Deliberatio*, and also in the Prayer Book of 1549. The hymn commemorates not only the birth of Christ, but His glory as the ascended Lord, the Lamb of God standing in the midst of the throne; and the transference of it to the close of the service is an original feature of the English rite, the significance of which has already been discussed (see p. 355). This position of the *Gloria in excelsis* has been retained in all subsequent revisions of the English rite. On the alternation of praise and penitence see p. 340.

The Blessing, composed in 1549, consists of two clauses. The

former (based on Phil. iv. 7) is found in the *Order of Communion* (1548) after the administration, where it marks the dismissal of the communicants from the altar.[1] The second clause recalls the language of some of the Episcopal benedictions, which in the mediæval English service are found between the Lord's Prayer and the *Pax Domini*, e.g. that found in Lacey's Pontifical (p. 153), with which it is almost identical. It is also closely parallel to the final blessing found in Hermann's *Pia Deliberatio*, except that it substitutes ' you ' for ' us.'

Supplementary Collects and Final Rubrics.

The rubric which follows the Blessing gives directions about the six Collects which are provided for occasional use. The first part of the rubric, according to which they are to be said ' after the Offertory, when there is no Communion, every such day one,' is derived from the Prayer Book of 1549. In that book the prayer for the Church had not yet been removed to its present position. When the place of the prayer was changed, the rubric remained unaltered, but the sense in which it is to be understood is shown by the first of the final rubrics, which directs that one or more of these Collects is to be said after the prayer for the Church. The further provision for the use of the Collects after the Collects of Morning or Evening Prayer, Communion, or Litany was added in 1552.

The first Collect is found in a *Missa pro iter agentibus* in the Sarum Use, and is derived from the Gelasian Sacramentary. The second occurs after the reading of the Martyrology following Prime. The fourth is Gregorian and was used in the Sarum Missal as the fifth Collect for the second Saturday in Lent. The other three were composed for the Prayer Book of 1549.

The first of the rubrics which follow provides the order of service to be used on days when there is no Communion. This and the next three rubrics have already been dealt with incidentally in the note on ' Non-Communicating attendance ' (see p. 330).[2]

The fifth rubric, inserted in 1552, is a modification of the rubric

[1] Lockton (*Treatment of the Remains at the Eucharist*, pp. 172 f.) adduces as parallels the use of the *Pax* after the Communion of the sick in some MSS. of the Gregorian Sacramentary.

[2] The third rubric, which fixes the number of communicants, has been dealt with in various ways in later revisions of the Anglican rite. The Scottish and American liturgies omit it, though the Scottish revision of 1929 inserts a new rubric directing that ' at every celebration of Holy Communion reasonable opportunity to communicate shall be given to the people who wish to do so.' The Non-jurors' Liturgy and the Irish and Canadian Prayer Books fix the minimum as ' two at least '; the South African as ' at least one.' The English Alternative Order (1928) omits the rubric, but inserts a new one. ' It is much to be desired that at every celebration of the Lord's Supper the worshippers present, not being reasonably hindered, will communicate with the Priest.'

of 1549, which had enjoined the use of unleavened bread 'without all manner of print, and something more larger and thicker than it was.' The object of the present rubric, as is shown by the words 'it shall suffice,' was not to suppress, but to relax the requirement of unleavened bread, by allowing the use of 'the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten.' This interpretation of the rubric was given by Archbishop Parker in his correspondence. The Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth (1559) endeavoured unsuccessfully to enforce the directions of 1549, and the use of ordinary bread became common, though the legitimacy of either was recognised by the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 and was debated during the revision of 1661. Explicit recognition is given to both in the Scottish Liturgy of 1929 and the English Alternative Order of 1928. The use of leavened or unleavened bread is one of the points of diversity between the Eastern and Western Churches.

The sixth rubric, inserted in 1661, was borrowed from the Scottish Liturgy of 1637, and deals with the disposal of the bread and wine which remain. It distinguishes between the consecrated and the unconsecrated bread and wine, a distinction which had not been drawn in the earlier rubric of 1552, the direction in that book being simply that 'if any of the bread and wine remain, the Curate shall have it to his own use.' The further provision that the consecrated bread and wine shall not be taken out of the church, but shall be reverently consumed by the priest and the communicants, was intended to guard against irreverence. For the bearing of this rubric on the practice of reservation for the sick see below, 'The Communion of the Sick.'

The seventh and ninth rubrics deal with the provision of the bread and wine for the Communion, and with the disposal of the money given at the Offertory.

The eighth rubric prescribes as a minimum rule that 'every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one.' This was a return to the earlier rule current in the West and in England before the Lateran Council of 1215, which reduced the minimum to one Communion a year. This latter rule continued until the Reformation and finds expression in the Prayer Book of 1549. The present rubric dates from 1552.

The 'Declaration on Kneeling' was due to the agitation of John Knox against the practice. It was inserted in the Book of 1552 by Order of the Council after many copies had been printed off. In its original form it denied that 'adoration is intended . . . unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood.' It was omitted in the Prayer Book of 1559, but owing to the request of the Presbyterian divines at the Savoy Conference, and in spite of the earlier statement of the bishops

that there was not 'any great need of restoring it, the world being now in more danger of profanation than of idolatry,' it was replaced with an important modification, the words 'corporal presence' being substituted for 'real and essential presence.'

The phraseology of the Declaration reflects the confused language which had become common among disputants in all parties during the Reformation period, when the careful distinctions drawn by the Schoolmen between the manner of Christ's presence in heaven and the manner of His presence in the Sacrament had become obscured or forgotten, and there was a general failure to recognise the changed conditions of the Lord's body after the resurrection and ascension. The phrase 'natural body and blood' was used by Ridley to express the identity of the body of Christ in the Sacrament with the body which was born of the Virgin Mary and which ascended into heaven; and his difference from his opponents was concerned only with the mode of the presence (see Ridley's statement, *Works*, Parker Society, p. 274). Similarly, the terms 'real' and 'corporal' are used with varying meanings. Ridley, in the statement referred to above, accepts 'really' as applied to the sacramental mode of presence, if it is interpreted to mean 'spiritually, by grace and efficacy,' but denies it in the sense of his opponents (*loc. cit.*, p. 273). Similarly, Gardiner (Cranmer, *On the Lord's Supper*, Parker Society, p. 89) says that 'corporal' may mean either 'the truth of the body present' or presence 'after a corporal manner,' and this latter he denies.

In its original form the Declaration was intended to reassure the extreme Reformers who disliked the practice of kneeling at reception. When taken in connection with other changes in the service of 1552 (*e.g.* the words of administration, 'Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee') it would seem that the denial of 'any real and essential presence . . . of Christ's natural flesh and blood' was intended to be acceptable to those who denied that the consecrated sacrament is the body and blood of Christ in any but a figurative sense. Dr. Darwell Stone (*Hist. of Doctrine of Holy Eucharist*, ii. 142), while showing that by stressing the word 'natural' and the scholastic distinction between the mode of Christ's presence in heaven and His presence in the Sacrament, the Declaration might be construed differently, concludes that in view of the opinions of the revisers, the character of the changes made in the Book of 1552, and the purpose with which the Declaration was inserted, it is incredible that it was intended to have any other meaning than 'a denial . . . that the consecrated Sacrament is the body and blood of Christ.'

The word 'corporal,' which was substituted for 'real and essential' in 1661, had already been used in the Canons of

1640, where 'any opinion of a corporal presence' is disavowed in connection with kneeling at reception. While the change of wording is intended to deny the gross and carnal conceptions of the presence which had grown up around the doctrine of Transubstantiation, it allows for the recognition of a real but spiritual presence, such as Article XXVIII recognises when it says that 'the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner'—a statement which replaces the earlier denial, in the Articles of 1552 and 1553, of 'the real and bodily presence (as they term it)' of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament.

On the practice of Kneeling at Communion see *ante*, pp. 351 f.; and on the Fast before Communion see pp. 253–56.

NOTE

The Eucharist with special intentions.

THE sense of the unity and fellowship of the faithful in the one Body of Christ was a marked characteristic of the early Church, and of this fellowship the celebration of the Eucharist was at once the symbol and the pledge. Hence we find the Eucharist brought into relation with the great moments of life—baptism, marriage, sickness and death. 'If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or if one member is honoured, all the members rejoice with it.' In the admission of a new convert to full membership of the Church, baptism, confirmation, and communion formed the three parts of one complete rite. The marriage rite was sanctified by the blessing of the Church and by participation in the Eucharist. The same interest in all its members led to the sending of the Eucharist to the sick. Nor was death regarded as severing the fellowship of the living with the departed members of the Church, the commemoration of the latter being accompanied by the celebration of the Eucharist.

In the present note it will suffice to indicate briefly the developments associated with the celebration of the Eucharist in connection with (1) marriage, (2) the burial and commemoration of the departed, (3) other special intentions.

1. *Marriage.* For the ante-Nicene period we have the evidence of Tertullian (*Ad Uxor.*, ii. 9), who speaks of the 'happiness of the marriage, which is arranged by the Church, confirmed by the oblation, and sealed by the blessing.' The celebration of the Eucharist took the place of the sacrifice in the pagan form of the rite. At a later period Pope Nicholas I (858–867), in his reply to the Bulgarians (c. 3), speaks of the offerings which the newly-married ought to make to God by the hand of the priest, and of the Blessing. The earliest Roman Sacramentaries correspond

with this description. In the Leonine Sacramentary (Feltoe, pp. 140 f.) there are proper Collects and a proper *Hanc igitur*, in which the oblation is made on behalf of the bride. The Nuptial Blessing, which in its original form was probably Eucharistic in character, beginning *Uere dignum et iustum est*, is preceded by a Collect.

The Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries present similar features, proper Collect, *Secreta* (*super oblata*), *Hanc igitur*, and Post-communion being provided, and also a Collect and Blessing before the Pax. The Gelasian Sacramentary explicitly directs in a rubric the Communion of the newly-married persons, and similar directions are given in the Mozarabic *Liber Ordinum* (ed. Férotin, p. 439) and in forms of the rite printed by Ménard (*Sacr. Greg.*, p. 287) and by Martène (*De ant. eccl. rit.*, ii. 614 f.).

In the later Roman rite there is a further Blessing after the *Ite missa est*. Since 1914 the Congregation of Rites has permitted the use of the Nuptial Blessing (which had hitherto formed part of the Nuptial Mass) in a slightly altered form, even when no mass is said (Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, 10th ed., 1928).

In the Greek Euchologion the Office of Matrimony consists of two parts, the Betrothal and the Crowning, and these are not of necessity performed on the same day. The opening rubric of the service for the Betrothal speaks of it as taking place 'after the Divine Liturgy' (Goar, *Euchol.*, p. 310), but in actual practice marriages are usually celebrated independently of the Liturgy, and in the evening. Goar, however (p. 324), quotes a rubric from earlier manuscript sources, and also evidence supplied by Symeon, Metropolitan of Thessalonica from 1410 to 1429, to the effect that newly-married persons received the Communion of the Presanctified (*i.e.* from the gifts previously consecrated and reserved), though Symeon implies that this was only on condition that they were fit to receive, which, he says, they ought to be ready to do, 'in order that they may be worthily crowned and rightly wedded.'

In the Sarum Use the Mass of Trinity Sunday is appointed, a proper Collect, *Secreta*, and Post-communion being added to those of Trinity Sunday. The Epistle (1 Cor. vi. 19–20), the Gospel (St. Matt. xix. 3–6) and the Sequence are suited to the occasion. The Gospel in the York Missal is St. John iii. 27–29. Before the Pax there are a Collect and the Nuptial Blessing (both Gregorian). There is nothing in the Sarum Use corresponding to the Blessing after the *Ite missa est*, which occurs in the Roman rite, though the York and Hereford Uses both have a special Blessing with the chalice at that point.

The Sarum Use also prescribes after Mass a blessing of bread and wine, of which the newly-married persons partake, the

prayer used making reference to the blessing of the five loaves in the wilderness and to the water-pots in Cana of Galilee. Similar directions are found in several of the *Ordines* printed in Martène (*De ant. eccl. rit.*, ii. pp. 617f., 620f., 627f., etc.). A corresponding feature in the Greek rite is the blessing of a cup of wine, of which the newly-married persons partake, as a sign of joy and their association in a common life.

In the First Edwardian Prayer Book the provisions of the Sarum Use were greatly reduced. No proper Collect, Epistle, and Gospel are appointed, but a rubric directs that the newly-married persons must receive the Holy Communion on the day of their marriage. The old Nuptial Blessing is represented by the prayer 'O God, which by thy mighty power,' but the prayer was detached from its original setting at the close of the Canon of the Mass, and placed before the final blessing in the Marriage Service, which the celebration of Holy Communion was intended to follow. The prayer is based upon the old Gregorian prayer, and it is no longer a blessing upon the bride alone, but includes the bridegroom also.

In 1662 the rubric directing that the newly-married persons are to receive the Holy Communion was altered partly in deference to the objections of the Presbyterian divines and partly because many of those who were married were not in real communion with the Church. In its present form, while relaxing the obligation, it upholds the earlier ideal by its declaration that it is 'convenient' (*i.e.* fitting) 'that the newly-married persons should receive the holy Communion at the time of their Marriage or at the first opportunity after their Marriage.'

In recent revisions of the Anglican rite efforts have been made to redress the inadequacy of the provision made in 1662 for the celebration of the Eucharist in connection with the marriage rite. The Canadian and Scottish Prayer Books provide a proper Collect ('O heavenly Father, who didst join'), which is partly reminiscent of one of the Sarum Collects. In both books the Epistle is Eph. v. 25–33, and the Gospel St. Matt. xix. 4–6 (Sarum). The American Prayer Book (1929) has the same Epistle and Gospel as the above, though the Collect is new. Lastly, the English Alternative Form (1928) provides a proper Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, the Epistle being Eph. iii. 14–19, and the Gospel St. John xv. 9–12. A further rubric, due to the desire to bring the Nuptial Blessing into closer connection with the Eucharist, directs that, if there be a Communion, the Prayer and Blessing, which are appointed at the conclusion of the Marriage Service, should be said before the final blessing of the congregation at the Communion.

2. *The Burial and commemoration of the departed.* Evidence for the celebration of the Eucharist at the commemoration of de-

parted members of the Church is supplied from two different quarters during the first half of the third century. In Africa Tertullian and Cyprian speak of the offerings made for the departed and the sacrifices celebrated for their 'repose' and of the prayers offered for their 'refreshment' and that they may obtain 'a part in the first resurrection.'[1] These references have specially in view the commemorations on the anniversaries of their deaths. In the case of martyrs these anniversaries were of a festal character and were known as *natalitia* ('birthdays').[2] Like the corresponding commemorations shortly to be mentioned, they probably took place in the cemeteries. A second piece of evidence is supplied by the *Didascalia*, a Syrian work of the third century (whether in the first or second half of the century is a disputed question), in which we find the injunction (vi. 2, ed. Connolly, p. 252), 'Offer an acceptable Eucharist both in your congregations and in your cemeteries and on the departures of them that sleep . . . and without doubting pray and offer for them that are fallen asleep.'

So far there is no positive evidence of the celebration of the Eucharist in connection with the actual burial. Evidence of this, however, is supplied at a later date by Eusebius (*Vita Constantini*, iv. 71). Describing the burial rites of Constantine in the Church of the Apostles at Constantinople, he says that 'he was honoured by the performance of the sacred ordinances and mystic liturgy.' Similarly, Augustine (*Conf.*, ix. 12) records that before the burial of his mother Monnica in A.D. 387, 'the sacrifice of our redemption was offered for the departed, as is the custom there.' We have not sufficient evidence to say that the custom was general, and even in Africa there were recognised exceptions to it. The third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), following an earlier Council at Hippo, in a regulation about the fast before Communion, directs that 'if the commendation of deceased persons, whether bishops or others, is to take place in the afternoon, it is to be celebrated with prayers only, if they who celebrate it are found already to have broken their fast' (Can. 29).

The Roman Sacramentaries provide a series of masses for the departed not only on the day of burial, but also for anniversaries and in the cemeteries.[3] In the Gelasian Sacramentary (though these masses contain non-Roman material) provision is made in one mass (III. cv., Wilson, p. 312) for its use not only on the day of burial, but also on the third, seventh, and thirtieth

[1] Tertullian, *De Cor.*, 3; *De Monogam.*, 10; Cyprian, *Ep.* i. (lxvi.) 2. The words *dormitio* ('repose,' or 'falling asleep'), *refrigerium* ('refreshment') are used in an early and simple sense.

[2] Tert., *De Cor.*, 3; Cyprian, *Ep.* xxxix. (xxxiv.) 3.

[3] See Leonine Sacr. xxxiii. (Feltoe, p. 145); Gelasian, III. xcii–cv.; Gregorian (ed. Wilson, H. B. S.), pp. 142–3, and in Supplement, *ibid.* pp. 213 f., 215 f. (anniversary), 217 (in cemeteries).

days, and on the yearly anniversary. Similarly in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 42) provision is made for the third, ninth, and fortieth days. Similar provision for the third, ninth, and fortieth days is found in the *Novellae* of Justinian (cxxxiii. 3) in the East, and in the *Penitential* of Theodore in the West. For parallel pagan observances see Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.*, Bk. xxiii. 3. 19.

While in the West the Requiem Mass [1] became a regular part of the rites of burial, in the Eastern Church custom has varied. In the Greek Orthodox Church the celebration of the Liturgy is not included among the rites of burial. Memorial services are held on the third, ninth, and fortieth days after burial, and also at intervals of three, nine and twelve months, those on the fortieth day and on the yearly anniversary being generally preceded by the Liturgy. Among the Russian Orthodox it is the custom to celebrate the Liturgy before the rites of burial (though these latter may take place without it), and also on the third, ninth, and fortieth days. The Liturgy is followed by the Pannykhida (an Office for the faithful departed). The Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom is used, with special Epistle, Gospel, Litany and prayer. The Contakion of the departed is sung after the Little Entrance; and the *prokeimenon* before the Epistle and the Anthem during the communion of the clergy are also specially chosen.[2]

The original idea underlying these commemorations was the natural wish of those left behind to maintain their union with their departed relations and friends, and of this union the Eucharistic fellowship was the deepest expression. The earliest prayers offered for the departed recognise that death is no barrier to this inner communion, and that as the faithful departed have not yet attained their perfect consummation, it is legitimate to commend them to the mercy of God. Hence prayers for 'repose,' 'refreshment,' 'light' and 'peace,' and also for cleansing, forgiveness and sanctification find a place in the early Liturgies of East and West. By the fourth century, however, we find in Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat. Myst.*, v. 9), indications of a more definite conception of the Eucharistic sacrifice as propitiatory in character. Speaking of the prayer for the departed in the Great Intercession of the Liturgy, he refers to the benefit which accrues to those for whom such supplication is offered in the presence of 'the holy and awful sacrifice.' 'When we offer to him our supplications for those who have fallen asleep, though they be sinners, . . . we offer Christ sacrificed for our sins, and make propitiation on their behalf and ours to the loving God.' Similarly in the West Augustine, while expressing the belief that the

[1] So called from the opening words of the *Officium* (or Introit), 'Requiem æternam dona eis, Domine.'

[2] I am indebted for information on these usages to the kindness of the Very Rev. Michael Constantinides and the Rev. Vladimir Theokritoff.

dead are aided by the prayers of the Church and the 'saving sacrifice,' and the alms which are offered on behalf of their spirits, propounded a conception of the Eucharistic sacrifice as propitiatory, which was developed later by Gregory the Great, and helped to foster the belief that masses for the dead are specially beneficial in winning for the departed remission of sin or alleviation of their lot.[1]

In both East and West before Augustine there was speculation on the condition of the departed and the discipline and purification which awaited imperfect and sinful souls hereafter. But there was no one consistent form of teaching on the subject. Later Eastern theologians as a whole,[2] while rejecting Origen's view of a remedial purgatory for impenitent souls after the resurrection, have maintained a reserve on the subject, and confine themselves to teaching that the departed are benefited by the prayers and Eucharists of the Church. In the West Augustine in this, as in many other respects, gave a direction to later thought, and (though guarding his language by the words 'it may be true') threw out the suggestion of a purgatorial fire of discipline and punishment to which souls who, in spite of sins and failings, have retained a living faith, may be subject between death and judgment.[3] What Augustine stated as a speculation Gregory the Great affirmed to be a matter of belief (*Dial.*, iv. 39), and the popularity of his *Dialogues*, in which he records visions illustrating the benefit accruing to souls in purgatory from the masses offered on their behalf, was, along with the writings of Augustine, largely responsible for the shaping of the later popular conception of purgatory as a state mainly of penal suffering.

One result of these developments is that the liturgical prayers of the Western Church in connection with the rites for the dead are marked by a more sombre tone than those of the Eastern Church, and the thought of sin and its punishment occupies a larger place. This is especially true of the Spanish liturgical books (Mozarabic Missal and *Liber Ordinum*), of the non-Roman sections of the Gelasian Sacramentary, and also of the Bobbio Missal.[4]

The actual prayers, however, in the masses for the dead in the

[1] For Augustine see *De An. et Orig.*, ii. 15. 21; *Enchir.*, 110; *Serm.* 172. 2; for Gregory see *Dial.*, iv. 39 f.

[2] The Synod of Bethlehem (1672), under Roman influence, went further in the direction of the later Western view than most Eastern theologians have approved.

[3] *Enarr. in Ps. xxxvii.*, 3; *De Fide et Op.*, xv. 24 f.; *Enchir.*, 67 f.; *De Civ. Dei*, xxi. 13, 16, 24.

[4] For the Gelasian Sacramentary see Wilson, pp. 295–299 (probably of Gallican or Irish origin). For the Bobbio Missal see the *Missa pro defunctis* (ed. Lowe, H.B.S., p. 162).

Roman Sacramentaries betray no trace of the popular belief in purgatory, though we find in them language of a propitiatory character applied to the Eucharistic offering.[1] The prayers in the series of masses for the dead in the Sarum Missal are largely derived from the Roman Sacramentaries and reflect their general character. They express the Christian hope in no uncertain manner, and ask for refreshment, rest eternal, light and peace, the fellowship of the Saints, and the joy of the resurrection. Prayers for pardon and deliverance from sins are common. As in the Roman Sacramentaries, we find applied to the Eucharistic offering the phrase 'sacrifice of propitiation' along with 'sacrifice of praise' and language is used which might easily be hardened into a theory that each mass constitutes a distinct sacrifice for sin.[2] But apart from one or two isolated prayers they exhibit no trace of the popular doctrine of purgatory.[3] It was this popular doctrine, as developed later on in the chantry system and the traffic in masses, which provoked the reaction of the Reformers against the whole system of masses for the dead, and led them to protest against any forms of prayer or commemoration which seemed to impair the 'one perfect and sufficient sacrifice of Christ.'

In the First Edwardian Book, though there was a drastic revision of the mediæval observances in connection with the burial and commemoration of the dead, a celebration of the Holy Communion was retained. The Introit was Ps. xlii; the Collect, 'O merciful God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' (though with a different ending from the present Collect); the Epistle, 1 Thess. iv. 13–18; and the Gospel, St. John vi. 37–40. Both Epistle and Gospel are derived from the Sarum Missal. In 1552 even this limited provision was removed from the Prayer Book. But the omission of any form for a celebration at burials created a need which there were various attempts to satisfy. In 1560 Queen Elizabeth put forth, by letters patent, a Latin Prayer Book, authorised for use in the Universities and in the Colleges of Winchester and Eton, and to this was appended a Latin form for a 'Celebration of the Lord's Supper at funerals, if the

[1] In this connection the influence of 2 Macc. xii. 43–45 must be borne in mind. It is referred to by Augustine, *De Cura pro Mort. gerenda*, i. 1. 3, and occurs as a 'prophetical' lesson in the Sarum (as in the Roman) Mass for anniversaries of the dead.

[2] See, *e.g.*, Legg, *Sarum Missal*, p. 439: 'satisfaciat . . . pro anima . . . sacrificii præsentis oblatio'; *ib.* 441: 'per hæc piæ placationis officia perpetuam misericordiam consequantur' (for the originals of these prayers see Gelasian Sacr. III. xcviii; Greg. Sacr. cvii; Gel. III. c.). Elsewhere there is a recognition of the unity of the offering with the sacrifice of Christ; *ib.* 439: 'ab omnibus uitiis condicionis humanæ hæc absoluat oblatio quæ etiam totius mundi tulit offensas.'

[3] The Post-communion in the *Trigintale B. Gregorii* (Legg, p. 460) is perhaps the nearest approach to language suggestive of purgatory.

friends and neighbours of the deceased persons wish to communicate.' The Collect, Epistle and Gospel are those of the first Edwardian Book (see *Liturg. Services of Queen Elizabeth*, Parker Society, pp. 430 f.).

Recent revisions of the Anglican rite have dealt with the omission (since 1552) from the Prayer Book of any provision for a celebration of Holy Communion at the Burial of the Dead. The Prayer Book Collect in the form which it has taken since 1552 finds a place in most of these revisions, though the American Book of 1929 substitutes for it two alternatives, 'O eternal Lord God, who holdest all souls in life' and 'O God, whose mercies cannot be numbered,' while the recent South African Order (1930) provides in its place a Collect ('O God the Maker and Redeemer'), which is a modified form of a Collect for the Commemoration of All Souls found in the English Alternative Book of 1928. The latter book also provides as an alternative the Collect for Easter Eve.

The Epistle and Gospel of the first Edwardian Book (1 Thess. iv. 13–18, St. John vi. 37–40) find a place in all these revisions, though as alternatives to the Epistle there are provided 1 Cor. xv. 50–58 (Scottish, 1929), 2 Cor. iv. 16–v. 4 (Eng. Alternative Book, 1928), Rom. xiv. 7–9 (S. African, 1930), and as alternative to the Gospel, St. John xi. 21–27 (Scottish since 1912, and Canadian) and St. John v. 24–27 (Eng. Alternative Book, 1928, and S. African, 1930).

In the Scottish (1929) Book a rubric directs that at Holy Communion in connection with burials or at memorials of the departed, if the *Agnus Dei* be sung or said, for *have mercy upon us*, and *grant us thy peace*, there should be substituted *grant* them *rest*, and *grant* them *rest eternal*.

The English Alternative Book of 1928 and the Scottish Book of 1929 further provide a special Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the Commemoration of All Souls. In both books the Collect 'O eternal Lord God, who holdest all souls' finds a place, though in the English form it is alternative to another Collect, 'O Lord, the maker and redeemer of all believers.' In the English form the Epistle is Rev. xx. 11–15, while the Scottish has 1 Thess. iv. 13–18, with the alternative 1 Cor. xv. 50–58. The Gospel in both is St. John xi. 21–27.

While the Scottish form directs that the special Gospel and Epistle provided shall not be used on a Sunday, the English form has a note that 'this service may be used on any day when desired, not being a Holy-day, or a day within the octave of Christmas, Easter, or Whitsunday.'

In all these forms an attempt is made to recover the sense of communion and fellowship with the departed in the one Body of Christ.

3. *Other special intentions.* In the earlier Christian centuries emphasis was laid upon the unity of the faithful in their approach to God in the Eucharistic worship of the Church. The one Eucharist gathered within itself the devotions and particular needs of the different members of the one Body. As late as A.D. 578 the Synod of Auxerre (Can. 10) forbade priests to say two masses on the same day at the same altar. To this tradition the Eastern Church has remained loyal, and the Western custom of 'Low Masses' is unknown. Many of the Eastern rites contain in the Intercession prayers for offerers and those for whom they have offered. In the Orthodox Church provision is made in the Office of the Prothesis, which precedes the Liturgy, for the faithful to make their oblations (in the form of small loaves) with special intentions, whether in honour of the Saints, or for the departed, or for the particular needs of the living, and from these oblations are taken portions (each for some special remembrance), which are brought to the altar along with the Eucharistic bread, at the Great Entrance.[1]

In the West the earlier rule laid down by the Synod of Auxerre ceased to be observed. As frequency of communion declined, masses were multiplied in order to give fuller opportunity of 'assisting' at them, and to satisfy the demands of the faithful, who wished them to be celebrated for their special intentions, which were thought to be more effectively pleaded if each was associated with a particular mass. The result was that many priests would say two or three masses each day in order to satisfy the demands of the faithful and their own devotional needs, and we find Church authority invoked from the eleventh century onwards to check this tendency.[2]

The practice of offering Mass with special intention, however, acquired an assured place in the Western Liturgies, both Roman and non-Roman, not only in connection with the anniversaries of the departed, but for various needs temporal and spiritual. Examples are found in the Bobbio Missal and the Mozarabic Missal, no less than in the Roman Sacramentaries. The latter include masses for travellers by land and sea, for plague on men and cattle, for rain or fair weather, for peace and in time of war, for the sick, in time of trouble, and for other needs. Many of these have passed over into the Sarum Missal or suggested similar forms, and others have been added to them. The term *missa votiva,* moreover, came to have an extended meaning, and was used to denote any mass, not of the day, said as a special

[1] See Brightman, *Litt. E. and W.*, pp. 546 f., App. Q. 'On the development of the Byzantine Prothesis.' For an exposition of the significance of the 'portions' see Catechism of Nicholas Bulgaris (Eng. tr., 1893), pp. 63 f. Cf. also Woolley, *Bread of the Eucharist* (Alcuin Club Tracts), pp. 45 f.

[2] See Vacant, *La conception du sacrifice de la Messe dans la tradition de l'église latine,* pp. 26 f.

act of devotion. Such are the Masses of the Trinity, of the Holy Ghost, of the Holy Cross, of St. Mary, and of the Angels.

Many of these developments arose out of a deep and living devotion and had a high religious value, in so far as they expressed the conviction that the Eucharist is the supreme act of Christian prayer and intercession offered by the members of the Body in and through the Head. Among the intentions for which special masses are provided in the Sarum Missal the following may be noted as having a special devotional value, either for the sanctification of human relationships or for the promotion of personal religion: 'For brothers and sisters,' 'For the welfare of a friend,' 'Against the temptations of the flesh,' 'Against evil thoughts,' 'To invoke the grace of the Holy Spirit,' 'For tears of contrition,' 'For the gift of holy Charity,' 'For the inspiration of divine wisdom,' 'For trouble of heart,' 'For any trouble.' Two Collects from these masses may be quoted. (1) From the mass 'For tears of contrition': 'Almighty and merciful God, who for thy thirsting people didst cause to flow from the earth a fountain of living water, bring forth from the hardness of our heart tears of contrition, that we may mourn for our sins and through thy mercy may obtain forgiveness of the same'; (2) from the mass 'Against evil thoughts': 'Almighty and most pitiful God, mercifully regard our prayers, and deliver our hearts from the temptation of evil thoughts, that we may become a worthy habitation of the Holy Spirit.' The priest's mass 'for himself' is also noteworthy in this connection.

But the degradation of popular Eucharistic beliefs in the course of the Middle Ages had led here, as elsewhere, to crude conceptions of a quantitative value in the masses offered and a mechanical view of their efficacy. It was, on the whole, a sound instinct which sought to restore to the normal and public celebration of the Eucharist its position as the meeting-place of the faithful, where their vows and devotions, their special intentions, and intercessions might be gathered up in one common act of corporate prayer and thanksgiving and communion. At the same time the loss of the provision for voicing explicitly special needs and special grounds for thanksgiving was a serious one. With the growth of more frequent celebrations and opportunities for communion there has come the desire for a greater variety in the liturgical provision for special needs and occasions of thanksgiving and intercession. In practice this need has been met to some extent locally or by diocesan authority. Such provision is a feature of several Diocesan Service Books in recent years. Thus the Oxford Diocesan Service Book (1921) provides a series of special Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for various occasions, Thanksgiving for Harvest, the Day of Intercession for Missions Overseas, 'For the

guidance of the Holy Spirit,' 'In time of War' and 'In any necessity.'

In this respect the various revisions of the Anglican rite have made only slight and tentative beginnings to meet the need. Apart from the special Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for Ember Days (Canadian, American (1929), Scottish (1929), English Alternative Book (1928)), and Rogation Days (Canadian, American, English Alternative Book; the last provides Epistles and Gospels only), the other provisions are: Thanksgiving for Harvest (Irish, Canadian, Scottish, English Alternative Book), Thanksgiving for the Institution of Holy Baptism and for the Institution of Holy Communion (English Alternative Book, Scottish (1929)), 'For the guidance of the Holy Spirit' (English Alternative Book), 'For the Synods and Councils of the Church' (Scottish, 1929), for Overseas Missions (English Alternative Book, Scottish (1929)), for the Consecration of a Church (Irish).

COLLECTS, EPISTLES, AND GOSPELS

By K. D. MACKENZIE

I. The Collect

In its widest sense the word 'Collect' may be used as the name of one of the three primary forms of liturgical prayer,[1] the other two being Litany, which is prayer in dialogue, and Eucharistic Prayer, which is a solemn act of praise (not necessarily connected with the Holy Eucharist). In its original form the Collect seems to have been the closing act of a stereotyped devotional form. First the presiding minister, whether bishop or priest, would suggest a subject for prayer, or at least call on the people to pray. This was followed by a time of silent individual prayer. If it were a Sunday, all would stand;[2] but if it were a penitential occasion, the deacon would bid them kneel. In the latter case he (not the subdeacon as in later times) would announce the end of the silent period by commanding them to stand. Finally, the officiant recited the 'Collect,' putting into public and corporate form the petitions of the people.

This very primitive form has not survived in any document, but the earliest formularies come very near to it, and can only be explained as survivals. Thus in the Gallican rites there are constant examples of the opening call to prayer, followed immediately by the Collect. In the Roman Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday the same feature occurs, in connection with the solemn prayers which are thought to be the one survival of the primitive 'Prayer of the Faithful.' In this case, as also on

[1] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, pp. 106 ff.

[2] One of the strangest things in Anglican ceremonial customs is our propensity to kneel for solemn public prayer, even on Sundays. In this we are unique in Christendom. The Latins stand, except at Low Mass (though no doubt the general congregation tends in practice to sit down, and some kneel for part of the time). The Easterns stand (though private devotion prompts individuals to occasional prostration). Non-episcopalians lean forward, covering the eyes. But our present Anglican custom is for the most part unofficial. So far as the Liturgy is concerned we are bidden to kneel only for the first section of the service to the end of the Decalogue, and for the Confession. The last words of the short Exhortation imply that the congregation has *not* been kneeling hitherto.

the Wednesday and Saturday Ember days (except at Pentecost), on some Wednesdays in Lent, on Candlemas day falling on a weekday after Septuagesima, and on Holy Saturday, the deacon sings *Flectamus genua* as soon as the priest has sung *Oremus*, and then, without any interval, the subdeacon sings *Levate*. Similarly before the *Oratio super populum* at the end of mass on weekdays in Lent the deacon sings *Humiliate capita vestra Deo* between the *Oremus* and the actual prayer. There is also an address to the people asking for their prayers in the Ordinary of the Roman Mass, the *Orate, fratres*. But this last, though an illustration of the same form as that of the primitive invitation to prayer, is certainly not a survival, but a mediæval addition.[1] Apart from these instances, the preliminaries to collective prayer have shrunk to the *Dominus vobiscum*[2] followed by *Oremus*. The English rite has departed still further from the primitive model. The traditional ritual group of *The Lord be with you, Let us pray*, followed by a Collect only occurs in the Order of Confirmation.[3] In Divine Service the preliminaries have been separated from the Collects, and in the Holy Communion *The Lord be with you* has been eliminated.

It is possible that the origin of the word 'Collect' is to be found in this primitive custom. Thus the eleventh-century *Micrologus* speaks of *Oratio quam collectam dicunt, eo quod sacerdos . . . omnium petitiones ea oratione colligat atque concludat.*[4]

A more probable explanation of the origin of the name is derived from the *Gregorianum*. In that Sacramentary the heading of the Collects is *ad collectam*. *Collecta* is a late Latin form of *Collectio*, and means assembly. It was the custom in Rome on the more important Sundays and festivals for the Pope, or his representative, to go in procession from one church to another before mass, and the *collecta* was the assembling of the congregation at the former church. Thus the *oratio ad collectam* meant the prayer which was said after the congregation had assembled, but before the procession started. In most cases the same prayer was repeated at the beginning of mass, and became the 'Collect' of the Mass in the modern sense, but Fortescue quotes one instance where the prayer *ad collectam* differs from that *ad missam*.[5]

There seems to be some slight connection between the *Kyrie* and the Collect. The former is the relic of the primitive Litany which preceded the Liturgy. This Litany was probably intro-

[1] Fortescue, *The Mass*, pp. 311 f.

[2] In the Roman rite a bishop says *Pax vobis* on festal occasions, viz. whenever *Gloria in excelsis* is said.

[3] It has been restored in the American and Scottish rites and in the proposed English Book of 1928.

[4] *Op. cit.* iii, quoted by Procter and Frere, *New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, ed. 1908, p. 524.

[5] *The Mass*, p. 245.

duced at Rome in the fifth century,[1] and as long as it lasted its petitions were no doubt similar to those surviving in our only examples of the original type of Collect—the Good Friday prayers. The Collect was, in fact, 'the summing up in Collect form of the petitions' already 'offered in Litany form.'[2] But the Litany very soon shrank into the *Kyrie*. It is not, therefore, surprising that its connection with the Collect was so far forgotten that the insertion of *Gloria in excelsis* between them was not felt as an intrusion.

The Sacramentaries[3] are our earliest sources for this form of prayer; indeed the bulk of a Western Sacramentary consists of little else. From the beginning, so far as our evidence goes, the Collect always varied from day to day. In the language of a later time it belonged to the Proper of the Mass, not to the Ordinary. Thus the *Leonianum* provides four Collects for almost every day, corresponding exactly to those which were afterwards known as *Oratio*, *Oratio Secreta*, *Post-communio*, and *Oratio super Populum*. The first of these is the public opening prayer of the Liturgy, the second is an offertory prayer (said secretly because the choir were still singing the Offertory chant), the third is a thanksgiving, and the fourth (afterwards limited to weekdays in Lent) is of a general character. Originally this last invoked a blessing on the congregation: hence came its title.

In the English rite only the first survives as part of the Proper: but the first petition of the prayer for the Church corresponds to the Secret, the Thanksgiving is an invariable Post-communion, and the Ordinal introduces other prayers 'after the last Collect, and immediately before the Benediction.' The Scottish rite provides ten 'Post-communions for certain Festivals and Seasons, which may be said immediately before the Blessing,' two 'General Post-communions,' and nine other Collects, which may be used in the same way. The proposed 'Alternative Order' of 1928 allows additional Collects before the Blessing.

In the Middle Ages, as in the modern Roman rite, more than one Collect was often said. The general principle was that the first Collect was that of the day, and one or more others might follow if there were any secondary commemoration belonging to the same day; but on the less important days it was arranged that there should always be at least two Collects besides that of the day. These additional Collects were arranged according to certain definite rules which varied in different dioceses. In the modern Roman rite, however, the third Collect is often *ad libitum*

[1] It was clearly a novelty at the beginning of the sixth. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

[2] Procter and Frere, p. 525.

[3] See pp. 132 ff.

sacerdotis. Oremus was repeated before the second Collect; but if there were more than two, all but the first were said *sub una conclusione:* i.e. the celebrant proceeded immediately from the conclusion of the first to the address of the second, and so on, without any conclusion, until he reached the final one. According to the mediæval English rites (but not in the present Roman rite) the number of the Collects was always odd, except on the festivals which fall in Christmas week: for no reason (according to Fortescue) except that *numero Deus impare gaudet.*[1] 'More than seven Collects are not to be said because Christ in the Lord's Prayer did not exceed seven petitions.'[2]

All this complication (and all this additional interest) was removed in 1549. One Collect (in addition to that for the King) is all that is provided. The only exceptions are the holy days after Christmas, on which there is a commemoration of the Nativity, and, since 1661, at Wren's suggestion, a repetition of the Collects of Advent Sunday and Ash Wednesday on every day of Advent and Lent respectively. There is not even any direction what is to be done when a Sunday and a holy-day coincide, though the practice of using both Collects in this case is suggested by common sense and is probably universal.

The Collect has its distinctive form, which is seen at its best in the ancient Collects of the Roman rite and, in equal beauty, in the English translations of them. The old Collects are almost always addressed to God the Father, and the divine name is always associated with the pleading of some divine attribute which justifies the coming petition. Then comes the petition itself, simple, terse, and definite. 'Then, in a perfect specimen . . . the petition has the wings of a holy aspiration given to it, whereupon it may soar to heaven.'[3] The ending is always the same: *Per [eundem] Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum filium tuum qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate [ejusdem] Spiritus sancti Deus per omnia sæcula sæculorum.* The more modern Collects, both Latin and English, are occasionally addressed to God the Son (in which case the ending is modified to correspond[4]) and are often more florid in

[1] But he quotes Amalarius as saying that it is 'because an uneven number cannot be divided, and God will have no division in his Church' (*Eclog. de off. Missæ, P.L.* cv. 1317).

[2] *Sarum Missal:* rubric under First Sunday in Advent.

[3] Goulburn, *On the Communion Office*, p. 37.

[4] This arrangement was set out in several *memoriæ technicæ* of which the following is a specimen.

'Per Dominum' dicas, si Patrem Presbyter oras.
Si Christum memores, 'per eundem' dicere debes.
Si loqueris Christo, 'qui vivis' scire memento;
'Qui tecum,' si sit collectæ finis in ipso.
Si memores Flamen, 'ejusdem' dic prope finem.

Quoted by Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. 243.

character. Characteristic examples in English are those of the first three Sundays in Advent and of many of the feasts of the Saints. These are for the most part creditable compositions, but, with the exception of the admirable Collect of All Saints, they lack the restraint and sensitive beauty of the old prayers.[1]

In the missals of the Roman rite, both mediæval and modern, the ending is never given in full: only the cue is provided, *Per Dominum; Qui vivis:* or the like. The same is true, approximately, of the translations of ancient Collects which appear in the earlier editions of the English Prayer Book. In 1661, however, the traditional ending, or much more frequently only a part of it, was printed, followed by *Amen.* This seems to have been part of the general plan of leaving nothing to chance, tradition or caprice; but the variations do not seem to rest on any principle, and the frequent curtailment of the familiar, sonorous and profoundly theological conclusion seems little better than a wanton maiming of an artistic form.

II. The Liturgical Lessons

The reading of Scripture has always formed a conspicuous part of the introductory portion of the Christian Liturgy, as it had of the Jewish. St. Justin Martyr mentions it as the first feature of the primitive rite. 'The commentaries of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time allows.'[2] Clement[3] and Origen[4] both refer to the practice. Books II and VIII of the *Apostolic Constitutions* have five lessons, two from the Old Testament, followed by psalm singing, then one each from the Acts, the Epistles and the Gospels. Tertullian states that the Roman Church 'combines the Law and the Prophets with the Gospels and the Apostolic letters,' and that lessons are also read in the African Liturgy.[5] The witness of St. Cyprian is the same:[6] he mentions the *ambo* as the place from which they were read.[7]

In the earliest times the lessons were chosen by the presiding minister, and he stopped the reader when enough had been read. Very soon, as was natural, proper lessons were assigned to particular days. These were at first merely marked in the margin of the continuous text of Scripture. The next stage is an index containing the first and last words of each lesson in order. The basis of the Roman arrangement can be traced back

[1] Dr. Lowther Clarke suggests that the form of the Collect is of Jewish origin. Cf. Wisd. i. 9 ff.; 2 Macc. i. 24 ff.; Acts i. 24 f. Everything is there except the terseness (and, naturally, the Christian ending). Perhaps, then, as he surmises, 'the verbosity of some B.C.P. prayers is a reversion to type!'

[2] *Apol.*, I. lxvii. 1.

[3] *Cohortatio ad Gentes* (Migne, *Patr. Gr.*, viii. 237 ff.).

[4] *Homilies*, passim.

[5] *De Praescript.*, 36.

[6] *Epp.* 38, 39.

[7] See Fortescue, *op. cit.*, Ch. I, vi.

to the fifth century, and in the Middle Ages St. Jerome was commonly supposed to have been the original author of it.[1]

The oldest Roman Lectionary [2] in existence is that of Würzburg, believed by Dom Morin to belong to the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century.[3] The same MS. contains an *Evangelarium* of the seventh century, of independent origin.[4] The Capitulary known as the *Comes* of Murbach, containing both Epistles and Gospels, seems to belong to the end of the eighth century.[5]

The number of lessons has varied from time to time and from place to place. The Gallican rite always maintained three, the Prophecy, the Epistle, and the Gospel. In the Roman rite these had been reduced to two for most occasions by the beginning of the sixth century; but there are relics of the older multiplicity in various parts of the Missal. The Ember Wednesdays, two other Wednesdays in Lent,[6] and Good Friday have three lessons: the Ember Saturdays have six or seven. There is also the evidence of the two chants which are ordinarily sung between the Epistle and the Gospel. These are obviously the relics of a time when two chants would be required because there were three lessons. The Orthodox rite has also, since the ninth century, reduced its lessons from three to two.[7]

The English rite, with its passion for uniformity and simplification, has abolished the ancient chants and always provides two lessons and no more; the former is usually an Epistle, but occasionally a Prophecy or a portion from the Acts of the Apostles.

The reading of the liturgical lessons was not in primitive times restricted to men in Holy Orders. But the majesty of the Gospel and the imposing ceremonial which so soon came to surround it naturally tended to confine the proclamation of it to a person of some ecclesiastical dignity. From the fifth century the reading of the Gospel ' becomes more and more the Deacon's special privilege.' [8] Later on, by analogy, the Epistle came to be assigned to the Subdeacon. This, however, was only in the West.

In England, before the Reformation, the Clerk had a canonical right to read the Epistle.[9] This right was continued after the Reformation.[10] In the 1549 Book it is assigned to him ' that is

[1] Procter and Frere, pp. 465 f. Fortescue, *op. cit.*, pp. 254 f.
[2] See p. 132.
[3] *Revue Bénédictine*, January 1910.
[4] *Ibid.* See also July 1911.
[5] See *Rev. Bén.*, January 1913.
[6] The Wednesdays following the Fourth and Sixth Sundays. The former was, in Rome, the day of the *aperitio aurium* of the catechumens, when in the course of a long rite the creed was revealed to them. The latter also seems to have been connected with the coming Paschal Baptism. See Schuster, *The Sacramentary*, ad loc.
[7] Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, pp. 371 f.
[8] Fortescue, *op. cit.*, pp. 280 ff.
[9] Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, iii. 7.
[10] See Atchley, *The Parish Clerk and his right to read the Liturgical Epistle.*

appointed,' and he is called 'the Minister,' and a contemporary manual interprets this as equivalent to the Clerk.[1] So the modern Roman Missal still insists that when Mass is sung without sacred ministers the Epistle shall be read by a *lector* (not sung by the priest).[2] Nor is it always insisted on that the 'Subdeacon' of the Mass shall actually be an ordained subdeacon. But he must be at least a tonsured clerk.[3]

Since 1552 the Prayer Book has assigned both the Epistle and the Gospel to 'the Priest,' but it is clear from the Canons of 1604 that this is not to be interpreted so strictly as to preclude the immemorial practice of the reading of the liturgical lessons by some one other than the celebrant. Canon 24 directs that he is to be 'assisted with the Gospeller and Epistoler.'[4]

There is little ceremonial attaching to the reading of the Epistle. In the modern Roman Use the Subdeacon kisses the celebrant's hand afterwards, and the celebrant makes a gesture of benediction. But from the first beginning of ceremonial development the Gospel has been treated as the very Word of Christ. The procession to the place where it is to be proclaimed has always, so far as possible, been of a magnificent character. The Deacon seeks the celebrant's blessing before exercising his function. Both in the mediæval Uses and in the modern Roman rite the *Textus* is censed.[5] The sign of the cross is made on the text, and on the forehead and breast[6] of the worshippers. The singing is prefaced with *Dominus vobiscum*, and *Gloria tibi, Domine*. After the Gospel, the celebrant (or the Bishop, if present) is censed and kisses the text.[7] There is much less authority for any response after the Gospel. The modern Roman use is to say *Laus tibi, Christe* when the Gospel has been *said*, but not when it has been sung. All the revised Anglican rites enjoin or allow something equivalent. But in the early and mediæval rites nothing was said or sung at this point.

III. The Proper of the English Liturgy

Abbreviations

W. *Comes* of Würzburg
M. *Comes* of Murbach
} See pp. 132, 379.

[1] Wickham Legg, *The Clerk's Book*. See P. Dearmer, *The Parson's Handbook*, ed. 1907, p. 331.
[2] *Missale Romanum, Ritus Servandus*, vi. 8.
[3] *S.R.C.*, March 14, 1906.
[4] Dearmer, *op. cit.*, p. 328.
[5] On the Altar (Sarum): after the Gospel has been announced (Modern).
[6] Also, in modern usage, on the mouth.
[7] In the mediæval Uses all in choir kissed the text.

Ha. *Hadrianum.*
P. Paduan Sacramentary.
Greg. *Gregorianum.*
Gel. *Gelasianum.*
M. Mixed.
L. *Leonianum.*
} See pp. 132–134.
Moz. Mozarabic rite.
SG. St. Gall (Gelasian MS.).
Pam. Pamelius.
Th. *Comes* Theotenchi.
A. Alcuin.
Cass. Monte Cassino Missal.
S. Sarum.
Y. York.
H. Hereford.
E. Mediæval English Uses in general.
R. Modern Roman rite.
R. All forms of Roman rite, including mediæval English.
B.C.P. Book of Common Prayer.
Ca. Canadian Revision (1922).
Sc. Scottish rite (1929).
Am. American rite (1929).
1928. Proposed new English rite of that year.

The ancient Sacramentaries, Lectionaries and Antiphonaries provide a rich and ever-growing number of Proper Masses. From about the time of Pope Damasus it seems that the principle of considerable variation according to the Calendar has been accepted and acted upon. The Proper of the Mass consists of at least nine parts: Introit, Collect, Epistle, Gradual with Alleluiatic verse or Tract, Gospel, Offertory, Secret, Communion, and Post-Communion. In the Sarum Missal a separate *Proprium* was provided for all Sundays and great feasts, very many Saints' days, all days in Lent and in the weeks of Easter and Pentecost, Ember Days, Rogation Monday and the more important vigils. For other Saints' days and vigils there was a *Commune.* For all Wednesdays, and for Fridays except after Trinity, there was a Proper Epistle and Gospel.[1] The days on which the Sunday Mass was repeated were few. Indeed, not only in the Middle Ages but until quite recent times, the Roman rite has tended to omit the Sunday Mass altogether in favour of the feasts of the Saints.[2]

[1] In early times in Rome there was a *Synaxis* every Wednesday and Friday with its Proper Lesson. In some arrangements the three Gospel Lessons for the week were the accounts of the same event taken from different evangelists.

[2] The great liturgical reformation which restored the dignity of the Dominical Mass and Office was made in 1911.

All this exuberance was swept away quite ruthlessly by the English reformers. The members of the *Proprium* were reduced to four, and then, by the excision of the Introit, to three: the ferial and vigiliary Masses disappeared from the *Temporale*, as well as the special observance of the whole weeks of Easter and Pentecost: *Corpus Christi* was eliminated: and the somewhat rank growth of the *Sanctorale* was cut down to the observance of two feasts of our Lady and twenty (afterwards nineteen) of the other Saints. This process has been reversed to some extent in the later Anglican rites, especially Sc 1928.

In the Epistles and Gospels, Sc often adopts R.V. renderings; 1928 does the same more sparingly, Am once, Ca twice.

Advent I.

Collect. 1549. Framed to harmonise with the Epistle, as is characteristic of the period. Cf. Advent II, Quinquagesima, Lent I, Easter II, St. Matthias, St. Barnabas.

Epistle. WM*R* (lengthened). (W gives Epistles for five Sundays, of which the Second, omitted here, appears in S on Trinity XXV.)

Gospel. MSY. The Gospels in R are one place in advance: Advent I (R) = Advent II (E, B.C.P.); and so on throughout Advent.

'The four Sundays in Advent set forth . . . the Majesty of our Lord's Person and Kingdom.'[1]

Advent II.

Collect. 1549. Develops one lesson from the Epistle, and so gives the Sunday a special character as devoted to the consideration of the witness of Scripture to our Lord.

Epistle. WM*R*.

Gospel. ME.

Advent III.

Gaudete Sunday (from first word of Introit in *R*). Its dignity arose from the fact that it was treated as the Sunday before Christmas, since the actual last Sunday in Advent was overshadowed by the Ordinations. The Pope spent much of Saturday night in vigil at St. Peter's.

Collect by Cosin: 1661, replacing a translation of the *R* Collect.

Epistle. WME.

Gospel. ME.

In B.C.P. the whole of this *Proprium* has reference to the coming

[1] Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer, ad. loc.*

Ordinations. R has transferred the Epistle from Advent IV to match the Introit.

Sc has a Collect for Advent Ember Days, 'which may be said after the Collect of the Day' (*i.e.* of the preceding Sunday). This is the second of the Ember Week Prayers of B.C.P., but was derived originally from the Scottish Book of 1637.

Ca has the same Collect, and Am another one for all Ember Days. Both have newly-selected Lessons and Gospels: Ca, Acts xiii. 1–3; Luke x. 17–24: Am, Acts xiii. 44–49; Luke iv. 16–21.

1928 prints several alternative Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for Ember Days after the *Commune Sanctorum*. The Collects are the two Ember Week prayers from B.C.P., the former of which was inserted in 1661 from Cosin's *Private Devotions*.

Advent IV.

In the most ancient *Ordines*, *Dominica vacat*. The Saturday Ember vigil was concluded with a Mass in the early hours of Sunday at which holy Orders were conferred; and the people were not expected to assemble for another Mass.

Collect. Originally derived from Gel for Advent II. In PHaGreg this is assigned to Advent IV, and is addressed to Christ, as an invocation of His presence at the Nativity. In this form it appears in *R*. In B.C.P. the address reverts to the Father. Ca returns again to the form of Greg*R*.

Epistle. WME. R has the Epistle which anciently belonged to Advent III.

Gospel. ME. R, as usually after an Ember week, repeats Saturday's Gospel.

Christmas Eve.

Sc provides a Lesson (Mic. v. 1–5) and a Gospel (Luke ii. 1–14, identical with the alternative Gospel for Christmas Day). 1928 gives these two, and also a Collect which is the *R* Collect for this day (PHaGelGreg), modified by the translation of *expectatione* as 'remembrance.' This is derived from 1549, where it serves as the Collect for the First Communion of Christmas.

Christmas Day.

The greatest feasts in ancient times had two Masses, the former of the vigil, said in the late afternoon of the preceding day, the latter of the feast, said in the morning of the day itself.

The 'Midnight Mass' (originally *ad galli cantum:* in R *in nocte*) is the original vigiliary Mass of Christmas, celebrated (in Rome) in the small chapel *ad praesepe* in St. Mary Major. (Christmas Day is of purely Roman origin.) To this was added in very early times a station at St. Anastasia, in memory of the martyrdom of

that saint. Then, as Christmas grew in importance, this Mass came to be thought of as an additional Christmas Mass *in Aurora*. Finally, all three became Masses of the feast, and yet another was added in celebration of the vigil.

1549, Am provide two Masses.

Collect. 1549, replacing the verbose composition of E (Moz, characteristically Gallican). This Collect is probably suggested by Greg for Sunday after Christmas.

The *R* Collect for the vigil, slightly altered as we have just seen, serves as the Collect of the First Communion of 1549 and Am. The same Collect appears in CaSc as ' an Additional Collect for Christmastide.'

Epistle. WM*R*.

The Epistle for the First Communion of 1549 and Am is Tit. ii. 11–14 (Am 11–15) from the WM*R* First Mass. Sc allows the same Epistle to be used at one celebration (if there be more than one), saying nothing about the order of sequence, and also on unoccupied days during the Octave.

Gospel. WM*R*.

The Gospel from the First Communion of 1549 and Am is Luke ii. 1–14 from the WM*R* First Mass. In regard to this Sc has the same direction as for the Epistle, but provides yet another alternative Gospel, Matt. i. 18–25. It seems obvious that there should be some opportunity for the solemn liturgical reading of the account of the Nativity, even though it forms the First Lesson at Mattins. The three Masses of *R* give us first the story of the Nativity, then that of the visit of the shepherds, and then the deep theology of the Incarnation.

St. Stephen.

Collect. The original is Greg and *R*. A shortened form appears in 1549; but it was again amplified by Cosin in 1661. In both English forms it is addressed to the Son, apparently to harmonise with the martyr's dying prayer. In its present form it is reminiscent of the Gallican *contestatio* for this day, but it is hardly likely that this was known to Cosin.

Lesson. WM*R* (shortened).

Gospel. WM*R*. The emphasis on *sending* might suggest an Apostle, and the Orthodox speak of St. Stephen under this title. (The Orthodox Gospel is Matt. xxi. 33–43, with the same stress on *mission*.)

St. John.

Collect. PHaGreg*R*.
Epistle. 1549.
Gospel. WM*R*.

H. Innocents.

Collect. 1661. Adaptation of PHaGel*R* (where it is addressed to the Son).

Lesson. WM*R*. The choice of this lesson had the curious effect that in the Middle Ages it was commonly believed that the number of the victims at Bethlehem was 144,000!

Gospel. WM*R*.

Sunday after Christmas.

Collect as for Christmas Day.

Epistle. M*R*.

Gospel is *R* Gospel for Christmas Eve. The change was made in 1549, but from then till 1661 the Genealogy was prefixed. The original *R* Gospel is Luke ii. 33–40, dating as it does from a period anterior to the feast of the Purification. On Christmas Day 'The Eucharistic scriptures memorialised the condescension of the Word made flesh; on this day they set forth the exaltation of human nature by that condescension.' [1]

The Circumcision.

At first this was simply the Octave day of Christmas and the *R* Mass hardly mentions the Circumcision. 'The change of Collect and Epistle . . . has altered the proportion of things, and in fact turned the day into a commemoration of circumcision, rather than of the Circumcision of our Lord; not to edification.' [2]

Collect. 1549. Adapted from a Benediction in Greg.

Epistle. 1549. But the Epistle in the Westminster Missal overlapped this passage, and is unique among ancient Epistles in having reference to circumcision.

Sc Epistle is Eph. ii. 11–18, which is given as an alternative in 1928. Am has Phil. ii. 9–13.

Gospel. Enlarged from M*R*, in which the Gospel consisted of Luke ii. 21 only. But in W (there being hitherto no feast of the Purification in Rome) it was continued to ver. 32.

1928 adds a Collect to commemorate the first day of the civil year. There can, of course, be no liturgical precedent for this, inasmuch as the year began on March 25 until the middle of the eighteenth century.

From the eleventh century onwards the Saints' days after Christmas were observed with Octaves, and there were in consequence no free days between the Circumcision and Epiphany, Jan. 5 being the vigil of the Epiphany, or, later and in England only, the Octave of St. Thomas of Canterbury. The direction to use the Circumcision *Proprium* on the Second Sunday after Christmas dates from 1552, and was amended in 1661 so as to

[1] Blunt, *op. cit., ad loc.* [2] Brightman, *The English Rite*, p. xcv.

allow for the employment of it 'every day . . . vnto the Epiphany.'

AmSc1928 provide for a Second Sunday after Christmas.

The Collects in Sc1928 are two different translations of a prayer from L (the same which appears in R as the blessing of the water at the Offertory). The Epistle in Sc is Tit. iii. 4–6 (appointed for the Daybreak Mass of Christmas in *R*) or 1 John iv. 9–16; in 1928 it is 2 Cor. viii. 9 (one verse only). The Gospel in both is John i. 14–18.

Am Collect is a free translation of the Collect of the *R* Daybreak Mass. The Lesson is Isa. lxi. 1–3; the Gospel Matt. ii. 19–23 (the *R* Gospel for the vigil of Epiphany).

Epiphany.

The oldest name, still used by the Orthodox, was 'Theophany,' witnessing to the origin of the feast as the great commemoration of the Incarnation considered as the revelation of God. In the East it is older than Christmas, but has always had a more theological and less historical or commemorative character. Indeed the Baptism of our Lord, rather than His Nativity, was the incident selected to illustrate the doctrine. The original idea has left traces in *R* in the preface and *Infra actionem:* and the *R* Gospel of the Octave Day commemorates the Baptism, though this Gospel is not found in the early *Evangelaria.*

The commemoration of the adoration of the Magi is Western, and so is the special association with the Gentiles.

The B.C.P. explanation of the title of the feast dates from 1661. It was one of Wren's suggestions,[1] and Cosin objected to the words 'to the Gentiles.'

Collect. PHa*R* (slightly altered).

Epistle. 1549. The *R* Epistle from Isa. lx was transferred to form the beginning of the First Lesson at Mattins.

Gospel. WM*R*.

B.C.P. gives no directions for the observance of an Octave. The letter of the rubrics therefore suggests that this *Proprium* should only be used until the following Sunday; but all mediæval tradition would favour the use of it throughout the Octave. AmCa direct the former course, Sc 1928 the latter.

Epiphany I.

A dislocation appears at this point between the ancient and modern rites on the one hand, and the mediæval ones on the other. At first the feast of the Epiphany had no Octave, and the Sunday services resumed their ordinary course. When the Octave was first instituted it was treated as one continuous

[1] So also Septuagesima, etc.

feast which included the Sunday which happened to fall within it. Thus the *Propria* for the following Sundays were all moved one forward. R and B.C.P. have reverted to the earlier arrangement, in spite of the fact that R keeps the Octave. Thus in R, as in B.C.P., the service for this day is the original Sunday service, with commemoration of the feast.

The Epistles for four continuous Sundays from this day evidently form part of a continuous course. Rom. was begun in *R* on Christmas Eve. It is now picked up again at c. xii.

The Gospels leave the consideration of the lowliness of our Lord's coming for that of the display of His glory by miracle.

Collect. PGregSGR (E, Epiphany II). It was in relation to this Collect that Celestine I made the famous aphorism, *Legem credendi lex statuat orandi.*

Epistle. WMR (E, Epiphany II).

Gospel. WMR (E, Epiphany II). It seems likely that this Gospel and that of the following Sunday may once have belonged to the days immediately following the Epiphany. They deal with events which have a close traditional connection with the feast. The appointment of an Octave entailed the repetition of the same service every day.

The Epistles for Epiphany I, II, III are from W; but there they are provided for the three days immediately following the feast.

Epiphany II.

Collect. GregSGR (E, Epiphany III).
Epistle. MR (E, Epiphany III).
Gospel. WMR (E, Epiphany III). Am has Mark i. 1–11.

Epiphany III.

Collect. PGregSGR (E, Epiphany IV).
Epistle. MR (E, Epiphany IV).
Gospel. WMR (E, Epiphany IV).

Epiphany IV.

Collect. PGregSGR (E, Epiphany V).

Epistle. 1549. The lengthening of the Epistle for Advent I makes it include the ancient Epistle for this Sunday: hence the alteration.

Gospel. Lengthened in 1549 from WM (E, Epiphany V).

Epiphany V.

Collect. GregSGR (E, Epiphany VI). *Pietate*, which in the original seems to be an attribute of God, is translated 'true religion.'

Epistle. MR (E, Epiphany VI).

Gospel. WR (SH, Epiphany VI). Equally suitable for the Third Sunday before Advent, to which it has often to be transferred.

Epiphany VI.

Collect. 1661, probably by Cosin. Framed from the Epistle.

Epistle and Gospel. 1661. The latter is more suitable for the Second Sunday before Advent, to which it has most often to be transferred.

From 1549 to 1662, in the somewhat rare event of there being six Sundays after Epiphany the *Proprium* for the Fifth Sunday was used on the Sixth also.

Preparation for Lent. This cycle of three Sundays was arranged by St. Gregory, and the Collects for the first two 'reflect the terror and grief that filled the minds of the Romans in those years during which war, pestilence, and earthquake threatened the utter destruction of the former mistress of the world.' [1]

Septuagesima.

Collect. PHa*R*.

Epistle. WM*R* (shortened). Additional significance is given to its teaching about the Christian athlete when it is remembered that at the stational Mass ordained by St. Gregory at the Basilica of St. Lawrence the congregation had just had a long and tiring walk to the martyr's tomb.

Gospel. WM*R*. But W provides also for ten Sundays after Epiphany, pointing back to a time before the institution of the Septuagesima season.

Sexagesima.

Collect (in the original) and Epistle recall the Station at the Basilica of S. Paul.

Collect. PHaSG*R* (with substitution of 'by thy power' for *Doctoris gentium protectione*).

Epistle. WM*R* (shortened).

Gospel. WM*R*. This is also possibly connected with St. Paul as the greatest of missionaries.

Quinquagesima.

In the Durham Book Cosin inserted this rubric: 'This Collect, Epistle, and Gospel shall serve only till the Wednesday following.' The Collect and Epistle remind us that discipline is unavailing unless accompanied by love.

[1] Schuster, *op. cit., ad loc.*

Collect. 1549. The *R* collect had reference to the sacramental Confession customary at this season.
Epistle. WM*R*.
Gospel. WM*R*.

Ash Wednesday.

There is a rubric in the Durham Book, ordering that the *Proprium* is to 'serve until the Sunday following.' So also AmSc. The text of 1661 seems to imply a reversion to the *Proprium* of the preceding Sunday. So also 1928, so far as the Collect is concerned.

Collect. 1549. Partly formed from one of the prayers for the blessing of ashes on this day. 'To be read every day in Lent,' 1661; 'until Maundy Thursday,' Sc1928; 'until Palm Sunday,' Am.
Epistle. WM*R*.
Gospel. WM*R*.
Sc and 1928 provide Epistles or other Lessons and Gospels for all weekdays in Lent. Of the Gospels rather more than half are from WM*R*, but only two of the other Lessons. W has no Lessons for the Thursday and Saturday after Ash Wednesday, as it dates from a period when the keeping of the days before Quadragesima Sunday was still voluntary, and there were no stational Masses, except the usual ones of Wednesday and Friday. M supplies the missing days, the Masses for which were drawn up in the time of Gregory II.
The Lessons and Epistles of Sc and 1928 are selected from the Prophets until the end of the First Week. After that the greater parts of Heb. and Col. are read through in order. This is a reversion to the primitive plan of reading the Scriptures straight through.

Lent I.

Collect. 1549. 'Motions' substituted for 'monicions' in 1559.
Epistle. WM*R*. A very happy choice for the Sunday before the Lenten Ordinations, combining as it does the thought of the opportunity of Lent with that of the ministerial ideal.
Gospel. WM*R*. This Sunday is still in some ways, as it was originally, the beginning of Lent. Hence a Gospel is chosen which sets the tone for the whole season.

Ember Days.

Sc has the same Collect as in Advent, and a Gospel (Matt. ix. 36–38), taken from the Ordering of Priests: to be used alternatively with those from the regular Lenten course.

Lent II.

Originally a vacant Sunday (cf. Advent IV). Hence there are great variations in the *Proprium*. Schuster speaks of the 'patchwork composition' of the R Mass, and E has not much more individuality. When the local Roman Sacramentary and Lectionary were adopted in other places, it was necessary to make up a *Proprium* from various sources.

Collect. PHaSG*R*. This Collect does belong to the Sunday, and has not been borrowed from some other day.

Epistle. Slightly lengthened from M*R*. In W this is the Epistle of the Vigil (*i.e.* the Saturday Ember Day).

Gospel. ME (R repeats the Gospel of the Saturday).

Lent III.

The Roman station to-day was at the Basilica of St. Laurence, and the *Proprium* is said to be influenced by that fact.

Collect. PHa*R*.

Epistle. WM*R* (lengthened). Pelagius II carried out extensive alterations at St. Laurence's Basilica, building a new *aula* and letting in the light from this into the older part of the building. An inscription by the Pope himself still connects this with the glare of the flames of the martyrdom. It is probable that there is an allusion to this symbolism in the selection of the Epistle: *Eratis enim aliquando tenebrae : nunc autem lux in Domino. Ut filii lucis ambulate : fructus enim lucis est . . .*

Gospel. WM*R*. There may be an allusion to the victory of God through His martyr Laurence, and to the dedication of the new *aula* in honour of the Blessed Virgin.

Lent IV

Laetare Sunday (from the first word of the Introit in *R*). Otherwise Refreshment Sunday (from the miracle narrated in the Gospel). In the East this day was kept as a festival of the Holy Cross, and in Rome the station was at the Basilica of 'the holy Cross in Jerusalem.' This is the explanation of the frequent mention of Jerusalem in the ancient *Proprium*. This is of a festal character throughout, and is evidently designed as a relief to the spirit in the midst of the severities of Lent.

Collect. PHaSG*R*. Prays for relief in the midst of merited suffering.

Epistle. WM*R* (shortened, and so omitting the magnificent climax of Gal. v. 1). Sc1928 provide Heb. xii. 22–24 as an alternative, no doubt on the ground of the difficulty of St. Paul's allegorisation in the traditional Gal. iv. The triumph of the Church over its persecutors, like that of Isaac, and of Christ.

Gospel. WM*R*. Refreshment in the wilderness of Lent.

Lent V. Passion Sunday.

Collect. PHaSG*R*.

Epistle. WM*R*. A classic statement of the theology of the Passion.

Gospel. WM*R*. The final declaration of war between our Lord and the Jews.

Sc provides six Collects 'which may be said at any service from Passion Sunday to Good Friday inclusive.' The first three are adapted from Latin Collects (the third from the *R* Collect for Wednesday in Holy Week); the last three are modern.

Lent VI. Palm Sunday.

The name is very ancient, occurring in Gel. But the Mass of the day has always been entirely connected with the Passion. The commemoration of the events of the original Palm Sunday is not a primitive feature in the West, and when it does appear (first in the ninth century) it remains entirely separate from the Mass. The only exceptions to be made to this statement are the fact that, according to Lanfranc's *Decreta* (col. 455) and some other authorities, the Gospel, Matt. xxi. 1–9, was to be used at Low Mass, and the very late usage (sixteenth or seventeenth century) of reading this passage as the Last Gospel of all Masses except that before which the blessing and procession of Palms has taken place. But palms have been held during parts of the service since the eleventh century.

Collect. PHaSG*R*.

Epistle. WM*R*. In R a genuflexion is made at the words *ut in nomine Jesu omne genu flectatur.*

Gospel. WM*R* (much shortened). The story of the Passion has been read as the Gospel at least since the middle of the fifth century.

The traditional way of announcing it, both on Palm Sunday and on the other days when it is read, has always been *Passio D.N.J.C. secundum N. Gloria tibi* has practically always been omitted. In mediæval times the striking custom arose of singing the greater part of the 'Passion' dramatically.[1] Another mediæval custom is that of holding palms while it is being sung.

The drastic shortening of the Gospel in B.C.P. dates from 1661. In WM*R* the whole of Matt. xxvi, xxvii. is read. 1549 omitted xxvii. 57–66. 1928 allows Matt. xxvi, xxvii. 1–61 to be 'read or sung,' distinguishing it from 'the Gospel,' which (if the whole Passion be read) is Matt. xxvii. 62–66. In that case Matt. xxv 1–13 may be read as the Gospel at other celebrations of Hoi. Communion.

[1] See p. 734.

Sc allows Matt. xxi. 1–13 at one celebration, if there be more than one.

Monday before Easter.

In the fourth and fifth centuries there was apparently neither Mass nor reading of the Passion on Monday and Tuesday.[1] But Gel and Greg both imply complete Masses for both days.

Am has a Proper Collect each day in this week.

Lesson. 1549.

Sc has 1 Cor. i. 18 ff. as an alternative.

Gospel. Since 1549 the Passion Gospels from St. Mark and St. Luke have been divided into two and assigned to Monday and Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday respectively. M has John xii. 1–23; E, John xii. 1–36; R, John xii. 1–9.

Tuesday before Easter.

Lesson. This is the WM*R* lesson for Monday (slightly lengthened). It is difficult to see the motive for the change.

Gospel. In the earliest *Evangelaria* St. Mark's Passion is not read, probably because it was thought to be a mere abbreviation of Matt. M has John xii. 24–43; W, John xiii. 1–32: *R*, the complete Passion according to Mark.

Wednesday before Easter.

Lesson. 1549. WM*R* have a Lesson from Isaiah.

Lesson shortened in Sc.

Gospel. WM*R* have the complete Passion according to Luke.

Thursday before Easter. Maundy Thursday.

Gel has three Masses, the first connected with the reconciliation of penitents, the second with the consecration of the holy oils, the third, in the evening, in commemoration of the Last Supper. The second was a festal Mass.[2] The R Mass borrows its festal character from the second, as may be seen by comparing the E uses. Thus S confines the use of *Gloria in excelsis* to the Pontifical Mass at which the bishop consecrated the oils. So also Grandison's Exeter *Ordinale* (fourteenth century) limits the use of (festal) white ornaments to the same occasion.

But the structure of the *R* Mass shows that it is actually the survivor of the third Mass rather than the second. For the third Mass apparently began at the Offertory. Gel has no Collect and all the early part of *R* is borrowed from elsewhere.

Collect. Am has a Collect referring to the Institution, and Sc gives as 'an Additional Collect' a translation of the well-known Corpus Christi prayer of St. Thomas Aquinas (rendering *Deus* as 'O Lord Jesus Christ').

[1] Tyrer, *The Services of Holy Week*, pp. 34, 74. [2] Greg has one Mass only.

Epistle. WM*R* (lengthened), repeated from the Third Nocturn of *R* Mattins. Am has the same passage much shortened.

Gospel. There is no precedent for reading the Passion on this day. M*R* have John xiii. 1–13 (which at one time was read on the preceding Tuesday) [1] and Am allows this as an alternative.

Good Friday.

Collects. (1) is a translation of the *Oratio super populum* in Ha*R* for Wednesday, which is also used for all offices until None on Saturday. It is greatly superior to the *R* Mass-Collect, repeated from Thursday.

(2) is a translation of the third of the solemn Prayers of *R*.[2]

(3) 1549; but evidently suggested by the seventh, eighth and ninth of the solemn Prayers. There is a revision of this prayer in Ca, another in Am, another in 1928, and a fourth in Sc. This last is an amendment of 1928, as suggested by the late Dr. Brightman. Sc allows, in addition, the use of a prayer for the Jews from the *Prayers and Thanksgivings*.

Epistle. 1549.

Gospel. WM*R* (much shortened). The Ambrosian rite has St. Matthew; Moz a cento from the four Gospels.

The shortening, as on Palm Sunday, dates from 1661. 1928 allows the whole of John xviii, xix. to be 'read or sung,' making the division between 'the Passion' and 'the Gospel' at the end of xix. 37 (the traditional point).

Easter Even.

There is some precedent for the provision of a service for the morning of the vigil of Easter (as distinguished from the vigiliary Mass, which was the climax of the vigil, and belonged in primitive times to the early morning of Easter Day). In the Ambrosian rite, since the twelfth century, at latest, the following service has found a place: Lesson, Psalm, Gospel, Collect. Something of the same sort seems to have been usual in Gaul in the sixth century.[3]

Collect. 1661.

Epistle. 1549.

Gospel. Ambrosian, Bobbio (lengthened).

Easter Day.

1549 had two *Propria*. These correspond to the vigiliary Mass and the Mass of the day. The former is the more important, like the vigiliary Masses of the Ember Saturdays: so much so that in some places it actually was the only Mass of Easter Day.[4] The vigil service, culminating in the Mass, 'was looked on as the most

[1] Schuster, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*
[2] See p. 374.
[3] Tyrer, *op. cit.*, pp. 145, 146.
[4] Schuster, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

important service in the whole year.'[1] But when it came to be celebrated on Saturday morning it naturally fell into the background.[2] Am provides two Masses, and Sc an alternative Epistle and Gospel which may be used at one celebration if there be more than one, and also on any day in the Octave not otherwise supplied.

Collect. PHaSG*R*.

Epistle. WM*R* (the Mass of the vigil; lengthened).

Gospel. WM*R* (Mass of the Saturday in the Octave).

The second Mass of Am is the same as that of 1549, except the Collect, which is a Greg prayer from the S *Processionale*, slightly altered. The same Collect, utilised by Cranmer in the vestige of a Procession which he introduced before Mattins on Easter Day,[3] appears in Sc and 1928 as an Additional Collect which may be used until Ascension Day (Sc) or during the Easter Octave (1928). Epistle, 1 Cor. v. 6–8; WM*R* (lengthened): Gospel, Mark vi. 1–8; WM*R*.

Sc has the same Gospel as its alternative one, but a new Epistle (Heb. xiii. 20–21).

Monday in Easter Week.

The Easter Octave is the oldest of all Octaves. In Rome the whole week was kept holy, and no secular business was done. But there is also considerable early precedent for restricting the actual holy days to three or four (including Easter Day). In the late Middle Ages four was the usual number.

Lesson. WMCass*R*.

Gospel. WMCass*R*.

The Scriptures are both connected with St. Peter, and in the Middle Ages the Pope used to make a solemn procession to St. Peter's on this day.

Am has a proper Collect; but the Collect of the First Communion of Easter Day is to be repeated all through the week. Cosin desired the use of the Collect from the *Processionale* mentioned above.

Tuesday in Easter Week.

Lesson. WMCass*R* (lengthened). Connected with the station at St. Paul's.

Gospel. WMCass*R* (slightly lengthened).

From 1549 till 1661 the Collect was that now used on Easter I.

Am has a proper Collect, derived from Greg*R* for the following Saturday.

[1] Tyrer, *op. cit.*, p. 147. [2] See p. 738.
[3] See p. 157.

Easter Week.

Sc1928 provide Epistles or other Lessons, and Gospels, for the remaining days of the week. The Epistles and Lessons are from WM*R*,[1] but only one of the Gospels (that for Friday).

Easter I.

Collect. 1549.

The Epistles on the Sundays from Easter to Pentecost are all from W, but the order has been changed.

Epistle. WMCass*R* (lengthened). Schuster suggests, rather fancifully, that the reason for avoiding the Pauline Epistles in Eastertide is the fact that St. Paul was not converted till after Pentecost.

Gospel. WMCass*R* (shortened). B.C.P. Gospel no longer commemorates the events of the eighth day after Easter, since they are now narrated in the second Lesson at Evensong.

Easter II.

Collect. 1549.

Epistle. WM*R* (lengthened).

Gospel. WM*R*.

Easter III.

Collect. First in L as part of a Mass for St. Laurence and other martyrs. PGregGelSG*R*.

Epistle. WM*R* (shortened).

Gospel. WM*R*. The first of a sequence of three from the last discourse of our Lord, chosen, says Schuster, either 'because He describes, as being within the limits of one prophetic vision, His death, His resurrection, His ascension to His Father and the descent of the Holy Ghost, so many different aspects . . . of the one mystery . . . the Christian Pasch—or because, owing to the length of the Divine Office on Maundy Thursday, it was impossible to read this discourse.'

Easter IV.

Collect. PGregGelSG*R*. *Deus qui fidelium mentes unius efficis voluntatis.* Literally translated in 1549. Cosin: 'which dost make all men to be of one mind.' The present rendering eliminates the idea of unity.

Epistle. WM*R*.

Gospel. WM*R*.

Easter V.

There is no early authority for calling to-day 'Rogation Sunday' (AmSc1928). There can hardly be any direct connec-

[1] Wednesday's Lesson is not in W.

tion between its services and the Gallican observance of the Rogation Litanies, which did not find its way to Rome till the ninth century. But the Collect and the Gospel do in fact form an excellent introduction to the Rogations.

Collect. PGregGelSG*R*.
Epistle. WM*R*.
Gospel. WM*R* (lengthened).

Cosin desired a rubric confining the use of this *Proprium* to the Sunday, and suggested a special Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the Rogation Days. The Commission of 1689 made a similar suggestion.

Rogation Days.

CaAm provide a special Epistle (or Lesson) and Gospel. The Epistle (Jas. v. 16–20) in Ca and the Gospel (Luke xi. 5–13) in Am are from the *R* Rogation Mass. (In R this is the Mass for all Rogation Days, including April 25, but on account of the vigil it is not used on Wednesday except in collegiate churches: in S it is proper to Monday only.) Lesson (Am), Ezek. xxxiv. 25 ff.; Gospel (Ca), Matt. vii. 1–11.

Sc1928 have a Proper Epistle and Gospel for each day. Those for Tuesday are from the *R* Rogation Mass.

Monday: Epistle, Jas. v. 7–11; Gospel, Luke vi. 36–42.
Tuesday: Epistle, Jas. v. 16–20; Gospel, Luke xi. 5–13.

Vigil of the Ascension.

Sc1928 have the *R* Epistle (Eph. iv. 7–13) and Gospel (John xvii. 1–11). The *R* Mass being post-Gregorian borrows the Collect of the Sunday, as do Sc1928.

Ascension Day.

Collect. PHaCassSG*R*.
Lesson. WM*R*.
Gospel. WM*R*. 1928 provides an alternative Gospel (Luke xxiv. 44 ff.), presumably on critical grounds.

Am orders the repetition of the Collect through the Octave, but from Sunday onwards this is evidently meant to be only by way of memorial; for the *Proprium* of the Sunday is to be used throughout the next week. Sc allows and 1928 enjoins the use of the Ascension Day *Proprium* throughout the Octave. This is in harmony with the later mediæval tradition. Am Gospel is Luke xxiv. 49–53.

Sunday after Ascension Day.

The *R* Mass is many centuries older than the observance of the Octave, and consequently looks forward rather than back. The expectation of Pentecost was vividly illustrated in early days in

Rome by the custom of showering roses through the opening in the roof of the Pantheon during the sermon at the stational Mass.[1]

Collect. 1549. Evidently suggested by the antiphon to *Magnificat* on Ascension Day (EGregGel); altered by being now addressed to the Father.

Epistle. WM*R*.

Gospel. WM*R*.

Whitsunday.

The *R* rite, as at Easter, has a vigiliary Mass which is properly the climax of an all-night vigil, but has in practice been celebrated on Saturday for many centuries.[2] Only Am now provides for two Communions.

Collect. PHCassSG*R*.

Lesson. WMCass*R*.

Gospel. A combination of the Gospel of the vigiliary Mass (John xiv. 15–21), WM*R*, with that of the feast, WMCass*R*, v. 22 being inserted between them. 1549 had the former part only. The latter part was added in 1552. The combination seems to make a passage of excessive length for a great festival, and it is strange that none of the Anglican revisions has curtailed it.

The alternative Am *Proprium* is to be used at the First Communion (if there be two). The Collect seems to be modern: the Epistle is 1 Cor. xii. 4–14: the Gospel Luke xi. 9–13 (part of the *R* Gospel for the Rogations).

Monday in Whitsun Week.

Lesson. WM*R* (lengthened).

Gospel. WM*R*.

Am has a Proper Collect.

Tuesday in Whitsun Week.

Lesson. WM*R*.

Gospel. WM*R*.

Am has a proper Collect.

Sc1928 provide Lessons and Gospels for the remaining days of the week. Thursday's Lesson and both passages on Saturday are new: the rest are from *R*. But Thursday's *R* Lesson is transferred to Friday. The *R* Mass for the Ember Days is very ancient (WM). The reference to the Eucharist in Wednesday's Gospel is interesting. Many centuries before the institution of Corpus Christi the instinct of the Church is seen turning to the thought of the Blessed Sacrament immediately after Pentecost. The observance of an Octave dates from the end of the fifth century, and it is noticeable that the ancient *Pericopæ* have hardly any

[1] Schuster, *op. cit., ad loc.*

[2] This vigiliary Mass has never had the importance of that at Easter. As at Christmas the final Mass is the principal one. Schuster, *op. cit., ad loc.*

mention of Pentecost after Tuesday. W indeed has no Mass at all for Thursday. The Gospel (Luke ix. 1–6; *R*Sc1928) seems to be chosen because of the station which at one time was held *ad Apostolos*.[1]

For the Ember Days Sc allows the Ember Collect to be said after that of Pentecost.

Trinity Sunday.

The feast was imposed on the Western Church in 1334. But it had long been customary to use a Mass of the Holy Trinity on this day as a votive Mass, and in England St. Thomas of Canterbury is said to have instituted it as a regular feast of that mystery.

In the earliest times, as with other Sundays following the Ember vigil, this day was left vacant. From the eighth to the fourteenth centuries, it was treated as the Octave of Pentecost. But the institution of the feast of the Holy Trinity made the Octave end (as the Easter Octave originally did) on Saturday. R prints the ancient Lesson and Gospel of *Dominica I post Pentecosten* immediately after those of Trinity Sunday, and they are actually used on the ensuing three days, unless these are otherwise occupied. E treated the problem differently. The whole Mass of the First Sunday after Pentecost except the Gospel was transferred to the following Sunday. This and all other Sundays to Advent were now reckoned by S as 'after Trinity.' HY generally reckon 'after the Octave of Pentecost.' Thus for the first few Sundays of this season E is one behind R. But as the season proceeds there are further complications. B.C.P. follows E consistently, but occasionally alters the length of the passages.

Collect. Greg*R*. The translation in 1549 was accurate: 'that through the steadfastness of this faith we may evermore be defended from all adversity.'

Lesson. ME.

Gospel. WME. This Gospel, the original one for the First Sunday after Pentecost, is, naturally, unconnected with the observance of the feast of the Holy Trinity.

From this point onwards the Epistles in W are not attached to the Sundays after Pentecost, but to Sundays grouped round the 'immovable festivals'; and there has been much dislocation of order. Henceforward, therefore, the letter W only means that a particular *Pericope* is found in that Lectionary and assigned to some Sunday after Pentecost.

Trinity I.

Collect. P[II] GregMSG[II]E.[2] In Gel assigned to *Dom. vi post clausum Paschae.*

Epistle. WMEPamTh. (lengthened).

Gospel. AMEPamTh.

[1] Schuster, *op. cit., ad loc.*

[2] *I.e.* in P and SG this is the Collect for the Second Sunday.

'The Sundays after Trinity may be regarded as a system illustrating the practical life of Christianity, founded on the truths previously presented, and guided by the example of our Blessed Lord.'[1] The subject of this day is the love of God and the love of man.

Trinity II.

Collect. GregSG^{III}E. (In Gel assigned to Sunday after Ascension Day.) But the present form is an adaptation dating from 1661. Until then there had been a literal translation of the Latin—' Lorde, make vs to haue . . .: for thou neuer faylest. . . .'

Epistle. WME (lengthened).

Gospel. ME.

Subject of the day: active love.

Trinity III.

Collect. P^{I}GregSG^{IV}E.

Epistle. WME (slightly lengthened). It seems probable that the Epistles for this Sunday and for our fifth after Trinity were chosen originally with reference to the coming feast of SS. Peter and Paul.

Gospel. WME.

Subject of the day: humility.

Trinity IV.

Collect. PGregSG^{V}E.

Epistle. WME (in W. it is the Epistle for Ember Saturday).

Gospel. ME. This Gospel does not appear at all in R; there is therefore at this point a further dislocation. The R Gospel will henceforward be two ahead of E, but the Epistle still only one.

Trinity V.

Collect. First in L: but the assignment of Collects in L is very vague indeed. PGregSG^{VI}E. This Leonine Collect recalls the disasters of the dying Western Empire.

Epistle. WME.

Gospel. WME. Perhaps chosen in preparation for SS. Peter and Paul's Day.

Trinity VI.

Collect. GelPGregSG^{VII}E. All the Collects from this point to Trinity XXI (except Trinity XVII) are in Gel, and for the most part in this order. But in Gel our Collect for Trinity VI is the first of a series *per Dominicis diebus* (*sic*), evidently intended for use on the Sundays after Pentecost, but not specifically assigned to particular Sundays.

[1] Blunt, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*

Epistle. WME. The Epistles now follow St. Paul's Epistles in order until Trinity XXIV (except Trinity XVIII, which represents a dislocation caused by Embertide).
Gospel. WME (lengthened).

Trinity VII.
Collect. GelGregE.
Epistle. WME.
Gospel. WME.

Trinity VIII.
Collect. GelPGregE.
Epistle. WME (slightly lengthened).
Gospel. WME.

Trinity IX.
Collect. L[1]GelPGreg.
Epistle. WME (lengthened).
Gospel. WME. Sc1928 provide as alternative Gospel Luke xv. 11–32 (*R*Sc1928 for Sat. after Second Sunday in Lent). It was thought no doubt that the parable of the Prodigal Son was even more worthy of a place in the course of Sunday Gospels than that of the Unjust Steward, especially in view of the supposed exegetical difficulty of the latter. But are not such difficulties the preacher's opportunity?

Trinity X.
Collect. Based on a Coll. in L. GelGregE.
Epistle. WME (lengthened).
Gospel. WME.

Trinity XI.
Collect. GelPGregE.
Epistle. ME (slightly lengthened).
Gospel. WME.
'The subject of this Sunday is the mercy and pity of Almighty God in bestowing the power of supernatural grace as a free and undeserved gift upon sinners.'[2]

Trinity XII.
Collect. GelPGregE.
Epistle. WME (slightly lengthened).
Gospel. WME.

Trinity XIII.
Collect. L[3]GelGregE.
Epistle. WME. Sc1928 provide as alternative Epistle Heb.

[1] Cf. Trinity V. [2] Blunt, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.* [3] Cf. Trinity V.

xiii. 1–6, presumably on account of exegetical difficulties in the traditional passage.

Gospel. WME.

Trinity XIV.

Collect. L[1]PGelGregE.

Epistle. WME.

Gospel. WME.

Trinity XV.

Collect. GelGreg.

Epistle. WME (lengthened).

Gospel. WME (lengthened). Perhaps deliberately chosen for harvest time and the *villegiatura* of the Roman citizens.

Trinity XVI.

Collect. GelGreg.

Epistle. WME.

Gospel. WME (lengthened).

Trinity XVII.

Collect. GregCass.

Epistle. WME.

Gospel. WME.

Trinity XVIII.

This *Proprium* belongs originally to the Sunday after the September Ember Days. In Rome, therefore, the Sunday was originally vacant. But the Mass is an ancient one, though probably not originating in Rome. The only sign of irregularity is the Epistle, which breaks into the otherwise fairly regular course of Pauline reading.

Collect. GelGregE.

Epistle. ME.

Gospel. WME (lengthened).

September Ember Days. Sc provides a special Lesson (Acts xx. 28–35) and two alternative Gospels (John x. 1–16 and John xxi. 15–22).

Trinity XIX.

Collect. GelGregE.

Epistle. WME (lengthened).

Gospel. WME.

Trinity XX.

Collect. GelGregE.

Epistle. WME. This is the season of the drawing off of the new wine; but Christians must not waste their time in feasting.[2]

Gospel. ME. The true feast.

[1] Cf. Trinity V.

[2] Schuster, *op. cit., ad loc.*

Trinity XXI.
Collect. GelGregCassE.
Epistle. WMCassE (lengthened).
Gospel. ME.
'The shield of faith' may perhaps serve as a connecting link between Gospel and Epistle.

Trinity XXII.
Collect. GregE.
Epistle. WME (lengthened).
Gospel. WMCassE (lengthened).

Trinity XXIII.
Collect. GregE.
Epistle. WMCassE.
Gospel. WMCassE (lengthened).

Trinity XXIV.
Collect. LHSY.
Epistle. WMCassE (lengthened). The Pauline course breaks off abruptly at this point. In early times it was, no doubt, continued on the weekdays.
Gospel. WMCassE (lengthened).

Trinity XXV. In SH *Dom. proxima ante Adventum.*
The substance of the rubric as to the lack or 'overplus' of *Propria*, according to the date of Easter, is first found in 1552. The directions here given are in accordance with tradition.
Collect. PGregSY. (H assigns this Collect to the preceding Sunday, and for this Sunday has another of the ancient series beginning *Excita.*) The original Collect is as follows: *Excita, quaesumus, Domine, tuorum fidelium voluntates: ut divini operis fructum propensius exsequentes, pietatis tuae remedia majora percipiant.*
Lesson. WME.
Gospel. WME.
The *Proprium* for this Sunday is of the character of Advent rather than of the other Sundays after Pentecost.

The Feasts of the Saints with very few exceptions have modern Collects, the requests for their intercessions being out of harmony with the dominant Anglican theology.

St. Andrew.
A day of great solemnity in Rome in the earliest times. An all-night vigil was observed, and L contains three Masses of St. Andrew in addition to that of the vigil. Perhaps this is accounted for by his close kinship with St. Peter.
Collect. 1552. A new Collect was written in 1549, recalling

the traditional death of the Apostle by crucifixion: altered no doubt on account of the extreme Reformers' dislike of ecclesiastical tradition.

Epistle. WM*R* (lengthened).
Gospel. M*R*.

St. Thomas.

Collect. 1549.
Epistle. *R*.
Gospel. *R*.

Conversion of St. Paul.

There is a Mass *in conversione S. Pauli apostoli* in the *Missale Gothicum* (probably early eighth century), and the fourth-century Martyrology of St. Jerome mentions a feast called *Romae translatio S. Pauli*, a very obscure phrase. But the feast of the Conversion does not seem to have been regularly observed until about the twelfth century.

Collect. Greg*R* (adapted). In R, according to ancient custom, there is always a commemoration of St. Peter when the Mass is of St. Paul, and *vice versa*.

Epistle. M*R*.
Gospel. M*R* (lengthened).

It seems to have been difficult, after the Reformation, to secure the liturgical observance of this day and of the feast of St. Barnabas. Both are traditionally of lower rank than the other feasts of Apostles. (The chief commemoration of St. Paul was in conjunction with St. Peter on June 29.) From 1552 to 1661 both days were printed in black letters in the Calendar, and Bishop Wren in 1636 had to give orders that their Collects, Epistles, and Gospels should not be forgotten.

Purification of St. Mary the Virgin.

In origin this feast is rather of our Lord than of the Blessed Virgin, and this is borne out by the character of the *Proprium*.

Collect. HaGelGreg*R*.

Lesson. *R* (lengthened). Reintroduced by Cosin in 1661: until that date in the English rite the Collect for the preceding Sunday was repeated.

Gospel. M*R* (lengthened). Until 1661 the Gospel ended at v. 27[a], 'he came by inspiracion into the temple.'

St. Matthias.

Collect. 1549.
Epistle. *R*.
Gospel. *R*. There is an evident reference to Judas as the 'wise and understanding' who was rejected.

Annunciation of B. V. Mary.

Like the Purification this day is more a feast of our Lord than of the Blessed Virgin. In conformity with most mediæval precedents, Cosin wished to alter the title to 'The Annunciation of our Lord to the Blessed Virgin Mary.'

Collect. Ha (Post-Communion Greg*R*).
Lesson. MSYR.
Gospel. M*R* (slightly lengthened).

St. Mark.

In spite of St. Mark's connection with Rome and with St. Peter his festival was not introduced into the Missal till the twelfth century, no doubt because he was not buried there.[1]

Collect. 1549. Entirely recast, apparently without authority, in the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth.
Epistle. E.
Gospel. SH. (In *R* this is the Gospel for the Common of a Martyr in Eastertide.)

SS. Philip and James.

The conjunction of the two Apostles seems to spring from the two accidents that on this day the church of the *Sancti Apostoli* was consecrated in Rome in the sixth century, and that it contained relics of these two. Until then the feast had been in honour of James the brother of John.

Collect. 1549.
Epistle. 1549, evidently chosen on the assumption, general at that date, that the Epistle was written by St. James the Less, identified with the brother of the Lord.
Gospel. WM*R*.

St. Barnabas.

Collect. 1549.
Lesson. Y (overlapping with R).
Gospel. S.

St. John Baptist.

The ancient Sacramentaries provide three or even four Masses, of which the first is the vigiliary Mass.

Collect. 1549.
Lesson. 1549.
Gospel. WM*R* (lengthened).

St. Peter.

According to all tradition this is the feast of SS. Peter and Paul. In Rome it was observed as the greatest feast of the year except Easter Day itself. There were three Masses besides the vigiliary

[1] Schuster, *op. cit., ad loc.*

Mass. In Gel the first is of both Apostles, the second of St. Peter, the third of St. Paul. Later, the commemoration of St. Paul was transferred to June 30. When the observance was reduced to one vigiliary Mass on June 28th and one festal Mass on the 29th, the Collect at the latter was of the two Apostles jointly, but the Lesson and Gospel referred to St. Peter only. Thus it was not altogether unnatural that the English reformers, who were intending to change the Collect in any case, should have changed the observance into a feast of St. Peter alone. Unfortunately, however, they eliminated the commemoration of the following day; so that the English Calendar is left in the strange position of having no commemoration of the *natalis* of St. Paul.

Collect. 1549.
Lesson. WMA*R*.
Gospel. WM*R*.

St. James.

Collect. 1549.
Lesson. 1549.
Gospel. *R* (lengthened).

St. Bartholomew.

Collect (derived from L for feast of St. John Evan.). *R* (modified to avoid the suggestion that the observance of the feast is commanded in the Divine law. The original is *Qui hujus diei venerandam sanctamque lætitiam in beati Apostoli tui Bartholomæi festivitate tribuisti*).

Lesson. H.

Gospel. ME. 'The Gospel . . . perpetuates an old tradition that St. Bartholomew was of noble birth, and that hence arose the "strife."'[1]

St. Matthew.

One of the most ancient of the festivals. A Mass is appointed for it in the Martyrology of St. Jerome.

Collect. 1549.
Epistle. 1549.
Gospel. *R* (in M this is the Gospel of the vigil).

St. Michael and All Angels.

The original feast and its Mass are in commemoration of the Dedication of the Basilica of St. Michael on the Via Salaria. 'All Angels' is an Anglican innovation, but a very happy one.

Collect. H*R*.
Lesson. S (Lesson for St. Michael in Monte Tumba: Oct. 16).
Gospel. WMCass*R*.

[1] Blunt, *op. cit., ad loc.*

St. Luke.

Collect. 1549. Am has a new one.
Epistle. 1549.
Gospel. SH (RY are slightly longer).

SS. Simon and Jude.

Blunt considers that the collocation of the two Apostles is suggested by St. Jude's emphasis on the unity of the faith:[1] but there is a tradition that they were actually martyred together.[2]

Collect. 1549.
Epistle. 1549. (Sc1928 provide as an alternative Rev. xxi. 9–14, no doubt on account of the opinion, usual among scholars, that the Epistle of St. Jude was not written by the Apostle.)
Gospel. M*R* (lengthened).

All Saints.

The feast of Nov. 1 dates from the ninth century, but a Mass of All Saints, or All Martyrs, has been celebrated at some time of the year from a very early period.

Collect. 1549.
Lesson. *R.* But this is the Lesson in W for the *Dom. in natale Sanctorum* then observed on our Trinity Sunday (which is still the Feast of All Martyrs among the Orthodox). The same Lesson was used from 608 onwards on the feast *S. Mariae ad Martyres* observed on the anniversary of the Dedication of the Pantheon as the Church of the B. V. Mary and All Martyrs on May 13. The change to Nov. 1 took place in the former half of the ninth century.

Am omits the numeration of the twelve tribes, and continues the Lesson to the end of the chapter.
Gospel. *R* (slightly lengthened).

IV. Additional Feasts in Anglican Rites other than 1661

The following (as far as *St. Margaret of Scotland*) are printed in some rites among the greater feasts.

St. Mary Magdalene.

In 1928 among 'Greater Feasts'; in Sc among 'Various Occasions.'

Collect. Modern.
Epistle, 2 Cor. v. 14–17,
Gospel, John xx. 11–18.

1549 had a very poor Collect, and the *R* Lesson and Gospel. The Gospel identified S. Mary Magdalene with the 'woman whyche was a synner.'

[1] *Op. cit., ad loc.* [2] Schuster, *op. cit., ad loc.*

The Transfiguration.

CaAmScIrish1928. Strangely omitted in 1549.

The Collect in Ca is based on that in Am,[1] but greatly improved in rhythm. ScIrish1928 are almost entirely different from these, and differ also from each other. Sc is very clumsy.

Epistle. Ca1928, 1 John iii. 1–3.

AmSc have the *R* Epistle 2 Pet. i. 16–18 (12–18 AmIrish).

Gospel. CaSc have the *R* Gospel, Matt. xvii. 1–9.

Am1928 have the corresponding passages from Luke and Mark respectively.

Sc also reckons among 'Red-Letter Days' the following Saints: *Kentigern, Patrick, Columba, Ninian, Margaret of Scotland.*

The first four have a *Commune.*

Collect based on Greg*R* through B.C.P. (Conversion of St. Paul).

Epistle. 1 Thess. ii. 2–12.

Gospel. Matt. xxviii. 16–20.

St. Margaret of Scotland.

Collect. Modern.

Epistle. *R.* Common *pro nec Virgine nec Martyre.*

Gospel. *R.* Common *pro nec Virgine nec Martyre* (shortened).

Dedication Festival.

Collect. Sc has an adaptation of *R*, by Bp. Dowden: Am a shortened form: 1928 a new and very cumbrous composition.

Epistle. Sc: 1 Pet. ii. 1–10. Am1928: the same shortened, or 1 Cor. iii. 9–17.

Gospel. ScAm1928: Matt. xxi. 12–16. 1928: also John x. 22–29.

We miss the inspired choice of the Lesson (New Jerusalem) and Gospel (Zacchæus) of *R.*

Thanksgiving for Harvest; or *Thanksgiving Day* (Am).

Collects. Am: 1789; ending, rather unhappily, with 'our comfort.' Sc has three, by Bp. Dowden: full of tags from Scripture and B.C.P. One or more may be said. 1928: a good modern Collect, from the Irish Prayer-Book.

Lesson. Sc: Deut. xvi. 13–15.

Epistle. Am: Jas. i. 16–27. 1928: Gal. vi. 6–10.

Gospel. Am: Matt. vi. 25–34. Sc: Matt. vi. 28–34. 1928: John iv. 31–36.

St. John before the Latin Gate.

Sc1928. All as on Dec. 27.

[1] By Dr. W. R. Huntington, probably suggested by *Secreta* in S.

Visitation of B. V. Mary.

Collect. Modern. Sc1928. (Suggested by S.)
Epistle. 1 John iv. 12–14. Sc.
Lesson, 1 Sam. ii. 1–3. 1928.
Gospel, Luke i. 39–45. Sc1928 (*R* shortened).

Lammas Day. Sc.

Collect. *R.*
Lesson, Acts xii. 1–11 (*R*).
Gospel, Matt. xix. 17–30.

Name of Jesus.

Collect. Sc and 1928 have different forms of the same: it is not clear which is the original.
Lesson, Acts iv. 8–12. Sc1928 (*R*).
Gospel, Matt. i. 20–23. Sc1928 (S).

Falling Asleep of B. V. Mary.

Sc: as on Sept. 8.

Beheading of St. John Baptist.

Collect. Modern. Sc1928.
Lesson, 2 Chr. xxiv. 17–21. Sc1928
Gospel, Matt. xiv. 1–12. Sc1928.

Nativity of B. V. Mary.

Collect. Sc and 1928 have each a modern Collect.
Lesson, Gen. iii. 9–15. Sc.
Gospel, Luke xi. 27, 28. Sc.

1928 makes no provision beyond the Collect. It is not at all clear what is intended. It is difficult to suppose that the Epistle and Gospel for the preceding Sunday are to be used, for this would be to depress the feast below the level of those days on which a *Commune* is to be used. But the only alternative seems to be 'the Common of a Virgin.' Reference to this will show its extreme unsuitability.

Holy Cross Day.

Collect. Sc: as on Palm Sunday. 1928: a modern Collect, far from satisfactory.
Epistle, 1 Cor. i. 27–35.
Gospel, John xii. 27–33 (overlapping with *R*).

Commemoration of All Souls.

Collect. Sc: a modern composition, somewhat arhythmic. 1928. The address 'O [Lord], the maker and redeemer of all believers' is taken from the *R* Collect, but is, rather strangely, made to apply to the Father. A very beautiful piece of liturgical English.[1] As an alternative, another form of the Sc Collect.

[1] From the Manual of the Society of the Resurrection. Probably by Dr. Brightman.

Sc: Epistle, 1 Thess. iv. 13–18 (*R In die obitus seu depositionis*), or 1 Cor. xv. 50–58 (R *Ad primam Missam*, approximately). 1928. Lesson, Rev. xx. 11–15.
Gospel, John xi. 21–27. Sc1928 (*R In die obitus seu depositionis*).

Conception of B. V. Mary.

Sc1928: as on the Nativity.

Independence Day. Am.

Collect by Bishop Parsons of California.
Lesson, Deut. x. 17–21.
Gospel, Matt. v. 43–48.

The Common of Saints.

Sc1928 provide *Communia* for Martyrs and other groups of Saints. The Collects all seem to be modern[1] and vary very much in character. That of a Bishop (1928) is the best, possessing all the qualities of a good Collect. That of a Matron (1928) is of almost incredible banality, and is probably the worst which has ever been admitted to an Anglican rite.
The Epistles, Lessons and Gospels are in some cases suggested by *R*, but for the most part seem to be independent selections.

The Anglican rites also contain a few examples of what the Roman rite calls Votive Masses.
AmSc1928 provide for a Celebration of Holy Communion at Marriages and Burials: Sc1928, 'at a Thanksgiving for the Institution of Holy Baptism'[2] and 'of Holy Communion,'[3] 'for Overseas Missions':[4] Sc for 'Synods and Councils': 1928 'for the guidance of the Holy Spirit.' 1928 also allows the *Proprium* for All Souls' Day to be used on any other day, except Holy-days (which of course include Sundays) and days within the Octaves of Christmas, Easter, or Whitsunday.

Post-Communions in Sc.[5]

Those for Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Whitsun, and Trinity are by Bp. Dowden. The first of the General Post-Communions and the second of the Collects which may be used as such are from the Book of Deer. The third of the latter is from the *Altus* of St. Columba.

[1] That of a Doctor or Confessor (1928) is derived from *The English Liturgy*.
[2] The Sc Collect is an amplification of *R* for Easter Tuesday.
[3] Alternative Collects, for one of which see Additional Collect for Maundy Thursday (Sc).
[4] The second alternative Collect in 1928 is from the form authorised by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1886 for use on the Day of Intercession for Foreign Missions. (The Sc Collect is the same slightly shortened.) The third was originally authorised for use in India.
[5] See p. 376.

HOLY BAPTISM

By THE EDITOR

At a time when the Church is becoming more sharply differentiated from the world, the origin and the nature of its initiatory rite deserve to be carefully studied. Its antecedents will be treated under four heads: (*a*) Jewish, (*b*) Gentile, (*c*) Mandæan, (*d*) John the Baptist.

I

(*a*) In the ancient world the symbolism of water was self-evident. As Tertullian says,[1] 'Jewish Israel washes daily because it is defiled daily.' There is no need to describe the lustrations of the Old Testament. It is more important to note the growth of the conception of a holy land and a holy people. As early as Amos vii. 17 an exile is said to be taken to 'a land that is unclean.' However, the Deuteronomic Reformation prescribed no purification for a foreign woman who married a Hebrew.[2] To safeguard racial and religious purity, in the Maccabæan period legislation was introduced by which Gentile women had to submit to a purificatory bath before being received into the Jewish community.[3] When the Pharisees became the dominating influence in Judaism and missionary propaganda was undertaken seriously, women were attracted more readily than men, in whose case circumcision was an obstacle. Thus at Damascus nearly all the women were said to be under Jewish influence.[4] Gradually baptism, which was originally the manner of initiation reserved for women, as circumcision was for men, became universal, and even indispensable, in the case of men also. Its effect was permanent, in that it sanctified the descendants of proselytes.

The evidence for proselyte baptism is contained in the tracts

[1] *De Baptismo*, 15. [2] Cf. xxi. 11 ff.

[3] Cf F. Gavin, *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*, pp. 9, 29 ff. The evidence is found in *Sanhedrin* 82 *a*, *Aboda Zara* 36 *b*. The Gentile woman was held to be permanently unclean, in the sense that the Jewess was periodically unclean. Another tradition taught that the Gentile was outside the sphere of the Levitical enactments and could not be ritually unclean.

[4] Josephus, *B.J.*, II. xx. 2.

Yebamoth, of the Babylonian Talmud, and *Gerim*, probably a thirteenth-century compilation of material that goes back to the first and second centuries of our era; scattered hints are found elsewhere.[1] The *Gerim* description is as follows.

The would-be proselyte is asked why he wants to become a Jew, and warned that sufferings await him 'on account of circumcision and baptism and all the other ordinances.' If he says, 'I am not worthy,' he may be accepted. (In *Yeb.* 47 *a*, *b*, instruction follows, then circumcision, then, when the man is well enough, baptism. *Gerim* does not mention circumcision in its description of baptism.) He is then taken to 'the house of baptism' and immersed up to the middle. At this point certain details of the law are rehearsed, such as 'the forgotten sheaf, the gleaning, the corner of the field, and the tithe'; a woman is instructed in her duty respecting the leaven and the lighting of the candle. (In *Yeb.* 47 *b* 'two men learned in the law' give the instruction.) The man then (totally) immerses himself, and on coming up is addressed with words of congratulation on having joined himself to Israel. Women are baptised by women (in this case, according to *Yebamoth*, two sages stand outside near by and give the instruction). According to R. Eli'ezer, a proselyte circumcised but not baptised is a Jew, but R. 'Aqiba says baptism is indispensable.[2]

Other features to be noted are these. Precautions are taken against clandestine baptism; three witnesses seem to be required; 'living water' must be used if possible. *Yebamoth* and *Gerim* both presuppose a more extended instruction than the summaries they give. Jewish catechetical instruction, so it is thought,[3] was dogmatic, ethical, and eschatological, and these three heads are represented in *Yebamoth* ('lighter and weightier Commandments,' 'penalties for transgressions,' and 'the world to come was made only for the righteous'[4]). Jewish baptism was sacramental in the sense that it mediated admission into the community of God's people. Only in one passage, *Sibylline Oracles*, iv. 163 ff., which may be the utterance of a hellenised Jew, does it seem to be regarded as bestowing the forgiveness of

[1] The passages will be found in Billerbeck's *Kommentar*, i. 102–12. *Gerim* is printed in a German translation in *ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ* (1926), pp. 1–38, with a Commentary; and in an abbreviated form in Gavin, *op. cit.*, pp. 33–35, where the parallel passages of *Yebamoth* are also given. An early Christian reference is Justin, *Dial.*, xxix. 1: 'What need of that other baptism [of proselytes to Judaism] to one who has been baptised by the Holy Spirit?'; cf. xiv. 1.

[2] This opinion was generally held. The influence of Egypt must have been strong. The native Egyptians practised circumcision, so that in their case baptism was the only initiatory rite possible for men as well as for women.

[3] By Seeberg (*Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*) and others (especially commentators on the *Didache*, who hold that 'the Two Ways' are a Jewish outline of catechetical instruction).

[4] Gavin, pp. 36–40.

sins: 'Repent ye . . . wash your bodies from head to foot in running streams, and lift up your hands to heaven, asking forgiveness.' [1] Children were baptised with their parents, but when they came of age could decide for themselves; if they left the Synagogue they were considered to have been non-Israelites all the time.[2]

(*b*) The practice of baptism was well known in the Gentile world.[3] If, as was probably the case, mystic brotherhoods originated in the fragments of races left in a country occupied by invaders, which guarded their traditions strictly and, since they alone knew the way of the god of the land, often seemed to the conquerors to possess a superior religion, initiation into the brotherhood was originally initiation into a racial unit, as proselyte baptism was admission into the holy people of the Jews. At Eleusis baptism is attested as early as the fifth century B.C. A statue preserved in the museum at Eleusis [4] represents the goddess baptising a man. She uses a shell, but this in an idealistic work of art does not exclude total immersion, which could not be depicted. Baptism is attested in the Dionysian mysteries.[5] The Attis-cult had the *taurobolium*, or blood-bath; an ox was slain over a board pierced with holes, beneath which the initiate sat in a trench. The theory was that he was buried with Attis, whom he represented, and then, sprinkled with the blood, he received the divine life and rose with the god; even in this life he enjoyed immortality.[6] Mithraism had both water and blood baptism.[7] The early Church saw in these rites a devilish parody of the Christian Sacrament. According to Justin Martyr,[8] the demons got the idea from the prediction of the Sacrament made by the Jewish prophet.[9] Tertullian says that

[1] The dictum of *Yebamoth*, 'a proselyte is like a child new born,' may imply sacramental forgiveness; see below, p. 416. However, G. F. Moore says emphatically: 'In the whole ritual there is no suggestion that baptism was a real or symbolical purification. . . . It is essentially an initiatory rite, with a forward and not a backward look' (*Judaism*, i. 334).

[2] See Billerbeck, i. 110.

[3] For this section see the many good books on the mysteries, especially the works of Clemen, Cumont and Reitzenstein. S. Angus, *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*, is perhaps the best English book. See also F. Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*; L. Patterson, *Mithraism and Christianity*; A. S. Geden, *Select Passages illustrating Mithraism*; and especially J. Leipoldt, *Die urchristliche Taufe im Lichte der Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 38–56.

[4] Reproduced by Leipoldt.

[5] See a picture from Pompeii in Leipoldt, p. 42. It is realistic and, since the bowl which is being prepared is only of moderate size, total immersion is excluded.

[6] So the Roman inscription of A.D. 376: 'taurobolio criobolioque in æternum renatus.'

[7] The recently discovered Mithræum at Trèves contains a hollow just inside the entrance: the sides are cut away to form a resting-place for the board.

[8] *Apol.*, 62. [9] Isa. i. 16.

the Gentiles 'are initiated into certain sacred rites (of Isis or Mithras) by a bath. . . . At the celebrations in honour of Apollo and those held at Pelusium, worshippers are dipped, and they have the effrontery to declare that their object is rebirth.'[1] The devil 'promises remission of sins as the result of a bath.'[2]

Egypt provides specially interesting material. The sun-god's image was bathed every morning. As he was supposed to be born anew each day and stress was laid on his plunging into the ocean each night, it seems as if the bathing represented a dying and rising again. Similarly the image of Osiris was immersed in the Nile, to symbolise the death of the vegetation with which he was identified, and its revival after the annual overflowing of the Nile. The king was baptised that he might obtain purity and eternal life. But every dead person was held to receive baptism in the next world, as a means of attaining immortality. In the case of the king, and sometimes in that of ordinary men, this baptism was anticipated by a ceremony performed on the dead body. The king's corpse was baptised by the gods, that is, by priests wearing masks representing the gods.[3]

(*c*) The Mandæans cannot be omitted in any survey of the subject, however brief, since baptism was their characteristic rite.[4] This Mesopotamian sect, which still survives, is thought to have lived originally in the Jordan valley; some scholars believe that it was pre-Christian. The problem is difficult. The documents are very late; conceivably, archaic elements are preserved in them, from which something of importance may be learned, but agreement among scholars is unlikely to be attained. It seems best to summarise the facts and leave the reader to judge as to their relevance.[5]

In the Mandæan Baptismal Liturgy the candidate goes down to Jordan,[6] where he is baptised. Expecting death he finds life,

[1] *De Bapt.*, 5.

[2] Tert., *De Præscr.*, 40.

[3] Leipoldt, p. 48. According to Hermas, *Sim.*, ix. 16, the Apostles and teachers after they had fallen asleep went to Hades and there preached *and baptised*. In the second-century *Epistola Apostolorum* Jesus is made to say that He went to the place of Abraham, etc., 'and gave them the right hand of the Baptism of life and forgiveness . . .', or perhaps 'with the right hand the Baptism . . .' (Kleine Texte, 152, p. 23).

[4] Their literature, written in a Semitic dialect akin to Aramaic, is available in German translations by M. Lidzbarski: *The Book of John* (Baptist); *Qolasta* (Liturgies); and *Ginza*. S. A. Pallis' *Mandæan Studies* is the fullest criticism of the new theories.

[5] What follows is derived from R. Reitzenstein, *Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe* (1929). Lietzmann, Burkitt and others show that the Mandæan Liturgy is dependent on the Syriac Baptismal Rite.

[6] A generic name for all baptismal water. Its retention through the centuries in Babylonia is an argument for the Palestinian origin of the sect. Reitzenstein (p. 20) quotes an inscription as evidence that the Mandæans lived by the Jordan in the second century A.D.

that is immortality, if his desire is sufficiently strong. The priest receives him, gives him holy food and drink, takes him between his knees—a symbol of adoption—and raises him up. The soul requires witnesses, but rejects the sun [1] as a witness.[2] A second baptism, after death, before the gates of heaven, is mentioned. This is perhaps symbolised by the anointing with oil which follows the baptism.[3] After the anointing comes the laying on of hands.[4]

If it could be proved that Mandæanism was pre-Christian, we should conclude that it was a form of pre-Christian Gnosticism. Since it claims to go back to John the Baptist, and some connection is obvious, John may have been influenced by some syncretistic sect on the fringes of Judaism.[5] But more probably certain disciples of John, failing to pass over to Christianity and unwilling to conform to the Judaism of the second century, coalesced with a Gnostic sect, carrying with them traditions of their prophet. Though they repudiated Christianity, their customs in the centuries that followed were influenced by those of the Church.

(*d*) The baptism of John had affinities with Jewish proselyte-baptism, but differed from it in several ways. John's movement was definitely prophetic. He arraigned the entire people, who were called upon to repent. The soldiers mentioned by St. Luke may have been non-Jews, in which case Jews and Gentiles were received without distinction.[6] Nothing is said about witnesses; John himself baptised, or rather the crowds immersed themselves in his presence.[7] But the movement was eschatological even more than prophetic. Baptism was a sign guaranteeing endowment with the spirit in the approaching Messianic Age. Though it was 'for the forgiveness of sins,'[8] its root idea was *initiation* into a community chosen out from the mass. This helps us to understand why, in the Church, Baptism, which grew out of John's baptism, is never repeated. Had forgiveness been the fundamental thought, repetition would have been natural; but initiation is once and for all. With the going out of the

[1] That is, the Persian religion.

[2] This description is derived from the baptismal odes, which, according to Reitzenstein, are better evidence for primitive custom than the prose liturgical directions.

[3] Cf. 2 Enoch xxii. 8 for this heavenly anointing.

[4] Discussion of this second part of the initiatory rite is postponed until the following chapter on Confirmation.

[5] Something like Essenism, but even further removed from official Judaism.

[6] The 'disciples' of Acts xix. 1–7 do not look like Jews, though the argument from silence is precarious.

[7] *ἐβαπτίζοντο* is more naturally taken as a middle in Matt. iii. 6, Mark i. 5; so in Bauer's *Wörterbuch*, 'sich taufen lassen.'

[8] John i. 29 teaches that the forgiveness of sins was the Messiah's prerogative.

crowds into the wilderness we may compare the semi-political Messianic movement described by Josephus; [1] a great multitude went into the wilderness 'in the expectation that God would show them there signs of freedom,' and were suppressed by Felix with great slaughter. St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. x. 2 are significant: 'Our fathers were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' This looks like a Rabbinic *theologoumenon* invented to explain proselyte-baptism. On the well-known principle that the conditions of the first age would be reproduced in the Messianic time (*Endzeit* = *Urzeit*), it was natural for Jews to go into the wilderness, in order to repeat there the experiences of their ancestors in the time of Moses and to be prepared for the Messianic Age.[2]

On the other hand, the ethical teaching of John is said to correspond closely with what is known of Jewish catechetical teaching given to proselytes.[3]

II

On the strength of St. John's Gospel (iv. 1, 2) it may be argued that our Lord took over the practice of baptism from John the Baptist. The silence of the Synoptists is curious but does not invalidate the evidence of the Fourth Gospel, in which the narrator gives the tradition as he received it, that Jesus baptised, explaining, however, that in actual fact it was the disciples who baptised.[4] For our purpose the evidence of the New Testament may be treated under five heads: (*a*) the minister of baptism, (*b*) the recipients, (*c*) the preparation demanded, (*d*) the formula used, (*e*) the manner of baptising.

(*a*) There was apparently no minister in the later sense when St. Paul was baptised, since he uses the middle voice in describing his experience.[5] He himself rarely baptised in person.[6] In the case of the 3000 baptised on the Day of Pentecost it is hard to

[1] *B.J.*, II. xiii. 4.

[2] See J. Jeremias in *Z.N.W.* (1929), pp. 312–20. Some Rabbis found evidence for baptism in Ex. xix. 10; see Billerbeck, i. 110.

[3] Leipoldt, *op. cit.*, pp. 7, 28. The fullest critical monograph on John is *Jean-Baptiste* by M. Goguel (Paris, 1928).

[4] In this passage rather than in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20 we shall find support for the 'Dominical' institution of Holy Baptism; but see (*d*) below for the value of the latter passage. Those who hold that the author of the Fourth Gospel was the son of Zebedee will not make the distinction made above between the narrator and the tradition he used. John iii. 5, 'except a man be born of water and the Spirit', could be taken as unequivocal testimony for Dominical institution if it were not for the divergent opinions relating to the historical value of the Gospel.

[5] Acts xxii. 16. However, the passive is used in ix. 18.

[6] 1 Cor. i. 14–17.

imagine the Apostles baptising each person separately in the modern manner. Probably such a mass baptism resembled the baptisms in Jordan, the candidates after confessing their sins baptising themselves before witnesses. St. Philip, however, went down with the Ethiopian eunuch into the water (Acts viii. 38). The difference made by the Church between Baptism and the Eucharist, Baptism by the laity being permitted in an emergency, but the Eucharist being always celebrated by an ordained minister, is most easily explained if the tradition of John iv. 2 is right and our Lord did not baptise in person. But there was always a minister in the sense that there was one who presided over the ceremony.

(*b*) We cannot here discuss the problem of infant baptism in the New Testament. On the one hand we have the analogy of circumcision and the references to the baptism of households: on the other hand the close connection of Baptism with conversion and public declaration of faith. An attractive solution is that children were baptised, but not as a rule until they reached the age of six or seven, up to which time they were considered to have retained the innocence of infancy,[1] but that from the very beginning illness or some other emergency will have caused parents to desire Baptism even for infants.[2] Those who wanted even the dead to be baptised are unlikely to have been content to leave their children unbaptised.[3]

(*c*) There is little in the Acts or the Epistles to support the idea of a catechumenate. The 3000 at Pentecost were baptised immediately. The eschatological view of Baptism was paramount, so that haste was necessary. The baptised were instructed Jews; the acceptance of Jesus as Messiah argued a fundamental change in their outlook and nothing more was required. However, 'the apostles' teaching' followed baptism (Acts ii. 42). As the Gentile mission developed and eschatological expectation died down, careful preparation became the rule.[4]

(*d*) Perhaps the confession 'Jesus is Lord' was used at Baptism.[5] The second-century reading in Acts viii. 37, 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God,' looks like a fuller form of 'I believe that Jesus is Lord,' which among Gentiles would replace the primitive 'Jesus is the Christ.'

[1] Cf. Tert., *De Bapt.*, 18: 'Why hurries the age of innocence to the remission of sins?'

[2] H. Windisch in *Z.N.W.* (1929), pp. 118 ff., 'Zum Problem der Kindertaufe im Urchristentum,' collects an imposing volume of evidence, Jewish and Gentile, respecting 'the age of innocence,' which supports this view. Some hold that infant baptism was originally universal, but came to be postponed owing to fear of post-baptismal sin; cf. Heb. vi. 4.

[3] 1 Cor. xv. 29.

[4] Cf. Acts xvi. 15, 33 for (*a*) speedy, (*b*) immediate baptism.

[5] Cf. Rom. x. 9; 1 Cor. xii. 3; Phil. ii. 11.

The actual baptismal formula, supposing one to have existed, is unknown. 'Baptising them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' (Matt. xxviii. 19) describes very well what must have been the primitive meaning of Baptism. The convert entered into a relation to God, to His Son the Messiah, and to the Holy Spirit of the Messianic Age, exactly as the disciples of John did at their baptism. The words which express the primitive thought sound to us too theological to be quite primitive, and scholars are almost unanimous in rejecting them as an authentic utterance of our Lord.[1] But in view of their use as a formula in the *Didache* (*c.* 100), and of the Trinitarian verse, 2 Cor. xiii. 14, it seems best to attribute high value to them short of this. If they represent the primitive definition of Baptism, baptising in or into the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts viii. 16, xix. 5), or of Jesus Christ (x. 48), may be a compendious description, bringing out the *differentia* of the Christian rite.[2]

(*e*) A commonly held opinion is that total immersion was the primitive custom. Certainly in Jewish proselyte-baptism immersion was the rule, and doubtless it continued in the early Church when conditions were favourable. But the probabilities of the case, on the Day of Pentecost, for example, and in the prison at Philippi, descriptions of baptisms,[3] and pictorial representations in the Catacombs and elsewhere, combine to show that affusion was the normal method.[4]

If it is asked in what sense Christ ordained Baptism, in view of the difficulties revealed by our survey, we may answer in the words of Dr. N. P. Williams: 'The universal prevalence of Christian Baptism' is to be explained by 'some command, or expression of purpose, given by the Lord Himself.' At His own Baptism, 'by undergoing this momentous experience, in which the interior influx of the Spirit was superadded to the exterior affusion of water, our Lord Himself, in His own Person, transformed the water-baptism of John into Christian Spirit-baptism.'[5] John iv. 1, 2 is sufficient evidence of an 'expression of purpose' that His followers should practise Baptism.

[1] St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. i. 17, 'Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the Gospel,' have been thought to exclude the possibility that he knew a command of our Lord as given in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

[2] Eph. v. 14 is probably from a hymn sung at Baptism; cf. the Odes of Solomon.

[3] Especially in the *Didache*.

[4] See C. F. Rogers, *Baptism and Christian Archæology*, and a summary of the conclusions of the book in an S.P.C.K. pamphlet, *Baptism and the Early Church*.

[5] *Essays Catholic and Critical*, pp. 417–18.

III

The *Didache* (Ch. 7) and Justin Martyr (*Apol.*, 61, 65) agree closely in their description of Baptism, and, when allowance is made for Justin's avoidance of Christian terminology, may fairly be combined to give a composite picture of sub-Apostolic practice. Baptism is preceded by a period of personal preparation (consisting of fasting, prayer and confession) and instruction. The threefold Name is used at the baptism, which is in a stream or bathing-place other than the normal place of assembly. The *Didache* allows, in cases of necessity, a threefold pouring of water on the head. In neither document is the laying on of hands or unction mentioned.

Tertullian's treatise *De Baptismo* is our main authority for the period about 200. The minister is the Bishop; by delegation priests or deacons may baptise; even laymen, if necessary, but never women. Postponement of baptism in the case of children is advantageous. Good Friday and Pentecost are the regular times; careful preparation is prescribed; sponsors are present. Unction and laying on of hands follow baptism, the minister in this case not being specified.

We now proceed to summarise the developed rite of the fourth and fifth centuries, comparing it with the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus preserved in 'The Egyptian Church Order,' which gives us the Roman rite of the early part of the third century. For brevity's sake two examples only are given, the Eastern rite as given by St. Cyril of Jerusalem and the North Italian one described in St. Ambrose's *De Mysteriis*[1] and the rather later *De Sacramentis*. The evidence is insufficient to justify a positive assertion, but Hippolytus probably represents the main line of tradition, of which the later types are local variations.[2]

(a) *The Making of Catechumens.* According to Hippolytus, postulants are examined as to their motive, status (slave or free, married or single) and occupation; image-makers, priests of the gods, hunters, soldiers, star-gazers, etc., are rejected. Three years' instruction is the normal period. The catechumens are separated from the faithful in church. They are instructed by 'the teacher.' After 'the prayer' and the kiss of peace, from which latter they are excluded, when the teacher, who may be a layman, 'has laid his hand upon the catechumens, he shall pray, and dismiss them.'

At this stage they are called *audientes*, 'hearers': when the special preparation for Baptism begins, *competentes* (or *electi*, in Greek φωτιζόμενοι).

[1] And in St. Ambrose's other writings.

[2] The Syriac-speaking Church had peculiarities of its own, treated later under Confirmation.

(b) *Immediate Preparation.*

Cyril of Jerusalem.	Hippolytus.	N. Italy.
1. The catechumens are enrolled at the beginning of Lent and are now considered to belong to 'the faithful.' They are exorcised frequently, and instructed throughout Lent (probably daily).	1. Those chosen for Baptism are examined as to their conduct. If the examination is favourable, they hear the Gospel henceforward. Every day hands are laid on them and instruction is given.	1. The catechumens give in their names and are signed with the sign of the cross.[1] They receive daily instruction.
	2. Near the time 'the Bishop binds every one of them by oath, that he may know if they are pure.'	
		3. On Palm Sunday the Creed is delivered.
	4. On the fifth day of the week they wash and are exorcised.	
5. They are breathed upon as well as exorcised. 'Whether thou be breathed upon or exorcised, the act is to thee salvation' (*Procat.*, 9).	5. On Friday they fast. The Bishop assembles those to be baptised on the morrow, and commands them to pray. He lays his hands on them and exorcises every unclean spirit. He then breathes on them; they are read to and exhorted.	

(c) *The Baptism.*

	6. At cockcrow prayer is said over the water, which should be flowing.	
7. Candidates undress partially, in the vestibule.	7. Candidates undress. (Children are baptised first, then men, then women.)	
		8. The *Effeta* (opening of the ears), performed by the Bishop[2] outside the baptistery.
	9. The Bishop gives thanks over the 'mystic oil' (or, 'oil of thanksgiving') and exorcises other oil. Two Deacons take the oil and stand on each side of the presbyter.	
		10. Unction, in the baptistery.

[1] *De Myst.*, iv. 20.

[2] *De Sacr.*, I. i. 2. The Bishop touches the ears and nostrils.

Cyril of Jerusalem.	Hippolytus.	N. Italy.
11. Renunciation of Satan and profession of faith in the Trinity (still in the vestibule).	11. The presbyter takes each person and bids him say: 'I renounce thee, Satan . . .'	11. Twofold renunciation.
		12. Consecration of font by the Bishop.
13. (In baptistery.) Candidates undress completely and are anointed with exorcised oil.	13. He anoints him with the exorcised oil and delivers him naked to the Bishop (or baptising presbyter).	
	14. The deacon goes down with the person into the water and instructs him in a short Creed.	
15. One interrogation, followed by threefold immersion.	15. The presbyter baptises him three times after three interrogations—'Dost thou believe . . .?'—keeping his hand on his head.	15. Threefold interrogation and threefold immersion.
	16. He comes out and is anointed by the presbyter with the sanctified oil.	16. Anointing of the head by the Bishop.
		17. Washing of the feet.
	18. He is dried and dressed.[1]	18. Vesting with white robes.

[Confirmation follows in all three cases.]

The Hippolytan account, which, owing to its fullness,[2] is of unique value, is so largely represented in the modern rite of the Eastern Orthodox Church that we are justified in considering it to be the common source of East and West. The Orthodox Baptismal Service is described elsewhere.[3] It is sufficient here to mention those features which it has in common with Hippolytus, adding the number of the relevant clause in the table above. At the reception of a catechumen, immediately preceding the baptism, the priest signs the person with the sign of the cross and lays his hand on his head (1); then exorcises him and breathes on him (1, 4, 5). In the latter part of the reception and the baptism, we have the renunciation of Satan (11),[4] the recital of the creed

[1] See Gavin, *op. cit.*, pp. 49–57, for the close resemblance of the Hippolytan rite to that of Jewish proselyte baptism. The only important differences are concerned with the instruction, which, however, is presupposed in the Rabbinic Tractates as already given, and the officiant.

[2] The blanks in the other columns do not necessarily imply differences from the Hippolytan rite. [3] See p. 842.

[4] Followed by the spitting upon Satan, as in *De Myst.*, ii. 7, according to a conjectural reading.

(11, Cyril), the blessing of the water (6), the blessing of the oil which is taken from the deacon (9), the unction (13), the threefold immersion—'the servant of God, N., is baptised in the name . . .'—(15), the vesting of the baptised person (18).

Turning to the West, we now give the salient features of the Roman rite as described by Duchesne,[1] with those of the Sarum rite.[2] The former goes back to the seventh century, when Infant Baptism was becoming general, but the service still presupposed adults.

Rome, 7th century.	Sarum Manual (Infants).
The Catechumenate.	
1. Insufflation (breathing).	(At the door.)
2. Signing with cross on forehead.	ditto.
3. Salt placed in mouth.	
The Seven Scrutinies in Lent.	
4. First scrutiny, names inscribed in register.	
5. Exorcisms after the Collect at Mass.	Exorcisms.
6. (At the third scrutiny.) Instruction in the Gospel, Creed and Lord's Prayer.	
Last Scrutiny on Easter Eve.	
7. Signing with cross and final exorcism.	Exorcism.
	8. The Gospel (Matt. xix. 13–15). *Effeta.*
9. *Effeta* (with saliva).[3]	
10. Candidates strip and are anointed on back and breast.	
11. Threefold renunciation of Satan.	
12. Recitation of Creed (*redditio symboli*).	Recitation of Lord's Prayer, Hail Mary and Creed.
	13. Signing on right hand and blessing.[4] (Introduction to Church.)
The Baptism.	
14. The Litany.	Ditto.
15. Benediction of font.	occasionally, as separate service.
16. Oil[5] poured on the water.	
	17. Threefold renunciation.

[1] *Christian Worship*, pp. 294-313.

[2] For information about other rites in East and West cf. T. Thompson, *The Offices of Baptism and Confirmation.*

[3] A Roman feature.

[4] These features are of Gallican origin; the chrysom in so far as it was made into a special ceremony.

[5] Blessed on Maundy Thursday after 'the holy chrism.'

Rome, 7th century.	Sarum Manual (Infants).
19. Threefold profession of faith.	18. Unction on back and breast. Threefold profession.
	20. Desire of baptism. Threefold immersion. Unction on head.[1] Giving of chrysom (white robe).[2]
21. Threefold immersion.	
22. Unction by the priest.	
23. Vesting in white robe.	
	24. Giving of taper.[2]
	25. Exhortation of godparents.

IV

The form for Public Baptism of Infants in the 1549 Book falls into three parts;

(a) *Introductory, representing the Order for Making a Catechumen.* This took place at the church door. Before the prayer 'Almighty and Immortal God' the priest asks the child's name and makes the sign of the cross on the child's forehead and breast, saying: '*N.*, receive the sign of the holy Cross . . . in token that . . .' After the prayer comes the exorcism of the unclean spirit; then the Gospel with the exhortation founded on it. The exhortation leads up to the Lord's Prayer and the Creed (*redditio symboli*), ending: 'let us faithfully and devoutly give thanks unto him: and say the prayer which the Lord himself taught. And in declaration of our faith, let us also recite the articles contained in our Creed.' After the following prayer, 'Almighty and everlasting God . . .' the priest takes a child by the right hand (the others following) and leads him into the church, saying: 'The Lord vouchsafe to receive you into his holy household, and to keep and govern you alway in the same, that you may have everlasting life.'

(b) *The Baptism.* This is virtually as in the 1662 Book, except for the Blessing of the Font, until the end of the actual baptising, which is followed immediately by the giving of the chrysom: 'Take this white vesture for a token of the innocence which by God's grace in this holy sacrament of baptism is given unto thee . . .'—and by the anointing: 'Almighty God . . . who hath regenerated thee by water and the Holy Ghost, and hath given unto thee remission of all thy sins: he vouchsafe to anoint thee with the unction of his Holy Spirit, and bring thee to the inheritance of everlasting life.' The final exhortation follows.

(c) *The Blessing of the Font* comes as an appendix after the Order of Private Baptism, though the prayers are to be said immediately before the baptising. They are derived from a Gallican source, the nearest to which is the Mozarabic source printed by Dr.

[1] This looks like an anticipation of the Bishop's anointing at Confirmation.
[2] These features are of Gallican origin; the chrysom in so far as it was made into a special ceremony.

Brightman.[1] The water is ordered to be changed at least once a month.

The service headed 'Of them that be Baptized in private houses in time of necessity' adapts the public service in the same way as is done in the 1662 Book.

In deference to Bucer's criticisms [2] and to secure greater unity, the Office was revised in 1552 and assumed virtually its present form, the sources and *rationale* of which we proceed to describe.

The Introductory Rubrics. (i) In 1662 the reference to the old custom of baptising only at Easter and Pentecost was omitted. 'Vulgar tongue' was put for 'English tongue,' [3] and 'upon any other day' for 'at home,' doubtless to discourage Private Baptism. (ii) The three godparents [4] possibly represent the early mediæval custom of having a godparent for the catechumenate, another for Baptism, and a third for Confirmation. The prohibition in Canon 29 (1604) of parents being sponsors for their children is obsolete.[5] (iii) The very short notice was sufficient in the seventeenth century, when the minister would know all his parishioners. The injunction that the Font 'is then to be filled with pure water' abolishes the custom of letting water stand in the Font. In the Sarum Manual the priest asks the sex of the infant and whether he has been baptised at home. Only the latter question, to prevent the sacrilege of repeating baptism, is found in the English rite, the former being unnecessary when notice is given beforehand.

Exhortation. Based in part on Hermann's *Consultation* and John iii. 5.

Prayers. The first is taken from Luther's Baptismal Office; it comes also in the *Consultation;* the connecting of Baptism with the Flood goes back to 1 Peter iii. 20, 21. The second translates one of the Sarum prayers at the exorcism. These prayers represent those formerly said over the catechumens.

The Gospel takes the place of the instruction originally given to catechumens; following Hermann, the Reformers took it from St. Mark instead of, as in the Sarum Manual, from St. Matthew.

Exhortation. Partly original in 1549 and partly from Hermann. The final words, 'give thanks unto him, and say,' which in 1549 led up to the Lord's Prayer and the Creed, now fitly introduce the prayer 'Almighty and everlasting God . . .,' which begins with a thanksgiving. The prayer is taken from Hermann. This ends the first part of the service, according to the old rite.

[1] *The English Rite*, ii. 738. [2] See Procter and Frere, pp. 74, 75.
[3] See pp. 813 f. for the translations of the Prayer Book already made.
[4] Not more, 'for whatsoever be more it is of evil' (Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, iii. 24).
[5] All Anglican revisions relax this rule.

Address to the Sponsors. Partly original in 1549 and partly from Hermann.

The Renunciation, etc. The questions were put to the child in 1549, his name being used, it being understood that the sponsors answered as of old. In 1552 the questions were put to the sponsors, and in 1662 'in the name of this child' was added in the first question. The Renunciation of Satan goes back to the primitive Church,[1] as does the Profession of Faith.[2] One question and answer was made in 1552 out of the 1549 'What dost thou desire? Baptism. Wilt thou be baptised? I will.' The question regarding obedience, added in 1662, is taken from the third answer in the Catechism.

The Blessing of the Water. The first nine prayers in the 1549 Office for blessing the water were reduced in 1552 to four, as at present. 'The Lord be with you,' etc., of 1549, introducing the final prayer, was omitted in 1552. In 1662 the words 'Sanctify this water . . . of sin' were added, to provide a formula for blessing, which since 1549 had been lacking.

The Baptising. In 1549 the priest names the child at the signing in the first part of the service, at the renunciation, and here. In 1552 these namings were reduced to the one at this place. The giving of 'the Christian name' was thus invested with a new importance. It became part of the rite about the twelfth century, when baptism of the newly born became the rule.[3] The dipping in 1549, following the Sarum rite, was threefold—first the right side, then the left, then the face. In 1552 this provision was omitted. The sufficiency of affusion goes back to mediæval[4] practice. The signing with the sign of the cross was transferred in 1552 from the early part of the service to this place, thus compensating for the omission of the chrysom and the unction. The accompanying words, 'we receive this child . . .,' composed in 1552, are a peculiarity of the English Prayer Book.

Conclusion. The short exhortation, leading up to the Lord's Prayer, and the Thanksgiving date from 1552. The final exhortation was composed in 1549. The Sarum Address to the Sponsors, which it represents, bids them charge the parents to preserve the child from perils until the age of seven: to see that it be taught the *Paternoster*, *Ave Maria* and *Credo*, and be confirmed

[1] See Hippolytus above, p. 420; and *De Sacr.*, I. ii. 5: 'Dost thou renounce the devil and his works? . . . Dost thou renounce the world and its pleasures?'

[2] Cf. p. 416. Note slight variations in the Creed: 'only *begotten* Son,' 'come again *at the end of the world*' (so in Hermann), 'everlasting life *after death*' (as in some Celtic books).

[3] For an early example of a new name given at Baptism see Bede, *H. E.*, v. 7, where Pope Sergius christens Cædwalla by the name of Peter.

[4] And primitive; see II (*e*) above.

'in all goodly haste.'[1] The 1549 addition, 'be further instructed in the Catechism,' suggests a rather later age for Confirmation. The conclusion, 'ye are to take care,' was added in 1662 in the place of a rubric to the same effect.

Rubrics. The first up to 1662 came in the Order of Confirmation, introduced by words which were then omitted—'that no man shall think that any detriment shall come to children by deferring of their Confirmation.' The second rubric, referring to the 30th Canon, was added in 1662.

Private Baptism.

Eusebius tells us of Basilides, who about A.D. 200 was baptised in prison (*H.E.*, vi. 5; cf. Acts xvi. 33), and of Novatian, who was baptised by affusion on his sick bed (vi. 43). The rubric in 1549 bids the clergy instruct the people in case of necessity to baptise their children, after calling upon God for His grace and saying the Lord's Prayer. Since 1604 'any other lawful minister that can be procured' has been allowed as an alternative to the Minister of the Parish. Lay Baptism is reckoned as irregular but valid. The form of conditional baptising is based on the Sarum one.

Baptism of Such as are of Riper Years.

This form was added in 1662 to meet the need caused by the neglect of the Sacrament during the Commonwealth and by the beginnings of missionary work in the plantations. Notice is to be given to the Bishop or his deputy, a provision which recalls the discipline of the early Church, in which baptism was administered by the Bishop or in his presence. The rubric at the end of the service states that Confirmation and Communion should follow as soon as possible. The candidate is to be examined and is exhorted to prepare himself with prayer and fasting. Such a baptism recalls the way of the primitive Church.

The Churching of Women.

In the Roman rite this is one of a number of Benedictions and is classed as a 'sacramental.' (Connected also with marriage are the blessing of the nuptial bed and the blessing of sterile persons.) The prominence of this particular custom is doubtless due to the example of the Virgin Mary as recorded in Luke ii. 22 ff. In this way the Jewish ideas of ceremonial uncleanness after childbirth (Lev. xii.) passed into the Christian Church. About 400, according to the Canons of Hippolytus, mothers who had not yet been purified were directed to sit among the catechumens.

[1] By 'my lord of the diocese' or 'his deputy,' which reminds us that 'suffragan bishops' were common in the Middle Ages.

But the element of thanksgiving was also prominent. St. Gregory, writing to St. Augustine, refers to the custom, saying: 'If a woman within an hour of her delivery enters the church to give thanks, she is burdened by no weight of sin.' [1]

In the 1549 Prayer Book the Office followed the Sarum *Ordo ad purificandum mulierem* very closely. It was called by the English equivalent, 'The Order of the Purification of Women.' The Psalm was cxxi, the rest of the service agreeing both with Sarum and with 1662. The Office was said 'nigh unto the choir door,' instead of, in the Sarum, before the door of the church. The opening words, 'Forasmuch as it hath pleased . . .' were optional—'these words or such like, as the case shall require.' The final rubric ordered her to 'offer her chrysom.' A comparison with the Baptism Service shows that the mother was not expected to be present at the Baptism, for the godparents are told to warn the mother that the chrysom must be returned 'at the purification of every child.' In 1552 the Office received its present name, 'The Thanksgiving of Women after Childbirth, commonly called the Churching of Women.' It was to be said 'in some convenient place nigh unto the place where the table standeth.' 'The woman that cometh to give her thanks' was substituted for 'the woman that is purified.'

In 1662 'some convenient place, as hath been accustomed, or as the Ordinary shall direct,' is prescribed in the opening rubric. Psalms cxvi and cxxvii are substituted for cxxi. The 1549 direction, 'if there be a Communion, it is convenient that she receive the Holy Communion,' remains unaltered. The Office ends abruptly without a blessing, since the Communion follows. It is presumed that the woman is competent to receive. The Office, therefore, should not be used in the case of an unmarried mother who has not shown signs of penitence.

Little change has been made in recent revisions. The English 1928 Book and the Scottish provide two final prayers, one suitable when the child has died, and a Blessing. The American Book has no Blessing, but a prayer for the child. The Office is traditional in England; thus a Roman Catholic book on Pastoralia states that 'most mothers will not go out for any purpose till they have been "churched," as it is often termed.' [2] In Canada, we are told, it has fallen into disuse, whereas in Newfoundland it is greatly valued. [3]

[1] Bede, *H. E.*, i. 27.
[2] J. Dunford, *Practical Suggestions for the Newly Ordained*, p. 39.
[3] W. J. Armitage, *The Story of the Revision of the Canadian Prayer Book*, p. 291.

In the revisions of the 1662 Offices the only one which affects their structure is the American combination of the Offices for Infants and Adults so as to form one Office. The English 1928 and the Scottish Books provide headings for the sections: The Promises (the part previous to them has no heading), The Blessing of the Water, The Baptism, The Thanksgiving, The Duties of the Godfathers and Godmothers. The four prayers beginning 'O merciful God . . . ,' which in 1549 belong to the Office of Blessing the Water, are put under the heading 'The Promises.'

All the Books except the American mention the fourth or fifth Sunday after birth, and all allow parents to be sponsors. 'Due' or 'timely' notice is required by all. The Irish Book orders that sponsors 'be persons of discreet age, and members of the Church of Ireland, or of a Church in communion therewith.'

The Canadian and Irish Books retain the words 'forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin,' which are altered by the others in various ways. The English 1928 Book has 'seeing that all men are from their birth prone to sin, but that God willeth all men to be saved, for God is love'; similarly the Scottish; the South African: 'all men are born with a sinful nature.' The first prayer, with its references to Noah and the Jordan, becomes optional or is omitted in all except the Canadian Book, where it is unchanged. The English, Scottish and South African revisions print the traditional responses before and after the Gospel. All except the Scottish order the congregation to say the Thanksgiving with the Minister.

There are slight changes in the Promises. In the Baptism of Adults the American Book adds two new questions: 'Dost thou believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of the Living God?' and 'Dost thou accept him, and desire to follow him as thy Saviour and Lord?' In all except the Canadian and Irish Books the prayer for Blessing the Water is introduced by the *Sursum corda* and is put in the form of a Eucharistic Preface. The Canadian and Irish Books alone retain the certifying that the child is too weak to be dipped. The American 1929 Book makes the sign of the cross at the reception compulsory instead of optional as up till then.[1] Some small changes are made in the concluding part of the Service in all the Books.

The South African Alternative Form gives as optional additions the ceremonies of the Chrysom and the Lighted Candle, with

[1] The Reformed Episcopal Church was organised in 1873 by those who were discontented with the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration as held by the American Episcopal Church.

these formulas: 'We give this white vesture, a token of the innocency bestowed upon thee, and for a sign whereby thou art admonished to give thyself to pureness of living, that after this transitory life thou mayest be partaker of the life everlasting.' 'Receive the light of Christ, that when the Bridegroom cometh thou mayest go forth with all the saints to meet him; and see that thou keep the grace of thy baptism.' [1] The South African Church also has a beautiful Form of Admitting Catechumens, based on primitive models.

Additional Note.—In the Gorham case, the Dean of Arches in 1849 pronounced against Mr. Gorham, whom the Bishop of Exeter (Phillpotts) had declined to institute because he held that Baptismal Regeneration was not absolute but conditional on an act of prevenient grace. The Dean held that, according to the doctrine of the Church of England, spiritual regeneration is given in Baptism unconditionally. On appeal the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that Mr. Gorham's views were not repugnant to the doctrine of the Church of England. Their reasons, however, are not convincing. As Mr. Warre Cornish, a writer with little sympathy toward Catholicism, says (*A History of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century*, i. 326), 'If the judges had been infallible in grammar they might have pronounced "generally" to be equivalent to "universally," and the judgment would have gone the other way; for the distinction drawn by Gorham is not acknowledged by lexicographers at the stage of the English language represented by the Anglican formularies. In the Church Catechism "generally" means "universally," as a "general" council means a "universal" council, and a "general" order an order to "all concerned."'

[1] The Godfather receives the candle when the baptised is an infant

THE CATECHISM AND CHILDREN'S WORSHIP

By A. R. BROWNE-WILKINSON

A 'CATECHISM' is properly speaking not a statement of doctrine but a method of instruction. We need not delay over the etymology of the word, which appears to imply a 'dinning in' of ideas. But, as often in similar cases, the real study is rather of the process which the word describes than of the precise history of the word and its cognates.

We may begin, therefore, by stating that, generally, 'Catechism' refers to a method of oral instruction, almost invariably by means of question and answer. Those to whom the instruction is given are 'catechumens,' and the status in the church which they occupy is designated the 'catechumenate.' At the outset (see Acts ii. 42) catechetical instruction followed Baptism; the Jewish converts already knew the fundamental truths of religion and had the Messianic hope—having confessed that Jesus was the Christ they needed to learn about His acts and words. But the needs of the Gentile Mission soon led to catechumenate before Baptism. There is not much evidence; but what there is suffices to indicate that all who entered the Church received instruction in the faith. So much we may learn from two early writings, the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, which may belong to the first century, and the *Apology* of Justin Martyr, about the middle of the second. Before long the task of the catechist came to be one of considerable distinction, as witness the fame at the beginning of the third century of the catechetical school at Alexandria, and of the *catecheses* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem in the fourth century. Such schools became places of sacred learning for Christians in all stages of progress; but the 'catechumenate' was a distinct status implying, usually, preparation for Baptism. The catechumenate, as it developed in the early centuries of the Church's history, came to include a threefold preparation for Baptism, viz. (i) instruction as to renunciation, (ii) instruction as to belief, (iii) exorcism. The names of those admitted to the course were carefully kept, and the Bishop satisfied himself that the preparation had been adequate before administering Baptism, Confirmation and first Communion.

The information that we possess about the catechumenate in the fourth century is fairly plentiful, and from that time forward there is no difficulty in following the general lines along which the catechetical instruction of the Church developed. The main substance of the instruction from the earliest time appears to have been the Baptismal Creed and the Lord's Prayer, together with teaching with regard to moral conduct and that practical habituation to Christian ideals of prayer and worship which would follow from attendance at the first part of the Eucharistic worship of the Church. It was customary during the instruction to hold a sort of examination, called *scrutinium*: by the seventh century the number of these scrutinies in Rome increased to as many as seven. Thus it was possible to find out whether the candidate knew the Creed and the Lord's Prayer and certain other doctrinal teaching by heart. In this way the memorisation of final portions of instruction came to be included in the process known as Catechesis, but the memoranda were not yet designated 'catechism.'

The system which has been briefly described was reproduced in England, and thus began the tradition in the Church of England of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and training in the Christian moral obligation which has always been hers. But in England, as elsewhere, this technique of teaching was originally intended for the instruction of adults: a fact which, when duly reflected upon, is of great significance. When it came to be the usual thing for persons to be baptised in infancy, their instruction obviously had to come after rather than before baptism, and it was enjoined that the clergy should carefully instruct the people. Thus Bede urges (A.D. 734) the Archbishop of York so to command his clergy, and the Council of Cloveshoo (A.D. 747) provides that Priests shall explain in the vulgar tongue the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the meaning and words of administration of Baptism and Holy Communion. Although the actual instruction (later to be known as catechism) now followed baptism, the words 'catechumen' and 'catechism' still usually referred to the initial stages of baptism, the exception being that the instruction of children is sometimes called catechising in the thirteenth century. In this way the catechumenate technically became merely a liturgical matter represented by the remains of the old order for the making of catechumens tacked on at the beginning of the baptism service; the *scrutinia* surviving in the form of the answers demanded from the godparents, this process itself being frequently called 'catechising,' and the interrogations 'catechism.' But right up to the Reformation the clergy are continually being charged by their bishops to attend to the systematic teaching of their people, and Primers for the laity as well as manuals of instruction chiefly for the use of the clergy existed.

The effect of the Reformation on Anglican usage was twofold. In the first place it provided a definite manual of instruction for general use in the form of a 'catechism'; in the second place an attempt was made to systematise the giving of religious instruction to the young.

The curate is to use this Catechism, which is in question and answer form, every Sunday and holy-day, and the young are to be sent by those responsible for them: penalties are provided in the canons for those who fail to fulfil this obligation. The Catechism which appears in the English Prayer Book of the sixteenth century is thus in effect an adaptation to the purpose of the instruction of the young before Confirmation of that instruction which had been originally prescribed for adult catechumens and later for all Church people. The Prayer Book Catechism in its present form dates from 1661, when it received the assent of Convocation: the first part, up to the 'Desire,' appeared in the 1549 Book, which also, according to strong but not quite unchallengeable testimony, was approved by Convocation. Izaak Walton, writing in 1653, attributes the Catechism published in 'our good old service books' to Nowell, Dean of St. Paul's, but he is almost certainly wrong, and Cranmer, although not the sole author, probably had much to do with it. Other names suggested are those of Goodrich, Bishop of Ely, and John Poynet, Bishop of Winchester.

It was intended to follow the 1549 Catechism with more advanced manuals. Dean Nowell prepared both a Larger and a Middle Catechism; and of these Overall, Dean of St. Paul's, made use in preparing the section on the Sacraments in 1604. With only two emendations and with slightly altered rubrical directions the completed Catechism took its place in the 1662 Prayer Book and has remained unrevised to this day.

Regarded as an example of the many catechisms which appeared in Western Christendom in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the Prayer Book Catechism stands high. It is much shorter [1] and more concise than the Catechism of the Council of Trent. This document is in four parts, dealing respectively with Faith, the means of Grace, the Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. Unlike our Catechism, it is not designed as a manual for the use of children, but for the clergy in their preparation of instruction. For the former purpose the Roman Catholic Church relies upon smaller Catechisms locally made. It is interesting to note that the Vatican Council of 1870 considered the question of a standardised popular Catechism, but abandoned the project, admitting that at least three grades would be wanted.

[1] Though shortness is a defect when it entails omitting all teaching about Confirmation, the Church, and the Ministry.

Another outstanding example of Reformation Catechisms is Luther's Small Catechism. Luther's views on what a Catechism should be are expressed in his German Mass composed in 1525. He writes: 'What we need first of all is a good plain Catechism . . . for such instruction I know no better form than those three parts which have been preserved in the Christian Church from the beginning—the Ten Commandments, the Creed and the Lord's Prayer—which contain in a brief summary all that a Christian ought to know.' The final form of Luther's Small Catechism, which eventually superseded all others in Lutheran churches, contained five parts: (i) The Law: the Schoolmaster showing man his sin and need of Christ. (ii) The Apostles' Creed: this section deals not only with the great works of God for man in creation, redemption and sanctification, but with the subjective faith, by which man apprehends God's work. (iii) The Lord's Prayer: in this section the life of the child of God with its duties, privileges and resources is set forth. (iv) Baptism, and (v) (after a connecting link on Confession and Absolution) the Sacrament of the Altar. The scope of Luther's Catechism is therefore closely parallel to the Anglican Catechism; but it is a much more diffuse document, and although intended as an exposition of doctrine for the instruction of the young and simple, it ends by reaching the dimensions, as it has also achieved the status, of a considerable theological treatise.

Of the other reformed Catechisms, the two most famous are the Heidelberg and the Westminster Catechisms. The Heidelberg Catechism, published in 1563, contains 129 questions with long confessional answers, which are far too long and prolix for the use of children. It deals with the sin and misery of man, the Articles of the Apostles' Creed, the Two Sacraments, the Commandments under the heading of the Thankful Life of the Christian, the Lord's Prayer.

The Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Assembly was finished in 1647 and adopted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in the following year. The Theology of this Catechism is Calvinistic. The ground covered is the Doctrine of God, Creation and the Fall of Man, Redemption, the work of the Holy Spirit, the Commandments, and at the end the Apostles' Creed is printed but not formally explained. It may thus be concluded, without undue complacency, that the Prayer Book Catechism possesses considerable advantages over other Reformation Catechisms as an instrument for the instruction of children, a purpose which all in common had ultimately in view. Its chief merit in this respect is its conciseness and freedom from argument. At the same time it may be questioned whether the scheme for the religious instruction of children represented by the Catechism together with its rubrics has been successful in the

past, and still more whether it is adequate in this respect for present needs.

Two points may be considered separately. The Prayer Book provides (i) a Manual of Instruction: (ii) a suggested plan for its use.

Regarded as a manual of teaching, it is a little difficult to assess the value of the Catechism. Modern scientific ideas of teaching have, undoubtedly, undermined the reputation of the catechetical method for children. A catechism can be a useful piece of apparatus in the hands of the modern educator, but not the only apparatus. Its place will be that of a syllabus setting out the programme of teaching, and also of a valuable thesaurus of approved formulations of doctrinal concepts which have been reached by inductive methods of teaching. It is, from the point of view of sound educational method, a terminus *ad quem* and not *a quo*. Everything here turns on the interpretation placed by the teacher upon the rubrics. These tell the curate to 'instruct and examine . . . in some part of the Catechism.' If this is interpreted as an obligation to educate children in the teaching enshrined in the Catechism so that they may come to value it as an expression of living ideas, all will be well, for such teaching will lead them into the adult possession of a document of abiding value. But to start with the document as a series of statements to be memorised with or without understanding is doubtful procedure. There is much to be said for learning by heart great statements of religious truth, which will be a permanent possession, gradually interpreted more fully by the experience of life, provided that they already enshrine for the hearer part, at any rate, of their meaning. The whole discussion, however, belongs to the subject of educational method and cannot be dealt with here. It must suffice to say that the ideal of providing a document which shall by the mere process of being committed to memory impart the Church's faith to children is now seen to be wholly impracticable, even though it be understood that it will be 'explained' and 'illustrated' during the process of learning.

Turning to the plan for the instruction of children in the faith contemplated in the rubrics belonging to the Catechism and the Confirmation Office, it must be admitted that it has never been successfully carried out except in rare instances.

Documentary evidence in abundance from the visitation articles, charges and other writings of bishops and divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries makes it clear beyond a doubt that, whilst they were anxious that the catechising of children in preparation for Confirmation should be faithfully performed, it was, in fact, very generally neglected. The Puritan opposition to Confirmation had the effect, no doubt quite unintentional, of weakening this system of instruction

simply because it was, by the rubrics, devised as a preparation for that rite. George Herbert, it is true, writes in *A Priest to the Temple* (published 1652, written *c.* 1630): 'The country parson values catechising highly . . . he useth and preferreth the ordinary Church Catechism, partly from obedience to authority, partly for uniformity's sake, that the same common truths may be everywhere professed, especially since many remove from parish to parish, who, like Christian soldiers, are to give the word and to satisfy the congregation by their Catholic answers.' But the anxious inquiries of more than one bishop as to whether the Sunday afternoon service has been turned into catechising by question and answer suggests that Herbert's statement is of an ideal rather than of a common practice.

In the eighteenth century the general slackness of Church life increased year by year. Confirmation was increasingly rare and casual in its administration. It seems indubitable that the instruction of the young in the Catechism was similarly slack and irregular. In the recently published *Diary of a Country Parson in the Eighteenth Century* I have not found one allusion to catechising in several years of ministry. It would seem that it was during the eighteenth century that the custom of children being herded together in a corner of the church at Morning and Evening Prayer with no arrangements for catechising became the general practice. No doubt there were frequent exceptions to this melancholy rule. Archbishop Herring's Visitation Returns reveal that catechising was very common in the first half of the century. Thus in the county of Notts practically every parish made some attempt to observe the rubric. The most frequent answers are that catechising was practised (*a*) in Lent, (*b*) in the summer months. Some parishes had classes on week-days.

The story of the revival of the Church's provision of special religious instruction of children can be traced down a threefold path which is nowhere a direct return to the Prayer Book provision.

First in order is the teaching of the religion of the Church in Day Schools. As early as 1699 the S.P.C.K. had begun to establish charity schools in which the teaching of reading, writing and arithmetic was subordinated to the education in the principles of the Church. By 1718 no less than 1378 schools were giving this education to 28,000 scholars. But it was not until the next century that the Church Day Schools, mainly through the efforts of the National Society, were dealing with a very large proportion of the children of the country. For the last hundred years at any rate the Church Day Schools have played a predominant part in religious education, and the Church Catechism has been a constant feature in the instruction given in them.

The second strand in the revival is represented by the Sunday Schools. The name of Robert Raikes, a churchman of Gloucester, is prominently associated with the beginnings of this movement, although previous efforts of a similar kind had been made by John Wesley (1737) and Lindsay and Hannah More (1769). By 1834 there were a million and a half children in these schools. This figure, however, includes all denominations, and for some time the Sunday Schools were not vehicles for specifically Church teaching. It was indeed this lack in the Sunday Schools from the Church point of view that led to the foundation of the Church of England Sunday School Institute in 1841. With whatever deficiencies, it is only fair to admit that for ninety years past the Sunday Schools of the Church have played a part second only to that of the Church Day Schools in the education of children in the faith. The methods of these schools have varied; often a real attempt has been made to give systematic training in the Catechism; but probably even more often the teaching given has been of a somewhat nebulous character. But during the last twenty years a widely successful attempt has been made to improve the Sunday Schools, both from the point of view of educational method and in respect of the definiteness of the teaching given. From the point of view of the present discussion it is to be noted that the type of lesson used in the Sunday School is not catechetical in method, although in these days it is doctrinal in character with the Catechism as its standard.

For the origins of the third strand we have to go to the Church of France. In France the tradition of catechising never suffered the same eclipse as it did in this country. From the latter part of the seventeenth century at least the Church in France widely possessed an excellent system of catechising. This system is known as the Method of St. Sulpice from the church in Paris where it was developed to a point of especial excellence. Here the term 'catechism' is applied in the old sense of a method of instruction and not of a document. The method consists of a course of instruction extending over about three years. The weekly 'catechism' is divided into three parts: the questioning, the instruction (reproduced in written analyses during the week), and the Gospel and homily through which the moral and spiritual significance of the instruction is enforced. Towards the end of the nineteenth century a determined effort began to be made to introduce this system into this country and to adapt it to the needs of the English Church. A certain amount of success has followed this attempt, and it must be admitted that it approximates more nearly to the Prayer Book plan than the others that have been mentioned. The Method, however, suffers from certain defects from an educational point of view;

but if still further revised and adapted, might be a very serviceable instrument for the teaching of older children.[1]

It remains to add a few notes on the subject of children's worship. In our present Prayer Book there is no provision at all for special services for children. This follows the whole course of the Church's liturgical tradition to the present day. As was indicated at the beginning of this chapter, the earliest custom of the Church was to permit catechumens to the first part of the Holy Eucharist. By this means the catechumen became accustomed to some, at any rate, of the features of Christian worship. The plan was devised for adult catechumens and extended to the case of children. Baptised children were probably present at the Eucharist with their parents from the beginning, and that they should communicate was an ancient and general custom. Thus it was by gradual habituation rather than by special and separate training that children were ordinarily accustomed to learn their worship. At the Reformation it was evidently expected that this policy would be retained. Children, it is enjoined in the Baptism Office, shall be called upon to 'hear sermons,' that is, presumably at the Communion Service, there being no indication of any other occasion.[2]

Much might be written about the excellence of this plan. But it is obvious that its practicability depends upon a circumstance on which for long past it has been impossible to depend, namely, that they will find themselves in church in the company of the elder members of their own family, and will grow up in an environment permeated with the spirit and meaning of the Church's liturgy. Directly it became usual for the children of the parish to be herded together in the corner of the church during services constructed with no regard to their special needs, and dominated by a discourse intended for the edification of their elders, the old arrangement for training them in worship was certain to fail. The question then became one of deciding whether to meet the need by maintaining the ideal of family worship by adapting part of the service to the children, or by supplying special children's services. The former device has been attempted widely in other Christian bodies, notably amongst the Presbyterians, but not often in the Church of England, except by the inclusion of an occasional children's hymn.

Many experiments have been made, however, in the Church of England in the latter direction. Children's services have for

[1] For a suggested adaptation of this method see *The Confirmation School* (C.E.S.S.I. and S.P.C.K., 1930), by the present writer.

[2] In the rubric at the end of the Service, 'Upon the Sundays, and other Holy days (if there be no Communion) . . .,' up to 1661 the words 'Sundays, and other' did not appear. 'The Ante-Communion Service' was meant by the Reformers only for week-days.

many years past been a common feature on Sunday afternoons, and in many parishes there have been children's Eucharists.

The children's Eucharist is usually a celebration of Holy Communion at which the children are specially trained, usually by a second priest or by a lay person kneeling with them, to follow and join in the main parts of the service. Ideally it is better that children should attend a Eucharist at which there are communicants, so that they do not miss witnessing the central act of the rite and associating the service with Communion. It is always desirable that the service for the children should be a real preparation for the service to which it is hoped that as adults they will come. Applying this principle to the Eucharist it is clear that a simple parish Eucharist, which is one of the ordinary services of the day, fulfils this aim better than a special children's Eucharist.

The same principle has to be applied to the other type of service. Speaking generally, the two tendencies which have prevailed in recent years have diametrically diverged. On the one hand there has been a custom of an afternoon children's service consisting of a form of shortened Evensong; and on the other hand there has been a type of service which bears no resemblance to the Prayer Book services, but which has, in arrangement as in the choice of prayers and hymns, been intended to come nearer to the mentality of childhood. Both of these extreme types fail from opposite causes. The first fails because it makes no attempt to provide for the difficulty for children of following the kaleidoscopic change of theme which the adult office presents, in addition to the unrelieved obscurity of difficult language. The second fails because, whilst coming within the reach of childhood's comprehension, it often comes too far within it and becomes trifling ('a man's reach should exceed his grasp' is true for children to a reasonable extent), and, further, it is so utterly different from the Church's Office that it affords no training for the future use of it.

There is therefore at the present time a distinct need for the provision of some guidance to clergy for the conduct of children's services of a kind which, whilst providing for the need of simplicity and special adaptation, shall also be a real introduction to the liturgical worship of the Church. This chapter may, therefore, suitably end with the enunciation of some broad principles which should govern the compilation of such services.[1]

(1) The first and most essential principle is that children's services should always be devised in such wise as to be a training for participation in the ordinary services of the Church. It is this principle which gives worth to that type of experiment which

[1] The writer's *Common Prayer for Children* (C.E.S.S.I. and S.P.C.K., 1931) is a collection of such services.

is associated with the notion of making a 'Children's Church.' In a few parishes it has been possible to set aside a special building as a children's church in which services specially devised to train children in the essential ideas of corporate worship are held. In other parishes the same kind of service is held, for children only, in the parish church. When this plan is rightly worked, the services are arranged on the same general plan as adult services, but the choice of the component parts of the service, prayers, lessons and hymns, follows the need of the children, and they themselves are given as much part in the actual conduct of the service as possible. The last point is important if we are to avoid the growth of that passive attitude in public worship which leaves all effort to the priest and the choir, which is the bane of so much of our public worship. The danger to be avoided in this plan is that the children, whilst forming an attachment to their own 'church' or service, form no acquaintance with the ordinary services of the big congregation and fail to pass on to them in due course. It is this consideration which leads us to prefer a simple parish Communion to a children's Eucharist as the regular method of training in Eucharistic worship, although occasional children's Eucharists are valuable for the training of the younger children.

(2) In services which are for children only, a nice balance must be secured between resemblance to the future adult services and the special features of the children's training in worship. The general structure of such services should suggest good liturgical form whilst avoiding undue rigidity. From time to time the general form may be varied to avoid staleness; but the variation should not be too frequent or too drastic, or all sense of form will be lost. At some points in the service the use of the Book of Common Prayer should be necessary, if only for the finding of a Psalm or Collect, or an Epistle or Gospel, in order that there may be practice in the use of the Book and familiarity with it.

But for much of the material the conductor will obviously go outside the Prayer Book, yet the forms used should weave in familiar phrases. Thus, to take a single illustration, here is a form of confession which could be used, which, whilst avoiding the difficulty of any of the Prayer Book confessions, retains and so familiarises the children with Prayer Book phrases.

> Heavenly Father, we have offended against thy holy laws. We have left undone those things which we ought to have done, And we have done those things which we ought not to have done. We are heartily sorry for these our misdoings. For thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ's sake forgive us all that is past, And grant that we may hereafter serve and please thee. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Such an idea as this is clearly capable of wide application. An admirable model of services which embody this idea is to be found in *St. George's Service Book for Schools.* The Litany form of praise, intercession and petition is much liked by children and should be freely used.

(3) In each service there should be a concentration upon some particular part of worship with the other elements proportionately foreshortened. Thus a particular service would especially concentrate upon praise: confession and prayer would not be omitted though reduced in proportion; but there would be a main concentration on praise introduced by a brief talk on the subject and including a reading about praise, a hymn of praise and a litany of praise. Thus in turn special attention can be given to all aspects of worship.

(4) The use of spoken 'rubric' needs careful attention, so that each act of worship is rightly introduced; but the art of brevity and restraint must be cultivated, or interminable talking on the part of the conductor will result. This 'rubric' will be the great means of getting a continuous line of orderly thought running through the whole service, besides serving the ordinary purpose of rubric in giving directions as to movement, posture, and so on.

(5) Children both learn truth and express response through objective means, therefore ceremonial and dramatic movement may be very freely used. Especially at festivals can this fact be used. For example, a patronal festival service needs more than the choice of suitable prayers, lessons and hymns. Processions of sections of the congregation to parts of the church bearing banners, and the recitation of a tiny Office at font, altar rails, chancel step, and so on, teach and express the significance of these parts of the house of God.

It has not been possible in the space at our disposal to do more than give the briefest indication of the principles which must guide the direction of children's worship. We may conclude this chapter with the suggestion that it is no longer possible to include all the material for training of children in the faith or in worship within the Book of Common Prayer. The Catechism represents a classic expression of that summary of the Church's faith and life, to the living apprehension of which our religious education of children will be directed. In the same way the liturgical services of the Prayer Book, whilst not as they stand suitable for the training of children, are the standards of worship for the happy acceptance of which we shall be consciously preparing them.

A Note on Revisions of the Catechism.[1]

1. *England.* In 1887 the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury adopted some questions and answers on the Church, to be appended to the Catechism. In 1888 it was reported that the Report could not be received by the Upper House, since the consent of the President had not been applied for and obtained, for drawing up and circulating a formulary professing to set forth the doctrines of the Church. A suggestion that the time had come for the revision of the Catechism came from the House of Clergy in the Church Assembly in 1924. The Archbishop of Canterbury in July 1926 presented to the Upper House of Convocation the draft, made by a Committee of Bishops, of a proposed revision of the Catechism. In the following October the Lower House suggested: '(*a*) that, in view of the inadvisability of having alternative Catechisms concurrently authorised, no Revision of the Catechism should be issued with the Revised Prayer Book . . .; but (*b*) that when the Revision of the Catechism is completed, it should be dealt with in a separate Measure.' The Bishops were asked to prepare questions and answers on Confirmation, the Holy Spirit in the Church, Sin after Baptism and Repentance, and the functions of Bishops, Priests and Deacons.

The draft Revision with the amendments adopted by the Lower House may be found in Report No. 566. Stress was laid on the purely provisional character of the draft, and so no purpose would be served by a discussion of it here.

2. *Canada* (1922). The changes are confined to arrangement and form, with a view to making questions and answers clearer and more explicit. Headings are introduced and the subject-matter is broken up into shorter sections. Thus the Duty towards God and my Neighbour and the Desire are arranged in sections corresponding to the Commandments and the clauses of the Lord's Prayer. The phrasing of the question is generally repeated in the answer.

3. *Scotland* (1929). The Canadian arrangement of the Duty and the Desire is followed, but the opening and concluding sections are not altered. After the Summary of the Creed follow these words: 'And these three Persons in one God I praise and magnify, saying, Glory be to the Father . . . world without end. Amen.' Three questions and answers are added on Confirmation, at the end of the Catechism. Confirmation is defined as 'an apostolic and sacramental rite by which the Holy Spirit is given to complete our Baptism, so that we may be strengthened in our Christian life.'

4. *The United States of America* (1929). An interesting attempt is made to revive the primitive (and mediæval) practice of cate-

[1] By the editor.

chising and instructing adults, as well as children, in church. In form, the two new catechetical services now provided are addressed *to adults*. The congregation is uniformly spoken of as 'the people,' never as 'children' or 'young people.' It is 'the people' who answer the questions addressed to the congregation, and join in the devotional exercises with which the catechetical instruction is interspersed. Not until the very end of the service is there any indication that the presence of children and young people is contemplated. However, the second of the final rubrics informs us that 'Fathers, Mothers, Guardians, and Sponsors' are required no longer '*to send, but to bring with them to church*,' 'those for whose religious nurture they are responsible,' and are expected themselves to share in the instruction which the minister provides. These new services have proved popular.

With regard to the present status of the 1662 Catechism in the American Church, the concluding rubric makes it clear that it is practically superseded, its place being taken by the augmented Catechism which is incorporated in the new catechetical services, and is now made the basis of instruction for Confirmation.

The only change of any theological significance, which, however, dates from 1789, is the alteration of 'which are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper' to 'which are *spiritually* taken . . .' This is not in practice considered to imply any difference in meaning, since the Preface of 1789, which is still printed, disclaims any intention of departing 'from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship.'

Attention may be called to the following new questions and answers.

Q. When were you made a member of the Church?

A. I was made a member of the Church when I was baptised.

Q. What is the Church?

A. The Church is the Body of which Jesus Christ is the head, and all baptised people are the members.

Q. How is the Church described in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds?

A. The Church is described in the Creeds as One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic.

Q. What do we mean by these words?

A. We mean that the Church is—

One; because it is one Body under one Head;

Holy; because the Holy Spirit dwells in it, and sanctifies its members;

Catholic; because it is universal, holding earnestly the Faith for all time, in all countries, and for all people; and is sent to preach the gospel to the whole world;

Apostolic; because it continues steadfastly in the Apostles' teaching and fellowship.

Q. What is your bounden duty as a member of the Church?

A. My bounden duty is to follow Christ, to worship God every Sunday in his Church; and to pray and give for the spread of his kingdom.

Q. What special means does the Church provide to help you to do all these things?

A. The Church provides the Laying on of Hands, or Confirmation, wherein, after renewing the promises and vows of my Baptism, and declaring my loyalty and devotion to Christ as my Master, I receive the strengthening gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Q. After you have been confirmed, what great privilege doth our Lord provide for you?

A. Our Lord provides the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, for the strengthening and refreshing of my soul.

Q. What orders of Ministers are there in the Church?

A. Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, which orders have been in the Church from the earliest times.

Q. What is the office of a Bishop?

A. The office of a Bishop is, to be a chief pastor in the Church; to confer Holy Orders; and to administer Confirmation.

Q. What is the office of a Priest?

A. The office of a Priest is, to minister to the people committed to his care; to preach the Word of God; to baptise; to celebrate the Holy Communion; and to pronounce Absolution and Blessing in God's Name.

Q. What is the office of a Deacon?

A. The office of a Deacon is, to assist the Priest in Divine Service, and in his other ministrations, under the direction of the Bishop.

CONFIRMATION

By THE EDITOR

SEVERAL times in the article on Baptism the description stopped before reaching the second part of the initiatory rite, which in the West since the fifth century has been termed Confirmation.[1] This separating of the two parts may seem unscientific, but it is the obvious method in a book intended primarily for Anglican readers, who are accustomed to think of Confirmation as a rite normally following Baptism after a long interval, and since the Reformation have had to defend it against Protestants who reject it while retaining Baptism.

Confirmation, says a recent writer,[2] differs from Baptism, which is solidly based on the words of Christ, in that, 'though from the first it has been distinct from Baptism, in the sequel it has not remained identical with itself; it has been transformed, it has evolved.' In the Eastern Church it takes the form of unction, with oil blessed by the Patriarch at Constantinople (or Moscow) on Maundy Thursday, administered by the priest immediately after Baptism; in the Latin rite it is administered normally by the Bishop, but sometimes by a priest, with laying on of hands and unction, the oil having been consecrated by the Bishop on Maundy Thursday, usually to children of seven years;[3] in the Anglican Communion it is administered by the Bishop only, normally to adolescents, and unction is not used; in the Lutheran Churches the minister blesses the candidates, usually laying on his hand, after a long course of instruction, but the sacramental side of the ordinance is almost entirely obscured.

[1] First in extant literature by Faustus, Bishop of Riez, formerly Abbot of Lérins; see H. J. Lawlor in *Encycl. of Rel. and Ethics*, art. 'Confirmation,' where the relevant passages are set out with great clarity and fullness. The volume entitled *Confirmation* (S.P.C.K., Vol. I, 1926) is the fullest historical treatment of the subject. On the liturgical side it should be supplemented by T. Thompson's *The Offices of Baptism and Confirmation*, which was, however, written before the Hippolytan origin of the Egyptian Church Order was recognised.

[2] R. de Journel in *Liturgia*, p. 708.

[3] Since the Decree *Quam Singulari* (1910), fixing seven as the age for First Communion. Among the Uniats the priest has normally what in the Latin rite he has exceptionally—authority to administer Confirmation.

In view of this diversity we are prepared to find some obscurities in the history of the rite.

I

The Jewish antecedents of Confirmation are obvious.[1] The passages relied on are those which are also quoted in books dealing with Ordination;[2] this suggests the rightness of the line of teaching which treats Confirmation as ordination to the priesthood of the laity. Laying on of hands in the Old Testament is a ceremony the root meaning of which is transference. The Hebrew word *samakh*, 'rest (hand) upon,' is used of transferring the sins of Israel to the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 21); of fastening guilt upon an offender (Lev. xxiv. 14; cf. Susannah 34); and, most important for our purpose, of transferring power from one person to another, as in Num. xxvii. 18–20, Deut. xxxiv. 9, where Moses lays his hand upon Joshua and imparts the spirit to him, primarily, it would seem, capacity for administration. This 'transference,' *semikhah*, is the word used in the early Rabbinic period for 'ordination' of elders and Rabbis.

We find Christ using the same gesture as a means of mediating health to the sick; in some way He imparted His own wholeness to the sufferers, so that transference once more is the root meaning. Again, He laid His hands on the children brought to Him, 'that he should lay his hands on them, and pray' (Matt. xix. 13), imparting a spiritual blessing.[3] In the light of Old Testament and contempory Jewish practice and of our Lord's own methods, it is only what we should have expected when we find the Apostles laying hands on persons to impart a spiritual blessing, and, in a specialised form of the general practice, on certain men in order to transfer the authority and power of office.

Confirmation was composed of two elements, the outward sign inherited from Judaism, and the new meaning derived from the Christian experience of the Spirit. The prophets taught that a further revelation of the Spirit, when God's law would be written in the hearts of all, was in store.[4] Moses the prophet exclaimed: 'Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets!'[5] In Rabbinic exegesis this was interpreted thus:

[1] For a fuller treatment see the writer's Essay 'Laying on of Hands in the New Testament' in *Confirmation*, Vol. I, pp. 1–24.

[2] See the writer's Essay 'The Origins of Episcopacy' in *Episcopacy Ancient and Modern* (S.P.C.K., 1930); and W. Lockton, *Divers Orders of Ministers*, where the Jewish evidence is given in detail.

[3] Cf. the writer's *New Testament Problems*, p. 37, for a suggestion that this is analogous to Confirmation rather than to Baptism.

[4] See especially Jer. xxxi. 31 ff.

[5] Num. xi. 29.

'In this world certain individuals have prophesied, but in the world to come all Israelites will be prophets.'[1] When prophecy revived in the person of John the Baptist, he proclaimed the coming of One who would baptise with spirit and with fire. Without going into the critical questions connected with our Lord's sayings about the coming of the Holy Spirit,[2] we can safely affirm that the Apostles on the Day of Pentecost would remember many sayings of Christ assuring them of the coming of the Spirit. When they had their great spiritual experience and became conscious of living in the last days, or world to come, foretold by the prophets, and of being themselves prophets endowed with the gift of ecstatic utterance, it was natural that they should wish to impart to others what they had received, following the example of Moses. In the light of Acts ii. 38: 'Be baptized . . . unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,' we shall probably be led to conclude that they laid hands on the 3000 besides baptising them. Certainly there is no suggestion in Acts viii that the Apostles were introducing anything new. We must remember, too, the prominence in the Apostles' minds of our Lord's own Baptism.[3] He had been baptised and had further experienced the illapse of the Holy Spirit to equip Him with power for His ministry. From the beginning this second part of the initiatory rite must have been prominent in the Apostles' minds and, one would suppose, in their practice.

In Acts x. 44 the Holy Spirit falls upon Gentiles as yet unbaptised. Baptism follows, but laying on of hands is presumably no more necessary than in the case of the disciples at Pentecost. The story is told as if it was exceptional—a kind of Pentecost of the Gentiles. But there may have been other instances, which may have led to the Syrian custom by which Confirmation preceded Baptism.

The position here maintained would be vulnerable if not supported by evidence drawn from the rest of the New Testament, since the historical value of the second chapter of the Acts has been impugned by critics and its unsupported evidence would be unconvincing. But the relevant passages support what is to begin with only a working hypothesis.

(a) *Acts* viii. Philip, himself an ecstatic[4] and a healer who would presumably use laying on of hands,[5] baptised the Samaritans but refrained from the further step of laying on hands that they might be received into the Spirit-filled body—that was reserved

[1] Quoted by Gavin, *Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*, p. 100. Cf. Joel ii. 28.

[2] John iii. 5 (where 'Spirit' has been taken by some to refer to Confirmation), xiv. 16, 26, xvi. 7, xx. 22.

[3] Acts i. 22; and cf. the framework of tradition represented in St. Mark.

[4] Acts viii. 39; cf. xxi. 9. [5] Acts viii. 7.

for Peter and John, who prayed and laid hands on them. The signs which followed (*v.* 18, Simon 'saw' that the Spirit was given) showed that the Samaritans too were the Lord's people and belonged to the 'all flesh' on whom the Spirit was poured.

(b) *Acts* ix. 17, 18. This we take to mean that Ananias laid hands on Saul that he might receive his sight; after which he was initiated, that is, he was baptised and was filled with the Holy Ghost through the Confirmation that followed. But the interpretation by which the laying on of hands in *v.* 17 represents Confirmation before Baptism is more common.[1]

(c) *Acts* xix. 1–7. St. Paul baptises disciples of John who have not heard that the Holy Spirit foretold by their master has come, and then confirms them.

(d) *Heb.* vi. 2. Teaching about baptisms (probably the distinction between Christian Baptism and its precursors [2]) and the laying on of hands are coupled as being among the first principles of Christ.

(e) 2 *Tim.* i. 6, 7. Timothy has received the gift of God through the laying on of Paul's hands, defined as a spirit of power and love and discipline—apparently a general Christian equipment, not the special grace of the ministry.

(f) There are a number of passages which refer to a definite act in the past at which the Spirit was imparted.[3] By themselves they do not prove the existence of Confirmation, but read in conjunction with the foregoing passages they are most naturally taken as referring to it.

Was unction associated with Confirmation in the Apostolic Church? The only positive evidence is the references to anointing in 2 Cor. i. 21, 1 John ii. 20, 27, but these may be metaphorical. In view of the use of oil in Jewish religious custom to consecrate *prophets*, priests and kings, its association with the bath,[4] its use by the Apostles during our Lord's ministry,[5] and the part it played in the later rite, it seems probable that unction was associated with the initiatory ceremony from the first, but with Baptism rather than with Confirmation.

The Roman Catholic Church teaches that Confirmation was instituted by our Lord.[6] But some theologians emphasise the absence of the word *immediate*. It may be held that He

[1] Acts xiii. 3 is the 'ordination' of Barnabas and Saul for a particular work, or 'the dismissal of missionaries,' certainly not Confirmation.

[2] See pp. 411 ff.

[3] *E.g.* Rom. v. 5, viii. 15; 1 Cor. ii. 12; 2 Cor. i. 21, 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30; Tit. iii. 5 ('the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost'); 1 John ii. 27.

[4] Cf. Ruth iii. 3; Ezek. xvi. 9; Susannah 17. [5] Mark vi. 13.

[6] The Council of Trent: 'Si quis dixerit, sacramenta novæ legis non fuisse omnia a Iesu Christo Domino nostro instituta . . . anathema sit.' See Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, 844, p. 281.

instituted Confirmation implicitly, not explicitly, but it is risky. 'If any theologian likes to run the risk, he will probably soon hear from the authorities. All loyal Catholics are glad that the question has disappeared and that we can receive our Sacraments directly from our Lord Himself, any silence in the Gospels notwithstanding.'[1] The Book of Common Prayer is content to base Confirmation on the example of the Apostles. Acts viii, according to the usual interpretation, is sufficient evidence. We cannot doubt that SS. Peter and John had 'the mind of Christ.' If the account given above is accepted, the significance of the visit to Samaria is greatly enhanced; it shows us the normal way by which the gift of the Spirit was transferred.

An alternative theory should be mentioned, which goes back to Luther. Confirmation in the Acts, he said, was the means of bestowing the charismata, or extraordinary graces, which have since died out. The English Reformers rejected this view, which indeed has little to commend it. In the light of the teaching of the New Testament as a whole, and of St. Paul in 1 Corinthians in particular, it is impossible to imagine that ecstatic utterance, the most conspicuous charisma, was ever looked upon as a 'first principle of Christ.' Besides, it is unscientific to isolate the New Testament from the subsequent history of the Church and to suppose that Confirmation was a second-century invention.

II

The second-century evidence for Confirmation is defective. It is not mentioned in the *Didache* (*c.* 100), possibly because the Manual was intended for the local Church and Confirmation was the concern of 'the apostles and prophets.' Nor does it occur in Justin's *Apology* (i. 65), but the conception of the Holy Spirit would have been very difficult to explain to pagans; Justin says that the newly baptised was brought to the place where the brethren were assembled and prayers were said on his behalf; the description reads like a summary in general terms of the rite in the *Apostolic Tradition* (see below). Tertullian says that, having been cleansed in the water, we are prepared for the Holy Spirit. 'Leaving the bath we are anointed all over with blessed unction,' as the Jewish priests were anointed, and as the Lord was anointed spiritually. 'Thereafter, a hand is laid on us by way of blessing, summoning and inviting the Holy Spirit.'[2]

Passing over a numbe: of allusions in the Fathers we now come to the definitely liturgical evidence, beginning, as in the case of Baptism, with the Roman rite of the early part of the third century as it appears in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus

[1] Mgr. F. C. Kolbe, *The Sacrament of Confirmation*, p. 60.

[2] *De Bapt.*, 6–8. The Gnostic sect of Marcosians anointed with balsam after immersion (Iren., *Hær.*, I. xxi. 3 f.).

(*The Egyptian Church Order*). The Bishop has previously sanctified a vessel of oil and exorcised other oil. The presbyter anoints the candidate with the latter oil before Baptism. After Baptism the presbyter anoints him with the sanctified oil, saying: 'I anoint thee with holy oil in the name of Jesus Christ.' The candidates then dress and proceed to the church. There the Bishop lays his hand on them and says: 'O Lord God, who hast made them worthy to receive remission of sins through the laver of regeneration of the Holy Spirit, send on them thy grace, that they may serve thee according to thy will; for thine is the glory . . .' Then, pouring the sanctified oil from his hand and putting it on the head, he says: 'I anoint thee with holy oil in the Lord Father Almighty and Christ Jesus and the Holy Spirit.' Signing the candidate on the brow he kisses him, saying, 'The Lord be with thee'; the candidate replies, 'And with thy spirit.' After which the confirmed persons pray with the faithful, in the Eucharist that follows.

For the main line of development in the East we take the rite as described by St. Cyril of Jerusalem in the middle of the fourth century (*De Myst.*, iii.). Before Baptism the candidates have been anointed with exorcised oil. After Baptism they are confirmed. 'Ye have been made Christ's by receiving the antitype of the Holy Spirit; and all things have been wrought in you by imitation, because ye are images of Christ,' who after His Baptism was anointed by the Holy Spirit. The oil used 'is no more simple ointment . . . after invocation, but it is Christ's gift of grace . . . which ointment is symbolically applied to thy forehead and thy other senses; and while thy body is anointed with the visible ointment, thy soul is sanctified with the Holy and life-giving Spirit.' Confirmation was called 'the seal'—'with oil he anointed thy head upon thy forehead, for the seal which thou hast of God' (iv. 7).

The north Italian rite described in St. Ambrose's *De Mysteriis* and the later *De Sacramentis* had an unction before the renunciation,[1] an anointing of the Christian athlete for 'the contest of the world.' After the immersion came unction of the head with chrism ('myrrh'), by the Bishop (*sacerdos*), who said: 'God the Father, who hath regenerated thee by water and the Holy Ghost, and hath forgiven thee thy sins, himself anoint thee unto eternal life.' Then followed the washing of the feet, a Western but not Roman ceremony, and the vesting in white robes. Finally, there was the 'signing,' or 'spiritual seal,' called also the *perfectio*, 'completion,' of Baptism, and connected with the sevenfold gift of the Holy Spirit. This final ceremony is not described more exactly, and the author of *De Sacramentis* does not help us by saying 'this is called regeneration.'[2]

Having traced what seems to be the main line of development,

[1] In *De Sacr.* only. [2] III. i. 1.

we now record other matters which must not be omitted. The early Syrian Church had a pre-baptismal unction only. Thus the *Didascalia* says: 'As of old the priests and kings were anointed in Israel, do thou in like manner, with the imposition of hand, anoint the head of those who receive Baptism, whether of men or of women; and afterwards—whether thou thyself baptise, or thou command the deacons or presbyters to baptise . . .'[1] Ephraem, Aphraates, Narsai, and other authorities attest the custom, with which the gift of the Holy Spirit was associated. The East Syrians maintained this peculiarity until about 650, when the Catholics added a post-baptismal unction, which even now has not found a place in all manuscripts. The West Syrians came into line with the main body of the Church soon after 500.

The imposition of one hand was the regular practice, though where the Greek word χειροθεσία is used it is impossible to say whether a singular or a plural noun is implied. In the West, and sometimes in the East, it was the custom to receive heretics by imposition of the hand. When it was finally decided that heretics should not be rebaptised, it still remained necessary to confirm them. Jerome and Augustine held that the ceremony was one of benediction only, but Gregory the Great (*c.* 600) wrote: 'The West reconciles Arians to the Church by the imposition of hands, but the East by the unction of holy chrism.'[2]

Scholars are wont to record the facts about the early history of Confirmation without venturing on a theory to account for them. A writer, therefore, who puts forward one of his own must do so with diffidence. The hypothesis that follows does, however, clear up some obscurities.

In Confirmation the outward sign is not so distinctive as it is in the case of Baptism and the Eucharist. Imposition of hands is a natural form of benediction and was used for receiving heretics, as well as for Ordination. Unction was associated with the bath and was also a recognised means of healing. It is not surprising, then, that in connection with both signs there is a borderland of doubtful cases where we cannot be certain that a sacramental rite is intended. The original method of initiation was twofold, immersion and the imposition of hands, representing the negative and positive sides, remission of sins and the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. Very soon, if not from the beginning, oil came to be used in connection with the baptismal bath, and, thanks to its Old Testament associations, acquired a religious meaning. In the East it became more important than imposition of hands and eventually unction practically replaced imposition. The first two anointings of the Hippolytan rite grew out of two types of

[1] iii. 12 (Connolly, p. 146). [2] *Ep.* xi. 67.

baptismal anointing, before and after the immersion. Another line of development concerned the Bishop, who was at first the normal minister of the combined initiatory rite. As the Church grew, he delegated Baptism to the presbyters, retaining Confirmation in his own hands. The post-baptismal anointing could be attached either to Baptism or to Confirmation. It eventually became part of the Confirmation rite, the presbyters' unction being also retained in some places.

But why did unction replace imposition of hands in the East? As the eschatological associations of Confirmation, for the existence of which in the earliest period we have argued, died out the special significance of imposition of hands would be forgotten. On the other hand, chrism would seem enormously important. At Baptism-Confirmation one became a Christian. What more natural than to make chrism the chief sign in the positive side of the ceremony? That the tendency was most apparent in the Syrian Church, where Confirmation became so integral a part of Baptism that the order of the two parts could be changed, is not surprising when we remember that the disciples were called *Christians* first at Antioch.[1] The development was probably well on the way when Theophilus of Antioch (*c.* 180) wrote: 'We are called Christians on this account, because we are anointed with the oil of God.'[2]

III

In the Eastern Orthodox Church to-day chrism[3] follows Baptism immediately. The Service begins with praise, and thanksgiving for Baptism,[4] proceeding to pray for 'the Seal of the gift of thy holy, and almighty, and adorable Spirit.' The priest then anoints the child, making the sign of the cross, on the brow, eyes, nostrils, lips, ears, breast, hands and feet, saying each time 'The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Amen.' Penitents returning to the Church are usually anointed. 'This intinction with myrrh has never been considered as a repetition of the sacrament, but is as it were the rededication of the new life of those returning to Orthodoxy, by the prayers and blessing of the Church and the invocation of the Holy Spirit.'[5] The anointing of the Russian Czar was generally distinguished from

[1] Acts xi. 26.

[2] *Ad Autol.*, i. 12. In the theory here sketched it is unnecessary to use the exceptional cases found in the Acts.

[3] Sometimes called 'Myrrh,' or again 'Bebaiosis' (= Lat. *Confirmatio*).

[4] '. . . hast been pleased to regenerate thy servant that hath newly received illumination, by water and the Spirit.'

[5] C. Androutsos, quoted by F. Gavin, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought*, p. 324.

Chrismation, but a Russian text-book says it is 'a special aspect, or, so to speak, the highest grade of it.' [1]

In the developed Roman rite of the sixth and seventh centuries [2] the Pope during the baptising withdrew to a chapel behind the baptistery, called the *consignatorium*. Thither came the newly baptised, a priest having first anointed them with chrism, saying: 'God . . . who hath regenerated thee by water and the Holy Spirit, and hath given thee remission of all sins, himself anoints thee with the chrism of salvation unto eternal life.' They then came before the Pope and stood in groups, over each of which the Pope prayed for the descent of the Holy Spirit with His sevenfold gifts, ending, 'and of thy mercy (*propitiatus*) sign them with the sign of the cross of Christ unto eternal life.' He then signed each person on the brow, with his thumb that he had dipped in the chrism, saying, 'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Peace be to thee.'

The present Roman rite is very brief and essentially the same as that just described. After versicles and responses the Bishop extends his hands towards the candidates and prays for the Holy Spirit in a formula differing only verbally from the early Roman prayer (and the Sarum). The sponsors then present each separately and the Bishop, having dipped the end of his right thumb in the chrism, says: '*N.*, signo te signo Crucis. Et confirmo te Chrismate salutis. In Nomine . . .' He then strikes the candidate lightly on the cheek, saying, 'Pax tecum.' [3] Versicles and responses follow, then a prayer for the candidates, lastly the beautiful blessing: 'Benedicat vos Dominus ex Sion, ut videatis bona Jerusalem omnibus diebus vitæ vestræ, et habeatis vitam æternam.' It is a separate Office, printed in the Pontifical, since Confirmation in the Western Church has for many centuries been normally separated from Baptism.

IV

The 1549 Prayer Book followed the Sarum Office closely. After introductory rubrics, discussed below, it begins with versicles and responses and the prayer for the Holy Spirit. Unction is discontinued. The formula is: 'Sign them, O Lord, and mark them to be thine for ever, by the virtue of thy holy cross and passion. Confirm and strengthen them, with the inward unction of thy Holy Ghost, mercifully unto everlasting

[1] See R. M. French in *Confirmation*, i. 284.

[2] As described by Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 314.

[3] The *alapa*, found first in Durandus (d. 1334). Possibly in origin designed to impress the occasion on the child's memory; or suggested by the feudal *accolade*. Symbolically explained as an exhortation to suffer for the faith. May it not have originated in a fatherly pat?

life. Amen. (*Then the Bishop shall cross them in the forehead and lay his hand upon their head, saying.*) *N.*, I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and lay my hand upon thee. In the name . . .' 'The peace of the Lord abide with you. And with thy spirit,' the prayer 'Almighty (and) everliving God . . .', and the Blessing make up the rest of the Service. Features absent from the present service should be noted: (*a*) the reference to inward unction, material unction having been discontinued; (*b*) the naming of the candidate, which gave an opportunity for changing the baptismal name;[1] (*c*) the linking of the signing with imposition of the hand.[2] In 1552 the formula given above was altered to the present 'Defend, O Lord . . .'

The 1662 Office is too familiar to require much discussion. The introductory rubrics referring to Confirmation are printed at the end of the Catechism.[3] The problem of age is treated below. Up to 1662 the examination in the Catechism was conducted by the Bishop or his deputy. The phrase 'shall be brought to the Bishop by one that shall be his Godfather, or Godmother . . .' in the earlier Prayer Books was then altered to 'every one shall have a Godfather, or a Godmother (as a witness of their Confirmation).' The later phrasing suggests the dying out of the custom of having a new godparent at Confirmation. Two rubrics of 1549–52 are not represented in 1662. One states that Confirmation 'is most meet to be ministered when children come to that age, that partly by the frailty of their own flesh, partly by the assaults of the world and the devil, they begin to be in danger to fall into sin '('sundry kinds of sin,' 1552). The other runs: 'It is agreeable with the usage of the Church in times past, whereby it was ordained that Confirmation should be administered to them that were of perfect age, that they being instructed in Christ's religion, should openly profess their own faith, and promise to be obedient to the will of God '—and is clearly a misreading of history.

The Exhortation is based on the first two rubrics of 1549–52, but 'ratify and confirm' as in 1552 replaces the 'ratify and confess' of 1549. The Bishop's question 'Do ye here . . .' represents the earlier examination in the Catechism by the Bishop. The versicles and responses are from Sarum, with 'Lord hear our prayer . . .' for 'The Lord be with you . . .', as in 1552. The invocation of the Holy Spirit is substantially the traditional Roman form. The reference to regeneration and forgiveness of sins originally presupposed that Baptism had

[1] Cf. S. L. Ollard in *Confirmation*, i. 86.

[2] See Ollard, *op. cit.*, i. 84, for the English pre-Reformation practice of imposition.

[3] Instead of at the beginning of the combined Confirmation and Catechism, as in the earlier books.

immediately preceded; it should now presuppose that the candidate, with the help of the parish priest, has sought and obtained forgiveness of post-baptismal sin. The Bishop's prayer, 'Defend, O Lord . . .' (since 1552) is very beautiful but, as Cosin said, it 'seems to be rather a prayer that may be said by any minister, than a confirmation that was reserved only to the Bishop.' 'The Lord be with you' that follows is a poor substitute for 'The peace of the Lord abide with you' of 1549.[1] The Lord's Prayer was added in 1662. The Prayer 'Almighty and everliving God . . .' was taken in 1549 from Hermann's *Consultatio*.[2] The Prayer that follows was added in 1662 and comes from the Sarum Breviary, where it is said after Prime.

In the concluding rubric, 'and there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion, until such time as he be confirmed, *or be ready and desirous to be confirmed*,' the final words were added in 1662, after a lengthy period in which Confirmation had been unobtainable. They are based on the Sarum rubric, 'or reasonably hindered from the reception of the sacrament of Confirmation.'

V

The recent revisions of the Book of Common Prayer prove a general agreement that the 1662 Office misses an opportunity. The English 1928, Scottish and S. African insert headings showing the division into Introduction, Questioning and Renewal of Vows, Confirmation itself, and the Dismissal or Conclusion (the last is not distinguished in the S. African).

In the Introduction the Minister in the American Order presents the candidates, saying: 'Reverend Father in God, I present unto you these persons to receive the Laying on of Hands.' The Canadian Book amplifies this on the lines of the Ordination Services. The Irish Book keeps the 1662 Preface, while the others (excepting the American, which substitutes a lesson from Acts viii[3]) expand it considerably, explaining its Apostolic authority, and the gifts received, and the obligations undertaken, by the candidates.

All the revisions amplify the next section, the Renewal of Baptismal Vows. The American addition is the shortest: 'Do ye promise to follow Jesus Christ as your Lord and Saviour?' and the least happy. 'Will ye endeavour to keep God's holy will and commandments, and to walk . . .?' is a better question

[1] This feature was omitted entirely in 1552.

[2] 1543; also in the 1539 *Ordnung der Kirchen zu Cassel* (Dowden, *Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, p. 35).

[3] The Canadian Book has, in addition to the expanded Preface, three lessons, from Acts viii, xix, and Heb. vi.

to put to a child.[1] The English, Scottish and S. African forms get rid of the misleading 'ratifying *and confirming* the same.'[2]

'The Confirmation' remains unchanged in the Irish, American and Canadian Books. So also in the English 1928, except for a rubric: 'No Hymn or Address shall be introduced into this part of the Service, except that a Hymn may be sung, if needed, in the course of the laying on of hands'; similarly in the Scottish and S. African Books. Confirmation is by prayer and imposition of hands. The prayer is that for the Holy Spirit in His sevenfold might, and any interruption which lends colour to the misconception that the words 'Defend, O Lord . . .' are the 'prayer' is forbidden. The Scottish form restores the signing from the 1549 rite: 'Sign them, O Lord, and mark them to be thine for ever by the virtue of the holy cross; mercifully confirm them with the inward unction of the Holy Ghost, that they may attain unto everlasting life. *Amen*. *N*., I sign thee with the sign of the cross and I lay my hands [hand] upon thee, In the Name . . .' In the S. African form, when all have been confirmed, the Bishop declares that they are admitted to receive the Holy Communion. The same form allows the Bishop at his discretion to add, '*N*., I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I lay my hand upon thee,' with or without the Holy Chrism.

The English 1928 Book prefaces the Blessing with these words: 'Go forth into the world in peace; be of good courage; hold fast that which is good; render to no man evil for evil; strengthen the faint-hearted; support the weak; help the afflicted; honour all men; love and serve the Lord, rejoicing in the power of the Holy Spirit'—a beautiful summary of the Christian's life in the world, but owing to its piling up of closely packed precepts, some of them beyond the range of immature minds, unsuitable in its present position. A Blessing should not be a sermon in miniature.

VI

It will be convenient to bring together some material regarding (*a*) the matter, (*b*) the minister, (*c*) the subject, of Confirmation; the questions which arise have been considered incidentally in the foregoing pages.

(*a*) In 1439, during the Council of Florence, Eugenius IV put out a Bull, known as *Decretum pro Armenis*, in which, in the part dealing with the Sacraments, the 'matter' of Confirmation is

[1] And indeed to a mature Christian. Confirmation is not a time for making exaggerated professions. But the American question is to be judged by its devotional value, not theologically.

[2] The English returns to 'ratifying and confessing' of the 1549 rubric.

defined as 'chrism made of oil and balsam, blessed by the Bishop.'[1] There have been four different views current in the West; that it consists (i) in the imposition of hands alone, (ii) in chrism alone, (iii) in either, (iv) in both. The *Decretum* of Eugenius is not regarded as infallible, and the usual modern view is that the 'matter' is imposition of hands and chrism conjointly. The spreading out of the Bishop's hands over the candidates before the signing 'was formerly considered by some to constitute a *manuum impositio*, and to be of the essence of the rite.'[2]

(*b*) In the early Church the Bishop normally imposed hands with unction on those who had been baptised. In the East the parish priest soon acquired the right to administer chrism. Two papal letters illustrate the state of things in the West. Innocent I wrote to Decentius in 416: 'Presbyters are allowed to anoint the baptised with chrism, either away from the Bishop, or when they baptise in his presence; but with chrism which has been consecrated by the Bishop; not, however, to sign the brow with the same oil, which is reserved to the Bishops alone, when they impart the Spirit Paraclete.'[3] Gregory the Great wrote to Januarius, Bishop of Cagliari: 'It has also come to our ears that some have been offended by our having forbidden presbyters to touch with chrism *candidates for baptism*. And we indeed acted according to the ancient use of our Church; but if any are in fact distressed, we allow that, where there is a lack of Bishops, presbyters may touch with chrism, even on their foreheads, *candidates for baptism*.'[4] St. Thomas Aquinas laid down the principle that the Bishop alone is the minister of Confirmation; the Pope grants to priests the privilege of administering the sacrament, as he does at times the power to confer minor orders. This has been accepted by the Roman Church. Theologians have added the teaching that the Eastern custom was tacitly accepted in that it became current without opposition from Rome; finally, it was approved by the Council of Florence.[5] Some have taught that the priest by virtue of ordination receives power to confirm but that it remains inoperative until the Pope grants a faculty to exercise the power.

At present the 'extraordinary minister' of Confirmation is the presbyter to whom by common law or special indult of the Apostolic See the faculty has been conceded. Such presbyters in common law are certain Abbots, Prelates, and Vicars Apostolic

[1] Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papststums*, p. 235.

[2] H. Thurston, *Enc. of Rel. and Ethics*, iv. 10 *a*. See Ollard, *op. cit.*, i. 220, for the practice of an Archbishop of York, who apparently held this view.

[3] Denzinger, *Encheiridion*, 98 (p. 45).

[4] *Ep.* iv. 26. The words in italics translate *baptizandos*, clearly used loosely of the whole initiatory ceremony.

[5] Denzinger, *op. cit.*, 697 (p. 239).

who are not Bishops; also presbyters of Oriental Rites, as regards adherents of their own Rite.[1]

The Anglican Communion has confined the administering of Confirmation to Bishops with inflexible rigidity. The results have been disastrous overseas, especially in America,[2] before the Episcopate was established. It is axiomatic with most Anglicans that a Bishop should be consecrated for a group of people remote from a Bishop, lest they should be deprived of the sacraments. But the setting up of a new diocese is a serious matter, and in some cases it might be wiser to send a priest with powers of jurisdiction but not consecrated as a bishop, to whom Confirmation might be delegated.[3]

(*c*) When country parishes were formed in the West, the parish priest brought those he had baptised to the Bishop of the neighbouring city for Confirmation. Outside Italy, especially, where dioceses were large, this became impossible, and Bishops began to visit their dioceses in order to confirm the children who had all been baptised in infancy. The Lateran Council (1215) defined the duty of Communion as beginning with 'years of discretion.' The exact meaning of this was disputed, but from seven to ten was the usual age for Confirmation, the door to Communion. The Catechism of the Council of Trent suggested ten to twelve. In Spain and some Spanish-American countries the custom has been to make Confirmation follow immediately on Baptism. The present law gives seven as the suitable age, which may be anticipated for a good cause.[4] In other words, 'the age of discretion' has been officially defined as 'the age of reason.'

The intention of the English Reformers being to combine instruction with Sacraments, we are not surprised to find seventeenth and eighteenth century Bishops asking in their Visitation Questions whether there are parishioners of sixteen years who are not communicants. The Anglican tradition of associating Confirmation with adolescence is deeply rooted. It is still defended by those who lay stress on instruction rather than on sacramental grace. But by others the wisdom of our present methods is disputed. Two among many utterances may be quoted. A distinguished psychologist writes:[5] 'Adolescence is the period at which there is a normal increase of sexual feeling

[1] *Codex Juris Canonici*, 782.

[2] For a century Confirmation was confined to a few wealthy persons who could come to England.

[3] This is a suggestion that could not be treated seriously unless it had met with a measure of approval from the Lambeth Conference. If the link with tradition were not to be broken completely, it would involve the restoration of episcopally consecrated chrism.

[4] Canon 788.

[5] E. G. Howe, *Motives and Mechanisms of the Mind*, p. 127.

and therefore a normal increase of guilt feeling. It is the time at which priggishness is most liable to be needed psychologically as an evasion of guilt. . . . The adolescent knight is often more interested in the gorgeousness of his armour and the purity of his motive than in the distant goal of the Holy Grail and the imperilled lady. It is therefore perhaps unfortunate that this should be the time that is usually chosen for seizing upon a boy's religious enthusiasm, which is too often mixed with unconscious motives, with a view to Confirmation. . . . Confirmation at this phase of rapid growth and emotional instability will too often lead to undesirable repressions, or to a later regret and refusal of religious experience.'

Fr. R. H. Tribe [1] points out that 'for a year after puberty the psychical system is so unstable that it is wise not to attempt to throw into it any new elements, but to let it carry on with the old.' The Catechism contains abstract and technical teaching, for which the mind is not ripe until seventeen or later. Sacramental grace, in Confirmation and Communion, can be received best at nine or ten. The combination of two different things at fourteen or fifteen, an age which fits neither, is wrong in principle.

It would be unwise, in view of Anglican tradition, to attempt to establish too young an age for Confirmation. But to get the period ten to twelve accepted by the Bishops is not impracticable if the parish clergy are themselves convinced.[2]

[1] See *Confirmation*, ii. 113. Fr. Tribe was a doctor of medicine before ordination.

[2] Communion was in the early Church an integral part of the triple initiatory rite—Baptism—Confirmation—Communion. The East in this respect is loyal to tradition. Very young children were communicated from the chalice only. The Missal of Leofric (eleventh century) directs the communion of the infant to take place in the Baptismal Service, immediately after putting on the chrysom, without mentioning Confirmation. The Sarum rubric orders that, if the Bishop is present, Confirmation shall follow Baptism immediately; and then first Communion, *si aetas ejus id deposcit.*

THE SOLEMNISATION OF MATRIMONY

By THE EDITOR

MARRIAGE is a universal human [1] institution, which the Church has ratified and blessed, following the example of Christ. We are not surprised, therefore, to find that our marriage customs are of pre-Christian origin. The price paid to the bride's father to compensate for the loss of a valuable worker, for a young woman was an asset rather than a liability to the primitive father, was later given by him in whole or in part to his daughter, and was finally symbolised by the ring; the gifts associated with marriage now appear in the form of wedding presents. A marriage, as distinguished from an irregular union, had to be celebrated with considerable publicity in ages when no written documents existed. The witnesses, including groomsmen and bridesmaids, ensured this publicity, as they still do. The reception of the woman into the man's family is symbolised by the joining of hands.[2] The passing of the bride to a new house and the setting up of a new family unit combined with the mystery surrounding the origin of life to make a situation in which evil spirits were to be feared.[3] The original purpose of the bridesmaids in festive attire seems to have been to deceive the demons in regard to the identification of the bride; the sleeping of the best man at the bridegroom's house the night before the wedding has a similar motive. The canopy over the bridal pair, which lasted on in France until the nineteenth century, was intended [4] to hide them from the evil eye of demons, and the bridal veil seems to represent the same idea; certainly the pealing of bells does. The rice [5] and the shoe after the ceremony are relics of primitive fertility cults. The ceremonial driving away of the wedded couple reminds us of the procession to the new home, and the custom of the husband's lifting the

[1] Even pre-human, for something resembling a permanent tie between male and female, with continuing joint care for offspring, has been detected in the apes. And many species of birds form permanent unions.

[2] And by the *exchange* of rings, in Germany and elsewhere.

[3] Tobit iii. 8 is the most accessible illustration.

[4] At least as a secondary purpose. The canopy is an extension to the husband of the bride's veil, or may be a simple borrowing of a Jewish custom, see below.

[5] Now superseded in England by the meaningless confetti.

bride over the threshold, not yet quite obsolete, is a last remnant of marriage by capture. Finally, as we shall see later, the wedding-cake stands for the culminating ceremony of the old Roman religious rite out of which the Christian service grew.

I

A brief glance at Hebrew marriage customs may prove of interest. Jacob serves for Rachel seven years, since he has no bride-price with which to buy her (Genesis xxix). He remains after marriage with his wife's people, for the matriarchate is still in force.[1] Genesis xxxiv represents symbolically the clash between *beena* and *baal* marriage, *i.e.* matriarchal and patriarchal conceptions. The Canaanites carried off their brides by capture, when they were dancing in the vineyard;[2] bargaining with the father followed later. Dinah by joining 'the daughters of the land' shows that she expects to be thus wooed. She is called 'the daughter of Leah,' not of Jacob, and her brothers, not her father, undertake to rescue her. Their wrath is caused by the reflection that under the matriarchate the loss of their only sister means the dying out of their family, descent being reckoned through females.

This method of reckoning descent was the obvious one in a nomadic state of society in which polygamy prevailed. When the Hebrew tribes settled in Palestine they gradually adopted other customs. The evidence of Genesis is ambiguous, but seems to reflect the clash of two systems. In any case, the man is always lord of the family in the writer's view—'he shall rule over thee' (iii. 16). The genealogies, which belong to the latest strata of the book, trace descent through the father and thus show the triumph of the patriarchal view.

Psalm xlv describes the marriage of a king's daughter, conceivably Jezebel (*v.* 12), to the Hebrew king. All thoughts of the matriarchate are to be banished; 'forget thine own people, and thy father's house.' Her dowry is worn in the form of gold woven into her garments (*v.* 13). An attractive explanation of the Song of Songs illustrates it by a modern Syrian custom. The peasants' wedding festival lasts a week; the threshing-floor is decorated as a throne, and the couple are called King and Queen. In Canticles the names of the typical king Solomon and his bride are used.[3]

[1] Rebekah, on the other hand, of her own free will breaks with tradition (Gen. xxiv. 58), the reasons for the exception having been explained (*v.* 37).

[2] It may be assumed that this is what Dinah went to see (xxxiv. 1).

[3] An Assyrian law may be quoted to illustrate Semitic usage. 'If a man desires to veil a concubine [*i.e.* to marry her], he shall bring five or six comrades and veil her before them and say: This is my spouse' (Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte zum A.T.*, p. 418).

Betrothal was the first stage of the marriage. Deut. xxii. 23, 24, implies an interval between betrothal and coming together, during which unfaithfulness on the part of the woman was reckoned as adultery. The actual wedding in the Old Testament period consisted of a procession bringing the bride, a marriage-feast, to which a quasi-sacramental meaning was attached, and the entering of the pair into the *ḥuppah*, or bridal-chamber.[1] This was a tent, presumably representing the separate tent of the newly married couple in nomadic times. It has become a canopy, held over bride and bridegroom, in the modern Jewish rite. No religious ceremony is mentioned in the Law, though Malachi ii. 14 suggests religious sanctions: 'The Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth.' By the time of Tobit vii. 13 formal written contracts were in use.

In the Gospels references to marriage ceremonies are incidental, and the interpretation of the most important passage, the Parable of the Virgins, is disputed.[2] Probably there was some religious element at this time, but not until the later Middle Ages did the presence of a Rabbi become obligatory at a Jewish wedding. The officiant now gives a number of Benedictions, which go back in substance to the Talmud.

II

The absence of distinctively Jewish features in the Christian rite of marriage is sufficient evidence that there was no matrimonial liturgical act in the primitive Church corresponding to Baptism or the Eucharist; had there been one, it must surely have had some Jewish affinities, which would have persisted in the later rite. But from the beginning there was definitely Christian marriage. St. Paul said that marriage must be 'in the Lord,'[3] by which we understand that it took place with the approval and before the face of the Christian community. St. Ignatius directs that marriage (like everything else) shall be within the bishop's cognisance: 'it is right for men and women who marry to be united with the consent of the bishop, and not according to lust.'[4] In Tertullian's time marriage was blessed at the Eucharist. 'How shall we describe the happiness of a marriage which is cemented by the Church, ratified by the oblation, and sealed with the benediction?'[5] But the actual marrying was a private ceremony. 'Touching the ceremonies of private and social solemnities—as those of the white toga, of

[1] Cf. Joel ii. 16.

[2] Matt. xxv. 1. Probably the background is the bridegroom's house and the last stage of the ceremonies.

[3] 1 Cor. vii. 39. [4] *Ad Polyc.*, 5. [5] *Ad Uxor.*, ii. 8.

espousals, of nuptials, of name-givings—I should think no danger need be guarded against from the breath of the idolatry which is mixed up with them. . . . Those above named I take to be clean in themselves, because neither the giving of manly garb, nor the marital ring or union, descends from honours done to any idol.' [1] The veiling of the bride was a ceremony attached to the espousals, the veil being worn from then to the nuptials.[2] Clement of Alexandria condemns false hair on the ground that the presbyter lays his hands in blessing on another woman; [3] the context shows that he refers to the nuptial blessing. Other patristic references are to the joining of right hands,[4] 'the sacerdotal veil and benediction,' [5] and the crown—'garlands are wont to be worn on the heads of bridegrooms, as a symbol of victory, betokening that they approach the marriage bed unconquered by pleasure.' [6] In sixth-century Gaul 'the bridegroom and the bride, when they are to be blessed by the priest, are to be brought by their parents or by attendants (*paranymphis*).' [7]

Duchesne sums up thus: 'No ecclesiastical law obliged Christians to seek a blessing on their marriage. The benediction was a matter of custom or propriety, and although it subsequently became the rule, it was never a condition of validity. The marriage is independent of the rite.' [8] The Eastern Orthodox view is different. 'The blessing of the priest is essential for the consummation of the sacrament. . . . It is true that there are instances of the acceptance by the Church of marriages not blessed by a priest, as valid, but this does not indicate that the Church normally gave such recognition. . . . The Roman view, that the ministers of the sacrament are the two parties who are to be made man and wife, is both wrong and vicious.' [9]

The first full description of the Church rite is found in Pope Nicolas's Response to the Bulgarians, 866.

The espousal (*sponsalia*) is the first step, the contract of future marriage made with the consent of the parties 'and of those in whose power they are'; then comes the delivery of the ring by the bridegroom to the bride (*subarrhatio*), and of the dowry, by written document, before witnesses. The marriage ceremony of the couple, who are however regarded as already married, comprises their presence at Mass, a blessing pronounced while the veil is held over their heads, and their crowning as they leave the church. 'Let the consent of those whose union is in question

[1] Tert., *De Idol.*, 16. The ring was taken over by the Jews about the seventh or eighth century, under Roman influence.
[2] Tert., *De Virg. Vel.*, 11.
[3] *Pæd.* iii. 11.
[4] Gregory of Nazianzus, *Ep.* 193.
[5] Ambrose, *Ep.* 19.
[6] Chrysostom, *Hom. in* 1 *Tim.*, 9.
[7] *Statuta ecclesiæ antiqua*, c. 101.
[8] *Christian Worship*, p. 428.
[9] F. Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought*, p. 382.

be legally sufficient by itself.' This is the custom 'which the holy Roman Church received of old.' [1]

Duchesne describes Pope Nicolas' ritual as the old Roman marriage rite, with the Mass substituted for the pagan sacrifice. In the ordinary marriage rite hands were joined as a symbol of union, by a *pronuba*, a matron married once, in the bride's house or in front of a temple. A wedding meal followed, then *deductio*, the procession to the new house, and *receptio*, symbolised by a solemn delivery of water and fire. But there was also a religious form of marriage. The espousals, as in secular marriage, consisted of mutual engagement in a set form of words, delivery of the ring, drawing up of marriage contract, and bestowal of gifts by the bridegroom on the bride. At the actual wedding the bride appeared veiled,[2] her head crowned with flowers. If the auspices were favourable, the ceremony proceeded. The presence of the Pontifex Maximus (representing the original Rex) and of the Flamen Dialis (representing Juppiter) was required. The marriage took place in front of them, and they took no other part. A cake of *far* (wheat) was offered to Juppiter Farreus and sacramentally eaten by the bridegroom and the bride. Of this ceremony W. Warde Fowler writes: 'It is possible that *confarreatio* may have been a very special religious form, originating in the marriage of the Rex only, or in families forming an inner circle of aristocracy. . . . The main object was to produce children capable of holding the exclusively patrician religious offices.' [3] This specially religious ceremony seems to have become obsolete in the early years of the Empire. It may be conjectured that the tradition lasted on in aristocratic circles and was introduced into the Church by high-born converts. That the religious form was adopted is shown by St. Ambrose's reference [4] to the ten witnesses required at Christian marriage, this being the number at the *confarreatio*.

The nuptial blessing in the Mass came after the consecration and before the fraction; the oblation had already been made *for the bride*.[5] The minister recited a simple prayer, then one of Eucharistic type. The Leonian Sacramentary has, almost in their present form, the prayers of the present Latin rite, which in contemporary practice varies in different countries and

[1] *Ib.*, p. 429. The passage is given in full by T. A. Lacey, *Marriage in Church and State*, p. 46.

[2] *Nuptiæ* is derived from *obnubilatio capitis*.

[3] *Enc. of Rel. and Ethics*, art. 'Marriage (Roman).' Other writers hold that *confarreatio* was the original marriage rite for all patricians. Note that Duchesne (pp. 433, 434) makes no distinction between the religious and secular types of Roman marriage.

[4] *De Lapsu*, 5.

[5] 'Hanc igitur oblationem famulae tuae illius, quam tibi offerimus pro famula tua illa' (Leonian Sacramentary).

dioceses so far as minor details and ceremonies are concerned. 'The ancient rites which surrounded marriage were essentially expressive and popular. The Church has never wished them to disappear; on the contrary, it has desired their preservation, in so far as they were in keeping with the sanctity of the sacrament. As a matter of fact, thanks to a number of circumstances, and in particular to the liturgical unification which had the effect of suppressing the local liturgies, many of them have been entirely discontinued, or appear only in certain hardly recognisable survivals.' [1]

The Eastern Orthodox rite is briefly as follows.[2] The espousals take place after the liturgy, the couple standing before the holy door. Prayers follow, referring to Isaac and Rebecca, and to Christ's espousal of His Church. The priest's formula is 'The servant of God *N.* is betrothed to the handmaid of God *N.* In the name . . .,' and *vice versa.* Rings are put on the right hands and exchanged. Then comes the marriage or crowning. Psalm cxxviii ('Blessed are all they . . .') is sung, an Exhortation follows, then questions and answers, and long prayers; finally the formula 'The servant of God *N.* is crowned unto the handmaid of God *N.* In the name . . .,' and *vice versa.* The wedding pair then partake of a common cup (in Greece, bread soaked in wine is used).

III

The Prayer Book Service so closely resembles its predecessors that it will be convenient to start from 1662, referring to sources when necessary.

The Form of Solemnisation of Matrimony (Sarum *Ordo ad faciendum sponsalia*) is prefaced by two rubrics concerning Banns.[3] These were published in the mediæval rite [4] at Mass 'when the greater number of people should be present.' In 1662 this was defined as 'before the Sentences for the Offertory.' A Law of 1753 provided for publication after the second lesson at Evensong, in the absence of a morning service, and about 1809 the printers began to alter the rubric to conform to the supposed meaning of the statute. Clearly the State is entitled to make whatever regulations it desires to avoid the risk of clandestine marriages. The clergy in this respect are acting for the State, which may inflict very severe penalties for breaches of the law. Canon 63 of 1603 prescribes an ecclesiastical penalty of suspension for

[1] *Liturgia*, p. 748.

[2] I. Hapgood, *Service Book of the Eastern Orthodox Church*, pp. 291 ff.

[3] 'Banns' is a form of 'ban,' originally a proclamation with penalties attached.

[4] The Synod of Westminster (1200), Canon 11, is the first English reference.

three years for infringing the regulations. The banns are to be read on three several Sundays, or Holy-days (Sarum, *per tres dies solennes et disiunctos*), but custom and the Act of 1823, which mentions Sundays only, have made holy-days obsolete in this connexion. 'Lawful impediments' are treated below. 'The Curate,' says Wheatly (1722), 'is not to stop his proceeding, because any peevish or pragmatical person . . . pretends to forbid him,' such as a churchwarden, afraid that a poor couple will be a charge on the parish.

Licences are dispensations from the necessity of banns, issued by the Bishop through his surrogate; they state the place of marriage and the hours between which it may be celebrated. Special licences, granted by the Archbishop of Canterbury, in virtue of legatine authority inherited from his mediæval predecessors, may specify 'any convenient time or place.' Banns and licences are in force for three months.[1]

The third rubric speaks of (*a*) the day, (*b*) the time appointed.

(*a*) The fourth-century Council of Laodicea forbade marriages in Lent. The Sarum rubrics, following later Councils, extended this prohibition to cover Advent Sunday to the Octave of Epiphany, Septuagesima to the Octave of Easter, and Rogation Sunday to six days after Pentecost, and such was the ideal of the Church of England until at least the eighteenth century. At the present time the clergy are content with discouraging marriages in Lent.[2] The Roman Catholic law allows marriages at any time, but Advent Sunday to Christmas Day and Ash Wednesday to Easter Sunday are closed times so far as the Nuptial Mass and Blessing are concerned; for proper reasons the Bishop may allow marriages in these periods, but unnecessary display is forbidden.[3]

(*b*) The traditional time for a marriage was at Mass, and Canon 62 of 1603 presupposes that it will be 'at Divine Service.' The same Canon confines the hours to between eight o'clock and noon. The Marriage Act of 1886 extended the limit until 3 p.m., and an amended Canon of 1888 followed suit, besides making solemnisation during Divine Service optional. The phrase 'Wedding Breakfast' witnesses to the old custom,

[1] The present Roman Catholic law provides for banns being read on three consecutive Sundays or holy days of obligation, at Mass or other services attended by the people. The Ordinary may permit in the place of banns a notice on the church door for at least eight days, provided that two feasts of obligation are included. He may issue dispensations from banns. Banns are in force for six months (*C.I.C.*, Canons 1023–5, 1030).

[2] *C.I.C.*, can. 1108. The popular idea that May is an unlucky month goes back to pagan Rome; see W. Warde Fowler, *loc. cit.*

[3] No marriages in Lent is 'the law of the Church' in the popular sense. Whether it is in the strict sense a law for Anglicans is a question the answer to which depends on whether we hold that unrepealed Canon Law is binding on Anglicans.

according to which the first meal of the day followed Mass. In a free-drinking age there was also a practical advantage in having weddings early in the day, when the parties were more likely to be sober.

The wedding party come 'into the Body of the Church,' instead of remaining in the porch, as before 1549.[1] They are accompanied by their friends and neighbours; the mention of friends rather than relations recalls 'the friends of the bridegroom,' or 'paranymphs.'[2] The man stands on the right side of the woman, the place of honour.[3] The *priest* then begins the service.

The Exhortation uses sentences from the Sarum and York Manuals and from Hermann's *Consultatio*. It is found in substance in a seventeenth-century Paris book, which presumably comes from a source common to both.[4] 'The causes for which matrimony was ordained' are the commonplaces of scholastic theology. They recur in the modern Roman law: 'The primary end of matrimony is the procreation and bringing up of children; the secondary end mutual help and a remedy against concupiscence.'[5]

The Exhortation concludes with appeals to disclose impediments made (*a*) to the congregation, and equivalent to a fourth reading of banns;[6] (*b*) to the bridal pair. The impediments are (*a*) existence of a legal previous marriage;[7] (*b*) relationship between the prohibited degrees;[8] (*c*) lack of consent on the part of parents or guardians of those under 21.[9] The first two by nature render the marriage void. The third is of force because the parties cannot make a valid contract, a point to be considered later. The exact legal force of the next rubric is obscure. Fortunately the clergy are rarely called upon to decide. It should be noted that the objector must 'allege and declare.' 'Allege' in the light of the Authorised Version of Acts xvii. 3 ('alleging that Christ must needs have suffered') means 'adduce proof,' and 'declare' means 'make clear' (cf. Psalm xix. 1, 'the heavens declare the glory of God'). If the interrupter cannot do this, besides depositing a substantial sum, the priest must not stop the service.

[1] Cf. Chaucer's 'Wife of Bath': 'She was a worthy woman all hire live. Housbondes at the chirche dore she had five.'

[2] John iii. 29. The splendid Sarum phrase 'coram deo, sacerdote et populo' is not represented in the rubric. At this point in the Sarum form banns were read for the fourth time.

[3] Sarum: 'vir a dextris mulieris et mulier a sinistris viri.'

[4] J. W. Legg, *Ecclesiological Essays*, p. 202.

[5] *C.I.C.*, Can. 1013.

[6] Which comes here in the Sarum rite.

[7] Or contract, according to the old books. The controversy respecting Henry VIII will be recalled.

[8] Cf. Canon of 1603, No. 99.

[9] Canons 62, 100.

The espousals proper follow.[1] The Sarum formula is given in Latin, though it was to be used 'in the mother tongue.' It is reproduced in the Prayer Book, Luther's phrase 'after God's ordinance, in the holy estate of matrimony' being interpolated. The parties have already 'engaged' themselves to marry; they now renew their engagement before God. The next question, 'Who giveth this woman . . .?', is answered by the action of the father, or friend, from whose hands the minister receives the bride. The York Use, from which the question is taken ('Who gives me this wife?'), makes it clear that the father yields his daughter to the priest, who represents God and gives her to the man, as God gave Eve to Adam.[2]

Next comes the contract, which follows the style of a conveyance. The contracting parties are named, the legal term 'to have and to hold' is used, the limitations are recited—'from this day forward . . . till death us do part' ('depart' in 1549, 1552), and subject to ecclesiastical law, 'according to God's holy ordinance' (Sarum, 'if holy Church it will ordain'). The woman adds, 'and to obey.'[3] The man then lays the ring upon the book, 'with the accustomed duty to the Priest and Clerk'—an obsolete provision. No provision is made for blessing the ring, as in the Sarum Manual. In 1549 the man gives 'a ring, and other tokens of spousage, as gold and silver.' The ring sufficiently represents the ancient bride-price. Originally it belonged to the espousals, but it has become attached to the wedding as obligatory, though the engagement-ring persists as a social custom. The ring is placed on the book as an acknowledgment that all worldly goods belong to God and are entrusted to us by Him. The old ceremony was to place the ring on each finger of the right hand in succession, leaving it on the fourth. The left hand was substituted in 1547. The man repeats these concluding words of the contract[4] after the priest. With 'I thee worship' compare Luke xiv. 10 ('then shalt thou have worship') and the mayoral address 'your worship.' 'With all my worldly goods I thee endow' is very exceptional, and is not represented in the York Manual.[5]

[1] J. W. Legg (*Ecclesiological Essays*, p. 183) maintains that this is part of the marriage, whatever it was in origin; Sarum has 'vis habere,' not 'habebis.' He quotes other rites where the same questions are asked, the espousals having already taken place.

[2] Cf. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V. 73, § 5 : 'In ancient times all women which had not husbands nor fathers to govern them had their tutors, without whose authority there was no act which they did warrantable.'

[3] Sarum, 'to be bonere and buxum (*i.e.* meek and obedient) in bed and at board'; York adds 'for fairer for fouler.'

[4] The ring being used in sealing, 'with this ring' may be taken as representing the sealing of the contract. This is clearer in Sarum and 1549, where 'this gold and silver I thee give' stands for the bride-price generally.

[5] The Chalons *Rituale*, 'de mes biens te doue,' is the nearest parallel (Brightman, *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1927).

The prayer 'O eternal God' is based on the Sarum prayer at this point. 'As Isaac and Rebecca lived faithfully together' is curious and abrupt as it stands; in 1549 it read: 'As Isaac and Rebecca (after bracelets and jewels of gold given of the one to the other for tokens of their matrimony) lived faithfully together.' 'Those whom God hath joined' down to 'I pronounce . . .' was a novelty in 1549, taken from Hermann. 'I pronounce . . .' was common on the Continent. 'Giving and receiving' renders a phrase which implies the German custom by which each received a ring. A blessing concludes the first part of the service.

Psalm cxxviii is said or sung as an introit [1] by the Minister or Clerks.[2] The officiant says the versicles and following prayers *facing* the kneeling pair, because in the Sarum Manual at this point he asks the congregation to pray for them. The concluding prayers and blessing are from the old rite, but 'O God, who by thy mighty power . . .' is a modification of the primitive blessing *of the bride* which took place after the Canon in the nuptial Mass.

The Communion Service follows immediately in 1549 and 1552, the homily being a substitute for the sermon. 'Then shall begin the Communion' (1552) shows that Sunday weddings are presupposed; 'the new married persons must receive the Holy Communion.' This requirement was a radical change from the mediæval custom of receiving 'bread and wine, or other liquid,' [3] to symbolise the beginning of the common life, and was a laudable attempt to restore the conditions which prevailed before Communion became infrequent in the Middle Ages. In 1662 the exhortation was brought forward into the printed service, to which it forms an abrupt close; the phrase 'if there be no sermon' refers to the subsequent Communion, which it is convenient (fitting) that the married pair should receive.[4]

IV

We now consider the Anglican revisions of the 1662 rite. The Irish makes few changes except in the opening Exhortation and may be omitted from the survey.

Introductory rubrics. The Scottish Book (1929) prefixes Canon

[1] Ps. lxvii was added as an alternative in 1549, when the prayer for fruitfulness was made optional.

[2] Apparently the rubric intends the Minister to say the entire psalm; or it may be sung by the lay-clerks (in a parish church represented by one parish clerk).

[3] Cf. J. W. Legg, *Ecclesiological Essays*, p. 196.

[4] 'The [R.C.] Church does not make it obligatory for the bridal pair to assist at Mass; but she strongly urges them thereto' (*Liturgia*, p. 746).

XXX, which forbids the marriage of parties within the forbidden degrees, or of a divorced person whose spouse is living, but allows it 'in cases in which a decree of nullity of marriage *ab initio* has been pronounced by a civil Court.' The Canadian Book (1922) similarly forbids such marriages, without mentioning decrees of nullity. The South African form refers to 'the questions put forth by the Episcopal Synod'; it provides that 'marriages shall not be solemnised in Lent without dispensation from the Bishop.'

The Exhortation is revised by all on more or less similar lines.

The Contract. The English (1928), Scottish, and American (1929) omit the wife's promise of obedience, retained by the Canadian, and by the S. African with the addition 'in all things lawful.' The American, Scottish, and S. African provide a prayer for blessing the ring. The American version of the next formula is 'With this Ring I thee wed: In the Name . . .' The others all have 'with my body I thee *honour*.' The English 1928, Scottish, and S. African read: 'All my worldly goods with thee I share.' The second part of the service is absent from the American book. English 1928, Scottish, and S. African add Psalm xxxvii. 3–7 as an alternative. In the Communion the Epistle is from Ephesians iii (English 1928, S. African) or v (Scottish, American, Canadian); the Gospel is John xv. 9 ff. (English 1928, S. African) or Matt. xix. 4 ff. (Scottish, American, Canadian). The Scottish and S. African books provide a Blessing of Civil Marriage.

The most authoritative statement regarding problems in the Mission Field is contained in the Report of a Committee of the Lambeth Conference of 1908: 'The Committee see no reason why national and local Churches should not adopt native forms of marriage and consecrate them to a Christian use, provided (*a*) that the form used explicitly states than the union is lifelong and exclusive, (*b*) that the form is free from all heathen and idolatrous taint, and (*c*) that provision is made for due registration of the marriage and for other formalities according to the law of the land, wherever such a law exists.' [1]

V

Several matters deserve separate treatment.

1. Marriage according to the Council of Trent (session xxiv, can. 1) is one of the Seven Sacraments instituted by Christ. When He did this is disputed. Every valid matrimonial contract between baptised persons is a sacrament.[2] The external consent

[1] *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, p. 375.

[2] *C.I.C.* 1012. Unconfirmed Catholics should receive Confirmation, 'if they can without grave inconvenience' (1021).

expressed in words is both matter and form of the sacrament. The ministers of the sacrament are the contracting parties.[1]

2. The Roman Catholic Church, however, has strict laws requiring the presence of the parish priest. The *Tametsi* decree of the Council of Trent (session xxiv) required the presence of a priest and two other witnesses, to validate the marriage. But this law is intended for Catholics only, baptised non-Catholics being exempted.[2] It was not promulgated in England and certain other countries, which were regarded as under pre-Tridentine law. The *Ne Temere* decree of 1908 simplified the Tridentine legislation and made it universally applicable.[3] The legislation is logical and praiseworthy, and applies only to those who accept the Roman discipline. The hardship arises in the case of mixed marriages, where after all the way of escape is easy. The non-Roman party can refuse to accept the conditions, and break off the marriage.[4]

3. We have seen that the essence of marriage is the contract. The principle governing this is that consent must be real, not forced; and there must be a genuine intention to fulfil the contract; thus impotence, not revealed, can invalidate it, so can ignorance of the physical obligations of marriage, according to Roman interpretations.

4. The dual nature of marriage, in that it is a natural human relationship and a civil contract, with which the State must be deeply concerned, as well as a religious act, involves it in difficulties from which the other sacraments are free. No part of the Church can hope to avoid some measure of conflict with the modern secular State.

5. Little attention has been given as yet to the changes which the emancipation of women must eventually effect in the marriage service. The woman in civilised countries is the man's equal in the eyes of the law. Her consent is as full and free as the man's. Yet our service supposes that she must be 'given away' by her father, or his substitute. The man 'weds' her in a sense other than that in which she weds him. In particular, the English formula 'With all my worldly goods I thee endow' is grossly

[1] Note that in the Roman Codex the priest is said 'matrimonio *assistere*.'

[2] By the *Codex Iuris Canonici*, can. 1070, a marriage contracted between a baptised and an unbaptised person is void. This is not regarded as applying when the baptised party is a non-Catholic. Most Anglicans would accept St. Paul's ruling (1 Cor. vii. 14) in another problem as applicable here: 'The unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.'

[3] With certain exceptions, *e.g.* in the case of persecutions, such as have occurred in Mexico.

[4] This may stand as a general statement, but it simplifies the problem too much. There are some very hard cases, which need not be discussed here.

one-sided. True, it represents the facts of the law, for a rich wife can claim support from a husband whom she in her turn, if he incurs misfortune, can leave to starve. The 1662 service keeps the balance fair by making 'obedience' part of the contract. A revised service may one day provide for equality of the sexes. But the present revised form of the office, whereby the wife retains the advantages of being the weaker vessel and repudiates the accompanying obligation, is a concession to sentiment which cannot be logically defended. The husband's safeguard is the public opinion of women, notoriously severe in judging their own sex; legally he gets the worst of the marriage contract.

6. The essence of marriage is consent before witnesses. So far as consent goes, we are in a healthier condition than bygone centuries, for the woman's consent is now a reality, whereas brides in their 'teens used simply to obey their parents. We should be careful not to lose the advantages of 'before witnesses.' While needless expense should be avoided, a wedding ought to be an occasion of publicity. In contrast to the civil marriage, which affords a bare minimum of publicity, the religious service is ordered by the Prayer Book to be attended by friends and neighbours. The impulse of a young couple, who ask to be married 'very quietly, just ourselves,' should normally be discouraged by the clergy.

7. The history of prohibited degrees of marriage is very complicated. In primitive tribes both endogamous and exogamous customs are found. A common form is exogamy within an endogamous system; that is, marriage must be with a member of another clan of a small community, outside which marriage is not allowed. The Egyptian Pharaoh regularly married his sister, to preserve the sanctity of the royal blood. The regulations in Leviticus xviii are incomplete, but their principles when worked out produce the results found in the Prayer Book Table. This Table was put forth by Archbishop Parker in 1563 and adopted by the 99th Canon of 1603. It is bound up with the Prayer Book, in the same way as the Thirty-nine Articles. The mediæval law was very severe, the marriage of cousins being forbidden as far as the seventh generation. In the Roman Catholic Church dispensations are given for marriages within the usual prohibited degrees (other than ascendants and descendants, and brother and sister), uncle and niece for example. The Anglican Table is clear and logical. Its equating of consanguinity and affinity cannot, however, be expected to convince those who repudiate the mystical and sacramental view of marriage. Biological experiments conducted on animals do not corroborate to any appreciable extent the supposed evils of inbreeding. But there are other considerations in the case of human beings.

Certainly a general relaxation of the prohibitions would have a disastrous effect on the purity and delicacy of family life.[1]

8. The *benedictio thalami* is not represented in the Prayer Book. In mediæval times it was an elaborate rite, accompanied by incense in some uses; the parties were blessed in bed. The Roman *Rituale* of 1584 directed that they should kneel, at the head and the foot of the bed respectively. The rite was omitted from the *Rituale* later, but it persisted locally for a long time. Oberon at the end of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* refers to the custom: "To the best bride-bed will we, Which by us shall blessed be; And the issue there create Ever shall be fortunate.'

9. It is too obvious to need emphasising, that a service which with the utmost solemnity, in God's sight, exacts a promise of lifelong fidelity ('so long as ye both shall live,' 'till death us do part'), and expressly repudiates divorce ('Those whom God hath joined together let no man put asunder'), cannot be used to bless the marriage of a party who has a partner living, to whom he or she has been lawfully married, by a priest who stops to think what the words quoted mean.

[1] In England marriage with a deceased wife's sister became lawful in 1907, with a deceased brother's widow in 1921. According to Canon 99 such unions are forbidden by the law of God. In so far as this view is based on a pre-critical attitude towards the Levitical legislation its claims on the conscience are weakened. Little attention has been given by Anglicans to the problem of dispensations, which would seem to be a necessary accompaniment of a rigid Church marriage code.

VISITATION OF THE SICK

Unction, Imposition of Hands, and Exorcism

By CHARLES HARRIS

I. The Lambeth Report on the Ministry of Healing

By common consent, and by the admission of the last three Lambeth Conferences (1908, 1920, 1930), the existing Offices for the Sick (1661) do not adequately represent, and indeed to some extent even misrepresent, the present mind of the Church towards disease. Accordingly, they need, not merely enrichment and improvement in detail, such as they received in the English 1927–8 Book, but thorough reconsideration, recasting, and great enlargement, in the light of the Church's fresh orientation of attitude towards ministration to the sick.

This change, which is vast and almost revolutionary, has gradually established itself *pari passu* with the rise of the new Dynamic Psychology, and of the various systems of Psychotherapy based thereon. The main factors which have assisted to bring about the change are the following:

(1) More careful study of Christ's attitude towards disease, mental and physical, and of the Church's actual exercise of the Ministry of Healing in apostolic, primitive, and mediæval times;

(2) The uneasiness caused by the vast and ever-increasing volume of insanity, nervous ailments, and 'moral diseases' of various kinds, with which modern medical science, unless assisted by religious ministrations, seems unable to cope;

(3) The rise of the New Psychology of Freud, Jung, Adler, and the British 'Eclectic' School, with its valuable practical applications in Psychiatry [1] and Psychotherapy; [2]

(4) Recent pastoral experience of hopeful and successful ministry to the sick on the lines of the Lambeth Report, which recommends on the one hand the revival of traditional methods of tried efficacy, and on the other the adaptation to religious use of the main principles and practices of modern psychotherapy;

(5) The increasing recognition by medical men, especially

[1] Medical treatment of mental illness.

[2] Medical healing by psychical means, *e.g.* psycho-analysis, mental re-education, and suggestion.

those skilled in therapeutic psychology, of the fact that disease, expecially mental and neurotic disease, has in many cases a definitely moral and spiritual, as well as physical basis; and that for this reason it is expedient to encourage the co-operation of properly trained members of the clerical profession in the treatment of at any rate mental, moral, and neurotic disorders;

(6) The rise and progress, first in America and later in England and Germany, of 'Christian Science,' which in spite of many errors and extravagances (resulting in the sacrifice of numerous valuable lives which timely medical aid might have saved) has at least had the good effect of drawing the attention of the Church to the inadequacy of its usual methods of ministering to the sick, and to the need of revising and improving them.[1]

The Lambeth Report.

Any up-to-date and really useful commentary on the Prayer Book Services for the Sick must be based upon 'The Report of the Committee appointed in accordance with Resolution 63 of the Lambeth Conference, 1920, on *The Ministry of Healing*' (S.P.C.K., 1924), which was accepted in its entirety by the Lambeth Conference of 1930 (apparently without a dissentient voice), and in all its main features by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, which, on January 22, 1931, petitioned the Upper House to take practical steps to give effect to its leading recommendations, particularly those relating to Unction and Imposition of Hands, and co-operation with the medical profession. As a result, a Joint Committee was appointed in January 1932 to draw up Services: (1) for Unction and Imposition of Hands; (2) for Imposition of Hands without Unction, for provisional use in the Province.

Already in the debates on the Revision of the Prayer Book the influence of this Report made itself felt. On November 27, 1924, the House of Clergy (which consists of all the proctors for the clergy of the Canterbury and York Convocations) adopted an 'almost unanimous' resolution in favour of including both Unction and Laying on of Hands in the Revised Book. The House of Bishops, unwilling to commit itself definitely to Unction until the Lambeth Conference of 1930 should have considered this Report, included in its draft only the Imposition of Hands; whereupon the House of Clergy, on February 22, 1927, reiterated its view that both rites ought to be included in the New Book.

[1] Christian Science is said to have passed its zenith in America. It is, however, still strong in England, and perhaps stronger in Germany. Its best features (from which useful hints may be gathered) are, (1) its philosophy of thorough-going optimism, and (2) its continual use of healthful suggestion. See H. A. L. Fisher, *Our New Religion* (1929), and G. Milmines' critical and judicious Life of Mrs. Eddy.

Ultimately only Imposition of Hands was included in the 1927–8 Book, but the recent action of the Canterbury Convocation has made it practically certain that in any future revision of the English Prayer Book a form for administering Unction will be included. Unction already finds a place in the American Prayer Book (1929), in the Scottish Episcopal Prayer Book (1929), and in the alternative book of Occasional Offices recently issued by authority for use in the Province of South Africa (S.P.C.K., 1930).

Principles of the Report.

The leading principles of the Lambeth *Report on the Ministry of Healing* are adequately expressed in the following quotations (the italics are not in the original):

'Every sort of curative treatment assumes, obviously, that disease is an evil to be combated. Theologically stated, this means that health, or an orderly condition of body, mind, and spirit, is God's primary will for all His children, and that disease, as a specific violation or falling short of this orderly condition, is not only to be combated, but *to be combated in God's name, and as a way of carrying out His will.* It is, of course, obvious that disease, like other forms of evil, is permitted by Him to exist, it may be, as a result of man's misuse of his freedom; it may be, as a stimulus to human sympathy and scientific research; it may be, as a means of spiritual discipline and efficiency. But, however it may be brought about, and in whatever way it may be overruled for good, it is in itself an evil. *It is much to be hoped that some of the language used in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick may be reconsidered in this connection, and due emphasis given to the principle just expressed.*

'With regard to the Form of Ministry to be used, we make the following suggestions:

'(*a*) For the purpose of healing, prayer and sacrament should be used in conjunction. Before any sacramental rites are employed, earnest and united prayer should be offered on behalf of the sick person in church, as well as by the patient himself and his friends at home.

'(*b*) Whilst religious methods are applicable to all cases of sickness, they would seem to be most appropriate where moral or intellectual difficulties and perplexities have contributed to the disorder. *These deep-lying roots of evil should be dealt with before any specific bodily healing is attempted; otherwise we shall be in danger of dealing with symptoms and neglecting causes; in which case no thorough or permanent cure can be hoped for. This preliminary treatment requires some real knowledge, not only of moral theology, but also of psychology; so that it is desirable that clergymen who give spiritual direction should be adequately trained and so enabled to give clear and practical guidance.*

'*In this preliminary treatment an opportunity should be given to the patient to make a special confession of his sins, and the priest shall absolve him, if he should "humbly and heartily desire" it.*

'(*c*) Then might follow treatment more immediately directed to the complete restoration of the patient. This may take the form of Unction (*i.e.* anointing with oil by a priest), or of Laying on of Hands (either by a priest or a lay person), or of both.'

The concluding paragraph seems to call for some criticism, or at least elucidation, for it is ambiguous, and capable of some misunderstanding.

Clerical and Lay Ministry to the Sick in Primitive Times.

Although it is perfectly true that in primitive times lay ministry to the sick, not only by Prayer and Bible reading, but also by Exorcism, Imposition of Hands, and Unction (always with oil previously blessed by a bishop or presbyter), was fully recognised, and that the possession of 'the charisma of healing' by a layman was considered to be one of the qualifications recommending him for ordination to the priesthood,[1] yet such lay ministry was always of an auxiliary and subordinate, never of a primary and independent character. From the beginning, the Bishop and his college of presbyters (who usually visited the sick together) were regarded as having entire pastoral charge of the sick, and as possessing, in an eminent degree, by virtue of their ordination, that 'charisma of healing' (including power to anoint, to lay on hands, and to exorcise) which our Lord bestowed upon His Apostles (Matt. x. 1 ff.), upon the Seventy (Luke x. 9, 17–20), and upon their successors in the Christian ministry (see especially James v. 14, where the expression 'the presbyters of the Church' is to be understood as including the Bishop, who in primitive times was always reckoned a member of the presbyterial college over which he presided, and was sometimes even called a presbyter; cf. 1 Pet. v. 1). Even when 'exorcists' came to be ordained in the West,[2] and were entrusted with daily spiritual ministrations to 'energumens' (*i.e.* persons suffering with mental and nervous disorders), the Bishop and his presbyters (assisted always by the deacons, who also were active both

[1] See the *Canons of Hippolytus*, 53, 54: 'If anyone presents a petition praying for his own ordination which says, "I have acquired *the charisma of healing*," let him not be ordained until this fact is evidently proved. Particularly let inquiry be made as to whether the cures performed by him really proceed from God.' (Cf. Mark iii. 22: 'By the prince of the devils casteth he out the devils.') These Canons are a compilation of the fourth century, but much of their substance is actually derived from Hippolytus (early third century).

[2] Exorcists were not ordinarily ordained in the East, nor even at the present day does the Orthodox Church recognise the minor order of Exorcists. The Church of Rome still nominally retains it, but makes no use of it, all exorcism, which is now an unusual ministry, being performed by bishops or priests.

as exorcists and visitors of the sick) retained in their own hands the primary responsibility for every kind of healing ministry. Every Sunday, at a fixed place in the Liturgy, the Bishop blessed and prayed for the sick (who were brought to church in beds or litters), and also exorcised the 'energumens.' The *Sacramentary of Serapion* (*c.* A.D. 350) contains two striking prayers for the Bishop's use in church; one entitled, *A Prayer for the Sick*, the other, *Imposition of Hands upon the Sick*. If the sick were few in number, it is probable that the Bishop laid his hands upon each individually; but, if they were numerous, he simply spread out his hands above them, an act which was regarded as being more or less equivalent. The expression 'Imposition of Hands' in early times frequently implied the joint use of Unction (see p. 512), which was often publicly administered in church.

In primitive times, Christian churches were regarded as *temples of healing*,[1] and as such rivalled and excelled the heathen temples of Æsculapius, especially in the treatment of mental disorders, upon which the Church concentrated its therapeutic efforts.

If the sick were too ill to be brought to church, they were daily visited in their homes by the Bishop and his presbyters, also by the deacons and exorcists. Minor Church officials, and singers also conducted daily choral services in the sick man's bed-chamber. The ancient services for the sick collected in Martène's classical work, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, contain many allusions to such practices. Fully representative of primitive and early mediæval usage is the following rubric, which occurs at the end of the Visitation Office in the 'Gregorian' Sacramentary (Menard's edition):

'Moreover, the priests and ministers of Holy Church ought to chant daily to the sick, with the utmost reverence, Vespers and Matins, with the hymn, *Christe, cœlestis medicina Patris*, etc., with antiphons and responses, also the lections and prayers appertaining thereto.' That this was also the custom in England is shown by the Missal of Bishop Leofric (eleventh century) which contains an interesting service for Visitation, Unction, and Communion based mainly on the 'Gregorian' office.

Modern experience confirms the ancient belief in the therapeutic

[1] See the *Canons of Hippolytus*, 219: 'As regards the sick, *their healing depends on their coming frequently to church, and enjoying [public] prayer*, except in the case of one dangerously ill. Let such a one be visited daily by the clerical body (κλῆρος), that they may give him fuller assurance [of recovery].'

We discuss here only the ordinary pastoral Ministry of Healing, not that which laid claim to be definitely miraculous. For the latter, see P. Dearmer, *Body and Soul*, pp. 256 ff., 287 ff., 339 ff.; also M. Hamilton, *Incubation or the Cure of Diseases in Pagan Temples and Christian Churches*. The Primitive Church, however, drew no very sharp distinction between the two ministries; nor should one be drawn now. The wonders of Lourdes have parallels in ordinary pastoral experience.

value (spiritual and physical) of ordinary Church services, especially if chorally rendered. The daily wireless services for the sick, and the frequent services in hospital wards and chapels, accompanied by psalmody and hymn-singing, are greatly appreciated by those for whom they are intended.

It was also the custom of the Bishop and his presbyters in early times to bless, not only the sick man's medicines, but also his food, particularly his bread and wine, his grapes and other fruit, also the water which he drank. With this water he was also sprinkled as a symbol of purification, and healing of soul and body. These blessed substances, when partaken of with faith, were regarded as therapeutic agencies, auxiliary to the major ministrations of Unction and Imposition of Hands.

The Sacramentary of Serapion (*c.* A.D. 350) contains, for the Bishop's use, 'A prayer for oil for the sick, or bread, or water'; also, 'A prayer concerning the offerings of oil and water that are made,' viz. by the people at the Eucharist. Similar prayers are found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 4), of date about A.D. 375, and in numerous ancient and mediæval Orders.

Bread and water were not infrequently blessed together with oil, and with the same form of words, but the Services for the Administration of Unction, and the (not very numerous) references to Unction in the Fathers, show clearly that a far greater and more definitely sacramental efficacy was attributed to Anointing than to the administration of blessed bread and water. The bread for the sick was usually blessed in commemoration of the miraculous blessing of the five loaves in the wilderness. It was supposed that these loaves, thus blessed by Christ, possessed not only nourishing, but also spiritual and therapeutic properties—in other words, that they were what the later schoolmen called 'sacramentals,' though in the early period no clear distinction between 'sacraments' and 'sacramentals' was drawn.

Allusions to the Bishop and his presbyters, as possessing 'the charisma of healing' in an eminent degree, are abundant in the early period. The *Canons of Hippolytus* direct that at the ordination of a Bishop or presbyter the following prayer shall be recited: 'Grant to him, O Lord, a mild spirit, and power to remit sins, and grant to him power to loose all bonds of the iniquity of demons [*i.e.* by exorcism], and to heal all diseases, and to beat down Satan under his feet quickly' (17). Similarly, in the *Apostolic Constitutions* the Bishop, when ordaining a presbyter, prays that he may be 'filled with the gifts of healing' (viii. 16). Deacons also received at their ordination authority to exorcise: 'Grant [to this deacon] power to vanquish every power of the Deceitful One by the sign of thy Cross wherewith he himself is signed' (39). Special value was attached to a visit paid to a sick

person by the Bishop himself: 'Let a deacon accompany the Bishop on all occasions, and let him point out to him the sick persons individually. *For it is a great thing for a sick man to receive a visit from the prince of the priests. He recovers from his disease, when the Bishop comes to him, particularly if he prays over him, because the shadow of Peter healed the sick*' (199. See also p. 641).

As we have already seen, the Bishop was from the first the principal exorcist, and so remained both in the Eastern and in the Western Churches throughout the primitive and mediæval periods. Not only did he exorcise in church every Sunday and Holy Day at the Eucharist,[1] but references to episcopal exorcisms on other occasions are also frequent. Thus Paulinus, St. Ambrose's deacon, relates of the saint, that he healed by exorcism, accompanied by imposition of hands, the young son of his host Decens, who was tormented by an unclean spirit. Speaking as an eye-witness, he further records, that 'in those days we saw, by his commandment, accompanied by the laying on of hands, a multitude of persons delivered from unclean spirits' (*Life of St. Ambrose*, Migne, *P.L.*, xiv. chs. 28 and 43). Very appropriately, therefore, does a ninth-century Pontifical of the Church of this famous exorcist (Milan) provide for the Bishop's use three emphatic exorcisms 'over a man vexed by a demon.' Dr. Magistretti's comment is as follows: 'It is not surprising that, in a book compiled for the use of our Bishop, a rite of exorcism is found, for our Ambrose himself in his 22nd epistle to Marcellina twice mentions imposition of hands upon those possessed by a devil as employed by the Bishop.'[2]

St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, was the mightiest exorcist of his age. His achievements in this direction—not all of which are credible to modern readers—are described by his friend and biographer, Sulpicius Severus. Unlike other ancient exorcists, St. Martin did not usually employ imposition of hands.

Copious evidence concerning the extensive use of exorcism by bishops in the Anglo-Saxon period is afforded by the Missal (or rather Pontifical) of Bishop Leofric (eleventh century), which contains not only general prayers for use 'over those who are vexed with devils,' but also special exorcisms, *e.g.* 'Imposition of

[1] Many of the ordinary prayers for the sick were exorcistic or semi-exorcistic in form. For example, the phrase 'rebuke the disease' in Serapion's liturgical 'Prayer for the Sick' implies the belief that, even in ordinary cases of sickness, diabolical influences are at work requiring 'rebuke.' There was a marked disinclination in the primitive and mediæval period to attribute sickness directly to God, though this was occasionally done. The tendency was to regard God as the *healer* of disease, not as its author. The sick person, after confession of sin, and full reconciliation to God, was expected to recover rapidly, aided by the daily ministrations of the Bishop and his presbyters.

[2] *Pontificale ad usum eccl. Mediol.*, ed. M. Magistretti, præfatus M. Ceriani, pp. 68–71.

hands upon a possessed catechumen,' 'Another on behalf of a possessed infant,' and 'Another upon a baptised energumen.' In this Missal both Laying on of Hands and Unction are strongly in evidence in connection with Exorcism; *e.g.* there is a special form for anointing 'one possessed with a devil.' Certain of Leofric's prayers of exorcism occur also in the modern Roman *Rituale*, which contains much extremely ancient material of this nature.[1]

Modern Use of Exorcism.

In the Orthodox Eastern Church, even at the present day, exorcism forms part of the ordinary ministry of a parish priest. It is not confined to cases of insanity or neurotic illness, because the belief still prevails that not a few malignant physical diseases are due, if not to 'possession' in the narrow sense, at least to diabolical influence. (See particularly the exorcisms provided in the *Euchologion* 'for those afflicted by demons,' and 'for every infirmity.' These are attributed to St. Basil and St. Chrysostom.)

With regard to the modern treatment of insanity and severe neurotic illness by priests of the Eastern Church, the Archbishop of Thyatira has been kind enough to furnish the following particulars.

'In the Orthodox Church there prevails a conception that mental diseases are not uninfluenced by demons. Therefore the first duty of a parish priest called to visit such a patient is to read upon him the exorcisms. Of these exorcisms there exist in our *Euchologion* two sorts, *i.e.* the Small Exorcisms and the Large. The first are attributed to St. Chrysostom, the second to St. Basil.

'To the above I will add that, as you have read in Dr. Dearmer's book [*Body and Soul*] about St. Naum in Macedonia, there exist in all Greek dioceses Chapels which are specially used by the mentally deficient. . . . In these Chapels it is usual to find wells, the water of which, called Agiasma, is believed to have the healing property. To such Chapels are sent the mentally unwell, accompanied by their relatives, to stay forty days, and use the waters, and all means of intercession for their recovery. The patients also drink the water every morning fasting. This water is also poured on the head of the patient. If there are lucid moments, the priest endeavours to give counsel in the confessional. He administers Holy Unction and the Blessed Sacrament. The Blessed Sacrament is received many times.[2]

[1] A very much fuller collection of exorcistic material will be found at the close of Gregory XIII's Roman *Rituale* of 1584, which is an invaluable collection of mediæval forms, indispensable to the serious student of mediæval Church life. A large number of varied and elaborate exorcisms is also included in Vol. II of Gerbert's *Monumenta Veteris Liturgiæ Alemannicæ*, pp. 127 ff.

[2] The administration of the Eucharist, as well as Unction and Imposition of Hands, to the insane, where there is no danger of irreverence, is primitive. Only in a few quarters was there any objection to it. The modern Latin Rite

Fasting is a requisite necessity, not only for the patient, but for his relatives too.'

With regard to the West, exorcism is still a part of the ministry—in theory at least—both of the Roman and of the Anglican priest. But at present, in most Roman dioceses, the parish priest is required to obtain his Bishop's licence, before he can use the dramatic *Ritus exorcizandi obsessos a dæmonio* provided in the *Rituale*.[1]

In the Church of England the position is somewhat similar. Canon 72 of A.D. 1604 forbids the parish priest *without episcopal licence* 'by fasting and prayer to cast out any devil or devils,' under pain of deposition from the ministry. This Canon was passed to put an end to the scandals caused by public competitions in exorcism between rival divines. Some authorities have held that, the language of the Canon being unqualified, not only public exhibitions of the kind indicated are forbidden (except under licence), but even the private use of exorcism in ordinary pastoral ministrations. But, inasmuch as restrictive enactments are usually—with good reason—interpreted in a narrow sense, the preferable opinion seems to be that the Canon prohibits only public and sensational exhibitions of exorcism, of a kind likely to be harmful and demoralising to both patient and spectators.

Of course, in these days, when mental diseases are usually attributed to pathological 'complexes' rather than to demons, exorcism in the full mediæval sense is seldom employed. Its place has been largely taken by what may be called 'quasi-exorcism,' the object of which is to encourage the patient to take up first a hostile and 'rebuking,' and finally a 'triumphant' attitude towards the obsessing 'complex,' which dominates his will. 'Quasi-exorcism' has been described as 'the process of personifying a complex, in order to get angry with it'; and this rough definition conveys the right idea, provided the correction is made, that an obsessing complex needs very little 'personifying.' It is, in its own nature, personal or semi-personal, being, in fact, a detached fragment of the patient's own mind, dissociated from consciousness and 'repressed.' It seeks from the depths of his 'unconscious' to dominate and enslave him, very much after the manner of a possessing demon. 'Quasi-exorcism' is a

---

of Exorcism (1925) has the following rubric: 'Let the possessed person be exhorted, if he be [sufficiently] strong in mind and body, to pray for himself to God, and to fast, and frequently to fortify himself by Holy Confession and Communion, according to the discretion of the priest.'

[1] It would appear from Canon 1151 of the new *Codex Juris Canonici* (1917) that this restriction is now extended to all Western dioceses. R.C. bishops (also priests, if they are granted a licence) are permitted to exorcise not only the faithful, but also non-catholics and the excommunicate (Can. 1152).

remedy of proved value in the treatment of 'obsessive' and 'compulsive' neuroses. It has been employed with conspicuous success in the cure of dipsomania. Where it forms part of the treatment, the patient is instructed to sign the pledge in a militant and combative frame of mind towards his infirmity; also, whenever he is invited to drink, to say in a challenging tone, 'I am a total abstainer.' As the cure progresses, he is encouraged to pass gradually to a state of 'triumph.' When this is reached, he is sent out for walks (with his pockets empty) and told to pass every public-house with his head erect, and his muscles braced, like a soldier. Finally, when the cure is nearly complete, he is sent out, *with his pockets full*, and instructed to stop before every public-house, and to jingle the money in his pockets triumphantly before passing on.[1] It is important that the parish priest should strongly urge dipsomaniacs and drug addicts to seek skilled institutional treatment. But even if his advice is followed, the patients will require the pastor's watchful after-care, to guard against relapse.

When the spiritual and moral preparation has been thorough, cases of dipsomania and drug addiction, and even of long established self-abuse and sexual perversion, are occasionally cured instantaneously and permanently by a single administration of Unction. As a rule, however, continuous and careful treatment for at least three months is required. If possible, medical co-operation should be secured. For the treatment of other forms of obsessive 'moral disease' (*e.g.* kleptomania, and pathological lying, anger, suspicion, and jealousy), the parish priest will usually have to accept more exclusive responsibility; but he should always, when possible, work in co-operation with a physician who has an adequate knowledge of therapeutic psychology, and is a practising Christian.

The technique of 'quasi-exorcism' has not as yet been exhaustively studied, but already, in experienced hands, it is able to produce results approaching those achieved by the great exorcists of primitive and mediæval times. Its value in cases of sexual obsession and perversion—where purely medical treatment

[1] See Dr. Alfred Carver's *The Institutional Treatment of the Alcoholist*, reprinted from *The British Journal of Inebriety*, October 1926, and obtainable from the C.E.T.S. Dr. Carver is the Medical Superintendent of Caldecote Hall, Nuneaton, and claims success in from 70 to 80 per cent. of the patients who come to that institution with good-will and real desire to be cured. He recommends institutional treatment for at least three months, and an immediate return to work after treatment without an intervening holiday. He lays great stress on the therapeutic and moral value of 'outdoor manual work,' which, 'if properly supervised, is one of the greatest instruments in our whole armoury for the rehabilitation of the alcoholist [and drug addict].' The present writer once cured a severe case of dipsomania partly by direct spiritual treatment, partly also by recommending a change of employment to *market-gardening*, for which the patient had an inclination.

frequently fails—is well established; but it should always be used in connection with sound moral and spiritual instruction, devotional exercises of a non-exciting and tranquillising character, and the administration of Unction.

The primitive practice of exorcism had not only a negative (or 'rebuking'), but also a positive aspect. It aimed at restoring the interrupted indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the mentally afflicted person. The theory was that the re-entry of the Holy Spirit expelled the evil influence (see below, pp. 488, 493, 502).

Status of Lay 'Healers.'

In these days of Christian Science, and other unorthodox and dangerous systems of 'faith-healing,' it is important to emphasise the scriptural and catholic principle, that the ministry of Spiritual Healing was entrusted by our Lord, not indeed exclusively, but primarily and predominantly to the Apostles, and to their successors, the bishops and other ordained ministers of His Church. The Anglican Ordinal definitely entrusts the newly-consecrated bishop with the apostolic commission to 'heal the sick' (*i.e.* by sacramental and other spiritual ministrations). The context decisively indicates that the sick in question are not only the physically infirm, but also, and indeed especially, mental, nervous, and spiritual sufferers ('hold up the weak' . . . 'bind up the broken'). It should be realised more generally than it is, that the responsibility of the Bishop towards the insane, and the victims of the various forms of 'moral disease,' is even more urgent than that towards the physically infirm.

If this principle is kept in mind, the problem of lay ministry to the sick is automatically solved. It is probable that in our age, as in that of St. Paul, 'gifts of healings' (1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30) are diffused somewhat widely among the devout laity. They are the endowment, either natural or acquired, of those who feel special sympathy with the sick, and for that reason have experienced a vocation to minister to them. Devout physicians and nurses often possess such gifts to a high degree.

But such lay ministrations, to prevent confusion, ought to be co-ordinated under proper spiritual authority. In a well-organised parish, there is no room for the eccentricities of irresponsible 'faith-healers.' Every serious sick case is known to the parish priest, and is immediately placed by him under well-considered and methodical spiritual treatment. This being so, it is obvious that lay ministers of healing, when such are available, should be selected from among the most devout and trustworthy communicants of the congregation. They should be trained for their work by the parish priest himself (or by some other competent instructor), and should work under his direction. In all serious cases of sickness he should acquaint them with the

kind of spiritual ministry to be employed, and should give them careful instructions as to the scriptural readings, prayers, exhortations, and hymns, which he thinks most suitable for use. Not until the value of their ministrations has been thoroughly tested should these lay ministers of healing be permitted to lay hands upon the sick, or to anoint. Even when this permission has been given, it should be made perfectly clear to them, that their work is auxiliary, not primary, and that their task is not to strike out a new line of their own, but rather to assist the parish priest, and to seek to deepen the impression which his more authoritative sacramental ministrations have made. This is, in effect, the programme advocated by the Guild of St. Raphael, which recognises the existence and lawfulness of a lay ministry of healing, but demands that it should be exercised under due ecclesiastical control.

Of the actual existence and official recognition of such a lay ministry, both in the apostolic age, and in primitive and mediæval times, there is ample evidence. Both in East and West oil was habitually offered by the laity at the Sunday Eucharist, to be blessed by the Bishop, and afterwards used for domestic healing.[1] Pope Innocent I, writing to Decentius in A.D. 416, states quite definitely that not only have the faithful the right, when sick, to be anointed by the clergy with 'the holy oil of Chrism,'[2] but also the further right 'to use it for anointing in their own need, or in the need of members of their households' (Migne, *P.L.*, xx. 560–1). The prevalence of the same custom in England is clearly attested by Bede, who refers in this connection to Innocent's letter (*Commentary on St. James*, Migne, *P.L.*, xciii. 39). Further evidence in abundance might be adduced, but it is needless.

It is important, however, to observe that, though Unction and Imposition of Hands by lay persons were widely in use in early and mediæval times for the cure of minor ailments, recourse was

[1] *Canons of Hippolytus* (28): 'But if oil is present, let him pray over it in this manner.' *Sacramentary of Serapion*, 'Prayer concerning the offerings [by the laity] of oil and water.' *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii. 4; 'Sanctify this water and this oil in the name of him or her who has offered them, and grant them power to restore health.' Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 305: 'Towards the end of the Canon [of the Mass] the faithful brought small vessels of oil to be blessed for their own use. This was the oil for anointing the sick, and the faithful could make use of it themselves. It served also for Extreme Unction.' *Leofric Missal*: 'Then let there be offered to the Pontiff [*i.e.* Bishop] oil from the vessels which the people offer for the anointing both of the sick and of the energumens [*i.e.* the insane].' Very numerous other authorities might be quoted.

[2] *I.e.* the Oil of the Sick. This, being regarded as a form of 'spiritual unction,' was not infrequently called 'chrism' by early authorities (*e.g.* Archbishop Theodore in his *Pœnitential*), as it still is in the Roman *Pontifical*. Similarly the terms 'muron' and 'sphragis,' usually restricted to the unguent of Confirmation, are sometimes applied to it by Eastern authorities.

always had to the more potent ministrations of the Bishop and his presbyters, where the disease was serious. The ministry of the Exorcists, whether ordained or unordained, was always unimportant and mainly of a routine character. Critical and difficult exorcisms have been performed in all ages by Bishops or Priests.

There is no foundation for the statement sometimes made [1] that the Healing Ministry was originally a lay and 'charismatic' ministry which only in the fourth and fifth centuries was gradually taken over by the clergy and annexed to the pastoral office. On the contrary, there is ample evidence that this Ministry was from the first as much part of the Apostolic Commission, as was the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments. In every ancient Church the Bishop himself, in virtue of his consecration, not of any personal 'charisma of healing' which he might have previously possessed, acted as the chief Exorcist and Healer. On the other hand, it was recognised that the possession by a layman of such a personal 'charisma' was a recommendation for his ordination.

Oil for healing the sick was sometimes taken from the lamps burning before the shrines of saints; or it was blessed by living saints reputed to have the power of working miracles; sometimes, again, it was hallowed by contact with or proximity to relics. But such uses of unction belong rather to the category of the miraculous, than of the pastoral and sacramental.

Consecration of the Oil of the Sick.

In primitive times, both in Eastern and Western Christendom, the Oil for the Sick was normally consecrated by the Bishop himself; but in his absence a priest was allowed to consecrate it. In the Eastern Church to-day, the Oil is consecrated by the seven ministering priests in course of the Anointing Service. Similarly the Nonjurors' Liturgy of 1718, influenced by Eastern usage, directed the ministering Priest to consecrate the Oil in the sick man's presence. On the other hand, it followed the usage of both East and West in restricting the consecration of the Chrism of Confirmation to the Bishop. In the West, co-consecration of the Oil by the Bishop and all the presbyters present was common in early times (cf. concelebration at the Eucharist). The practice is enjoined in Menard's text [2] of the Gregorian Sacramentary ('then oil is offered to the pontiff, and both he and all the presbyters bless it to anoint a sick man'), and in numerous other Western Rites, including the eleventh-century Pontificals of Amiens and of Leofric (for other instances, see Catalani's Commentary on the *Pontifical*, Menard's edition of the Gregorian Sacramentary, and Martène, *op. cit.*).

[1] As, for example, by Dr. Woolley in his booklet *Exorcism and the Healing of the Sick*.

[2] The Gelasian Sacramentary has no rubric on the subject, but co-consecration was probably in use.

The Western restriction of the consecration of the three liturgical oils ('of the sick,' 'of the catechumens,' 'of chrism') to Maundy Thursday seems already implied in the Gelasian Sacramentary, but is not primitive. The 1st Council of Toledo, Can. XX, A.D. 400, declares: 'It is quite certain that it is lawful for the Bishop to consecrate the Chrism at any time.'

When the Bishop's oil was not available, it was usual for priests in early times to consecrate oil for their own use.

As Magistretti observes (*op. cit.*), though various Councils of the eighth and ninth centuries forbid presbyters to consecrate the Chrism of Confirmation, none forbids them to bless the Oil of the Sick. He quotes a fifteenth-century Milanese rubric: 'If thou hast no oil consecrated by the Bishop, in case of necessity first bless oil with this exorcism,' etc., and gives an early form for blessing oil, which was obviously used by the priest in the sick man's room, for it concludes with the rubric, *Here beginneth the Imposition of the Hand.* The Ambrosian *Rituale* of 1560, used in St. Charles's pontificate, still allowed parish priests to consecrate, not only the Oil of the Sick, but also the Oil of Catechumens, as a normal practice without any suggestion of necessity.

An Anglican priest need have no hesitation in consecrating his own oil, when episcopal oil is difficult to obtain; but he should ordinarily use oil supplied by his own Bishop, partly out of respect for his office as the chief minister of the Sacraments, and partly from psychological considerations, episcopal oil having undoubtedly much greater 'prestige' in the eyes of patients than the oil of a simple priest.

When it is desirable that auxiliary daily anointings should be performed by the husband, wife, or nurse of the sick person, or by some authorised sick-visitor, or by the patient himself, oil in sufficient quantity should be blessed by the priest. An ancient form for this purpose is still retained in the Roman *Rituale* (Tit. viii. cap. 19). From its wording (it speaks of obedience to a divine command, obviously that given through St. James) it seems clear that in earlier days, before the blessing of oil was restricted to bishops, it was regarded as effecting sacramental consecration.

II. Western Tradition of Unction

Theology of Unction as taught in Western Liturgies.

The Archbishop's Report regards Unction, and its associated ceremony of Imposition of Hands, as 'sacramental rites.' 'These rites,' it declares, 'have scriptural authority,[1] and are sacramental in the sense that a blessing is sought and received through the

[1] For Unction, see Mark vi. 13; James v. 14; for Laying on of Hands, Luke iv. 40; Matt. viii. 3; Mark v. 23 (xvi. 18); Acts ix. 17.

performance of outward and visible actions.' The Report further indicates that a spiritual blessing is to be expected on all occasions when these rites are administered (provided, of course, that they are received with suitable dispositions); also, in most cases, recovery or improvement in health. Where, however, improvement in health is not granted, it is assumed that some compensating spiritual advantage will be bestowed, *e.g.* 'the grace to bear sickness patiently.' The Report is emphatic in its teaching that Unction (with its associated ceremony of Laying on of Hands) is a ministry primarily to the soul, and that it is only through the soul that it affects the body beneficially.

This view is in accordance with long-established tradition, both in East and West; and it has, moreover, the support of the great majority of theologians who have seriously investigated the subject.

On the other hand, the status of Unction as a sacrament, conveying sanctifying grace to the soul of the worthy recipient, has lately been assailed:—

(1) By certain theologians, not numerous, but weighty, who maintain that Unction is not a sacrament conferring grace to the soul, but a supernatural means of healing bodily—and perhaps also mental—diseases; also—

(2) By certain psychologists who contend that it is only a particular method of using therapeutic 'suggestion,' valuable indeed, but in no wise differing in principle from the secular suggestion employed by many modern schools of psychotherapy.

The inadequacy of the second contention will be at once realised if it be remembered that secular psychotherapy works entirely with 'endopsychic' forces (*i.e.* forces belonging to the minds of the physician, and of his patient); but that in the Church's Ministry of Healing a superior power is invoked, viz. that of God, or of Christ. It is simply and solely through *religious faith*, on the part both of priest and patient, that healing is sought to be effected. Undoubtedly the priest employs 'suggestion,' as well as prayer, instruction, and exhortation, to inspire the sick man with faith in God, but, when this faith has once been implanted, suggestion falls into the background, and healing takes place through religious faith. Beyond all question, the great dynamic force at work in the Church's Ministry of Healing is *the patient's firm faith in God as the physician of souls and bodies, and in the Church's sacramental ministrations of Unction and Imposition of Hands as conveying by Christ's appointment spiritual blessings and remedies to the soul, and through these healing to the body.*

Our Lord, in His own healing ministry, almost invariably required from the sick (or their representatives) faith in God, and also in Himself as representing God and ministering His grace. (See, for instance, Mark ii. 5, the case of the palsied man;

Luke viii. 48, 'Thy faith hath made thee whole'; Mark vi. 5, 'He could there do no mighty work . . . because of their unbelief.')

The Apostles, who received this ministry from Christ, exercised it in a similar manner. It was because St. Paul perceived that the cripple at Lystra 'had faith to be healed,' that he felt entitled to say to him: 'Stand upright on thy feet' (Acts xiv. 8–10). Similarly, St. Peter gave this explanation of the healing of the lame man at the Gate Beautiful. 'His name, *through faith in his name*, hath made this man strong. . . . Yea, *the faith which is through him* hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all' (Acts iii. 16).

The truth is that the 'suggestion' theory does not deal with the facts which it seeks to explain. The indispensable preliminary to the effective administration of Unction is the induction in the patient of what is technically called 'the faith state.' This is a state, not of secular expectation of recovery, but of *spiritual communion with God and trust in Him.* It cannot be induced in one who is not truly penitent, and who does not submit his will entirely to God, whether for recovery or for continued illness.

Evidence of the Roman Pontifical.

Investigation of the Western tradition of Unction may fitly start with the very ancient form for consecrating the Oil of the Sick on Maundy Thursday provided in the Roman *Pontifical.*

The service for 'Extreme Unction' contained in the Roman *Rituale* is less suitable for the purpose, because, being continually in use, it has suffered extensive doctrinal revision, to bring it into harmony with late mediæval, and especially Tridentine, conceptions.

On the other hand, the form for blessing the oil given in the *Pontifical,* being used only once a year in the course of a service of a very primitive character,[1] has escaped doctrinal revision, and still preserves unaltered the teaching, and indeed the phraseology, of the ancient Sacramentaries traditionally ascribed to Gregory the Great (590–604), and Gelasius (492–496).

The opening Exorcism ('Exorcizo te, immundissime spiritus,' etc.) is not found in these Sacramentaries, but is undoubtedly ancient. It is found in the eleventh-century *Ordo Romanus X*,[2]

[1] The oil is blessed during the Canon of the Chrismal Mass, not at the altar, but at a supper-table placed behind the altar. At this the Bishop sits, representing Christ at the Last Supper, with six presbyters seated at his right hand, and six at his left, representing the twelve Apostles. He stands, however, for the actual exorcising and blessing of the oil.

[2] Only the opening and closing words of this Exorcism are quoted, but the identification is certain. This manner of quoting shows that Exorcism was already an established part of the Roman Liturgy and familiar. *Ordo Romanus X* is printed and annotated by Mabillon in Vol. II of his *Musæum Italicum*, p. 95 ff. (reprinted by Migne, *P.L.*, lxxviii. col. 1009).

which contains much ancient material; in the eleventh-century Leofric Missal; twice [1] in the collection of ancient Alemannic, Gallican, Ambrosian, and Roman forms collected in Gerbert's *Monumenta Veteris Liturgiæ Alemannicæ;* in not a few ancient Orders cited by Martène and Catalani; also in a greatly expanded form in the Sarum *Pontifical*, in the Magdalen *Pontifical* (twelfth century),[2] and other authorities of about the same date. Both its phraseology and its doctrine are obviously ancient, and antedate the ninth century.[3]

The form for blessing the oil which follows the Exorcism ('Emitte, quæsumus, Spiritum sanctum,' etc.) is practically identical with the form which is common (with a few unimportant variations) to the Gregorian and Gelasian Sacramentaries. The Gregorian form, as usually given, omits the phrase 'permanens in visceribus nostris.'[4] Its antiquity, however, is decisively attested by its occurrence in the Gelasian Sacramentary. The Gelasian version adds the interesting information that the oil was sometimes *tasted* ('gustanti') as well as applied to the body.

The teaching of the Roman *Pontifical* concerning Unction may be thus summarised:

(1) It is 'a spiritual unction' and 'perfect chrism' analogous to the unction bestowed in Confirmation. Not only is it definitely called 'chrism,' but the critical words, 'the unction wherewith thou didst anoint Priests, Kings, Prophets, and Martyrs,' are common to it and to the form for consecrating the Chrism of Confirmation.

(2) It restores the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, for the strengthening, healing, and consecrating of the Temple of the sick man's personality ('that this oil may become a spiritual unction for the strengthening [or healing] of the Temple of the living God, that the Holy Spirit may be able to dwell therein': 'this ungent of celestial medicine'; 'a protection of mind and body,' etc.).

(3) This indwelling of the Spirit is intended to be *permanent* ('a perfect chrism, *abiding* in our inward parts').[5]

[1] It occurs once in its proper position, before the blessing of the Oil of the Sick, in Vol. II. p. 77, the manuscript from which it is printed being of the tenth or eleventh century. It occurs again, displaced, before the blessing of the Oil of the Catechumens (not of the Sick) in Vol. I. p. 74, where it was called 'Ambrosian.' But, like so many other 'Ambrosian' forms, it probably came originally from Rome, as its wide extension through Western Christendom strongly suggests.

[2] Henry Bradshaw Society, Vol. 39.

[3] I owe much of my information about this Exorcism to Dr. Brightman.

[4] However, one of the three ninth-century MSS. used by H. A. Wilson for his critical edition of the Gregorian Sacramentary contains it.

[5] Alone, or almost alone, among modern Latin theologians, J. Kern strongly emphasises the primitive doctrine (preserved in the Roman Pontifical) that Unction of the Sick is 'a royal anointing,' conferring a grace of strength and

(4) It is effectual for bodily diseases (' for the expulsion of all pains, all infirmities, and every sickness of . . . body ').

(5) But also and still more for mental and spiritual disorders (diseases of the *mind* are mentioned three times). The allusion to mental diseases implies that the oil is to be used for exorcism, as indeed we know from abundant evidence that it actually has been from the earliest times.

(6) Furthermore, the oil is to be used *for sick persons in general*, and not merely for those in danger of death. This is shown, not only by the title of the oil (the ' Oil of the Sick '—contrast ' Extreme Unction '), but also and still more clearly by its being described as a remedy for *every kind* of pain and infirmity, and in particular for *mental and spiritual disorders.*[1] These latter seldom involve danger to life. Doubtless, insanity sometimes takes the form of an irresistible impulse to commit suicide, but the *Pontifical* contains not the slightest indication that Unction of the insane is to be restricted to this very limited section of them.

Evidence of the Roman Rituale.

The *Rituale* Service for ' Extreme Unction ' has undergone so much doctrinal and rubrical revision that it can only be used as an authority for primitive doctrine and practice after critical reconstruction. In its present form it restricts Unction to those who are in danger of death ' by sickness or old age.' This restriction is one of the most unfortunate of the mediæval abuses[2] which attached themselves so plentifully to this sacrament, because it has the effect of depriving of its benefits the great majority of those who, according to the terms of its institution, are entitled to receive them.

Both theologically and practically the effects of this restriction, which, beginning in the ninth century, became very general in the West about the opening of the thirteenth (though it was not authoritatively decreed by the Church of Rome until the Council of Trent), have been vast. It transformed what had

---

sanctification very similar to that of Confirmation (see his *De Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis*, 1907, esp. p. 240). The conception which underlay the primitive use of Unction was that the gift of the Holy Ghost, conferred originally at Confirmation, normally gave strength and health, not only to the soul, but also to the mind and the body of the recipient. When, however, the effective indwelling of the Holy Spirit was for any cause interrupted (*e.g.* owing to grave sin, want of faith, carelessness in the performance of religious duties, or severe mental shock), then the devout reception of Unction restored it. Unction was thus regarded as the complement of Confirmation rather than of Penance.

[1] Unction is described as *tutamen mentis et corporis, ad evacuandos omnes dolores, omnesque infirmitates, omnem ægritudinem corporis.*

[2] On these abuses, see Excursus ii appended to this chapter.

hitherto been a general Sacrament of Healing into 'Extreme Unction,' or (as it was otherwise called) the 'Sacrament of the Dying' (*Sacramentum Exeuntium*).[1] The *Rituale* still retains prayers for recovery of a thoroughly primitive type, but their effect is restricted by the rubric which confines the Ordinance to an insignificant fraction of the sick, many of whom are in a desperate condition before anointing takes place.

Many post-Tridentine Roman theologians recognise that neither the title 'Extreme Unction' nor the ideas associated with it are primitive. Catalani, in his Commentary on the *Rituale*, defends the title by maintaining that it merely means *the last of the various unctions which a Christian receives*, the earlier ones being those at Baptism, Confirmation, and Ordination to the Priesthood (Vol. I. p. 300). But *The Catholic Encyclopædia* rejects this explanation: 'The name "Extreme Unction" did not become technical in the West till towards the end of the twelfth century, and has never become current in the East. [Some have contended that the name means] "last in order of the sacramental or quasi-sacramental unctions." . . . But having regard to the conditions prevailing at the time when the name was introduced . . . it is much more probable that it was introduced originally to mean "the unction of those *in extremis*," *i.e.* of the dying, especially as the corresponding name *sacramentum exeuntium* came into common use during the same period' (Art. 'Extreme Unction'). The Fathers of Trent are generally understood to favour the late mediæval view:—'This Unction is to be administered to the sick, but especially (*præsertim*) to those who are so dangerously ill that they seem to be departing this life, whence also it is called the Sacrament of the Dying' (Sess. xiv. 3). It might be argued that the word 'especially' here used gives justification to those who maintain that the Council of Trent does not categorically forbid the anointing of the sick in general, but only discourages it. Certainly modern Rome indulges the Uniat Churches of the East with a far wider use of Unction than she permits in the West. Nevertheless, both the *Rituale* and the new *Codex Juris Canonici* (Canon 940) restrict Unction to those in danger of death.

Another non-primitive feature in the *Rituale* is the excessive stress which it lays upon *the remission of sins*—particularly sins committed through the bodily senses. The actual 'form' prescribed speaks of nothing else. In the last edition (1925) the parts of the body to which Unction is directed to be applied are the eyes, the

[1] Peter Lombard (*c.* 1100–1160) was apparently the first theologian to use the term *Unctio Extrema*. He says: 'This sacrament was ordained for a double purpose, viz. for the remission of sins, and for the alleviation of bodily infirmity' (*Sent.*, IV. 23. 2). Peter, however, strongly emphasises the curative function of the rite, and recommends its frequent repetition with a view to its full efficacy. Nevertheless he expressly states that Extreme Unction is so called because it is given to persons *in extremis*.

ears, the nostrils, the mouth, the hands, and the feet.[1] But 'in case of necessity it is sufficient to anoint on one sense, or more properly on the forehead.'[2] The formula prescribed is: 'By this holy Unction, and his most merciful pity, the Lord pardon thee all sins committed through *sight*,' etc.

Whether the sins remitted are mortal or venial is not stated. They can hardly—in ordinary cases—be mortal, because the rubrics prescribe that, 'if there is time, and the condition of the sick person permits, before Extreme Unction, the sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist are to be administered.' The meaning probably is, that if the sick person is penitent, but too weak to confess to the priest, all his sins, even though deadly, are sacramentally remitted by Unction. This explanation is that given by certain Eastern theologians. For instance, Macaire writes: 'The Apostle [James] evidently presupposes that before having recourse to the Unction of Blessed Oil, the sick person has already received the Sacrament of Penance. . . . And in our days also, in the Orthodox Church, whoever has recourse to Unction . . . begins by purifying himself from his sins by confessing them before his spiritual father. . . . But since, when enfeebled by a grave malady . . . the man is not always in a state to present a true and perfect repentance [confession] of his sins . . . God in His mercy has dispensed, especially in favour of invalids of this kind, a new remedy for the healing of their moral maladies in the Sacrament of Unction' (*Théologie Dogmatique Orthodoxe*, Vol. II. p. 562).

There is a further difficulty connected with venial sins. These, according to modern practice, would normally be confessed and remitted through absolution; and, even if not confessed, they would presumably be forgiven through worthy participation in the Eucharist, which, in modern Roman practice, precedes Unction.

The Council of Trent, following St. Thomas and other scholastic doctors, teaches that among the effects of Unction is the removal of 'the relics' of sin, which are usually understood to be spiritual weaknesses, bad habits, and evil tendencies engendered by past sin. The language of certain ancient and mediæval rites, and modern pastoral experience, suggest that this really may be among the effects of Unction. But the language of the *Rituale* (at any rate in its 'form' of Unction) speaks, not of 'relics' of sin, but of *actual* sin ('quidquid . . . deliquisti').

[1] The new *Codex* forbids the traditional practice of anointing on the loins or reins, which was supposed to remit sins of lust. The York, and other mediæval Orders, directed anointing on the navel for the same purpose. The Sarum Manual directed anointing on the loins in the case of a man, and on the navel in the case of a woman.

[2] We have here an interesting approximation to modern Anglican usage.

Reconstruction of the 'Rituale' Service.

The Unction Service of the *Rituale* may readily be restored to its primitive condition by collating it with its oldest known form, viz. that contained in *Ordo Romanus X* (printed and annotated by Mabillon in his *Musæum Italicum*, Vol. II, and reprinted by Migne, *P.L.*, lxxviii, col. 1020). Though this *Ordo* belongs, as a document, to the eleventh century, much of the material which it contains is considerably more ancient. In particular, the bulk of 'The Order for Visiting a Sick Man' is shown by satisfactory internal evidence to antedate the reign of Charlemagne.

It is a well-established and generally admitted fact, that at the beginning of the ninth century, or a little earlier, the process began (in Western Christendom only) which four centuries later transformed 'Unction of the Sick' into 'Extreme Unction.'

Clear evidence both of the date and of the nature of this change is afforded by various contemporary authorities, notably by the second *Capitulare* of Theodulf,[1] a trusted ecclesiastical adviser of Charlemagne, who was Bishop of Orleans from about 798 to 818, and by the Council of Metz (847). From these we gather that it was then becoming the accepted view, at least in official quarters: (1) that the primary—or one of the primary—effects of Unction is *remission of sins;* (2) that Unction, when applied to the organs of the bodily senses (eyes, ears, nostrils, etc.), remits *the sins committed through those senses;* and (3) that, though Unction is not without efficacy for the healing of bodily and mental infirmities, yet its more important effect is *preparation for death.*

These tendencies are clearly manifested, though in a somewhat undeveloped form,[2] in an appendix to the Visitation Office of *Ordo X*, entitled *Ordo compendiosus et consequens ad ungendum infirmum*, which may accordingly be assigned to the ninth century. None of them is in evidence in the main service, which may accordingly be dated before the year 800.

Reference to *Ordo Romanus X* shows that practically the whole of the present *Rituale* service is contained in it. Almost the only portions not found there are the title, the bulk of the rubrics, and (of course) the form of anointing, which in this precise form is probably of the twelfth century, though similar forms had been in use in some places from the ninth.

The following additions and changes will restore the Service to its original form.

[1] The entire *Capitulare* is printed in Migne, *P.L.*, cv. col. 220 ff.; the relevant portions in Martène, *op. cit.*, and Puller, *The Anointing of the Sick*, p. 397.

[2] For example, though remission of sins of the senses is mentioned, and the formula 'Per istam sanctam unctionem,' etc. is employed, the directions as to the parts of the body to be anointed are vague: 'Dipping his thumb in the Oil of the Sick, let the priest make the sign of the cross on the sick man's body *in seven or in several places.*'

(1) Change the title *Ordo . . . Extremæ Unctionis* into *Ordo ad Visitandum Infirmum.*

(2) Omit all the directions based on Tridentine conceptions, including preliminary rubric 2, which directs Viaticum to *precede* Unction. (In ancient times, at Rome as elsewhere, Viaticum *followed* Unction. See the discussion in Book VIII, ch. 8 of the *De Synodo Diœcesana* of Benedict XIV, who declares that 'None but those entirely ignorant of Church history will deny that the former custom was for the sick to be anointed after sacramental confession, but before . . . Viaticum.' Benedict allowed this order to continue in places where the ancient custom still prevailed.)

(3) Insert early in the Service, after the prayers for the household, the emphatic and encouraging prayers for recovery, provided in the ancient *Ordo.* These entreat God to heal the sick man, as He healed Tobit, and Sarah the daughter of Raguel, and Peter's wife's mother, and the centurion's servant, and King Hezekiah. They reach a dramatic climax in a petition that God will raise the sick man from his bed, as Peter raised Tabitha from the dead. These faith-inspiring prayers, introduced for the purpose of bringing the sick man into the 'faith-state' requisite for the effective administration of Unction, have naturally—but with grievous loss—been omitted from the modern *Rituale* service, which, influenced by late mediæval conceptions, has allowed the healing efficacy of Unction to recede considerably into the background.[1]

(4) After the sprinkling of the sick man with Holy Water, add the following short dialogue, which provides an interesting commentary on the teaching of the Roman *Pontifical*, that this ministry should be regarded as a 'spiritual unction,' restoring the interrupted indwelling of the Holy Ghost.

℣. For what purpose hast thou summoned me, brother?

℟. That I may confess my sins to God and to thee; and that thou mayest pardon me, as his representative, and mayest assign me a penance, and mayest pour into [*or* upon] me *the unction of the Holy Ghost.*

℣. The Lord Jesus Christ pardon thee all thy sins, and impart to thee his health-bringing Unction. Yet, if the Lord regard thee favourably, and heal thee, wilt thou guard that Unction?

℟. I will guard it.

. . . . . .

℣. The Lord so succours fallen man, that not only through Baptism and Confirmation, but also through the medicine of

[1] These prayers are retained, in a slightly altered form and order, in the Sarum Manual, not, however, as part of the Service of Extreme Unction, but as an introduction to that of Visitation.

Penance and Unction, the spirit of man is restored [*or* healed, 'reparetur'] unto life eternal.[1]

℟. Thanks be to God.

[Then follow Sacramental Confession, and the Seven Penitential Psalms.]

(5) Omit the whole present form of anointing with the words 'Per istam sanctam Unctionem,' etc.

(6) Prefix to the first of the three concluding prayers a direction for anointing to take place during the prayer which in the present *Rituale* service *follows* the Anointing ('Domine, Deus, qui per Apostolum tuum Jacobum locutus es,' etc.).[2]

This noble and well-balanced prayer is very ancient, being found, not only in *Ordo Romanus X*, but also in the earlier Gregorian Sacramentary. Both in doctrine and in expression it is thoroughly primitive.

Doctrine of the Reconstructed 'Rituale' Service.

So restored, the *Rituale* Service agrees in doctrine (and also in suggested practice) with the Roman *Pontifical*. It regards Anointing as a 'Spiritual Unction,' restoring to the sick man the indwelling of the Holy Ghost for the strengthening, healing and sanctifying of his entire personality; it gives due prominence to bodily, while fully recognising spiritual healing; it also recognises the exorcistic efficacy of Unction. Like the *Pontifical*, it contemplates the anointing of sick persons in general, and not merely of those in danger of death.

Its central prayer, after alluding to the well-known injunction of St. James, proceeds as follows:

'Cure, we beseech thee, O our Redeemer, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, the languors of this sick man, and heal his wounds, and banish (*dimitte*) his sins, and expel from him all pains of mind and body, and mercifully restore to him complete wholeness both within and without [*i.e.* of soul and body], that, healed by the help of thy mercy, he may be restored to his former duties.' . . .

It will be noticed that the *Rituale* supplements the *Pontifical* by mentioning remission (or banishing) of sins as an effect of Unction.

[1] Observe here the persistence of the primitive belief that not only Unction, but also the Sacraments generally, notably Baptism, Confirmation, and Penance, possess healing virtue, which affects the body through the soul.

[2] The older portion of *Ordo Romanus X* provides *two* prayers for anointing, of which this is the second. The former one is shorter and vaguer, and, if used alone, would probably be expanded by extempore prayer. The more modern Appendix to the *Ordo* directs Unction first on the head, and afterwards on the organs of the five senses. It contains no direction for anointing on the loins. Its form for anointing the hands differs considerably from the modern Roman. It speaks of remission of sins 'of touch, of walking, of the loins, and of the flesh.'

It lays no particular stress upon this effect—indeed it mentions it only once—nevertheless a causal connection between Unction and remission of sins is clearly affirmed.

As we shall see later, remission of sins is mentioned as one of the effects of Unction in quite early documents. It is only excessive stress upon it which marks a document as late.

The Gregorian Sacramentary.

Probably the most ancient full Service for the Administration of Unction now in existence is that contained in the 'Gregorian' Sacramentary as printed by Menard, and reproduced (with his commentary) in Migne (*P.L.*, lxxviii, col. 231–36). In this Service Unction is regarded as a normal accompaniment of the Visitation of the Sick, whether they are in danger of death or not.

The rite contemplates the presence of a plurality of priests and inferior ministers, of a choir, and (probably) of a general congregration of sympathetic fellow-Christians.[1]

The service begins with the Exorcism and blessing of Holy Water *in the sick man's presence*, and his sprinkling therewith.[2] Psychologically, this procedure is preferable to that of the later rituals, which direct the sick man to be sprinkled with water already hallowed. The mingled Water and Salt are declared to be 'for the safety [or salvation] of believers,' and 'for health of mind'; also 'for the expulsion of demons and banishment of diseases.' They are blessed, 'that they may be, unto all who receive them, health of soul and body.'

Practically all the ancient and mediæval rituals (including those of Sarum and York) make the sprinkling of the sick man with Holy Water an integral part of the rite of Unction. That the Church from very early times regarded sprinkling with Holy Water as a semi-sacramental ministration of a remedial character auxiliary to Unction, has already been indicated. Both the oil and the water were sometimes taken internally as well as applied externally.[3]

[1] This probability is established by fairly frequent references to the presence of the laity in rites derived from or influenced by the Gregorian. In some rites they *kiss* the sick man, after the priests and other ministers of the Church have done so, and in one or two they even *lay their hands upon him*, thus associating themselves with the priestly ministry of benediction and healing, which in ancient times was regarded (as it still is in the East) as *an act of the whole Church*, not simply of the ministering priest. The corporate character of the ministry of Unction, and the duty of the laity to co-operate in its administration, if not by their presence, at least by earnest prayer, needs reaffirmation at the present day.

[2] The whole house was also sprinkled.

[3] *Gustantibus* occurs in the Verona Latin Fragment, of date about A.D. 490. This is generally considered to be a translation of the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, which belongs to the early third century. *Gustanti* also occurs in the Gelasian form for consecrating the oil, and in an Ambrosian 'Benedictio Olei' not later than the eleventh century, printed in an Appendix to M. Magistretti's edition (1897) of an early Milanese *Pontifical*.

There follows in the Gregorian Service a series of prayers for recovery, of which the first (mentioning the healing of Hezekiah) occurs also in *Ordo Romanus X.* The last occurs both in this *Ordo* and in the modern Roman *Rituale.*[1]

Then occurs a remarkable rubric (reproduced in many ancient Orders), which shows in the clearest way that the persons anointed in early times were not usually *in extremis*:—'And thus let the sick man bend his knee or knees, and stand at the right hand of the priest, and thus let this Antiphon be chanted: *The Lord said to his disciples, Cast out devils in my name and lay your hands upon the sick, and they shall recover.*'

The imperative form in which our Lord's words are here quoted shows that Imposition of Hands by the presbyters followed the Antiphon, the sick man presumably kneeling, both for this ministration, and for the Unction which ensued. No rubric actually directing Imposition of Hands occurs in Menard's text, but (as he points out in his Commentary) more than one ancient MS. of the Sacramentary specifically requires Imposition of Hands at this point:—'Here let all the priests and their assistants (*ministri*) lay their hands upon the sick man' (*Codex Rodradi*); and 'Let all the priests lay their hands upon the sick man, at the command, or only by the permission of the Bishop, because canonical order thus instructs us' (*Codex Tilianus*). The last rubric is specially interesting as testifying that the principle that the Bishop (not the presbyters) is the chief minister of the Sacrament of Unction was still recognised in the West.

The psychological purpose of the requirement that the sick man shall rise from his bed and *stand*, is obviously to inspire him with the belief that his recovery has already begun, and will soon be accomplished[2] (cf. the command 'Arise and take up thy bed and walk,' Mark ii. 9; John v. 8).

After another Antiphon (which is apparently intended to accompany the Imposition of Hands) comes the following rubric: 'And thus let him thoroughly anoint (*perungat*)[3] the sick man with consecrated oil, on the neck and throat, and between the shoulders, and on the breast; also (*seu*)[4] let him be more thoroughly and liberally anointed where the pain is more

[1] It has been translated and commented on above.

[2] In one or two of the later Orders the anointing of the feet is accompanied by the dramatic command, 'Rise and walk.'

[3] On the thoroughness of the early anointings, Matthæus Galenus is illuminating: '[Unction] was not formerly performed so sparingly as now; but the whole body was smeared and anointed. Not only were the organs of the senses anointed, but all the parts in which the disease lurked, and that sometimes for seven successive days. . . . What wonder if [in our days] recovery is rare, when scarcely any attention is now paid to the affected parts, which our ancestors used to anoint for seven successive days' (quoted in Martène, *op. cit.*, Vol. I. p. 298).

[4] *Seu* or *sive* frequently means 'and' or 'also' in late and mediæval Latin.

threatening (*ubi plus dolor imminet*). And let the sick man pray [1] while he is being anointed, and let one of the priests recite this prayer: 'I anoint thee with Holy Oil in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that no unclean spirit may lie hid in thee, or in thy members, or in thy marrow[s], or in any joint of thy limbs, but that the power (*virtus*) of Christ most high and of the Holy Ghost may dwell in thee,' etc.

Altogether three prayers for anointing are provided in this Office, testifying to the wealth of liturgical materials for sick visitation possessed by the ancient Roman Church. Of these, the first occurs early in the Service, and is obviously out of place. It begins: 'I anoint thee with Holy Oil, as Samuel anointed David to be king and prophet.' This reference to anointing as 'a spiritual unction' is in harmony with the teaching of the Gregorian, Gelasian and Hippolytan forms of consecrating it, and (as will be shown later) of the Greek *Euchologion*. The second, which follows the rubric which directs anointing, and of which we have quoted the opening clauses, deals almost exclusively with physical ailments. The third, however, contains clear references to moral and spiritual disorders, inserted, in a way that to modern minds seems inappropriate, in a list of physical maladies.[2] It beseeches God 'to expel the corruption of all forms of vain glory [*or* deceitfulness [3]], to heal the ancient scars of [wounds of] conscience; [4] to expel inordinate passions [*or* sufferings]; [5] to restore the substance of flesh and blood; and to grant pardon of all sins.' [6] The prayer concludes thus: 'May this holy anointing with oil be the expulsion of the present disease and languor, and the wished-for remission of all sins.' [7]

After this, the sick man is communicated with the reserved sacrament, apparently in both kinds (*corpore et sanguine Domini*),[8] the formula of administration not being mentioned.

[1] The requirement that the sick man shall himself be in 'the faith-state,' and join in the presbyters' 'prayer of faith,' is important for the efficacious administration of Unction.

[2] The ancient Church did not draw the same sharp distinction that we do between maladies which are spiritual and mental, and those which are physical. Modern therapeutic psychology to some extent supports the point of view of the ancient Church, by insisting on the unity of the organism and on the spiritual and moral basis of not a few apparently physical diseases.

[3] vanitatum. [4] conscientiarum. [5] passiones.

[6] delictorumque cunctorum veniam tribue.

[7] peccatorum omnium exoptata remissio.

[8] Contrast with this the method of Communion in the later *Ordo Romanus X* (Appendix), where the priest gives the sick man the Eucharist of the Lord's Body dipped in ordinary wine, which by such intinction is declared to be 'transmuted into Christ's blood.' Compare with this the rubric of Leofric's 'Office for Visiting and Anointing a Sick Man' (in his Missal):—'Here let the sick man be communicated, and let [the priest] place the sacrifice in wine or (*sive*) water, saying, "May the mixture and consecration of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be unto us and all who receive it unto remission of all sins and

Then follows a remarkable rubric—remarkable, that is, in view of the frequent prohibitions of the repetition of anointing in later times:—'And let [the priests] do this to him *for seven days*, if necessary, not only with regard to Communion, but also with regard to any other administration;[1] and the Lord shall raise him up, and if he is in sins, they shall be forgiven him.'[2]

Of the final rubric, directing choral services twice daily by the sick man's bedside, we have already spoken.

It may be added that in ancient times sick persons were expected to join in the singing, as the patients still do when choral services are held in hospital wards. The Irish Book of Dimna (perhaps as early as the seventh century) has the following quaint direction:—'The sick man sings if he can; if not, the priest sings in his person.' In certain Orders stress is laid on the singing of the Lord's Prayer by the sick man.

At the close of the Gregorian Office there occurs an Appended Note, obviously not earlier than the ninth century:—'Many priests also anoint the sick on the five senses of the body. . . . This they do, that if any stain has inhered in the five senses of the mind and body, it may be healed by this medicine of God.'

Remission of sins (but not of sins of the senses), as an effect of Unction, is mentioned five times in the Gregorian Office. Comparatively little stress, however, is laid upon it—far less than in the corresponding Service for Anointing in the Greek *Euchologion*, which seems to be of a considerably later date.

Antiquity of the Gregorian Office.

In recent times both the antiquity and the authority of the 'Gregorian' Office for Unction have been widely questioned. It is omitted altogether from the critical edition of the *Gregorian Sacramentary* prepared by the Rev. H. A. Wilson in 1915 from three ninth-century MSS. for the Henry Bradshaw Society. This edition, however, had for its object, not a complete reconstruction of the Sacramentary, but an accurate reproduction of

---

eternal life."' Maskell changes the difficult *sive* into *sine*, I think rightly. If *sine* be read, Leofric, like *Ordo Romanus X*, contemplates Reservation in the species of bread alone, and the consecration of the wine, in the sick man's presence, by dipping the Host into it. Belief in the efficacy of such consecration by contact prevailed for a long time at Rome and elsewhere, though it always had opponents.

St. Gregory's phrase (*corpore et sanguine Domini*) almost certainly indicates Reservation and Communion in both kinds (see below, p. 548). But occasionally in early times such phrases accompanied Communion in only one kind, the doctrine of 'concomitance' being implicitly held.

[1] tam de communione tam de alio officio.

[2] From various other authorities we gather that, if recovery did not occur within a week, the priests continued their daily or frequent ministrations of Unction, Imposition of Hands, and Communion.

the famous transcript of 'the Sacramentary of Pope Gregory, taken from the authentic copy of the Library of the Cubicle,' which Pope Hadrian I (784–791) despatched to Charlemagne, and which became in the Emperor's hands the instrument of a vast liturgical reformation in his dominions.

This influential transcript, however, though doubtless extremely accurate, and containing all the services to which Hadrian attached primary importance, was far from complete. As Duchesne remarks, 'it was far from containing all the necessary details and formularies. . . . It is an essentially stationary Sacramentary, to be used only on festivals and days of solemn assembly. It makes no provision for Sundays and ordinary days, much less for private solemnities such as marriages and funerals; nor, again, for the sick' (*Christian Worship*, pp. 121–23).

The 'Gregorian' Office for Unction is contained (with considerable variations) in several manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries, such as the Codex Tilianus, Remensis, Ratoldi, and S. Eligii, which last Menard adopted as the main authority for his important annotated edition of the Sacramentary (1642).[1] The Service is thus attested by MSS. almost as old as those that omit it.

Internal evidence testifies to its high antiquity and Roman *provenance*. The leading authorities on Unction place the great dividing line in its history at the beginning of the ninth century or a little earlier. Now the 'Gregorian' Office—with the exception of the Appended Note, which is certainly later—shows not the slightest affinity with any distinctively ninth-century ideas about Unction. It therefore antedates the ninth century, but, if so, then nothing hinders it being very much older. Both its language and its rubrics are consistent with a very early date. The writer does not regard Menard's text as the actual Gregorian Order for Unction, but only as the nearest approximation to it which we possess. To attempt a critical reconstruction of the original Unction Service of the Church of Rome from its numerous liturgical descendants is an attractive task, but it lies beyond the scope of this Essay.

Menard's Service is certainly a definite 'office,' and not a mere fortuitous aggregate of prayers for the sick. It exhibits (as has been indicated) a certain amount of disorder; it also contains intrusive matter, *e.g.* a benediction of new fruits, and a prayer at the first cutting of a young person's hair.[2]

But the Service as a whole is well articulated, and the prayers

[1] Reprinted in Migne, *P.L.*, lxxviii.

[2] On the other hand its Benediction of Bread, which contains the petition that 'all who take it may receive health both of body and soul,' may well be an original part of the Office. In primitive times it was the custom of the bishop and his presbyters to bless, not only the sick man's medicines, but also his food, particularly his bread and wine (see above, p. 477).

are arranged in a well-considered psychological sequence. Moreover, it is well provided with rubrics, and these find frequent and early echoes in many parts of Western Christendom. Reference to Martène will show that the rubrics directing the sick man to stand at the right hand of the priest, and the priest to anoint him liberally in the most painful place, and to communicate and anoint him daily for a week, and to provide him with daily choral services, are reproduced—usually almost verbatim—in not a few early Offices, including those of these islands.

The wide reproduction of these rubrics is good evidence that the Service of which they formed part proceeded from some generally recognised liturgical authority, presumably Rome.[1]

Literary authorship by Gregory of the Roman Unction Service is improbable. In his liturgical writings, the saint shows himself not so much an author as an editor and compiler. It may be conjectured that he treated the leading Visitation Office of his Church (a Church accustomed to minister to the sick daily probably had several) very much as he treated the Mass; that is to say, he introduced a few minor improvements, but left the bulk of what he found in use untouched.

The Most Ancient Western Evidence.

That the blessing of Oil for the Sick by the Bishop of the diocese was a firmly established practice in the West at the beginning of the fifth century is indicated by the Epistle of Innocent I to Decentius, A.D. 416 (Migne, *P.L.*, xx. 560–61), the genuineness of which is not now disputed.

The oldest known form for blessing the Oil is contained in the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus (early third century), a work no longer extant in the original Greek, but fairly well represented by the crude and careless Latin of the Verona Fragment (a MS. dating from the close of the fifth century), and the more complete Ethiopic version (the so-called 'Egyptian Church Order').

The passage referring to the blessing of the Oil (which was offered for that purpose by the people) occurs at the close of the Eucharistic Office, and runs as follows: 'Si quis oleum offert, secundum panis oblationem et vini, et non ad sermonem dicat, sed simili virtute gratias referat dicens, "Ut oleum hoc sanctificans das, Deus, sanitatem utentibus et percipientibus, unde uncxisti reges, sacerdotes, et profetas, sic et omnibus gustantibus comfortationem et sanitatem utentibus præbeat"' (see R. H. Connolly, *Texts and Studies*, Vol. VIII, No. 4, p. 176).

[1] The absence of an Anointing Office from many of the manuscripts of the ancient Roman Liturgy by no means proves that none was in use. No existing compilation is complete, and a semi-private office, like that for Visitation or Unction, was especially liable to be overlooked, or deliberately omitted.

This slovenly and obviously defective piece of Latin may be roughly translated thus:—'If anyone offers oil [let the Bishop bless it] after the manner of the oblation of bread and wine;[1] and let him not speak according to these exact words, but let him give thanks with similar meaning[2] [*or* efficacy], saying, "Sanctifying this oil, O God, mayest thou give[3] health to those who use and receive it. With this unction thou didst anoint kings, priests and prophets. So [now] may it afford strengthening to all who taste it, and health to those who use it."'

The Ethiopic has, in place of the first 'utentibus,' 'to those who are anointed.' It is a reasonable supposition, therefore, that Hippolytus wrote χριομένοις, and that the not very intelligent Latin translator misread it as χρωμένοις.

There are several obscurities and difficulties in this Benediction, but one thing is evident, that Hippolytus, like 'Gelasius,' 'Gregory,' and the modern Roman *Pontifical*, regarded the Oil of the Sick as a 'spiritual unction' analogous to that given to the baptised in Confirmation, and to that in ancient days poured out upon the prophets, priests, and kings of Israel. The Old Testament bears emphatic witness to the fact that spiritual and moral endowments of a high order were (at least from the age of Samuel) bestowed upon the prophets, and also upon the anointed kings of Judah, who were regarded as endowed not only with wisdom to rule and judge their subjects, but also with a quasi-priestly charisma, enabling them to represent God to their people and their people to God; also to bless them in His name (see especially Solomon's prayer and blessing of the people at the Dedication of the Temple, 1 Kings viii; cf. also 1 Chron. xxix. 20, they 'bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the king').

We are therefore justified in concluding that, though Hippolytus attributed healing virtue to the Oil, he did so because he regarded it as *a spiritual unction* conveying grace to the soul. Accordingly, the 'strengthening' and 'health' spoken of in the Verona Fragment should probably be understood as applying to the soul as well as to the body.

III. Eastern Tradition of Unction

The Euchologion.

The Eastern tradition, as authoritatively expressed in the Service for Unction in the Greek *Euchologion*, is in agreement with the earlier, as distinguished from the later, Western tradition.

[1] The meaning probably is that it is to be offered at the altar, and there blessed with similar ceremony.

[2] The Bishop is expected to expand the somewhat jejune form with suitable *extempore* prayer of his own.

[3] Reading *des* for *das*, as the Ethiopic version suggests.

The Service is a public one, performed, whenever possible, in church by seven priests, and involving the presence of a choir, which sings a series of elaborate anthems, of at least one deacon, and of a representative congregation. The presence of a plurality of sick persons seems also implied in one or two passages. So great is the importance still attached to the presence (by representation) of the entire Church, that one of the popular Eastern names for the Anointing Service is 'Congregation.'[1] Dealing with this point the Patriarch Tikhon remarks: 'It is performed in church, *in the presence of an assembly*, if the sick person be able to leave his bed; or at home, *before an assembly of the people*.' Even if, in case of necessity, a single priest performs the Service, 'he does so in the name of *the whole assembly*' (see the E.T. of the *Euchologion*, 2nd edit., 1922).

In the East, all persons seriously ill are anointed, whether they are in danger of death or not. This is clear, not only from express statements by Eastern authorities, but also from the final rubric, which (in words not unlike those of the Gregorian direction to the sick man to *stand*) bids the patient *walk home*:—'And he that hath caused the Anointing Service to be performed (ὁ ποιήσας τὸ Εὐχέλαιον) maketh a humble reverence (βαλὼν μετάνοιαν), and saith, "Holy Fathers, bless and pardon me the sinner." Then having received from them blessing and pardon, he departeth (ἀπέρχεται), rejoicing in God.' The rite is repeated as often as is deemed necessary. The sick person is expected to confess, if he is able, before the rite, and either before or after it he receives the Eucharist. With regard to the effect attributed to the Unction, the official orthodox doctrine is that it is a sacrament 'which heals the infirmities of the soul and of the body' (Macaire, *op. cit.* Vol. II. p. 552).

The *Euchologion* Service lays great stress upon physical and mental healing, but still more upon spiritual benefits, particularly *remission of* ~*ns*. Much more is said about forgiveness than in the Gregorian Office. No allusion, however, is made to sins committed through the senses.

The *Euchologion*, in agreement with Western tradition, regards the ministration as a form of 'spiritual unction.' For example, the priests are directed to pray, 'that this oil may be blessed by thy power and mercy, and by the descent of the Holy Ghost upon it'; and again, 'Send down thy Holy Spirit and hallow this oil, and make it to be unto this thy servant *N.*, who is anointed therewith, unto perfect remission of his sins, and unto inheritance of the kingdom of heaven.'

The date of the *Euchologion* Service has not been precisely determined. It is later than the age of Justinian (483–565), for it asks for the intercessions of St. Samson, a younger contemporary

[1] See Macaire, *Théologie dogmatique orthodoxe*, Vol. II. p. 552.

of his. On the other hand, it is contained in a MS. of the closing years of the eighth century. A seventh-century date seems suitable. Its very elaborate character, and its strong and frequent insistence upon remission of sins, do not favour a very early date. Not a few quite early documents recognise remission of sins as among the effects of Unction, but they do not for the most part greatly emphasise it.

It may be added that the Orthodox Service of Unction has exerted an extensive influence upon the rites of Eastern Christendom as a whole, including the separated Churches. For example, the Coptic Office for Unction,[1] in spite of important variations, is clearly based upon the anointing service of the Orthodox *Euchologion.*

The Coptic Office is repeated daily for a week (*E. T.*, p. 107); and this suggests that quite possibly the enormously long and unwieldy *Euchologion* Service may be the result of the 'telescoping' into one of seven Services for seven successive days, each originally distinct and provided with its own proper prayers and lections. The Russian Archbishop Ignatius argues strongly in favour of this view (*De sacramentis*, p. 296 ff.), and his arguments are favourably regarded by Kern, *op. cit.*

For adequate study of the difficult and complex *Euchologion* Service, Goar's classic commentary (1657) is indispensable.

Sacramentary of Serapion.

Lack of space forbids any description of the other picturesque and interesting Eastern Orders of Unction. Many of these are accessible (in translation) in the classical pages of Renaudot, Assemani, and Denzinger.

It is necessary to pass at once to the earliest known liturgical document of the East which mentions Unction, the *Sacramentary of Serapion*, of date about 350.[2]

This document (as has been already mentioned) provides two forms for blessing the Oil of the Sick, in conjunction with bread and water.

The first form ('A Prayer concerning the Offerings of Oil and Water,' made by the people at the Eucharist), after explicitly mentioning bodily and mental healing, has the following ambiguous expression: 'That the partaking of these creatures may be *a healing medicine* (φάρμακον θεραπευτικόν), and *a medicine of complete soundness* (φάρμακον ὁλοκληρίας).'

By '*a* medicine of complete soundness,' Serapion presumably means something more than a mere 'healing medicine.' If so,

[1] See *Coptic Offices*, by R. M. Woolley, pp. 89–108.

[2] There is an important reference to it, a century earlier, in Origen, *Homily ii on Leviticus*, 4; but we are only here concerned with the liturgical evidence.

he must be thinking of the healing of *the sick man's entire personality, body, soul, and spirit* (cf. 1 Thess. v. 23).

That this is actually so is clear from the second form ('A Prayer for Oil of the Sick, or for Bread, or for Water'), where the word ὁλοκληρία recurs. Its main operative clauses run as follows:

'. . . Send forth [a] healing power of the Only-begotten from heaven upon this oil, that it may become to those who are anointed, or partake of these creatures, unto the driving away of every sickness and every weakness, unto a medicine of preservation against every demon; unto the expulsion of every unclean spirit; unto the separation of every evil spirit; unto the chasing away of every fever and shivering fit and every infirmity; *unto good grace and remission of sins; unto a medicine of life and salvation* (φάρμακον ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας); *unto health and complete wholeness of soul, body, spirit* (ὁλοκληρίαν ψυχῆς σώματος πνεύματος); *unto complete strengthening* (ῥῶσιν τελείαν) . . .'

Here 'complete soundness (ὁλοκληρία)' is more closely defined (in language reminiscent of St. Paul, who uses the adjective ὁλόκληρος, 1 Thess. v. 23) as soundness of 'soul, body, spirit,' and is associated with 'complete strengthening,' which in this connection must include strengthening of the soul.

Serapion's doctrine is thus in full agreement with that of the Roman *Pontifical*, which speaks of 'a spiritual unction for the strengthening of the Temple of the living God,' *i.e.* of the sick man's entire personality.

Father Puller, in common with all those who deny that Unction confers spiritual or sanctifying grace, finds this passage surprising and embarrassing. Indeed he can only interpret it in accordance with his own doctrine by advancing the theory that the words 'unto good grace and remission of sins' are an interpolation of a kind admittedly not unusual in liturgical documents in actual use (see his *The Anointing of the Sick*, pp. 95 ff.).

This particular manuscript, however, was never in actual use. Its prayers are in such disorder that they could not possibly be used in church without extensive rearrangement. Obviously it is an unofficial compilation, made by an unknown Christian, who for some unknown reason was interested in the prayers of Serapion.

Moreover, the deletion of the words 'unto good grace and remission of sins' does not suffice to bring the teaching of the document into agreement with that of Fr. Puller. It is possible (though not easy in view of the context) to follow him in assigning to φάρμακον ζωῆς καὶ σωτηρίας an exclusively physical sense. But there still remains the very comprehensive phrase 'complete wholeness of soul, body, spirit,' which surely must signify the restoration to integrity, not only of the sick man's body, but also of his entire spiritual constitution.

It may be added, that Dr. Brightman, who saw no sufficient reason for rejecting these words when he first edited the Sacramentary in 1900 (see *J.T.S.*, Vol. I. pp. 88–113, and 247–77), remains of the same opinion still. Commenting upon Fr. Puller's arguments he writes: 'It is not clear that the clauses [rejected by Fr. Puller] in general *interrupt* the list of bodily sicknesses, since all the terms from εἰς χάριν to πνεύματος are *prima facie* spiritual, and εἰς ῥῶσιν τελείαν may only be a summary of all the preceding, in fact probably is so in any case.'

Fr. Puller is certainly mistaken in supposing that only late documents recognise the spiritual effects of Unction. Indeed, a few are extant which—*in the form given for anointing at least*—recognise only these. Thus the form in the Book of Dimna (possibly as ancient as the seventh century) runs: 'I anoint thee with consecrated oil in the name of the Trinity, that thou mayest be saved for ever and ever.' The form given in the Stowe Missal (ninth or tenth century) is similar: 'I anoint thee with hallowed oil, that thou mayest be saved for evermore, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'

Forms such as these, which (explicitly at least) recognise only the spiritual effects of Unction, are, of course, very exceptional; as also are those which (like the Benediction of the Oil in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii. 29) explicitly recognise only its power to heal diseases.

Without adducing further evidence (which is abundant), it must suffice here to state summarily that the bulk of the early liturgical documents which refer to Unction take what may be described as a 'sacramental' and spiritual, and not merely a therapeutic view of the rite, attributing to it spiritual, mental, and bodily effects, with varying degrees of emphasis.

IV. Mental, Moral, and Neurotic Illness

Unction in Mental Cases.

The ancient and early mediæval Church habitually used Unction and Imposition of Hands in the treatment of mental and neurotic diseases.[1] Fr. Puller also regards Unction as valuable for the cure of 'sickness of mind,' *e.g.* melancholia, or hysteria, or madness (pp. 26–27).

But it could hardly have this effect, unless it were capable of conveying sanctifying grace to the soul, and in particular of promoting (when received with proper dispositions) the elimination of vices and bad habits, and the implanting of Christian virtues.

[1] Not a few forms for consecrating the Oil state explicitly that it is to be used for anointing not only the sick but also the 'vexaticii' or 'energumeni' (Gerbert, *Vetus Liturgia Alemannica*, Vol. I. chap. iii).

Modern pastoral experience, and indeed the experience of most psychotherapists, strongly suggests that many or most instances of 'mental' disease are also instances of 'moral' and 'spiritual' disease. 'When we go deeper, and investigate the origin of the psychoneuroses,'[1] writes Dr. Hadfield, 'we often find that they are concerned with problems essentially moral. . . . These physical and mental symptoms are due to defects of character. . . . The physician is thus compelled to face the moral problems which lie at the root of these disorders. . . He is often called upon to deal *directly* with moral diseases, such as uncontrollable temper, sex-perversion, stealing, cruelty, despondency, irritability, and vanity' (*Psychology and Morals*, p. 2).

'Moral diseases' (in which the will is 'obsessed' or paralysed) must, of course, be carefully distinguished from 'sins,' which can only be committed by a person whose will is free to choose between good and evil.

The irrational fears, anxieties, hesitations, timidities, and specialised 'phobias' of neurotic patients, which often find expression in stammering, 'tics,' and other physical symptoms, are instances of what in normal persons would be called sins of cowardice, lack of faith in God, and so forth.

Similarly, the 'obsessions' and 'compulsions' which dominate the thoughts and conduct of many nervous subjects, *e.g.* those of jealousy, envy, suspicion, hatred, vindictiveness, rage, sullenness, gloom, despair, self-centredness, selfishness, invalidism, deceit, dishonesty, scrupulosity, megalomania, pride, self-abasement, avarice, prodigality, misleading phantasies, fixed ideas, untidy and repulsive habits, lust (natural and unnatural), cruelty, alcoholomania, morphinism, and the like, require not only 'mental' treatment in the narrow sense, but definitely moral and spiritual (including sacramental) ministrations. The priest who, in co-operation with a properly qualified medical man, attempts to treat such moral ailments must aim at implanting in the patient's mind, and particularly in its 'subconscious' region (where the real cause of the malady is deeply rooted) a powerful impulse not only to 'rebuke' and triumph over the evil obsession, but also to acquire the opposite virtue. Psychological knowledge and skill are, of course, required, in order to bring to light and dissolve the pathological 'complexes,' but the treatment, if it is to result in complete and lasting cure, must be moral and spiritual throughout.

Unction and Remission of Sins.

Two important Christian Sacraments, Baptism and Penance, have, as their primary object, remission of sins; and of these the latter (in obedience to the precept of St. James) has in all ages been

[1] *I.e.* functional nervous disorders.

administered in close connection with Unction, whenever the circumstances of the case have rendered it desirable or necessary. It is clear, therefore, that remission of sins cannot be the primary, or even one of the primary, objects of Unction. As for the mediæval idea that Unction was ordained to remit a special class of sins, viz. those committed through the physical senses and sexual organs, there is neither scriptural, nor psychological, nor sound theological ground for any such classification of sins, nor for any such view of the special purpose of Unction. All sins are *sins of the entire moral personality, not of any particular organs*, and should be treated as such. Not a few modern Roman Catholic theologians definitely take this view. For example, Wilhelm and Scannell write: 'Although remission of sins is the first effect mentioned by the Council [of Trent], the sacrament was not primarily instituted for that purpose' (*Manual of Catholic Theology*, Vol. II. p. 491).

On the other hand, there is reasonable ground for supposing that remission of sins may be among its secondary and indirect effects; just as it undoubtedly is of the Eucharist.

Indeed, if the traditional view is correct, that Unction was ordained for the healing of all manner of diseases of the soul and mind, as well as of the body, then obviously its devout reception must dispose the soul to immediate and thorough repentance after sin, and therefore to the speedy acquisition of pardon.[1]

But our investigations suggest that the connection between Unction and sin and its remedy is of a deeper and more fundamental character than this, and actual pastoral experience shows that this is the case.

In the treatment of moral disease by Absolution and Unction, the diversity in effect of the two ordinances becomes clear on the psychological plane. Although the victim of a moral disease is only in small measure responsible for the sins he confesses, it is the custom to absolve him before he is anointed, to give him complete peace of mind. After absolution, the patient feels 'forgiven,' and is relieved to that extent; nevertheless, he still feels the inward urge to repeat the sin for which remedy is sought. He is 'forgiven,' but not 'cured.'

Then follows Holy Unction. If its administration is immediately effective as, if the preparation has been thorough, it not infrequently is, then he experiences something quite different from pardon, viz. *inward liberation from the power of sin.* His partly dissociated and inharmonious personality is knit together into an effective unity. His will recovers strength and regains control. His disordered and conflicting passions and

[1] 'Gonet, St. Bonaventura, and not a few Thomists and Scotists teach a *mediate* remission of sins through the excitation of acts of devotion, love,' etc. (Kilker, *Extreme Unction*, 1925, p. 31).

instincts contribute their energy to the attainment of moral ideals chosen by the will. Anxiety, tension, and 'double-mindedness' disappear, and are replaced by a feeling of repose, expansion, and emancipation, such as perhaps has never before been experienced, because many—perhaps most—instances of moral disease have their origin in infancy or early childhood. Very possibly the patient, after awaking from the tranquillising and healing sleep into which, after the Anointing, it is customary to send him by whispered suggestion, will make some such remark as: 'I feel a new man—I feel that I shall never sin in that way again.' Such expectations are actually fulfilled in not a few instances—unfortunately by no means in all. In any case, prudence suggests the continuance of treatment until all serious danger of relapse is over.

Facts such as these suggest that the specific effect of Unction is not to pardon sin, but to destroy it at its root, by healing the morbid condition of the soul from which it springs—in short, Unction is rather a *remedial* than an absolving rite. This view of Unction is quite as clearly attested in the liturgical forms as remission of sins.

V. Ministry to the Sick in the New Testament

Teaching of St. James.

The late mediæval theory that Unction was primarily ordained for remission of sins—particularly those of the senses—finds no secure support in the familiar passage of St. James's Epistle (v. 14–16), which has been so frequently quoted in its support. This theory is largely based on an unfortunate mistranslation, which is common to the Vulgate ('et si in peccatis sit, dimittentur ei'), and to the A.V. ('and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him'). A glance at the Greek (κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκώς, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ) is sufficient to show that 'sins' cannot be the subject of the passive impersonal ἀφεθήσεται, and that the natural translation is: 'and if he is in a state of having committed sins, forgiveness (*or more technically* 'absolution') shall be imparted to him,' viz. by the presbyters, to whom he has confessed them. That confession is intended by St. James to precede absolution, is evidently shown by the particle οὖν ('therefore') in the clause which follows: 'Confess *therefore* your sins to one another and pray for one another that ye may be healed' (ἰαθῆτε). St. James argues thus: *Because* it is a good thing for sick persons who have sinned to make confession to the presbyters for the purpose of obtaining forgiveness (and therewith healing); *therefore* it is a good thing for all Christians who have sinned to confess their sins informally one to another, and mutually to pray for pardon, that they may be healed

(ἰαθῆτε). The 'healing' spoken of by St. James is more than the pardon of sin, it involves a 'healing' or strengthening influence upon the whole personality. In St. James's view, forgiveness of sins, whether obtained formally through absolution, or informally through mutual prayer, mediates (to some extent at any rate) the 'healing' or 'corroboration' of the entire human personality. This point of view is surprisingly modern and is in harmony with the current teaching of the psychological schools.

This wide and inclusive use of ἰαθῆτε yields considerable support to the widely held view that the 'saving' or 'healing' (σώσει) spoken of by St. James has reference to the soul as well as to the body.

The opinion that ἀφεθήσεται in this passage has reference to Absolution rather than Unction appears to have the support of the majority of the Fathers, notably Origen (*loc. cit.*), and Chrysostom (*De Sacerdotio*, iii. 6); also of our own Venerable Bede (*Commentary on St. James*, Migne, *P.L.*, xciii. 39). A respectable minority of Roman Catholic scholars, including Bellarmine and Estius, take the same view; but the great majority, influenced largely by the Vulgate mistranslation, are of the opposite opinion.

Among Anglicans, the view that ἀφεθήσεται refers to Absolution is strongly urged (largely on grammatical grounds) by Sparrow (*A Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer*, 1657, pp. 347–8); also by Thorndike, Bull, and Hammond, and in more recent times by Fr. Puller.

Since Absolution and Unction were normally administered together in the course of a pastoral visit to the sick, their separate effects were not discussed in early times. Similarly, there was little attempt to draw precise distinctions between the effects of Baptism and Confirmation, so long as they were both administered in the course of the same Service.

The early Liturgies of Unction often speak with an uncertain voice upon this subject. A considerable number attribute remission of sins vaguely to 'this ministration'; others to Absolution and Unction conjointly; others to Absolution alone. The great majority, however, seem to regard Unction as having at least some effect in procuring the remission of sins. This point of view is more frequently expressed and receives more emphasis in documents from the ninth century onwards; nevertheless, it is present even in the earliest, and (as we have seen) probably contains an important element of truth.

The mediæval Western Church tended to regard Unction as 'the Complement of Penance,' *i.e.* the Sacrament which completes—with regard to sins—whatever Penance has left undone. This view has also Eastern support (see Macaire, *op. cit.*). Endless—and for the most part unnecessary—discussions have arisen as to whether the sins spoken of by St. James are 'mortal' or 'venial'

in character. Had due consideration been given to the psychology of sickness, this question would not have arisen in this form.

Every competent parish priest is aware that it is necessary to absolve sick persons for two distinct reasons:

(1) Because, their sins being objectively grave, absolution is needful *for theological reasons;*

(2) Because their sins, though not objectively grave, greatly trouble their consciences, and therefore require absolution *for psychological reasons.*

The consciences of not a few sick persons, particularly neurotic subjects, are pathologically scrupulous. Some of them (especially if they have had a Calvinistic upbringing) are apt to imagine that they have committed 'the unpardonable sin,' or have been numbered by divine predestination among the 'goats' or 'lost sheep.' In all such cases it is the duty of the parish priest to absolve the sick person, however trivial—or even imaginary—he may consider the sins confessed to be. In extreme cases he may even find it necessary to repeat the assurance of pardon daily for weeks; employing also technical psychological devices to cause the conviction of pardon to penetrate the depths of the patient's 'subconscious.'

St. James reminds the presbyters of the necessity of faith both in themselves and in the patient whom they are attempting to heal:—'the prayer of *faith* shall save (σώσει) the sick man, and the Lord shall raise him up (ἐγερεῖ).' *Prima facie,* the physical sense of these expressions seems the more obvious. On the other hand, the comprehensive sense given to ἰαθῆτε in the next verse; St. James's strong insistence upon *faith*; the failure in primitive times to draw any rigid distinction between spiritual and bodily healing; the frequent use in the early Orders for Unction of such terms as 'heal,' 'save,' 'safety,' 'salvation' in a combined physical and spiritual sense; above all the all-embracing compass of the Ministry of Healing which our Lord entrusted to His Apostles, render the wider interpretation upon the whole more suitable.

Jewish Unction.

Some light is thrown upon the meaning of St. James's injunction, and the antecedents of the ordinance of Unction, by a Jewish non-medical use of oil, which does not seem to be generally known.[1]

All the references to Jewish anointing given by Billerbeck to illustrate James v. 14, and Mark vi. 13, are of a medical or quasi-medical character. But the Talmud bears testimony

[1] I owe the following information mainly to Prof. G. A. Cooke. Some allusion to the practice is to be found in *The Jewish Encyclopædia.*

that, besides the custom of anointing medicinally with oil as, for instance, for the cure of skin disease (T.B. *Yoma*, fol. 77*b*),[1] a more definitely religious practice was also in vogue. Certain Jewish 'healers' were accustomed to anoint the sick with the accompaniment of whispered prayer, the words used being adapted from Exodus xv. 26: 'If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, *I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians, for I am the Lord that healeth thee.*'

The Rabbis suspected these healers, and disliked their procedure as savouring of magic, but that it prevailed widely is beyond doubt.[2]

The word 'whisper' in the O.T. certainly has associations with magic, *e.g.* Ps. lviii. 5 [Hebr. 6]; but it is used of prayer in a good sense, Isa. xxvi. 16, R.V.mg. Putting a charitable construction upon the practice of these Jewish 'healers,' we may venture to suggest that their anointing, accompanied by a whispered 'prayer of faith,' had analogies with the procedure recommended by St. James.

The 'whispering' of the prayer showed remarkable psychological insight. These ancient healers knew nothing of the 'subconscious' or 'unconscious' mind of the New Psychology, but they found by experience that their 'whispered' prayer, probably many times repeated, had the effect of lulling the patient into a reposeful state of 'relaxation' or 'reverie,' in which his mind was unusually receptive of spiritual influence and therapeutic suggestion. In the modern administration of Unction, the priest aims at bringing the patient into a similar reposeful condition, but with fuller understanding of the psychological processes involved, and with the use of a more refined technique.

Unction does not seem to have been employed by the Jews for the purpose of exorcism, as is asserted in the Catholic Encyclopædia. This was, however, a very early Christian development.

That St. James's presbyters employed Imposition of Hands in connection with Unction is probable, both from our Lord's own practice, and from that of the Apostles. So closely united were the two ceremonies in the minds of the primitive Christians, that Origen (*loc. cit.*), by inadvertence, actually quotes St. James as commanding it:—'If anyone be sick, let him call for the elders

[1] T.B. = Babylonian Talmud; T.J. = Jerusalem Talmud.

[2] See T. J. *Maaser Sheni* ii. (fol. 53[a]), 'putting oil upon his head and whispering'; similarly, T.J. *Shabbath* xiv. (fol. 14[a]); T.B. *Sanhedrin* xi. 1 (fol. 90[a]), 'These are they who have no share in the world to come. . . . R. Akiba adds . . . and he who whispers over a wound saying, "All the sickness which I brought on Egypt I will not bring upon thee."'

of the Church, and *let them lay their hands upon him*, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord.'[1]

Our Lord's Practice.

Our Lord sometimes healed by word alone (Mark i. 25, ii. 11, iii. 11–12, v. 8, vii. 29; Matt. viii. 13; Luke xvii. 14; John iv. 50); by word also He raised the Widow's Son, and Lazarus. But His usual method of healing was by Imposition of Hands. It was because Jairus knew this that he fell at His feet, exclaiming, 'My little daughter is at the point of death: I pray thee that thou come and *lay thy hands upon her*, that she may be made whole' (Mark v. 23; see also vi. 5, viii. 23; Luke iv. 40). He also on several occasions touched the sick. For instance, He touched the leper (Mark i. 41), and the eyes of the two blind men at Jericho (Matt. xx. 34); He took by the hand Peter's wife's mother (Mark i. 30), and Jairus's daughter (v. 41); also the epileptic boy (ix. 27). In certain cases He employed ceremonial of a more imposing kind, partly to engender faith, but partly also to convey his meaning more clearly, by way of therapeutic 'suggestion.' In the case of the blind man at Bethsaida, 'he took him by the hand, brought him out of the village, and when he had spit on his eyes[2] and laid his hands upon him, he asked him, Seest thou aught?' etc. (viii. 22). In the case of the deaf and dumb man He 'put his fingers into his ears, and spat,' and 'touched his tongue' (vii. 33).

Of special importance, as giving scriptural warrant for the later universal use of *water* for healing purposes, in conjunction frequently with Unction, is our Lord's procedure in sending the man born blind to bathe in the pool of Siloam ('He made clay of the spittle, and anointed his eyes with the clay, and said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam,' etc., John ix. 1 ff.). This incident, together with the healing of Naaman through a sevenfold immersion in the river Jordan (2 Kings v), has usually been considered to justify the practice of bathing in sacred fountains and pools for healing purposes. This practice is still in full use

[1] Great stress is laid upon Imposition of Hands by all the priests present in the existing Ambrosian rite of Unction, and Magistretti shows (*Manuale Ambrosianum*, 1905, Vol. I. pp. 79 ff., 94 ff., 174 ff.) that Unction was frequently called 'Imposition of Hands' in the mediæval Offices of Milan, probably also by St. Ambrose himself (*De Pœnitentia*, I. 8), by St. Augustine (*Vita*, by Possidonius, 27), and by St. Athanasius, *Epist. Cyclica* (Migne, *P.G.*, xxv. 234).

In the present Roman *Rituale* the prayer recited just before Unction implies the actual imposition of hands by a plurality of priests ('May all the power of the devil be extinguished by the imposition of *our* hands'). The actual rubric (1925), however, only directs the priest to 'extend his right hand over the patient's head'—an action considered equivalent in the Roman Communion.

[2] Saliva was considered to have healing properties, not only by the Jews, but also by the ancients generally (see Tacitus, *Hist.*, IV. 81, who records that Vespasian healed a blind man by means of it).

in both the Eastern and the Western Churches. Such bathing has always been accompanied by religious exercises. Experience shows that even now it not infrequently has beneficial results.

It is not recorded that our Lord anointed the sick with oil, though the probability is that He sometimes did so, in connection with His frequent Impositions of Hands. Both the medical and the religious uses of anointing were known to the Jews (see above); and the most natural explanation of the Apostles' practice of anointing (Mark vi. 13) is that they followed therein our Lord's own example. St. James's mention of Unction alone is probably due to the fact that when he wrote the presbyters were somewhat inclined to omit anointing, when laying hands upon the sick. In view of later practice, it is likely that St. James used the term 'presbyters' *as including the Bishop*. Although the primitive Bishop was the head of the presbyterial college, he was also a member of it—indeed he was sometimes even called a presbyter (cf. 1 Pet. v. 1, συνπρεσβύτερος).

That our Lord normally expected religious faith in those whom He healed, is manifest in so many passages of the Gospels, that formal proof is unnecessary. In certain cases He accepted the vicarious faith of parents, of close relatives, or of friends (Mark v. 22, vii. 24, ix. 14; Luke vii. 2; John iv. 46). In at least one instance He accepted the imperfect faith of a sick person (John v. 1–13). It is recorded in John ix. 35–38 that Jesus, after healing the man born blind, took measures to bring him to more definite faith in Himself as 'the Son of God.'

That our Lord attached importance also to *repentance* is shown by Mark ii. 5 ('Son, thy sins are forgiven'); and John v. 14 ('Sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee').

Unction a Ministry of the Spirit.

The traditional view that Unction—and the Ministry of Healing in general—is *a ministry of the Holy Spirit* finds secure support in the New Testament. It was in virtue of His Messianic Unction of the Holy Spirit that our Lord cast out devils and performed His works of healing (Isa. xi. 1–10; Mark i. 10; Acts x. 38, 'How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil'). He Himself declared that He performed them by the Spirit or 'Finger' of God (Matt. xii. 27; Luke xi. 20). Moreover, the 'gifts of healings' are numbered by St. Paul among the gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor. xii. 4 ff.).

Our Lord's Attitude towards Sickness Compared with that of the Prayer Book.

Broadly speaking, our Lord's attitude towards sickness—bodily, spiritual and mental—was one of uncompromising hostility.

Sickness, like sin, belonged, in His own view, to the kingdom of Satan which He was sent into the world to destroy. He recognised that sickness is sometimes the result of sin (Mark ii. 5; John v. 14), but even in such cases He healed the sinner, as soon as He was satisfied of his repentance. He discountenanced the view, common in Jewish circles, that sickness and calamitous accidents are usually due to the special wickedness of the sufferers, or of their ancestors (Job iv. 7 ff.; John ix. 2–3; Luke xiii. 4). There is nothing in our Lord's teaching or practice to give countenance to the attitude towards sickness predominantly exhibited by our unrevised Visitation Office. This, in contrast to the Sarum Office from which it is derived, suggests that the sick man, even after sincere repentance and absolution, should glorify God by remaining ill and suffering patiently. The mediæval, like the apostolic Church, believed that sickness is sometimes the result of sin, but it expected the sick man, after sincere repentance, followed by confession and absolution, to recover quickly and to glorify God by returning to his daily duties.

This primitive attitude is faithfully preserved in the *Ordo ad visitandum infirmum* of the Sarum Manual, the form and sequence of which our Reformers preserved, while departing in large measure from its spirit. This *Ordo*, after preliminaries of the usual type, begins with nine earnest and confident prayers for recovery, alluding to the raising of Tabitha, and the healing of Tobias and Sarah (through the ministry of the Angel Raphael), and of Hezekiah. Only one of these, and that the least confident, was retained in the 1549 Book, which definitely countenanced the view that sickness is, as a rule, a divine punishment for sin, and that therefore it is a sick person's principal duty to glorify God by remaining ill and suffering patiently, rather than by recovering quickly through the ministrations of His Church. Expectation of recovery, though not entirely absent from the service, was definitely relegated to the background.

The 1549 Office, however, contained one excellent feature. It corrected the mediæval abuses and misunderstandings which had for centuries attached themselves to 'Extreme Unction,' and attempted to restore the use of it as a Sacrament of Healing. The cure by Unction of spiritual and mental, as well as bodily disorders, was definitely contemplated:—'He vouchsafe . . . to restore unto thee thy bodily health, and strength to serve him, and send thee release of all thy pains, troubles, and diseases, both in body and mind.' On the other hand the occurrence of the phrase 'to pardon thee all thy sins and offences committed by all thy bodily senses' shows that the compilers had not yet emancipated themselves from the late mediæval error that the purpose of Unction is the remission of sins committed through the five senses and the bodily organs.

The 1552 Book contained no recognition of Unction, but retained the reference to the healing of 'Peters wifes mother, and the Capitaines servuaunt,' while omitting the preservation of 'Thobie and Sara by thy Angel from daunger' (1549 and Sarum). In 1661 the whole of the references to healing were omitted, and the Visitation Services acquired that character of unrelieved gloom, which renders their use depressing and painful to both priest and patient. For more than three hundred years the Anglican Church abandoned all serious attempts to heal the sick by spiritual and sacramental ministrations. The neglect of the needs of mental patients was, if possible, even more complete than the neglect of those of physical sufferers.

Both the apostolic and the primitive and mediæval Church recognised that God sometimes punishes with sickness and even death 'the sinner with a high hand'—the presumptuous and blasphemous offender (see, *e.g.*, Acts v. 1 ff., xii. 20 ff., xiii. 8 ff.; 1 Cor. xi. 29–30; and Lactantius's treatise *De Morte Persecutorum*). But, apart from such cases, there was a marked disinclination to regard God as the direct author of disease, particularly in the case of devout believers. St. Paul viewed his 'thorn in the flesh,' which he ultimately came to regard as spiritually profitable to him, not as a direct infliction by God, but as the work of 'a messenger of Satan "to buffet me"' (2 Cor. xii. 7–9).

Most of the ancient and mediæval Offices for the Sick take a similar view. If these are examined with attention, it will be found that most of the allusions to sickness as a 'visitation' or a 'chastisement' (of which there are not a few) have as their practical object the moving of the sick man to thorough and earnest repentance. As soon as repentance has taken place, and absolution has been pronounced, it is taken for granted that it is the will of God that the sick man should recover quickly—normally within a week.

That in certain cases, for wise but inscrutable reasons, God permits the righteous to suffer from painful and incurable diseases, and to glorify Him by patient endurance, was admitted. But, in practice, the Church did not encourage either the patient or the priest to take this view of any particular case—at any rate until the most prolonged and persistent ministrations had failed to restore health. Firmly convinced that 'health, or an orderly condition of body, mind, and spirit, is God's primary will for His children, and that disease, as a specific violation of this orderly condition' is normally contrary to that will, it devoted its utmost energies to the restoration of the patient's spiritual, mental, and physical health, usually with success.

The Church's Ministry of Healing, unlike that of Christian Science, has from the beginning been conducted in close co-operation with orthodox medicine. Entirely in harmony with

later developments is the narrative of Acts xxviii. 7–10, which represents St. Paul the Apostle, and St. Luke the physician, as working together in harmony for the benefit of the sick people of Malta. The vote of thanks accorded to both shows that each ministered to the sick in his own way.

VI. Treatment of Insanity and Neurosis

Insanity in the New Testament.

Our Lord undoubtedly regarded the casting out of devils (*i.e.* the curing of insanity and neurotic disorders) as the greatest and most beneficent of His mighty works, and as among His most signal triumphs over Satan. That both the Synoptic Evangelists and the multitudes who witnessed His miracles were of the same opinion is manifest from passages too numerous to quote fully (see, *e.g.*, Mark i. 27: 'And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What is this? a new teaching! With authority he commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey him'; see also i. 34; i. 39; v. 1–20).

The power and also the injunction to cast out devils (*i.e.* to heal the mentally afflicted) was given by our Lord to the Ministers of His Church, in a most solemn manner (Matt. x. 8; Luke ix. 1, x. 17–20; Mark iii. 15, vi. 7, 13; [xvi. 17]; cf? Matt. vii. 22), and of all ministries to the sick it is obviously the most important still, and the most neglected.

Primitive Treatment of Insanity.

Numerous passages from the Fathers, in which they appeal to the Church's acknowledged success in casting out devils, as a manifest proof of the divinity of Jesus, and of the divine authority of His Church, show clearly that this ministry was usually—though not invariably—successful, and that it excited wonder among the heathen, and led to conversions.[1]

Upon the whole, it is not unfair to claim that the Christian Church was the pioneer of those more rational and humane methods of treating insanity which have come to prevail in the

[1] Cf., for example, Cyprian, *Ad Demetrianum*, xiv, xv: 'If you would only hear and see how [the demons], when adjured by us, and chastised by spiritual whips, and subjected to the torments of words, are expelled from the bodies which they possessed. . . *Come, and establish the truth of what we affirm.*' Tertullian: '[The demons] at our touch and breathing . . . leave at our command the bodies they have entered, unwilling, and distressed, and before your very eyes are put to shame' (*Apol.*, 23); 'We not only reject these wicked spirits, we overcome them; we hold them daily up to contempt; *we exorcise them from their victims, as multitudes can testify*' (*Ad Scap.*, 2); etc. Gibbon ridicules this ministry of exorcism, but does not deny its efficacy (*Decline and Fall*, chap. xvi).

asylums of Western Europe since about the middle of the nineteenth century, and which supplanted an earlier regime of brutality and callous indifference to the sanctity of human personality, which was a disgrace to civilisation, and to the Church which tolerated it.

The very considerable success of the primitive Church in the treatment of insanity was mainly due to the following causes.

(1) *Great importance was attached to individual and daily treatment.* The patient was loved; his personal dignity was respected; and he was surrounded by an atmosphere of tender care. Every day he was visited by the Bishop, presbyters, and deacons (in Western Churches, also by the ordained exorcists), who encouraged and instructed him, prayed with him, blessed and exorcised him, anointed and laid their hands upon him, and (unless there was danger of irreverence) communicated him.[1]

On Sundays, and on many week-days also, he was blessed and exorcised publicly at the Eucharist, the whole Church interceding for him with affectionate interest.

Modern asylum treatment—even to-day—is of a far less personal and individual character. 'Whatever curative treatment the asylum may possess,' writes Dr. B. Hollander, 'the one thing that could have saved the patient it cannot supply, and that is "individual" treatment. For what personal attention can a patient receive in an asylum, even when there is a so-called hospital annex, when a thousand or more patients have to be visited by the medical superintendent, and two or three assistant medical officers?'

That recoveries under such unfavourable conditions are rare is not surprising. 'No wonder that the recovery rate of the present day in the most comfortable and luxurious palaces for the insane, and under the most humane treatment, is no greater than in the days when strait-jackets and rough treatment were freely used in badly furnished asylums' (*The First Signs of Insanity*, pp. 22, 23).

(2) The early Christian method of treatment had the further advantage of securing for mental patients what they need most, and what in modern asylums they cannot obtain, viz. '*association with healthy minds*' (*op. cit.*, p. 22).

(3) *Great stress was laid on what is now called 'occupational therapy,' the importance of which has for some time past been recognised in all up-to-date mental hospitals.*

Useful tasks, suitable to their capacity, were assigned to the 'energumens,' whose self-respect—a most important con-

[1] The Communion of insane persons capable of reverent behaviour, though occasionally objected to, was widely practised in the primitive Church. The psychological as well as theological arguments in favour of it are strong (see above, pp. 479, 542).

sideration in all dealings with the insane—was thus restored to them.

In many places such simple tasks as sweeping and cleaning the church, and lighting the lamps for service, were assigned to them.

(4) *The primitive Church, rightly recognising that insanity, even when mainly produced by physical causes, is a psychical disorder, employed mainly psychical remedies in treating it.*

Early Christian psychology was naïve and crude. It thought of insanity in terms of demonic 'obsession' and 'possession'; not, as we do, in terms of 'dissociation' and 'repression.' But, inasmuch as it recognised the essentially psychical nature of insanity, and the importance of psychical treatment, it was nearer to the actual truth, and also more correct in its treatment, than were most of the materialistic alienists of the nineteenth century, who regarded insanity as little more than a physical disorder of the brain, and accordingly treated it mainly by physical remedies.

Upon this point, Dr. C. Stanford Read writes: 'A school of thought held sway, which founded insanity upon a physiological basis, and endeavoured to base all pathology in terms of organic change in the brain. Although the great value of this method cannot be gainsaid, there is ample evidence that other aspects of approaching the problem of insanity are essentially necessary. Of late years another school has advanced the belief that the majority of cases of insanity are psychogenic in origin, and that even when gross physical disease has been the exciting factor, the symptoms can only be adequately understood at the psychological level' (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, 14th ed., art. 'Insanity').

Supporters of the 'psychogenic' school naturally stress the importance of mental, moral, and spiritual methods of treatment; and are usually willing to co-operate in the treatment of mental patients with well-qualified priests.

In these days, all the 'functional' neuroses (hysteria, neurasthenia, etc.) are regarded as 'psychogenic' (*i.e.* mental in origin and in nature). The following among the true insanities (psychoses) are also regarded as 'psychogenic' by numerous leading authorities; mania, melancholia, paranoia, dementia præcox (schizophrenia), and epileptic insanity, which last may have some physical basis in the nervous system, but seems to be predominantly a 'neurosis of terror.'

(5) *The treatment of the ancient Church was based upon an optimistic philosophy, and was therefore hopeful and encouraging.* In a similar way, modern psychotherapists seek to cure their patients by encouraging them to take a hopeful view of life in general, and of their own case in particular.

(6) *The good mental and bodily health enjoyed by the early Christians, and their very considerable success in curing mental and nervous disorders,*

receive (partial) psychological explanation from the fact that (like the more enlightened of modern mental physicians) they definitely aimed at the conquest of fear, and the establishment of complete peace of mind.

The ancient heathen world was terrified by fear of malignant demons, hostile influences, baleful planets, the evil eye, black magic, bad luck, irresistible fate, and the dark mysteries of death. On the other hand, converts from heathenism accepting the Church's faith in a beneficent Father in heaven, who had sent His own Son into the world to deliver it from the power of sin and Satan, lost at the moment of their Baptism the whole of their fears, and therewith in many cases the whole of their diseases, especially those of a mental kind, for one of the most potent causes of mental illness is anxiety and fear.

(7) *The ancient Church fully understood the importance of prophylactic measures against mental disease, and began its protective treatment with the new-born infant.*

Personal benediction, with Laying on of Hands, was the chief preventive measure employed. Particular attention was paid to the benediction of infants, children and adolescents, whose tender years were thought to require special protection. These were blessed frequently, with Imposition of Hands, not only by the Bishop and his presbyters, but also by their parents and godparents, for the purpose of guarding them against evil and unwholesome influences, and assisting their mental, moral, physical, and especially their spiritual development. All through the Middle Ages the blessing of infants and children was considered to be one of the most important functions of a Bishop.

The Ministry of Personal Benediction.

The ancient and mediæval Church was firmly convinced of the therapeutic value of personal benedictions, in both physical and mental cases. The ancient service-books of the Church are interspersed with hundreds of benedictions, suitable to almost every conceivable circumstance. One of the greatest weaknesses of the Anglican Visitation Office is its failure to make any provision for that 'ministry of benediction,' which earlier ages regarded as of such fundamental importance. A 'Parish Priest's Benedictional' might fitly be added to the present Visitation Office, containing from thirty to fifty carefully selected personal benedictions.

Upon all suitable occasions (as, for example, after serious spiritual interviews, or in time of anxiety or trouble), the parish priest should bless his parishioners of all ages.

Therapeutic Value of Religious Exercises.

The belief of the primitive Church in the curative and healthful effect of religious exercises and sacramental ministrations is

shared by many modern psychologists who are not in dogmatic accord with the Church's standards of faith. Even Freud, who regards the Christian religion as man's 'great illusion,'[1] has noticed the coincidence of the recent increase of mental and nervous disorders in Western Europe with the decay of public and private religious observances, and has suggested that it is not fortuitous.

Value of Absolution.

The use of Absolution (in suitable cases) as an integral part of the Ministry of Healing is not only recommended to us by St. James, and by the example of the Church in all ages, but has definite warrant in our Lord's own practice, who absolved the palsied man before He healed him (Mark ii. 1 ff.), and gave a comprehensive commission to His Apostles, after His Resurrection, to absolve in His name all penitent sinners however great their offences (John xx. 21–23).

The Archbishop's Committee is, therefore, justified in attributing therapeutic as well as spiritual efficacy to sacramental Confession and Absolution (*Report*, pp. 19–20). This therapeutic effect, however, though real, should not be over-estimated. Although sacramental Confession alone sometimes suffices to remedy mental and nervous trouble of considerable severity, this usually happens only when its origin is recent and its circumstances well remembered. The more severe neuroses are due to 'repression,' causing complete forgetfulness of their origin, which in many cases goes back to infancy or early childhood. In all such cases, more elaborate spiritual treatment is required.

The Spiritual Interview.

The established means of preparing nervous and mental sufferers for the sacramental Ministry of Healing is the *Spiritual Interview*. In this the patient discloses to the priest (confidentially, and under the seal of professional secrecy), not merely his sins, but *the entire state of his soul*, in the course of an absolutely candid autobiography. This should begin with his first dim recollections of infancy, should provide a detailed account of his entire moral, spiritual and religious development; of his relations (satisfactory and unsatisfactory) with his parents, brothers and sisters, schoolmasters and schoolfellows, wife, children, employers or employees—in fact, all persons who have exercised any important influence upon his life. A specially detailed account should be given of painful mental or physical shocks, personal outrages, and any unhealthy influences which may

[1] Freud's opinion is not dogmatically expressed, and there are some indications in his writings that it may not be final. He favours co-operation between analysts and ministers of religion.

have contributed to the production of the disorder. The nature of the patient's prevailing thoughts, dreams, phantasies, and habitual impulses should be studied, and any defects in his moral ideals and outlook should be carefully noted for future correction. In complicated cases, several interviews (of a length not exceeding an hour) are usually required before definite treatment can begin. Absolute candour is indispensable. If the patient keeps back any essential fact through false shame or prudery, treatment will almost certainly fail. On the other hand, if the patient makes an unreserved disclosure of the whole of the morbid symptoms, however repulsive or horrible they may be, the effect is likely to be immediate relief of mind (through what is sometimes called ' abreaction '), and the laying of the foundations of a permanent cure.

In cases where the sickness is wholly or almost wholly physical, and there is little mental trouble, a single interview of a much simpler and entirely devotional character is often sufficient to prepare the patient for anointing.

Relation of Priest to Patient.

It is the duty of the priest, as representing the Fatherhood and loving-kindness of God, to adopt a mild, paternal, sympathetic, and ' unrebuking ' attitude towards the patient.

If the patient shows any embarrassment in coming to the point, the priest should assure him that nothing that he can possibly have to reveal will have the effect of 'shocking' him, or of moving him to contempt. He should add that not a few even of the most virtuous people have dark episodes in their lives which it is painful for them even to think of.

The following words of Dr. Hadfield are worth quoting in this connection:—'Patients suffering from [moral and spiritual] ailments often present themselves to the physician instead of seeking the aid of the clergyman or moralist. . . . They feel, rightly or wrongly, that the moralist will blame them or tell them to exert their wills. They feel, rightly or wrongly, that they are *not* to blame for their condition. They have, moreover, already exerted their will to no purpose, they have turned their attention to other things, they have been blamed, condemned, threatened; they have been treated with sympathy and love, and all in vain. They then begin to realise that they are suffering from a " moral " disease, and go to a physician *who will treat them as sick and not sinful.* The psycho-physician is anxious to help the morally sick; he shrinks from nothing; he is shocked at nothing; and *no word of blame ever falls from his lips* ' (*Psychology and Morals*, p. 2; italics mine).

Another point is of hardly less importance. The priest,

throughout the Spiritual Interviews, should be alert to discover the patient's virtues (actual or potential) as well as his failings. His aim should be, on the basis of an accurate spiritual diagnosis and thorough study of the patient's personality, *to devise a moral and spiritual regimen, calculated to correct his defects by developing his virtues.*

Schemes of Treatment.

Accurate diagnosis should be followed by *carefully considered treatment*, consisting of moral and religious instruction, the implanting of worthy moral ideals, first in the conscious mind, and afterwards (by suggestion given during the 'hypnoidal' condition of 'relaxation' or 'reverie') in the submerged area of the 'sub-conscious'; suitable devotions, 'auto-suggestions' (to be used by the patient just before sleeping, just after waking, and during the repose of the midday rest or 'siesta'); and (of course) sacramental ministrations.

These last should take the form of—

(1) *Absolution*, which it is sometimes convenient to give during the spiritual interviews, if the patient's mind is seriously distressed.

(2) *Holy Communion*, prepared for and received with a view to the healing, strengthening, and nourishing, not only of the soul, but of the entire psycho-physical personality.

(3) *Unction and Imposition of Hands*, performed while the patient is in a relaxed, tranquil, and receptive condition of mind.

Treatment should continue daily—or very frequently—until the patient is decidedly better.

In all cases the treatment should include a rule of life and a daily time-table; also (wherever possible) active works of charity, *e.g.* visitation of other sick persons, almsgiving, and intercessory prayer.

For physical treatment, which is usually desirable, the patient should be referred to his medical adviser.

In most nervous cases, suitable physical exercises, outdoor games, and, above all, outdoor work (*e.g.* gardening) are of great, though subordinate, value.

Co-operation with the Medical Profession.

With regard to mental diseases, co-operation with the medical profession is especially important in their incipient stages, when alone they are readily curable.

The signs of incipient insanity can usually be detected by an experienced parish priest long before the patient considers them grave enough to require medical treatment. If the priest, at the first moment that he notices them, obtains the patient's

permission to discuss the situation with his medical adviser, the probability is that it will be possible to devise effective measures for averting the threatened catastrophe.

Every parish priest should be acquainted with the preliminary symptoms of the chief mental and nervous complaints, and he should be always on the watch to discover them. By far the most useful treatise on this subject is *Pastoral Psychiatry and Mental Health* (1932), by J. R. Oliver, who writes with unusual authority, being at once a priest, a physician, and an experienced psychotherapist. A brief but useful description of the early symptoms is given in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (14th edition), Vol. XII. pp. 385 ff.

The Prevention of Insanity.

Insanity is much more easily prevented than cured: accordingly, the main energies, both of the Church and of the medical profession, should be directed towards its prevention.

Fortunately, both parish priests of experience and alienists of the modern school are now fairly agreed as to the form which preventive measures should take.

Setting aside the forms of insanity due to physical injuries, infections such as that of syphilis, and toxins of various kinds, there is good reason to suppose that a vast amount of insanity and neurotic illness is due to psychical causes, particularly to shocks of a terrifying, painful, and humiliating nature, experienced during infancy and early childhood. Among these must be reckoned *moral outrages*, which often leave an indelible scar upon the soul.

It follows that the most effective weapon for combating insanity, and reducing its appalling and ever-increasing volume,[1] is *an improved mental, moral, and spiritual hygiene in infancy and early childhood.* Paralysing and enervating terror is the enemy to be fought, and the utmost efforts of priests, parents, educationalists, and physicians should be directed towards its elimination from child life. If these unfortunately fail, remedial treatment should at once be applied, and steadily continued, until the child is restored to his normal condition of cheerfulness, courage, and confidence.

Everything that 'upsets' a child, *e.g.* quarrels between parents; accidents (such as falls or burns); frights caused by fierce animals; ugly masks and 'guys'; terrifying grimaces; monstrosities and deformities exhibited at fairs; talk about operations;

[1] *The Annual Report of the Board of Control* (1930, p. 14) states: 'On the 1st January, 1930, the number of notified insane persons under care in England and Wales was 142,167, an increase of 1,307 during the preceding year, the average annual increase for the five years preceding January 1, 1930, being 2,167.'

suggestions that 'bogies' lurk in dark corners; unorthodox 'hell-fire theology'; frightening references to Satan, witches, and ghosts, and the like, are exceedingly harmful in the present, leading, for example, to 'night terrors,' and conducing to neurosis or insanity at a later age, when the system is subjected to abnormal strain.

A child's fear of the dark should always be treated seriously. Remedial treatment should at once be applied, and he should be allowed a night-light, until he himself declares that he no longer needs it.

Terrified and timorous children should be blessed daily, with laying on of hands, by their parents, and frequently by the parish priest, until courage, confidence, and trust have been re-established.

The priest should strongly recommend to parents the practice of blessing their children, which the Church inherited from Judaism, and which was usual in England two hundred years ago. A visitor to England at that period thus describes the practice: 'Well brought-up children, on rising and going to bed, wish their fathers and mothers "Good morning" or "Good evening," and kneeling before them ask for their blessing. The parents, placing their hands upon their children's heads, say "God bless you," or some such phrase, and the children then kiss their parents' hands' (quoted by J. Wickham Legg, *English Church Life*, p. 168).

All defective and backward children, all feeble-minded persons, idiots, and epileptics, also the blind, deaf-mutes, the halt, the maimed, the deformed, the paralysed, the victims of 'shell-shock'—in short, all who suffer affliction either in mind or body should be frequently blessed by the priest with suitable prayers and laying-on of hands. Public services for the blessing of children in church, which were once general, might also be revived in many places with profit. An impressive and beautiful service of this nature, in the course of which Imposition of Hands is employed, is provided in the Roman *Rituale*. This also contains an Office 'for Blessing Sick Children,' and another 'for Blessing a Child with the object of obtaining for him the Mercy of God.'

When children are approaching the age of puberty, they require special pastoral attention from the priest, and affectionate and watchful care from their parents, in order that the transition to adolescence may take place normally and without undue psychical tension. By such ministrations, the peril of dementia præcox (schizophrenia), which, if allowed to develop, is frequently incurable, is likely to be averted. The exact nature of this common and distressing mental disorder is obscure, but it is usually considered to be due to arrest of development at this critical age, the young person being 'stranded on the rock of puberty.'

Pastoral ministrations of a cheerful and encouraging nature are frequently needed by women suffering from depression of spirits during pregnancy, and almost always during the *menopause* (45–50 years). The *senium*, the corresponding period in men (55–65 years) is much less often accompanied by serious mental strain.

The pastor should always bear in mind that *fear of insanity is one of the most potent factors in producing it.* His first task, therefore, in dealing with anyone who has this fear upon him, is to diminish or remove it. This he can usually do by pointing out that recent research has done much to correct the exaggerated views that used to be held concerning its hereditary and inevitable character. It is now known that ' a hereditary taint is present in the relatives of 70 per cent. of mentally sound people; of 77 per cent. of the insane,' and that ' an insanity taint is of importance only when present in the parents ' [*E.B.*[14], art. ' Insanity ']. Moreover, there is considerable evidence indicating that certainly in many—perhaps in most—instances insanity or neurosis is transmitted from parent to child more by psychical infection than by physical heredity. A child removed early from a neurotic home usually grows up healthy, while all the other children are more or less affected.

What a child inherits from an insane or neurotic parent is usually a somewhat nervous temperament, or at most a slight predisposition towards insanity, which may be successfully counteracted by the timely application of suitable hygienic measures of a mental, moral, and spiritual nature, by pastors, physicians and friends.

VII. Sexual Cases

Treatment of Sterility, Impotence, and Frigidity.

As in early and mediæval days, so in ours, experienced priests are frequently applied to by childless married persons, that they may be aided by their prayers and other spiritual ministrations to obtain offspring.

Such persons should be referred to their medical advisers for physical treatment, which is often necessary. In not a few instances, however, the causes of infertility are of an entirely moral and spiritual nature, and require treatment by a priest rather than by a physician. There is a good discussion of the moral and psychical causes of infertility in Dr. C. J. Child's valuable monograph *Sterility and Conception* (1922). He there remarks that sterility may be due to ' incompatibility of sentiment, as is borne out by many instances where husband and wife, having lived together for many years without issue, separate and remarry, and each has a family by the new partner.' He

adds that ' numerous cases are encountered where the impotence [of the husband] is purely psychical. . . . There are various kinds of psychical processes that lead to impotence, but they are all generally based upon the emotions, and the most usual one is fear.'

Such psychical impediments to fertility usually yield rapidly to encouraging spiritual ministrations. Treatment should aim at producing complete conjugal harmony and union of hearts, the entire removal of all causes of disagreement and displeasure between the parties, and an emotional as well as intellectual appreciation of the beauty, sanctity, and sacramental character of Christian connubial relations.

Johannes Neumann makes the surprising statement (*Einführung in die Psychotherapie für Pfarrer*, 1930, chap. ix), that some 80 per cent. of German women of the older generation suffer from sexual ' repression,' and that for this reason ' many marriages are ruined through the psychological frigidity of the wife.' He attributes this largely to the severity of German fathers, who sometimes beat their young daughters, with the result that the latter, when married, involuntarily shrink from their husbands.

In England, where fathers are usually kind to their daughters, frigidity in women (which is a not uncommon ailment) is usually due to Manichæan teaching imparted directly or indirectly by an over-prudish mother, or to some unfortunate sexual shock.

A parish priest who is trusted by his people is frequently called in to adjust differences between husband and wife, or to reconcile them when they have quarrelled and separated.

In not a few instances, investigation reveals that the original source of the trouble is the unsatisfactory character of the connubial relations, which have been cold and unsympathetic from the very day of marriage, owing to the ' repression ' of one of the parties, usually (but by no means always) the wife. Sexual repression in women gives rise to the following ' nervous ' (or rather ' moral ') disorders, which are here arranged in ascending order of gravity : (1) Frigidity (partial); (2) Sexual anæsthesia (complete); (3) Dyspareunia; and (4) Vaginismus, which last is the extreme physical expression of sexual abhorrence. Of these, the first two are compatible with child-bearing; the third renders it difficult; the last almost impossible.

All these conditions (which are ' moral ' and ' spiritual ' rather than physical maladies, for they result from false ethical and theological beliefs) yield with great difficulty or not at all to medical treatment of a physical kind. On the other hand, they yield rapidly and easily to suitable treatment by an experienced priest. Such treatment should include sound theological and ethical instruction on the sacramental character of marriage; the sanctity of the human body and the sexual instinct; the high

privilege of co-operating with the Creator in the beneficent work of peopling earth and heaven with new citizens; suitable devotions and well-selected spiritual readings; frequent joint Communion of the two parties with suitable intention; also frequent blessing of both parties with Imposition of Hands. Treatment should lead up to the solemn administration of Unction, stress being laid on the hallowing of the body and of the entire personality (including the sexual life) through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost thus imparted. Repetition of Unction is usually unnecessary, for it produces a powerful and permanent impression upon the minds of the parties.

Where there has been serious disagreement, and complete rupture of connubial relations, a second affectionate courtship within marriage may be usefully recommended. The parties should renew their marriage vows and receive the priest's blessing, before resuming cohabitation.

The priest who devotes attention to ministrations of this kind will not infrequently have the satisfaction of restoring to a broken-hearted wife the alienated affections of her husband, and of transforming a married life of continual discord into 'a perpetual honeymoon' (Neumann).

The early and mediæval Church attached great importance to ministrations of this nature. Good examples of the services used will be found in Gregory XIII's Roman *Rituale* of 1584 (see p. 521, *Pro tollenda sterilitate mulieris et subole impetranda;* pp. 522–4, *Orationes pro impeditis in matrimonio a dæmone vel maleficiis* (accompanied by Imposition of Hands on both parties). For ministrations having a similar object, see *De benedictione fœtus in utero matris* (*op. cit.*, p. 519); and the Sarum *Benedictio super lectum*, and *Benedictio super eos in lecto*, pronounced by the priest on the wedding night.

Other Sexual Cases.

In practically all cases, disorder of the sexual life is accompanied by other symptoms of moral and nervous disorder. Accordingly, it is the duty of the priest to treat, not the sex abnormality alone, but the entire disordered personality of the patient. By restoring this to normality he will *ipso facto* cure the sexual disorder.

Adolescents, who in these days so frequently declare themselves unable to control their sexual instinct (which, misled by inaccurate versions of the Freudian psychology, they regard as irresistible), should be informed that this and every instinct of man can readily be brought under control *by the hearty acceptance of worthy moral and religious ideals.* The priest should then proceed to give clear moral and spiritual instruction concerning the sanctity of the sexual instinct, as being the means whereby the human race co-operates with God in the creation of immortal

souls; also concerning the moral worth and sacramental character of monogamous conjugal and parental life.

It should also be explained that the sexual instinct admits of 'sublimation'; *i.e.* profitable *diversion* into activities which are not directly sexual, but are of a creative, socially useful, and unselfish kind; further, that it is the duty and privilege of a Christian, until marriage with a worthy partner is possible, to 'sublimate' his sexual instinct by engaging in earnest and unselfish work in the service of God and man.

Treatment should follow instruction, whenever necessary. But in many juvenile and adolescent cases, nothing but instruction (including, of course, information about 'sublimation'), together with sympathy and encouragement, is necessary.

Encouragement is especially needed in dealing with self-abuse. Neumann justly remarks: 'Treatment by encouragement is the best cure for self-abuse. This holds both for men and women. . . . The masturbator is always a discouraged person' (p. 237).

Grave cases of sexual obsession require (besides ministrations of the ordinary kind) the *quasi-exorcistic* use of Unction, which is sometimes extraordinarily effective (see above, pp. 480 ff.).

In all the graver sexual cases, Unction should be used. Treatment, if successful, should conclude with a final administration of Unction for the purpose of *the solemn reconsecration of the violated Temple of the Holy Ghost.* Before its administration in this sense, and for this purpose, St. Paul's teaching that the human body is the temple of the Holy Ghost should be strongly impressed on the mind of the patient; and 1 Cor. vi. 19–20 should be read. This method of administering Unction is a valuable safeguard against relapse.

Sexual cases should only be undertaken by priests of mature age and ripe experience, preferably married.

Much of the physiological information necessary in dealing with sexual cases, also much wise advice, will be found in the following works of the late Dr. Mary Scharlieb: *Straight Talks to Women* (1923); *Change of Life, its Difficulties and Dangers* (1920); *Maternity and Infancy* (1926); *The Bachelor Woman and her Problems* (1929); and *The Psychology of Childhood, Normal and Abnormal* (1927).

The present writer owes much to her inspiration, encouragement, and practical advice.

VIII. Characteristics of a Good Visitation Office

As nearly all the Churches of the Anglican Communion have been lately reconsidering their services of ministry to the sick, and may desire to supplement them, a few final suggestions as to the direction which reform might profitably take will not be unseasonable.

In the first place, what ancient precedent suggests and modern psychological considerations demand, is *One Principal Comprehensive Service of Visitation, containing the whole of the ministrations which a sick person normally requires, arranged in a carefully considered order, and containing a sufficient number of alternative scriptural readings and prayers to serve for at least a week without undue repetition.* Daily Unction, Imposition of Hands, and Communion, for seven days (and longer if necessary) were usual in the early Church; and modern experience fully confirms the value of such repeated ministrations. Consequently any Revised Visitation Office which aims at giving the maximum assistance to the sick should make ample provision for continued and varied ministrations.

(1) *The title should be 'Visitation of the Sick,'* this being a return to the meaning of the term in ancient times, when Absolution, Imposition of Hands, Unction, and Communion were normally included in a single 'Visitation' Service of considerable, but not excessive length.

(2) *The Service should be preceded by a carefully written and fairly long Introduction,* giving instruction concerning the method of preparing the sick for these rites. It should there be definitely stated that Unction and Imposition of Hands are of value in the treatment, not only of physical, but also of spiritual, moral, and mental diseases.

(3) *Confession and Absolution, when needed, should find place at the beginning of the Service.* This is their natural, and also their most convenient place.[1] This arrangement gives the priest the opportunity of seeing the patient privately, and giving him any needful confidential counsel before he admits to the room any of the friends and neighbours of the sick man, who may wish to take part in the Service that follows. Absolution should always be given emphatically in the form 'I absolve thee,' not in a precatory form. It should normally be accompanied by the ancient ceremony of the laying on of hands, which has an encouraging and 'corroborative' effect upon the mind of the patient. Although precatory absolution is equivalent *theologically* to the form 'I absolve thee,' it is far from equivalent *psychologically.* Our Reformers were guided by a sound psychological instinct when they refused to weaken the authoritative and emphatic form of Absolution provided in the Sarum Manual.

The Revised American Book of 1929, alone of the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion, provides no form for absolving the sick person after the private confession to which it directs him

[1] In nearly all early Offices for the Sick, Sacramental Confession is placed early in the Service, or before it. However, the eleventh-century North Italian Order for Unction (probably Ambrosian), recently edited by Dom C. Lambot (Henry Bradshaw Society, Vol. LXVII), strangely places Confession after Unction. Only one other instance of this is known—also Ambrosian.

to be moved, ' if he feel his conscience troubled with any matter.' This is a serious defect from the psychological as well as the theological point of view.

(4) For the purpose of strengthening the sick man's faith, there should be inserted early in the Office *a selection of confident and hopeful prayers for the healing of soul and body*, interspersed with readings from Holy Scripture, selections from the Psalms, and antiphons, which may be either said or sung. The antiphons of the Gregorian Office are quite suitable. The readings from Holy Scripture should in all cases include narratives of our Lord's miracles of healing, also references to the healing of the soul, such as are contained in the parables of the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, and the Lost Sheep. These parables, it may be added, are employed very effectively in the Unction Service of the Greek *Euchologion*.

The English 1928 selection of readings for the sick requires reconsideration and revision. Including psalms, over sixty readings from Holy Scripture are given. Not one of these is a narrative of any of our Lord's miracles. There are readings about ' Christ our Example in Suffering,' and about ' Patience in Suffering,' but not a single one about ' Recovery.'

The Roman Visitation Office contains a much more suitable selection of readings than the 1928 Service. The prayers also are (for the most part) much more suitable. The Scripture readings include Matt. viii. 5–13 (the Healing of the Centurion's Servant); Mark xvi. 14–18 (' They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover '); Luke iv. 38–44 (the Healing of St. Peter's Mother-in-law); John v. 1–14 (the Healing of the Impotent Man at the Pool of Bethesda); John i. 1–14 (emphasis is here laid on the healing purpose of the Incarnation, ' And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us ').

The Service also includes Imposition of the Priest's Right Hand upon the sick person, with the words, ' They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.'

Although the modern Roman Church has largely lost the idea of healing from its administration of Unction, it has retained it in full force in its Visitation Office, and in several other important ministrations; *e.g.* the *Rituale* contains thoroughly suitable services for ' the Blessing of an Infant,' ' the Blessing of a Child to obtain for him the Mercy of God,' ' the Blessing of Children, particularly when they are presented in Church,' ' the Blessing of Sick Children ' (with Imposition of the Priest's Right Hand); ' the Blessing of a Sick Adult ' (with extension of the Right Hand towards the patient); and ' the Blessing of a Pregnant Woman ' (with her offspring). All these, and others of a like kind, might well be included in the Anglican Prayer Book.

It may be added that there is a Roman Office intended for the

treatment of developed insanity. The crude theory of possession which underlies it renders it unsuitable for modern use. But its retention in the *Rituale* is a continual reminder to the clergy that no class of sick persons needs the ministrations of the Church so much as the mentally afflicted.

(5) As is suggested by the Gregorian Office, which directs that *Christe cœlestis medicina Patris* should be sung as an Office Hymn in the sick man's room at Mattins and Evensong, an Office Hymn might be provided which could be read if no singers were present.

(6) *Exhortation and Instruction* (brief, and calculated to strengthen the sick man's faith) might follow.

(7) *The Sick Man's Confession of Faith* (the Apostles' Creed).

(8) *The Sick Man's Communion* (preferably, according to primitive custom, with the Reserved Sacrament).[1] This should be preceded by a short liturgical Confession and Absolution, and the Prayer of Humble Access; and followed by a short Thanksgiving.

(10) *A period of absolute silence*, with prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit for the healing, strengthening, and sanctification of the sick person both in soul and body.

(11) *Unction on the forehead, with consecrated oil*, in the form of a cross, while a suitable prayer is recited. If thought fit, Unction may be preceded by a brief Imposition of Hands, of a soothing character, intended to induce in the patient a state of tranquil receptivity.

(12) *A prolonged Imposition of Hands* for the purpose of both healing and blessing. If the psychological conditions of the Service have been well managed, it is usually possible, by the help of a few whispered suggestions, to conclude the ministration by sending the patient into a tranquil healing sleep, which should occupy at least twenty minutes.

(13) *Silent prayer*, after which the congregation departs quietly, leaving the patient sleeping, or in repose, resting in God.

It will be noticed that Unction and Imposition of Hands are closely united in this Order, as they ought to be, for they are organically related. It is a serious defect of the American, Scottish, and South African Orders for Unction that they do not permit the union of the two ceremonies in the same Service, but require a choice between them. This should be remedied when occasion offers.

The South African Order has this rubric: 'If the sick person is

[1] To insert the entire Communion Office at this point seriously disturbs the continuity of the Ministration, impairs its balance, and unduly lengthens it. It is desirable to study brevity in conducting a Ministration which (if ancient precedent and the needs of the patient are duly considered) should include, not only Communion, but also Unction and Imposition of Hands, also in many instances Sacramental Confession and Absolution. On Reservation, see below (pp. 543 ff.).

both communicated and anointed on the same occasion, the Unction shall precede the Communion.'

The sequence here directed has the support of the very general —though not quite universal—practice of the ancient Church, including the Church of Rome.

On the other hand, psychological reasons plead for making Unction the climax of the Service. It is more definitely and exclusively a Sacrament of Healing than the Eucharist, and it requires, for its effective administration, a less alert and more quiescent frame of mind than is desirable when the Eucharist is administered. Probably the rubric should permit both sequences, but there can be little doubt that, from the psychological point of view, it is better that Unction should come last.

When, however, the patient is actually dying, there can be no doubt that Holy Communion should be administered last, according to ancient precedent. It is the Eucharist, not Unction, which is the soul's 'medicine of immortality,' and its 'most necessary provision' (*viaticum*) for its journey into the next world (see below pp. 544 ff.).

With regard to the formula of Unction, if only one is provided, the most suitable is that of 1549, which is reprinted in the Archbishop's Committee's Report. It has the great advantage (shared also by the South African formula) of definitely mentioning diseases of *the mind*, which according to ancient ideas are the most important of the diseases which require treatment by Unction. It is a grave defect of the American and Scottish forms that they contain no allusion to mental diseases, which at no period of the Church's history were so common as now. The most questionable phrase in the 1549 formula is: 'pardon thee all thy sins and offences, committed by *all thy senses, passions and carnal affections*.' Sins are always sins of the personality, never of the senses, a mediæval form of expression which implies a crude and indefensible psychology. Moreover, there are sins which are purely spiritual, *e.g.* pride and selfishness, as well as sins connected with the 'passions' and 'carnal affections.' It would be better to amend the clause so as to run 'pardon thee all thy sins and offences of whatever nature.' The clause 'if it be his blessed will' should be omitted.

Besides the principal form, several others might fitly be provided, suited to special kinds of spiritual and bodily infirmity. One form should be very brief, it being left to the officiating priest to expand it by suitable extempore prayer.

Repetition of Unction.

As certain Anglican priests are doubtful as to the lawfulness of the repetition of Unction, a rubric should be inserted in the

Visitation Office declaring that it is lawful to repeat the Rite of Anointing frequently—even daily—until recovery (or death) occurs.

The 'Gregorian' Sacramentary, which directed the daily Unction (and Communion) of the Sick, set the standard for all Western Christendom. The following Orders collected and printed by Martène, and ranging in date from about A.D. 800 to the thirteenth century, prescribe daily Unction and daily Communion: iv, v, vii, x, xv, xxii (see Bk. I. chap. vii). The evidence comes from Italy, Gaul, Germany and England. In England, the eleventh-century Missal of Leofric still prescribes daily Unction and daily Communion, but the beginnings of restriction can be traced back to Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, 960–988, who directs daily Communion for a sick monk, but Unction only on the first day of sickness (*Regularis Concordia*, in Migne, *P.L.*, cxxxvii, 500). The *Synodus Baiocensis* (Mansi, Vol. XXV. p. 23) as late as about 1300 decrees: 'Let the priests often teach the people that it is lawful for this sacrament to be repeated, and often (*sæpe*) received in any serious illness involving danger of death.' Peter Lombard (*c.* A.D. 1100–1160) argues strongly for the frequent (or more frequent, *sæpius*) administration of Unction in the same sickness: 'Just as prayer [for the sick] can be repeated, so also it appears that Unction can be repeated. St. James makes mention of both in this passage, and each helps the other to secure for the sick man healing (*alleviationem*) of body and soul.' He adds that 'this sacrament of Unction is *frequently* (*sæpe*) repeated in almost every Church' (*Sententiarum*, lib. iv, distinctio 23). The repetition of Unction in the same sickness is also approved by Bonaventura (*In Sent.* iv, dist. 23, qu. 4), Petrus Cantor, Alanus Porretanus, and others; also (in principle, at least) by Aquinas, who writes: 'This sacrament is a kind of spiritual remedy applied in the manner of a bodily remedy. But a bodily remedy is repeated; wherefore also this sacrament can be repeated' (*In Sent.* iv, dist. 23, qu. 2, art. 4; see also *Supplement* to Third Part of the *Summa*, qu. 33, art. 1).

Details of the later restrictions upon the repetition of Unction imposed by Councils and the *dicta* of theologians are given by W. Maskell in his *Monumenta Ritualia* (Vol. I, 2nd edit., pp. cclxxii ff.), by Martène (*op. cit.*) and very fully by J. Launoy in his exhaustive treatise, *De Sacramento Unctionis Infirmorum*, 1673. Some mediæval authorities maintained that Unction should *never* be repeated during life; others that a year should elapse before repetition. Launoy (p. 553) gives a long list of continental diocesan Manuals, published in the sixteenth century, which state that 'Unction can be repeated, but not in the same sickness, unless it be protracted beyond a year.'

The Council of Trent forbade the repetition of Unction in

the same sickness, unless the patient partially recovers, and again falls into danger of death.

J. Kilker, writing in 1925, states that 'By far the great majority of [Latin] theologians deny the validity of Extreme Unction, when repeated in the same danger of death' (*Extreme Unction*, p. 52). But since the publication in 1907 of J. Kern's scholarly treatise, *De sacramento extr. unctionis*, the view that Unction can be validly repeated an indefinite number of times has become much more usual in the Roman Communion. Among defenders of its iterability (at least in principle) may be mentioned Menard, Martène, Launoy, Catalani, Gerbert, Pellicia, Schanz—in fact almost all who have thoroughly investigated the early history of the rite. They regard the repetition of Unction as *valid, but (in the West) not now licit, because the Council of Trent has forbidden it.*

The Non-jurors also approved the repetition—even the frequent repetition—of Unction, as the following rubric shows: *The sick person shall be anointed as often as he desireth, at the discretion of the Priest* (Liturgy of 1718).

Service for Imposition of Hands Alone.

The main Service of Visitation should be followed by a shorter Service providing for Imposition of Hands without Unction. Frequent Unction will naturally be employed until recovery has begun, but after that, the parish priest will on many occasions use Imposition of Hands alone for the purpose of blessing and healing the patient.

Other Necessary Services.

There are further required—

(1) *A Service for Assisting the Dying*, similar in character to that in the Roman *Rituale*, but fuller, and containing more matter suitable for the friends of the dying man to use by his bedside in the absence of the priest. In accordance with ancient precedent, the narratives of the Passion should be among the devotions used.

(2) *A Service for the Commendation of the Soul.* It is desirable that this should contain in full and unexpurgated form the greatest of all Commendatory Prayers, the *Proficiscere anima Christiana de hoc mundo*, which is found in the Sarum Manual, and has been endeared to the whole English-speaking world by Newman's *Dream of Gerontius*. The abbreviated form, inserted in the 1928 Book, should be retained as an alternative; but the complete prayer ought certainly to be given.

(3) *A Parish Priest's Benedictional*, containing a comprehensive selection of Benedictions for all ordinary parochial occasions. It should contain benedictions upon infants, children, the sick, the blind, the deaf, the deformed, the feeble-minded, the insane, those in trouble, etc. Forms should be included for blessing a

home, a school, and a hospital. Graces, and benedictions upon food, should also be provided, suitable for various occasions, both public and private.

EXCURSUS I

Modern Latin Theologians on Unction as a Therapeutic Rite.

The view advocated in this essay that Unction is essentially and predominantly a therapeutic rite, and not primarily a preparation for death, has been held by not a few learned and weighty Roman Catholic theologians from the seventeenth century onwards, though until recently respect for the Tridentine Decrees (as usually interpreted) prevented most of them from giving any but the most cautious (and usually somewhat ambiguous) expression to it.

Now, however, it is widely held that the Council of Trent did not make the late mediæval view of Unction absolutely obligatory, and authors of good repute have for some time past been permitted to advocate a return to more primitive and scriptural conceptions. Among these is Fr. Ildefonso Schuster, who in a standard work, bearing the censor's *nihil obstat*, writes as follows: 'Contrary to the present rule, as this sacrament was administered *per modum unctionis medicinalis* to the sick, and not only to those about to die, the ancients sometimes repeated the anointing for seven days, until the sick man had been healed, or passed quietly away.' And again: '[This sacrament was] only in later days termed Extreme Unction, thus helping to give it the frightening aspect as of certain death which it now possesses. . . . Formerly Holy Anointing, the completion as it were of the sacrament of Penance, preceded as a rule the Holy Viaticum; but these three sacraments were commonly received, not indeed in the last hours of life, as is the corrupt practice of these later times, but even before the sick person's condition gave any cause for anxiety' . . . 'In the first centuries the administration of Extreme Unction was accompanied by magnificent and impressive ceremonies. The faithful were so far from sharing the dread felt in our days for this sacrament of comfort and healing, that they habitually reserved the holy oil for the sick in their own houses . . . (and) made use of it with great faith to anoint wounded or aching limbs' (*The Sacramentary*, 1924, Vol. I. pp. 198–199; Vol. V. p. 327).

Weighty Roman authorities have long recommended the anointing of sick persons, not only when they are 'in danger of death,' but even when they are 'in danger of danger of death'—a very different matter. This decidedly liberal interpretation of the intentions of the Fathers of Trent appears to have been first suggested by St. Alfonso dei Liguori.

EXCURSUS II

Errors, Abuses, and Superstitions connected with Unction.

The theory that Unction is predominantly a preparation for death led to the widely spread mediæval opinion that a person, once anointed, might more fitly die than live. This, of course, caused the bulk of the laity to shrink from asking for Unction until all hope of recovery—even the faintest—had been abandoned.

If an anointed person happened to recover, he was expected to behave like one dead to the world. It was regarded as his duty, for example, to fast perpetually, especially from flesh, to walk barefoot, and never again to have intercourse with his wife. A will made by such a person was in some places treated as invalid.

These abuses (together with another widely spread abuse, viz. depriving the poor of the Sacrament by demanding extortionate fees for its administration) were attacked by numerous mediæval Councils, but with little success, because by the thirteenth century the ecclesiastical authorities themselves had for the most part adopted the root error from which the abuses sprang, viz. that Unction is primarily *a preparation for death* rather than a sacrament of spiritual and bodily healing.

Both in the popular and in the ecclesiastical mind, the association of Unction with approaching death was exceedingly strong. Certainly as early as the eleventh century, and possibly as early as the ninth, the public service-books of many churches made a strong suggestion to the patient that he ought to expire as soon as possible after Unction, by directing that he should be lifted from his bed, and laid upon the ground to await his end, having nothing beneath him except a coarse hair-cloth sprinkled with ashes.[1] This gruesome ceremony, fraught with sinister and funereal suggestion, was prescribed or recommended (with numerous varieties of detail) in very many dioceses of Italy and France, but apparently nowhere in Germany or England.[2] It is recorded that the kings of France submitted to it. It was regarded as an outward expression of the deepest humiliation and penitence, and of willing submission to death, regarded as a penalty for sin.

[1] This ceremony is ordered in the eleventh-century *Ordo Romanus X*, which contains much early material.

[2] The rite is not mentioned in the Sarum and York Manuals, but we read that devout English laymen occasionally asked for it. Roger Hoveden relates of Prince Henry, son of Henry II, that after confession and absolution 'he laid aside his softer coverings [*or* garments], put on hair-cloth (*cilicium*), and tying a rope round his neck . . . said, "Drag me from this bed by this rope, and lay me on that bed of ashes," which he had prepared for himself. They did as he commanded, and placed at his head and feet two great squared stones' (*Chron.*, Vol. II. p. 279).

Launoy states (*op. cit.*, p. 547) that it survived in certain parts of Italy and France till nearly the end of the sixteenth century.

It is all-important that Anglicans, in reviving the much-abused sacrament of Unction, should make it clear that the purpose of it is far wider than mere preparation for death. To do this, it is necessary to discard the term *Extreme Unction*, to which all Eastern theologians strongly object (*e.g.* Metrophanes Critopulus in his 'Confession,' Symeon of Thessalonica in *P.G.*, clv. 518; and among modern writers Ignatius, Macaire, Mesolaras, and Christos Androutsos); which several modern Latin theologians of weight consider misleading; and which Chardon roundly denounces as an abuse produced by an abuse (Migne, *Cursus Theologiæ Completus*, xx. 747). Notwithstanding the explanation in the Catechism of the Council of Trent (II. 6. 2), that the phrase means the last of the anointings (which, however, might in practice come to mean Unction *in extremis*), it remains *certain* that the original meaning of 'Extreme Unction' really was (what in the popular mind it still is) the Unction of persons *in extremis*. Peter Lombard, apparently the first theologian to use the term,[1] makes this perfectly clear in his definition. Extreme Unction, he declares, is 'Unctio infirmorum quæ fit *in extremis* oleo per episcopum consecrato' (*op. cit.*, lib. iv, dist. 23).

Chardon's criticism of the sinister and dangerous suggestiveness of the term is fully justified. In these days it is a fact fully recognised by anthropologists, that expectation of death, if only sufficiently strong, may actually kill. Consequently if Unction is given and received, not as a Sacrament of Life and Health, but as *a sealing for death*, its administration may actually hasten death, instead of prolonging life and promoting recovery. Though this Sacrament tends *per se* towards life and health, yet improper dispositions and wrong beliefs on the part of the recipient may place so strong a barrier in the way of the proffered grace of health, that life may actually be imperilled by its administration. Undoubtedly Unction ought to be administered to the dying (as to other sick persons), but always with some degree of hope, however faint, that recovery may take place (see below, p. 603).

Unction and Release from Purgatory.

It was taught by many leading schoolmen, both Thomist and Scotist, that Unction, when received with the proper dispositions, frees the soul from all obligation to suffer temporal punishment in Purgatory, and consequently secures for it *immediate* admission into heaven. Aquinas says: 'Extreme Unction

[1] It was to some extent in *popular* use as early as the ninth century. The Virgin Maura (in that century) summoned Prudentius, Bishop of Troyes, to administer to her 'Extreme Unction' (Migne, *P.L.*, cxv. 1374*c*).

has for its purpose the completion of the work of purification in one who is about to appear before God, by freeing him from the debt of temporal punishment, that thus nothing may remain in him which, on the departure of his soul from the body, could keep him back from the possession of glory' (*Contra Gentiles*, iv. 73). Duns Scotus in closely similar language insists that Unction, worthily received, gives *immediate* admission to glory (*Reportata Parisiensia*, Bk. IV, dist. 23, qu. unic.).

Alexander III (Orlando or Roland Bandinelli), Pope from 1159 to 1181, taught that besides remission of sins, Unction confers in the future life a degree of bodily glory not to be obtained without it (*Die Sentenzen Rolands*, ed. A. M. Gietl, 1891, p. 262).[1]

The Fathers of Trent, having in view the necessity of defending against Protestant attacks the mediæval doctrine of Purgatory, and the propriety of offering prayer and sacrifice for the dead, prudently omitted from their decrees concerning Extreme Unction all mention of a doctrine which seemed in large measure to abolish Purgatory, and to render prayer and masses for the dead in most cases unnecessary.[2]

For the next three hundred years this doctrine was for the most part either ignored by Latin theologians or actively controverted.[3] Indeed many of them went to the other extreme, and maintained the harsh doctrine (pronounced by Kern inconsistent with the loving-kindness of God and the mercy of Christ) that only in the rarest cases can the soul of a Christian, however devout, attain to glory without passing through the painful fires of Purgatory.

In 1907 Kern's learned treatise, *De Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis*, revived the almost forgotten teaching of the Schoolmen, that one of the principal purposes of Unction is the preparation of the soul for immediate entrance into heaven. Since the War, Kern's teaching has attracted wide support in the Roman Communion. Among its now numerous adherents are Toner, Pohle-Preuss, Vermeersch, Kilker, and Geddes. Kern attempts to provide adequate safeguards against the grave abuses to which the doctrine may lead, by emphasising the need of adequate preparation and great devotion on the part of the recipient of Unction, if the desired effect is to be obtained. He teaches also that the effect may sometimes be speedy rather than immediate admission to glory.

[1] I owe this reference to Dr. Darwell Stone.

[2] Kern, however, contends (*De Sacramento Extremæ Unctionis*, pp. 207 ff.) that the Tridentine Fathers intended to include among the 'reliquiæ' of sin effaced by Unction 'the debt of temporal punishment' (to be paid in Purgatory). This, of course, may be so; but the majority of Roman Catholic theologians of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are (as Kern admits) of another opinion.

[3] Suarez and Alfonso dei Liguori are exceptions. Both favoured the doctrine, but said comparatively little about it.

Followers of Kern in their sermons recommend to the laity the devout reception of Unction as a certain means of escaping Purgatory, or shortening their sojourn therein.

It is unnecessary in this place to subject the arguments of Kern to detailed criticism, because we have already rejected the fundamental assumption on which they depend, viz. that Unction is primarily *a preparation for death*. It is sufficient merely to remind the reader that, according to primitive ideas, the divinely ordained preparation for death ('the provision for the last journey,' 'the medicine of immortality') is not Unction, but *the Eucharist received as viaticum*. Recent Eastern criticism of Kern's position is mainly directed to this point.

Kern would have been better advised had he set to work to correct the mediæval doctrine of Purgatory, which (it is worth observing) the Fathers of Trent prudently refrained from *explicitly* authorising, contenting themselves with the cautious affirmation that 'there exists a Purgatory; and that the souls therein detained are assisted by the prayers of the faithful, and especially by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar' (Sess. XXV., *Decretum de Purgatorio*). This doctrine, narrowly and strictly interpreted, would be accepted by most Anglican, and very many Eastern authorities; though there would be objections in many quarters to the term 'Purgatory,' on account of its sinister suggestion, and the numerous abuses which (as the Council of Trent itself acknowledged) attached themselves to it in the mediæval period.[1]

Eastern Abuses.

Among various abuses prevailing in the East may be specially mentioned the administration of Unction to persons in health (after Confession and Absolution) for the purpose of imparting fuller remission and cleansing from sin, with a view to a good Communion.

Goar, a very high authority, commenting on the *Euchologion* in 1647, absolutely denied that in his day such a practice anywhere existed, and explained away the apparent instances of it alleged by Latin controversialists. But that it widely prevails to-day, at least in the patriarchate of Constantinople, and particularly in Greece, cannot be questioned. Mesolaras definitely defends it as a fitting preparation for Communion (Ἐγχειρίδιον, p. 281); and Ralli actually states that the subject of this Sacra-

[1] The doctrine that the souls of Christians, in some cases at least, require purgation in the Intermediate State, is primitive, and is accepted to-day by important Orthodox authorities. But the usual Western mediæval teaching concerning Purgatory is materialistic, harsh, and irreconcilable with the mercy and loving-kindness of God. That the souls of reasonably good Christians, immediately after death, are 'in joy and felicity,' is the constant teaching of the Fathers, also of modern Orthodox and Anglican theologians.

ment is 'a baptised person, whether whole or sick' (περὶ τῶν μυστηρίων, p. 115).

It is said that among the Armenians in mediæval times the laity substituted Unction for Penance, considering it to be a less arduous and more agreeable method of obtaining Absolution. Because of this, its administration was discontinued by the ecclesiastical authorities. It is said to be now no longer in use among the Armenians, though the service once employed in its administration is still extant (Galanus, *Concil. Eccl. Armen. cum Rom.*, 1661, p. 632).

In Russia it is strictly forbidden to give Unction to the whole. The written directions handed to all priests at their ordination prescribe: 'Let no priest under any circumstances dare to perform the unction of oil over the whole.' Nevertheless, once a year, on Maundy Thursday (or on Holy Saturday) the faithful in some places are solemnly anointed with the use of a form given by A. Maltzew in his *Die Sacramente der Orthodox-katholischen Kirche des Morgenlandes*, 1898, pp. 549 ff. Some Russian theologians regard this practice as a mere abuse; others as an edifying non-sacramental rite; others as a unique exception to the general rule, sanctioned by the Church, and therefore a licit use of the Sacrament.

Patriarch Tikhon (who ought to be well informed) stated that this ceremony is only performed in the Cathedral of the Assumption, Moscow, on Holy Thursday. He appears to be entirely ignorant of the practice of anointing the whole which prevails extensively in Greece (see E. T. of the *Euchologion*, p. 607).

For the strange customs of the Nestorians in connection with Unction, see Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, p. cclxxvii, and Denzinger, *Ritus Orientalium*, Vol. II. p. 518. Unction is said to have become obsolete among the Nestorians, and rare among the Copts, whose service-books, however, prescribe daily Unction for a week in all cases of sickness. It appears that in certain instances the priests perform the service on the first day only, the patient anointing himself on the other six days with oil blessed by them. Such subsidiary anointings are in accordance with primitive practice, and should not be regarded as an abuse.

SUPPLEMENT. The Services for Unction and the Laying on of Hands, compiled by the Joint Committee of the Canterbury Convocation (see p. 473), were finally authorized (June 1936) 'for provisional use in the Province subject to due diocesan sanction,' and were published by the S.P.C.K. The Unction Service, which includes the Communion of the sick person, may be held either in church or in the house of sickness. Two forms for hallowing the oil (by either Bishop or Priest) are provided. The first is adapted from the Sarum Pontifical, the second from the Non-jurors' Liturgy. Apart from two modern prayers, the intercessions are drawn from the Sarum and York Manuals, the 'Gregorian' Sacramentary, the Greek Liturgies, and the Coptic rite. Imposition of Hands accompanies Unction. The prayer following the Anointing closely resembles the 1549 form. An alternative prayer is provided for use 'if there be small hope of recovery.'

THE COMMUNION OF THE SICK, VIATICUM, AND RESERVATION

By CHARLES HARRIS

ONLY one of the very numerous surviving early and mediæval Orders for the Visitation of the Sick contemplates the consecration of the Eucharist in the sick man's *house;* and in no instance is a direction given to celebrate in the sick man's *bed-chamber.*[1] In practically all pre-Reformation Orders, Communion (always given with the Reserved Sacrament, usually in one, sometimes in both kinds) formed only a single incident, brief but essential, in a comprehensive ministration comprising (1) Sacramental Confession, whenever needed; (2) Earnest and confident prayers for recovery frequently based on the scriptural miracles of healing and resurrection, and interspersed with suitable lections and anthems; (3) Imposition of hands in close connection with

[1] The Mass for use in a private house provided by the Gelasian Sacramentary was intended for (occasional) use in a private Oratory. It contains no allusion to sickness. On the other hand, the unique *Missa pro infirmo* appended to the Order for Visitation and Unction in the tenth-century Moissac Sacramentary (Martène, I. 7, 4; Ordo xi) distinctly contemplates celebration in the sick man's *house* (which may, however, mean a monastery or college). Thrice in this Mass the sick man is spoken of as being 'in this house'; not, however, 'in this room.' The sick man's Communion takes place, not at the Mass, but *in the course of the Visitation Office.* What is clearly intended is that the priest should first say Mass *in the oratory* of the house or monastery; and then carry the Sacrament reserved therefrom to the sick man's chamber or cell, and there begin the Visitation Office, which directs him to communicate the sick man in the ordinary way, after anointing him.

The normal early and mediæval practice was for a *Missa pro infirmo* to be celebrated in church on the first day that a serious case was visited, then for the priest to carry the Sacrament (reserved from that Mass) to the sick man's house. If no such Mass was said, he would make use of the Sacrament reserved in the Aumbry, Hanging Dove, Turris, or other receptacle, for the sick man's Communion. We learn from St. Augustine (*De Civit. Dei*, xxii. 8. 6) that the Eucharist was occasionally celebrated in haunted houses for exorcistic purposes. This was also the mediæval practice, but it was prescribed that the Mass should be said *in the oratory*, if the house possessed one. Even in these days, a priest is sometimes called in to exorcise a haunted house, as part of his ordinary parochial ministry. In such cases it is more important to encourage and bless the inmates of the house (who are in a state of abject terror) than to exorcise the house. This ministry is usually successful, probably because *it alters for the better the psychical atmosphere of the household.*

Unction; (4) Unction; (5) Communion, preceded and followed by very brief devotions (for further particulars see pp. 558 ff.).

Communion normally followed Unction, even at Rome. Only in rare cases did it precede it. At present throughout Latin Christendom Unction follows Communion, exceptions only occurring in certain instances, where a Church is still permitted to retain its own *Rituale* or local customs (see above p. 532).

The theory implied in the modern Anglican Prayer Book, and in the present Roman *Rituale*, is that the sick are communicated exclusively for their spiritual benefit. The Roman form of administration speaks only of this ('The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve *thy soul* unto everlasting life,' Tit. IV. cap. 2). And although the Anglican form, inherited from early mediæval times, lays special emphasis upon the effect of the Eucharist upon the body, the Rubrics and Prayers show little appreciation of this fact.

Modern dynamic psychology, which emphasises the unity of human personality, and the close organic connection between soul and body, teaches that every state of the soul affects the state of the body, and *vice versa*.

This was precisely the point of view of Primitive Christianity, the psychological outlook of which, though vitiated by its somewhat uncritical acceptance of the current demonology, was surprisingly sound and practical.

In early days the sick were communicated with a view to their mental and bodily as well as their spiritual health; the current belief being that at the Incarnation our Lord came into the world to be the Physician and Saviour, not of the soul alone, but of *the entire man*. Accordingly, not only the physically infirm, but also neurotics, epileptics, the insane, the mentally defective, and the 'possessed,' were freely communicated, when faith and devotion were present and there was no risk of irreverence.[1]

Unction, Imposition of Hands, and Exorcism were regarded as the chief healing ordinances, but secondary therapeutic effects were attributed to the sacraments in general, particularly to Communion, Absolution, and Baptism. A widely accepted view was that Baptism possessed, besides its more general therapeutic effects, a special efficacy for the cure of insanity.[2] Ex-

[1] This was the rule, though some early authorities discouraged the Communion of the insane. With regard to the 'possessed,' the Church of Rome still observes the ancient rule (*Rituale*, tit. xi, c. 1, 10), as does the Orthodox Church (see pp. 479, 517).

[2] Cyprian lays particular stress on this effect of Baptism. See Bingham, *Antiquities*, xi. 5. 5. References to the admission of 'energumens' to the Catechumenate and to Baptism are frequent in the early period. The Roman Church still ordains exorcists with the words 'Receive . . . and possess the power of laying hands on "energumens," whether baptised or catechumens' (*Pontificale*, Ratisbonæ, 1888, p. 20). On the other hand, there are instances

communication to some extent cancelled the effect of Baptism. It placed the guilty person under the power of Satan, and made him specially liable to grave physical and mental diseases (cf. St. Paul's teaching on 'the destruction of the flesh,' 1 Cor. v. 5). Repentance, followed by Absolution and restoration to Communion, enabled the penitent sinner once more to participate in the therapeutic effects of the Incarnation.

The long disuse of the Ministry of Healing has made these views seem strange—indeed all but superstitious—to many. They are, however, absolutely scriptural, primitive, and psychologically sound. Their whole-hearted adoption is a necessary condition of successful therapeutic ministry to the sick.[1]

Primitive Reservation.

In early times the unity of the Church was a matter of deep concern. It was at once expressed and safeguarded by insistence upon the principle of 'the one Eucharist.' Both at Jerusalem (Acts ii. 46) and in the Pauline Churches (Acts xx. 7) 'the Breaking of Bread' was the centre of worship and fellowship. St. Paul lays especial stress upon this point: 'For we who are many are one bread,[2] one body; for we all partake of the one bread'[2] (1 Cor. x. 16). In the next generation St. Ignatius (about A.D. 110) writes: 'Take heed to have but one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup unto the unity of his Blood; one altar; as there is one Bishop, along with the Presbytery and Deacons, my fellow-servants; that so, whatever ye do, ye may do it according to God. . . . Let that be deemed a valid Eucharist which is celebrated either by the Bishop or by one to whom he has entrusted it' (*Philadelphians*, 4; *Smyrnæans*, 8).

The idea of a private celebration—at least as a normal practice—is plainly out of keeping with such a corporate conception of the Eucharistic rite as this. Consequently we are not surprised to find in the earliest description of the Eucharistic Service

---

of the baptism of 'energumens' being postponed until the approach of death.

It should be remembered that Exorcism was used frequently and continuously during the whole of the period of preparation for Baptism, also at the beginning of the baptismal rite itself.

[1] It is still the popular belief in England that delicate infants thrive better after being baptised. The eleventh-century N. Italian Services, edited by Dom Lambot for the H.B.S., 1931, strongly emphasise the therapeutic value of Baptism by directing (in the case of a sick infant) a special prayer for healing, together with a special benediction of the font, intended to communicate to the water definitely therapeutic virtues (pp. 6–7). Faith in Confirmation as a cure for blindness still exists in parts of England. It may be based on actual cures of 'psychical' or 'nervous' blindness.

[2] *Or* loaf.

(that of St. Justin Martyr, *c.* A.D. 155) that the absent, whether sick or whole, were communicated from the one altar or table of the Lord. 'When the President [or Bishop] has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent [by saying *Amen*], then those whom we call deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine mixed with water over which the thanksgiving has been pronounced; and they carry away [a portion] to those who are absent.' And again: 'The distribution and partaking of those things over which the thanksgiving has been pronounced is made to each one, and [they] are sent to the absent by the hands of the deacons' (*Apol.*, I. 65, 67).

Whether any other methods of Reservation were in use in Justin's age is not known. It is certain, however, that by the end of the second century, the laity, both in Africa and in Rome—probably also in other places—were permitted to carry the Sacrament away with them in suitable receptacles, to communicate themselves at home on days when they were unable to come to church, or when the Eucharistic Liturgy was not celebrated. Daily Communion was thus rendered possible for all; and there is reason to believe that it was extensively practised.[1]

The sick, however, were not normally communicated in their homes by their lay friends. They were visited daily (or at least very frequently) by the clergy, from whom they received the Reserved Sacrament, and by whom they were also frequently anointed.

Importance of the Viaticum.

From very early times great importance was attached to reception of the Eucharist by the dying, partly as a 'provision for the (last) journey' (ἐφόδιον, *viaticum*); partly also as an assurance of resurrection to life eternal.[2]

[1] See *Egyptian Church Order* (i.e. Hippolytus's *Apostolic Tradition*), p. 177 in Hauler's *Didascalia*, or p. 190 in *Texts and Studies*, Vol. VIII. 4; Tertullian, *De Oratione*, 19; *Ad Uxorem*, ii. 5; *De Exhortatione Castitatis*, 7 (which probably refers to the private distribution of the Eucharist to members of his family by a Christian father); Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, 26 (where the vessel of Reservation is named 'arca'). See above, pp. 101, 102.

That such private Reservation was still allowed both in the East and in the West late in the fourth century is shown by Basil, *Ep.* xciii, and Jerome, *Ep.* xlviii. 15. Owing to abuses of various kinds this privilege was gradually withdrawn. It lasted longest in the Celtic Churches. In the mediæval Western Church generally, it was an exceptional privilege granted to favoured individuals, especially monarchs, who were sometimes even allowed to carry the Reserved Sacrament on their persons.

[2] Cf. the naïve and archaic language of the N. Italian Service Book mentioned above: '[The dying man] is to be communicated with the Holy Sacrifice, even if he has eaten on that very day; because the Communion will be a defence to him, and will assist him to obtain the resurrection of the just, for *the Communion itself* (*ipsa*) *will raise him up*. And when thou communicatest him,

If the majority of recent critics are right in finding in John vi a direct (or indirect) reference to the Eucharist, then the main ideas connected with *viaticum* have scriptural authority (see especially v. 54, 'he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day').

St. Ignatius (*c.* A.D. 110), who is usually supposed to have been acquainted with the Fourth Gospel, speaks of the Eucharist as 'the medicine of immortality' (a phrase which has stamped itself upon the mind of the Church); and expresses an ardent desire to receive it in view of his approaching martyrdom ('breaking one bread, which is the medicine of immortality, and the antidote that we should not die, but live for ever in Jesus Christ,' *Ephesians*, 20; 'Come fire, and cross, and grapplings with wild beasts! . . . I desire the bread of God which is the flesh of Christ, who was of the seed of David, and for a draught I desire his blood, which is love incorruptible,' *Romans*, 7).

The earnest desire of the early Christians to receive the Holy Communion in their last hour finds liturgical expression in the *Liturgy of St. Basil* ('Grant unto us at our last breath to receive worthily our share of thy hallowed gifts unto a *viaticum* (ἐφόδιον) of eternal life, for an acceptable defence before the awful Judgment Seat of thy Christ'); and very similar words occur in that of *St. Mark*.

The giving of *viaticum* was always a solemn ecclesiastical act, under the control of the Bishop, who decided whether it should be given or not; though, as a matter of fact, it was never refused, even to those who had lapsed in time of persecution, if there was any real evidence of repentance.

The first Œcumenical Council (of Nicæa, A.D. 325) laid down the rule concerning *viaticum*, which has ever since been authoritative for the entire Church: 'Concerning the dying, let the ancient and canonical rule still be kept; that none be deprived at the hour of death of the most necessary *viaticum* (τοῦ . . . ἀναγκαιοτάτου ἐφοδίου). . . . And let the Bishop give the Eucharist, with due investigation, to everyone who asks to receive it at the end' (Can. 13).

Nicæa I is accepted as œcumenical not only by the Church of England, but also by the English State, which has adopted the decrees of the first four Œcumenical Councils (though not these exclusively) as the standard of Christian orthodoxy.[1] It therefore forms part of the authoritative teaching of Church and State, that to receive Communion in the hour of death is 'most necessary' (ἀναγκαιότατον). This implies that there is

say thus: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ *intincted with his blood* preserve thy soul to life eternal. Amen"' (p. 47). Communion in this case was in both kinds by intinction.

[1] See below, p. 600.

an urgent obligation upon every dying person to seek Communion, and upon every priest to use the utmost diligence to give it.[1] Belief that *viaticum* is 'most necessary' for the dying has had a decisive influence upon the entire history of Reservation, and has been an important factor in its modern revival.

That as early as the middle of the third century the clergy of Alexandria were accustomed to reserve the Eucharist continuously, for the purpose of giving *viaticum* at any hour of the day or night, is clearly shown by an incident recorded by Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria (who died about A.D. 264), and preserved by Eusebius. An aged Christian, Serapion, who had been excommunicated for sacrificing to heathen deities in time of persecution, but had since lived blamelessly, lay dying, and sent his young nephew to find one of the priests, and to request him to come and communicate him before he died. The priest, being too ill to come, entrusted the Sacrament to the lad, who himself communicated the dying man, to his great comfort. Dionysius thus comments on the incident. 'I had ordered that persons at the point of death, if they made request, and especially if they happened previously to have humbly sought [reconciliation], should be absolved (ἀφίεσθαι), that they might depart in good hope' (*H. E.*, vi. 44).

In time of persecution, the utmost endeavours were made to communicate the martyrs in prison, in order to strengthen them for their approaching conflict (Cyprian, *Ep.* v. 2). This, however, was not always possible. It is related of Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, who was martyred under Maximinus at Nicomedia in 311 or 312, that, as he lay dying in prison, without access to church or altar, and unable to move because

[1] It has been the practice of the Church to give Communion to a dying person, even if he has already received it in church on the same day, while in health. Whether reception in such circumstances is strictly obligatory *jure divino* is a disputed point among Latin theologians. In primitive times, dying persons were allowed to repeat their *viaticum* as often as they desired—even several times in the same day or night. Thus in the fifth century St. Melania caused the dying convert Volusianus (who had just been baptised) to be communicated three times in the same night. Later, she herself, perceiving her end approaching, caused the Eucharist to be celebrated by her chaplain in the oratory contiguous to her cell, and communicated. '[Then] at day, the bishop of Jerusalem [again] brought her the Eucharist. Then in the evening she communicated for the third time a few moments before she expired'—(*Vita S. Melaniæ*, ed. Rampolla y Tindaro, 1905, LV, LXVII).

Similarly, in the fourth century, the dying S. Basil of Cæsarea, by an heroic effort, rose from his bed and received the Eucharist in church. On the same day he also received it at home, whereupon, 'lying in his bed, with the Eucharist still in his mouth, he rendered up his spirit to the Lord' (see the anonymous *Vita Basilii*, c. iv, in Migne, *P.G.*, xxix. 315).

In the modern Roman Church, a person who has received *viaticum* may be—and often is—communicated daily until he dies or recovers. This practice is in accord with that of primitive antiquity, and is to be recommended in suitable cases.

of bonds and wounds, 'he celebrated the awful Sacrifice upon his own breast while lying down,' and communicated both himself and other Christian prisoners, who formed a ring round him, to guard the sacred action from the observation of the heathen (Philostorgius, *H. E.*, ii. 13). This, of course, is not an instance of Reservation, but it affords a remarkable illustration of the importance attributed in early days to *viaticum*.

Private Celebrations for the Sick.

Private celebrations for the sick, though not entirely unknown, were exceedingly rare in the primitive and mediæval periods, and some of the instances usually quoted are doubtful. Perhaps the clearest example is that recorded by Uranius in his *Epistle concerning the Death of Paulinus of Nola*, 2: 'And when about to set forth to meet the Lord, he ordered the sacred mysteries to be celebrated (*exhiberi*) beside his bed; in order that he might commend his soul to the Lord, after the sacrifice had been offered in concert with the holy bishops,' viz. Symmachus and Acindynus, who had come to visit him. This instance, though clear, is not a normal one. Paulinus was a bishop, not a layman, and Uranius's language (*una cum sanctis episcopis oblato sacrificio*) suggests that he desired, not only to receive the Eucharist, but also to exercise his priestly office for the last time, by *concelebrating* with the visiting bishops. This point cannot, however, be pressed, because the expression 'to offer sacrifice' was sometimes used of communicating as well as of celebrating. Paulinus died about 431. In England, we read that Archbishop Dunstan had Mass celebrated by his bedside, as he lay dying, and so received his *viaticum*.

The mind of the Church with regard to private celebrations is expressed in the Canons of various early Councils, both Eastern and Western ('Neither bishops nor presbyters ought to offer in houses,' *Laodicea c.* 350, can. 58; 'Any presbyter, who without consulting his bishop celebrates a service in whatever place he wishes, acts dishonourably,' *Carthage, c.* 390, can. 9. A similar regulation was made by the Eastern *Concilium in Trullo*, can. 31).

Occasionally, but very rarely, the Eucharist was celebrated in the private oratories of prominent citizens (for an instance see Paulinus, *Life of St. Ambrose*, 10). As has been indicated, the Gelasian Sacramentary provides an order for a mass in a private house, but the prayers contain no allusion to sickness. Freestone's conclusion is a fair deduction from the facts: 'We may sum up by remarking that the instances of private celebration for clinical communion are greatly outweighed by the constant attitude of disapproval towards the performance of the Liturgy elsewhere than in a consecrated building.' [1]

[1] *The Sacrament Reserved*, p. 31.

Reservation in Both Kinds.

Freestone's conclusion (*The Sacrament Reserved*, pp. 119 ff.), that during the primitive period (*i.e.* the first four and early fifth centuries) Reservation for the Sick was normally in one kind only, has not been seriously shaken by recent criticism, though certain good authorities now consider that he has somewhat underestimated the amount of Reservation in both kinds in this period, and that the 'Justinian' method of communicating the sick lasted longer and prevailed more widely than he allows.

More open to adverse criticism is his conclusion that Reservation in both kinds continued to be rare throughout the later period. A most significant fact in this connection is that the prevalence of the Manichæan heresy in Rome caused both Pope Leo the Great (440–461) and Pope Gelasius I (492–496) to lay special stress on reception of the chalice, as a testimony of orthodoxy. The latter, writing to bishops Majoricus and John, goes so far as to declare: 'We have learnt that certain persons, after receiving only the portion of the sacred Body, abstain from the chalice of the sacred Blood. These persons, without doubt (since they are said to be bound by I know not what superstition), should either partake of the sacraments in their entirety, or be excluded from the entire sacraments; because division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege'[1] (quoted by Gratian, *Corpus J.C. Decr.*, iii pars; *De Consecr.*, dist. 11. c. 12).

Too much ought not to be read into these words of Gelasius. He is speaking, not of the Communion of the Sick (which from the most ancient times had frequently been given in one kind only), but solely of Communion in church at Mass. Nevertheless, the circumstance that two Popes laid dogmatic stress on Communion in both kinds must have made orthodox members of the Roman Church attach more importance than before to the reception of the chalice, not only in church, but also in their own homes when sick.

The copious historical evidence now available supports this conclusion. Prof. M. Andrieu, in his valuable treatise *Immixtio et Consecratio*, 1924, produces (pp. 114 ff.) a truly imposing list of instances, ranging from the sixth to the end of the eleventh century, of Communion being given to the sick in both kinds. In several instances, it is expressly stated or clearly implied, that the chalice itself was carried from the church.

Andrieu contends that, though the phrase '*corpore et sanguine Christi*,' so often used in connection with Communion of the Sick, occasionally (owing to belief in Concomitance) denotes

[1] Leo I had previously excommunicated certain Manichæan heretics who abstained from the chalice. He speaks very strongly on the subject in *Serm.* xlii (xli) (see Migne, *P.L.*, liv. 279–80).

Communion in one kind alone, yet such instances are rare, and, moreover, are balanced by others, where the statement that the sick person was communicated 'with the Body of Christ' by no means excludes the subsequent administration of the Cup, which is sometimes casually mentioned in another part of the same document, or is established by independent testimony.

Dom Lambot, who accepts Andrieu's conclusions, writes: 'The practice of administering in *viaticum* the bread and the consecrated wine prevailed for a long period *everywhere* (fut longtemps partout répandu),' *op. cit.*, p. xli, note.

There can be no doubt that Freestone is perfectly right in maintaining that, throughout this later period, Reservation of the Host alone still remained in use, and that in cases of emergency or special difficulty the sick were communicated, as in the primitive period, in one kind. On the other hand, it seems to be an established fact, that in cases where no serious inconvenience was involved, the clergy usually preferred to give and the sick to receive Communion in both kinds.

It should be specially noted that from the sixth century onwards it was the frequent—perhaps the most usual—practice for the ministering priest (in cases of sickness which were not urgent) first to celebrate in church a Mass for the Sick; then, laying aside his chasuble, and carrying in his hands the chalice and paten, to go forth from the church in solemn procession to the sick man's house (accompanied by all the ministers and clerks, if any were present), and to communicate him directly from the altar, precisely in the manner described by St. Justin Martyr. Allusions to this practice are so numerous in both mediæval Orders and historical documents that it is needless to cite examples.

Accordingly, the 1549 Revisers had the support of early mediæval as well as primitive precedent, when they prescribed as the normal method of communicating the sick (when due notice was given) the carrying of the Sacrament (in both kinds) directly from the altar to the sick person, while still permitting Perpetual Reservation of the Host alone, with a view to making satisfactory provision for cases of special difficulty, or sudden emergency—in particular, unexpected calls to give *viaticum* to persons *in extremis* (see below, pp. 551 ff.).

Reservation in the Church of England.

Reservation, being an œcumenical custom, was accepted from the beginning by the Church of England. The Celtic and the Roman missionaries, differing upon many points, were agreed upon this. It is recorded that the Celtic clergy frequently carried the Reserved Sacrament about with them on their journeys, for the purpose of communicating any sick or dying

persons whom they might happen to meet.[1] The Oil of the Sick was also carried in a similar manner by both priests and bishops.

At the period of the Reformation, Reservation was regulated by the Canon Law, especially as contained in Wm. Lyndwood's *Provinciale, seu Constitutiones Angliæ*. This great treatise, having been approved by the Convocations of both Provinces, possessed unquestioned authority, and statutory force was given to its constitutions by the Act, 25 Hen. VIII cap. 19 ('Provided also, that such Canons, Constitutions, Ordinances, and Synodals Provincial, being already made, which be not contrariant nor repugnant to the laws, statutes, and customs of this realm, nor to the damage or hurt of the king's prerogative royal, shall now still be used, and executed as they were afore the making of this Act').

It was further provided that the ancient Canon Law should remain in force until such time as it should be reviewed and determined by a commission of thirty-two persons appointed for that purpose.

But inasmuch as the labours of this Commission proved abortive, Lyndwood's *Provinciale* still possesses—in theory at least—both canonical and statutory force. Certain of its provisions have been recognised as authoritative by both ecclesiastical and secular courts within living memory.

The seventeenth-century Anglican divines were familiar with the *Provinciale*, and frequently quote it as authoritative. A new edition, containing the greater part of Lyndwood's valuable notes, was published at Oxford in 1664 by Dr. Sharrock. The full text may be conveniently read in the unusually well-printed edition of 1527.

The principal regulations about Reservation contained in the *Provinciale* are the *Constitutions* of John Peckham, of date 1279 and 1281. The most important passage from Peckham is thus rendered in the English translation of 1534, which omits Lyndwood's annotations:—'We commaunde the most worthy sacrament of the aulter from hencforth so to be kept, that in every parish church ther be a tabernacle[2] with a closing

[1] Instances of private celebrations in England in the Middle Ages are very rare. One tenth-century Canon, however, allows Mass to be celebrated in a private house, 'for great need, or if anyone be sick'; and another 'for anyone's extreme sickness.' On the other hand, another Canon of that age fines a priest 12 ores, who celebrates in an unconsecrated building, without alluding to any exception (B. Thorpe, *Ancient Laws*, pp. 398, 417, 445). Danger from pirates or invading armies was usually considered to justify the practice of celebrating in a private house.

On the Continent, private celebrations for the sick seem to have been least unusual in Spain. They were, however, uncommon everywhere, and in most places strictly forbidden (Martène, I. 3. 5). The practice was not entirely unknown in France even in the seventeenth century.

[2] This term was applied both to the hanging dove (containing the pyx) over the altar, and to the aumbry or cupboard for Reservation.

(*clausura*) come(n)ly made, worthely as the greatness of the cure and thability of the chyrch may bere, in the which the lorde's body may be collocate, and in nowyse shal it be put in a purse or bag for fear of breakyng, but in a fayre pyx garnyshed within with the purest lynyn, so that without jeopardye of breaking it may lightly be taken out and put in, which honourable sacrament we commaunde every Sonday to be renewed' (p. 66; for the Latin, see Bk. III, p. 179, of the 1527 edition and p. 352 of that of 1664).

Peckham's directions obviously exclude separate Reservation of the two kinds; but they do not *necessarily* exclude Reservation of the intincted Host, a practice which was not unknown in his time, though Reservation in the species of bread alone was more usual.[1] As the practice of giving Communion in one kind, even at Mass, had already established itself in some places in his day, and rapidly spread afterwards, Reservation in both kinds naturally became obsolete.

First Prayer Book of Edward VI.

The 1549 English Prayer Book prescribed by rubric two new methods of communicating the sick:—

(1) 'If the same day there be a celebration of the Holy Communion in the Church, then shall the priest reserve (at the open Communion) so much of the sacrament of the Body and Blood as shall serve the sick person, and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any). And as soon as he conveniently may, after the open Communion ended in the Church, shall go and minister the same, first to those that are appointed to communicate with the sick (if there be any), and last of all to the sick person himself. But before the curate distribute the Holy Communion, the appointed General Confession must be made in the name of the communicants, the curate adding the Absolution, with the Comfortable Sentences of Scripture following in the open Communion, and after the Communion ended, the Collect, *Almighty and everlasting God, we most heartily thank thee*, etc.' This rubric merely revived the earlier mediæval practice. It is unnecessary to assume that it was based upon the familiar passage in Justin's *Apology*. The Compilers cannot have known this passage (as has been suggested) through the Latin version of Justin by Pico della Mirandola. Pico translated only the *Cohortatio*, not the *Apology*. The Greek text of Justin was not printed till 1551.

[1] Where the *intincted* Host was reserved (a procedure which in my opinion Peckham does not contemplate, but refrains from forbidding, because it was the recognised practice in some districts), the Host was probably enclosed in a small interior receptacle resting on the linen lining of the pyx, or else the linen lining was so arranged as to cover the sides only (not the bottom) of the pyx.

It was further directed that the sick man should give notice overnight, or early in the morning, of his desire to communicate, and of the number purposing to communicate with him. This method of communicating the sick is mentioned first, and is obviously regarded as the normal one in case of notice being given.

(2) 'But if the day be not appointed for the open Communion in the Church, then (upon convenient warning given) the curate shall come and visit the sick person afore noon. And having a convenient[1] place in the sick man's house (where he may reverently celebrate) with all things necessary for the same . . . he shall there celebrate the Holy Communion after such form and sort as hereafter is appointed.'

This form included Introit, Kyrie, the present Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, *Sursum corda*, etc., and the entire Canon.

Actual celebration in the sick person's *house* constituted a distinct breach, not only with mediæval, but also with primitive tradition, but the Compilers were probably only imperfectly aware of this. Their avowed object was to do all things according to 'the laudable custom of the primitive Church,' and they probably imagined that instances of private celebrations for the sick in primitive times were more frequent than in fact they were.

Since, however, they retained Reservation as the normal method of communicating the sick, their departure from primitive custom was not serious, and is capable of satisfactory defence. Beyond doubt it is an advantage to a chronic invalid, unable to go to church, to have occasional opportunities of taking part in the entire service of Holy Communion.

What, however, cannot be defended is the unsatisfactory Collect and Epistle provided for use on all such occasions. These suggest that sickness is normally—indeed in all cases—a 'correction,' 'chastisement,' 'rebuke' and 'scourging' from God, not an evil to be combated. Instead of encouraging the patient to glorify God by recovering, they suggest that his duty to God is to remain ill and continue to suffer patiently. The allusion to death, again, though not unsuitable in administering *viaticum*, is of somewhat sinister import, and therefore inappropriate

[1] It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that 'convenient' does not mean 'near the sick man's bed,' but 'comely,' or 'fitting,' according to its established contemporary signification, as is made obvious by what follows ('where he may *reverently* celebrate'). In a large and well-furnished house the sick man's bed-chamber might often be 'convenient'; seldom, however, in a mean cottage. In a cottage, the priest would normally celebrate in the best living-room, carrying the Reserved Sacrament afterwards to the sick man. If this living-room were too small, too dirty, or otherwise not 'convenient,' he would bring the Reserved Sacrament with him from the church. (For 'convenient' in this sense, cf. 'faire or conveniente cup' in the Communion Office, also Eph. v. 4; Prov. xxx. 8; and especially Wisd. xiii. 14, 'a convenient [*i.e.* worthy or handsome] room.') Aless translates, *in loco decenti*.

for ordinary use. It is, of course, the duty of the parish priest to instruct the patient to prepare for possible death, but, on the other hand—at least in normal cases—to expect recovery. To associate the idea of death in ordinary cases with the administration of Sick Communion and Unction is a serious psychological and theological mistake. They should rather be associated in the patient's mind with life, health, and recovery. Moreover, Heb. xii. 5–6 is misunderstood and misapplied. The biblical context shows that it really refers, not to disease, but to persecution, shame, and threatened martyrdom.

This Collect and this Epistle have unfortunately been retained in all subsequent editions of the Prayer Book, even in that of 1928; which, however, has somewhat improved the Office by providing two alternative Collects (one of which refers to healing), an alternative Epistle (2 Cor. i. 3), and an alternative Gospel (John x. 14, 15, 27–30).

It is probable that the two methods of communicating the sick provided by the First Prayer Book were intended to be supplementary to the traditional method. It is significant that they only provide for the giving of Communion *after previous notice has been given*, and *within certain hours* (viz. the forenoon).[1] The priest is not instructed (probably because there was no need) how to deal with cases of emergency which call for immediate attention. Of all the summonses to minister which a parish priest receives, the most urgent is the summons to give *viaticum* to a person *in extremis*. Such calls come at any hour of the day or night, most commonly perhaps in the small hours of the morning, when vitality is at its lowest point. They must have been quite common in 1549, when the great bulk of the clergy and people of England still believed that to receive *viaticum* in the hour of death is 'most necessary,' and when neglect to provide it would have been regarded as a grievous neglect of duty, and deeply resented.[2]

Viaticum had always been given previously with the Reserved Sacrament; and the Perpetual Reservation which alone rendered its giving secure was not forbidden by the 1549 Book—in fact it was still presumably enjoined by both Canon and Statute Law. Consequently it is practically certain that in many parishes at least the incumbent would continue to reserve continuously, both for giving *viaticum* and for other purposes as well.

The Book, for example, made no provision for the cases, which

[1] 'The curate shall come and visit the sick person *afore noon*,' second rubric of *The Communion of the Sick*.

[2] For an account of the important Brandenburg Church Order of 1540 (Lutheran), which was in the hands of the 1549 Revisers, and from which they borrowed a few phrases of their rubrics, see pp. 574 ff. Though this Order prescribed Reservation, the Compilers did not adopt the methods there directed.

must have been as common in 1549 as now, when a poor sick person desired Communion, but there was no 'convenient place' in his over-crowded and ill-provided house, where 'the curate might reverently minister with all things necessary for the same.' Again, the priest was not instructed what to do, if the intending communicant lived in a remote place, at a distance from a good road. It is most unlikely that the priest would take the risk of carrying the chalice over stiles, rough country, and unbridged streams. The Sacrament being perpetually reserved, he would almost certainly carry it in one kind only—in the pyx, as had been the custom. That the Edwardine Reformers, while insisting strongly on Communion being given in both kinds at Mass, permitted the Host alone to be still administered in cases of 'necessity,' is well attested. The Act of Parliament, passed on Dec. 27, 1547, for the purpose of implementing the decision of Convocation in the previous November, prescribed 'that the said most blessed Sacrament be hereafter *commonly* delivered and ministered unto the people . . . under both the kinds, *except necessity otherwise require*' (*Act against Revilers and for Receiving in Both Kinds*, Statutes of the Realm, iv. 2; Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, p. 322). Almost identical words occur in the Proclamation prefixed to *The Order of the Communion*, 1548, which was in the possession of all Parish Priests. The only interpretation which they could reasonably give to the words of the Proclamation, 'the most blessed Sacrament of the body and bloud of our saviour Christ should henceforth be commonly delivered unto all persones . . . under bothe kyndes, that is to say, of bread and wyne, *except necessitie otherwaies require*,' was that it authorised them to reserve the Host alone for the purpose of communicating the sick and dying in cases of 'necessitie.' The reason why the 1549 Book did not give explicit directions as to the method of giving Communion by Reservation in cases of 'necessitie' was the obvious one that it was quite familiar. On the other hand, the two fresh methods were entirely unfamiliar, and the clergy required to be instructed as to their due use.

There is, fortunately, a fair amount of evidence—quite as much as could reasonably be expected under the circumstances—that this is what actually took place. 'Though,' writes Mr. Lockton (*The Remains of the Eucharist*, p. 250),[1] 'there were two different forms of procedure put forth for use . . . it seems probable that very frequently neither of these, but the traditional method of administering the reserved sacrament, was adopted, and that in some places, though not in others, there was continuous reservation in one kind as before; and this does

[1] Lockton includes in his survey the slightly different method of ministering the Reserved Sacrament prescribed in Aless's Latin translation of the 1549 Book, published in 1551. But with this we need not here concern ourselves.

not appear to have been always prevented by the civil authorities, as might have been expected. Pyxes occur very frequently in the inventories of Church goods made by the Commissioners on their visitation in 1552, *and not seldom they were allowed to be retained. In some cases they are spoken of as actually containing the blessed sacrament*, as at Edlesborough, Bucks, and Flintham, Notts. A noteworthy example is that of Saffron Walden, where, in connection with the visitation on Oct. 5, 1552, is mentioned . . . " a little round box to carry the sacrament in, with a purse to put it in " . . . We notice that this was within a month of the time, Nov. 1, when the Second Prayer Book would be obligatory.

' The use of a pyx in the form of a " little round box " would hardly be necessary, or even particularly useful, if the sacrament in both kinds was to be taken from the Church immediately after the service, and it seems evident that the rubrics of the First Prayer Book, which clearly, as we have noted, did not provide for every possibility, were not interpreted as forbidding continuous reservation. The Saffron Walden case indeed suggests that it would continue even under the Second Book ' [1] (the italics are not in the original).

Lockton, with commendable caution, somewhat understates his case, and draws from the evidence only the minimal conclusion, that Perpetual Reservation (in one kind only, as prescribed by the ancient Canon Law) continued in use in the period 1549 to 1552 ' in some places, though not in others.'

Numerous fresh facts, however, recently made available, point to the probable conclusion, that Perpetual Reservation in one kind was somewhat widely diffused in most parts of the country, except perhaps London (the headquarters of the Reforming Movement), where not many pyxes seem to have been in use in 1552. The antiquarian authorities rightly draw attention to the fact that even in this year there were very numerous instances of pyxes being still preserved in parish churches. For example, Preby. Christopher Wordsworth mentions that of the 122 churches in the Oxford diocese, 45 still retained pyxes.[2] To this number we must add the cheap substitutes for pyxes (boxes of base metal) which were certainly in use in some parishes (perhaps in many) as substitutes for pyxes of gold or silver purloined or sold. More-

[1] The removal by the Commissioners of the pyxes (in a considerable number of instances) cannot fairly be regarded as evidence that pyxes were ' illegal ornaments.' Being plunderers, they probably removed them in most cases where they were of any considerable value. After their departure the churchwardens would in many instances replace the costly pyx by a ' little round box ' of little worth. All sorts of illegal things were done in the period 1549–52 by bishops and other authorities of extreme reforming views; *e.g.* in some places altars were demolished, vestments forbidden, and the two altar lights (expressly retained by the Injunctions of 1547) prohibited.

[2] See *Prayer Book Dictionary*, p. 610.

over some allowance ought also to be made for the natural tendency of incumbents and churchwardens to hide their treasured pyxes on the approach of the predatory Commissioners, with a view to preserving them.

The Saffron Walden case mentioned by Lockton is even more significant than he represents it. The specially noteworthy point about it is that the Commissioners did not merely allow a receptacle for Perpetual Reservation to be retained; *but they themselves handed over 'the little round box' to the Wardens for the express purpose that it might be used for carrying the Sacrament to the sick.* On the day when they did this (Oct. 5th, 1552), the Second Book of Edward had already been enacted by Parliament (this took place on April 15th, 1552), and it was to come into actual use in less than a month (on Nov. 1st). Of course, technically speaking, what happened only proves that the Commissioners regarded Continuous Reservation in one kind as lawful *under the First Book.* But it is altogether unlikely that they would hand over to the Wardens for actual use an object which in their belief would become an 'illegal ornament' in less than a month. Here we have evidence approaching—if not quite reaching—certainty, that the Royal Commissioners regarded continuous Reservation in one kind as lawful even under the Second Book of Edward.

It may be worth while, in this connection, to give a literal transcription of this significant entry :—'*Goods delivered for the ministration of the divine service.* To James Cowle and Thomas Marten, churchwardens, a chalice of silver and gilt of 15 ounces; a cope of red velvet; [1] a carpet of blue velvet for the Communion Table, and seven linen cloths for the same; *a little round box to carry the Sacrament in, with a purse to put it in ;* and all the surplices' (*Proceedings of the Essex Archæological Society*, N.S. iii. 25-27, spelling modernised).

Mr. F. C. Eeles, who first drew attention to this entry, remarks: 'Saffron Walden . . . was a fair-sized town near London—not a distant, hole-and-corner place, out of touch with what was going on. *Here we have strong confirmation of the Bishop of Salisbury's*[2] *position that Reservation was not excluded by the Prayer Book of* 1552' [3] (italics mine).

[1] The cope (the use of which would be discontinued on Nov. 1) was obviously intended to be cut up and made into a hearse-cloth or altar-cloth, as was expressly directed in not a few other cases by the Commissioners.

[2] *I.e.* Bishop John Wordsworth, an unusually well-equipped liturgical authority—one, moreover, not friendly to the modern movement for the revival of Reservation (see his *The Ministry of Grace*, p. 382). Mr. Eeles' opinion on this matter is of considerable weight, owing to his extensive and accurate archæological knowledge.

[3] Letter to *The Guardian*, Sept. 11, 1901, quoted by V. Staley in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, Vol. II. p. 160.

The Revisers of 1549 appealed to the doctrine and practice of the primitive Church as authoritative, and they were well aware that the primitive as well as the mediæval Church regarded *viaticum* as most necessary. And since they gave no explicit directions in their Book for the manner of giving *viaticum*, the natural conclusion to draw is that they intended to permit—or at least to tolerate—the giving of *viaticum* in the traditional way.

Their exhortation to the laity to receive the Sacrament frequently in time of health, lest in case of a sudden visitation they 'be unquieted for lack of the same,' also their statement (suggested by a rubric of the Sarum Manual) that in case of necessity spiritual communion may be substituted for sacramental communion, fall far short of denial of the primitive doctrine formulated at Nicæa, that to receive *viaticum* in the hour of death is 'most necessary.' [1]

The Second Book of Edward.

The Prayer Book of 1552 omitted all mention of Reservation. It directed that if a sick person, desirous to receive the Holy Communion, gave due notice, and secured 'a good number' of neighbours to communicate with him, then the curate 'shall there minister the Holy Communion' in a convenient place.

It should be observed that the priest is not directed to 'celebrate' (*i.e.* 'consecrate') as in 1549, but only to 'minister.' The 1552 Book contained no direction (as did that of 1549) to recite the Prayer of Consecration, or indeed to use any prayers at all after the appointed Collect, Epistle, and Gospel.

The directions given are so vague that they are capable of several interpretations.

(1) Since the word 'minister' properly means 'distribute,' and was always used in this sense in the 1549 Book, and since, moreover, the 1549 direction to consecrate by using the form of consecration provided in the Communion Office was struck out in 1552, it has been suggested that the Compilers intended the priest to 'minister' (*i.e.* 'distribute') the Bread and Wine to the sick man and his friends, *without first consecrating them.*

But though it is undeniable that certain of the Compilers held the extreme Protestant view that the elements become sacramental by 'use,' not by consecration, and perhaps even regarded the practice of consecrating them as superstitious, yet

[1] The Sarum Office *De extrema Unctione* has the following rubric: 'Then let the sick person be communicated, unless he has previously been communicated (*i.e.* in the preceding Office for *Visitation*); and unless there is reasonable fear of vomiting or some other irreverence, in which case let the priest say to the sick person, *Brother, in this case faith alone sufficeth thee: only believe and thou hast eaten*' (similarly the York Office). Archbishop Egbert trusts in God's mercy for the dying man, if through no fault of his own he fails to receive the Eucharist in the article of death (*Pœnitentiale*, lib. 1. cap. 13).

it is clear that the majority were not of this opinion, because they inserted in the 1552 Communion Office a very definite Prayer of Consecration addressed to God; not a mere exhortation or Scripture reading addressed to the communicants, as many of the more extreme continental Reformers recommended.

Moreover, their directions can hardly have had this intention or effect, because the Elizabethan Revisers, who held very different views, did not think it necessary to introduce any alterations into the 1552 Office for the Communion of the Sick.

(2) According to another view, equally possible grammatically, the Compilers intended the priest in all cases to bring the Reserved Sacrament with him from the church, and immediately after the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel to 'minister' (distribute) it to the sick man and his friends in both kinds, precisely as is directed in the 1549 Book.

It is quite true that the 1552 Revisers—or most of them—were not prepared absolutely to condemn Reservation as prescribed in the 1549 Book. Indeed the 1552 Act of Uniformity, which prescribed the new Book, declared that the old one contained nothing 'but what was agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church'; and that such doubts as had been raised proceeded rather from 'the curiosity of the ministers, and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause.'

Furthermore, they were well aware that Reservation for the Sick was not only tolerated, but even defended and practised by not a few of the leaders of the school of thought to which they mostly belonged, viz. the advanced Calvinistic. For example, it is all but certain that they had before them, as they worked, the Latin translation of the Service Book used by the French-speaking congregation of 'Reformed' refugees, which had been settled at Glastonbury since 1548 under a Flemish pastor named Valerandus Pollanus, who had previously ministered to them at Strassburg.[1] Strange to relate, this ultra-Protestant Liturgy pre-

[1] It is morally certain that it was mainly from Pollanus that the 1552 Revisers derived the idea of prefixing to Mattins the present Sentences, Confession, and Absolution, and to the Communion Office the Decalogue with congregational responses. The tenth response is particularly reminiscent of Pollanus.

Whether they also consulted the somewhat similar *Forma et Ratio Tota Ecclesiastici Ministerii*, which was used by the 'Reformed' congregations in London presided over by John Laski (a Lasco), is more doubtful. However, certain coincidences both of subject-matter and of phraseology render it not unlikely. H. A. Daniel's statement, that this Liturgy prescribed Reservation for the sick, seems to be the result of misunderstanding. It is true that in all forms of this Liturgy the deacons are directed to distribute the remains of the Eucharist to the sick (*valetudinarii, maladieux, kranken*), as well as to the poor and aged. This, however, was for consumption at ordinary meals, not for sacramental Communion. Laski gave directions that the sick were to be exhorted to *meditate* on the Eucharist, but not apparently to receive it.

scribed Reservation of the 1549 type as the *sole* method of communicating the sick (for the details, see below, p. 578).

It is, moreover, quite certain that the Revisers had before them Martin Bucer's elaborate *Censura* of the 1549 Book, which runs to 28 chapters. Commentators on the Prayer Book have mostly failed to notice that though Bucer detected numerous and grievous faults in nearly every other part of this Book, he found nothing whatever to censure in the Service for Sick Communion, though this prescribed Reservation as the normal method to be used. 'That which is here prescribed,' wrote Bucer, 'is sufficiently in harmony with the divine Scriptures'; and he expressed satisfaction that the sick were by this Order to be communicated directly from the Table of the Lord (instead of, as formerly, from the Aumbry or hanging Pyx).

Bucer, who knew hardly any English, had to use as his text on which to comment the inaccurate and protestantised Latin translation of Alexander Aless, which is prefixed to the *Censura* in his published works (see *Scripta Anglicana*, 1577, pp. 370 ff.). Aless, in spite of his profession on the title-page to give a 'bona fide' translation, introduced fundamental changes into the 1549 Office for Sick Communion, with the object of bringing it into closer accord with the principles and practice of 'Reformed' foreign Churches, particularly those of Strassburg and Frankfort. Accordingly, in his version Aless: (1) cancelled the 1549 provision that the sick man might receive the Reserved Sacrament *alone*, substituting the 'Reformed' requirement that there must be fellow-communicants in all cases; (2) he introduced the strange 'Reformed' regulation, that when a Deacon (or the Pastor) carried the Reserved Sacrament to a sick person, communicants from the church must accompany him, and receive the Eucharist again in the chamber of sickness; (3) he gave the entirely false impression that *continuous* Reservation was excluded by the 1549 Book, for he stated that if the priest were unexpectedly summoned (for example, at night) to give *viaticum* to a dying person, he would not actually communicate him, but only instruct him to make an act of spiritual Communion.

All these changes were calculated to enlist the favourable judgment of Bucer; and in part account for it. Nevertheless, it must be recognised that, even after this extensive garbling,[1]

[1] Probably the most audacious of Aless's falsifications was his statement that the 1549 Visitation Office discontinued Unction of the Sick, the rubrics and prayers for which he entirely omitted ('Let the priest recite this Psalm, *in place of the Anointing formerly in use*'). Bucer, however, who seems to have received occasional help from an assistant who knew English, was aware that the English Book made provision for Unction, and of this he expressed decided disapproval. Both Luther and Calvin rejected the rite of Unction. The former, however, was prepared to tolerate its continuance on two conditions: (1) that it was not regarded as a Sacrament, and (2) that it was not believed to

Aless's translation still retained Reservation as the normal method of communicating the sick, and actually prescribed it on all days when the Eucharist was celebrated in church. Bucer, therefore, quite certainly classed Reservation (at least of the 1549 type) among the things which are 'sufficiently in agreement with the divine Scriptures (*divinis Scripturis satis consentanea*),' and his *Censura* made his opinion known to the 1552 Revisers.

The 1552 Revisers also possessed the criticisms of Peter Martyr (now lost) on the 1549 Book. Since Martyr was as ignorant of English as Bucer, he had to work upon a (presumably) more correct Latin version, which was prepared for him by Cheke. He expressed decided disapprobation of the 1549 provision for Reservation, and was surprised to learn that Bucer had neglected to censure it (see his letter to Bucer, of date January 10, 1551 = 1552, printed in J. Strype's *Memorials of Cranmer*, Vol. III. pp. 661–64).[1]

For these and the like reasons the 1552 Revisers found themselves unable to condemn Reservation outright. Nevertheless, there is strong evidence that most of them disliked it intensely, as is especially made evident by the Edwardine draft of the *Reformatio Legum*. Consequently, it violates historical probability in no inconsiderable degree, so to interpret the 1552 Office for Sick Communion as to make it positively prescribe Reservation. For if it prescribes Reservation at all, it prescribes it exclusively; and, though this, as we have seen, was actually done in certain ultra-Protestant quarters, all that we know of the 1552 Revisers forbids us to suppose—unless coercive evidence requires it—that they took this course.

(3) A third view is that the Compilers intended the priest *to consecrate specially in all cases, and never under any circumstances to reserve.*

The difficulty of this view is, that if this was their intention they carefully concealed it. Not only did they omit the 1549 direction to the priest to 'celebrate' (*i.e.* 'consecrate') with the appointed 'Canon,' but they further directed the priest to 'minister' the Sacrament—a term which not only in the 1549 Book, but in current usage also, seems at this period always to have meant 'distribute,' not 'consecrate.' Of equal significance is the fact that they failed to prohibit Reservation, which they

possess supernatural healing virtue. The Protestant Churches almost universally held that, 'gifts of healing' having ceased, Unction ought no longer to be practised.

[1] Cartwright condemned Reservation, and attacked the Eucharistic theology of Justin, Tertullian, and Cyprian, who approved it. Whitgift made a general defence of their orthodoxy, but since he did not explicitly defend Reservation, his attitude towards it is doubtful (*Works*, ii. pp. 541 ff. Parker Soc. ed.).

must have known would continue—at least in some quarters—unless it was expressly forbidden.

(4) Upon the whole, the best solution of this difficult problem is that the Compilers, being unable to agree, left the whole matter discreetly vague.

They could not agree to condemn Reservation, partly because it was practised by some of the most extreme Reformers, partly also because through the publication of the first edition of Justin Martyr by Stephanus in 1551 it had become evident to all the world that Reservation—at least of the 1549 type—was absolutely primitive. On the other hand, they intensely disliked it. In the end they followed what, from their point of view, was obviously the best policy. (1) They said nothing whatever about Reservation, hoping that, since it was not mentioned, it would be seldom practised and would ultimately die out. (2) Instead of directing the priest either to 'reserve' or 'celebrate' or 'consecrate,' they used the word 'minister' in a vague and indeterminate sense. It is possible that even in 1552 there was a tendency (which became more definite in the age of Elizabeth) to use the two words loosely and almost interchangeably. However this may be, it would seem that the 1552 Revisers deliberately chose this word, hoping that (since Reservation was no longer mentioned) most priests would understand it in the sense of 'celebrate,' but taking the risk that some—they hoped only a few—would understand it in its stricter sense as a direction to 'distribute' the Reserved Sacrament.

This is practically the view to which Dr. W. P. M. Kennedy, a particularly well-equipped Tudor authority, was led, after an unusually thorough investigation. 'Ecclesiastical affairs,' he writes, 'about 1552 almost demanded an ambiguous position about communion of the sick. . . . Some were for no communion at all, some for a celebration, some for a ministration [by Reservation], while even those who most disliked the mediæval custom were not in a position either in 1552 or 1559 to condemn the method of 1549, though glad to see it quietly disappear. . . . The Reformers left a loophole for it.'[1]

The Elizabethan Prayer Book.

The Elizabethan Prayer Book represents a considerable reaction from the low sacramental views entertained by the 1552 Revisers towards higher and more traditional conceptions of the nature of the Eucharist.[2] As stated above, the 1552

[1] *The Law and Custom of Reservation, 1547–1661*, p. 18.

[2] An interesting indication of this is that Elizabeth's 1560 Latin Book restored the *Benedictus* after the *Sanctus* (omitted in 1552) in the following form: 'Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. Osanna in excelsis.' The permissive use of the *Benedictus* is sanctioned by the 1928 Book.

Office for the Communion of the Sick was retained unaltered, but it was officially interpreted (1) as requiring the administration of the *consecrated* elements in all cases; [1] and (2) as permitting Reservation, at least of the 1549 type.

The attitude both of Queen Elizabeth and of Archbishop Parker towards the question of Reservation is fortunately quite unambiguous. In 1560, Walter Haddon, an accomplished Latinist, acting under instructions from Elizabeth, produced a Latin version of the Prayer Book, founded on, but not identical with, Aless's translation of the 1549 Book. Two impressions were issued in 1560, the second of which incorporated an Appendix, containing a form for celebrating the Lord's Supper at Funerals, and a Memorial Service for Benefactors.[2]

The official and authoritative character of this Prayer Book is beyond doubt. It opens with the Royal Letters Patent (dated April 6), authorising and 'exhorting' its use in the Universities, and in the Colleges of Winchester and Eton, and, moreover, recommending its private use by all the clergy, on those occasions when, for any sufficient reason, they did not read Prayers publicly in church. The Queen further acknowledged it as authorised by the Crown in a Commission of Jan. 22, 1562. The Letters Patent state that the Book is issued by the Queen under powers belonging to her under the recent Act of Uniformity, and that it is 'in harmony with (*convenientem*) our English Book of Public Prayers, now received and used throughout our kingdom.'

'Haddon's work,' writes Clay, who edited the Book for the Parker Society in 1847, 'came forth with the express sanction of Elizabeth's Letters Patent. It was enjoined by her authority upon the universities, the great public schools, and the clergy in their private devotions. . . . Of necessity, therefore, this Prayer Book assumed a character which must render it an object of no common interest, and ever entitle it to much consideration.' Similarly, Kennedy declares that 'Haddon's translation had behind it royal authority, that Parker was ordered to regulate its use in the province of Canterbury'; also that 'Haddon's Latin Prayer Book was never withdrawn.'

The statements sometimes made that the Letters Patent were withdrawn, and that Elizabeth intended the 1560 Book to be

[1] The Latin Prayer Book of 1560 expressly directs the priest who ministers to a sick person to *celebrate* the Supper, and after the *Sursum corda*, to proceed '*to the end*,' viz. of the Communion Office. In 1573, Robert Johnson was condemned to prison for a year for delivering to communicants in church an unconsecrated cup of wine. His plea that consecration is unnecessary was unanimously rejected by the Court as preposterous.

[2] The authorities state that Elizabeth's Latin Book was intended for public use in Ireland, in those numerous parishes in which English was not understood. I am not aware of any direct evidence of its actual use in Ireland.

superseded by the later Latin Prayer Books of 1571 (or 1572), 1574, and 1594, are erroneous. Elizabeth, as Kennedy and Clay correctly state, never withdrew her authorisation. All these later versions were essentially private ventures, having an entirely different purpose, viz. the production, *for private use alone*, of a more or less accurate Latin version of the statutory English Book of 1559. They begin with the Act of Uniformity (omitted by Elizabeth's Book of 1560), and the only important feature which they possess in common with the special features of the 1560 Book is, they make it clear that the priest who celebrates for the sick is actually to *consecrate*. Doubtless Elizabeth knew of them, and permitted them to be published, for on their title-pages occur the words *Cum privilegio regiæ majestatis*, but there is not the least evidence that she ever authorised their public use. The only Latin Prayer Book ever authorised by Elizabeth to be used in public worship, and for the purpose of communicating the sick, was that of 1560, and that authority remained in force till the end of her reign, though (as was natural) the Book was little liked by the Puritan party, and its use in the Universities was as far as possible evaded by Puritan dons.

When, therefore, the Convocation of 1640 decided unanimously 'to petition the Royal Majesty that the Latin Version of the Public Prayers be again imprinted,' the reference obviously was to the only official Latin Prayer Book ever authorised by the Crown for public use, viz. that of 1560. This Book, therefore, and therewith the method of Reservation which it prescribed, received in 1640 the explicit approval, though not the full synodical authorisation, of the Convocation of Canterbury.[1]

The 1560 Book directs Reservation for the sick in a manner similar to, but not quite identical with, that prescribed in 1549. 'But if the sick man cannot come to Church, and asks to receive communion in his own house, then he shall signify to the parish priest at least on the day *before*,[2] or early in the morning, how many intend to communicate with him. And if it happen that on the same day the Lord's Supper is celebrated, then the priest at the Supper shall reserve so much of the Sacrament as suffices for the sick man, and soon after the end of service shall go to the sick man with some of those present, and shall first communicate with[3] those who stand by the sick man and have been present at the Supper, and last with[3] the sick man. But

[1] E. Cardwell, *Synodalia*, Vol. II. p. 628. The troubles which immediately ensued prevented this project being carried out.

[2] The Book, by a careless slip, has *the day after*, perpetuating a blunder of Aless, whose version was made use of by Haddon.

[3] *Communicabit cum illis . . . cum infirmo.* Aless had written, *communicabit eos . . . infirmum.* Lockton suggests that Haddon may have only attempted to improve Aless's Latin without altering his meaning. If so, the priest is *not* directed by the 1560 Book to communicate with the sick man, but merely to

first let the General Confession and Absolution with the Collect be recited, as has previously been directed.'

It is certain, therefore, that Elizabeth did not regard Reservation of the 1549 type as in any way inconsistent with the 1559 Prayer Book which was authorised by Parliament, nor with the 1552 Office for Sick Communion, which was retained unaltered.

Archbishop Parker held the same opinion. Not only did he obey Elizabeth's instructions with regard to the use of the 1560 Book, but he deliberately altered a clause of the Edwardine draft of the *Reformatio Legum* which prohibited Reservation, in such a manner as to permit it.

This clause, as drawn up by the Edwardine Commissioners on Canon Law, ran as follows:—'And so we do not suffer the Sacrament either to be elevated, or carried about, or reserved, or worshipped.' Parker, who revised the draft in 1561, altered the wording so that it read, 'And so we do not suffer the Sacrament to be elevated, or carried about *through the country*, or reserved *to the next day*,[1] or worshipped.' The obvious purpose of the change was to forbid public processions of the Host, but to permit such unostentatious carrying of the Sacrament to the sick *on the same day* as had been authorised in 1549, and more recently by the Latin Book of 1560.

That Reservation by the parochial clergy was not unusual in the early years of Elizabeth is further shown by the fact that Calvin was consulted as to its propriety. In a letter dated Aug. 12, 1561, and preserved by Strype, he expresses great dislike for the practice, but does not absolutely condemn it. 'It is a perilous thing to carry it [the Sacrament] hither and thither promiscuously.' To carry it 'with pomp' is absolutely intolerable. It is right to communicate the sick, but the Sacrament should be given to as few of them as possible. 'Judgment and selection should be used, lest it be given to any except in danger of life.' Specially noteworthy in this letter is Calvin's judgment in favour of the primitive practice of giving *viaticum* to the dying. This letter was probably a considerable surprise to the recipient, whose name is not given by Strype (Strype's *Annals of the Reformation*, Vol. I., pt. 1, ch. 21).

Similarly, in his *Institutes*, Calvin significantly refrains from condemning Reservation, contenting himself with the cautious judgment that it is 'safer' ('*tutius*') under existing circumstances not to practise it: 'Those who practise it have, I confess, the example

---

give him the Reserved Sacrament. However, a study of the phraseology of the continental Protestant Church Orders has led the present writer to reject this suggestion.

[1] Parker seems here to be quoting (and misunderstanding) a passage from the pseudo-Clement (seventh century), which is discussed below (pp. 591 ff.). His misunderstanding is not important for our present purpose.

of the ancient Church. But in so great a matter, in which a mistake involves great peril [of idolatry], there is nothing *safer* than to follow the truth itself [*i.e.* the manner of Christ's original institution].'[1]

Dr. W. D. Maxwell, who, as a High Church Presbyterian, makes the most of Calvin's Catholic tendencies, and labours to discover them even in Knox, contends that Calvin personally advocated Reservation, and was only prevented from practising it at Geneva by the 'iconoclastic opinions' of his congregation.

He quotes, as if conclusive, Calvin's words: 'It displeases me that with us [*i.e.* at Geneva] the Supper is not administered (*administrari*) to the sick' (*Opera*, 1870 edition, Vol. XVII. p. 311). *Administrare* is a vague word. It properly means 'proffer'; and that is probably its meaning here. But the Eucharist can be 'proffered' to a sick man, after a private celebration in his own house, as well as after a public celebration in church. That Calvin advocated private celebrations for the sick we know for certain; that he considered it 'safer' not to reserve (owing to a supposed danger of 'idolatry') we also know. The utmost that can be safely affirmed is that Calvin was prepared to *tolerate* the carrying of the Reserved Sacrament to the sick after service, provided that this was done 'without pomp.' Whether he ever reserved at Strassburg, where he was pastor from 1538 to 1541, must be left undecided. Reservation was certainly in use in that city as early as 1548, and perhaps considerably earlier (see below, p. 579). If Reservation was already the established use of the Reformed Church of Strassburg, when Calvin was pastor there, it is quite possible that he reserved, for he had no objection on principle to the practice. In the absence of direct contemporary evidence, this is all that can safely be said (see W. D. Maxwell, *John Knox's Genevan Service Book*, 1931, pp. 55–57).

Practice of Foreign Reformed Churches.

To Calvin's great regret, the Church of Geneva, over which he presided till his death, refused to follow his lead in three matters to which he attached importance: (1) the establishment of the Eucharist as the principal service every Sunday (the propriety of which he deduced from Acts xx. 7); (2) the giving of Communion in their own homes to persons dangerously ill, or confined to bed for a long time; (3) the giving of *viaticum* to the dying.

In one of his *Epistles* (363) he gives pathetic expression to his disappointment that his Church had strictly forbidden the last two practices. 'It is a harsh thing (*durum*), and of evil example (*mali exempli*), that at the present time [at Geneva] a Christian who keeps his bed for a long time, or is near death, is prohibited

[1] *Institutes*, IV. xvii. 39.

from professing and manifesting his agreement in piety with the Church [by receiving the Eucharist]. And yet the Supper is the sacred bond which unites the sons of God. However briefly [in this letter] I have treated this question, you yet understand by what considerations I have been led to the conclusion that the sick ought not to be deprived of Communion. I do not wish, however, to cause trouble over this matter. As you are aware, the custom in this Church is different. I acquiesce, for it is useless to contend [against the general feeling]' (*Epist.* 363; cf. also 361, as quoted by Dr. Lyndesay in his *A True Narrative*, see below, pp. 585–87.)

In the same letter he speaks on the subject of *viaticum*, less in the manner of a Protestant divine than of a Catholic doctor. 'It seems to me that it can be clearly (*probe*) gathered from the nature, purpose, and [traditional] use (*usu*) of the Mystery, that those who suffer from a long-standing disease, or whose life is in peril, should not be deprived of so great a benefit. It has efficacy (*valet*) for the confirming of our faith, to receive as it were from Christ's hand a token (*tesseram*) to assure us that we are accounted members of his body, and are nourished with his blood unto hope of eternal life. And thus the receiving of the Supper equips us to engage in spiritual battles. For if now a devout Christian perceives that he must depart out of this world, how can he fail to be assaulted and harassed by many temptations? Rightly, therefore, will he desire to be armed to sustain those assaults. Do you think, then, that we ought to snatch from him that unique assistance (*singulare adjumentum*), relying on which he may descend with more alacrity to the struggle, and win the victory?'

Calvin lived and died a convinced Protestant; but in these moving and pathetic words he gave classical expression to what every devout Catholic through all the Christian ages has thought and felt concerning the supreme value of 'the medicine of immortality' received in the hour of death. It is sad indeed to reflect that, supposing the narrative of his end given by Beza (in whose arms he died) is exhaustive, this great Reformer, who bore such emphatic witness to the virtue of *viaticum*, died without it.

Calvin's successor at Geneva, Theodore Beza (1519–1605), is referred to by both continental and British writers as an advocate, not only of Communion of the Sick, but also of Reservation—and not without justification.

His voluminous and able (but, where his prejudices are engaged, inaccurate and unreliable) controversial writings contain two discussions (I think not more) of Reservation. In the first he merely states (*Tractationes Theologicæ*, 1570, Vol. I. p. 256) that the Church of Geneva regards the Communion of the sick and dying as unnecessary, and strictly forbids it; adding, however,

'if it can be practised in any place without superstition and scandal, and, moreover, with edification to the Church, we are of course (*sane*) unwilling for that cause to make a schism between Churches. But, on the other hand, let it be permitted to us to consider what ought to be retained in our own Churches.'

In the second passage (Vol. III. pp. 148 ff.) he discusses the subject of Reservation fully and explicitly. He personally approves the practice, mentioned by Justin Martyr, of sending the Eucharist to the sick by the hands of the deacons, either immediately after the public Eucharist, or at least on the same day, on the ground that such distribution of the elements may fairly be accounted part of the public service—'one and the same action (*una et eadem actio*) therewith.'

On the other hand, he strongly condemns Reservation of the hallowed Elements till the next day; contending that it is highly probable, if not quite certain, that they will have lost their Eucharistic virtue by then. The doctrine that the effect of consecration is permanent, though approved by so high an authority as St. Cyril of Alexandria, seems to him superstitious. If it is thought desirable to communicate a sick person on a day when the Eucharist is not celebrated in church, it is, in his opinion, far better to perform the entire Service (not, however, without fellow communicants representing the Church) in the sick person's own room, than to communicate him 'with stale bread and a spent word [of consecration] (*rancido pane et praeterito verbo*).'

He considers that the sick ought to be communicated in both kinds, for it is unlawful 'to separate what the Lord has conjoined.' Nevertheless he concedes that under very peculiar and exceptional circumstances Communion in one kind might be tolerated.

Beza's reasons for forbidding Reservation till the next day seem to the modern reader decidedly fanciful. (1) The flesh of the Paschal Lamb, 'the express type of our Eucharist,' was not allowed to be reserved till the morrow; (2) St. Paul declares that the flesh of the idol sacrifices only retains its malignant virtue 'in use,' with the obvious implication that a similar principle applies to the Christian Eucharist; (3) 'Clement, Bishop of Rome,' commands the clerks who serve at the Eucharist 'to remove the remains of the fragments of the Body of the Lord to the sacristy, and to consume them there *on that very day*.' He uncritically accepts this spurious Epistle as genuine, and wrongly interprets it as forbidding Permanent Reservation for the sick. What 'Clement' quite clearly forbids is the Reservation till next day of any superfluous Hosts which may have been consecrated, not for the sick, *but for the people*—an entirely different matter. That perpetual Reservation for the sick and dying was in full

use in the seventh century, to which this Epistle belongs, is beyond doubt (on this passage see further below, p. 592).[1]

With Beza's discussion may be compared that of a Swiss Protestant divine of still more extreme opinions, Hospinian († 1626). This writer, whose knowledge was encyclopædic, but whose judgment was prejudiced by a strong animus against both Lutheranism and Romanism,[2] devotes a long and learned discussion to Reservation in his *Historia Sacramentaria* (Zürich, 1598). He concedes (but, unlike Beza, grudgingly and ungraciously) that Reservation as described by Justin Martyr is lawful, because it is one with the public Service (*una et eadem actio*), and does not involve Reservation beyond it. The holy Elements, he contends, only possess Eucharistic virtue 'in use'; and this 'use' cannot lawfully be extended beyond the day on which they are set apart. He excuses the procedure of Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse in the early fifth century, who, according to the account of St. Jerome (*Ep.* 125, par. 20), was in the habit of carrying the Sacrament in both kinds to the sick in a wicker basket and a glass bottle, by the unlikely supposition that he always did so, in the manner which Justin describes, immediately after Service. All other methods of Reservation, even those approved by the ancient Fathers and practised by the primitive Church, he stigmatises as unlawful 'abuses.' They are excusable in some slight degree, because in days of persecution Christians were often debarred from attending church regularly for the purpose of receiving the Eucharist; moreover, primitive Reservation was always for Communion alone, never for adoration or pompous processions; nevertheless, continuous Reservation was always an 'abuse,' and as such ought not to be practised by enlightened professors of the pure Gospel.

Hospinian pronounces continuous Reservation unlawful: (1) because it involves disobedience to the plain command of God in the Old Testament ('The Lord forbade the remains of the Paschal Lamb, the express type of our Eucharist, to be reserved till the next day'); (2) Christ commanded the Bread and Wine to be eaten and drunk, not reserved; (3) Reservation is largely based on the false belief that *viaticum* is necessary to salvation; (4) it involves imminent peril of idolatry (*op. cit.*, Bk. IV. pp. 379 ff.).

In both Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches, a considerable

[1] Beza characteristically omits to state that the clerks are to consume the remains 'with fear and trembling.' It did not suit his case to quote in full a passage which might well suggest that a disciple of the Apostles held the Catholic doctrine of the Real Objective Presence.

[2] Hospinian's bitter polemic, *Concordia discors*, caused great resentment in Lutheran circles. He claimed the title 'orthodox' exclusively for Zwinglians and Calvinists, and attempted to reconcile their incongruous beliefs, with a view to united aggressive action against Lutheranism and Romanism.

volume of Protestant opinion favoured giving Communion to the sick, not only by special Celebration, but also by Reservation. The learned and devout physician Harchius (apparently a Lutheran), whom Beza attacks violently in his *De Cœna Domini*, was definitely in favour of both, quoting with approval the chief primitive instances of Reservation, and adding: 'I cannot help approving the pious and sedulous custom prevailing in the reformed part of Germany of celebrating very frequently the Lord's Supper, and of also charitably administering the Eucharist to the sick when they ask for it.'[1]

Harchius belonged to a fairly numerous class of learned, liberal-minded, and peace-loving Reformers (to be found both within and without the Roman Communion), who advocated the Reunion of Western Christendom, and the termination of the long schism with the East on the basis of the discarding of all mediæval abuses and superstitions, and the common acceptance, as normative and authoritative, of the teaching and practice of the ancient Fathers, and of the primitive Undivided Church. Such, among those who died in the Roman Communion, were Erasmus († 1536), Cassander († 1566) and John Barnes († 1661); to whom may be added Marco Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro († 1624), a divine of great ability and learning, but of unstable moral character, who, after becoming an Anglican, returned before his death to the Church of Rome.

Among members of the Protestant Churches who shared their views, especial mention ought to be made of the great names of John Vorstius († 1676), a learned German theologian who became librarian to the Elector of Brandenburg; of Gerard John Vossius († 1649), German classical scholar and theologian, whose criticism of Calvin's doctrine of Predestination and frankly expressed Catholic sympathies won for him the friendship and patronage of Archbishop Laud; and above all of Isaac Casaubon († 1614), perhaps the greatest scholar of a most scholarly age, who towards the end of his life became an enthusiastic Anglican, and declared that 'no Church approaches nearer than the Anglican to the model of the once flourishing [undivided] Church, since it holds a middle way between those who err either by excess or by defect' (see the Preface to his *De Rebus Sacris et Ecclesiasticis Exercitationes*, 1614).

The last three scholars regarded as permissible, not only

[1] I quote Harchius' words from Beza, not having access to the work which the latter so bitterly criticises for its liberality of sentiment. Harchius attempted to mediate between the Lutherans and the Calvinists in the matter of the Eucharist, and even to promote more friendly relations with the Roman Church (see on this another learned and judicious work by him—a wonderful production for a layman—*Patrum Orthodoxorum Irenæi, Cyrilli, Hilarii, et reliquorum, Fides de Eucharistia, et Sacrificio Universali Ecclesiæ*).

'Justinian' Reservation, but also continuous Reservation, even public Reservation of the Sacrament in church, provided that its object was not extra-liturgical adoration, to which they were all opposed, but the facilitating of the Communion of the sick, the dying, and the unavoidably absent.

They desired, however, that such Reservation should be voluntary, not compulsory; and contended that the Council of Trent had gone beyond primitive precedent in making the practice absolutely obligatory. Vossius has several allusions to the subject in his voluminous works, and discusses it at length in his *De Sacris Cœnæ Dominicæ Symbolis Disputatio* (see pp. 433–39 of Volume VI. of his *Opera*, 1701). Various relevant quotations from the not easily accessible works of these authors are collected by Wm. Forbes in his *Considerationes Modestæ* (see Vol. II. pp. 379 ff. of his works, as reprinted in *The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*).

In the year 1609 a liberal-minded French Protestant writer, whose eirenic treatise was translated into English in the same year (it was reprinted in 1610), goes so far as to claim that Protestant Christendom *in general* approves of Reservation for the Sick. He propounds the question: 'Is it necessary to reserve the Sacrament for carrying it in procession and for other usages, or only for carrying it to the sick?' He reviews the practice of the Roman, the Eastern, and the Abyssinian Churches; quotes the Lutheran Confession of Württemberg ('Among us, the Ministers of the Church are commanded to baptise and to dispense the Sacrament of the Saviour, both publicly in church and privately in the houses of those who are near death'); alludes to the favourable judgment of the Calvinist Beza on the question of Reservation; and sums up by saying: 'In the beginning of the Christian Church it was the custom to send the Eucharist by the deacons to the absent sick, to whom I doubt not it afforded great comfort. My strong desire would be that this custom should be restored to use.' Having stated that 'the Christian nations are agreed against the Latin Church that we ought not to reserve the Sacrament in order to use it for any other purpose than that for which our Saviour has ordained it, namely for Communion,' he continues: 'As for the Reservation which is to be carried to the sick . . . the Greeks and the Latins do approve it, *yea, and the Protestants likewise.*' He concludes: 'The Resolution of this question is, that none ought to reserve any of the Sacrament, except for the purpose of carrying it to the sick' (*Tradition Catholiq, ou traicte de la croyance des chrestiens d'Asie, d'Europe, et d'Afrique, ez dogmes principalement controuersez en ce temps* . . . 1609, *par Th. A.I.C.*, pp. 180–182).[1]

[1] A MS. note in the Bodleian copy incorrectly attributes it to 'Morton Eudes, Anglois.' The dedicatory epistle to Henry, Prince of Wales, shows clearly that the author belonged to a French-speaking Protestant Church. He was,

It may be here added that the *Saxon Confession* of 1551 (Art. 15),[1] and the *Württemberg Confession* of 1552 (Art. 19),[2] though they condemn the cultus explicitly (the former even declaring, 'the Holy Spirit forbids any cultus of God without an assured mandate of God'), and though they emphatically condemn Reservation in only one kind, yet prudently refrain from condemning Reservation in both kinds for the sole purpose of communicating the sick and the absent.

The Reformers and Fasting Communion.

One of the most urgent practical problems connected with the visitation of the sick is the extent to which they ought to be required to observe the rule of fasting Communion. In these days it is not very unusual for devout and scrupulous Anglicans, even when seriously ill, to insist on fasting before Communion from the previous midnight, contrary to the advice of their physicians and pastors. In the present writer's judgment, the parish priest is fully justified in relaxing the rule concerning the fast before Communion to whatever extent the patient's condition may require, very much in the manner which is now authorised in the Roman Communion (see below, p. 607); nor need he limit the relaxation to two days a week, seeing that not a few sick persons desire to receive Holy Communion daily, and are benefited thereby not only in soul but also in body.

In mediæval times, sick persons desiring to communicate (unless they were in 'extreme sickness,' or imminent danger of death) were required to fast strictly from the previous midnight. Since the Reformers expressed no disapproval of the current practice, but, on the contrary, facilitated its observance by directing that the sick should be communicated as soon as possible after the public Celebration in church (which was early), or at all events before noon, they must be supposed to have approved it. The reader should remember that it would be an anachronism to attribute to the Church authorities of the sixteenth century anything like the modern solicitude for the health and comfort of the sick. The Reformers of all schools expected persons seriously

however, fervently pro-Anglican, praising the unequalled learning of the divines of England, especially in patristics, their incomparable Prayer Book based on the ancient Liturgies, and the wisdom and prudence of James I in seeking gradually to win the Scottish nation to adopt episcopacy and 'Catholic' practices. The English translation by L. O[wen], in spite of a few doubtful and obscure renderings, is a good one. It deserved its wide circulation.

[1] 'Est et manifesta profanatio, partem coenæ Domini circumgestare et adorare.'

[2] 'Alius error est quod una pars Eucharistiæ solet in singularem cultum Dei gestari et reponi. Vetat autem Spiritus Sanctus, ne cultus Dei, sine certo Dei mandato, instituatur.'

ill to listen to interminable instructions and exhortations, and to take part in long-drawn-out services which (according to modern ideas) must have imposed undue strain upon the unfortunate patients.

The duty of fasting Communion was not a matter of debate between the Reformers and the Church of Rome, consequently the allusions to it in the Protestant literature of the sixteenth century are rare and incidental. They are sufficiently numerous and definite, however, to show that the ancient strictness was generally approved, not only by the Lutherans, but also by the Calvinists. Many of the latter even enhanced the rigour of the existing custom by abstaining from food for several hours *after* receiving Communion, as had been the practice in a few places in mediæval times (p. 254).

The Lutherans, holding a definitely 'objective' view of the Eucharistic presence, fasted mainly in honour of the Lord's Body. See, for example, the Lutheran Church Order of Anhalt, printed in E. Sehling's *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des xvi Jahrhunderts*, 1917, Vol. II. p. 552, which contains the rubric: 'Let the priests (*sacerdotes*) be always fasting and temperate (*jejuni semper et temperati*), lest dishonour be done to the sacrament[s] (*ne sacramenta inhonorentur*).' The plural *sacramenta* is perhaps used as a singular for the Eucharistic rite as a whole, or it may refer to the two Eucharistic species, to each of which the term 'sacramentum' was sometimes applied. Both usages seem to be sufficiently established. Dr. Brightman prefers the latter interpretation.

On the other hand, the Calvinists regarded their fast before [and after] Communion mainly as a devotional exercise In Scotland the Eucharistic fast was observed by the Reformers with great rigour. Dr. W. McMillan mentions that 'at Aberdeen in 1598 the sacramental fast had to begin on Saturday at eight hours [o'clock] at night, and to continue on Sunday till four hours after noon.' He refers also to the case of Robert Blair (A.D. 1604), who desired to communicate, but 'having gotten my breakfast, I durst not, for it was then a generally received opinion that the Sacrament behoved to be received fasting.' 'The custom,' observes McMillan, 'continued many years after.' He also states: 'The Reformers kept faithfully to the Roman practice of morning Communion. . . . They had their celebrations in the early morning. At Glasgow the service started at 4 a.m.; and at Stirling it was half an hour earlier; while at Elgin the first bell was to ring at half-hour to three (2.30 a.m.). . . . In the east of Scotland the hours were a little later, 5 a.m. being the hour of commencement at Edinburgh, St. Andrews and Perth. . . . In these places there were usually second services beginning at eight or nine o'clock. . . . Whatever the time of commencement, the service was not expected to last beyond the hour of noon'

(*op. cit.*, pp. 190 ff.). Pollanus, at Glastonbury, celebrated at 8 a.m.

In England fasting Communion was not a subject of controversy between Anglicans and Puritans. Hooker (*Eccl. Pol.*, iv. 2, 3) assumes as a matter of course that the party of Cartwright is in agreement with the Anglican Church on this matter ('It is not, I am right sure, their meaning that . . . the Eucharist should be ministered after meat'). Whitgift (*Works*, ed. Parker Society, Vol. III. p. 88) uses similar language ('The places of Scripture which you [Puritans] quote in the margent to prove sitting at the Communion declare that Christ and his disciples sat at the table; but that proveth nothing. For you might as well have said that they received after supper, we before dinner; *they after meat, we before meat.* . . . It behoveth meek and humble spirits in such indifferent matters to submit themselves to the order of the Church'). Peter Martyr writing to Bucer on November 4, 1550, gives similar testimony as to Protestant practice: 'At this day we so minister the Eucharist in the morning time, that after dinner we will not have the Communion in the sacred assembly.'

The great Anglican divines of the seventeenth century prescribe and strongly recommend the practice, but the most judicious of them allow for exceptions in the case of sickness, or feebleness of health. Thus Jeremy Taylor writes: 'Let us receive the consecrated elements with all devotion and humility of body and spirit; and do this honour to it, that it be the first food we eat and the first beverage we drink that day, *unless it be in case of sickness or other great necessity.* . . . It is a Catholic custom that they who receive the Holy Communion should receive it fasting. This is not a duty commanded by God; but, unless it be necessary to eat, he that despises this custom, gives nothing but the testimony of an evil mind. . . . *But sick people and the weak are . . . readily to be excused in this thing.* . . . For necessity and charity are to be preferred before such ceremonies and circumstances of address' (*Holy Living*, iv. 10, 9; *The Rule of Conscience*, iii. 4, 15; *The Worthy Communicant*, vii. 1). Many other similar testimonies might be quoted.

That the Puritans within as well as outside the Church of England were in agreement with the Catholic school on this matter, is shown clearly by the statement of Dr. Daniel Featley, the decidedly Puritan chaplain of Archbishop George Abbot (1562–1633), who held similar views: 'As for our Communion there can be no excesse. . . . For the people have warning a weeke at least before to prepare themselves, and they receive always fasting before' (*Stricturæ in Lyndomastigen*, 1638; quoted in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, edit. 1904, part iii, p. 97).

After a period of considerable neglect, there was a great revival of the practice of fasting Communion in the Anglican Church dur-

ing the nineteenth century, as a result of the Oxford Movement. Among the Presbyterians of Scotland, however, the practice has of late years so much declined, that it is now not unusual on Sacrament Sundays to arrange for a 'second table' (at which Communion is given with the Reserved Sacrament) in the afternoon or evening. It is still, however, prescribed by authority, that once or twice a year in every parish, 'days of fasting, humiliation, and prayer' shall be held on some day of the week preceding a Sunday on which the Lord's Supper is celebrated.

It may be added that ancient discipline of the Church required that Baptism, as well as the Eucharist, should be received fasting. The attitude of the 1661 Revisers towards the whole question is illustrated by the rubric directing that adult candidates for Baptism should 'be exhorted to prepare themselves with Prayers and Fasting for the receiving of the holy Sacrament.'

Evidence of Protestant Liturgies.

The continental Reformers—even those of the Lutheran School—attached far less importance to ministrations to the sick and dying than did the early and mediæval Church; indeed not a few of the 'Reformed' (Calvinistic) Church Orders ignore the needs of the sick and dying altogether, and do not even provide a funeral service. In Scotland, Knox (unlike Calvin and Beza) was definitely opposed to the Communion of the Sick under any circumstances, and his attitude was very widely though far from universally approved by both Scotch Presbyterians and English Puritans.

With regard to Lutheran practice, our most copious source of information is the comprehensive *Kirchenordnung im Churfurstenthum der Marcken zu Brandenburg*, 1540, which (as has been indicated) was used to some extent by the compilers of King Edward VI's First Book. This Order devotes a long and instructive section to the Visitation, Absolution and Communion of the Sick. In doctrine it is High Lutheran, and in ceremonial matters decidedly conservative (*e.g.* it retains the elevation of both Host and Chalice at Mass).

(1) According to this Order, if a sick man desiring Communion is too weak to attend the long public 'Mass' (this term is freely employed), yet strong enough to come to a short private service later in the day, the 'priest' (this, not 'pastor', is the usual term in this Order) is to reserve at the public Mass sufficient consecrated Bread and Wine (apparently on the Altar), and subsequently to communicate the invalid 'privately' at 'a fitting time' (*i.e.* not later than noon) with very brief accompanying devotions. There is no mention of any other communicants, and the priest is not directed to receive with the sick man.

This procedure is in striking contrast to that of the 'Reformed'

Churches, which agreed in insisting on the presence of fellow-communicants at all sick Communions as a matter of principle.

The Order is silent as to whether persons in health, unavoidably prevented from attending the public Mass, were to be permitted to receive Communion in the same way. It is certain, however, that such a permission would have involved no breach of Lutheran principles (see below on Hermann's Liturgy).

(2) 'But if the sick man is so weak that it is necessary to carry the Sacrament to his house, then (after demand made and notice given, as above) the priest, wearing a surplice (*Korrock*), shall bear it out of church from the Altar after Consecration with fitting reverence, the sacristan (*Custer*) going in front with a bell, and a lantern containing a lighted candle.' Arrived at the house, the priest is to place the Reserved Sacrament on a table, 'honourably' (*ehrlich*) covered beforehand with a white linen cloth. This done, he is to 'exhort,' 'comfort' and 'instruct' the sick man at considerable length; to recite at least Ps. xxv; to read St. John iii. 16 ff., followed by a passage from St. Paul; also to offer certain suitable prayers. Before giving Communion to the patient (in both kinds), he is to hear his confession and absolve him. The service concludes with the Aaronic blessing (Numb. vi. 23); but, if requested, the priest is to add Psalms xci and cviii.

(3) In case of an unexpected emergency (for instance, a sudden call to give *viaticum* during the night), the priest is to repair to the church, to recite the Lord's Prayer, to consecrate with the words of institution only, and (preceded, as above, by the sacristan carrying a lantern) to carry the Sacrament so consecrated to the dying man, and to communicate him in the manner already described. Continuous Reservation for the purpose of providing *viaticum* is obviously not here contemplated; though, on the other hand, it is not expressly forbidden.

(4) This Order assumes that in large towns the sick will be communicated in all cases by Reservation. In country places, however, where distances would usually be long, and the bad state of the roads would often render the carrying of the Chalice perilous, the priest is directed to celebrate Mass privately in the sick man's house, using a simplified form of the public service.

(5) This Order, like most of the sixteenth-century Lutheran Service Books, prescribes careful ablutions. 'After giving Communion, the priest shall wash his fingers over the Chalice, and give the ablution to the sick man, or some other [communicant].'

It is worthy of notice that the early Lutherans, unlike the Calvinists, treated the smallest remains of the consecrated species with scrupulous reverence. It is recorded of Luther and Melancthon, that if a single drop of consecrated wine happened to be spilled while they were giving Communion, they would fall

upon their knees and lick it from the ground (see H. A. Daniel, *Codex Liturgicus*, Vol. IV. p. 444, where other facts of a similar nature are given).

(6) Practically all the early Lutheran Orders not merely recommend but require the sick man to confess to the priest or pastor, and to receive absolution, before communicating. Bucer (whose later views were more Calvinistic than Lutheran) also urged confession:[1] 'First we ought to suggest to all sick persons, and also to exhort them, to disclose to us [pastors] privately their scruples of conscience, to enable us more fully to instruct and console them in all matters pertaining to their salvation.' He requires that the friends present shall withdraw during the private confession. He directs them, however, to return, to hear absolution pronounced, because 'absolution, being a work appertaining to the entire Church, ought always to be imparted in the presence of the visitors of the sick man, who represent the Church of Christ' (see the *Forma et modus ægrotis communicandi Absolutionem et Sacramentum Cœnæ* in his *Scripta Anglicana*, pp. 364 ff.).

(7) Not a few Lutheran Orders further require that all persons who desire to communicate with the sick man shall first make their confession to the priest or pastor, and receive absolution. Even when this is not expressly ordered by the Office for Sick Communion, it is often to be inferred from directions given elsewhere in the Order, that communicants must in all cases confess privately and be absolved, before they receive the Eucharist (for instances, see the *Visitatio et Communio Infirmorum ex Agenda Austriaca*, 1574, reprinted in Daniel's *Codex Liturgicus*, Vol. II. p. 432; see also E. Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen*, Vol. II. p. 96. Archbishop Hermann (Lutheran) gives similar directions). The strictness of early Lutheranism in this matter often exceeded that of the Church of Rome.[2] It may be added that even among Calvinists, private confession to the pastor was more often recommended and practised than is usually realised.

(8) The Lutheran Church, unlike the Calvinistic, communicated its sick members freely and frequently, either by Reservation, or by special Consecration in the sick person's house. The

[1] Bucer's formula of Absolution is worth quoting. Though less emphatic than the Anglican (to which in his *Censura* he raises no objection), it strikes a note of decision and authority often lacking in Protestant Absolutions. *I who by command of Christ represent the Christian Church pronounce thee free and loosed from all thy sins: and I promise thee all his grace, consolation, works* [i.e. *merits*], *and life: also eternal life, in the name of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* Let all say, *Amen.*' Bucer claimed to absolve, not merely as representing the Church, but also in virtue of our Lord's commission to the Apostles, 'Whosesoever sins ye remit,' etc., which he quotes as the principal authority for this ministry.

[2] Lutheranism, however, even in its early days, laid far less stress than Roman Catholicism on the complete enumeration of all remembered sins, consequently the tendency was for Lutheran Confession to degenerate into a mere formality, and finally to disappear.

latter soon came to be the more usual method, except in High Lutheran quarters, where many mediæval practices were retained. No Lutheran forms seem expressly to forbid Reservation. The great majority, however, prescribe clinical celebration. Some do not specify the method of giving Communion.

(9) With regard to the Communion of the absent, Hermann von Wied († 1552), the Lutheran Archbishop of Cologne, authorised celebrations in private houses for the purpose of giving Communion not only to the sick, but also to travellers, and persons in health prevented by various reasons from attending church (*Simplex et pia deliberatio*, ed. 1545, p. 97). Hermann's Service Book, however, though highly influential in England, where it was much studied in translation, is not good evidence of ordinary Lutheran practice. It was apparently nowhere used on the Continent, except for a short time in Hesse.

It is somewhat surprising to learn that in Presbyterian Scotland, at a time when Communion was generally denied to the sick, private celebrations for mariners about to start on a voyage were sometimes permitted, even on weekdays. Dr. W. McMillan gives details of an instance in the year 1594 at Aberdeen (*The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church*, 1550–1638, p. 214).

The views of Luther himself concerning Reservation find expression in an important letter to Joachim II, Elector of Brandenburg from 1535 to 1571. The relevant part of it is reproduced by Daniel, *op. cit.*, p. 437.

Luther, in spite of a strongly expressed fear of 'idolatry,' was prepared to sanction Reservation for the Sick: 'The Sacrament may well be carried to the sick, provided it be taken from the Altar at Mass, and not placed in the Tabernacle (*Sacramenthaüslein*); provided also that no superstition (*Aberglauben*) is involved.'

He definitely sanctioned Reservation in both kinds; and yet felt perplexed about its propriety in all cases, when he considered the difficulties involved. To reserve the Chalice is, he admits, an 'innovation' (*Neuerung*), 'causing the whole world to open its mouth and eyes, and giving occasion to the Papists to mock.' To carry the Chalice a long way seems to him inconvenient. On the other hand, he cannot but feel that to carry the Host alone is 'a mockery of God, and only half a Sacrament—indeed no Sacrament at all.' Upon the whole, he prefers that Reservation should be practised as quietly and unostentatiously as possible; and that controversy and criticism should be avoided by saying nothing about it in the published Service Books.

Luther's advice in most cases was followed. Very few of the numerous Lutheran Orders prescribe or even mention Reservation. On the other hand, they do not forbid it, but discreetly 'leave a loophole' for it, as did the 1552 English Book.

The reader will have noticed: (1) that Luther did not contemplate, though he did not expressly forbid, *continuous* Reservation; (2) that in connection with Reservation in both kinds, he assumed that the actual Chalice would be carried to the sick person. The possibility of using the intincted Host, or reserving the consecrated wine in a stoppered vessel, does not seem to have occurred to him.

The attitude of the 'Reformed' Churches towards Communion of the Sick differed greatly from the Lutheran, and was far from uniform.

(1) The Church of Geneva rigorously denied Communion to the sick and dying under all circumstances. Laski took a similar line, as also did many English Puritans. Through the influence of John Knox, this view was for a time dominant in Scotland.

(2) Peter Martyr and others approved of private celebrations for the sick, but were intolerant of all forms of Reservation.

(3) Calvin also strongly favoured private celebrations for the sick and dying; but he was prepared at least to tolerate Reservation, provided that it was practised without superstition and theatrical 'pomp.'

(4) Beza, his successor, advocated Reservation for the sick on all days on which the Eucharist was publicly celebrated in church. On other days, he recommended that the Eucharist should be celebrated (in the presence of fellow-communicants) in the house of sickness.

(5) Not a few Calvinists objected on principle to celebrations in private houses, and yet desired to communicate the sick. Pastors holding these views communicated the sick *exclusively* by Reservation of the Justinian type.

Of this number was Pollanus, whose Liturgy contains the following rubric: 'But if a sick man asks for the Eucharist, [then] on the very day on which the Supper is celebrated by the Church, a deacon (*diaconus*) is sent with certain of the believers (*piis*), that they may communicate [a second time] with the sick man' (V. Pollanus, *Liturgia Sacra*, 1551 = 1552, p. 28).[1]

The Liturgy of the 'Reformed' Church of Frankfort-on-the-Main, printed in 1554 (2nd edit., 1555), shows that the Calvinists there took the same view as Pollanus. It has a rubric prescribing Reservation for the sick verbally identical with his, except that for 'a deacon' it reads 'one of the ministers' (*unus ex ministris*). (*Liturgia Sacra, seu Ritus Ministerii in Ecclesia Peregrinorum Frankfordiæ ad Mœnum*, 1555. See the reprint by A. L. Richter in

[1] I translate from the Latin version of this French Liturgy, which Pollanus presented to Edward VI. In his fulsome dedication, the young king is addressed as a second Josiah sent from heaven for the salvation of England; and he is exhorted to make still further efforts for the extirpation of 'idolatry.'

Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI Jahrhunderts, Weimar, 1846, Vol. II. p. 158.)

Since Pollanus derived his Liturgy, not from Frankfort, but from Strassburg, it is obvious that Reservation for the sick was also the practice at Strassburg at least as early as 1548 (when Pollanus left the city), and probably earlier still.[1]

Reservation and the Scottish Reformation.

Scottish Reformation documents, following the lead of Calvin and Beza, speak with considerable caution on the subject of Reservation, and indeed (by implication) seem even to allow it for the purpose of Communion. 'Adoration, Veneration, bearing throw streitis and townes (*urbes*[2] *et vicos*), and keiping of bread in boxis (*pixide*) or buistis (*i.e.* capsules), are a profanation of Christ's Sacramentes, and na use of the same' (*Scottish Confession*, 1560, Art. 22).

This article merely forbids public and ostentatious reservation in a 'pyx' or 'capsule,' after the mediæval manner. It says nothing against unostentatious Reservation in a cupboard in the chancel or in the vestry. Similarly, it does not condemn carrying the Sacrament to the sick 'without pomp,' as Calvin expresses it, but only ostentatious public processions of the Host, which have as their purpose, not Communion, but adoration. This article, even if taken in its strictest and most literal sense, is consistent, not only with occasional, but also with *perpetual* Reservation for the purpose of Communion.

The same remark applies to the Westminster Confession (1646):—'Worshipping the elements, the lifting them up, or carrying them about for adoration, and the reserving them for *any pretended religious use*, are all contrary to the nature of this Sacrament, and to the institution of Christ' (Art. xxix. 4).

'Reservation *for any pretended use*' must mean 'Reservation *for some superstitious use*.' It cannot with the least plausibility be understood to mean '*Reservation for the purpose of Communion*,' i.e. for the very purpose for which the Westminster Divines—as well as the Council of Trent—declared that the Sacrament had been instituted.

[1] The peculiar method of communicating the sick by Reservation prescribed in Elizabeth's Latin Prayer Book of 1560 is derived ultimately from the Frankfort Liturgy through Alexander Aless. Aless in his Latin translation of the 1549 Prayer Book altered the rubrics dealing with Reservation in such a way as to make them more acceptable to the 'Reformed' of Frankfort and Strassburg. Haddon, while compiling Elizabeth's Latin Book, had Aless's translation before him. This translation, however, does not direct the priest himself to communicate again with the sick man. The requirement that the priest should communicate a second time was probably suggested to Haddon by the Liturgy of Pollanus, which directs *the deacon* who carries the Sacrament to do this.

[2] Another Latin version has *plateas*. Du Cange defines 'platea' as '*via publica, locus vacuus, ager cum mansione*' (vi. p. 359).

From the modern Presbyterian point of view Dr. H. J. Wotherspoon writes as follows:—'Reservation for sick and others . . . is strictly within the destination and purpose of the consecration. Its antiquity and prescription are certain. Justin treats it simply as part of the normal distribution (*1st Ap.* 67, 65). The Sacrament is not over until all who wait to be fed have received, the invalids and the "prisoners," in whatever restraint of duty or incapacity they are held, so long as it is restraint absolute. The alternative to reservation for the sick is, of course, celebration specially for each, *which in some circumstances is extremely difficult, and where there is only one minister of the sacrament and many sick may be merely impossible.* And while in clinical communion there is loss to the communicant in the fact of his absence from the consecration, there is compensation in his sense of fellowship with the worship of his brethren, and of receiving along with them' (*Religious Values in the Sacraments*, 1928, p. 284, italics mine).

Although the fact is not generally known in England, Reservation is practised to-day on a considerable scale throughout the Presbyterian world, nor is its legitimacy or propriety challenged. 'Suffice it to say,' writes Maxwell (*op. cit.*, p. 56), 'that the carrying of the Communion to the sick is now a common, though not a universal, custom among Presbyterians throughout the world.' Dr. McMillan gives similar testimony: 'Where Church of Scotland ministers to-day give the Sacrament to the sick and aged, this [*i.e.* Reservation] is the practice that is generally followed' (*The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church*, 1550–1638, p. 212).

As a matter of fact, no less than three methods of Reservation are at present in use among the Presbyterians of Scotland:—

(1) The method already described.

(2) Reservation of the Elements which have been consecrated at a morning or principal celebration, for use at 'a second table' in the afternoon or evening (*op. cit.*, p. 212). This practice is obviously based on the principle that it is lawful to reserve, not only for the sick, but also for the whole, if the latter are unavoidably prevented from attending the principal Eucharistic Service.

(3) A now obsolescent method. 'In the eighteenth century there was a practice in vogue in the Shetland Islands for communicants to carry away in a clean handkerchief a portion of the Sacramental bread for the sick; and there is reason to believe that it still exists' (p. 213).

The existence of this custom shows that the Church of Scotland has, over long periods of time, at least *tolerated* Reservation in one kind only for the purpose of giving Communion to the sick.

As to the antiquity of Reservation in the Presbyterian Church, opinions differ. Considering, however, (1) that Presbyterians

have almost invariably communicated the sick on the actual day of the public celebration in church, and (2) that in the early period there was a much stronger and more general objection to private celebration than to Reservation, it seems necessary to assign to it a very early origin. It appears to be established, though evidence is scanty, that after the death (A.D. 1572) of John Knox, who was an opponent of Sick Communion, there was a gradual reaction in its favour, confined at first to a very few places. Since private celebrations had been officially forbidden in 1560 and again in 1581, it was impossible, without breach of the existing ecclesiastical law, to celebrate in a sick person's home. But the law did not forbid—at least not expressly—the carrying of the Sacrament to the sick after the public celebration in church. Consequently, the practice of Reservation, which Beza advocated, began to be adopted by those Presbyterian ministers (at first few in number) who desired at once to obey the law and to communicate the sick. That others, less numerous, broke the law (which was not everywhere observed) and celebrated for the sick, as well as for mariners, in their homes is also probable. Unfortunately the earliest evidence for the Communion of the Sick in Presbyterian Scotland does not specify the method employed. But at any rate, it is clear that the closely related practices of Sick Communion and Reservation came into vogue *pari passu*.

In these days, when the relations between the Church of England and the established Church of Scotland are becoming more cordial, it is interesting to notice how closely in accord (at least on the practical side) are the official references of the two Churches to the subject of Reservation. The formularies of both are consistent, not only with temporary Reservation of the 'Justinian' or 1549 type, but also with permanent Reservation, which also (as we have seen) has the sanction of primitive antiquity.

It may be added that even among modern English Nonconformists, the practice of reserving for the sick is not entirely unknown. That valuable compilation, *A Free Church Book of Common Prayer*, 1929, which reached a second edition within a few weeks of publication, contains a short Order (p. 282) for *The Communion of the Sick when the Sacrament is reserved.* Here we read: 'If provision has been made for the Communion of the sick by reserving, when the Holy Communion is celebrated in church, so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as may be needed, the Order may be as follows:

'After the minister has read one or more of the Sentences, there shall follow the Confession, Absolution, and *Agnus Dei.* Then the sick may receive Communion in one kind, or in both kinds, or by intinction, and the following words shall be said, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ (*or* the Body and Blood of

our Lord Jesus Christ) keep thy body and soul unto life eternal. Amen."'

It is somewhat startling to find in a widely-circulated Free Church Service Book definite recognition accorded to all the three methods of Reservation (viz. in one kind, in both kinds separately, and in both conjointly) which have behind them the authority of Catholic tradition, priority being accorded to that which is supported by the greatest weight of authority (especially in primitive times), viz. Reservation in the species of Bread alone.[1]

But to return to the early Presbyterian tradition:—there is one significant difference between the Scottish and the Anglican Reformation documents dealing with Reservation, which calls for especial notice. Whereas the Scottish documents declare the extra-liturgical cultus to be a 'profanation' of the Sacrament, and 'contrary' to the Institution of Christ, the Anglican Articles (with extraordinary restraint, considering the personal opinions of most of their compilers) content themselves with the cautious—and correct—statement, that it was not established by 'Christ's ordinance.' What view ought to be taken of it, regarded as a purely 'ecclesiastical' ordinance, is not stated in Arts. xxviii and xxxv, nor, for that matter, in Art. xxxiv. The principle therein laid down, that National Churches have power 'to ordain, change and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying,' has certainly a wide sphere of legitimate application. But it may be seriously questioned whether it is 'edifying' for a National Church, by forbidding Reservation, to place difficulties in the way of devout Christians receiving in the article of death that provision for their journey which the First Council of Nicæa declared to be 'most necessary.' And if, on examination, it further appears that no method, except the traditional one of Perpetual Reservation, is adequate to give reasonable security to the dying that *viaticum* will be forthcoming when it is needed, then acceptance of the *doctrine* of the Nicene Fathers carries with it acceptance also of *their practice*, which undoubtedly was the giving of *viaticum* by Reservation, not by special Consecration. This is one of the cases in which doctrine and practice are so closely bound up together, that their separation is not really feasible. Wherever it is seriously and widely believed that the Eucharist is 'the medicine of immortality' for the dying, and therefore 'most necessary,' an insistent demand for continuous Reservation

[1] It is also worthy of note that this Book contains a Service for Unction of the Sick (with Imposition of Hands) to be performed normally in church in the presence of the congregation, like the Anointing Service in the Greek *Euchologion*.

is certain to arise. That has always been the case in the past, and it is so to-day.

Enough has probably now been said to satisfy the reader that, contrary to popular opinion, there is little truth in the usual statement that Reservation in any form is inconsistent with the standards and principles of Protestantism. It is certainly not inconsistent with standards of Scottish Presbyterianism. The Scottish Presbyterian minister is as free to reserve, with as strict loyalty to his own doctrinal and liturgical standards, as are his Episcopalian brethren in Scotland and England.

Views of the English Reformers generally.

Kennedy states, from an extensive knowledge of the literature, that hardly any of the English—as distinguished from the continental—Reformers condemned Reservation *per se*. What they denounced so unsparingly was the mediæval Reservation of the Sacrament above or near the altar 'with pomp,' and its extra-liturgical cultus inside and outside church. Even the contentious and vituperative Becon expressed himself on this point with unusual mildness and restraint: 'The Church of Christ when it was most pure . . . knew of no such reservation of the Lord's Bread, as it is now used *in the Pope's Church*.' And Jewel expresses the prevailing sentiment of the Elizabethan Reformers in the words: 'Reservation in old time was not that the Sacrament should be adored, but that it should be received of the people; and specially that persons excommunicate, for whose sake it was reserved, being suddenly called out of this life, upon their repentance, at all times might receive the Communion, and depart with comfort as members of the Church of God. . . . It is the canopy [over the pyx] wherein all the question standeth. . . . The hanging of the Sacrament [over the High Altar], and the canopy, wherein the greatest danger stood, being removed, *somewhat may be considered touching Reservation, when it shall be thought necessary*.' [1]

The steady growth of Puritanism during Elizabeth's reign must have caused Reservation to become rarer. Probably by the end of the sixteenth century it was somewhat unusual. Nevertheless, its lawfulness, at least in its 1549 form, seems never to have been contested. Antony Sparrow, commenting on the Office for the Communion of Sick in 1657, writes as follows:—'The Rubric . . . directs the priest to deliver the Communion to the sick, but does not there set down how much of the Communion Service shall be used at the delivering of the Com-

[1] Quoted by W. P. M. Kennedy, *op. cit.*, who collects other evidence. Jewel's implied judgment in favour of giving *viaticum* to the dying, and his suggestion that it might be desirable to reserve continuously for this purpose, should be carefully noted.

munion to the sick, and therefore seems to me to refer us to former directions in times past. Now the direction formerly was this: "If the same day (that the sick is to receive the Communion) there be a celebration of the Holy Communion in the church, then shall the priest reserve (at the open Communion) so much of the Sacrament of the body and blood as shall serve the sick person, and so many as shall communicate with him,"' etc. Sparrow proceeds to quote the entire directions of the 1549 Book as being still authoritative or at least permissive.[1] This work of Sparrow's was highly esteemed, and remained for a long period the most authoritative treatise on the Prayer Book. It was reprinted by Newman in 1839.

Modern Interpretations of the Language of the Articles.

In modern times the following statements, which occur in the Articles of 1553 and 1563, have sometimes been quoted as evidence that Reservation was condemned and prohibited during the period 1552 to 1661.

'The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them.'

'The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.'

Considering that in the year 1560 Reservation of the 1549 type was explicitly authorised by the Queen and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and was in considerable use among the parochial clergy, it is impossible to suppose that these statements were intended to condemn every kind of Reservation. As a matter of fact, their language is more restrained than might have been expected. With great forbearance, and with the obvious purpose of conciliating the great Catholic party, pro-Anglican and pro-Papal, which was still in full communion with the Church of England, the Elizabethan Reformers refrained from condemning—at least in express terms—even those mediæval practices connected with Reservation which most of them were continually denouncing as abuses. In the same spirit they omitted from the Litany the condemnation of 'the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities' (contained in the 1549 and 1552 Books), though this precisely expressed the personal opinion of nearly all of them.[2]

The Elizabethan policy of combining Catholics and Reformers in one Church had its difficulties then, and has them now. But as long as it endures, it will be necessary to take account of Catholic as well as reforming opinion in dealing with vexed questions, such as Reservation.

[1] See *A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer*, 1st edit., 1657, p. 349.

[2] Even the Papal party for the most part conformed till 1570, when Pius V excommunicated Elizabeth, and absolved her subjects from their allegiance.

During the excitement which followed the publication of Tract XC, the above interpretation of the Articles, which alone suits the historical situation in 1563—and indeed, in the opinion of most modern authorities, is the only one which is grammatically possible—was denounced in some quarters as 'an evasion rather than an explanation' of the Articles. It is now the established (though not quite universal) view. It finds expression not only in Anglo-Catholic writings, but even in those eminently 'safe' Commentaries on the Articles which cautious and prudent bishops recommend for study to their ordination candidates. Dr. E. C. S. Gibson, for instance, commenting on the words 'The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped' (Art. xxviii), writes: 'The statement made in the Articles is worded with the utmost care, and with studious moderation. It cannot be said that any one of the practices is condemned or prohibited by it. It only amounts to this: that none of them can claim to be part of the original divine institution. *The Sacrament . . . was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.* That is all that is said: and in a formulary, such as the Articles, that was sufficient' (*The Thirty-nine Articles*, 2nd edit., 1898, p. 665). Dr. E. J. Bicknell writes similarly: 'This last section of the Article is carefully worded. . . . The practices mentioned are not condemned as sinful. No anathema is levelled at those who retain them,' etc. (*Introduction*,[2] 1925, p. 503).

Of the bearing of Article xxxiv on this subject we have already spoken (p. 582).

Synod of Perth.

Although the Episcopal Synod of Perth, held on August 25th, 1618, did not explicitly deal with Reservation, its proceedings have an important bearing on the subject. It scandalised much Scottish opinion by not only permitting but even *requiring* the minister to give Communion to every chronic invalid or dying person who desired it, provided that he was able to persuade three or four devout neighbours to communicate with him. (This proviso was, of course, a concession to the Calvinistic view that Communion must *under all circumstances* be a corporate act.)

The Synod prudently left the method of giving Communion to the sick undefined. It spoke vaguely of an 'administration' (not 'celebration')—a term which in that age would most naturally suggest a *distribution* of the Reserved Sacrament brought by the minister from the church, but which also might be fairly interpreted as permitting the Sacrament first to be consecrated in 'a convenient place' in the sick man's house, and afterwards 'administered' to him.

Two things are specially noticeable in connection with this

Synod: (1) that there was much stronger objection to celebrating the Eucharist in a sick man's house, than to reserving it at the public service in church; and (2) that the official apology for its acts (by Dr. David Lyndesay, Bishop of Brechin) defended both practices with the evident implication that both were authorised. The author of 'the seditious pamphlet' (to which Lyndesay replied in a masterly and persuasive manner) is almost prepared to concede Reservation; but is inflexibly opposed to consecrating in a private house. 'Some divines,' he writes, 'condescend thus far, that the Communion may be sent to the sick at the time of the public action. But Tilenus[1] says: Scarce any cause can be rendered, wherefore the public action should pass in private. . . .' And again: 'The Communion was sent to the sick in the time or immediately after the action [service] in Justin Martyr his time. It became afterwards to be reserved for the use of dying persons, etc. . . . *Yet in all antiquity we read not that the Communion was celebrated at the sick man's bedside.*' To this point the writer continually recurs, and it cannot be denied that, from the historical point of view, he occupies strong ground against his opponent. (See above, pp. 541, 547.)

Lyndesay, in his powerful but charitable reply, defends the whole of the Synod's decisions against which objection had been brought:—especially Private Baptism (when necessary); Kneeling at Communion; Eucharistic Adoration ('It is no error . . . to believe the spiritual powerful presence of Christ's body at the sacrament, and in that respect to worship his flesh and blood there; yea, Augustine saith, that it is sin not to worship his flesh there'); also both Reservation and private Celebration for the Sick. He has no difficulty in showing that Reservation is a primitive and useful custom; and he skilfully evades the pamphleteer's objection that there is no primitive authority for a private Celebration, by referring to the authority of Calvin, who approved it:—'As to the sending of the Sacrament to the sick, it was a custom of the ancient Church, which Beza allows [*i.e.* approves]. . . . Beza in his *Questions* thinks that the Sacrament should be sent to the sick. Calvin holds that it should be celebrated at the sick man's bedside, so both agree that it should be given to the sick. . . . To conclude, to deny a necessary comfort to the sick, which may be ministered without breach of any divine law, cures not the public infirmity of the Church, but grieves the sick, and fosters in those who are in health a base

[1] A humorous feature of the situation is that this learned French Protestant divine shortly afterwards became a convert to Anglicanism, and addressed an open letter to the Scottish nation, condemning Presbyterianism, and recommending the hearty acceptance of the episcopal form of government, as already happily established in England. This letter so pleased James I that he invited the author to England, and offered him a pension.

opinion and contempt of the Sacrament.' (*A true Narrative of all the Passages of the Proceedings of the General Assembly in the Church of Scotland, holden at Perth, the 25 of August, Anno Dom.* 1618, pp. 119 ff.)

A leading part in this Synod was taken by William Forbes (1585–1634), whose early and much-lamented death deprived the Anglican Church of one of the greatest theologians, and wisest and most tolerant ecclesiastical statesmen, which it has produced since the Reformation. His death immediately after his consecration to the see of Edinburgh, expressly created for him by Charles I, was a serious blow to the fortunes of Episcopacy in Scotland, and to the prospects of an understanding with England in religious matters. A divine as judicious and conciliatory as Hooker, and even more comprehensive in knowledge, he devoted his great talents unceasingly to the composing of the differences among Protestants, with a view to ultimate reunion with Rome on terms honourable to both parties, the basis of agreement advocated by him being Catholicism as understood and practised by the undivided Church.

At the Synod of Perth he was chosen to advocate the practice of kneeling at Communion; and in the same year he defended, in a public disputation with Aidie, the lawfulness of prayers for the dead.

Forbes defended the lawfulness, not only of Reservation of the 'Justinian' type, which was practised by many Lutherans and Calvinists, but also of *continuous public* Reservation in church, for the purpose of communicating the sick, the dying, and the absent. He desired, however, that such Reservation should be optional, not compulsory, as in the Church of Rome; because he held (it seems with insufficient warrant) that the primitive Church was not quite unanimous in its approval of the practice. 'It was the ancient custom,' he wrote, '. . . that the Sacrament should be publicly reserved in the sacristy (*in pastophorio*) or in a pyx, for the purpose of carrying it to the absent and the sick, as is clear from the story about Serapion in Eusebius. . . . It was reserved, however, that it might be received and eaten (as Vossius observes); *and this devout custom ought by no means to be condemned* (*hic pius mos neutiquam damnari debet*).' Among Protestants, he claims as in general agreement with his point of view Vorstius, Vossius, and Casaubon; and concludes: 'Let the abuse prevailing in the modern Roman Church of reserving the once consecrated host in *ciboria* for the purpose of being carried about in processions and for theatrical pomp be abolished . . . and the controversy may be closed, without condemning the practice of the ancient Church with regard to Reservation, which then prevailed' (*Works*, in *Anglo-Catholic Library of Theology*, Vol. II. pp. 540–42).

Forbes, in common with all theologians of the reformed Churches, maintained the absolute necessity of communicating the laity in both kinds at every public celebration of the Eucharist. On the other hand, he was prepared to tolerate—and apparently even to sanction—Communion in one kind, when given out of church in cases of necessity or great emergency. He quotes with approval the words of Vorstius (*In Antipistorio, parte* 2, p. 350): 'But in this matter we always make exceptions for special cases, in which we do not contentiously deny that perchance one kind may suffice'; and refers in support to Casaubon (Epistle prefixed to his theological *Exercitationes*), to Andrewes (*c. Card. Bellarm. Apol.*, c. 8, p. 192), both of whom except cases of clear necessity from the general rule; also (with some justification) to Bucer, who cautiously remarks: 'If there were a person who could not drink wine, and to such a one only the Lord's bread were administered, . . . there would surely be a dispensation of the Church with regard to this Sacrament, which would be lawful, and would be granted, according to the example and words of the Lord concerning the sabbath.' The reference is to our Lord's words: 'The Son of Man is Lord also of the sabbath.' (See Bucer, *In defens. Christ. Reform. Herman. Archiep. Col.*, c. 73.)

The truth is that much Protestant opinion on the Continent tolerated or approved Communion in one kind:—not, of course, in church, but out of church in special circumstances. Luther's confused and contradictory utterances on this subject cannot be reconciled, as Hospinian and many others have pointed out. Nevertheless, it is certain, that at least in some moods he was prepared to acquiesce in Communion in one kind in cases of emergency. This was certainly the view of Lutherans generally. For example, D. Chytræus (*Historia Augustanæ Confessionis*, ed. 1578, p. 430) represents the Protestants as declaring: 'We deem those excused who partake of one kind through necessity, which may be manifold and various. But by this concession we do not express approval of the [Roman Church's] prohibition of the other kind.' That the English Reformers permitted Communion in one kind in cases of necessity, has already been shown (p. 554). Facts of this nature do not seem to have been duly weighed by the majority of those who in these days contend that Reservation in one kind only for the sick and dying is inconsistent with the principles of the Reformation.

The views of Forbes were accepted with enthusiasm at Aberdeen, the principal High Church centre in Scotland at that time. But among the more extreme Presbyterians who looked to Geneva rather than the primitive Church as their standard, they inspired dislike and alarm, especially after the issue of the unfortunate Scottish Prayer Book of 1637. The Eucharistic teaching of Forbes, particularly with regard to the Real Presence, Reservation,

and Communion in one kind, was attacked with vituperative vehemence by Robert Baillie (1599–1662), a learned but most intolerant opponent of Episcopacy, in a long appendix to the third edition (1641) of his anonymous *Ladensium* αὐτοκατάκρισις, *the Canterburians Self-conviction* (1st edition, London, 1640). Baillie quotes Forbes copiously, and denounces his 'evill talents,' 'most gross poperie,' and sinister 'design to bring us back to Rome.' However, not even Baillie attacked Reservation *per se*. His polemic was directed against continuous public Reservation in church, with its attendant danger of 'idolatry'; also against Communion in one kind, which Forbes allowed as an exceptional practice.

The natural conclusion to draw from the facts connected with the Synod of Perth is that, owing to strong popular opposition, the sick were seldom communicated at this period in Scotland; but that, when they were, it was usually by Reservation, not by special Consecration, because the Presbyterian objection to the former practice was considerably weaker, and in some cases non-existent. The subsequent history of Reservation in both the Episcopal and the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland strongly confirms this conclusion.

The circumstance that Reservation was esteemed lawful by the Scottish Bishops in 1618 does not of itself prove that it was lawful at the same time in England. But, inasmuch as the avowed object of the Synod of Perth was to bring about as much conformity as possible with the Church of England, the proceedings there afford indirect confirmation of the conclusion which we have already reached on other grounds, that it was lawful and was actually practised under the English Books of 1559 and 1604.

The 1661 Prayer Book.

The lawfulness of Reservation under the 1661 Book depends almost entirely upon the interpretation of the following much-disputed rubric:—

'And if any of the Bread and Wine remain unconsecrated, the Curate shall have it to his own use: but if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same.'

It is historically certain that the object of this rubric was not to forbid Reservation, but to prevent the irreverent practice —not uncommon among the Puritan clergy—of using the remains of the consecrated elements in their homes as food at ordinary meals. A similar practice prevailed in Scotland—perhaps also in England—of distributing these remains after

service to the poorer communicants, to be taken home by them and used in the same way.

Already in 1636 a Scottish Canon had directed that the consecrated remains should be consumed by the poorer communicants, 'before they go out of the Church.' Next year the ill-fated Scottish Book directed that the consecrated remains 'shall be eaten and drunken by such of the communicants only as the presbyter which celebrates shall take unto him, but *it shall not be carried out of the Church.*' The 1661 rubric had much the same object in view as the rubric of 1637, and largely adopted its language. If it be contended that, whatever the actual purpose of the 1661 rubric, its literal observance does in fact exclude Reservation, the answer is that this is by no means the case.

In order to understand this rubric, it must be read in connection with the 1661 Offertory rubric which directs: 'The priest shall place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient.'

It being granted that down to 1661 Reservation was lawful (and this upon the evidence can hardly be reasonably disputed), this rubric could only naturally mean at the time, that at the Offertory the priest was to place upon the Table so much as he thought sufficient *for all the intended communicants*, whether those communicants were all at that moment in church, or some of them sick at home awaiting Communion. On days when the priest thought it expedient to reserve, he would place an extra amount upon the Table, intended for the Communion of the absent. Then, after the Consecration, he would set aside in a place of safe keeping so much of the consecrated elements as would suffice for communicating the absent sick. If he had correctly calculated the number of intending communicants in church, and had made proper provision for them, nothing would remain for the communicants present to consume. Consequently the conditional rubric, 'if any remain of that which was consecrated,' would not come into operation. On the other hand, if he had miscalculated, and consecrated too much, then some would 'remain,' and this remainder would not be 'carried out of the Church,' but after the Blessing the celebrant would call unto him certain of the communicants, and with them 'reverently eat and drink the same.'

Reservation being still lawful in 1661, and no change in the law intended by the Revisers (as is usually granted even by the opponents of Reservation), this is the obvious 'literal' meaning of the rubric, and indeed the only meaning which it can naturally bear. The idea that it means anything else can only be logically based on the assumption that in 1661 Reservation either actually was, or was believed by the Revisers to be, unlawful—an assump-

tion which is based on no evidence, and is contrary to fact. The majority of the active Revisers were men of the Laudian school, who regarded the 1549 Book with veneration, and were attached to the practices of the primitive Church. To suppose that men like Sparrow, and Thorndike, known advocates of Reservation,[1] and actively concerned in the Revision, deliberately acquiesced in the framing of a rubric which according to its literal meaning (for that is the contention of opponents of Reservation) obviously excludes Reservation, is not in accordance with sound principles of historical criticism. The frequent contention, 'The Revisers had forgotten the whole subject of Reservation, and excluded it by inadvertence,' does not harmonise with the known facts. Only four years earlier Sparrow had published his classical *Rationale*, wherein he quoted the 1549 rubrics on Reservation in full, and declared the practice to be still lawful. A second edition was issued in the very year of the Revision (1661). All the Revisers, of whom Sparrow was one, had had their attention recently drawn to the subject, and they were perfectly aware that legality was being influentially claimed for the practice by one of their own number. The truth is that the rubric of 1661, interpreted 'literally' and in accordance with the facts of history, has no bearing, direct or indirect, upon Reservation. Indeed it is consistent, not only with the 'Justinian' method of Reservation which the 1549 and 1560 Books authorised, but also with 'continuous' Reservation, which (as we have seen) was also in use, at least to some extent in the period 1549–1552.

It is worth adding that the ultimate source of the 1661 rubric goes back beyond the Reformation to the seventh-century apocryphal epistle of St. Clement to St. James the Lord's brother, familiar to the Elizabethan and Caroline divines through its inclusion in the collections of Gratian and Lyndwood (see the *Provinciale*, iii. 25). The pseudo-Clement writes: 'Let so many hosts indeed be offered on the altar as ought to be offered by the people, but *if any remain*, let them not be reserved until the morrow, but be carefully consumed by the clerks with fear and trembling.'

This and numerous other mediæval regulations and rubrics (including those of the Sarum Missal), some of which expressly forbid the remains to be 'taken out of the Church' (as had been allowed in the primitive period when the laity were permitted to carry the Sacrament home for the purpose of daily Communion),

[1] I refrain from citing as evidence the inscription upon the supposed pyx of Jeremy Taylor (*Haec pyxis quondam erat usui Jer. Taylor Episcopo*), because recent investigation seems to show that this inscription is not contemporary. A description of this interesting but enigmatic object is given in C. Wordsworth's article on Reservation in the *Prayer Book Dictionary*, pp. 609, 611; and in V. Staley's edition of *Hierurgia Anglicana*, Vol. II. p. 164.

have no bearing whatever upon that part of the Eucharist which was reserved for the sick, and stored in a 'turris,' 'pyx,' 'ciborium,' or other suitable receptacle. Pseudo-Clement and the other mediæval authorities (including Lyndwood, who has a note upon the subject) take it for granted that the Eucharist will be perpetually reserved for the sick and dying. The 'remains' of which they speak are not the portion for the sick, but the surplus of the consecrated species remaining on the altar after the Communion of the priest and people. These were dealt with in different ways in different Churches.[1] It is probable (indeed almost certain) that Parker misunderstood Pseudo-Clement's direction, somewhat as certain modern authorities, unfamiliar with liturgical tradition, have misunderstood the 1661 rubric. It seems fairly clear that he, like Beza, took 'Clement' to mean that the Sacrament might be reserved for communicating the sick *on the same day*, but *not reserved to the morrow* for that purpose (see p. 564). If so, Parker was certainly wrong, for the remains of which Clement speaks were quite clearly not intended for the sick.[2]

Thorndike and Sparrow.

That some at least of the Revisers did not consider that the new rubric excluded Reservation is historically certain. Thorndike, writing about eight years after the Revision, observes:—

'As concerning the Eucharist . . . the Church is to endeavour the celebrating of it so frequently that it may be reserved to the next communion. For in the meantime it ought to be so ready for them that pass into the other world, that they [the priests] need not stay for the consecrating of it on purpose for every one.

[1] For the details, see W. Lockton, *The Treatment of the Remains at the Eucharist after Holy Communion*, 1920; and W. E. Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, pp. 894–7.

[2] Not only Mr. Lockton, but also Mr. Cuthbert Atchley takes this view of the 1661 rubric. 'The good Fathers of 1661,' writes the latter, 'remembered their Lindewode. . . . That this decree [recorded by Lindewode] was in force before the sixteenth century, at a time when reservation of the Eucharist for the sick was universally practised, may be seen from the same work, Lib. iii, tit. *De custodia Eucharistiæ* . . . where it is written, "The Presbyter will always have the Eucharist ready for the sick, nor is that hindered by the regulation which forbids the reservation of superfluous hosts placed on the altar, for it is true that [hosts] ought not to be reserved for the use of the consecrating priests, but for the use of the dying"' (quoted in V. Staley's *Hierurgia*[2], Vol. II. pp. 164–5: I have translated Lyndwood's Latin).

Lockton plausibly argues that Lyndwood's (*i.e.* the usual) punctuation of Clement's phrase, *quod si remanserint, in crastinum non reserventur*, is wrong, and it ought to be translated 'but if any [hosts] remain until the morrow, let them not be reserved [any longer]'; cf. Exodus xii. 10; xxiii. 18; xxix. 34, etc. The point is interesting, but not worth discussing here, because, whatever the correct translation, it is certain that there is no reference to that part of the Eucharist which was reserved for the sick.

The reason of the necessity of it for all, which hath been delivered, aggravates it very much in danger of death. And the practice of the Church attests it to the utmost. Neither will there be a necessity of giving it in one kind only, as by some passages of antiquity may be collected, if common sense could deceive [decide?] in a practice of this nature.' [1]

This passage is specially interesting, because it shows that Thorndike considered that the 1661 rubric is consistent, not only with Reservation of the 1549 type, but also with *continuous Reservation for the purpose of giving 'viaticum' to the dying.* Upon the necessity of this he strongly insists, quite in the spirit of the Fathers of Nicæa. He does not condemn the mediæval practice of giving *viaticum* in one kind only. However, he regards it as unnecessary, and seems rather to recommend that continuous Reservation *should be always in both kinds.*

The evidence of the later editions of Sparrow's *Rationale*, published in 1661, 1664, 1676, and 1684, points in the same direction. It is quite true that he did not alter his book to take account of the changes made in 1661. Nevertheless, the later editions obviously passed through his hands, for they embodied small changes. For example, that of 1672 contained services drawn up by Bishop Andrewes for consecrating a Church and a Cemetery (pp. 301 ff.); and that of 1676 a long new paragraph strongly insisting on the duty of fasting Communion (pp. 236–8). All these editions, including the last published in his lifetime (1684), retain unaltered his expression of opinion that the 1549 method of Reservation was still lawful. No opinion adverse to Reservation has been or is likely to be produced from writings of the 1661 Revisers, who (as we have seen) were for the most part admirers of the 1549 Book, and sympathetic with primitive Catholic tradition.

Reservation after 1661 was probably somewhat rare; and, except among the Non-Jurors and the Episcopalians of Scotland, tended to die out. But it seems to have lasted, at least in some remote districts in England, well into the nineteenth century. Bishop John Wordsworth wrote in 1901: 'I am inclined to think that something like the custom of the First Prayer Book . . . has had a greater continuance among us than is perhaps generally supposed. I have heard of a case of the Sacrament being taken to a sick woman directly after a public celebration at Corfe Castle, fifty years ago, and I am told that the like tradition exists at Penkridge. I shall be glad to know if it can be traced elsewhere.' [2]

Reservation is thus, in the opinion certainly of some and

[1] *The Reformation of the Church of England better than that of the Council of Trent*, in the *Anglo-Catholic Library*, Vol. V, p. 578.
[2] *Further Considerations on Public Worship*, p. 15.

probably of all of those who actually drew up the new rubric of 1661, entirely consistent with the present Prayer Book. It was not, however, unnatural that after the practice had become almost obsolete, and the liturgical tradition had become obscured, another view of the meaning of the rubric should suggest itself to some. Already in 1722 Samuel Downes, who in that year published a posthumous edition of Sparrow's *Rationale*, drew attention in a footnote to the new rubric of 1661, not expressly stating, but probably believing that it negated Sparrow's assumption that Reservation was still authorised. The Compilers of the Non-Jurors' Communion Office of 1718 probably had this new interpretation in view when they slightly altered the 1661 rubric, so as to make it, beyond all possibility of doubt, consistent with Reservation. In more recent times, not only Courts of Law,[1] from which accurate determination of technical liturgical questions is hardly to be expected, but even Archbishops,[2] and at least one distinguished liturgical expert,[3] have interpreted the 1661 rubric as excluding Reservation.

[1] Sir Lewis Dibdin in the Court of Arches (in an undefended and otherwise unsatisfactory case) pronounced Reservation 'an ecclesiastical offence' (Dec. 10, 1906). A similar decision was given by Mr. Justice Coleridge in the King's Bench Division (March 28, 1920) in the Salford Patronage Case. On the other hand, recent action by diocesan chancellors and bishops shows a tendency to follow the judgment of liturgical experts, and to recognise the changed conditions of Church life. In Oct. 1926, the Chancellor of the Diocese of Liverpool granted a faculty for erecting an aumbry 'with a lamp hanging near' in the south wall of the Lady Chapel of St. Luke's Church. He stipulated that Reservation should be in both kinds; and that the elements should 'never be taken from the aumbry except for the purpose of administration.' He held that the 25th and 28th Articles do not prohibit carrying the Sacrament to the sick, and that the 1661 (disputed) rubric, 'being designed against irreverence, had no substantial relevance' (see *Southport Guardian*, Oct. 2nd, 1926). At St. Margaret's Church, Oxford, a faculty was granted during Dr. Burge's episcopate for removing the place of Reservation from the aumbry to a tabernacle upon the altar. A faculty was granted to St. Barnabas', Oxford, for the erection of an altar of which a tabernacle formed a structural part. The Bishop (Dr. Burge) publicly consecrated this altar, which is still in use. Episcopal permissions to erect aumbries are now too numerous for specific enumeration. On the other hand, as lately as January 1931, the Chancellor of Truro diocese strangely granted a faculty for the removal of a pyx from the Church of St. Mary in Truro Cathedral, although the Bishop himself had sanctioned its being placed there. The Chancellor gave no reasons for his ruling that Reservation is illegal, merely stating baldly that, 'According to the law as it now stands, Reservation of any kind is unlawful' (see *Western Morning News*, Jan. 10, 1931).

[2] See the two Archbishops' Opinions published in 1900. Archbishop Temple, however, speaking of perpetual as well as other methods of Reservation, was careful to state that 'such a practice was quite consistent with the Christian faith, and there was nothing wrong in it in itself.' Both 'Opinions' exhibit strange ignorance of the history of the practice.

[3] Dr. J. Wickham Legg, who, however, points out that this view was not taken at the time, and that certain eminent Revisers continued to maintain the lawfulness of Reservation even after 1661, and that the practice still continued.

But the majority of the best liturgical authorities are still of opinion that the 1661 rubric neither did nor was intended to prohibit Reservation. For example, Procter and Frere's standard commentary, in use as a text-book in most theological colleges, and possessed by nearly every parish priest, states the position thus:—'The rubric was not intended to touch upon the question of the Reservation of the Sacrament for the Communion of the sick; it was only concerned with the consumption of that which remains, and authorises the ablutions by which this consumption is reverently and adequately carried out.'[1] Lockton, as the result of a particularly thorough historical inquiry, comes to a similar conclusion.[2]

The same view was taken by Dr. Brightman, who during the last few months of his life devoted considerable attention to the subject of Reservation, with a view to its adequate treatment in the present volume. A considerable amount of the new evidence produced in this Essay was supplied by him. The final conclusions to which he was led were: (1) that, when the English Reformers restored the Chalice to the laity, they intended Communion in one kind to continue in cases of 'necessity': and (2) that Continuous Reservation of the Eucharist, not only in both kinds, but also in one, has been lawful under all the post-Reformation Prayer Books, including that of 1552, however little in most periods it may have been actually practised.

The adverse decisions of the Courts of Law are due, partly to the inevitable lack of the requisite technical knowledge on the part of civil law judges,[3] who have received no canonical, theological, or liturgical training of any kind; partly also to the assumption (entirely unjustified) that liturgical documents can be satisfactorily interpreted on the same principles as civil law documents. Because the 1661 Book is 'annexed' to an Act of Parliament, it is assumed that it should be interpreted precisely like an Act of Parliament—in other words, that its rubrics should be regarded as exhaustive (and therefore prohibiting all practices which they do not specifically command), that they should be logically precise and consistent in every particular, and (above all) that they should be interpreted with little or no reference to the liturgical tradition of which they form part, or to the known views and intentions of their authors.

It ought not to need pointing out that, though the 1661 Book was authorised by Parliament, it was not drawn up by Parlia-

[1] *New History of the Prayer Book*, p. 502.

[2] *The Remains of the Eucharist*, pp. 238–72.

[3] The two Provincial, and nearly all the Diocesan Ecclesiastical Courts, are now presided over by civil law judges, who have no professional knowledge of the liturgical, theological, and canonical questions, which it is frequently their duty to decide. In pre-Reformation days ecclesiastical judges were carefully trained for their work.

ment, but by Convocation; and is accordingly not a 'legal' but a 'liturgical' document, having its roots in liturgical tradition, and requiring interpretation in its light. No competent liturgical scholar works on the principle—accepted as an unquestioned axiom by the Courts, and even by the 'Opinions' of Archbishops Temple and Maclagan—that rubrical 'omission' is equivalent to prohibition. The rubrics of liturgical documents are notoriously incomplete, and not seldom (on a superficial view) inconsistent. A narrow 'legal' interpretation of the Sarum Missal, which nowhere mentions Reservation,[1] and lays great stress upon the complete consumption of the remains of the Eucharist, would lead to the absurd conclusion that it prohibits Reservation. The same method of interpretation applied to the rubrics of the Liturgies of the Orthodox Church would lead to the equally false conclusion that only the single method of Reservation which they prescribe is legitimate, and that the others are 'illegal.'[2]

The unsatisfactory character, in respect both of constitution and competence, of the unreformed Courts which at present decide ecclesiastical issues, is thus commented on by H.M. Commissioners in their 1906 Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline. 'The failure of the Court of Final Appeal to command the obedience of the clergy is a source of inevitable weakness in the Provincial and Diocesan Courts. . . . A Court dealing with matters of conscience and religion must, above all others, rest on moral authority if its judgments are to be effective. As thousands of clergy, with strong lay support, refuse to recognise the authority of the Judicial Committee [of the Privy Council], its decisions cannot practically be enforced.'

No friend of the Church of England desires to condone lawlessness, or to encourage contempt for authority, but it is only fair to point out that the early pioneers of Reservation had strong historical and liturgical authority on their side, and regarded themselves as obeying in the strictest and most literal manner the rubrics of the 1661 Book, the ancient canon law of the Church of England, and the tradition of the Universal Church. Reservation for the sick, the dying, and the absent, seemed to them, as it seems to the present writer, just one of those 'laudable practice[s] . . . of the whole Catholic Church of Christ,'[3] which the 1661 Revisers declared it their intention, not to abolish, but to retain.[4]

[1] Except, of course, in the Mass for Maundy Thursday, when the Eucharist was reserved for use in the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday.

[2] See below, pp. 607–08.

[3] See the 1661 Preface.

[4] See this forcibly argued, as far back as 1887, by J. W. Kempe in his *Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the Sick and Dying not inconsistent with the Order of the Church of England*, with preface by T. T. Carter.

The Modern Situation.

The recent revival in the Church of England of continuous Reservation on a large scale is the result, hardly at all of antiquarian, or legal, or 'liturgical' considerations, but almost entirely of practical pastoral needs.

Continuous Reservation goes back to the middle of the nineteenth century. Neale began it about 1855 at East Grinstead, and it has been continuous there ever since. It was in use in other Community Chapels at early dates. There were instances in the diocese of London and elsewhere in the 'sixties and 'seventies. At All Saints, Plymouth, the Rev. R. C. Chase established Permanent Reservation of the Sacrament in 1882. Often, in early days, Reservation took place in the Parsonage or Clergy House, in order to show due respect to (hostile) ecclesiastical authority, and to avoid unnecessary friction. To-day the practice is widely spread—much more so than the published statistics indicate.

The main cause of the revival of Reservation was the revival by the Tractarians and their successors of the teaching of the Fathers of the English Reformation,[1] that the laity ought to be encouraged to communicate frequently, and at least every Sunday. The aspiration of the English Reformers 'to turn the Mass into a Communion'[2] was shared by the Tractarians, who defended it as in accordance with apostolic and primitive tradition, and took much more effective methods of securing the desired result.

Persistent teaching of this character (which to some extent is now given even in Evangelical parishes) and the provision of much more frequent opportunities for Communion (every Sunday and Holy Day in practically all churches, and daily in many) have led to the fortunate result, that to-day hundreds of thousands of the Anglican laity communicate every Sunday, and that even in quite small parishes there are often small groups of communicants who have learnt greatly to value the privilege now granted to them by their pastors of receiving the Bread of Life every day. Such lay persons, when sick, naturally desire to be communicated at least as frequently as when in health, especially as they now know that this privilege has belonged to the laity at least since the days of Justin Martyr; and that

[1] Calvin shared their views, but the resistance of the laity, unaccustomed for hundreds of years to frequent Communion, prevented him from establishing the Eucharist at Geneva as the principal service every Sunday. Bucer fully agreed with Calvin.

[2] This did not mean that 'the Mass' was something different from 'the Communion,' but merely that there ought to be lay communicants—as many as possible—at every Mass. The identity of the reformed service with the mediæval Rite was unambiguously stated in the 1549 Book:—'The Supper of the Lorde, and the Holy Communion, *commonly called the Masse*.'

(owing to the revival of Reservation) it now involves little inconvenience or expenditure of time on the part of their pastors.

It does not diminish the significance of this fact to urge (as some opponents of Reservation do) that they themselves have ministered in parishes, where the sick do not desire frequent Communion, and where indeed they seldom ask for it at all.

This, of course, is true of some parishes. But it is also true that in other parishes the laity not only communicate frequently in church, but also, when ill, desire to be frequently communicated at home. Especially is this the case where there is a daily Eucharist, which has encouraged the devout laity who have leisure to communicate several times a week or even daily. There are now numerous parishes where many persons, when sick, desire to be communicated weekly, and some even daily.

It is this vast change in the religious habits of churchpeople, brought about mainly by persistent Tractarian teaching (though the efforts in this direction of numerous devout Evangelical pastors must also be recognised), which, by gradually transforming a Church of non-communicants into a Church of communicants, has rendered the practice of Reservation more and more necessary every year, and has caused its steady extension. This is not indeed the only cause, but it is the most potent.

At the present day, a single-handed priest, celebrating daily in church, often finds it necessary to provide for numerous sick Communions out of church, some weekly, some frequent or daily. In a large parish, when there happens to be much sickness, a single priest may sometimes be called upon to provide for as many as half a dozen sick Communions daily for a considerable period.

To do this by consecrating separately in each house, consumes much time, involves habitual 'duplication,' and protracts the celebrant's fast to an unduly late hour. 'Duplication' (or 'bination') is strongly disliked by many priests (unless there is some important occasion for it) on both personal and canonical grounds. The practice was severely restricted by ancient and mediæval canons, and the English Reformers had such a strong dislike for it, that they went so far as to withdraw, in 1552, the 1549 direction, which had ancient authority, to celebrate twice on Easter and Christmas Day.

Needs of the Absent.

Again, under modern conditions, a considerable number of persons in perfect health (cowmen, nurses, mothers suckling young infants, postmen, railway-men, garage-keepers, omnibus-men, motor-drivers, etc.) find it quite impossible to attend the Eucharist except on rare occasions. It is impossible to provide for their frequent, or even for their regular weekly Communion, except by

Reservation. Such persons can usually arrange to come to the church at some time convenient to themselves, and there receive the Reserved Sacrament. Nursing mothers, again, can hardly bring their babies with them for a long service, but they can easily do so for the five-minutes' service used in connection with the Reserved Sacrament.

Reservation has never been exclusively for the sick; always also for the unavoidably absent. The primitive Church, to which the Fathers of the English Reformation made their frequent appeal, laid quite as much stress on the need of regular Communion for the absent whole as for the absent sick. St. Justin Martyr, our earliest witness to Reservation, states explicitly twice that the Sacrament was carried to the absent, making no mention of the sick.

One of the strongest objections felt to the 1928 Book by many parish priests is that, if its rubrics are adopted, Communion of the absent whole is excluded, whereas the rubrics of the 1661 Book (which in their view permit Reservation) indicate no such restriction. The exclusion of the whole from the privilege of receiving the Reserved Sacrament (except in the company of sick persons) was deprecated almost unanimously by the Lower Houses of Convocation, and appears to have no basis in reason. In very many—probably the majority—of parishes in which Reservation is practised under the authority of the 1661 Book, Communion is given to persons in health unavoidably prevented from attending the Eucharistic Service. In these days there is, unfortunately, much Sunday work, and the rigorous enforcement of the 1928 rubric prohibiting the giving of the Reserved Sacrament to the whole would involve hardship to many thousands of over-worked people.

The Eucharist and the Ministry of Healing.

The recent revival of the Ministry of Healing must certainly be reckoned among the factors encouraging frequent Communion, and by consequence the practice of Reservation.

It is now widely taught and believed that the devout and well-prepared reception of the Holy Eucharist conduces to bodily as well as spiritual health. This belief (as has been already fully shown) is psychologically sound, and in accord with the belief of the primitive Christians, who spoke of the Eucharist as '*φάρμακον*,' ' medicina,' ' sanitas,' in a combined spiritual and physical sense.

Viaticum.

But, beyond all doubt, it is chiefly the revival of the ancient belief that *viaticum* is ' most necessary ' for the dying, which has rendered the restriction of Reservation to the 1549 type unacceptable, and indeed impossible.

It is now believed with deep conviction by many thousands of devout lay persons, that it is their bounden duty to receive the Eucharist in the article of death, and equally the duty of their pastors to supply them with it. Those who do not share this belief are bound by the law of Christian charity to respect it, and to recognise that those who hold it are bound in conscience to act upon it. Such belief is entirely consonant with the principles of the English Reformation. The First Council of Nicæa, which declared *viaticum* in the hour of death 'most necessary,' is accepted not only by the English Church, but also by the English State. The Statute, 1 Eliz. c. 1, which defines the State's attitude towards orthodoxy and heresy, declares that to be heresy which is so adjudged 'by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or *by the first four general Councils* [of which Nicæa was the first], or by any other general Council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the same Canonical Scriptures.'

The doctrine that *viaticum* is 'most necessary' does not mean that the salvation of a dying person is imperilled if through some unfortunate and unforeseen contingency he fails to receive it. But it does mean that there lies upon everyone who believes it a serious obligation to do everything that is humanly possible to prevent the possibility of the passage of a Christian soul out of this world without *viaticum*. It has not been the habit of the Church to regard frequent Communion as a *substitute* for *viaticum*. Even when Communion has already been received in health on the same day, it always has been and still is the custom for a dying Christian to seek to receive that 'most necessary provision' for his journey, before he departs into the other world.

Experience shows that the only secure and satisfactory method of providing *viaticum* is by the traditional method of continuous Reservation. Cases are unfortunately not unknown, where the parish priest, suddenly called out in the middle of the night to give *viaticum*, finds the dying person quite able to receive the Sacrament when he arrives, but sinking so fast into unconsciousness that the greatest haste is necessary. If he has not brought the Sacrament with him, and it is necessary to find 'a convenient place,' and make various arrangements before consecrating it, the sick person may become unconscious or die before it can be administered. The necessary preliminaries often cause considerable delay, especially in the middle of the night, when the house is dark and in disorder, and the family is distracted with anxiety. Several instances of tragic deaths after the priest's arrival, and before arrangements could be made to consecrate the Sacrament, are known to the writer.

It must also be remembered that the administration of *viaticum* (which is usually accompanied by Unction) may actually *save* life. Most parish priests of long experience can remember

instances of persons *in extremis* brought back to life almost by a miracle through the timely administration of *viaticum*. Had it not been administered, the patient in all human probability would have died

All priests who believe that *viaticum* is 'most necessary' for the dying are bound to take every precaution which is possible to secure that it shall not be lacking when need arises. Every avoidable case of death without *viaticum* involves (for those who believe in its necessity) a painful tragedy. It is true that a sudden urgent call for *viaticum* does not happen often in a small parish, but it happens sometimes; and when it does happen, and (as a result of negligence on the part of the Church authorities) it is not received, a tragedy happens. It is felt to be this, not only by the priest and the patient, but also by every relative and friend who sympathises with the dying person's feelings. It is no solace to their wounded sentiments to be told that the Bishop only forbids Reservation for the dying in *small* parishes. People die suddenly in small as well as large parishes, and the relatives of dying persons thus needlessly deprived of *viaticum* are likely to feel that if the Bishop really cared for the souls of the dying, he would permit Reservation in *all* parishes, lest any Christian (except by unavoidable mischance) should lack in his last hour 'the medicine of immortality.'

In these days of motor-cars and aeroplanes, fatal accidents are much more common than they used to be, and as a rule in such cases the only practicable way of giving *viaticum* is by means of the Reserved Sacrament. It is not possible to celebrate the Eucharist reverently—or indeed at all—by a roadside, or in the middle of a field, or on a railway embankment. On the field of battle also, *viaticum* can only be given to the fallen by Reservation.

It is a matter for real regret that the Church of England should, even apparently, show less concern for the spiritual welfare of its dying members than the Church of Rome, and that its Bishops, through what the writer cannot help regarding as a mistaken policy, should appear to not a few of their spiritual children to be less their 'Fathers in God,' than harsh administrators, unfeelingly depriving dying Christians of that reasonable security, which ought to be theirs, of obtaining in their last agony a believer's supreme support.

It is hardly necessary to add that the rule concerning the fast before Communion has never been held to apply to the reception of *viaticum*. And since *viaticum* is 'most necessary' for a dying person, it follows logically that a priest, even if not fasting, is bound by duty as well as charity, to celebrate at any hour of the day or night in order to provide it, if the Reserved Sacrament is not available. Several instances of this being actually done are on record in the early and mediæval periods. The presence of a

grave spiritual necessity or emergency outweighs the obligation of any merely ecclesiastical rule, however august and venerable.[1]

The Minister of Viaticum.

The normal minister of *viaticum* is a Bishop, or priest; or (in the absence of a priest) a deacon. But owing to the great necessity of *viaticum*, lay persons (including women and young persons) were always allowed in primitive times—and indeed till the close of the tenth century—to carry the Reserved Sacrament to the dying, if the services of a priest were not available. A deacon or lay person thus giving *viaticum* to a dying Christian would, of course, receive his confession (if he were able and desirous to make one). He would also pray for his pardon, but would not pronounce formal absolution. From the tenth century onwards the administration of *viaticum* by laymen was discouraged or forbidden in the West for reasons which to the present writer seem not only insufficient, but even frivolous and superstitious.[2]

If antiquity be followed (as in the writer's opinion it ought to be), the proper person to administer *viaticum* (in the parish priest's absence) is the parish clerk, who, according to the traditional view, belongs to the clerical body; or, if he is an unsuitable person, then a lay reader, or some other devout communicant, chosen and instructed by the parish priest. If (in a married priest's absence) a sudden summons to give *viaticum* should come to the Parsonage in the middle of the night, the priest's wife (who commands immediate access to the place of Reservation) will in most cases be the most suitable person to perform this supreme act of Christian charity.

With regard to missionary and colonial dioceses, in which the ministrations of a priest are usually rare and difficult to obtain, primitive precedent would fully justify the authorising of cate-

[1] In spite of the ultra-rigid insistence of the modern Roman Church upon the duty of the celebrant to be fasting, the traditional view advocated above has weighty and wide support among Latin theologians (see, for instance, A. Lehmkuhl, *Theologia Moralis*, 1886, Vol. III, n. 202; and D. M. Prümmer, *Manuale*, 1915, Vol. III, n. 202, who grant that it is at least *lawful* for the priest to celebrate). De Lugo, who quotes seven theologians in favour of celebrating, considers their opinion weighty and 'probable,' but regards the adverse opinion as 'more probable' (*De Euchar.*, d. 15 n., 67–68). Vazquez, Suarez, and very many modern Latin theologians (probably the majority) are in general agreement with De Lugo.

[2] They were not unlike those reasons, professedly 'reverent,' but in truth most irreverent, which in later times were used to justify the withdrawal of the Chalice from the laity. Among other absurdities, it was contended that it was 'more reverent' to allow a Christian to die without *viaticum*, than to sanction the 'irreverence' of its administration by lay hands. As a matter of fact, the administration by a layman of the Reserved Sacrament, previously consecrated by a priest, involves far less invasion of sacerdotal functions than does lay Baptism, in which a layman actually performs the entire Sacrament, and is considered justified in so doing, if the emergency is great.

chists or other reliable lay persons, not only to give *viaticum* to the dying, but also to administer the Reserved Sacrament at the Sunday Service—in fact on week-days also, if the faithful desired it. The present writer makes this suggestion only tentatively, but entirely seriously, knowing that the idea has the support of not a few clergy in the mission field, who, however, have not as yet had opportunity of acting upon their convictions.

The subject of the lay administration of *viaticum* has not been seriously discussed by Convocation since the Reformation. It cannot, however, fail to receive careful attention, when the subject of Reservation comes before Convocation (as it must sooner or later) for synodical determination.

Unction of the Dying.

The doctrine defended in the previous Essay, that Unction is intended for all the sick, and not merely for the dying, is quite consistent with its regular administration (in connection, of course, with *viaticum*) to dying persons. Its ' corroborative ' and ' exorcistic ' virtue is obviously suitable for the dying, who need its aid to meet their end with Christian fortitude, and to resist effectually the assaults of Satan, who sometimes, in the weakness and desolation of the last agony, tempts even the most devout Christians to doubt the certainty of their salvation. These doubts are effectually removed by the impressive action of the priest, who, anointing the dying man's brow with the Unction of the Spirit, seals him as Christ's for evermore.

After Unction and *viaticum* should follow (as has already been indicated) the solemn recitation by the priest of the great Prayer of Commendation (*Proficiscere, anima Christiana, de hoc mundo, in nomine Dei Patris Omnipotentis, qui te creavit. Amen, etc.*), prescribed in the Sarum rite of *Extreme Unction*, and in the modern Roman *Rituale*. The rolling periods of this great ' Prayer of Faith,' punctuated by the frequent *Amens* of the bystanders, form an imposing and thrilling climax to the Church's ministry to the dying.[1]

1927–1928 Prayer Book.

These and the like considerations have led the clergy as represented in Convocation, and the laity as represented in the Church Assembly, to the conclusion that, whether Reservation is technically ' legal ' or not, it ought (under appropriate regulations) to be permitted. With regard both to population and to frequency of Communion, the state of this country is utterly different from its state in 1661. Even on the supposition (widely doubted or denied) that Reservation is technically ' illegal,' it

[1] According to Sarum (but not Roman) Use, the *Amen* is said at the end of every clause of this Commendation.

does not follow that it ought to be prohibited. Assuredly it is not more 'illegal' to communicate a sick man with the Reserved Sacrament, than to celebrate for him in his house, without the presence of the 'three (or two at the least)' fellow-communicants, which the rubric absolutely requires, unless a pestilence is raging.[1] Numerous 1661 rubrics of undoubted meaning are in these days disregarded, not only because they are inconvenient, but also in some cases because they are disliked. It seems unreasonable to insist rigidly on the observance of one rubric, the breach of which is intended solely to facilitate obedience to Christ's command, 'This do in remembrance of me,' while permitting without rebuke the breach of other rubrics, the neglect of which still more obviously constitutes an 'ecclesiastical offence'[2] (*e.g.* the omission of the *Quicunque vult* when prescribed).

The precise methods and conditions of Reservation have not yet been synodically determined; but, as an emergency measure, Convocation and the Assembly have provisionally acquiesced in the regulation of Reservation by the administrative action of the Bishops, more or less on the lines of the rubrics of the 1928 Book.[3] These rubrics, however, are not authoritative, and are differently interpreted and administered by different Bishops—in a generous sense by some, in a narrowly restrictive sense by others.

The 1927 Book contained the following rubric: 'If further provision be needed in order to secure that any sick person may not lack the benefit of the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body of

[1] It should be observed that the Prayer Book requirement of at least two fellow-communicants applies only to the special case when the priest *celebrates* in the sick man's house, not to the more normal case when he communicates him with the Reserved Sacrament.

[2] The Report of the Royal Commission (1906) reminds us that it is technically illegal to sing hymns during a service; to introduce addresses into the Confirmation Office, to bless the people except at the end of the Communion Service; to have a collection at Mattins and Evensong; to give out notices otherwise than as is prescribed after the Nicene Creed; to shorten the words of administration; to omit the longer exhortation at Communion, to shorten or omit 'Dearly beloved brethren'; to communicate any persons who have not given in their names on the day before; to baptise otherwise than at Mattins and Evensong on Sundays and Holy Days; to catechise except at Evensong; to sing 'Glory be to thee, O Lord,' before the Gospel; to pass from Mattins to the Communion Service without saying the Litany; to omit the Commandments; to allow a deacon to read the Choir Offices; to use any other prayers after the third Collect at Mattins and Evensong than those provided; to confirm a child except in the presence of a godparent. It is also illegal to celebrate more than once on the same day, even on Christmas Day and Easter; or to celebrate without preaching a sermon or reading a homily. Of course, it is a distinct breach of the rubrics to celebrate in a sick man's house, unless at least two other communicants are present.

[3] By persuasion, however, not coercion. It has not even been suggested in Convocation that the observance of the rubrics of the 1928 Book should be treated as a matter of 'canonical obedience.' Only a 'Canon' or equivalent synodical act could give them such binding force.

Christ, the priest, if licensed thereto by the Bishop so to do, may, to that end, when Holy Communion is celebrated in the Church, reserve as much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as is needed for that purpose. And the Bishop shall grant such licence, if satisfied of the need, unless in any particular case he see good reason to the contrary.'

This rubric was framed as the result of conferences between the representatives of the chief ecclesiastical parties. It was adequately discussed both in Convocation and in the Assembly; and the Prayer Book embodying it was in the end approved (not, however, synodically) by the two Convocations in a united session by a majority of over 7 to 1.

After the rejection of the 1927 Book by Parliament, the Reservation rubric was altered by the Bishops, for the purpose of conciliating the opposition (mainly non-Anglican and non-English) of members of Parliament. As thus altered, it assumed the following form, which *prima facie* is of a much more restrictive character.

'If the Bishop is satisfied that in connection with hospitals, or in time of common sickness, or in the special circumstances of any particular parish, the provisions of the preceding rubric [which permits temporary Reservation of the 1549 kind] [1] are not sufficient, and that there is need of further provision in order that sick and dying persons may not lack the benefit of the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, he may to that end give his licence to the priest, to reserve at the open Communion so much of the consecrated bread and wine as is needed for that purpose. Whenever such licence is granted or refused, the Minister, or the people as represented in the Parochial Church Council, may refer the question to the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province.'

This rubric was severely criticised at the time as constituting a humiliating surrender to (mainly) non-Anglican and secular opinion, and as being unduly restrictive. It was also objected to, because no opportunity was given for discussing it as a separate item, or suggesting amendments to it. It was presented both to Convocation and to the Assembly as part of a complete book, to be accepted or rejected *en bloc*. The procedure adopted was

[1] This rubric runs: 'When the Holy Communion cannot be reverently, or without grave difficulty be celebrated in private, and also when there are several sick persons in the Parish desirous to receive the Communion on the same day, it shall be lawful for the priest (with the consent of the sick person or persons) on any day when there is a celebration of the Holy Communion in the Church, to set apart at the open Communion so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as shall serve the sick person (or persons), and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any). And, the open Communion ended, he shall, on the same day, and with as little delay as may be, go and minister the same.'

strongly challenged in Convocation as unconstitutional, and the gravest doubt is still felt in many quarters as to the validity in any sense of the decision ultimately reached.[1]

In consequence, partly of the severely restrictive character of the new rubric, and partly of the manner in which it was drawn up and laid before the Lower Houses, the convocational majority in favour of the Revised Prayer Book, which was 7 to 1 in 1927, sank in 1928 to less than 3 to 1.

The further provisions of the 1928 Book with regard to Reservation are as follows: 'The consecrated Bread and Wine thus set apart shall be reserved in an aumbry or safe. The aumbry shall (according as the Bishop shall direct) be set in the North or South wall of the sanctuary of the church, or of any chapel thereof, or, if need be, in the wall of some other part of the Church approved by the Bishop, provided that it shall not be immediately behind or above a Holy Table. The door of the aumbry shall be kept locked, and opened only when it is necessary to move or replace the consecrated elements for the purposes of Communion or renewal. The consecrated Bread and Wine shall be renewed at least once a week.'

It is further provided that the Sacrament shall be reserved for the Communion of the sick, and 'for no other purpose whatever,' that it shall be administered in both kinds, that the priest shall not 'expose' the Sacrament; and that 'no service or ceremony in connection with the Sacrament so reserved' shall take place.

Communion of the sick with the intincted Host is permitted, 'when it is desirable,' a suitable form of administration being provided.

The already not unusual practice of communicating certain sick persons in church with the intincted Host, to guard against danger of infection through the chalice, is authorised in the following words:—'The same form shall be used, with the permission of the Bishop, when it is deemed necessary, through grave danger of infection, to administer both kinds together to certain communicants at the open Communion.'

The modern English Rite, like that of Sarum, has no special formula for administering *viaticum*. The modern Roman and many early and mediæval Orders prescribe a form differing slightly from that ordinarily used in communicating the whole.[2]

[1] The Lower House has always exercised the right of criticising *in detail* all proposals of the Upper House laid before it; also of 'concurring' not only in whole, but also *in part*, thereto. Sometimes 'concurrence' is refused to a single word or phrase. No opportunity was given of exercising these rights in 1928, consequently there are strong reasons for regarding the whole proceedings as invalid.

[2] The Roman formula is: 'Receive, brother (sister), the *viaticum* of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he may guard thee from the malignant enemy, and lead thee into life eternal. Amen' (*Rituale*, 1925 edition, Tit. iv, c. 4).

It is too early at present to forecast what precise form Reservation will ultimately take in the Church of England. The whole matter is at present in the experimental stage, and is not likely to come before Convocation for synodical determination for some time to come. In actual practice, Reservation takes place in most instances under the authority of the 1661 Book, the diocesan Bishop 'tolerating' (without officially approving) the widely current view that this Book permits it.. Bishops do not, for the most part, actively interfere with the practice of communicating the absent whole by Reservation, although they twice refused the petition of the Lower Houses that this should be explicitly authorised by the Revised Book.

Application for 'licences' to reserve have been few in number, because most of those who reserve, while recognising the right of the Bishop to 'regulate' Reservation, are of opinion: (1) that the actual right and duty to reserve is inherent in the parish priest, as being entrusted with the custody of the Sacraments, and charged with the responsibility of supplying all needful sacramental ministrations as well to the sick and dying as to the whole; (2) that continuous Reservation is an œcumenical custom, authorised by the mediæval English Canon Law (never yet formally abrogated), which requires such Reservation (without licence) in every parish church; (3) that the rubrics of the 1661 Prayer Book, even according to their strictest and most literal interpretation, contain nothing inconsistent with the practice of continuous Reservation, and do not suggest that a licence for the purpose is necessary. At no time in Christian history has a licence to reserve in a parish church been deemed requisite.

Reservation in other Churches.

The present Canon Law of the Roman Church (1917) prescribes Reservation in all cathedral, parochial, and quasi-parochial churches, without licence being required. (This was also the law and custom in mediæval England.) Reservation in other buildings requires episcopal or papal licence. Except in Uniat Eastern Churches, Reservation is in one kind only (*Titulus* XV, Can. 1265 ff.). The faithful are bound by precept to receive the Communion when in danger of death from whatever cause. Even if they have already received the Communion earlier in the day, they are to be strongly (*valde*) urged to receive it again. *Viaticum* may be given to persons not fasting. With regard to other sick persons, if they have been lying ill a month, without assured hope of speedy recovery, they may be communicated once or twice a week, by the advice of a prudent confessor, after having taken some medicine or liquid food (Can. 864, 858).

In the Orthodox Eastern Church, only one method of Reserva-

tion for the sick is prescribed by rubric. The reserved intincted Hosts, in the form of small cubes, are dried by heat, and kept either in an 'artophorion' upon the Holy Table, or in a small cupboard hung to the back of the Iconostasion. Reservation may take place at any Liturgy, and the Blessed Sacrament is perpetually reserved in every church. In communicating a sick person, the priest places a small quantity of water in a spoon, and therein soaks the intincted Host until it is quite soft. He then administers it with the spoon to the sick man. The *viaticum*, when asked for, is instantly carried to a sick person at any hour of the day or night.

Other methods of Reservation, not prescribed by rubric, are also in use. In Churches where the Eucharist is celebrated daily, it is not always thought necessary to dry the intincted species. In certain instances the species of wine is reserved separately in a closely stoppered vessel, and intinction takes place in the sick man's presence in a miniature chalice, communion in both kinds being given as usual with a spoon. Reservation of the sort described by Justin Martyr is also in use. In fact, the sick are communicated by preference in this way, direct from the Liturgy, the deacon going before with a light, the priest following with the chalice in his hands containing the Hosts steeped in wine. If an urgent call for *viaticum* comes while the Liturgy is in progress, the priest breaks off the service immediately, and leaving the congregation takes the Sacrament to the dying man. The adult sick are always communicated in both kinds. Infants, however, and children up to the age of about seven, are communicated in the species of wine alone.[1]

In the Scottish Episcopal Church, both the English Communion Service and the Scottish Office are in use. The disputed rubric at the end of the English Office has never been interpreted in a restrictive sense. The Revised Scottish Prayer Book (1929) contains the following rubric:—'According to long-existing custom in the Scottish Church, the Presbyter may reserve so much of the consecrated Gifts as may be required for the Communion of the Sick, *and others who could not be present at the celebration in Church.* All that remaineth of the Holy Sacrament, *and is not so required*, the Presbyter, and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink.'

It will be noticed that the Scottish rubric explicitly authorises Reservation for *the absent*, and understands, by 'all that remaineth of the Holy Sacrament,' all that remaineth *after the needs of the absent as well as of the present* have been provided for.

[1] This information is derived from Mr. Athelstan Riley, and the late Mr. W. J. Birkbeck. Mr. Riley's principal informant was the Very Rev. the Archpriest Eugene Smirnoff, chaplain to the Russian Embassy.

This, as we have seen, is the historical and original meaning of the much-debated 1661 Anglican rubric.

Reservation was traditional in the Scottish Church even in the eighteenth century. It is said that during the continuance of the penal laws from 1746 to 1792, when the assembling of more than four persons under a pastor ordained in the Scottish Church was forbidden, most Communions, whether of the sick or of the whole, were made from the Reserved Sacrament.[1] Reservation in Scotland is almost always in both kinds, the reserved species being placed in an aumbry in the chancel wall, or in a tabernacle on the altar.[2]

The American Revised Prayer Book (1929) retains the 1661 direction that 'if any of the consecrated Bread and Wine remain after the Communion, it shall not be carried out of the Church'; but this is not in practice understood as forbidding Reservation, which is widely in use.

Reservation was revived almost as early in the U.S.A. as in England, and was already a subject of contention in the early 'seventies. At the General Convention of 1874 a strong attempt was made to prohibit Reservation together with certain other practices which were widely disliked. The attempt miscarried mainly owing to a brilliant speech by the Rev. James De Koven, who represented the needs of the sick and the dying in such moving language that many of the opponents of the practice changed their opinion. Largely, but not entirely, as a result of this decision, George D. Cummins (1822–1876), Assistant Bishop of Kentucky, seceded with seven other clergymen and a score of laymen (in December, 1873), and formed the 'Reformed Episcopal Church.'

Since 1874 there has been no attempt at a general prohibition of Reservation in the U.S.A., though certain individual bishops who disliked it—not many in number—have discouraged it.[3] To-day, Reservation exists in some churches at least of all the principal towns, and is widely diffused elsewhere, especially in the Northern States. In parochial churches, Reservation is nearly always in one kind only, but occasionally the intincted Host is reserved. In a few hospital chapels the Sacrament is reserved in both kinds separately. Communion is given freely to the absent as well as to the sick.

In Canada, Tractarian views are not widely held, and Reservation is much rarer. It is found, however, in certain great centres of population, like Toronto and Montreal, and in some other places.

[1] See Darwell Stone, *The Reserved Sacrament*, p. 36.

[2] For further details see F. C. Eeles, *Reservation of the Holy Eucharist in the Scottish Church.*

[3] Very strangely, Bishop Hall, a member of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, was one.

In Africa, Reservation is in use in all Anglican dioceses south of Central Tanganyika, in some dioceses in every parish and quasi-parochial church. The new South African Communion Office (1927) contains the following rubric:—'And if any remain of the Bread and Wine which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, etc., *except so far as is otherwise provided in the Order for the Communion of the Sick.*' This *Order* (as given in *An alternative form of the Calendar and Occasional Offices for the Sick*, 1930) contains the following rubric:—'But if the sick person, desirous to receive the Holy Communion in his house, does not wish that the service be celebrated there, or if it cannot be there celebrated reverently or conveniently, as also when there are several sick persons in the Parish desirous to receive the Holy Communion on the same day, the Curate shall administer the reserved Sacrament in such form and manner as shall be sanctioned by the Bishop.'

It is apparently left to the diocesan Bishop to determine whether the Sacrament is to be reserved in both kinds or in one.

Reservation is in use in all missionary dioceses which adhere to Tractarian traditions, as, for instance, in Corea, where it is universal. It is also in use in parts of India, also of Australia, where most of the Bishops of the newer dioceses are in sympathy with Catholic practices.

The subject was not discussed at the last Lambeth Conference (1930).

Communion in One or Both Kinds.

The doctrine of 'Concomitance' (*i.e.* the doctrine that Christ is received whole and entire under either kind) is now so generally held—even by theologians as decidedly anti-Roman as Dr. Gore—that the question whether Reservation should be in two kinds or only in one has ceased to have first-class theological importance. Inasmuch as the living, not the dead, Christ is received in Communion, and the blood ('which is the life') is inseparable from the living organism, it seems impossible to believe that the Body and Blood of Christ can be separately received. Moreover, since our Lord's Human Nature is an integral and inseparable element of His Personality, it seems clear that sacramental reception of His Humanity must involve sacramental reception of His Divinity.

That the primitive Church—implicitly but unhesitatingly—accepted Concomitance is evident from the fact that in early days Reservation was *usually* in the species of bread alone, and that the dying occasionally, and infants often, were communicated solely in the species of wine. There is no need to repeat the evidence for this collected in the classical work of W. H. Freestone,

The Sacrament Reserved. That he somewhat under-estimates the amount of primitive Reservation in both kinds is probable,[1] but that he is right in his main contention seems practically certain. That the English and many of the continental Reformers tolerated or approved Communion in one kind in exceptional cases, has already been indicated.

In the days of Leo I, Gelasius, and Gregory I, the prevalence of the Manichæan heresy caused the Roman Church to lay unusual stress upon the reception of the Cup; and for this and other reasons it seems probable (as has been indicated) that the Gregorian Sacramentary intends the sick to be communicated (by Reservation) in both kinds. Quite certainly in documents closely related to this Sacramentary, and based mainly upon it, Communion in both kinds is directed. For instance, separate forms of administration are provided in the *Ordo ad visitandum infirmum*, edited by Menard from the (now lost) late eighth-century MS. of St. Remi:—'*Communicet infirmum tunc dicens*, Corpus D.N.J.C. redimat te in vitam æternam. Sanguis D.N.J.C. et sanctorum communio sit tecum et nobiscum in vitam æternam. Amen' (see further above).

Reservation of the intincted Host was common in the later Middle Ages. It is explicitly required by Regino, abbot of Prüm (died A.D. 833), who directs: 'the sacred oblation ought to be intincted in the blood of Christ, that the presbyter may be able truthfully to say to the sick man, May the body and blood of Christ profit thee.'[2]

That Communion should be received in both kinds at the Eucharist is an accepted axiom everywhere, except in Latin Christendom. Even modern Rome permits Communion in both kinds in the Uniat Churches of the East.

With regard to the sick, many considerations suggest that, when the sick person lives close to the church and there is no serious inconvenience or danger of irreverence, the priest should carry the consecrated Gifts straight from the church, and communicate him in the ordinary way if he is sitting up in bed, or by slightly intincting the Host in the Chalice if he is recumbent. Such solemn 'going forth' of the priest, immediately after the Celebration on Sundays or week-days, bearing in his hands the Chalice and Paten (veiled in a 'fair linen cloth'), vested in alb

[1] See especially the remarks of R. H. Connolly, a Roman authority, in *Texts and Studies*, viii. pp. 79–81.

[2] Such 'true' or 'sacramental' intinction must be carefully distinguished from the spurious or 'consecratory' intinction in ordinary wine mentioned above (see p. 497). A typical form of administration for the intincted species is the following:—'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ intincted with his Blood preserve thy soul to life eternal' (from an eleventh-century Narbonne Pontifical). (*Notitiæ*, I. 70, printed in Migne, *P.L.*, cxxxii, 205.) Another has been given above (p. 545 n.). Many further instances might be quoted.

and stole, and preceded by the parish clerk or other server wearing his surplice, for the purpose of giving Communion to sick persons living near the church, is one of the most edifying and beautiful sights of modern village life. It differs entirely in nature from the spectacular 'processions of the Host,' for the purpose not of Communion but of adoration, to which most of the Reformers expressed emphatic objection.

On the other hand, to reserve permanently in both kinds separately is a practice involving considerable difficulties. A chalice cannot be used for the purpose, for metal communicates an unpleasant flavour to wine after about twelve hours. The containing vessel must be of glass or porcelain. Moreover, it must be tightly and securely stoppered. All the ordinary double pyxes fail to seal securely the containing vessel, and there is danger of irreverence by effusion. If a stoppered vessel is carried to the sick man's room, it is usually necessary to pour the consecrated Wine into a chalice before communicating him, and difficulties occur about the ablutions, if he is not sitting up.[1]

Reservation of intincted wafers offers fewer practical difficulties. Two methods are at present in use in the Church of England, and to some extent in America.

(1) One method is to intinct the wafer to the very smallest possible extent (*e.g.* with one tiny drop in the centre), so that it can be stored and handled as if dry. This may be done by dipping one wafer into the consecrated wine, and lightly touching with it another wafer in the centre.

(2) The other method is to intinct it to a somewhat greater extent (by dipping its edge in the chalice), and then gently to press it between two dry wafers, to which it adheres.

Wafers thus intincted soon deteriorate, and should be frequently renewed. The second method is lengthy and awkward, if several Hosts have to be prepared.

The ancient Church never treated the manner of Reservation as a matter of principle. The predominant consideration was convenience, and that consideration cannot be ignored to-day. Tradition—especially early tradition—predominantly favours Reservation in the species of Bread alone. But Reservation in both kinds has some support in the primitive, and very extensive support in the early mediæval period. Accordingly, it cannot fairly be said that a Province or a National Church which

[1] Difficulties about the ablutions are best avoided by reserving the species of wine *in a glass vessel with a wide stoppered mouth.* The consecrated wafer can then without difficulty be slightly dipped into the consecrated wine in the sick man's presence, and immediately placed in his mouth. No ablutions are necessary when this method is employed. If a dying person's tongue and throat are parched, a small portion of the Host, steeped in water or ordinary wine, may be administered in a spoon, or the patient may be given a draught of wine or water before and after administration.

should prescribe Reservation in both kinds exclusively would contravene Catholic tradition. Nevertheless, the present writer, having had long practical experience of both methods of Reservation, ventures to hope that Convocation may never impose on all the clergy a strict canonical obligation to reserve in both kinds in all cases; and that, if there should ever be such an obligation, Reservation of the conjoint species by intinction may be allowed, at least as an alternative to the Reservation of both species separately. At all times the corruptibility of the species of wine has placed difficulties in the way of its *continuous* Reservation.

It does not fall within the scope of a commentary upon the Communion of the Sick to deal either theologically or practically with the extra-liturgical cultus of the Blessed Sacrament, which has no necessary—or even close—connection with the primitive practice of Reservation for the sick, the absent, and the dying. Such cultus is almost unknown in the Orthodox East and in the Episcopal Church of Scotland, where Reservation is universal. In only a small minority of the numerous English churches in which the Sacrament is now reserved for Communion is there any 'service or ceremony in connection with the Sacrament so reserved.'

EXCURSUS on 'the Grace of the Chalice.'

The mind of the Church from the beginning has predominantly favoured the doctrine of 'Concomitance.' But Concomitance does not *necessarily* exclude the view that a certain 'augmentation' of grace, usually described as 'joy,' 'gladdening,' 'exhilaration,' or 'inebriation of the soul,' is sacramentally conferred by the Chalice.

Among Anglicans, A. P. Forbes argues in favour of this view with earnestness and ability in his learned treatise, *An Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles*, 1862, Vol. II. pp. 597 ff. He contends that 'while the Sacrament under one kind conveys all the graces necessary for salvation, the Chalice has a grace of its own, "the grace of gladdening."' He interprets mystically of the Host the words of the Psalmist, 'bread to strengthen man's heart'; and of the Chalice, 'wine that maketh glad the heart of man.' The latter, he thinks, confers 'that spiritual transport, the *inebriatio animæ* of which the Scripture speaks.' He further argues that, just as a physical banquet is incomplete without drink, so Christ's Spiritual Banquet can only be *completely* enjoyed, with entire satisfaction to the soul, if to spiritual eating is added *spiritual drinking* ('my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed').

C. Pesch (*Prælectiones*, 1914, Vol. VI., par. 822) considers this opinion orthodox in the Latin Communion, though the *communis*

sententia is against it. He claims that St. Thomas's opinion is adverse. On the other hand, as Vazquez (Vasquez) points out, certain Thomists deny this, making out a case which, though probably unsound, is plausible. Vazquez, in the course of an elaborate discussion (*Opera*, 1631, Vol. III. p. 350 ff.), considers that the majority of Catholic theologians have been biassed in their judgment, owing to the need of defending against Protestant attack the denial of the Cup to the laity, a practice which is obviously more easily justified if the Chalice confers *no* additional grace. With arguments substantially the same as those of Forbes, he earnestly defends the view that the Chalice imparts *augmentum gratiæ*. He claims, as favouring his view, Gaspar Casilius, Arboreus, Ruardus, the Fathers of Trent, and especially Pope Clement VI (A.D. 1342–1352), who granted by Bull to the King of England the privilege of receiving the Chalice *ad gratiæ augmentum*.

De Lugo (*Disputationes*, 1869, Vol. IV. pp. 39 ff.) mainly condenses the arguments of Vazquez; but he adds that Clement granted a similar permission to the King of France to receive the Chalice '*ad majus gratiæ augmentum*.' I have not been able to find either of these Bulls, but a very similar Bull of Clement's, dated Jan. 5, 1352, grants the same privilege for life to the Dauphin, who had petitioned for it with a view to '*devotionis et salutis augmentum*.' (It is printed in full in Martène-Durand, *Veterum Scriptorum . . . Amplissima Collectio*, I. 1456 sq.).

De Lugo makes the surprising statement that 'Francis Blanco, Archbishop of Compostella, who took part in the Council of Trent, declared that it was the unanimous opinion (*unanimem sententiam*) of the Fathers [that the Chalice imparts additional grace], but that they were unwilling to define it out of due season (*extra tempus*), lest occasion should be given to the heretics to raise an outcry (*vociferandi*); and claims that the decrees of the Council express harmony with this view. He refers especially to *Sess.* xxi. c. 3, where it is cautiously declared that "those who receive only one species are not defrauded (*fraudari*) of any grace *necessary to salvation*."' The implication, in De Lugo's opinion, is that they are defrauded of *some* grace.

The view of Vazquez and De Lugo seems scarcely compatible with whole-hearted approval of Communion in one kind. Naturally, therefore, their arguments in favour of it are perfunctory, and seem lacking in conviction.

In the present writer's opinion, the doctrine of Concomitance logically excludes (or reduces to a bare possibility) the theory that additional grace is *sacramentally* conferred by the Chalice.

On the other hand, he holds that the *psychological* benefit of giving Communion in both kinds, both in church and out of church, is great. Not only are the religious associations of the

Chalice of a most moving kind, but the common cup powerfully suggests human fellowship of an intimate, unselfish, generous, and uplifting nature (cf. the institution of 'the loving-cup'). Accordingly, in his opinion, the sick should be communicated in both kinds, except in cases where this procedure is seriously inconvenient, as it usually is, when there is a sudden call to give *viaticum* to a person *in extremis*.

Those Anglican priests who adhere to the opinion of Forbes, Vazquez, and De Lugo will, of course, endeavour to communicate the sick and dying *in all cases* with at least the intincted Host, and will reserve perpetually in both kinds for that purpose.

Eastern theologians, especially since the withdrawal of the Chalice from the laity in the West, have usually contended that the sick (like the whole) are bound by divine precept to receive in both kinds. (See especially Macaire, *Théologie Dogmatique Orthodox*, Vol. II. 483 ff.) Macaire treats the instances to the contrary in primitive times as abnormal, and not to be imitated. The modern Orthodox Church invariably communicates the adult sick in both kinds.

The doubt, occasionally expressed by members of the Western Church, as to whether the wine in which an intincted Host is dipped retains its nature after the artificial drying to which it is subjected in the East, is perhaps hypercritical. The Eastern Church acts with the serious intention of communicating the sick in both kinds; and there can be little doubt that, the circumstances being abnormal, God gives effect to the Church's intention.

When a Host is intincted in the Western way, *i.e.* without artificial drying, it always retains some moisture; consequently the species of wine certainly retains its nature until it is consumed, or becomes corrupt. Nothing but prolonged subjection to heat suffices to deprive an absorbent substance, like bread, of all its moisture.

THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD

By A. S. DUNCAN-JONES

I

THERE is something obviously mysterious about death. It is a natural human instinct to treat with reverence the body from which the living spirit has departed. The literature of Greece and Rome is rich in descriptions of funeral rites. The pyramids stand as an age-long witness to the elaborate arrangements made by the ancient Egyptians to provide the illustrious dead with everything that might be needed on their last journey and in the life beyond. The Hebrews were specially zealous in the care of the dead, as the Old Testament shows in many places. The cardinal example is the loving devotion which attended our Lord's burial in the tomb 'where was never man yet laid,' and the determination of the women to anoint the body with proper respect. The Resurrection of our Lord exercised a profound influence on all who accepted it. Death became the gate of immortality. The whole conception of the relation between the living and the departed gradually underwent a great enlargement. Hope replaced wistfulness in funerary inscriptions. The characteristic note is struck by the earliest examples that we know, those from the Roman catacombs: *Vivas in pace, vivas in Spiritu Sancto, spiritum tuum Deus refrigeret.* It is true that we have nothing earlier than the third century. But early dated inscriptions are rare.

The literature of a date earlier than the funerary inscriptions bears witness to a vivid sense of the continued reality of the departed, and of their intimate relation to the living. In North Africa it was the custom to offer the Eucharist for the benefit of the departed in the second century.[1] Memorial feasts or agapæ were evidently common in the third century. The following passage from a commentary on Job of that period admirably illustrates what was probably by that time the general Christian attitude. Death is a release to a larger and happier life.

> We do not celebrate the day of a man's birth, as it is only the commencement of pains and trials, but we celebrate the

[1] Tertullian, *De Cor.*, 3; *De Exhort. Cast.*, 11; *De Monog.*, 10.

day of his death because it is the putting away of all pains and the escape from all temptations. We celebrate the day of death because those who seem to die do not really die. For that reason we both make memorials of the saints and also devoutly commemorate our parents and friends who die in faith, both rejoicing over their state of refreshment and also entreating for ourselves a pious consummation in faith.[1]

The writer goes on to show how a special grace was given to these feasts by inviting the poor and needy to share in them. It was charity, the love of God shed forth by the Holy Spirit in the Church, that bound the living and the dead together. It was the same charity that bound rich and poor together. It was in a sacred meal that all were one. Nothing could show more clearly the concreteness of Christian thought about personality and its continuance. Death makes no radical change. When Tennyson wrote—

> Eternal form shall still divide
> The eternal soul from all beside;
> And I shall know him when we meet:
>
> And we shall sit at endless feast,
> Enjoying each the other's good,[2]

he described the traditional view.

When the Church was completely free to express its mind after the conversion of Constantine, this closeness of relation between living and departed found clear expression in the worship of the Church. The early instincts are probably best seen in the Eastern Orthodox liturgies in which the whole body of the faithful departed are prayed for, the saints no less than the ordinary Christian; and the living and the departed are brought into the closest connection. A study of the Great Intercession of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom brings this out. The fact that St. Augustine found a difficulty in this common prayer for all departed Christians alike, whatever their degree of sanctity, shows that it was the old tradition.

So far we have been discussing the general Christian attitude to the dead. It is necessary to have it in mind when funeral rites are studied. If we turn to the rites themselves, the first fact that emerges is that we have very little information concerning them before mediæval times. And this is a fact of considerable importance, because the attitude of Christian people towards the departed underwent a subtle but far-reaching change somewhere round the year 1000. Its cause is to be found in St. Augustine. The change was, broadly, one from glad confidence

[1] Origen, Lommatzsch, Vol. XVI. p. 238. [2] *In Memoriam*, xlvii.

in the love of God to an emphasis on God the just and terrible Judge. The difference may be illustrated by a comparison between the *Dies Iræ*, that masterpiece of mediæval religious poetry, and the language of St. Cyprian.

> How often (he says) has it been revealed to us . . . that our brothers who have been released from the world by the Divine summons ought not to be mourned for, since we know that they are not lost but gone before; while appearing to lose they have really gained ground, as travellers and navigators are wont to do.[1]

It is in accordance with this line of thought that decent burial becomes a Christian duty. The places where the bodies of Christians are laid bear titles congruous with the prayers offered for the dead. They are sleeping-places, *cœmeteria*, *accubitaria*, *cubicula*. They are holy places because they are full of the expectation of a larger life. From the eighth century in England it was the custom for the bishop to set apart places of burial by a solemn act of consecration.[2]

The earliest references to funeral rites chiefly tell us of the care with which the body was washed, anointed and decently wrapped in white linen cloths.[3] At the obsequies excessive mourning is out of place—it may, says Cyprian, lead the heathen to think that the faith Christians profess in the love of God is not genuine. The Christian will wear white at funerals, not black as the heathen do. St. Jerome gives the first hint of the form of service when he says that Christians do not use the howling of the heathen but the comfortable words of the Psalter. Similar evidence from the fourth century is supplied by the *Apostolic Constitutions*, a manual of Church Order, compiled in the neighbourhood of Antioch, which gives what is probably the oldest description of a funeral. Contact with dead bodies, the unknown author emphatically asserts, is not defiling.

> Do not seek after Jewish separations, or perpetual washings, or purifications upon the touch of a dead body. But without such observances assemble in the cemeteries, reading the holy books, and singing psalms for the martyrs which are fallen asleep, and for all the saints from the beginning of the world, and for your brethren that are asleep in the Lord. Offer the acceptable (or 'gracious,' *gratam*) Eucharist, the antitype of the royal body of Christ, in your churches, and in the cemeteries; and in the funerals of your

[1] *De Mortalitate*, c. xx.

[2] Pontifical of Egbert of York, A.D. 735–66. (Surtees Society, Vol. XXVII. p. 54).

[3] Eusebius, *H.E.*, vii. 22; cf. Prudentius, *Cathemerinon*, hymn 10.

dead lead them forth with psalms, if they were faithful in the Lord. For 'Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints,' and again, 'Turn, my soul, unto thy rest; because the Lord hath done me good.' And in another place, 'The memory of the just is with praises, and the souls of the just are in the hand of God!' [1]

Four elements that persist can be detected. The funeral procession from the house of the departed, the psalms and antiphons that accompany it, the reading of scriptures, and the offering of the Eucharist. The procession had a character of its own. It was a triumphal procession, a προπομπή, says St. Chrysostom, and, as he witnesses, this character was given to it by the torches carried, by the waving palm-branches and the smoking incense, by the frequent cries of 'Alleluia.'

There was undoubtedly from the first another element in funeral rites. The procession, psalms and readings culminated in prayer at the grave. For many years this was probably informal, and left to the discretion of the minister. But one beautiful example remains to us, of which it may be said with some safety that it was used for this purpose.

It is found in the 'Prayer Book' of Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, and therefore belongs to the first half of the fourth century. The conflation of Hebrew and Greek thought is striking.

O God, who hast authority of life and death, God of the spirits and Master of all flesh, God who killest and makest alive, who bringest down to the gates of Hades and bringest up, who createst the spirit of man within him and takest to thyself the souls of the saints and givest rest, who alterest and changest and transformest thy creatures, as is right and expedient, being thyself alone incorruptible, unalterable and eternal, we beseech thee for the repose and rest of this thy servant; give rest to his soul, his spirit, in green places, in chambers of rest with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all thy saints: and raise up his body in the day which thou hast ordained, according to thy promises which cannot lie, that thou mayest render to it also the heritage of which it is worthy in thy holy pastures. Remember not his transgressions and sins and cause his going forth to be peaceable and blessed. Heal the grief of his relatives who survive him with the spirit of consolation, and grant unto us all a good end, through thy only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, through whom to thee is the glory and the strength in the Holy Spirit, for ever and ever. Amen.[2]

[1] vi. 30; see also viii. 41, 42. [2] c. 18.

It is time now to turn to the mediæval services from which those of the Prayer Book are derived. In doing so the change spoken of above must be borne in mind. Two elements contributed to this. As the Church passed out of the first ages of enthusiasm and included all conditions of men, the original glad confidence often seemed out of place. More and more the emphasis came to be laid on the period of purgation. The germ of the idea is pre-Christian.[1] It is found already in 'Enoch,' and quite early it played a part in popular and semi-heretical literature. Its recognition in the Liturgy was, however, slow. In the Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries there is hardly a trace of it. The prayers are all prayers for final bliss without any emphasis on what happens in between. The following is typical: 'Receive, O Lord, our prayers for the soul of thy servant, *N.*: that, if any stain of our earthly infirmity abide in him, it may be removed by the healing of thy forgiveness.' But in the later rites of the Middle Ages the doctrine of Purgatory became ever more precise. It is seen full-blooded in the York Use, for example. Such a prayer as the following finds a place:—'Loose him, and deliver him from the cruel fire of the boiling pit.' More and more the avenging judgment dominates the thought of death, and with it the era of chantry priests sets in. The elements we have already observed are all there. When the body had been washed and shrouded, it was carried in procession to the church, the coffin covered with a seemly hearse-cloth or pall. Psalms and anthems were sung by priest and clerks, or by the members of the gild, if the deceased belonged to one, as was very commonly the case. But the character of the procession had greatly changed from an earlier day. The friends still carried torches of candles; incense was still swung in front of the body. But it was no longer a triumphant procession; it was a doleful cortège. The mourners were not dressed in white, but in black, as was the coffin. The psalms sung were penitential, the *Miserere* being conspicuous among them.

The body, if that of a priest, was set down in the chancel; if of a layman, outside the chancel gates. In church the services were of two kinds. There was the Mass and there was the Office. The Office is not earlier in date than the eighth century. We have an account of what funerals were like in England in the sixth and seventh centuries in the Penitentials of Theodore of Canterbury and Egbert of Rome. Their form was based on that of Rome and there was no vigil.

> The custom is to carry the dead to the church, to anoint his breast with chrism, and to say Mass for him; then to carry him to the grave with chanting, and when he has been laid in the grave, to say a prayer over him.

[1] H. Thurston, *The Memory of our Dead*, p. 178.

The *Officium pro defunctis* consisted of two parts. First, an Evening Office which went by the name of *Placebo*, because this was the first word of the opening antiphon, 'Placebo Domino in regione vivorum.' It consisted almost entirely of psalms, namely, cxvi, cxx, cxxi, cxxx, cxxxviii, with appropriate anthems or antiphons. The note of praise was sounded in the Magnificat, which formed the climax. But it is significant that the one psalm which was of an exultant character, cxlvi, which followed the Magnificat, was said without note, while the more sombre psalms were sung. The next morning the rest of the Office was sung—Mattins and Lauds. Mattins consisted of three Nocturns, each of which had three psalms and three lessons from the Book of Job.

Lauds consisted of five psalms with antiphons, the Benedictus, the *Kyrie eleison* and the Lord's Prayer. The tone of Mattins and Lauds was similar to that of Vespers of the Dead. There were no hymns, no invitatories. All was as spare and as bare as could be. The name by which the Morning Office came to be known is the Dirge—a corruption of *Dirige*, the first word of the first antiphon. It fitly describes the whole vigil. The Service has an undoubted beauty and solemnity. There is something strangely soothing to jangled nerves in its very monotony, and the constant repetition of the moving refrain, 'Rest eternal grant unto him, O Lord: and let light perpetual shine upon him,' infuses an unearthly peace. None the less the general atmosphere is in contrast to that of more primitive times, to say nothing of the New Testament. A somewhat more confident note is struck in the Mass. The Eucharist cannot avoid being a thanksgiving. '*Requiem æternam*'—rest eternal—sounds at the beginning, and is the burden of the whole. True, the *Dies Iræ* could not be exceeded for sternness. But the final Communion, *Lux æterna*, reaches a world beyond. 'May light eternal shine, O Lord, upon them for endless ages with thy blessed ones; for thou art gracious.' After Mass the priest, having taken off his chasuble, performed a short service over the body. Originally this consisted of censing, sprinkling with holy water, and the Lord's Prayer, in which, at the priest's bidding, all joined, gathered round the hearse. In later times this developed into what are called the Absolutions, a series of prayers and antiphons of which the burden is forgiveness and deliverance from judgment. Then followed the interment. The funeral cortège proceeded to the place of burial. Before the service began the priest had made the sign of the cross over the spot, sprinkled it with holy water, and dug lightly the shape of a cross. Now the grave was properly dug while psalms were sung. The corpse was lowered into the grave, a final Collect for forgiveness uttered, the grave was filled in and the procession returned to the church, singing the seven Penitential Psalms.

Masses were said during the following month on the third, ninth, and thirtieth day. The choice of the ninth day points to a pre-Christian origin.[1]

The Office of the Dead was originally designed only to be used as an element in actual obsequies. But in course of time it came to be regarded as a necessary prelude of all solemn Requiem Masses, and in monasteries, largely under the influence of Cluny, it became the rule to say the Offices for the Dead daily. It would be difficult to exaggerate the degree to which the whole of later mediæval worship was dominated by the thought of the departed, and particularly by the need for shortening the pains of Purgatory. This excessive domination to some extent explains the violent reaction of the Reformation against prayer for the departed altogether.

It is to that period and to the English provision of funeral rites that we must now turn. In the first form issued, that of 1549, the four main elements are to be recognised, the procession, the inhumation or actual burial, the Office for the Dead, and a funeral Eucharist. The procession is considerably truncated. It goes not to the house, only to the church-stile. The extreme sort of Protestant had a great objection to these processions. Thus, for example, in 1583 Marmaduke Middleton enjoined in his diocese of St. David's that the clerk 'should not carry about the town a little bell called "the bell before the burial" after the use of popish superstition,' and 'that there be no prayers made for the dead either in the house or upon the way or elsewhere.'

The procession went straight from the church-stile to the grave, the antiphons at the head of our present service being said or sung the while. The prayers included a definite commendation of the soul to God. The Office, which could be said either before or after the actual burial, contained Psalms cxvi, cxxxix, and cxlvi, the lesson from 1 Corinthians xv, versicles and responses. Provision was also made for the celebration of the Eucharist at a funeral. In 1552 the funeral rites were much cut down, there was no provision for a Eucharist, nor indeed for any service in the church at all. The whole rite took place at the grave. In 1662, though much was restored, the Eucharist was not. During the Commonwealth, from 1644 onwards, burial services were forbidden.

II

The present Service (1662), according to the introductory rubric, is not to be used for the unbaptised, the excommunicate (that is, '*majori excommunicatione*, for some grievous and notorious

[1] Seyffert's *Dictionary of Classical Antiquities* (ed. Nettleship and Sandys), p. 102.

crime, and no man able to testify of his repentance,' Canon 68 of 1604), or those that have laid violent hands on themselves (as proved by the rare verdict of *felo de se*).

The priest and clerks meet the corpse at the entrance to the churchyard and precede it into the church or towards the grave; 'that is, into the church on all ordinary occasions; and to the grave if the person has died of any infectious disease. . . .' So Procter and Frere; but Wheatly may be right when he interprets 'into the church' of cases where the grave was within the church, as was common at this period, 'towards the grave' of ordinary burials.

Of the texts said or sung in the procession, the first two were used in the Sarum Office of the Dead, the third is a shortened version of the 1549 one. Psalms xxxix and xc were introduced in 1662, the former, containing the words 'thou hast made my days as it were a span long,' being considered appropriate for a young person, the latter for an old one. The Lesson from 1 Cor. xv dates from 1549. A few verses had been used as the Epistle in the Sarum Mass for the Dead, and parts of the chapter are given in Hermann's *Consultatio* for reading and exposition.

At the grave, sentences are said or sung 'while the corpse is made ready to be laid into the earth.' That is, according to Wheatly, 'stripped of all but its grave-attire,' coffins being rarely used before the nineteenth century. The first sentence is from Job xiv and was used in Mattins of the Sarum Office of the Dead. The other sentences are from the antiphon to the *Nunc Dimittis* of the third week in Lent. They are ascribed to Notker, the monk of St. Gall in the ninth century, the originator of Sequences. Their English form is due to Coverdale's *Goostly Psalms*.[1] Earth is then cast upon the body by some standing by,[2] usually three times, a custom of immemorial antiquity.[3] The priest's words, 'Forasmuch . . . departed,' are based upon Hermann; what follows is from the Sarum Office and Phil. iii. 21. The passage 'I heard a voice . . .' comes in the Sarum Vespers of the Dead.

It has often been the custom in the past to refer to the Funeral Service in the 1662 Book as though it possessed a unique perfection and beauty. In more recent times it has come in for a good deal of criticism, sometimes not very well-informed. For example, it has been condemned as gloomy. Compared with its mediæval predecessors this is markedly not the case. The emphasis is changed from judgment to the power of Christ's Resurrection. Hope has taken the place of trepidation. A more substantial criticism would be that the service tends to too great complacency.

[1] Dowden, *Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, pp. 161–3.
[2] By the priest, up to 1662.
[3] Cf. Horace, *Odes* I. xxviii. 36, 'injecto ter pulvere.'

The presumption seems to be that all who depart hence are in joy and felicity. The corruptions that flowed from excessive concern with the state of the departed produced a drastic reaction. The lack of any clear scriptural sanction for prayers for the departed caused Cranmer to reduce them to the very minimum. This defect, for such it is now felt to be by most students who attempt to achieve a balanced view of Christian teaching, assisted to widen the chasm between the living and the dead.

However, justice should be done to the dilemma which confronted the Reformers. The traditional services were, and still are in the Roman Manual, essentially prayers for the dying extended to the graveside. But if the destiny of the soul is irrevocably fixed at death and prayer is legitimate for the *faithful* departed only, prayers for the dead may be considered inappropriate in an Office intended for all. They are justifiable if a charitable view is taken and all are for this purpose reckoned as 'faithful.' Catholics and Reformers, each in their own way, agreed in taking the charitable view.[1]

III

It remains to summarise recent revisions of the Office. The introductory rubric is enlarged to exclude those who die 'in the act of committing any grievous crime' (English 1928, Scottish, S. African). The Irish Book defines suicides as those 'in whose case a verdict shall have been found of *felo de se*,' and allows a selection from the Office to be used when infants who are the offspring of Christian parents die unbaptised without wilful neglect on the part of the parents, or when older persons die in a state of preparedness or desire for Baptism. The corresponding rubric in the American Book comes at the end of the Service and rules that the Office 'is appropriate to be used only for the faithful departed in Christ'; other cases are to be dealt with by the minister at his discretion.

The English 1928 and Scottish Books provide a heading to the opening sentences—'The Introduction' in the former, 'The Procession' in the latter—and increase their number to nine; any of the Penitential Psalms may be used in this part.

The same two books style the next section 'The Service in Church.' Alternative Psalms are provided: xxiii (English 1928, Scottish, Irish); xxvii (American); xlvi (American); ciii (Irish, Scottish—a few verses only); cxvi (Scottish—part); cxxi

[1] In the reign of Elizabeth we find the *Placebo* and *Dirige*, with celebration of the Eucharist at which the chief mourners only communicated, at St. Paul's Cathedral, for Henry II of France (Sept. 9, 1559). Explicit prayers were offered for the departed. See Swete, *Church Services and Service-Books* (1930), p. 131; J. W. Legg, *The Burial Service* (1897), C. H. S., No. xxi.

(American); cxxx (English 1928, Scottish, American, S. African); S. African omits Ps. xxxix. 'Rest eternal . . .' may be substituted for the *Gloria Patri* (English 1928, Scottish, S. African).

In the lesson, 1 Cor. xv, English 1928, Scottish, American and S. African omit some verses. All revisions allow alternatives, the Scottish as many as seven. And all make some provision for prayers to be said in church; the Scottish Book gives as many as fourteen prayers.

At the actual interment[1] the treatment of the phrase 'our vile body' deserves notice. It becomes 'the body of our low estate' (English 1928, Scottish, S. African), or 'our corruptible body' (Canadian). In the American Book the phrasing is: 'the corruptible bodies of those who sleep in him shall be changed.'

All the revisions provide an Order for the Burial of a Child.[2] The English 1928, Scottish, Irish, and S. African have a prayer for consecrating the grave, when the burial is in unconsecrated ground. All except the Irish have proper Collects, Epistles and Gospels.

The English 1928 and S. African Books recognise cremation.[3]

The Canadian Office includes an inspired prayer from Jeremy Taylor, which is so little known that it may be quoted here.[4]

> O God, whose days are without end, and whose mercies cannot be numbered: Make us, we beseech thee, deeply sensible of the shortness and uncertainty of human life; and let thy Holy Spirit lead us in holiness and righteousness all our days: that, when we shall have served thee in our generation, we may be gathered unto our fathers, having the testimony of a good conscience; in the communion of the Catholic Church; in the confidence of a certain faith; in the comfort of a reasonable, religious, and holy hope; in favour with thee our God, and in perfect charity with all men. . . .

[1] 'In certain portions of Canada it is practically impossible to consign bodies to the ground during the severe winter months' (Armitage, *The Canadian Revision of the P. B.*, p. 288).

[2] The Canadian only for baptised children.

[3] Cf. *Codex Juris Canonici*, 1240: 'Ecclesiastica sepultura privantur . . . qu mandaverint suum corpus cremationi tradi.' But dispensations are not unknown.

[4] Also found in the American Book under Visitation of the Sick.

THE ORDINAL

By W. K. FIRMINGER

I

WHAT is the meaning of Order? We may reply, in the words of St. Augustine, that order is 'an arrangement of things like and unlike which assigns to each its place.' [1] Holy Order is the assignment to each of the lot that has been divinely chosen for him. In Acts i. 17, it is said of Judas that 'he was numbered among us and received his lot in this ministry.' From being the means by which a selection is made, 'lot' (κλῆρος) is transferred to that which it secures. By the 'lot' given in answer to prayer, St. Matthias obtained his 'lot' in the apostolic ministry. Harnack maintains that the early Greek-speaking Christian community at Rome was the first to use κλῆρος as equivalent to 'clergy.' [2] Tertullian, the Father of Latin theology, sometimes uses 'ordo' as an equivalent to κλῆρος in the sense of clergy. As a Montanist Tertullian asks (*De Exhort.*, 7), 'Are not even we laymen priests?' and asserts that it is the authority of the Church and the honour which has acquired sanctity by the sitting together of the order (*honor per ordinis consessum*, i.e. the college of the presbyters sitting on special seats in the sanctuary) which have established the difference between the order and the laity (*plebem*). As a Catholic, he had complained (*De Præscr.*, 41) of 'the rash, light, and fickle ordinations of the heretics,' that is to say, their capricious interchanges of 'sacerdotal functions.' 'To set within the bema' (the sanctuary) is an Eastern synonym for 'to ordain.'

As to the Greek words χειροτονία, χειροθεσία, ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν, we are fortunate in being able to refer to the article prepared for the *Lexicon of Patristic Greek* by Prof. C. H. Turner. χειροτονία (lit. 'stretching out the hand') in a general sense is appointing formally; technically it is used to 'include the whole of the conditions which constitute a regular ordination, and of those the two most important were election by the people and the laying on of hands of the bishops.' Prof. Turner says

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, xix. 13.
[2] *Constitution and Law of the Church*, p. 115.

that χειροτονέω and χειροτονία are 'never used in connection with any other ecclesiastical rite than ordination—neither of Confirmation nor of the reconciliation of penitent and heretic; that is to say, they never mean simply "laying on of hands." There is always in the background the sense of appointment as well.' χειροθεσία, ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν, are not equivalents to χειροτονία, but 'are related to it as the "matter" or visible sign of the sacrament of which χειροτονία is the whole.' The technical distinction between χειροτονία as 'ordination' and χειροθεσία as excluding it, made by the writer of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, is an idiosyncrasy of his own.[1]

Coeval with the beginning of the Christian Church, ordination by laying on of hands (*ṣĕmikah*) was the practice in the appointment of the elders (*zĕkēnim*, πρεσβύτεροι), who formed the Palestinian Sanhedrins. The Old Testament precedent for the kind of 'apostolical succession' this Jewish ordination supplied was the appointment of the seventy elders in the wilderness, when God descended in the theophanic cloud and took of the spirit that was upon Moses and put it on the elders (Num. xi. 16–25). For the ordination of scholars the precedent was that of Moses, who, by God's command, laid hands on Joshua, and placed some of his honour upon him, in order to 'appoint a man over the congregation, which may go out before them, and which may go in before them, and which may lead them out, and which may lead them in; that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd' (Num. xxvii. 15 ff.). The picture given us in the Acts of the Church in the apostolic days is of a Spirit-possessed fellowship entering into its great possession as the true Israel, through the Spirit's indwelling endowed with charismatic gifts. Even of the Church's Lord it is said that 'He through the Holy Spirit' gave 'commandment unto the apostles whom he had chosen' (Acts i. 2). When, in the Upper Room, the Risen Lord, Himself 'anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power' (Acts x. 38), had breathed on His Apostles and imparted to them His own mission from the Father, He bade them receive the Holy Ghost, and committed to them the power of remitting and retaining sin. Receiving their commission directly from the Lord, and inspired with the Spirit that was upon Him, who is 'greater than Moses,' the Apostles, by His command, waited till they were 'baptised with the Holy Ghost.' When the Spirit comes, the Apostles lay on their hands, and men 'receive the Holy Ghost.'

The laying on of hands had been a characteristic action of our Lord: in His acts of merciful power by laying on His hand He blessed, and in thanksgiving by this same action

[1] Cf. *J.T.S.* xxiv.

He consecrated. About to ascend to His Father, He led His Apostles out to Bethany, and 'lifted up his hands and blessed them.' According to the Acts, the laying on of hands is practised by the Apostolic College at Jerusalem; it spreads to Antioch,[1] where the faithful are first called Christians. It is employed in the Pauline Churches, and so becomes the universally adopted sign of Ordination. Dr. Joseph Coppens,[2] who has made a very extensive study of the Imposition of Hands, and dealt with the Jewish precedents, is perhaps right in believing that the Jewish custom of ordaining would not in itself have led to the adoption of that ceremony as the Christian outward and visible sign of Ordination. Yet here we have a conspicuous instance of what Dr. Liddon has described as 'the inspiration of selection.' Guided by the Holy Spirit, who is the Interpreter of the will and work of Christ (Acts i. 8; John xvi. 25–6), following the precedents supplied by the Old Testament in the ordination of the seventy elders, of Joshua, and the Levites, and adopting the Lord's significant manner of bestowing His grace, the Apostolic Church employed the laying on of hands as the visible sign of an imparted commission.

That which is bestowed on an ordinand by Ordination, however, is not merely something which distinguishes him from the laity on the one hand, or from other ministers in an hierarchy on the other; nor is it even a power—a personal property of his own—of performing this or that service or office. By the laying on of hands with prayer, the ordinand receives, or is admitted into, that endowment of the Holy Spirit which (1) is the extension throughout the ages of Christ's gift to His Apostles, and (2) is nothing else but the abiding presence and power of Him whose office it is to cleanse, sanctify, illumine and sustain. The minister can do nothing apart from the operation of the Holy Spirit, who takes of the things of Christ and presents them to the Church (John xvi. 15). Apart from the operation of the Giver of life, all sacraments are of necessity null and void. Through the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, the one abiding Priest employs His chosen earthly minister as His living instrument; but it is He Himself who baptises, confirms, consecrates the Eucharistic elements, absolves the penitent, ordains and admits men as His Ministers, joins hands in Christian wedlock, and strengthens the sick.

[1] With Acts xiii. 2, 'Separate me (ἀφορίσατε δή μοι) Barnabas and Saul,' compare Num. viii. 11, καὶ ἀφοριεῖ Ἀρὼν τοὺς Λευείτας. The Levites are to be prepared 'to do the service of the Lord.' 'The children of Israel . . . lay their hands on the Levites.' So Barnabas and Saul are sent away 'for the work whereunto I have called them.'

[2] In *L'Imposition des Mains et les Rites connexes.*

II

In the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, Leo XIII wrote: 'All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, ought both to signify the grace which they effect, and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite—that is to say, in the matter and form—it still pertains chiefly to the form; since the matter is the part not determined by itself, but is determined by the form.' In examining ancient Ordination rites, we not unnaturally look at the prayers which accompany the laying on of hands in order to learn how the particular Church, to which these rites belong, understood the grace of the sacrament. It must, however, be understood that in some Ordination rites the laying on of hands is repeated, and to single out any one of the prayers which accompany the several impositions and to describe it as the essential form is therefore arbitrary.

The earliest Ordination prayers that have come down to us are those of the 'Church Orders.' A description of these books will be found in an earlier chapter of the present volume, and it is therefore only needful to say in this place that the *Canons of Hippolytus*, described by Bishop John Wordsworth as 'the Roman Church Order,' have been more accurately described by Dr. C. H. Turner as 'a very secondary authority, a version of a version, not only late in their present Arabic dress, but also not earlier than the fourth century in their substance.' After the labours in England of Dom Hugh Connolly and in Germany of Prof. E. Schwartz, the Ethiopic, Coptic and Arabic texts, together with Hauler's *Verona Fragments*, which constitute the so-called 'Egyptian Church Order,' are now recognised by scholars as the lost treatise—the *Apostolic Tradition*—of that important but elusive person, Hippolytus. We thus have Ordination prayers which go back to the commencement of the third century. The rite cannot be described as a mere literary fragment, for it appears to be still in use in the Abyssinian Church, and through *Apostolical Constitutions* (Book VIII) its forms appear in the Ordination rites of the Coptic and Maronite Churches, and through the *Testament of Our Lord*, in the rite for the consecration of the Coptic patriarch.[1]

In the rite for the ordination of a bishop, found in the *Apostolic Tradition*, after an election by all the people, the bishops with the presbyterate and the people are assembled, on a Sunday. With the consent of all, the bishops lay their hands on the elect, the presbyterate standing by silently. 'But let all keep silence, praying in heart for the descent of the Holy Spirit: let one of the bishops present, at the request of all, laying on a hand on him who is ordained bishop, pray, saying thus:

[1] Denzinger, ii. 48.

O God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of mercies and of all consolation,[1] who dwellest on high, and beholdeth lowly things,[2] who knowest all things before they be,[3] thou who hast set boundaries in thy Church by the word of thy grace, foreordaining from the beginning the race of the righteous (from) Abraham, appointing rulers and priests,[4] and not leaving thy sanctuary without a ministry; thou from the beginning of the world hast been well pleased to be praised in those whom thou hast chosen: pour forth now that power, that is from thee of thy principal spirit (*principalis spiritus*),[5] which thou didst give to thy beloved Son, Jesus Christ, which he bestowed on thy holy Apostles, who established the Church in each place, thy sanctification, to the glory and unfailing praise of thy Name.

[Here we give the parallel prayer at the ordination of the presbyter.]

Grant, O Father, Reader of the heart, to this thy servant, whom thou hast elected to the episcopate, to feed thy holy flock and to show forth to thee the primacy of the priesthood (*primatum sacerdotii*), serving without blame day and night unceasingly to propitiate thy countenance and to offer the gifts of thy Holy Church, to have, in the spirit of the primacy of the priesthood (*primatus sacerdotii*), power to remit sins according to thy commandment, to give the lots according to thy precept, to loose every bond according to the power which thou didst give to the Apostles, to please thee moreover in meekness and purity of heart, offering thee a sweet-smelling savour: through thy Child (*puerum*) Jesus Christ, through whom to thee be glory with him and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, look down on this thy servant and impart the Spirit of grace and counsel of the presbyterate, that in a pure heart he may aid and govern thy people, as thou didst look down on the people of thy choice and didst order Moses to choose presbyters, whom thou didst fill with thy Spirit, which thou gavest to thy servant; and now, O Lord, vouchsafe to preserve in us unfailingly the Spirit of thy grace, and make (us) worthy that, believing in thee, we may minister in simplicity of heart, praising thee, through thy Child (*puerum*) Christ Jesus, through whom be glory and power to thee, Father and Son with the Holy Spirit, in the Holy Church, both now and for ever and ever. Amen.

We have printed the two prayers in this way because the *Apostolic Tradition* directs: 'But when a Presbyter is ordained, let the Bishop lay his hand on his head, the Presbyters also touching it together, and let him speak according to what has been said before, as we have said before over the Bishop (*secundum ea, quæ praedicta sunt, sicut praediximus super episcopum*), praying and saying:

[1] 2 Cor. i. 3. [2] Ps. cxiii. 56. [3] Susannah 42.

[4] Cuius imperio fit ut ex Adamo perseveret genus iustum ratione huius episcopi, qui est magnus Abraham: qui prælaturas et principatus constituit (*Can. Hipp.*).

[5] Cf. *Apost. Constit.*: τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ πνεύματος, which is based on the LXX Ps. li. 12, rendered by the Vulgate 'Spiritu principali.'

God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . .' The *Canons of Hippolytus*, however, give another direction: 'But if a Presbyter is ordained, let all things be done as with the Bishop, except that he may not sit on the throne. Let even the entire prayer be prayed over him as over the Bishop, with the sole exception of the name of the Episcopate. Let the Bishop in all things be made equivalent (*æquiparetur*) to the Presbyter except in regard to the throne and ordination, because (the Presbyter) is not given power to ordain.' The prayer for the Presbyter, therefore, is not given in the *Canons*. The earlier Ethiopic and Latin versions of the *Apostolic Tradition*, after directing that what is said in the ordination of a bishop is to be said at the ordination of a presbyter, immediately give a prayer which is not the Bishop's prayer; and as this prayer for a presbyter has no exordium, it may be believed that the original intention was that the opening of the Bishop's ordination prayer was to serve as the opening of the Presbyter's as well.

The *Apostolic Tradition* enjoins that when a Deacon is ordained the Bishop alone is to lay on his hand, because the Deacon is not ordained for the priesthood (*in sacerdotio*), but 'for the ministry of the Bishop (*in ministerio episcopi*).' The Deacon does not receive the *communem presbyteri spiritum*, 'of which the presbyters are partakers.' It is on account of this *communis et similis cleri spiritus*, that the presbyters lay their hands on the candidates for the presbyterate, but the Bishop alone lays hands on the candidate for the diaconate, who is to undertake the work which the Bishop will entrust to him. 'The Presbyter derives from the spirit of his order' authority to receive, but not authority to give; and therefore he does not ordain.

The *Apostolic Tradition* ascribes far more liturgical authority to the Deacon than it does to the Presbyter. The text of the Deacon's ordination prayer as given by Dom Connolly may be compared with the Latin translation from the Abyssinian *Sinodos* which Mgr. L. P. Bel supplied to Canon Estcourt.[1]

Abyssinian.	*Apostolic Tradition.*
Send forth on thy servant whom thou hast chosen the Spirit of goodness and watchfulness that he may be a Deacon in thy Church, that he may approach to thy Temple and offer thy holy things to thee with (*apud*) him who is consecrated thine high-priest,[2] and glorify thy name: cause that he may keep a heart pure and without spot: that he may attain to the highest dignity of the priesthood with honour, etc.	Give the holy Spirit of grace and earnestness and industry to this thy servant whom thou hast chosen to minister to thy Church and to offer in thy holy of holies that which is offered to thee by thine ordained Chief Priests[2] to the glory of thy name; thus without blame in pure life having served the degrees of ordination he may obtain the exalted (priesthood?) and thy honour, and glorify thee, etc.

[1] *The Question of Anglican Ordinations*, p. xxxv.

[2] *I.e.* the Bishop.

This 'offering' appears to refer to the act of the Deacon in holding the chalice for his Bishop at the time of consecration. The presbyters, however, can celebrate with the Bishop, but, as Dr. Brightman says, 'between the more conspicuous activity of the Bishop as the president and mouthpiece of the collective priesthood on the one hand, and the active, though subordinate, ministry of the diaconate on the other, the more passive and silent rôle of the presbyterate was obscured and made inconspicuous.'[1] The idea of the *sacerdotium* is that of a college, the powers of which are inherent in the Bishop who has received a gift of the Holy Spirit, such as was bestowed on the Apostles by our Lord, an endowment which by his ordination the Presbyter shares, after the manner of the seventy elders on whom the Lord placed the Spirit that was on Moses without withdrawing the Spirit from him. 'Let that Eucharist be considered valid which is under the Bishop or him to whom he commits it,' St. Ignatius had written to the Smyrnæans. The question of the competency of a presbyter to consecrate the Eucharist is not raised; but it is clear that the Presbyter celebrates the Mysteries as the delegate of the Bishop. The act is proper not to the Presbyter personally, but to the *sacerdotium* of which he is a member.

With the Presbyter's prayer of the *Apostolic Tradition* we may compare the Presbyter's prayer in the Sacramentary of the Egyptian Bishop of Thmuis, Serapion, the friend and correspondent of St. Athanasius:

> We[2] stretch forth the hand, O Lord God of the heavens, Father of the Only-Begotten, upon this man, and pray that the Spirit of truth may dwell upon him. Give him the grace of prudence and knowledge and a good heart. Let a Divine Spirit come to be in him that he may be able to be a steward of thy people and an ambassador of thy divine oracles, and to reconcile thy people to thee, the Uncreated God, who didst give of the Spirit of Moses upon the chosen ones, even Holy Spirit. *Give a portion of Holy Spirit to this man also, from the Spirit of thy Only-Begotten,* for the grace of wisdom and knowledge and right faith, *that he may be able* to serve thee in a clean conscience, through thy Only-Begotten Jesus Christ.

Dom Pierre de Puniet has rendered the words I have italicised by the words 'lui communique l'Esprit même du Christ, afin qu'il puisse remplir désormais les functions du Christ.' This free rendering brings out what is the essential idea. The High-priesthood, Christ's own office, the office in which our Lord, as

[1] *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, p. 386.
[2] This points to the Presbyters' imposing their hands along with the Bishop.

a greater High-Priest than Moses or Aaron, is invested, is that in which the Bishop acts, when he offers the gifts of the Holy Church in the spirit of High-priesthood. The Holy Spirit is invoked to take of the Spirit of the Only-Begotten, which is on Him, who in the Church is the antitype of Moses, and to place it on him who is being ordained to the presbyterate.

The prayer, *Deus honorum omnium*, of the Leonine and Gregorian Sacramentaries, resembles the prayer of the *Apostolic Tradition*. To the analogy of Moses and the Seventy Elders that of the sons of Aaron is added. The prayer is for a renewal in the ordained of the Holy Spirit (Ps. li. 10), so that, as 'men of the second order and dignity,' they may assist their 'High Pontiff' in his own ministry.

> God, Giver of all honours and dignities . . . that contend for thee; through whom all things progress; through whom all things are established, the growths of orderly nature having developed for the better through an order disposed in a fitting design: Whence priestly grades and levitical offices instituted in mysterious sacraments have increased: so that when thou hadst set up High Pontiffs to rule thy people, thou didst chose for their society and assistance men of a second order and dignity. Thus also in the wilderness, through the minds of seventy prudent men, thou didst propagate the spirit of Moses; which helpers he used as assistants in the people and easily governed innumerable multitudes. So also thou didst transfuse in Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron, the abundance of the paternal plenitude, so that the ministry of priests might suffice for saving victims and sacraments of more frequent duty. By this providence, O Lord, thou didst add to the Apostles of thy Son, teachers, companions of the faith, by whom they filled the whole globe with second preachers. Wherefore to our infirmity also, Lord, we pray, bestow these aids, who in that we are the more fragile so much the more we need these many (supports). Bestow, we beseech, Almighty God, on these thy servants the dignity of the presbyterate, and renew in their inward parts the spirit of holiness, that they may obtain, as received by thee, O God, the office of second worth, and set forth the strictness of morals by the example of their conversation. May they be prudent (*providi*, but perhaps *probi*) co-operators of our order, and may the beauty (*forma*) of integral justice shine on them, so that when they must render a good account of the stewardship entrusted to them, they may obtain the rewards of eternal blessedness.[1]

[1] From the text printed by Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 360, which differs from that of the present Roman *Pontifical*.

The Gregorian prayer for the Episcopate has a lengthy exordium which recalls the letter in which Pope Celestine I (422–432) chided the bishops (*sacerdotes*) of Gaul on the score of superstitious observances in costume. 'Those who have not grown up in the Church, but, coming in by another road,' wrote Celestine, 'have introduced with themselves into the Church those things which they had in another mode of life. . . . We must be distinguished from the common people and the rest by our learning, and not by our clothes; by our mode of life, and not by our costume; by purity of mind, and not by elegance of dress. For if we begin to busy ourselves with novelties, we shall tread underfoot the traditions handed down to us from the Fathers in order to make room for worthless superstitions.' The Gregorian Ordination prayer for a Bishop refers to the priestly garments in which Moses was commanded to vest Aaron as 'ænigmatica figura,' since 'the dress of the ancient priesthood is the ornament of our mind,' and 'now it is the splendour of souls, and not the honour of vestments that commends pontifical glory.' God is thus besought to bestow on the servant whom He has chosen *in ministerium summi sacerdotii* whatever the garments of the ancient high priesthood, by the brightness of gold and the glitter of gems and variety of workmanship, signified.

> Perfect in thy priests the height of thy mystery (*mysterii tui summam*) and sanctify them, set forth in the ornaments of all glorification, with the dew of heavenly unction.[1] May this, Lord, copiously flow on their head, run down to the lower parts of the mouth, descend to the extremity of the whole body, that the power of thy Spirit may envelop both their exteriors and interiors. May constancy of faith, purity of affection, sincerity of peace abound in them.

At this place in the prayer, where it is found in the *Missale Francorum* and in Gelasian books, there follows a passage which is not found in the Gregorian books. The opening sentence: 'In thy service may their feet be lively in preaching the gospel of peace,' Mgr. Batiffol considers to be more in keeping with the diocese of St. Martin of Tours than with Rome. A ministry of reconciliation in words and deeds and in power of signs and wonders is entreated, and a discourse and preaching not in persuasive words of human wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and in power.

> Give to them the keys of the kingdom of heaven: may they use, not boastingly, the power thou bestowest for edification, not for destruction. And may whatever they

[1] When the ceremony of Unction was introduced, in many pontificals this was, as it is in the modern Roman rite, the point at which it took place.

should bind on earth be bound in heaven, etc. May he who blesses them be blessed, and he who curses them be filled with curses. May those whom thou dost set over thy family, Lord, be faithful and prudent servants, that they may give them their meat in due season, so that they may set forth every man perfect. May they be unweary in care, fervent in spirit. May they hate pride, love truth, nor ever, overcome by lassitude or fear, desert it. Let them not set light for darkness, nor darkness for light. Let them not call evil good, nor good evil. May they be debtors to the wise and obtain fruit from the progress of all.

Here ends the interpolated matter, and the rest follows:

Grant to them the episcopal chair to rule thy Church and universal people. Be to them authority: be to them power: be to them strength. Multiply on them thy benediction and grace, that, for ever seeking thy mercy, they, fit for thy service, may be set apart by thy grace.

In the description of ancient Western liturgical books, given elsewhere in this volume,[1] it has been stated that the so-called Gelasian Sacramentary represents the rites in use in the Gallican Church prior to the arrival at the Court of Charles the Great, sometime between 784 and 791, of the Hadrian Sacramentary. The Gelasian presbyter's prayer, *Sanctificationum omnium Auctor*, implores God to pour the hand of His blessing (. . . *tuæ benedictionis infunde*)[2] on the servant whom 'we dedicate with the honour of the presbyterate, so that by purity of deeds and strictness of living he may prove himself to be an elder (*seniorem*), established in those rules which Paul set forth to Titus and Timothy; that, O Almighty, he, meditating on thy law, by day and by night, may believe what he may read, teach what he may believe, and imitate what he may teach,' etc., and 'preserve the gift of thy ministry pure and unstained.' Then comes a passage for which there are conflicting readings. As it stands in Wilson's edition of the Gelasian Sacramentary it is a petition that the priest who is being ordained may 'through the service of thy people transform the Body and the Blood of thy Son by a stainless benediction and by an inviolate charity into a perfect man, into the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ, at the day of judgment of eternal justice, with pure conscience, full faith, full with the Holy Ghost, may . . .' It would seem that the petition based on Eph. iv was originally a prayer that the new priest might be enabled to transform the body of Christ so that it would come in the unity of the faith 'unto a perfect man, unto the measure

[1] See pp. 132 ff.

[2] The text is corrupt.

of the age of the fullness of Christ.' This doubtfulness of the text led to some copyists reading 'transformetur' for 'transformet' and making 'corpus' read 'corpore,' so that the petition would be that the new priest might himself be transformed by his participation in the Eucharist.

In the Orthodox Church of the East, the rites of Ordination are, in contrast to those of some of the separated Eastern Churches, short and simple. The three sacred orders of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon are 'within the Bema,' while the minor orders of subdeacon, reader and singer are 'outside the Bema.'[1] The person to be ordained Deacon is conducted by two Deacons, and the person to be ordained Presbyter by two priests,[2] from the platform that skirts the Bema into the Bema, and there the Bishop signs the ordinand three times on his head. The candidate for the subdiaconate does not enter the Bema, but remains outside. While the candidate is kneeling (the candidate for the diaconate on his right knee: the candidate for the presbyterate on both knees), the Bishop, laying on his hands, makes the proclamation:

> The Divine Grace, which always healeth that which is sick and filleth up that which lacketh, advances *N.* the most pious $\frac{\text{Subdeacon}}{\text{Deacon}}$ to a $\frac{\text{Deacon}}{\text{Presbyter}}$. Let us all therefore pray for him that the grace of All-Holy Spirit may come upon him.

The proclamation in both cases is followed by two prayers said secretly, while the Bishop holds his hand on the head of the person. At the consecration of a bishop, the elect is led up by three bishops to the consecrator at the footpace of the Altar, and in the consecrator's hands is placed a paper on which is written: 'By the election and approbation of all the most God-loving bishops, and of all the sacred Council, the Divine Grace, which always healeth, etc.' The consecrator reads this proclamation, and then opens the Gospel, and lays it on the head and neck

[1] The Order of Deaconess fell into abeyance in the East in the twelfth century. The Bishop prays that God will 'give the grace of thy Holy Spirit to this thy servant, who desires to offer herself to thee and to fulfil the grace of the diaconate, as thou didst give the grace of thy diaconate unto Phœbe, whom thou calledst to the work of the Ministry.' She is invested in the diaconal stole, and after she has received Communion, the Bishop gives her the chalice, which she receives and places on the altar. Her ecclesiastical rank was thus superior to that of the subdeacon. In the East the office of Deacon is not, as it usually is with us in the West, a stepping-stone to the presbyterate, but a lifelong appointment. See the forms of Ordination of Deaconesses in *The Ministry of Women* (S.P.C.K. 1919).

[2] So in Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus Vulgatus*, and in Martène's Ordo XIII.

of the elect, the other bishops touching him at the same time. He then makes three crosses on the head of the new bishop, and, keeping his hand there, he prays secretly to God, who 'by thine illustrious Apostle Paul hast enjoined on us the degrees and ranks for the service and ministry of thy sacred and stainless mysteries at thy holy Altar, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers,' to strengthen with 'the visitation and might and grace of thy Holy Spirit this man, who has been elected and deemed worthy of coming under the yoke of the Gospel and the episcopal dignity, through the hands of me, a sinner, and the fellow-bishops.' While one of the bishops, loud enough for the attendant bishops to hear, recites the diaconal sentences, the consecrator, still keeping his hand on the new bishop, prays secretly:

> O Lord our God, who, because the nature of man cannot endure the presence of the substance of the Godhead, hast in thy governance appointed for us teachers of like passions with ourselves, occupying thy seat, to offer unto thee sacrifice and oblation for all thy people, do thou, O Christ, grant that this man, now made a steward of episcopal grace, may be an imitator of thee, the True Shepherd, giving his life for thy sheep, to be a guide to the blind, a light to those in darkness, a teacher of the ignorant, an instructor of infants, a lamp in the world; that, having trained the souls committed unto him in this present life, he may stand unashamed at thy judgment-seat and receive the great reward which thou hast prepared for those who contend for the preaching of thy Gospel. For thou, O God, hast mercy, and dost save us, and to thee we ascribe glory, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, now and for ever, and to ages of ages.[1]

At the ordination of a presbyter in the Orthodox Church, the assistant presbyters do not join in the laying on of hands, but the Bishop, who has already signed the head of the ordinand three times, holds his right hand on the ordinand's head and says: 'The Divine Grace which always healeth the sick, and filleth up that which lacketh, advances *N.*, the most pious deacon, to a presbyter. Let us all therefore pray for him, that the grace of the All-Holy Spirit may come upon him.' The Bishop, continuing to hold his hand on the head of the ordinand, says two prayers secretly. The first of these prayers is for 'the great grace of thy Holy Spirit,' that he who has been advanced to minister (ἱερουργεῖν) 'the word of thy truth may direct well that great priestly honour.' The second secret prayer is that God will fill with the Holy Spirit

[1] St. Gregory Nazianzen (died 389 or 390), in his Oration on his father, speaks of the proclamation.

'this man whom thou hast been pleased should enter the degree of presbyter.' The functions of the degree are 'to stand blamelessly before thine Altar, to preach the Gospel of thy Kingdom, to minister (ἱερουργεῖν) the word of thy truth, to offer to thee gifts and spiritual sacrifices, to renew thy people through the laver of regeneration.' After that the new priest is raised from his knees, and the Bishop, rearranging the stole of the new priest, says 'worthy,' which all within the Bema and the singers repeat.

A reference to Old Testament precedent is not altogether absent from the Orthodox Ordination rites. The first of the secret prayers, which follow the proclamation at the consecration of a bishop, is to God, 'who by thine illustrious Apostle Paul hast enjoined on us the order of degrees and ranks for the service and ministry of thy sacred and stainless mysteries at thy Holy Altar, first Apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers': but it is besought that God will strengthen the new Bishop 'with the visitation and grace of thy Holy Spirit, as thou didst strengthen thy Holy Apostles and Prophets; as thou didst anoint Kings; as thou didst sanctify the high priests.' In the second prayer for the bishops, the appointment of 'teachers of like passions with ourselves, occupying thy seat, to offer unto thee sacrifice and oblation for all thy people,' is said to be because 'man cannot endure the presence of the substance of the Godhead.' The Bishop is to be an 'imitator of the True Shepherd giving his life for the sheep.'

It should be observed that the form of the proclamation corresponds with the Orthodox baptismal proclamation: 'The servant of God, *N.*, is baptised in the Name of the Father, Amen, and of the Son, Amen, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.' The person of the minister is not asserted, as it is God Himself, God working through His mystery, who baptises. God's eternal choice of a servant to serve Him lies behind man's choice of the ministry. So in the second secret prayer for the Deacon we read: 'O Lord of all, fill this thy servant, whom thou hast chosen to enter on the ministry of the Diaconate, with all faith, and power, and sanctification, by the visitation of thy Holy and quickening Spirit, for it is not by the laying on of my hands, but by the watchfulness of thy rich mercies, that grace is given to thy chosen ones.'

Morin, who was anxious to prove that Ordination forms are precative in form, was unable to recognise in the words of the proclamation the essential Greek form, although he admitted the fact of its great antiquity. A recognised authority, Simon of Thessalonica (died about 1430), regarded the proclamation as the most operative thing in the ceremony, for 'the grace is given simultaneously with the words,' but he takes the broad view that the whole rite constitutes a moral unity. In Archbishop

Makarios's *Dogmatic Theology of the Mysteries* it is stated that the Fathers of the Orthodox Church regarded the proclamation, 'the Divine Grace, etc.,' as an essential form of ordination.[1] Certainly, as Cardinal Gasparri (*De sacr. ordin.*, 1089) says, this view is the 'now received opinion.' But what an Orthodox theologian would understand by 'form' is different from what is understood by a Latin theologian. 'Whatever grace there be in the water of Baptism,' writes St. Basil (*De Spiritu Sancto*, 15), 'is not then of the nature of the words, but of the presence of the Holy Spirit.' 'The Divine Grace advances' indicates a divine power which is at work, and it is this divine power, theologians of the Eastern Church hold, and not the mere concurrence of a mystic ceremony with an essential form, which accomplishes the mystery of Holy Order.

The 'Divine Grace' proclamation appears in every Eastern Ordination rite, the Nestorian excepted; although in the Coptic and Syrian Jacobite rites it is pronounced by the Archdeacon, and not by the Bishop. A significant passage of a prayer in the Greek rite for the ordination of deacons appears in the Syrian Jacobite rite: 'for not in the imposition of our sinful hands, but in the visitation of thy copious mercy, grace is given to them.' In the Maronite [2] rite for deacons we read in one prayer: 'for not in the imposition of our sinful hands, but by the rich operation of thy mercies, grace is given them,' and in another prayer shortly afterwards: 'for not through the imposition of the hands of us sinners and fearful men, but through the illapse of the divine mercies of thy Holy Spirit, grace is bestowed on all those whom thou hast made fit, so that by it they may be worthy who approach to thee.' Later, after having placed his hands 'on the Mysteries,' the Bishop says the two prayers—the first of them secretly, with one hand 'over the Mysteries' and the other placed on the candidate's head. In the second of the prayers occur the words: 'non enim per manus impositionem,' etc. Before these two prayers are said the candidate is not regarded as yet ordained a Deacon, for in the preceding prayer there is a petition, 'Ascribe this thy servant to the third order, which is the diaconate.' If there be any 'essential form' and 'moment of consecration' in the Maronite rite, they are perhaps to be found after the obsignation, the vesting, the procession round the altar in which the candidate carries the censer, and the procession round the church in which he carries the book of the Gospels. It is then that he receives yet another laying on of hands, this time 'coram altari,' tne Bishop holding first the paten with the Holy Body, and saying a prayer, and then holding the chalice, and saying another. After this, the Bishop proclaims: 'He is ordained in the Church of God.' In the Maronite rite of Ordination to the

[1] I owe this reference to my friend, the Archimandrite G. D. Kazakos.
[2] The Maronites belong to the Roman obedience.

presbyterate, immediately before an unction of the thumb and palm of the candidate, the Bishop, in a prayer which rehearses God's redemptive work from man's fall to Calvary, the laying on of our Lord's pure and holy hands on His Apostles when He ascended on the Mount of Olives, His sending of the Holy Spirit, the constitution of 'sacerdotes et pastores et ministri' ('nine orders . . . according to the number of the choirs of Angels'), says: 'And we also, thy poor and sinning servants and the work of thy holy hands, who, albeit we were unworthy, have received the power of the priesthood from thine Apostles, pray thee, and implore thy mercy for this thy servant *N.*, who *expects* thy great gift by the laying on of hands, which he receives by us at this instant, that thou wouldst bestow on him the priesthood and the gift of the Holy Spirit.' As the Bishop anoints the head of the ordinand, he says a prayer in which occur the words: 'Anoint him with thy true and living (Spirit) and mingle him with thy divine sacraments, and bestow this order of the presbyterate on this thy servant.' After this prayer, the Bishop again lays on his hand, and says: 'He is ordained in the Church of God.'

In the Coptic Church the proclamation ('the Divine Grace') is made by the Archdeacon. In the prayer said while the Bishop lays his hands on the candidate for the diaconate occur the words, 'For it is not by the imposition of hands,' etc. This prayer is practically identical with the Deacon's prayer in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, but not with that of the *Apostolic Tradition*. The prayer which is said while the Coptic Bishop lays his hand on the candidate for the presbyterate is, with a number of verbal alterations, the prayer found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* and is an expansion of the Presbyter's prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition*. Similarly, in the Coptic rite the first of the Ordination prayers for a bishop is, with many verbal alterations and omissions, the prayer for the Bishop in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and its original basis is Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*. The second prayer corresponds with the concluding part of the second prayer in the Greek Ordination of bishops—'a guide of the blind,' etc.

The proclamation 'the Divine Grace' is in the Armenian rites said by the Bishop after it has been sung by the people; and the same importance is attached to it by the Armenian Church as by the Greek. The wording of the prayers which follow confirms this estimate. Tradition of instruments takes place after the robing of the new priests and the unction of their hands. According to Issarverden's translation of the Roman Armenian rite, the Bishop says, as he delivers the chalice and paten with *unconsecrated* elements to the newly-ordained priest: 'Receive these because ye *have received* power through the Grace of God to consecrate and complete the Holy Sacrifice, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, for the living and the dead': but in the

Armenian Church itself the chalice and paten are delivered with 'the Life-giving Body and Blood' with the words: 'Take and receive authority to seal and perfect Holy Sacrifice'—a form analogous to that which accompanies the placing of the girdle round the priest: 'Take authority from the Holy Ghost to loose and to bind, as our Lord gave authority to the Apostles, saying: Whosoever . . . ye bind,' etc.

In the Nestorian rite for the ordination of presbyters, when the candidates are kneeling on both knees with hands extended, the Bishop says: 'May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which at all times supplies that which is deficient, with the blessing of God the Father and the power of the Holy Spirit, be with us at every moment, and perform through our hands this tremendous and sublime ministry for the redemption of our life.' He then lays his right hand on the candidates, 'that they may be presbyters elect.' He signs their heads, and the Archdeacon calls for prayer. Again laying on his right hand, he in a low voice prays that God will look on His servants and 'elect them to the priesthood by an holy election by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit' that 'they may lay their hands on the sick and they may be healed, and in a pure heart and good conscience serve thy holy altar, offering to thee the oblations of prayers and of confessions in thy Holy Church,' etc.

Nearly all the Oriental rites correspond with the description given by the writer who called himself 'Dionysius the Areopagite,' and who flourished at the end of the fifth century. In his work on the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, he notices these ceremonies:

1. The candidate for the diaconate when presented kneels on his right knee: the candidates for the presbyterate and episcopate kneel on both knees.
2. The laying on of hands.
3. The signing with the cross.
4. The proclamation.
5. The kiss that terminates the ceremony, and
6. Peculiar to the consecration of bishops, the laying of the Bible on the head of the Bishop elect.

This necessarily brief examination of ancient Ordination prayers will serve to throw a strong light on the meaning of Order and Ordination. The doctrine of the Oriental prayers, in particular, is clearly expressed in a passage from St. John Chrysostom's 85th Homily on the Gospel of St. John: 'What speak I of priests? I say that neither angel nor archangel can give us any of these things: which be given unto us of God; but it is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost which is the effectual cause of all these things: the priest doth only put on his hands and his tongue.' St. Gregory of Nyssa, in a

remarkable passage in his sermon on the Baptism of Christ, speaks of the 'sanctification bestowed by the Spirit' as working a change in the ordinand: 'The same power of the Word makes the priest venerable and honourable, separated, by the new blessing bestowed upon him, from his community with the mass of men. While but yesterday he was one of the mass, one of the people, he is suddenly rendered a guide, a president, a teacher of righteousness, an instructor in hidden mysteries; and this he does without being changed at all in body or in form; but while continuing to be in all appearance the man he was before, being, by some unseen power and grace, transformed in respect of his unseen soul to the higher condition.' This unseen power is, in the words of the Greek rite, 'the visitation of thy Holy and Quickening Spirit.'

In the Orthodox Church this characteristic grace of Holy Order is confidently believed to be an endowment of the Holy Spirit, and because the Church on earth is the covenanted home of the Holy Spirit, St. Cyprian and St. Firmilian, in their memorable controversy with Pope Stephen, repudiated sacraments administered outside the Church as invalid. St. Basil, who accepted the view of his predecessor, 'our own Firmilian,' writes that 'those who had apostasised from the Church had no longer on them the Grace of the Holy Spirit. . . . The first separatists had received their ordination from the Fathers, and possessed the spiritual gift by the laying on of their hands. But they who were broken off had become laymen, and, because they were no longer able to confer on others the grace of the Holy Spirit from which they themselves are fallen away, they had no authority either to baptise or to ordain.' In the same letter (No. 188), St. Basil makes use of that prerogative, which the Orthodox Church calls 'the Economy,' and accepts, 'for the stewardship of the many,' baptisms which in the strictness of his theory would in themselves be invalid. Pope Innocent I (401–17), although he endorses the practice of Pope Stephen, and recognises Arian baptism as valid (*ratum*), yet, in making that concession in regard to baptism only, denies that Arians can receive the Holy Spirit thereby, 'since, when their leaders departed from the Catholic faith, they lost the perfection of the Spirit which they had received: nor could they give the fullness which is especially operative in Ordination.' The attitude of St. Basil and Pope Innocent I shows how both East and West were at one in the conception of the Ministry as the sphere in which the Holy Spirit operates through a human agency.

We have noticed that in the Orthodox prayer for the ordination of a deacon, the Bishop says: 'it is not by the laying on of my hands, but by the watchfulness of thy rich mercies that grace is given to thy chosen men.' With this thought the English

'King's Book' of 1543 concurs. 'Priests and bishops, although in the execution of their office and administration they do use and exercise the power and authority of God committed unto them, yet they be not the principal causes, nor the sufficient, or of themselves the efficient causes or givers of grace, or any spiritual gift which proceedeth and is given by God by his word and sacraments; but God is the only principal, sufficient and perfect cause of all the efficacy of his word and sacrament; and by his only power, grace and benefits it is that we receive the Holy Ghost, and his graces, by the office and administration of the same priests and bishops; and the said priests and bishops are but only as officers to execute and minister with their hands and tongues the outward and corporal things wherein God worketh and giveth grace in word, according to his pact and covenant made with and to his espouse the Church.'

With the Ordination prayers for the presbyterate already examined we may now contrast the form which Pope Eugenius IV declared to be essential for the ordination of a presbyter. 'Receive the power of offering sacrifice in the Church for the living and the dead, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' In the same decree, Eugenius declared the matter of the Sacrament of Holy Order to be the delivery (*porrectionem*) of the chalice with wine and the paten with bread. In language borrowed from a treatise of St. Thomas Aquinas, *De articulis fidei et ecclesiæ sacramentis*, that Pope instructed those questionable representatives of the Armenian Church who had come to him after the closing of the Council of Florence in 1439, that 'all sacraments are complete by three things—things as matter, words as form, and the person of the minister conferring the sacrament with the intention of doing what the Church does.' It is true that this doctrine as to what constitutes the essential form and matter of Ordination has been widely abandoned by Latin theologians, yet for several centuries it represented the belief of the majority of the Schoolmen; it constitutes the basis on which the rubrics of the Roman rite for the ordination of priests have been constructed, and it is the practice of the Holy Office at Rome to direct that wherever a case occurs of the omission of the *porrectio instrumentorum* and accompanying words the ordination should be repeated *sub conditione*, but if the ordinand has for some reason failed to receive the imposition of hands, that ceremony is alone 'cautiously supplied.' In exercising their intention to ordain, the vast majority of bishops of the Roman Communion must have intended to use the form *Accipe potestatem*, etc., and not the ancient prayer *Deus honorum omnium auctor*, as the essential form in the ordination of a presbyter. How, we may ask, came it about that in the West the laying on of hands that is to be found in every Catholic rite

of Ordination to the sacred Orders came to be regarded as secondary to a ceremony which was not older than the eleventh century, and how could a form of Ordination in which the Holy Spirit is not mentioned be regarded as the essential form in a sacrament in which, as Innocent I has written, the Holy Spirit is 'especially operative'?

The answer to these questions is to be found in the gradual substitution by Latin theologians from the eleventh century onwards of the Augustinian conception of a sacrament for the primitive conception of a 'mystery' which is still that of the Orthodox Church of the East. St. Augustine is no less emphatic than St. Cyprian in the belief that the 'Holy Spirit is not outside the Church,' but he does not draw from that belief, as St. Cyprian had done, the consequence that outside the Church there can be no valid sacraments. Not 'extra ecclesiam nulla *sacramenta*,' but 'extra ecclesiam nulla *salus*,' is St. Augustine's attitude. In conceding authentic sacraments either to schismatics or to the *ficti* or unconverted within the Church, he deprives sacraments of their efficacy. Thus for him, what the schismatic or the *fictus* within the Church receives by baptism is not forgiveness of sins and regeneration, but a 'character' or mark which will serve to condemn the soldier who has deserted his Commander. And it was from St. Augustine that the Schoolmen derived their doctrine of the composition of a sacrament in matter and words. The *locus classicus* for this doctrine is a passage in the 80th Treatise on the Gospel of St. John, where, after pointing out that our Lord said, not 'through the baptism wherewith ye have been washed,' but 'through the word which I have spoken unto you' (John xv. 3), St. Augustine writes: 'Take away the word, and the water is neither more nor less than water. The word is added to the element, and there results the sacrament, as if it were itself also a kind of word.' The Saint adds that the efficacy of word is 'not because it is uttered but because it is believed,' but even so, the contrast between the older doctrine of the Holy Spirit performing His office in response to the sacramental action of the Church and the newer theory of the external efficacy of the conjunction of a word, received in faith, with a physical action or material thing is obvious. In his attempt to rationalise the practice of recognising the sacraments of the Donatists as valid, St. Augustine, in effect, developed a tendency, which is conspicuous in the works of St. Optatus, to give sacraments a self-derived efficacy. The scientific systematisation which his elusive language has undergone at the hands of the Schoolmen has produced a doctrine of matter and form which suggests to many the idea that the grace of a sacrament is a mechanical or magical product of the exact performance of external rites accompanied by

prescribed formulas and with visible elements. The words of Leo XIII, with which this section commenced, 'Matter is the part which is not determined by itself,' reflect the revived knowledge of Greek philosophy which led the Schoolmen to apply the Greek metaphysical doctrine of matter and form to the sacraments.[1]

St. Augustine's metaphor, of a mark or character indelibly set on a man at his baptism to show to whom he belongs, was applied by the Schoolmen to express the effect of Confirmation and Ordination; Aristotle had distinguished three qualities of the soul: (1) Emotions (πάθη), (2) Faculties (δυνάμεις: *potentiae*), (3) Moral states (ἕξεις, *habitus*). Alexander of Hales taught that character belongs to the second kind of quality, and that it is a *habitus* which disposes the soul towards an assimilation of the soul to Jesus, our Priest. St. Thomas Aquinas, on the contrary, denied that character could be *habitus*, for the reason that character admits of being both well and badly used, while a good habit cannot have a bad end, or bad habit a good one. Character cannot be an emotion, since it is indelible. He contended that character is therefore a *potentia*, and its purpose is not to fit the soul for the reception of grace, but to invest a man with power to perform acts of divine worship—a passive power in receiving divine things and an active power in imparting them. St. Thomas, indeed, teaches that the laying on of hands signifies 'a most copious effect of grace, by which they on whom hands are imposed are by a given similitude maintained as the ministers for whom a copiousness of grace is requisite'; but in his system the sacramental matter is the delivery to the ordinand of the instrument essentially necessary for the execution of his office, as a token of the power (or character) conferred on him. The laying on of hands, according to this theory, is a preparation of the ordinand, but not the matter of Ordination. In the light since thrown on the history of sacramental theology the doctrine of St. Thomas could only be maintained on one of two suppositions: (1) that ordination to the presbyterate was not a sacrament until the ceremony of the tradition of the instruments had been introduced, or (2) that the Church has it in her power, by sporadic enrichment of her liturgical books, to alter the outward and visible signs handed down from the Apostles. The point, however, which should be regarded as the salient one is the supersession of primitive emphasis

[1] William of Auxerre (died *c.* 1237) is said to have been the first to press Aristotle's theory of matter and form into the theology of the sacraments, and also the first to use the formula 'intentio faciendi quod facit ecclesia.' In the *Mitrale* of Sicard, Bishop of Cremona (d. 1215), 'stola . . . et casula, oleum calixque, patena simul et haec verba [accipe potestatem . . .] sunt hujus sacramenti substantia; caetera praecedentia et subsequentia sunt solemnitatis.'

on the operation of the Holy Spirit by the mediæval doctrine of character.[1]

III

We now proceed to discuss in some detail the Ordination rites and ceremonies of the Middle Ages.

Since the beginning of the seventeenth century 'the Form and Manner of Making and Consecrating Bishops, Priests and Deacons according to the Order of the Church of England' has been commonly and conveniently spoken of as the 'Ordinal.' The mediæval 'Ordinale,' however, was a manual which by reference to a dominical letter showed the priest the festivals he was to observe in reciting the Divine office, or the changes he was to make in the ferial office. Of the greatest importance for our subject is the tract called an 'Ordo.' In Mabillon's *Museum Italicum* (1689)[2] will be found a series of fifteen *Ordines Romani* which provide us with descriptions of liturgical functions of the Papal Court from at least the ninth century to the time when that Court was resident at Avignon. These *Ordines*, however, at the most only give the first words of the prayers and formulas in order to show how the ceremonies, which it was the writer's purpose to describe, should fit in with them. For the text of the formulas and prayers we have to turn to the liturgical book called the 'Sacramentarium' (*liber sacramentorum*, or simply *sacramentorum*), and here we find few if any directions as to ceremonial, but only the words which the celebrant himself has to say. By segregating the rites which the Bishop alone is competent to celebrate, adding the things to be said or done by his assistants or the candidates, and by supplying directions as to the ceremonial, the mediæval pontificals came into existence. If we consult Feltoe's convenient edition of the *Sacramentarium Leonianum*, we find, on p. 121 under the heading 'Consecratio Presbyteri,' three formulas unaccompanied by any direction as to ceremonial, viz. a bidding (*Oremus dilectissimi*,[3] etc.), a collective prayer (*Exaudi nos*, etc.), and a long

[1] The writer would safeguard himself from being judged to regard the doctrine of ministerial character as in its essence untrue. In the form that doctrine has been developed in scholastic theology it appears to him to be an undue materialisation of the metaphors of St. Paul in 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30. 'To whom Christ hath imparted power both over that mystical body which is the society of souls, and over that natural which is Himself for the knitting of both in one (a work which antiquity doth call the making of Christ's body); the same power is in such not amiss termed a kind of mark or character and acknowledged to be indelible. Ministerial power is a mark of separation because it severeth them that have it from other men, and maketh them a special *order* consecrated unto the service of the Most High in things wherewith others may not meddle. Their difference, therefore, from other men is in that they are a distinct *order*.'—Hooker, *Eccl. Polity*, v. 87. 2.

[2] Cf. Migne, *P.L.*, lxxviii; and Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut Moyen Âge*.

[3] In the present *Pontif. Rom.* 'carissimi' for 'dilectissimi.'

prayer (*Domine sancte Pater omnipotens, Deus honorum omnium*, etc.). As to what was to take place while these formulas were said, the Bishop would follow his own discretion or be guided by the custom of his Church, until at last the increasing complexity of the ceremonies rendered it necessary for an 'ordo' to be compiled.

'The pontifical of any Church,' Maskell observes, 'is among the scarcest of its books existing.' The reason for this scarcity is obvious: a book containing only rites which a bishop could celebrate would not be a necessary possession for ordinary priests. The book might be the property of an individual bishop and be withdrawn from the safe-keeping of his cathedral after his death. The materials which were taken over from the sacramentaries by pontificals of churches from Milan northwards were practically the prayers and formularies of the Roman books (as found in the Leonine or Gregorian sacramentaries) and those of the Gelasian sacramentaries used in the Gallican Church, into which the prayers and formulas in use at Rome had been already incorporated. Into the Gelasian books had been imported the series of canons which are now called the *Statuta ecclesiæ antiquæ*, but which, owing to the circumstances of their having been inserted in Gallican collections of canons in such a way that they read on continuously with the anti-pelagian anathematisations of a council of 214 bishops at Carthage in 417 or 418, were for many centuries mistaken for the canons of a Council of Carthage at which St. Augustine himself assisted.[1] The authorship of these canons has by recent writers been ascribed to St. Cæsarius of Arles; but as the canons were quoted at the Council of Agde in 506 with the words 'sancti patres nostri synodali sententia consuerunt,' and as St. Cæsarius only became a bishop in 503, that opinion cannot carry weight. For ordination to the minor orders the canons prescribe ceremonies unknown at Rome. The canons are now ascribed to a compiler at Arles in the fifth century. Canons 2–10 read as follows:—

> 2. When a bishop is ordained, let two bishops place and hold the volume of the Gospels over his head and neck; and while one pours forth the benediction on him let all the others who are present touch his head with their hands.
>
> 3. When a presbyter is ordained, while the Bishop is blessing him, let all the presbyters who are present hold their hands on his head close to the hand of the Bishop.
>
> 4. When a deacon is ordained, let the Bishop, who alone blesses him, place his hand on his head, because he is consecrated not to the *sacerdotium*, but to the ministry.[2]

[1] They are so referred to in *The King's Book*.

[2] Compare with Hippolytus, *Apost. Trad.*: 'Quia non in sacerdotio ordinatur, sed in ministerio episcopi.'

5. When a subdeacon is ordained,[1] since he does not receive the laying on of hands, let him receive an empty paten from the hand of the Bishop and an empty chalice. But from the hand of the Archdeacon a cruet with water, a bowl and napkin.

6. When an acolyte is ordained,[2] he should be instructed by the Bishop how he is to act in his office. But from the Archdeacon let him receive a candlestick with candle in order that he may know that he is entitled to kindle the lights of the church. And let him receive an empty cruet for pouring wine into the Eucharist of the Blood of Christ.[3]

7. When an exorcist is ordained, let him receive from the Bishop's hand the booklet in which the exorcisms are written, the Bishop saying to him: 'Receive and commit to memory and have power to lay on hand on the energumen whether baptised or a catechumen.'

8. When a reader is ordained, let the Bishop make mention of him to the people, pointing out his faith and simplicity of life. After this, in the sight of the people, let him deliver to him the volume of that which he is to read, saying: 'Receive and be thou a reader of the word of God, to have, if thou faithfully and usefully fulfil (thy) office, part with those who have ministered the word of God.'

9. When a doorkeeper is ordained, after that he has been instructed by the Archdeacon how he should behave in God's house, let the Bishop, at the Archdeacon's suggestion, deliver to him from the altar the keys of the church, saying:

[1] At Rome in the ninth century there was no solemn ordination for a subdeacon. The candidate brought forward an empty chalice which had been handed to him by either the Bishop or the Archdeacon, and received a simple blessing. John the Deacon, early in the sixth century, however, mentions the tradition of the chalice to the subdeacon.

[2] At Rome, the candidate approached the Bishop, during Mass, carrying a linen bag, such as was used to carry the *oblatæ*, or consecrated Hosts, at the time of the Fraction, and kneeling, received a blessing: 'At the intercession of the glorious and ever virgin Mary and the blessed Apostle Peter, may the Lord save and guard and protect thee.' In the Irish canons (*Wasserchleben*, pp. 23–26) the acolyte is not reckoned among the seven degrees. Duchesne writes: 'The order of acolytes seems not to have been everywhere in use in the Gallican countries. . . . In the *Missale Francorum* a prayer only is found, and that, too, without an invitatory, and in an unusual place, viz. between the blessing of the doorkeepers and that of the lectors. At Rheims, in the fifth century, there were no acolytes.' The order does not exist in the Orthodox Eastern Church. The acolyte is mentioned as the fourth order in Ælfric's Canons, A.D. 957 (?), and by the law of Wihtred, the weregeld for his murder was £4.

[3] *Ad suggerendum vinum in eucharistiam Sanguinis Christi.* This is evidence to attest the custom of supplementing the consecrated wine by pouring unconsecrated wine into the depleted chalice and thus consecrating the added wine *per immixtionem*. See Andrieu, *Immixtio et Consecratio*, pp. 13–15.

'So act as about to render to God account for those things which by these keys are brought to light.'

10. The psalmist, that is, the singer, may, without the Bishop's privity, at the sole bidding of the Presbyter undertake the office of singing, the Presbyter saying to him: 'See that what thou dost sing by mouth, thou dost believe in heart: and what thou dost believe in heart, thou dost attest by deeds.'

Prior to the adoption of Gallican ceremonies, the ceremonies at Rome appear to have been very simple. At Rome, on either the Wednesday or Friday in an Ember week, the candidates were presented to the faithful during the stational masses in the churches of S. Maria Maggiore and the Holy Apostles. The Pope, or a notary on his behalf, shortly after the commencement of Mass, ascended the ambo and published the *si quis*: 'The Lord God and our Saviour Jesus Christ being our helper, we elect in the order of deacon (or presbyter) that subdeacon (or deacon) from that title. If anyone has aught against these men, for God and on behalf of God, let him come forth with confidence and say it. May he be mindful of his communion.' The ordination itself took place at the Mass of the Vigil, anciently at night-time, but from the eighth century in the afternoon. Before the reading of the Gospel, the Archdeacon went to the candidates who were awaiting him beneath the ambo, and leading one of them by the hand, the other following, he presented them to the Pope at the altar. Passing over the ordination of deacons, we come to that of the presbyters. The Archdeacon, after he had invested the candidates in planeta and stole, arranged them before the Pope before the altar.[1] The Pope then pronounced the invitatory or call to prayer: *Oremus dilectissimi*, etc., and he and the whole assembly prostrated themselves, while the Schola Cantorum sang the Litany, which appears to be in this case substituted for silent congregational prayer. At this point the evidence of the *Ordines Romani* becomes obscure. The S. Amand Ordo has 'accipiunt orationem presbyteri (or presbyterii) ab ipso.' Mabillon's Ordo VIII, which describes an ordination in which a single person is ordained subdeacon, deacon and priest on one and the same occasion, has 'et tunc aliam illi dans orationem, consecrat eum presbyterum.' Ordo IX might lead one to infer that the candidates for the diaconate and the presbyterate received the imposition of hands *en bloc*. 'Singillatim impones manus capitibus eorum' refers to the candidates for the diaconate, and if it does not include the candidates for the presbyterate, all Ordo IX

[1] In the ninth century, whatever the case may have been elsewhere, at Rome the chasubles and stoles were worn by acolytes and subdeacons and were not tokens of the sacred orders.

would give for the latter is ' complentur benedictiones eorum qui presbyteri ordinantur.'

In the Gallican Churches, in which the Ember seasons were not as yet known, the presentation of the candidates took place at the Ordination itself. The Bishop addressed the people, and they responded ' Dignus est.' The Bishop then called the people to prayer by the invitatory '*Commune votum communis prosequatur oratio*," etc., in the case of deacons, and '*Sit nobis, fratres communis oratio*,' etc. in the case of priests. The Ordination prayers which follow the invitatories are the *Domine sancte, spei, fidei, gratiæ* for deacons, and *Sanctificationum omnium auctor* for presbyters.

The two rites of Ordination for deacons and presbyters were therefore similar in structure, and not so very unlike the Byzantine rite, which in the case of each of the orders commences with a proclamation and call to prayer accompanied by the laying on of hands, to which two prayers (said secretly) by the Bishop follow.

The canons of the Gallican *Statuta ecclesiæ antiquæ*, however, appear in the Gelasian Sacramentary and in the *Missale Francorum*. In later pontificals the canons are detached from one another and set in the ritual before each order to which they apply. Thus, therefore, after the Roman and the Gallican rites had been fused the canon of the *Statutes* directing the assistant presbyters at an ordination of presbyters to lay on hands together with the Bishop would appear immediately before the Roman invitatory *Oremus dilectissimi*. This[1] may account for the fact that, in the present Roman Pontifical, at the first laying on of hands by the Bishop in which the presbyters assist, no words are spoken. In that rite, while the Bishop proclaims the invitatory *Exaudi nos*, he and the presbyters hold out their hands extended, and this extension of hands is now held to be morally a continuation of the first silent imposition of hands on the heads of the candidates. Somewhat to the perplexity of liturgical scholars (*e.g.* Dom Guéranger) the Roman Congregation of Rites has ruled that this extension of hands during the invitatory, which is not strictly speaking a prayer, is not to be continued during the collective prayer *Exaudi nos*. During the singing of the Eucharistic prayer, *Deus honorum omnium*,[2] the Bishop is directed to hold his hands extended before

[1] So Dr. Frere thinks.

[2] The prayer *Deus honorum omnium* is spoken of as Eucharistic. But it seems that it was not until the tenth century that it was prefaced by the *Dominus vobiscum, Sursum corda, Vere dignum*, etc. It is now very widely regarded by Roman Catholic scholars as the essential form in the Roman rite for the ordination of presbyters, as the prayer *sanctificationum omnium* is believed to be that of the Gelasian rite. Of it, Dom P. de Puniet writes: ' Ces paroles sont ce qu'ils a de plus solennel dans l'ordination: elles énoncent clairement ce qu'elles produisent, de pair avec l'imposition des mains: elles transmettent le vrai sacerdoce du Christ avec son caractère indélebile, avec les prérogatives qui y sont attachées, celles en particulier d'offrir le saint sacrifice et de con-

his heart. The decision of the Congregation of Rites does not seem so extraordinary when one remembers that until comparatively recently Roman theologians looked elsewhere in the Roman pontifical for the form for the presbyterate.

By the fusion of the Roman and Gallican rites two sets of originally separate 'essential forms' appear in one and the same rite; and in the Gelasian sacramentaries, which represent that fusion, in the rite for the

Roman	Oremus dilectissimi Exaudi nos	} are headed	Ad Ordinandos Presbyteros.
	Deus honorum omnium	,,	Consecratio.
Gallican	Sit nobis fratres	,,	Consummatio presbyteri.
	Sanctificationum omnium	,,	Item benedictio.

With these fused materials at their disposal, the compilers of the later pontificals set to work to enrich their Ordination services. They seem to have felt that the ancient formularies did not sufficiently express (1) the sacrificial functions of the presbyter, (2) and his power to absolve sinners.

In some pontificals, therefore, the power to offer sacrifice was connected with the vesting of the newly-ordained presbyter in the chasuble. In the tenth-century Corbey pontifical of St. Eloi these words accompany that ceremony: 'May the blessing of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost descend on thee, that thou may be blessed in the sacerdotal order and offer pleasing hosts to God for the sin and offence of the people: to whom be honour and glory for ever and ever.' And so in the Egbert pontifical and the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert, the Cahors pontifical, etc. In a Bec pontifical (Martène's Ordo XI) the reference to sacrifice appears in connection with the anointing of the presbyter's hands. When the tradition of instruments was introduced, the formula for the chasuble was altered and its bestowal was shifted to another place in the rite.

The feeling that it was desirable to express in the rite the Presbyter's commission to remit and retain sins is betrayed by an addition to the rite made by marginal entries in two pontificals belonging to the Church of Rouen which Morin has described.[1] On the margin of a Rheims pontifical, which he believed to be of the twelfth century, Morin found written by a later hand: 'And after partaking of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, before the post-communion is said, then let the Bishop draw down the chasuble of each by the shoulders, kissing him.' In another Rouen pontifical, about a century later, is written, that after the Com-

férer les sacraments, avec les grâces nécessaires pour bien accomplir les functions sacerdotales'.—*Le Pontifical Romain: Histoire et Commentaire*, T. 1, p. 271 (Paris, 1930).

[1] *De sacris ordinibus*, Pars III, C. 2 (Antwerp edn., 1688, p. 106).

munion the Bishop successively lays hands on the inclined heads of each, and says to each what follows: 'Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou dost remit,' etc. Afterwards, extending the chasuble of any of them, he invests any one of them, their hands remaining joined, saying thus: 'The stole of innocency,' etc. In the Sarum pontifical translated by Maskell, before the post-communion is said, the Bishop lays his hand on each of the newly-ordained priests and says, 'Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins ye remit,' etc. and then draws down the chasuble of each *in sinu per scapulas*, kissing him and saying, 'The peace of the Lord be always with thee.' [1]

This final laying on of hands with the words of our Lord in St. John xx. 22, 23 finds its place in the present *Pontificale Romanum*. After this final imposition of hands had been widely introduced in the mediæval pontificals, the fact that it was a late introduction was lost to memory. John de Burgo, in his influential manual, *Pupilla Oculi*, mentions that in his ordination of priests there are two partial matters and forms, viz.—

1. The tradition of the instruments of the Mass and the accompanying words, conveying power to offer sacrifice.
2. The laying on of hands with the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins, etc.'

De Burgo is speaking of the final laying on of hands, but St. Ivo of Chartres (died 1116), in his sermon *De excellentia sacrorum ordinum*, is speaking of an imposition of hands which took place at the commencement of the Latin rite, when he says of presbyters: 'Then when they are ordained, while the Bishop is blessing them and holding his hand on their head, all the presbyters who are present lift their hands close to the hand of the Bishop on their heads and invoke the Holy Spirit on those who are ordained: they (the newly-ordained), after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, receive the stole on either shoulder.' Honorius of Autun (1106–35?) in his *Gemma Animæ* (I. 181), writes of presbyters: 'On these the Bishop in ordination lays on hands and bestows the power of loosing and binding, so far as they live in such a way that they may be able to loose and bind others; he places on them this yoke of the Lord while he binds their necks with the stole, so far as they should so obey the law of God that they may be worthy to rule others; he anoints their hands with chrism, that the things they bless may be blessed, so far as they keep themselves from every impure work, so that they may be able worthily

[1] The final benediction is the blessing which once accompanied the investiture in the chasuble. Maskell notes that this ceremony was 'adopted into the use of the Church of Bangor before the end of the next century,' but 'we have no trace of it in the Winchester pontifical.'—*Monumenta*, ii. p. 232.

to consecrate the Body of Christ.' [1] Morin refers to a life of St. Lietbert, Bishop of Cambray, written by Rodulph, Abbot of St. Trudo (after 1031): 'When at the imposition of the pontifical and at ordination it was said to the new priest: "Receive the Holy Ghost whose sins," etc., he trembled.'

In regard to the first laying on of hands, a rubric of the pontifical of the College of Foix is cited by Morin: 'The Bishop standing, saying nothing, lays on hands on the heads of each according to the custom of the Roman Church: and likewise all the presbyters who assist. But according to the custom of certain Churches they say: "Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins,"' etc. This pontifical does not mention any laying on of hands at the end of the rite.

A late Mainz pontifical directs 'accipe spiritum sanctum' to be sung as an antiphon while the Bishop advances towards the candidates: the Bishop and presbyters are to go in a circuit and lay hands on each one of the candidates, the Bishop saying: 'May the Holy Ghost come upon thee and the power of the Most High guard thee from sin.' In the *institutio ad pietatem christianam* put forth by a Council held at Mainz under Archbishop von Heusseman in 1549, it is said: 'A Bishop therefore, in conferring orders, looking attentively to the aforesaid promises and commands of the Lord, uses such a form of words as comes closest to promises and commands of such a kind.' When about to bestow the sacerdotal order, he says, 'Receive the Holy Ghost.' Later on we read: 'At the commencement, laying hands on their heads, the grace of absolution, and power of remitting and retaining sins, is communicated to them.'

Through the Pontifical of Durand of Mende a final imposition of hands accompanied by the words 'accipe spiritum sanctum, quorum,' etc., found its way into the place which it holds at the present day in the *Pontificale Romanum*. It may perhaps represent a ceremony which took place elsewhere at the beginning of the rite, the alteration of the chasuble being substituted for the investiture in the stole.[2] From what has been said it is clear that the associ-

[1] Honorius (C. 185) writes: 'The Lord in the Gospel laid hands on the Apostles and constituted them princes and priests of the Church, and the Apostles laid on hands when they gave the Holy Spirit.' The *Speculum ecclesiæ*, wrongly assigned to Hugh of St. Victor (Hittorp, Col. 1345), repeats the statement of St. Ivo; but the genuine Hugh writes (*De Sacramentis*, L. II, pars. iii, c. 12): 'They after the invocation of the Holy Spirit receive the stole on either shoulder.' Evidently Hugh is referring to an invocation that was made at the commencement of the service.

[2] In the Pontifical of Egbert the investiture in the stole with the words, 'May the Lord encircle thy neck with the stole of justice and may the Lord purify thy mind from all corruption of sin,' follows immediately the *Statuta eccl. antiq.* clause enjoining the laying on of hands, and before the Invitatory. In Martène's Ordo III it comes with the same formula between the *Exaudi nos* and the *Deus honorum omnium*. In the Cahors pontifical after the invitatory, but without a

ation of the laying on of hands with the words of our Lord conveying the power of absolution was no novelty when it appeared in the Edwardian Ordinal, and there is much evidence to support the belief that it in many places accompanied the laying on of hands, as a marginal insertion in a Bamberg pontifical directs.

The sixteenth-century pontifical of Archbishop Bainbridge (died at Rome in 1514) brings us within forty years of the Edwardian Ordinal. In this book we find a very striking instance of the freedom mediæval churches exercised in liturgical matters. In this book, at the ordination of presbyters, the Gelasian invitatory for the ordination of deacons, altered by the institution of 'sacerdotii' for 'diaconatus' and 'sacerdotiali' for 'Leviticæ,' is said while the Bishop and Presbyters lay hands on candidates for the presbyterate, and the Bishops and Presbyters again lay on their hands at the Eucharistic prayer *Deus honorum omnium*. On any strict theory of matter and form, the Bishop in using this pontifical ordained the new presbyters at least twice. In this pontifical a final laying on of hands by the Bishop occurs at the end of the rite.

A tenth or eleventh century MS. preserved at Paris bears the name of the Pontifical of Egbert,[1] Archbishop of York (735–766), and is an attempt to collect episcopal rites in a single volume. If the Gelasian Sacramentary in its essence is of Roman *provenance* there is little reason for challenging the heading 'incipit ordo de sacris ordinibus qualiter in Romana ecclesia presbyteri, diaconi, subdiaconi, vel ceteri ordines clericorum benedicendi sunt,' although a very great deal of the contents—notably the ceremonies and formulas for the ordination of clerks in minor orders—never came into use at Rome until Rome, after giving so much, began in her turn to borrow. The *Benedictional of Archbishop Robert*,[2] now in the Public Library at Rouen, is more than a collection of episcopal benedictions: it verges on being a pontifical. The word 'Alia' is so frequently placed over kindred formulas that one cannot but suppose it was the compiler's

formula. In the Bec pontifical (Martène's Ordo XI) after the *Exaudi nos*, but without a formula, and so in the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert. In the Sarum pontifical, the benedietion that accompanies the investiture in the chasuble in the Pontifical of Egbert comes after the newly-imported final laying on of hands. In the modern Roman Pontifical the words 'Stola innocentiæ induat te' follow the words 'Accipe Spiritum sanctum, quorum,' etc. at the end of the rite.

[1] Published by the Surtees Society.

[2] Edited for the Henry Bradshaw Society by H. A. Wilson, 1902. Written during the latter half of the tenth century at the New Minster of Winchester, this book passed to the Abbey of Jumièges, either with Robert of Jumièges, the expelled Archbishop of Canterbury in 1052, or with Robert of Normandy (brother of Queen Emma, the mother of Edward the Confessor, Archbishop of Rouen 990–1037). The contents have been added to in Normandy.

intention that the Bishop was to select those formulas which he thought the most suitable. The two pontificals [1] edited by Metzger in 1914 afford early examples of attempts to produce a volume of episcopal rites. Recently Professor Andrieu has rehabilitated the reputation of the *Ordo Romanus Vulgatus*, first printed by Cassander at Cologne in 1561, and included by Melchior Hittorp in his *De divinis catholicæ ecclesiæ officiis* in 1568. From the time of Tomasi, who described this *Ordo Romanus* as a 'farrago diversorum rituum secundum varias consuetudines,' liturgical scholars have given this *Ordo* a cold shoulder. Professor Andrieu, however, has called attention to the wide dissemination of copies of this work, particularly in Italy, into which country it appears to have been imported by the clergy who followed in the train of the 'Holy Roman' emperors. We can now see how justly the expression 'farrago diversorum rituum' describes almost any pontifical from the ninth to the thirteenth century. It would have been a serious thing for a bishop to change the use of his diocese in regard to the ceremonies of the Mass or Baptism, for that would, to say the least of it, have involved the labour and expense of altering the service-books of many churches and chapels; but in the case of Ordination rites it was no difficult matter to rearrange the parts of a single pontifical or to impart some new and impressive ceremony by a few strokes of the pen on the margin. A salient instance of how a bishop would, on his own authority, introduce new ceremonies into diocesan usage, is supplied by Durand of St. Pourçain, who, after having held the office of Master of the Sacred Palace at Avignon, was consecrated bishop of Le Puy-en-Velay in 1318, and was translated to Meaux in 1326. Nearly half a century after St. Thomas Aquinas had given his authority to the opinion that character is impressed on the candidate for the diaconate by the delivery of the Book of the Gospels, we find Durand of St. Pourçain recording the fact that in the 'most ancient *Ordinarium*' of the church of Annecy there was no direction given for this ceremony. With his own hand he added such a direction in the margin of the *Ordinarium*. He did this because he desired to conform with other churches, but his own view was that the delivery of the Gospel Book cannot express the principal function of a deacon, for that is to carry the Sacrament. It was, however, impossible to make the delivery of the empty chalice to the deacon the essential matter of his ordination, for the empty chalice was delivered to the candidate for the subdiaconate. The deacon is *par excellence* the minister: his principal function is therefore expressed by the laying on of hands, for the hand is 'the organ of organs.' In this matter of private opinion Durandus follows St. Bonaventura.

[1] One is that of Poitiers, and the other of Constance.

The Egbert Pontifical and the Benedictional of Archbishop Robert provide an anointing of the hands of a deacon and of both head and hands of both priests and bishops. In the Gelasian Sacramentary, after the 'benedictio subdiaconi,' there is given a form for the consecration of his hands: 'May these hands be consecrated by this unction and our benediction, so whatever they bless may be blessed, and whatever they sanctify may be sanctified'; but in the Gelasian Sacramentary the Ordination rites have been separated. In Book I. xx we are given the rites for the ordination of presbyters and deacons, and in I. xcvi–xcix the rites for the ordination of the subdeacons, the minor clerks and the Bishop. Thus the formula for the anointing of hands lost its way. That the ceremony of anointing the hands of deacons and priests had been introduced into Gaul in the ninth century, and that it was not the use at Rome, we know from a letter of Pope Nicholas I (died 867). At the commencement of the following century there was at Rome a period described by M. Andrieu as one of indecision, during which, 'without altogether abandoning their ancient customs, the Roman clergy forced themselves to set them in harmony with those described in the Franco-German books.' It was then that the Roman Church adopted the ceremony, probably of British origin, of anointing the hands of the newly-ordained priests.[1] As to bishops, M. Andrieu points out; two cases would arise: (1) bishops elect whose hands had been anointed when they were ordained presbyters, and (2) those whose hands had not been anointed. In the first case it was considered unnecessary to re-anoint the hands of the Bishop elect. But there were deacons who were to be ordained *per saltum* to the episcopate, and as they would not be first ordained presbyters, it was decided that they should receive the presbyterial unction of the hands at their consecration to the episcopate. M. Andrieu cites an *Ordo* preserved at the British Museum (Cod. Add. 15222, F. 11) which directs that the hands of the Bishop elect, if not already consecrated, are at his ordination to the episcopate to be consecrated by the form used for presbyters. At a later date the Roman clergy learned that in the Franco-German books there was a form for the consecration of a bishop's hands different from that for the consecration of a presbyter's: they consequently adopted that form, and the former compromise was abandoned.

The chapter of the *Statuta* which relates to the ordination of a subdeacon makes it quite clear why the subdeacon is ordained by the delivery of instruments signifying the functions of his office—'because he does not receive the laying on of hands.' Yet the tendency of the Western mind to express ideas by material symbols was too strong to be held in check by the authority of

[1] The question whether the anointing of Christian emperors and kings is older than that of anointing in Ordination has not yet been answered.

the *Statuta*. The delivery of this book of the Gospels to the deacon appears to have been, like unction, a contribution from the British Church.

The introduction of the ceremony of delivering to the newly-ordained priest the paten with the bread and the chalice with the wine and saying to him in so doing: 'Receive power of offering sacrifice to God, and celebrate Masses both for the quick and the dead,' enters into the pontificals in a highly significant way. In a Vatican MS. of the Gregorian Sacramentary of which Morin gives an excerpt is to be found this surprising direction: 'When a bishop is ordained, let two bishops place and hold the volume of the Gospels on his head, and while one pours forth the benediction, let all the other bishops, who are present, touch his head with their hands. When this has been done let him receive the paten with the *oblatæ* and the chalice with wine, and let him say to him: "Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass both for the quick and the dead."' In a tenth-century MS. 'composed by an Italian in the neighbourhood of Rome,' which Morin studied when he was at Rome, it is the Archdeacon who lays on (*imponat*) the Gospel Book on the deacon, and the delivery of the instruments to the newly-ordained priests is made by the Bishop. A direction in a pontifical of the Colbertine Library, printed by Martène, directs the Bishop to place the instruments in the hands of any of the ordained (*ordinati cujuslibet per se*), although the words *accipe potestatem offerendi*, etc. are to be said to all, if there be many. In a Mainz pontifical, from which Morin gives extracts, the Bishop offers the prepared chalice and paten to 'two or more to touch,' and the formula is given in the plural. Of two Beauvais pontificals cited by Morin, the first, belonging to the tenth century, does not mention the delivery of the instruments to the priest; in the second, belonging to the eleventh century, in the margin, and in a different handwriting and character, the Bishop is directed to give the chalice,[1] and the formula is in the plural: 'accipite calicem et habete potestatem atque licentiam offerre sacrificium,' etc.

Of the ceremony of the tradition of the instruments, Cardinal Van Rossum has very truly said: 'As is usual in such a case, its commencement is found in this place or that: slowly it is added elsewhere—a beginning in a margin, then in the case of new volumes in the text itself: so step by step it creeps on, and at last is found everywhere.'[2] The ceremony is first introduced not

[1] It is at least curious that St. Thomas in his *De articulis fidei* writes that the *matter* of the sacrament of ordination is in the case of a presbyter the tradition of the chalice, and the form 'accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium,' etc. Similarly, in the Supplementum to the *Summa* worked up by his disciples out of his *Commentary on the Sentences*, he speaks only of the tradition of the chalice.

[2] *De essentia sacramenti ordinis*, p. 128.

as an essential, for that would be tantamount to a declaration that all previous ordinations were null and void, but as an edifying accessory ceremony. Hugh of St. Victor (died 1141), describing the added accessory ceremonies, implies that the presbyters were ordained when the Bishop and the assistant presbyters imposed their hands. He writes:[1]

'Presbyteri cum ordinantur, episcopo eos benedicente, et manus super capita eorum tenente, omnes presbyteri qui præsentes sunt manus juxta manum episcopi super capita eorum, et Spiritum Sanctum super eos qui ordinantur invocant. Unguntur presbyteris manus sicut episcopis, *ut cognoscant* se hoc sacramento gratiam consecrandi accipere, et opera misericordia erga omnes pro viribus exercere debere. Unctio capitis specialiter ad episcopum pertinet, ut intelligat se vicarium esse de quo scriptum est: "unxit te Deus, Deus tuus te oleo lætitiæ." Hi post invocationem Sancti Spiritus stolam super utrumque humerum accipiunt, quæ in modum sustentaculorum dextrum latus munit et sinistrum, ut ex hoc intelligant se per arma justitiæ a dextris et a sinistris esse munitos, ut eos nec adversa tangant, nec prospera extollant. Accipiant et calicem cum vino, et patenam cum hostiis de manu episcopi, quatenus his instrumentis *potestatem se accepisse* agnoscant placabiles Deo hostias offerendi.'

In St. Ivo's sermon the past 'accepisse' (*have* received) is used instead of the subjunctive 'accipiant' (may receive). It must, however, be remembered that Ivo uses the word *sacramentum* as St. Augustine did, to denote the minor ceremonies, and that the sevenfold enumeration of the sacraments had not in his day become an established doctrine.[2] It was thus possible for him to conceive of the various attributes of the priesthood being bestowed each by its own matter and form, for the consideration of Order as a sacrament with a single matter and form (although it is implicit in his words 'hi cum ordinantur, episcopo eos benedicente,' etc.) had not been worked out by him. Peter Lombard draws his matter from the same sources as do Hugh and St. Ivo, but although he strangely omits to mention the imposition of hands at the ordination of presbyters, he yet makes it clear that the presbyter's hands are anointed in order that the newly-ordained priests may understand that they *have* received (*accepisse*) the grace of consecration, and the instruments are delivered to them that they may know that they *have* received the power of offering sacrifice.[3] The disfigurement of the doctrine of Holy Order, represented by Pope Eugenius' instruction to the Armenians, is subsequent to the time of the Master of the Schools.

[1] *De Sacramentis*, II, pars iii, c. 12.

[2] St. Augustine calls the salt of the catechumens a sacrament, and St. Ivo speaks of 'the Sacraments of Baptism.'

[3] *Sententiarum Libr. iv:* Lib. iv, dist. 24.

The introduction of the *Veni Creator* into the mediæval rite of Ordination, immediately before the ceremony of anointing, could not but have the effect of obscuring the significance of the imposition of hands, and also of augmenting the importance of a comparatively recent innovation. There is evidence to show that for a period, prior to St. Thomas Aquinas, the belief became widespread that unction is the essential matter of the sacrament of Holy Order.[1] The lack of historical knowledge which rendered such errors possible must have been largely due to the dependence of scholars on manuscripts, and the danger was increased by what to-day we should call plagiarism.[2] In an age of printed service-books, such errors would hardly be likely to arise.

Sufficient perhaps has now been said to show that the ceremonies added to the rites of Ordination had the grave result of obscuring the truth that according to Apostolic tradition the laying on of hands is the outward and visible sign of the sacrament of Holy Order. The great Spanish commentator, Maldonatus, in the sixteenth century complained that so long as it was not acknowledged that the laying on of hands is the sacramental sign, so long would it be impossible to convince Protestants that the sacrament of Order can trace its origin in the New Testament.

In the First Edwardian Ordinal the tradition of instruments to the Presbyter and that of the pastoral staff to the Bishop were retained, and their disappearance in the Second Edwardian Ordinal may be sincerely regretted, for the spirit of historical inquiry, with which the Schoolmen were so poorly supplied, has come to stay, and the danger of these beautiful accessory ceremonies being regarded as essentials has ceased to be a real one. The same thing also may be said as to the thoroughly scriptural ceremony of anointing. To judge the Edwardian books, however, we have to remember that the controversies to which the added ceremonies had given rise were prejudicial to the cause of Catholic truth. 'Last of all,' wrote a sturdy Protestant wit, 'one singular doubt have they: what maketh the priest, the anointing or the putting on of hands, or what other ceremony or what words? About whom they howl and scold, one ready to tear out the other's throat. One saith this and another that: but they cannot agree. Neither can any of them make so strong a reason which another cannot improve.'[3]

The earliest extant Ordination rites belong to a time when in

[1] See Saltet, *Les Réordinations*, p. 233.

[2] Hugh of St. Victor incorporates in his master work long passages by other writers without any acknowledgment of his borrowing. A large portion of Innocent III's book on the Eucharist is similarly an excerpt from Hugh, and another treatise ascribed to Innocent is almost in its entirety by Hugh.

[3] W. Tyndale, *The Obedience of a Christian Man.*

the West the Bishop was the *sacerdos*, the parish priest *par excellence*, the minister of Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist and Absolution. From St. Cyprian to St. Ambrose the word *sacerdos* is most frequently used to denote not the Presbyter but the Bishop. As the number of Christians in the great cities increased and the faith spread over the country-side, the central city church was no longer adequate and 'parish' churches came into existence. First more frequent liturgical days and then the daily celebration of the Eucharist necessitated a devolution of the functions of the Bishop as *sacerdos*. The far-reaching influence of the development of ecclesiastical organisation on liturgical practice and the conception of the Ministry may be studied in Dr. C. H. Turner's Essay in the first volume of *The Cambridge Mediæval History*. As the early collegiate character of the Ministry became obscured, the sacerdotal character of the Presbyter came more clearly into view. In protest against the overbearing pride of the Roman deacons, St. Jerome asks: 'When the Apostle clearly teaches that presbyters are the same as bishops, must not a mere server of tables and of widows be insane to set himself up arrogantly over men through whose prayers the Body and Blood of Christ are consecrated (*conficitur*)?'[1] He proceeds to enumerate passages of the New Testament showing that *episcopos* and *presbuteros* are terms which can be applied interchangeably. The prevalent theory of the Schoolmen, which denied that a new 'character' is imparted by consecration to the episcopate and held that the episcopate is not an order distinct from the presbyterate, is an inversion of the ideas of the third century.[2]

Our survey of the history of the pontificals has thus brought us to a period in which the essential importance of the laying on of hands had been obscured, and the nature of the episcopate widely misrepresented. Thanks to frequent quotations from St. Jerome in official works, Presbyterianism had come into full being within the pale of the Latin Church. Perhaps the most significant action of the Roman Church in regard to the episcopate was taken in 1400, when Boniface IX bestowed on the Abbot of the Augustinian monastery of St. Osyth at Chich in Essex the right of bestowing, not only the diaconate, but the priesthood. On the 6th February, 1403, Boniface, at the representation of the Bishop of London of loss of rights of patronage and jurisdiction, revoked the concession.[3] In after years, William Barlow was a member of the community at St. Osyth!

[1] *Ep.* cxlvi (*ad Evangelum*).

[2] Cf. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, Supp. Q. 38, Art. 2: 'When a man is raised to the episcopate he receives a power which he retains for ever. This, however, cannot be called a character, because a man is thereby placed not in direct relation to God, but to Christ's mystical body.'

[3] Hocedez, 'Une découverte théologique' (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, June 1924).

The English divines in 1543 were still under the influence of the scholastic doctrine that the only sacred orders spoken of in the New Testament are the presbyterate and the diaconate. They read this doctrine in the text-book set for their graduation at the Universities: 'Although all orders are spiritual and sacred,' wrote the Master of the Schools, 'yet excellently the canons agree that two orders only are to be called sacred: the diaconate and presbyterate to wit; because these two only the primitive Church is read to have possessed, and concerning these only have we the Apostles' precept' (*Lib. Sentent.* IV, Dist. 24).[1]

The Edwardian Ordinals must be admitted to have the merit of being based on the truth that the sacramental sign of Holy Order, handed down by apostolic authority, is the laying on of hands and prayer. In 1549 the English divines returned also to a more ancient view as to the Episcopate. In the Preface to the new Ordinal, instead of saying that Scripture maketh express mention of two orders only, they said: 'It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons.'

We may close this section by briefly tracing the history of the authoritative *Pontificale Romanum.* About the year 1292, William Durand, Bishop of Mende, had compiled a *Liber pontificalis ordinis*, which he designed to be in complete accord with the usage of Rome, where he had been ordained and where also he was a member of the Papal curia. Until quite recently so little has been known of this important pontifical, that Dr. Fortescue, in his article on Durand of Mende in the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, described it as 'now lost.' As a matter of fact, although the book has never been printed, a large number of copies of it exist, and it has been described by the late Mgr. Batiffol. In 1485 Augustin Patrizi, called Piccolomini after Æneas Silvius Piccolomini (the future Pius II), by whom he had been adopted, in collaboration with John Burchard, the famous Master of Ceremonies of Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, and Alexander VI, and the scribe who drew up the general rubrics of the Missal, published in print a *Liber Pontificalis* based on Durand's work. In a new edition published at Venice in

[1] Cf. also these two passages:

The K[illegible]g's Book.

And of these two orders, that is to say, priests and deacons, Scripture maketh express mention, and how they were conferred by the Apostles by prayer and the imposition of their hands.

The Council of Benevento (1091) *under Urban II.*

Sacros ordines dicemus diaconatum ac presbyteratum. Hos siquidem solos primitiva legitur ecclesia habuisse: super his solum præceptum habemus Apostoli.

1511 the title of Pontifical is given to Piccolomini's work. In 1595, at last, under Clement VIII, the title *Pontificale Romanum* was officially accorded to a new edition prepared by a special commission. Again, in 1645, under Urban VIII, a revision took place, and it is on this edition Joseph Catalani wrote his well-known commentary. Benedict XIV in 1752 made additions. Thus it was after the Council of Trent that the Roman Church, by issuing a fully authorised version of the *Pontificale Romanum*, set within its own obedience a termination to the long-continued process of evolving new Ordination ceremonies by diocesan innovations and local fashions.

IV

An Act of Parliament, January 31st, 1549-50, empowered the King to appoint six prelates and six other men learned in God's law to prepare and set forth a 'Form and Manner of making and consecrating Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons and other ministers of the Church.' Nine bishops voted in favour of the Bill, and five against it. On February 2nd the Commissioners, whose names are not recorded, were appointed by Order of Council. It is not unlikely that they were the divines who in September 1548 assembled at Cranmer's house at Chertsey for the consecration of Ferrar (appointed to the see of St. David's in the place of Barlow, translated to Wells), and who also met at Windsor to discuss 'a uniform order of prayer.' In that case they would be Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Ridley of Rochester, Holbeach of Lincoln, Thirlby of Westminster, Goodrich of Ely, May, Dean of St. Paul's, Haynes, Dean of Exeter, Robertson, afterwards Dean of Durham, and Redman, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cranmer, in his letter to Queen Mary in September 1555, describes the Conference at Windsor as consisting of 'a good number of the best learned men reputed within this realm, some favouring the old and some the new as they term.'

The record of Ferrar's consecration in Cranmer's Register states: 'Lectis publice communibus suffragiis de more Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ usitatis, consecratus et benedictus, per impositionem manuum episcoporum prædict. fuit.' The reference is no doubt to the 'Litanie with suffrages' put forth in 1544, and reprinted in the year following as the 'Common Prayer of Procession.' The Register continues: 'Qua peracta idem Reverendissimus publice et palam recitatis quibusdam Psalmis, Hymnis et Orationibus, una cum Epistola Pauli et Evangelio Matthæi. . . .' Here in parentheses it is to be noticed that, according to the usage of the majority of pontificals, the Epistle and Gospel would be those for the day and not ones specially chosen for the Consecration Service. The 'qua peracta' implies that Ferrar's conse-

cration took place before the recitation of the Introit, Collect, and Epistle; but this loose way of speaking is paralleled by a rubric in the Sarum pontifical in which the consecration of a bishop is directed to take place 'antequam missa celebretur.' According to the Sarum pontifical the consecration would take place before the Gospel: according to the Edwardian Ordinal it would take place after it. The Register continues: 'Consecrata, in lingua vernacula, sacra Eucharistia.' Again in parenthesis, we notice that the *Order of Communion*, issued on March 8th, 1548, would have been in use since the previous Easter, and so 'at the time of Communion,' and 'after that the priest himself hath received the sacrament,' and 'without varying of any other right or ceremony of the Mass,' he would proceed to communicate the people according to the New Order, which provided an exhortation which is practically identical with our present one 'at the time of the celebration, the invitation, general confession, absolution, comfortable words, and words of administration.' Cranmer, in his letter to Queen Mary, says that the men of the old and new learning 'agreed without any controversy (not one saying contrary) that the service of the Church ought to be in the mother tongue.' Certainly the Canon of the Latin Mass must have been said in English at Ferrar's consecration: and that would have been an innovation; but what was then done was done with the implied consent of Thirlby, who under Queen Mary was Bishop of Norwich, and afterwards of Ely. Although not one of the three consecrating bishops, Thirlby was present at Ferrar's consecration, and on that occasion received the Holy Communion at Cranmer's hands. After the accession of Queen Mary, Ferrar was degraded not from the episcopate, but from the presbyterate.[1] But why?

On February 2nd, 1550, in accordance with the Act of January 31, by Order of Council the Commissioners were appointed to prepare the Ordinal: their names, however, are not recorded in the Council Book. These steps were probably taken in order to legalise a book which had been already completed, and perhaps had even been experimentally used at an Ordination held by Cranmer and Ridley at St. Paul's before the end of 1549. The fact that in so short a time as one week after the appointment of the Commissioner, Heath, Bishop of Worcester, 'wolde not assent to the boke made by the reste of the bishops and clergy,' seems to confirm the belief that the book had been in existence for some time. The book was actually published in March by

[1] On the other hand, Scory, who had been translated from Rochester to take the place of Day at Chichester, and had been consecrated by Ridley and by the Edwardian rite, was under Mary restored by Bonner: 'Our beloved confrère . . . John, late Bishop of Chichester . . . to the public performance and execution of his ecclesiastical ministry and pastoral office.'

Grafton, nearly a year after the appearance of the First Edwardian Book of Common Prayer. The colophon of the Ordinal showed that it was intended to be bound up with the Prayer Book; but it was in fact, legally speaking, an independent publication.

On March 4th, Heath, on his refusal to subscribe to the Ordinal, was sent to prison, and eighteen months later was deprived of his see.[1] Hooper, on the other hand, who had been appointed to the bishopric of Gloucester, stood out against the vestments and the ceremonies, and only after some months in the Fleet Prison accepted a compromise and was consecrated.

In his prison in the Tower, in July 1550, Bishop Gardiner told the members of Council who visited him that, although he himself would not have made the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, yet, as it was, he could with conscience keep it, and cause others in his diocese to keep it. 'The truth of the very presence of Christ's most precious Body and Blood in the sacrament,' he said, 'there was as much spoken in that book as might be desired . . . there never was more spoken for the Sacrament than in that book.' Gardiner also 'showed them how he liked the declaration of the cause of the changes in the end of the book, whereby appeared the Catholic doctrine not to be touched, but only ceremonies removed,' which 'the Bishop said was wisely handled.' Pressed by Somerset for an opinion about the new Ordinal, Gardiner deplored the omission of the ceremony of anointing, but added that as the new Form had been legally established, the only alternative to it was to accept the consequences of non-compliance. The choice that Gardiner had made is revealed by his actions. In expectation of his release from the Tower, he gave a farewell party, made presents to the ladies, and directed his servants to prepare his house in Southwark for his return. But the star of Somerset was on the wane, and that of Warwick was in the ascendant. Bishop Gardiner was left in the Tower; and with the fall of Somerset (executed January 23rd, 1552) the *entente* between the men of the old and new learnings was broken up. In April the Second Act of Uniformity was passed, and the Second Prayer Book with a Second Ordinal was ordered to come into use on the Feast of All Saints.

The Compilers of the First Ordinal had not availed themselves of the permission to draw up rites of ordination 'for the other ministries of the Church.' The matter of the Minor Orders had been involved in the provocation caused by the immunity claimed by the clergy from the criminal jurisdiction of the secular courts. The reader will recall the fact that a criminal condemned in those courts could by reading the first verse of the 51st Psalm (the 'neck-verse') make good his claim to be handed

[1] In September, Heath stated before the Council that he would not *disobey* the book, but he refused to *subscribe* to it.

over to the jurisdiction of the Bishop. By directing the ordinaries that the Minor Orders should be given simultaneously with the subdiaconate, Wolsey had hoped to bar the way to this method of escaping the justice of the land, for ordination to the subdiaconate carried with it the obligation of celibacy, which would have served to restrain pretenders to ecclesiastical privilege. Dr. Pollard states that it was Wolsey's aim to abolish Minor Orders and so stay the creation of criminous clerks.[1] In 1516 the Pope himself, Leo X, prohibited in England ordination to the Minor Orders, in all cases save those in which the subdiaconate was also to be bestowed.

Referring to the First Ordinal, the Venetian Envoy, Daniele Barbaro, observed: 'Nor do they differ from those of the Roman Catholic religion, save that in England they take an oath to renounce the doctrine and authority of the Pope.' Even of the Second Prayer Book, John Knox wrote: 'The whole order of your booke appeareth rather to be devised for upholding of massing-priests than for any good instruction which the simple people can receive thereof. Your sacraments were ministred for the most part without the soule, and be those to whom Christ Jesus were no true minister; and God grant that so yet they are not.' A separatist Nonconformist in the first half of the seventeenth century wrote: 'All authority is given into the hands of the prelates alone, and their book of ordination, whereby they make bishops, priests and deacons, is against the very form of ordination of the ministry presented in the Scriptures, and nothing else but a thing word for word taken out of the Pope's pontifical, wherein he sheweth himself to be anti-Christ most lively.' The fact is that, whatever difference there may be in ceremonies or the language of the formularies, the English Ordinal has precisely the same aim in view as the Pontifical, namely, the setting apart of persons for those Orders of Ministers which from the Apostles' time there have ever been in Christ's Church. The Preface to the Ordinal definitely excludes the idea that one kind of ministry was to be substituted for another.

'To the intent these orders should be continued, and reverently used, and esteemed, in this Church of England, it is requisite, that no man (not being this present Bishop, Priest or Deacon) shall execute any of them, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted, according to the form hereafter following.'[2]

In the revised form Ordinal of 1661–2, the last words are altered to 'Or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination.'[3] The direct implication of these words is that the

[1] *Wolsey*, p. 54.

[2] The archaic spelling is not followed.

[3] This touches a very sore point with the Presbyterians and Nonconformists —the recognition by the English Church of Orders bestowed by Roman rite.

continuance of Holy Order is dependent on Episcopal Consecration or Ordination. The intention of the Ordinal is not different from that of the Pontifical.

When we come to consider the actual changes made, we should notice, in the first place, that the Edwardian Ordinal by placing the laying on of hands in its true position as the essential sacramental sign varies from the pontificals, in which the repeated laying on or of extension of hands tends to obscure the truth that the laying on of hands is the essential sacramental sign of ordination to Sacred Orders. The doctrine of ordination to the presbyterate, to which the rubrics of the Roman pontificals give formal expression, is the doctrine propounded by Pope Eugenius IV, and it is very significant that Cardinal Pole in his Legatine Constitutions of 1552 promulgated that Pope's erroneous definition of the matter and form of Order.[1] Following the received scholastic fallacy that a sacramental form must of necessity be imperative, the compilers of the first Edwardian Ordinal chose imperative words from the New Testament, and, in doing this, they no doubt were influenced by St. Augustine's doctrine of a sacrament as a kind of 'visible word.'

There is a significant passage in the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* in which Pope Leo XIII writes: 'The words which until quite recently were commonly held by Anglicans to constitute the proper form of priestly Ordination, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," certainly do not in the least definitely express the sacred Order of the Priesthood.' Surely Pope Leo was misinformed and had been led to suppose that the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost' are the whole of the English imperative form. Let us refer to the First Edwardian Ordinal.

After a prayer in which reference is made to the gift bestowed by the ascended Lord (Eph. iv. 10–12), the sending abroad into the world of 'Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors, and Pastors,' and thanks are ascribed to God for having called His 'servants here present to the same office and ministry,' there follows:

> *When this prayer is done, the Bishop with the priests present, shall lay their hands severally upon the head of every one that receiveth orders. The receivers humbly kneeling upon their knees, and the Bishop saying:*
>
> 'Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven: and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained; and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of

[1] The Marian bishops seem to have been more concerned with the omission of the ceremony of anointing, yet in some cases of priests ordained by the Edwardian rite, they supplied the anointing, but did not re-ordain. See *Priesthood in the English Church*, Church Historical Society, p. 20; Frere, *The Marian Reaction*, p. 153.

God, and of his holy sacraments. In the name of the father, and of the son, and of the holy ghost. Amen.'

The Bishop shall deliver to every one of them the Bible in the one hand, and the Chalice or cup with the bread, in the other hand, and saying:

'Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments in this congregation.'

In the Second Ordinal the direction to the Bishop to deliver the Chalice and the Bread was omitted.

The imperative form for the consecration of a bishop is preceded by a prayer which refers to the gifts of the ascended Lord (Eph. iv. 10–12). 'The authority given unto him not to destroy but to save, not to hurt but to help,' speaks of the Episcopal office.

Take[1] the holy ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by imposition of hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness.

At this point in the First Ordinal, the Archbishop is directed to lay the Bible on the neck of the consecrand. In the Second Ordinal this is altered to: 'Then the Archbishop shall deliver him the Bible saying, "Give heed unto reading, exhortation, and doctrine, etc."' The words which follow the exhortation to study the Scriptures cannot possibly be regarded by any student of Ordination prayers as aught else but as an admonition to a bishop:

Be to the flock of Christ a Shepherd, not a wolf: feed them; devour them not; hold up the weak, heal the sick, bind together the broken, bring again the outcasts, seek the lost. Be so merciful, that you be not remiss, so minister discipline, that you forget not mercy: that when the Chief Shepherd shall come, you may receive the immarcescible crown of glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

These words were in the First Edwardian Ordinal accompanied by the tradition of the pastoral staff, but not of the ring.[2] In the Second Ordinal the investiture with pastoral staff disappeared.

[1] 'Receive' in the ordination of a presbyter to express St. John xx. 22. 'Take' in the consecration of a bishop so as to recall 2 Tim. i. 5.

[2] The ring is a non-Roman ceremony of investiture; and it came into vogue in the Gallican Church prior to the struggle between the *imperium* and the *sacerdotium*. Cf. the letter of Charles the Bald to Pope Nicholas I in 867 relative to Abp. Ebo: 'Anulos et baculos et suæ confirmationis scripta more Gallicarum ecclesiarum ab se acceperunt,' *P.L.*, cxxiv, Col. 874. The ceremony can be traced back to Spain in the seventh century. It is mentioned by St. Isidore, *De eccl. offic.*, ii. 5. In the middle of the eleventh

The ceremony of placing the Gospels open on the head, neck or shoulders of the Bishop elect seems to have occasionally afforded an opportunity for prognostications, and perhaps for this reason the Salisbury, Bangor and Exeter pontificals direct that the book should be held closed.[1] As the ceremony of the imposition of the book is prescribed in what the English divines took to be the Canons of the Fourth Council of Carthage (*i.e.* the *Statuta Ecclesiæ antiquæ*) the presentation of the book instead of an imposition may be regretted. Amalar, in the tenth century, who wrote ironically of the compiler of these Canons ('scriptor libelli doctior atque sanctior Apostolis'), and who also was scandalised by the direction that presbyters should lay on hands on an ordinand to the presbyterate, but not on the ordinand to the diaconate, objects that this laying on of the Gospels has neither ancient authority, apostolic tradition, nor canonical authority.' The Pseudo-Alcuin repeats this. The ceremony, however, is alluded to by Palladius in his life of St. John Chrysostom, and by that Saint himself (*Homil. de laude evangelii*). *Ordo Romanus X* mentions the ceremony at the consecration of a Pope, but does not explicitly mention a laying on of hands. In *Ordo Romanus XIII* the book is held by two cardinal deacons. In the Eighth Book of the *Apostolical Constitutions* the deacons hold the Gospels open on the head of him who is being consecrated while the prayer is said by the principal bishop, and here again there is no explicit mention of a laying on of hands. There is nothing to show that the Pope in consecrating imposed the Gospels on the heads of the bishops whom he consecrated. The ceremony appears in the ninth-century Milanese pontifical edited by Magistretti, and in the *Ordo Romanus antiquus*. Mgr. Batiffol supposed that it was introduced at Rome by one of the Syrian or Greek-born Popes, at the end of the seventh century, and that its purpose was to show that the Pope derived his order from Christ, and not from the Bishop of Ostia and the other suffragans.[2] In Gaul the mid-eighth century sacramentary of Gellone attests the existence of this ceremony. In the Salisbury pontifical the direction that the consecrating Bishop and the assisting Bishop are to lay their hands on

century the mitre was bestowed on lay princes by the Popes, and (see *Ordo Romanus XIV*) a mitre was placed on the head of the Emperor and Empress at their coronation in the thirteenth century.

[1] Maskell gives the following instances. The open book at the consecration of Lanfranc showed 'Date eleemosynam et ecce omnia munda sunt vobis.' Lanfranc was famous for his almsgiving. At Wulfstan's, 'Ecce vero Israelita, in quo dolus non est.' At St. Anselm's, 'Vocavit multos, et misit servum suum, et coeperunt omnes se excusare.' Catalani says that at the consecration of St. Athanasius the Saint's future expulsion from his see was foreshown by the words occurring: 'Qui preparatus est diabolo, et angelis eius.'

[2] Canon Lacey, in the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* (T.I. pp. 193 ff.), argued that a similar practice was followed at Alexandria.

the Bishop elect follows after the direction to impose the Gospels; the Bishop in so doing says the *Veni Creator*.[1] The Roman pontifical, on the other hand, has for the moment of the laying on of the Gospels 'Nihil dicens'; and then, when the actual laying on of hands takes place, all the bishops say 'Receive the Holy Ghost.' The Exeter pontifical agrees with the Roman in this. Although the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost' do not appear in very many pontificals, Catalani, the most eminent of all commentators on the Pontifical, has said: 'Nearly all the Schoolmen who have discussed the matter and form of the episcopate constitute the form in these words: *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, which are said by the consecrator and the assisting bishops, when the book of the Gospel has been placed on the head.'

Archbishop Parker's Register at Lambeth shows that at his consecration on December 17th, 1559, the four bishops by whom he was consecrated, according to the use of the Church of Exeter, all pronounced in English the imperative form, 'Take the hollie gost,' etc. Writing of concelebration at the Sacrament of the Altar, St. Thomas has explained: 'Because the priest only consecrates in the person of Christ, and the many are one in Christ, therefore it matters not whether the Sacrament be consecrated by one or many.' The rule that at least three bishops should join in the laying on of hands when a bishop is to be consecrated has been explained by the theory that it originated in a desire to preclude clandestine action, or to protect the rights of the province, and that therefore the assistant bishops are witnesses rather than co-consecrators.[2] The rule certainly secures this safeguard, but the precautionary motive does not exclude the consequence that the co-operation of the several bishops is an act of co-consecration as well as an act of testimony. Father Puller, who has discussed the subject in his *Orders and Jurisdictions*, cites the high authority of Mgr. Carinci, a Prelate of the Curia, a Papal Master of Ceremonies, and Professor of Liturgy at the Propaganda, who says: 'The assistants must do and say everything that appertains to the essence of the consecration, and must have the intention of consecrating: hence they are ministers.'

It should be noticed that in the first Edwardian Ordinal, before the imperative form for the ordination of a presbyter,

[1] In a rubric of the Sarum Pontifical the assistant bishops are called 'Episcopi consecrantes.'

[2] Martène: *De antiquis ritibus*, Lib. I, Cap. VIII, Art. X. 16: 'The assertion must be made tha. they [*i.e.* all the bishops] are not only witnesses but co-operators.' He cites St. Isidore: 'Episcopus non ab uno, sed a cunctis comprovincialibus episcopis.' Cf. Card. Gasparri, *Tractatus canonicus de sacra Ordinatione*, Cap. V, Sec. II, Art. II. 3. Dom Pierre De Puniet (*Le Pontifical Romain*, T.I. p. 266) has suggested that the participation of presbyters with the Bishop in the imposition of hands in the ordination of a presbyter may be a relic of the presbyter's primitive episcopal power.

there is a prayer, 'Almighty God and Heavenly Father,' which, preceded by the *Dominus vobiscum*, is a recital of redemptive acts, and with its 'We render unto thee moste hartie thanks, we worship and praise thee,' is almost Eucharistic in form, and by its reference to the sending forth of the ministry into the world is reminiscent of the *Deus honorum omnium* of the Pontifical; and that there is a prayer of a very similar kind preceding the imperative form for the consecration of a bishop. It is not improbable that these prayers represent what in the fused Gallican and Roman pontificals were styled the 'Consummatio,' and that the imperative form for the ordination of a presbyter represents the third prayer and corresponds with the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum peccata*, etc., at the third (or exclusive) laying on of hands in the mediæval rite. In the case of the prayer which precedes the imperative form of consecration to the episcopate we notice that, while its exordium is similar to the prayer for the presbyterate, in its conclusion it takes up the language of the ancient pontifical.

Grant, we beseech thee, to this thy servant such grace, that he may be evermore ready to spread abroad thy gospel, and glad tidings of reconcilement to God, and to use such authority given unto him, not to destroy, but to save, not to hurt, but to help: so that he as a wise and a faithful servant, giving to thy family meat in due season, may at the last day be received into joy.

Sint speciosi, munere tuo, pedes ejus ad evangelizandum pacem, ad evangelizandum bona tua. . . . Da ei, Domine, ministerium reconciliationis. Da ei, Domine, claves regni cælorum, ut utatur, non glorietur, potestate quam tribuis in ædificationem, non in destructionem. Sit fidelis servus et prudens, quem constituas tu, Domine, super familiam tuam; ut det illis cibum in tempore opportuno.

The intention of the imperative form was further defined in the Edwardian Ordinals. After the Bishop had announced to the people his intention to receive this day the ordinands 'unto the holy office of Priesthoode,' he prayed to 'Almightie God, geuer of all good thinges, which by thy holy Spirit hast appointed divers orders of ministers in thy churche,' to behold mercifully His servants now 'called to the office of Priesthoode.' In 1661–62, after the imperative forms had been made more ample, this prayer was transferred to the commencement of the services that it might serve as the Collect for the Ordination Mass.

In his book against Anglican Orders,[1] Canon Estcourt endeavours to prove that the Ordinal is 'founded upon the Lutheran doctrine, namely, Ordination is only the public recognition and admission of a person to an office, with prayers that he may have grace to discharge faithfully the duty imposed upon him, and to live in a manner consistent with the same; and thus it excludes the idea of a sacrament, or any sacramental grace being conferred therein.'

[1] *The Question of Anglican Orders Discussed*, pp. 209 ff.

Estcourt, to bring home his point, comments at length on the words 'called,' 'tried,' 'examined,' and 'admitted.' He refers to the Lutheran mode of examining the candidates before the magistrates or other electors,[1] and the Calvinist mode of examination in the presence of the people, and tells us that 'as it was not convenient to have a real popular election,'[2] the *call* in the Ordinal is simply announced to the people. He writes that *admitted* is a 'perfectly novel word that came in with the Lutheran doctrine. It finds its first appearance in this country in the Declaration concerning Bishops and Priests, published in 1537.' On the contrary, Canon VI of the Council of Lambeth, A.D. 1330, runs: 'Prohibemus ut nullus ad ordines accedat, vel *admittatur*, nisi canonice fuerit examinatus.'[3] Logically, the expression 'admitted to the priesthood' contradicts the Lutheran doctrine that all Christians are priests. Dr. Frere, in his revised edition of Procter's *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, writes that the compilers of the Ordinal had before them a draft of an Ordination Service drawn up in 1549 by Martin Bucer for their special benefit. Dr. Frere holds that 'while they rejected Bucer's doctrinal standpoint, they accepted much of his plan, and drew largely upon him for the exhortations and examinations,' and he notices that psalms selected by Bucer appeared in 1549 for the Introit of the Ordination Mass at the ordering of priests, that some of the Epistles and Gospels were suggested by Bucer, and that in the Bishop's exhortation preliminary to the examination of the candidates for priesthood, and the prayer which follows it, his influence is also conspicuous. Bucer's draft, *De Ordinatione legitima ministrorum ecclesiæ revocanda*, was published

[1] 'Ex his omnibus credo confirmatum esse eos qui sacramentis ac verbo inter populos præsunt, non posse nec debere sacerdotes vocari.'—Luther, *De institutione Ministrorum*. In this document Luther refers to the Ordination form '*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*,' and ironically connects it with the 'potestas gloriosissima' of the priest in pronouncing absolution.

[2] As to *called*, Estcourt writes: 'This does not mean "vocation" in the Catholic sense, which is the interior attraction by which a person, moved by Divine grace and the signs of God's will, is led to embrace the ecclesiastical state for motives of promoting God's glory and his own and others' sanctification' (p. 210); but he admits that 'in the Anglican rite the interior vocation is alluded to in the first question put to the candidate for the diaconate, whether he is moved by the Holy Ghost.' We find references to an election by the people in the ancient Latin rites. In *Ordo Romanus IX* the reader from the ambo proclaims: 'Cognoscat fraternitas vestra quia illi et illi *vocantur* in tali officio. Si quis habet contra hos viros aliquam querelam,' etc. The Gelasian rite for ordaining a deacon inquires of the people 'si vestra apud meam concordat electio, testimonium quod vultis vocibus adprobate,' and the congregation exclaim 'Dignus est.' Then follows the bidding, 'Let common prayer follow the common vote,' etc. Pope Cornelius ordained Novatus, 'meeting the opposition of all the clergy and many lay persons as well,' Eusebius, *H.E.*, vi. 43.

[3] Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, Lib. 1, Tit. 5.

1577 among his *Scripta Anglicana;* but was it written, as Dr. Frere supposes, in 1549? In 1551, at Archbishop Cranmer's request, Bucer in his *Censura* gave his considered judgment on the First Book of Common Prayer. Bucer states that he studied the Book 'per interpretem' and it is clear that the Ordinal had not been submitted to him. He refers, however, to the 'nuper edita ordinationis formula,' and complains that, in it, of the canonical examination he deemed so essential 'something is prescribed.' At the close of the *Censura* he begs leave to go beyond the task assigned to him and add an appendix 'de quærendis, formandis, examinandis ecclesiae ministris'; since in his opinion it was not possible to restore only in part, when Christ demands a restoration of the whole. His editors in the margin say that they have included Bucer's appendix to the *Censura* under the heading 'De ordinatione legitima,' etc.

The passages of Bucer's appendix which Dr. Frere thinks influenced the compilers are therefore Latin translations of the First Edwardian Ordinal, and not a draft which lay before the compilers of the First Ordinal. But although the draft, which Bucer submitted to the Bishop of Ely, does not possess the importance assigned to it, yet it does show what an Anglican Ordinal, 'founded on Lutheran doctrine,' might have been. Contrast with the Edwardian imperative forms the one formula that Bucer provided for all three orders:

> Manus Dei omnipotentis, Patris, Filii et Spiritus sancti, sit super vos, protegat et gubernet vos, ut eatis, et fructum vestro ministerio quam plurimum afferatis, isque maneat in vitam æternam. Amen.[1]

The principal alterations effected in the Second Ordinal were the omission of the tradition of the 'chalice or cup with the bread' in the ordination of priests, and of the pastoral staff in the consecration of bishops: the omission of the direction that the candidate for the diaconate should have 'upon hym a playne albe'; and the omission of introit psalms in the ordering of priests.

During the reign of Queen Elizabeth the Puritans attacked the Ordinal, not only because it embodied an Episcopalian con-

[1] Bucer recognises three orders of 'presbyters and curates,' viz. the order of bishops, of presbyters whom the ancients used to call cardinals who governed the Church in places in which there were no bishops, and those assistant presbyters who 'amongst us are called deacons.' For the ordination of a 'superintendent, that is bishop,' he advised that the rite should be tempered (*attemperatur*) and be fuller and graver than an ordination of a presbyter of the second order, and that 'some distinction' should be made between the ordination of a presbyter of the second and the third order. Bucer's draft was therefore tendered as a revision of the First Edwardian rite for the ordering of priests, altered so as to make it available for the ordination of bishops, priests and deacons.

ception of the ministry, but because they took exception to the sacramental character of the Ordination forms. 'A thing much stumbled at in the manner of giving orders,' writes Hooker, 'is our using those memorable words of our Lord and Saviour Christ, "Receive the Holy Ghost." The Holy Ghost they say we cannot give, and therefore we "foolishly" bid men receive it.' When, however, after the failure of Cromwell's rule, the restoration of the episcopate and episcopal ministry came into view, the Puritan estimate of the Ordinal underwent a change, and an attempt was made to prove that the Edwardian Ordinal gave expression to the identity of the episcopate and the presbyterate. But as early as 1641, in that scheme for 'the Reduction of Episcopacy,' with which the name of Archbishop Ussher has perhaps been wrongly associated, the Ordinal had been appealed to to show that presbyters, no less than bishops, are invested with power to shepherd the congregation of God. The changes made in the Ordinal in 1661–62 [1] were thus made deliberately, in despite of that appeal.

A. In the ordaining of Deacons:

The word 'pastor' as applied to a presbyter was held by the Presbyterians and Nonconformists to be an admission that the right to shepherd or rule God's flock belonged to the presbyter as well as the bishop. 'All Bishops, pastors and ministers' in the suffrage in the Litany was made to read 'All Bishops, Priests and Deacons.'

B. In the ordaining of Priests:

1. In the Edwardian Ordinal the alternative epistles at the ordering of priests, (1) Acts xx in which the words occur, 'Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock among whom the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to rule the congregation of God,' etc., and (2) 1 Tim. iii: 'This is a true saying, If any man desire the office of a bishop,' etc., were transferred to the service for the consecration of bishops, and the present epistle from Ephesians iv was substituted.

2. In the Exhortation the word 'Pastors' was erased, and before the words 'ministry of Priesthood,' 'Order and' inserted.

3. To the imperative form, after 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' was added, 'for the office, and work of a Priest, in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands.'

[1] The text of the Ordinal subjected to revision was that printed in 1639 by Robert Barker, the King's Printer, and it differs occasionally from the text of the Edwardian and Elizabethan books. The text used for the revision of the Prayer Book was one printed by Barker in 1636.

C. In the consecration of Bishops:

1. At the presentation of the Bishop elect, 'ordained and' was added before 'consecrated Bishop.'

2. In the imperative form, for 'Take the Holy Ghost and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which in thee by imposition of hands,' was substituted 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. In the Name,' etc. This excludes the Presbyterian contention that a bishop at his consecration is charged to stir up a grace already bestowed on him at his ordination to the presbyterate.[1] So do the following words inserted in 1661–62: 'And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by *this* imposition of *our* hands.'

As to the prayer 'Almighty God, Giver of all good things,'[2] we have already noticed that it had stood immediately before the exhortation of candidates for the priesthood: in 1661–62 it was given a different place as the special Collect for Ordination Mass, the words 'for the edification of the Church' being substituted 'for the profit of the congregation.' Similarly in the prayer in the Consecrating of a Bishop, 'Almighty God, Giver,' 'the edifying and well-governing of thy Church' is substituted for 'profit of thy congregation.'

These alterations, as Dean Prideaux wrote in 1688, were made to meet the contention of the Presbyterians, 'that the office of a bishop and a presbyter or priest is one and the same, and not at all distinct, but that both names belong to every presbyter,' a contention which they endeavoured to support by alleging that the Edwardian Ordinal 'added no new authority to that which was often given him by the priests, and that both orders were the same according to our old Ordinal.' It has, however, been asserted in the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* that these alterations were made because 'the Anglicans' had come to believe that their Ordination forms as they stood were defective and unfit: but, as long ago Bishop Burnet pointed out, our divines could not possibly have imagined that such alterations would have a retrospective effect and *ex post facto* validate invalid orders. It is true that on a page pasted into at least some copies of a book

[1] See *Reasons Shewing the Necessity of Reformation*, etc., which was addressed to Parliament by 'divers Ministers of Sundry Counties in England,' and was probably drawn up by Cornelius Burgess. 'The very Book of Ordination . . . doth more than tacitly admit a Bishop and Presbyter not to differ in order.' For the Nonconformist interpretation of the alterations in the Ordinal in 1661–62, see *The Healing Attempt*, 1689.

[2] Perhaps this is due to a current misreading of 'bonorum' for 'honorum' in the Gregorian Ordination prayer.

called *Erastus Senior*,[1] and published in 1662, the writer claims that 'they have acknowledged the greatness of our (Roman Catholic) exception against these forms, by amending them in their new book,' and adds, 'being no bishops now they cannot ordain validly, by any form whatsoever'; but it is certain that the Revisers could not have had the benefit of a book which was published only after they had completed their work.

V

We have discussed these problems at some length because of their importance in the vindication of the Anglican position. It remains to treat various practical matters.

The Preface to the Ordinal prescribes: 'and none shall be admitted a Deacon except he be twenty-three years of age, unless he have a faculty. And every man which is to be admitted a Priest shall be full four-and-twenty years old. And every man which is to be ordained or consecrated a Bishop shall be fully thirty years of age.'[2]

In its Edwardian shape, the Preface had ruled: 'none shall be admitted a Deacon, except he be XXI years of age.' The Rule at the end of the Form for the Ordination of a Deacon requires that a Deacon must continue in that office 'the space of a whole year (except for reasonable causes it shall otherwise seem good unto the Bishop), to the intent that he may be perfect, and well expert in the things appertaining to the ecclesiastical administration.'

The institution of Minor Orders,[3] provided that the Orders were bestowed not as merely initiatory—all at one time, or in rapid succession—would secure the purpose of the injunction, 'Lay hands[4] suddenly on no man' (1 Tim. v. 22), and also a riper experience of 'things appertaining to the ecclesiastical

[1] The writer, a Roman Catholic priest, John Lewgar, under the guise of a sectary, had two years before published under the name of 'John Web, Gent.: A Serious Detester of the Dregs of the Anti-Christian Hierarchy yet remaining among us.' It is an attack on both Episcopalian and Presbyterian ordinations.

[2] See the 84th Canon of 1604: 'not under four-and-twenty years old.' By Statute law (13 Eliz. C. XII, § 5) 'all dispensations, qualifications, and licences' for Ordination to the priesthood of a person under the age of twenty-four are 'merely void in law, as if they had never been.' 44 Geo. III, C. 43, § 1, declares the ordination of a person under the age of twenty-three complete 'as merely void in law, as if such admission had not been made,' but protects 'any argument of granting faculties heretofore lawfully exercised, which may be now lawfully exercised by the Archbishop of Canterbury.' The faculty is granted to 'persons of extraordinary abilities' (Gibson, *Codex*, Tit. VI, C. V.).

[3] In 251 Pope Cornelius had about him 46 presbyters, 7 deacons, 7 subdeacons, 42 acolytes, 52 exorcists, readers and doorkeepers, and over 1500 widows and persons in distress (Eusebius, *H.E.*, vi. 43).

[4] The words may perhaps apply to the laying on of hands in penance.

administration.' The intervals of time canonically prescribed to intervene between ordination to a lower and to a higher Order are technically called *interstitia*. A primitive ideal is expressed by the eleventh canon of Neocæsarea (A.D. 315): 'Let not a presbyter be ordained before he is thirty years of age, even though he be in all respects a worthy man, but let him be made to wait. For our Lord Jesus Christ was baptised and began to teach in his thirtieth year.' This Canon is included in the Collection of Canons made for Archbishop Egbert of York. De Burgo, in his handy *Pupilla Oculi*, gives (Pars. VI, Cap. 4) 'major xix' for the diaconate, 'major xxiv' for the priesthood, and 'major xxx' for the episcopate.[1]

The Preface mentions the times appointed in the Canon for the ordination of a deacon. The Ember (Anglo-Saxon *ymbren* = *recurring*) Seasons, Quatuor Tempora, originated at Rome in the fifth century, in a revival of the fast on Wednesday and the prolongation of the Friday fast over Saturday. Mediæval writers attribute the limitation of general ordinations to Pope Gelasius (492–96), in whose time the December Ember season was added to the three original seasons corresponding with the seasons of sowing, reaping, and the vintage.[2] Before that time ordinations at Rome to the presbyterate and diaconate took place at Easter. In the Excerptions of Archbishop Egbert we read: 'But [let the ordination of] priests and deacons be on the Sabbaths of the four seasons; that this ordination being performed in the presence of the people, the reputation of the elect and the ordained may be debated under the testimony of all.' As a matter of fact ordination, at least at Rome, took place at the end of the Saturday vigil, practically on the Sunday morning. The choice of a time of fasting as a season of ordination is in keeping with apostolic practice (Acts xiii. 2, 3). The use of special Ember Collects—the first appears to be an original composition by Bishop Cosin—for the whole Ember week is peculiar to the English Church since 1661–62.

The Eucharist must be regarded as an integral part of the Form and Manner of making Deacons and Priests. It is

[1] Pope Siricius (385), in a letter to Himerius of Tarragona, describes the ascent of a man vowed to the service of the Church from his infancy. He is to remain a reader up to the 'accessus adolescentiæ': up to the age of thirty he may be an acolyte or subdeacon; if unmarried he may then be a deacon for five years and a presbyter for ten, and seemingly at forty-five he is eligible for the episcopate. If baptised in mature age, he will remain a reader or exorcist for two years, an acolyte and subdeacon for five, and then after intervals, deacon, presbyter, bishop. Pope Zosimus (418), on writing to Hesychius, Bishop of Salona in Dalmatia, lays down a less exacting *cursus* by which 'the *sacerdotium* of the presbyterate could seemingly be reached at the age of twenty-nine.' See Wordsworth, *Ordination Problems*, p. 76 *et seq.* This legislation must have been of an ideal kind.

[2] Gelasius, *Ad Episcopos per Lucaniam*, *Ep.* i. c. 13. Gratian, *Decret. Dist.* lxxv, c. 7.

perhaps permissible to express a deep regret that the ancient custom of the newly-ordained presbyters concelebrating with the Bishop who has ordained them—a custom which is still maintained by the Roman Pontifical [1]—is not enjoined by the Ordinal. Yet it should be noticed that in the Salisbury rite, the newly-ordained presbyters do not concelebrate, nor does the newly-consecrated Bishop, although the latter at a separate altar celebrates contemporaneously with the Bishop who consecrated him. In the Roman Pontifical the Collects, Epistles and Gospels at the Ordination Masses are those of the day. In the Lectionary (*Comes*) of Jerome, the work of Alcuin at the Court of Charles the Great, special Epistles and Gospels are appointed. Hittorp's *Ordo Romanus* gives the passage about the sending of the Seventy (St. Luke x. 1) as the Gospel for the ordination of presbyters, and 1 Tim. iii. 1–7 as the Epistle at the consecration of a bishop. In the Salzburg pontifical (Martène's Ordo IX) the Gospel at the consecration of bishops is St. Luke x. 1 *et seq.*

The first rubric in the Forms for making Deacons and Priests requires that 'after Morning Prayer is ended, there shall be a Sermon, or Exhortation, declaring the duty and office of such as come to be admitted $\binom{\text{deacons}}{\text{priests}}$; how necessary that order is in the Church of Christ; and also how the people ought to esteem them in their office.' This is in the spirit of the Preface to the Ordinal. The rubrics of the mediæval pontificals connect the sermon with declarations of canonical impediments and moral prohibitions and the danger that visits simony. As to the high dignity and weighty office and charge of the priesthood, the Bishop himself admonishes the ordinands when they have been instructed by 'the holy Lessons' taken out of the Gospel: 'And if it shall happen the same Church, or any member thereof, to take hurt or hindrance by reason of your negligence; ye know the greatness of the fault, and also the horrible punishment that will ensue.' This address contains several passages reminiscent of

[1] 'But let the ordained Presbyters, kneeling on the ground here and there where it is most convenient, have their books before them, and say after the Pontiff, *Suscipe Pater*, etc., and all the other things of the Mass, as the Pontiff says them: and let him take good heed to say the *Secreta* carefully, and somewhat loudly, so that the ordained Priests may be able to say all with him, and especially the words of Consecration, which ought to be said at the same moment by the ordained as they are by the Pontiff.' The *ordinati*, however, kneel at the consecration and are communicated in one kind. In the *Apostolic Tradition* the newly consecrated Bishop says the Mass. In the later mediæval Roman rite the newly consecrated Bishop begins Mass in a separate chapel, but after the Offertory returns to the consecrating Bishop and concelebrates with him. With the primitive custom of *Apostolic Tradition*, cf. the words of the Bishop's ordination prayer, 'offerre dona sanctae ecclesiae.' The Sarum custom differs from the modern Roman in this respect.

the Latin pontifical. Sent forth to be 'Messengers, Watchmen, and Stewards of the Lord; to teach, and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family; to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for his children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever,' the priests are never to cease their labour, their care, their diligence until they bring all such as are committed to their charge 'unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ. . . .' Compare the words of the Gelasian prayer: 'et per obsequium plebis tuæ—et inviolabili caritate, in virum perfectum, in mensuram ætatis plenitudinis Christi in die justi et æterni judicii, conscientia pura, fide plena, Spiritu Sancto pleni persolvant.'

At Rome in the eighth and ninth centuries the presentation of the ordinands before the people took place on a day prior to their ordination.[1] In countries where the Gelasian Sacramentary was in use, on the day of the ordination the Bishop addressed the people and demanded in the case of deacons: 'si vestra apud meam concordat electio, testimonium quod vultis vocibus adprobate.' In the ordination of priests, in a rather longer address, he called on the people to proclaim their election by their voice, 'quod est acceptabilius Deo, aderit per Spiritum Sanctum consensus unus omnium animarum.' The people responded 'Dignus est.' In the earliest of all Ordination rites, the *Apostolic Tradition*, the election of the Bishop and of the deacon is mentioned. The *suffragium* thus given by the people is different from the formal *judicium* given by the bishops in electing a bishop to a vacant see within their province. The *consensus* of the bishops secured the transmission of the apostolic succession, for, as Dr. Turner says,[2] 'to belong to the succession, a bishop had first to be lawfully chosen by a particular community to occupy the vacant *cathedra* of its church, and secondly to be lawfully entrusted with the *charisma* of the episcopate by the ministry of those already recognised as possessing it.' The succession passed from holder to holder: the *charisma* through the consecrators to the consecrated. In the consecration of a bishop the bishops not only ratified the choice of the individual community, but also placed the Bishop-elect in the episcopate of the whole Church. The request for the concurrence of the people in our Ordinal shows that 'according to the constitution of the Church, the Bishop cannot arbitrarily ordain whom he will. The whole congregation, or body of Christ, must be consentient to his act, or rather set him in motion. A bishop ordains those whom the Church offers to him' (Bp. Woodford, *The Great Commission*, p. 129).

[1] In the Armenian Church ordination to the priesthood is preceded by a Calling Service.

[2] *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, p. 107.

The presentation is made by the Archdeacon or his deputy. The first mention of this officer occurs in the work of St. Optatus (*c.* 370) against the Donatists in recounting (I. 16) the quarrel of Lucilla with the Archdeacon Cæcilian. In the *Pilgrimage of Etheria* (*c.* 385) the Archdeacon is the officer who calls the faithful to prayer. The *Testament of Our Lord* mentions 'chief deacons,' and enjoins: of the deacons 'let him who is considered among them to be most earnest and best in governing, be chosen to be the receiver of strangers. Let him always be in the place of the guest-house which is the Church, clothed in white garments, a stole only on his shoulder' (I. 34). It seems, however, that neither the title nor the office of the Archdeacon was yet in view. The Gallican *Statuta ecclesiæ antiquæ* bears witness to the part taken by archdeacons in ordinations to the Minor Orders. *Ordo Romanus VIII* describes the Archdeacon divesting the recently ordained deacon of his dalmatic, vesting him in the planeta, and then leading him to the Bishop to be ordained presbyter. According to this same *Ordo*, the Archdeacon, on the day before the consecration of a bishop, after the letters dimissory are read, canonically examines the elect as to his immunity from four particular vices.[1] At the consecration on the morrow, while the gradual is being sung, the Archdeacon, assisted by the subdeacons and acolytes, robes the Elect in dalmatic, planeta, and sandles, and then presents him to the Pope. After the consecration is over the Archdeacon places the pallium on the new Bishop's shoulders.

In the Orthodox Church also the Archdeacon presents the candidates for the diaconate and presbyterate. In the East, where the diaconate is often a lifelong career, the Archidiakonos is not, as is usually the case in the West, a presbyter. Bishop John Wordsworth remarks that the first notice of archdeacons chosen from the presbyters is found in the letters of Hincmar of Rheims, A.D. 874. In the Maronite Communion the Archidiaconate is regarded as one of the nine Orders recognised by their Church, and is bestowed sacramentally by laying on of hands, an imposition of the book of Gospels, etc. According to the elder Asseman, the Syrian Jacobites follow the Maronite practice in this respect, with the exception of the tradition of the Gospel-book, but it is not certain whether imposition of hands on the Archdeacon takes place in the Syrian Jacobite rite. In the Nestorian Church, in which the Archdeacon has

[1] One of the questions the Pope asks the Elect in the subsequent examination is, 'How many years are you in the Diaconate or Presbyterate?' In the preconisation which the Pope makes when the Elect is presented to him by the Archdeacon (a formula resembling the Greek), he says that the clergy and people have 'elected him, a deacon or presbyter, to be their Bishop.' This is evidence of consecration *per saltum*.

certain minor episcopal functions entrusted to him, the Archdeacon appears to be 'princeps presbyterorum,' and his ordination is sacramental.

In accordance with the Canon Law, the Archdeacon presents the candidates. As he does but act on behalf of the Church, it may be regretted that the ancient formula has been altered: it was: 'Postulat hæc Sancta Ecclesia, reverende Pater, hos viros ordinibus aptos consecrari sibi a vestra Paternitate.'

Before the solemn examination of the ordinands takes place, and after the Bishop has commended 'such as be found meet to be ordered, to the prayers of the Congregation,'[1] the Litany, with the added suffrages and special prayers, is sung or said.

The Litany, in our Ordinal, leads up to the Eucharist. The rubric which follows the Epistles in the rite for the diaconate in the 1661–62 Book has now become obsolete, and is no longer printed.[2] With the exception of the oath of due obedience to the Archbishop taken by Bishops at their consecration, oaths are not now administered during the Service of Ordination. So now the public examination of the candidates for the diaconate follows immediately on the reading of the Epistle.

By some expositors the public examination of the ordinands is considered to be a practical application of St. Paul's words: 'But thou, O man of God . . . fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on the life eternal, whereunto thou wast called, and hast professed a good profession in the sight of many witnesses.' The Sarum rite for the consecration of a bishop begins with a solemn examination of the Bishop elect, who is asked such questions as:—

> Will you teach those things which you understand from divine Scripture to the flock for which you are to be ordained, both by word and example?
>
> Will you show subjection and obedience through all to the holy Church of Canterbury and to me and my successors, according to canonical authority and the decrees of holy Pontiffs?
>
> Will you preserve humility and patience in yourself, and teach others likewise?
>
> Do you believe the One Author of the New and Old Testaments, the Law and the Prophets, and the Apostles to be God and Almighty Lord?

[1] This commendation corresponds with the Gregorian *Oremus, dilectissimi*, or the Gelasian *Commune votum communis prosequatur oratio.* In the mediæval pontifical there is a shifting about of these invitatories.

[2] See the Clergy Subscription Act of 1865.

For the Bishop there could be no private examination such as there can be for candidates for the diaconate and presbyterate.[1] The Anglican compilers have, with necessary modifications, carried back the questions addressed to the Bishop elect, to the rites for the Ordination of Priests and Deacons. The answers, as Bishop Woodford rightly says, are vows: made vocally to the Bishop, they are 'the soul's promises to God,' first, to a *pattern life*, second, to a *life of belief*, third, to a *life of ministering*.[2]

A very beautiful feature in the English rite is the time for silent prayer which intervenes between the examination and the singing of the *Veni Creator Spiritus*.[3] Such a time for silent prayer would in ancient times have intervened between the invitatory of the Gregorian Sacramentary, *Oremus dilectissimi*, and the deacon's call, *Levate*, and would have been followed by the Collect in which the Bishop expressed in words the secret prayer of the whole congregation, 'Hear, O Lord, our prayers, and on these thy servants send the Spirit of thy Benediction.'

In the Edwardian Ordinals the hymn 'Come, Holy Ghost, eternal God,' which is an expanded paraphrase rather than a simple translation, is placed before the examination of the candidates for the priesthood. In 1661–62 the *Veni Creator Spiritus* was transferred to its present position, where it stands after the silence and before the prayer which immediately precedes the laying on of hands; but two alternative translations are substituted for the Edwardian translation. The first and most familiar comes from Bishop John Cosin's *Collection of Private Devotions* (1627): the second is a revised revision of a translation in *Archbishop Parker's Psalter*. The author of the original remains unknown.

The prayer 'Almighty God, and heavenly Father,' which recounts our Lord's redemptive acts, His Ascension, and His sending abroad into the world His Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, and Doctors, and dwells on the fact that it is the same Office and Ministry to which the ordinands are called, is very similar to the ancient Ordination prayers, and also most effectively sets forth the intention expressed in the Preface to the Ordinal of continuing and using the same Office and Ministry in the Church of England.

The words 'Be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of his holy Sacraments,' recall St. Paul's description of

[1] Precedents for the public examination of candidates for the diaconate and the priesthood can be found in some mediæval pontificals; *e.g.* Martène, T. II., Orders VII, VIII, XIII. And see the *Pontificale Thuani* cited by Morin, who speaks of an examination of ordinands 'in conspectu episcopi, vel cleri, sive populi.'

[2] See *The Great Commission*.

[3] Cf. Keble's poem 'Ordination' in *The Christian Year*.

ministers as 'ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God' (1 Cor. iv. 1). The Edwardian rubric which precedes the laying on of hands in the ordination of priests speaks of 'every one that receiveth orders,'[1] and this word in itself makes it difficult to understand how anyone can possibly maintain that the Ordinal is consistent with the view that ordination is but the public recognition of a call antecedently given and received, and not in itself what Hooker describes as 'a gracious donation which the Spirit of God doth bestow.' 'The Hand which imposeth upon us the function of the Ministry doth, under the same form of words, so tie itself thereunto, that he which receiveth his burden is thereby for ever warranted to have the Spirit with him and in him for his assistance, and, countenance, and support, in whatever he faithfully doth, to discharge duty.'

Note on Revisions

The changes in the Ordinal made at recent revisions are very slight. The following are worthy of notice:—

(i) The question at the Making of Deacons, 'Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament?' is treated as follows:—*English* 1928 and *Scottish*, 'Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament, as given of God to convey to us in many parts and in divers manners the revelation of himself which is fulfilled in our Lord Jesus Christ?'; *Irish*, no change; *American*, 'Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain all Doctrine required as necessary for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ?'; *Canadian*, 'Do you believe the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation?'

(ii) The American Ordering of Priests since 1793 has had an alternative formula: 'Take thou Authority to execute the Office of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the Imposition of our hands. And be thou . . .'

(iii) The English 1928 and Scottish Books in all three Orders introduce a prayer of Eucharistic form. The Bishop (or Archbishop) says, 'Lift up your hearts,' etc., continuing, 'It is very meet, etc,' which introduces the long prayer before the Laying on of Hands in the 1662 Rite, in the case of priests and bishops; a new prayer of considerable beauty for deacons brings this Order into line with the other two.—[ED.]

[1] 1661–2 'receiveth the order of Priesthood.'

PART III

SUPPLEMENTARY ESSAYS

THE LESSER HOURS

By E. C. TRENHOLME

THE services of Prime and Compline in the 1928 Prayer Book are a revival of two of the ancient Lesser Hours of prayer. The greater services of Mattins and Evensong (or Vespers) were supplemented by five shorter and less varying services, Prime in the early morning, Terce at the third hour, about 9 a.m., Sext at the sixth or midday hour, None at the ninth hour, about 2 or 3 p.m., and Compline the last thing at night. Apart from variations for festivals, most of the Psalms were said in regular order at the greater services, in the course of a week; but the 119th Psalm and some others were reserved for daily repetition at the Lesser Hours.

Historically the two chief services were derived from the family devotions used by the early Christians at dawn and sunset. The Lesser Hours had their forerunners in Jewish and primitive Christian times of private prayer, on rising and thrice in the day and at bedtime. The Book of Daniel, the Psalms, the Acts of the Apostles, bear witness to prayer being offered three times or even seven times a day, and specifically at the third, sixth and ninth hours (Dan. vi. 10; Ps. lv. 17, cxix. 164; Acts ii. 15, x. 9, iii. 1).

In the early Church these hours were devotionally connected with Gospel events, as when St. Cyprian in his tractate *On the Lord's Prayer* (c. 34) would have Christians to pray at the third hour, when the Spirit descended at Pentecost, and at the sixth and ninth as the times of our Saviour's crucifixion and death. In keeping with this, the office of Terce has its hymn to the Holy Spirit, and all the Hours have been linked up in thought with the Passion of our Redeemer.

> At Mattins bound, at Prime reviled,
> condemned to death at Tierce,
> Nailed to the Cross at Sext, at None
> his blessed side they pierce:
> They take him down at Vesper-tide,
> in grave at Compline lay,
> Who thenceforth bids his Church observe
> her sevenfold Hours alway.

When martyrdom gave way to peace, and monasteries arose, the monks or virgins were wont to assemble for psalmody at the

Hours, and the old prayer-times became occasions for services of praise. In the fourth century, when these devotions were adopted and developed by Eastern monasteries, Mattins was moved back to a time just after midnight (cf. St. Basil's Longer Rules, xxxvii). In the West, two centuries later, St. Benedict devoted part of his famous Rule for monks to regulating the Divine Office, basing his arrangement partly on that of the Roman Church, but with wide variations. Presumably Psalm cxix was already used daily at the Hours in Rome, as part of the arrangement of the Psalter for the week. St. Benedict altered this in favour of another arrangement of Psalms, which is preserved in the monastic breviary. The Roman breviary kept its old arrangement until in our own day Pope Pius X altered the whole distribution of the Psalms. The ancient daily use of Psalm cxix is apparently now confined to the Anglican Communion, in which Religious Communities and not a few of the clergy and laity recite it at the Hours.

The frequent breaking away from other occupations to praise God together was part of the devotional ideal of the monk or nun. It is an ideal commendable to other Christians, but for them the Hours must generally mean private rather than common prayer. The system was indeed taken over from monasticism and became the common prayer of the secular clergy in the West, as we find it in the breviary, but in practice it had to be modified. The Hours came to be said in groups, instead of separately at their proper times. At last, in the English Prayer Book, only the two greater daily services were retained, and the Psalter was spread over a month instead of a week. Our Mattins contains parts of Prime, as the Hour which used to be combined with Mattins, and our Evensong witnesses to the former combination of Vespers and Compline.

Yet there was a form in which the Lesser Hours survived the Reformation in England. There were the primers. In the Middle Ages, these prayer books for the laity contained a shortened and simplified form of the Hours of our Lady, a special office in honour of Christ's Mother and of the Incarnation. In the breviary, the office of the Blessed Virgin was a customary addition to the canonical Hours of the Church. In the primers, it was the devout layman's office, in Latin or English, and was accompanied by other popular devotions, such as the Hours of the Passion. Several primers of the Reformation period, under Edward VI and Elizabeth, contain reformed editions of the Hours, with the former Psalms from the office of our Lady. The Hours are unvarying in form, and extremely short, Terce, Sext, and None having only one short Psalm each.

Since these primers there have been no authorised Hours till the appearance of the new Order of Prime and of Compline

(England, 1928). But the tradition was maintained by a succession of private manuals, from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century, beginning with Cosin's *Collection of Private Devotions* in 1627.

These primer Hours were intended only for private devotion. They would serve the Christian who sings a Psalm by himself at his prayers, as the devout William Law recommended; but they are too short for Church or community services. In the nineteenth century, new English office books went back to the full breviary order for the Hours, thus recovering not only the ancient use of Psalm cxix and others, but also the old liturgical variations of antiphons, and other changeable parts of the office, which graced the Christian year. They demonstrate how well, with competent editing, the old Latin forms appear in an English dress. But they are hardly a popularisation of the Hours.

If, however, the Hours are to be included among the Church services in the Prayer Book, simplification is undoubtedly desirable and indeed necessary. The revisers are therefore right in omitting the numerous old variations in Prime and Compline. If any of them were to be allowed, the Eastertide and festal Alleluias in the responsory after the short lesson would have a strong claim.

Prime and Compline are the first and last of the five Lesser Hours. After Mattins in the night, and a rest, the monks rose again to begin the day with Prime. Its Psalms included the first sections of cxix, to which the Athanasian Creed was added. Its Collect is now our third Collect of Morning Prayer. Preparatory to dispersing for work after Prime, another prayer was said, now the second additional Collect at the end of the Communion Service. This our revisers have taken as the Collect for their Prime. The Athanasian Creed, which need not be said at Mattins, may be said (*if desired*) every day at Prime.

To what extent, and in what ways, the Order of Prime will be useful as a Church service remains to be seen. It would gain in devotional value if Terce, Sext and None were also restored, and the whole of Psalm cxix recited as a great utterance of the soul to God. These Lesser Hours are very fitting little services for such occasions as Retreats and Quiet Days, when common prayer is made and spiritual addresses are given at intervals through the day. Unofficial versions of the Hours are already much used for this purpose.

As possible Church services, Terce, Sext or None would be too short, by themselves, to justify the ringing of the church bell and the summoning of a congregation. In Retreats, each Hour included in the time-table is followed usually by an address, or intercessions, or a period of private meditation. In Religious Houses, certain of the Hours have appended to them such

exercises as the common reading of the Rule, or the daily offering of the community intercessions, or a spell of silence for midday self-examination or night prayers. The drawback of their brevity for public Church services could be met in similar ways. The gathering need not be for the Hour alone. It can be made the occasion for giving a devotional reading, or for offering intercessions and thanksgivings, or for some kind of class or profitable meeting.

With the Hours restored to the Prayer Book, it is conceivable that here and there, in some cathedral or collegiate church, the praises of God might be offered again in their generous old sevenfold daily round, or in some approximation to its fullness. Sanctuaries where time is given to worship are justified, in a world which renders too little worship to Heaven. Is this mere dreaming of the old mediævalism, which flew too high and broke down in failure? Not quite, for there are new factors, such as the change of liturgical language from Latin into noble English, and the advance of education and culture to appreciate traditional devotions.

The spiritual value of the Lesser Hours, whether for public or private devotion, is very much that of the great Psalm recited in their course, cxix. Superficially, this Psalm may appear monotonous, owing to its constant repetition of the same thoughts in the simplest words, bare of all imagery. But many earnest hearts find it, on the contrary, an absorbingly satisfying utterance. Repeated daily for years, and known by heart throughout, it loses nothing of its freshness and reality, but rather gains in them with the years. This assuredly would be testified in most Religious Houses where the daily office is assiduously chanted or recited in choir by the community.

Canon Liddon's tractate, *The Priest in his Inner Life*, contains his thoughts on what he calls 'that marvellous Psalm, the 119th,' in its connection with the Hours. He is at pains to point out that it does indeed represent in the very highest degree what 'is more or less true of all Scripture, the paradox of seeming simplicity overlying fathomless depth.' He recommends to the clergy the recitation of the lesser canonical Hours as 'a natural complement to the Mattins and Evensong of the English Church,' and dwells on the features of Psalm cxix as supremely expressive of 'the true spirit of ecclesiastics . . . the inward and outward bearing of the Priest of Jesus Christ.'

There will always be some amongst the laity too who will appreciate the Hours. A layman, Lord Beauchamp, compiled what was the standard English version of them in the middle of the nineteenth century. In some modern hour-books useful devotional additions have been made to the prayers of the Hours, in the form of intercessory and other special Collects.

Thus the unity of the Church is prayed for at the Third Hour, the conversion of sinners at the Sixth, and the confirmation of the faithful at the Ninth, in Collects which seem to have been thus used from Tractarian times. A series of Collects on the Hours of the Passion of Christ is also a frequent addition, from old sources. The 1928 Order of Compline includes a Passion prayer from this series.

The three central Hours have properly more variations for days and seasons than Prime and Compline have. For popular use and Church services the amount of variation should be reduced. But there might be changes of antiphon, etc., at least to mark the chief seasons, and to distinguish festival from common days.

Compline, in Latin *Completorium*, is the completion—of the Hours, and of the day. The 1928 Order of Compline will be a useful additional evening service; a musical setting is obtainable. The three alternative short lessons give scope for some seasonal variety, and the Sarum changes of hymn might be followed from a hymn-book. The pleasing first Collect is Roman; 'Lighten our darkness' is Sarum; the third is from the Hours of the Passion, and is followed by two more evening Collects of considerable beauty.

The structure of Compline in the Scottish Book is rather different. The Confession and Absolution come before the Psalms instead of towards the end of the Office, thus conforming to the Anglican custom of beginning with confession of sins, as in Mattins and Evensong, and to the modern Roman use, as opposed to the Sarum; the hymn 'Before the ending of the day' is not printed.

THE CORONATION SERVICE

By L. G. WICKHAM LEGG

THE observant visitor to England has often found a cause for wonder, and sometimes for envy, in that, in order to meet the need of the present, we have from time to time revolutionised our Constitution and our customs, while at the same time we preserve with curious tenacity the antique trappings in which they were decked in the past. The most solemn of all our ordinary State functions, the opening of Parliament, is in its arrangements the same as it was under Edward I, long before Parliament Act, or collective responsibility of Ministers, or even House of Lords and House of Commons had been conceived. Again, the judges administer laws made yesterday in the wigs and gowns of bygone ages, and it needs no deep reflection to perceive that we are surrounded on all hands by survivals of a similar nature. Time, by the perfectly natural process of the development of ideas, has, as it were, transubstantiated our institutions: the substance has changed beyond recognition, the accidents remain; for, inasmuch as we are not, as a people, prone to wanton destruction, we allow the accidents to survive as interesting remnants of the past, provided they do not hamper our movements. Such, to a superficial observer, might the Coronation Service seem to be; striking him at first sight as a curious survival of a purely mediæval ceremony from which any original meaning has been entirely evacuated, and yet no ingenuity is needed to show that through something like a thousand years of history it has, with far more constancy than any other of our ancient and customary ceremonies, maintained an inner meaning of permanent value. For, long before the Papacy, by putting forward its claims to universal sovereignty, drove men to the doctrine of the divine right of Kings, longer still before the Huguenots expounded the theory of an original compact or Rousseau seduced Europe with his *Social Contract*, the Coronation Service had explicitly taught that a Christian king is no irresponsible despot, but a ruler with duties towards his people; while its structure implied that, unless certain conditions were fulfilled, it was the right of the Church to refuse to make him King, for only after some form of recognition by the people and an oath to rule justly would the blessing of the Church be given and the King be invested with the insignia of office.

The Service.

The service may be regarded as a drama in three acts, all of which have been constant parts of it from the earliest times. In the first, the prince presents himself to the people and makes certain promises; in the second, he is consecrated and anointed, and in the third the King, invested in the full majesty of state with robes and *regalia*, is solemnly enthroned. This is the climax; afterwards he receives Communion, to offer himself and his people to God in the most sacred office of the Christian religion. But before we actually begin to describe the service it would be well to note the rubric that 'On the morning of the Coronation early, care is to be taken that the Ampulla be filled with oil, and together with the spoon, laid ready upon the Altar in the Abbey Church.'

The Ampulla has an interest of its own. It is in shape an eagle of gold, the oil being poured into the spoon through the beak. There should be no need to remind the reader of the famous story how at the baptism of Clovis a crystal phial was brought down from heaven with the chrism for the anointing of the King, and how every French King down to the ill-starred Louis XVI was anointed at his coronation with chrism into which a small fragment of the solidified oil of Clovis was mixed. In days of Anglo-French rivalry the prestige accruing to the King of France from being anointed with this heaven-sent oil was a source of much jealousy to the King of England, and we find traces of a rival story under Edward II, which ripens under Richard II into the detailed legend that the Virgin Mary had given to St. Thomas of Canterbury, when in exile, a phial of oil for the anointing of the King of England. It would seem that Richard had had ideas of being anointed a second time with oil from this phial which was miraculously and opportunely found at the Tower, but nothing was done before his deposition. To Henry IV the discovery of the phial was a godsend. In view of the weakness of his title to the throne, he could obtain great prestige as compared with Richard, if he could say he had been consecrated with oil from St. Thomas' holy ampulla while his rival had not. The phial was therefore placed in a golden eagle, and what eventually became of it is uncertain (a shrewd guess might be urged that Henry VIII's campaign against the memory of St. Thomas was the signal for its disappearance), but the eagle remained, to be broken up with the rest of the *regalia* on the abolition of the monarchy in 1649, and the present eagle is the substitute made in 1660. The spoon is an old mediæval silver-gilt spoon, but the burden of proof that it is the spoon that was used for the coronation before 1649 lies on the shoulders of those who propound that thesis.

As to the oil, it must be remembered that before 1603 the King was anointed with two kinds of oil. Of the three kinds of oil blessed on Maundy Thursday, that of the sick, that of the catechumens, and the chrism, the two former were simple olive oil, the last was a mixture of oil and various scents. The King used to be anointed not merely on the head, breast and hands as in 1911, but between the shoulder-blades and on the elbows as well, but it was only on the head that he was anointed with chrism; for the other places the oil of the catechumens was used. At and since the coronation of James I, owing to the discontinuance of the blessing of the oils in this country at the Reformation, compound oil made specially for the purpose has alone been used on at least three occasions, and probably more often.

I. *The recognition and oath.*—There is some reason to believe that in days gone by the recognition was the culminating point of an elaborate rite, the opening scene of which was not in the church but in Westminster Hall, where, in the assembly of magnates, the King was enthroned, and afterwards led in procession [1] on foot to the Abbey church, and presented to the assembled people, who gave their assent by acclamation. The last occasion upon which these ceremonies were carried out in full was at the coronation of George IV; in the following reign motives of economy were alleged for suppressing the ceremony in Westminster Hall and the procession, and these parts of the inauguration rites have not been since revived. Nowadays,[2] therefore, the King, preceded by lords carrying the *regalia* and the three swords, viz. *Curtana* (or sword of mercy), which is carried between that of justice to the temporalty and that of the spiritualty, passes from the door up to the presbytery, and on the platform erected under the lantern, technically known as the 'theatre,' is presented to the people at the south, west and north sides by the Archbishop asking whether those assembled to do the King their homage and service are willing to do the same, and peers and people 'with loud and repeated acclamations' signify their assent.

Now, although under a monarchy the succession to which is regulated by Act of Parliament there can be no question of a real election, it is impossible to doubt that the origin of this ceremony goes back far into the darkness of antiquity, when election was more a reality than it has ever been in historic times except at revolutionary periods. It may indeed be asked whether the effective election was not that in Westminster Hall, and whether the recognition in the Abbey was not merely of the nature of a

[1] The procession in many minute details remained the same from the coronation of Richard I, when we have the earliest description of it.

[2] We shall follow in this description the Coronation Service for our present King and Queen.

confirmation before the specifically ecclesiastical rite could begin. Be that as it may, for many centuries it has been a form, seeing that, before the Yorkists claimed the throne by hereditary descent alone, the only approach to an opportunity being given to the people to reverse the decision of the magnates is contained in the story, probably apocryphal, that Hubert Walter tried at this moment to divest himself of the responsibility of crowning John. Yet, form though it was, it is interesting to note that at the Revolution a certain nervousness was here apparent. Whereas the Archbishop used to present the King as 'the rightful inheritor of the crown of this realm,' any awkward questions of a legitimist nature were avoided in 1689 by the present formula: 'the undoubted King of this realm.'

When the acclamation has ceased, there follows a solemn supplication for the King in the form of a litany, sung by two bishops. A litany has been a continuous feature of the service since the days of the Normans, and it became part of the preparation for the consecration of the King and closely linked with it; but since the insertion in 1689 of the consecration and investiture into the body of the Communion Service, the litany has resumed its more normal position as the 'Anglican introit.' In the Communion Service, the collect for wise government that is now used is one of the most ancient prayers in the service, having been a feature of the service ever since the very earliest days, not indeed as the Collect, but as one of the consecratory prayers before the anointing,[1] or elsewhere; and the Epistle and Gospel are those passages of Holy Scripture which were chosen for the purpose in the Middle Ages.

After the Creed and the sermon, 'which is to be short, and suitable to the great occasion' (for so runs the rubric drawn by men who knew the capacity of seventeenth-century divines), the King is invited to take the oath. In its earliest form the oath is scarcely an oath at all; it is a general precept incumbent upon Kings, and, placed as it is at the end of the service and drawn in the third person, it reads almost like a rubric. In St. Dunstan's order, however, it appears as a solemn declaration in the first person singular at the beginning of the service, and is implicitly a condition *sine qua non* for the Archbishop proceeding further with the coronation. By this early oath the King promises three things: protection and peace to the Church; the repression of rapacity and all iniquity; the tempering of justice with mercy, 'in order that to me and you a clement and merciful God may vouchsafe his pardon.' According to tradition it was the ignorance of Edward II which caused the oath to be changed from a continuous declaration into an examination of the King by way of question and answer, a form which has ever since

[1] It was made the Collect in 1902.

been retained. Down to the Revolution the King swore to observe the laws of the glorious King St. Edward his predecessor, and those which the commonalty of his kingdom shall have chosen (*quas vulgus elegerit*); to maintain peace; to exercise mercy in his judgments; while to the Church he promised protection and the maintenance of its privileges. The actions of James II showed that the language of this oath was far too vague, and so, as the time had not yet come when calling God to witness could be regarded as 'a mere matter of form,' it comes about that no part of the service reflects more clearly the constitutional conflict of the seventeenth century and the triumph of the movement against 'popery and arbitrary power.' In the first place, the form of the oath is determined by Act of Parliament, and secondly, instead of promising to govern according to laws made by St. Edward and the common people, a phrase which, whatever meaning it may have had in the Middle Ages, is unintelligible in modern times, the King swears to govern 'according to the statutes in Parliament agreed on and the laws and customs of the land.' Prerogative above the common law, suspending and dispensing powers are here by implication all abandoned; and whereas James II had promised to protect 'the Church,' without openly specifying what he meant by this term, the new oath laid down that the King is to protect 'the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law' and 'the settlement of the Church of England.' [1]

II. *The consecration and anointing.*—The Archbishop has now received the pledges he requires; from the people in their recognition of the King, and from the King in his oath to govern according to law; and he now enters upon the solemn consecration of the King.[2] After the singing of the hymn *Veni Creator*,

[1] There are traces of a coronation oath of a totally different character which may be that taken by Edward I, though it appears in none of the service-books. The French text is printed in Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, Vol. II, § 179, (p. 109 in the edition of 1896). In it the King promised to maintain the ancient rights of the Church, the honours and dignities of the Crown without diminishment, recall those hurt, decayed or lost into their ancient estate, as well as to regard peace and equity in his judgments, and abolish all evil customs. This oath was known to Henry VIII, whose personal alterations are still extant (Brit. Mus. MS. Tib. E. viii. fo. 89). I know of no document which illustrates more clearly the despotic nature of Henry's conception of the Constitution, for all through run provisos that the laws and customs he is to keep by oath shall not be 'prejudicial to his crown and dignity royal.' Fortunately it was never administered, and all the Stuart Kings took the mediæval oath. In this connection it may be remarked that one of the charges against Laud was that he had tampered with the coronation oath by omitting the word 'chosen' from the clause: 'the laws which the commonalty shall have chosen.' But the omission was of earlier date and due perhaps to a slip of the pen.

[2] In the mediæval rites and Stuart times this consisted of *Veni Creator*, and no less than four consecratory prayers, culminating in a prolix consecratory preface.

a single consecratory prayer, 'to bless and sanctify thy chosen servant who is to be anointed with this oil [1] and consecrated King,' invokes upon the King the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Spirit, at the end of which the King, rising from his knees, goes to the chair of King Edward, in which is the 'stone of destiny,' and which is placed in the middle of the presbytery facing the altar. Seated in this ancient chair, he is anointed with chrism in the form of a cross from the spoon by the Archbishop upon the head, the breast and the hands, and is afterwards blessed with a solemn and ancient benediction. Meanwhile, to veil these secret rites from the public eye, four Knights of the Garter hold a canopy over the King, while the choir sings the famous anthem, 'Zadok the priest,' the only anthem in the service that has always remained in its original place.

III. *The investiture and enthronement.*—According to the mediæval theory, the most decisive moment of the service has now been passed; the prince is now King and ready to receive the *regalia* and be enthroned. First of all, then, he is robed in a long white linen vestment like a rochet, called the *colobium sindonis*, over which is passed the *supertunica* of cloth of gold, with sleeves like a dalmatic. Over this *supertunica* the King is girt with the sword, immediately after receiving the spurs. Though handed from the altar by ecclesiastics, these emblems of chivalry are actually put upon the King's person by a layman, the Lord Great Chamberlain. Not so the emblems of royalty proper, with all of which the King is invested by churchmen. It is the Dean of Westminster who places round the King's neck the *armilla*,[2] which in shape is nothing but a stole, and the Imperial robe or *pallium* embroidered with the eagles of empire and the floral emblems of England, Scotland, Ireland and India.[3] This vestment, which is fastened in front by a clasp in manner of a cope, is probably the descendant of the imperial *chlamys;* it is also four-cornered, which gave occasion formerly to remind the King that the four corners of the world were subject to the power and empire of God. The symbolism of Empire conveyed in the *pallium* was doubtless the reason why since 1685 the orb is delivered at the same moment, an innovation which is perhaps unfortunate, for the orb has to be immediately surrendered in order to leave the King's hands free, and thereby

[1] It is perhaps unfortunate that the direction to the Archbishop to lay his hand upon the Ampulla has been inserted here since 1689. It suggests that the prayer, which is clearly a consecration of the King, is also in some way a consecration of the chrism, whereas ever since the Reformation it has been customary for the chrism to be consecrated on the morning of the coronation by a Bishop of the chapter of Westminster.

[2] The relation of the *armilla* to bracelets is an obscure question which cannot be gone into here.

[3] The lotus of India was substituted at the coronation of King Edward VII for the lilies of France, which were in the *pallium* of Queen Victoria.

an element of hesitation is introduced into the steady progress of the investiture. Immediately afterwards, the Archbishop himself delivers the ring, 'the ensign of kingly dignity and of defence of the Catholic faith,' the Royal sceptre (with the cross), 'the ensign of kingly power and justice,' and the rod with the dove, the emblem of 'equity and mercy,' and finally, after a prayer over the crown of St. Edward, he places it upon the King's head, amid the acclamations of the people, the blare of trumpets and salvoes of artillery.[1] And then follows the delivery of the Bible, introduced in 1689, a ceremony which, however significant it may be to pious eyes, is dramatically weak when placed in close juxtaposition after the climax of the coronation.

This brings the investiture to a close, and the Archbishop sums it up in a benediction upon the newly-invested King, which is directed upon him personally in the first instance, then upon his reign, and finally widens out to a general benediction upon the nation at large.

Rising now from King Edward's chair, in which he was anointed and crowned, the King, surrounded by the Bishops and representatives of the House of Lords, passes up to the throne upon the 'theatre,' and is there enthroned by the Archbishop with an address inculcating steadfastness and courage. After which, as monarch in full state, he receives the fealty of the lords spiritual and the homage of the lords temporal, and is finally acclaimed as King by the rest of the people.

The Queen's coronation.—At this point follows the coronation of the Queen Consort. Kneeling before the altar, the Queen is consecrated on its steps, and afterwards, also kneeling between the steps and King Edward's chair, and under a pall held by four peeresses, she is nowadays anointed on the head only, and is invested with the ring, 'the seal of a sincere faith,' the crown 'of glory, honour and joy,' and the sceptre and ivory rod, two *regalia* which are delivered without any set formula. After a short prayer bringing the rite to a close, the Queen rises, and goes to the 'theatre,' and not the least touching sight in the whole of the ceremonies of the day is when the Queen 'as she passeth by the King on his throne, boweth herself reverently to His Majesty,' and then seats herself in her throne, beside, but below that of the King.

This little service has preserved the mediæval structure far

[1] This acclamation does not appear before 1685, and is due to the conception that the act of coronation is the central part of the ceremony. It is doubtful whether this can historically be justified, the crown being merely one of a number of *regalia* of which perhaps the sceptre, the emblem proper of sovereignty, is the most important. But though it spoils the dramatic arrangement of the service, coronation is so firmly fixed in the popular mind as the supreme moment that it would be unfortunate to alter such a detail.

more than that of the King, for it retains the mediæval order of the delivery of the insignia, in that the crown is still delivered before the sceptre and rod (which was the old sequence for the King); and it may be noted that the Queen is anointed kneeling, not seated, like the King. That the King should be anointed seated, which is a singular position, may arise from the circumstance of the 'stone of destiny.'

The Communion.—When the Queen has taken her place in her throne, the choir sings the offertory anthem, during which the King and Queen come down from the 'theatre,' and laying aside their crowns and sceptres kneel down on the steps of the altar to make their oblation. First of all the King offers bread and wine for the Communion, over which the Archbishop says a Collect, which is the old 'secret' of the mediæval orders. After which the King offers an altar-cloth and an ingot of gold weighing a pound, while the Queen also offers an altar-cloth and a 'mark of gold.'[1] The combining of these two oblations in one stage of the service is an innovation of 1902. Formerly the oblations of the altar-cloths were made when the King and Queen entered the church immediately after the Recognition; it is a small matter, but some may regret that what seemed to be an act of humility and gratitude at the outset of the service has been merged into an oblation specifically connected with the Communion Service itself.

After receiving Communion, the King and Queen return once more, crowned and carrying their sceptres, to their thrones, and during the *Te Deum* of thanksgiving (which used till 1902 to follow the King's enthronement, but is equally well placed as it is) retire into the chapel of St. Edward behind the high altar, where the King is divested of his crown, sceptres and coronation robes, and arrayed in a parliament robe[2] of purple velvet. Wearing this, and crowned, no longer with the crown of St. Edward, but with the richly jewelled Imperial crown, and with sceptre and orb in his hands, the King returns through the church to the west door, followed by the Queen arrayed as before, among the peers and peeresses wearing the coronets of their several degrees.

History and theory of the Coronation Service.

It is a curious reflection that it is in England, where, so far as our knowledge at present goes, the Christian coronation rite

[1] The old oblation was (1) a pall and pound of gold by the King, (2) a pall by the Queen, at the first oblation; and bread and wine and a mark of gold by the King only at the second oblation.

[2] A robe lined with ermine with a cape above it of the same fur.

had its origin, that it has survived the longest, for with the Hungarian monarchy in abeyance, and the other mediæval monarchies of Europe absorbed or destroyed, no State is left on the Continent where mediæval traditions have been continuously maintained.

The English Coronation Service has been subjected to six different recensions or editions, of which no less than four were made in the Middle Ages, and the fifth is peculiar to the coronation of James II. Save for a few alterations of detail, the service as we know it to-day belongs to the sixth recension, originally drawn up for the coronation of William and Mary. Of these recensions the first need not detain us beyond noting that it may possibly have arisen in the ninth century; the most important were the second, the fourth and the sixth. The second, as Dr. Armitage Robinson has given us reason for believing, was framed by no less a person than St. Dunstan for the great coronation of King Edgar at Bath, when in 973 there was celebrated the final union under one sceptre of the Saxons, the Mercians and the Northumbrians. But it has another interest in its wide diffusion beyond England. Long after it had been abandoned in its native land, it continued to be used for the coronation of the Kings of France, and it was last used at the coronation of the unhappy Charles X. Like his predecessors on the throne of the lilies, he was consecrated with a prayer that he would not abandon the sceptre of the Saxons, Mercians and Northumbrians, while it is clear that at one time the order spread to Italy, for a Milanese pontifical contains a Coronation Service of this selfsame recension, with the prayer that the King of Italy likewise may rule over the Saxons, Mercians and Northumbrians.[1] In the native home of the order, it is not surprising to find that these allusions to the centrifugal tendencies of the Anglo-Saxon polity disappeared under the centralising Normans; but the conservative Englishman may be pardoned a smile when he reflects that in this case it was the logical and realistic Latins who were guilty of retaining these formulæ in circumstances where they can have had no meaning whatever.

The fourth recension, drafted in the fourteenth century and preserved in two magnificent manuscripts—the missal of Abbot Litlington, which lay on the altar at Westminster and was used by the Archbishop at the coronation, and the *Liber regalis*, which was held by the King during the service—has a twofold appeal. To mediævalists it is the full flower of the mediæval English coronation in which the service attained to the highest pitch of elaboration. To others it is attractive because, with all its faults, its structure is dramatically the most logical of all, and it has the prestige of having been in use for a longer period than

[1] Paris, Bib. Nat. MS. Latin, 977.

any other.[1] Its faults are the turgidity of diction common to most Latin liturgical forms, and an overloading with Biblical illustration that would have roused the envy of a Covenanter; defects which, it is true, it inherits from its predecessors. And even with the omission, since 1603, of the seven Penitential Psalms, James II was not exaggerating when he spoke of the 'extreme length of the service.' Strangely enough, it was the accession of a Roman Catholic king which dealt the death-blow to the mediæval coronation rite. Under royal orders, Archbishop Sancroft revised the whole service, seriously dislocating the mediæval arrangement and carefully removing all words that suggest the consecration of inanimate objects; but at the Revolution yet more drastic rearrangement took place in the sixth recension. By inserting the Coronation Service proper into the order for Holy Communion,[2] it was hoped to secure that the scandal of James II's refusal to communicate should not recur, while the interests of the Church of England were consulted by the new coronation oath, and the Protestant tinge was deepened by the presentation of the Bible, 'the most valuable thing the world affords, the royal law and lively oracles of God.'

There can be little doubt whence was derived the central idea of initiating the monarch with these rites. The stories of Saul and David and Jehu gave irresistible precedent for the rite of anointing, while from pagan sources there was universal experience on which men could draw for investiture with the emblems of authority, whether a scourge or a staff or a fillet or a lance or a crown; and the combination of the Bible precedents with the practice of all primitive chieftains gives us the kernel of the Coronation Service. But if we go further and ask what precisely the Coronation Service did, or what its relation was in later ages to the theories of monarchy prevalent from time to time, it is as well to be cautious. On one point, however, we can speak decisively. Until Edward I, no king dated his reign from his predecessor's death; there was in every case an *interregnum* between the death of the predecessor and the coronation of the successor, while a careful examination of the rubrics of the *Liber regalis* will show that a century after the accession of Edward I the word *rex* is only used to denote the anointed king: the service made the King, and the reign begins at the moment of anointing.

> Not all the water in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm off from an anointed King;
> The breath of worldly men cannot depose
> The deputy elected by the Lord—

[1] The translation made in 1603 carries literalness to the verge of baldness.

[2] By a curious coincidence, this was a reversion to the arrangement in the first recension.

are lines (so hackneyed that an apology is almost required for quoting them) which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of the first royal exponent in England of the doctrine of divine right; but he did not explain that two very different ideas of royal power are expressed in them. An inauguration ceremony involving not only an implied election but an oath to govern on conditions, and coronation at the hands of the Church, runs counter to the whole theory of divine, indefeasible, hereditary right. For if the deputy be really elected by the Lord, the Coronation Service becomes a pageant into which it is difficult to read much significance. James I, with his usual philosophical acumen, seems to have realised the difficulty,[1] and indeed it is rather a wonderful thing that, seeing that there was no Protestant rite at hand for his coronation, he did not suppress the ceremony altogether. Immemorial custom and possibly personal vanity on the part of the King must have served to keep the ceremony alive.

The first two lines, however, suggest another train of thought. If the balm cannot be washed off from an anointed King, it follows that, even if he be deposed, something has happened which no worldly events can destroy; the King, like the clergy at ordination, has received something which is indelible. The parallel between the Coronation Service and the order for the consecration of a bishop has often been pointed out, but it would be more convincing if no analogy could likewise be drawn with the coronation of a Queen Consort and the investiture of a Duke of Normandy, or the ordination of a priest. In truth, structure is in itself no strong argument, for it would seem that ecclesiastical imagination was not equal to providing fundamentally different rites for every kind of inauguration ceremony. Again, while it is true that certain kings were anointed with chrism like a bishop, so too are candidates for confirmation, and if it can be shown that the anointing of a King, so far from being borrowed from the consecration of a bishop, did in fact serve as a precedent for anointing the bishop, is there much force in the argument that because the King is anointed like a bishop, therefore he receives a sacred and indelible 'character'? Many people, both now and in the Middle Ages, have been struck by the curious similarity of the *colobium sindonis*, *supertunica*, *armilla* and *pallium* to the alb, dalmatic, stole and cope, so that poor little Henry VI is described as having been after his coronation 'despoyled of all his busshoppes geare,' but it is difficult to meet the argument that the *colobium sindonis* is in reality a white robe to cover the newly-anointed body of the King, like the white gloves and coif which he used to wear for the same reason, and that the *pallium*

[1] *Trew law of free monarchies* (*Works of . . . King James I*, London, 1616), p. 195.

is an Imperial *chlamys*.[1] But while the arguments from parallelism should not individually be pressed too far, cumulatively they certainly have an effect, and it would be exceedingly rash to go to the opposite extreme, and deny that historically there is any foundation for the view that the King does receive a 'character' upon consecration. That *Rex est persona mixta cum sacerdote* is a maxim of the common law of England, derived perhaps from faint traditions of priest-kings and kept alive by the coronation rites in Christian times. Nor is our common law singular in this opinion. The theory was propounded in France in the fifteenth century, and in the Empire the maxim that *Imperator non est omnino laicus* was countenanced by the custom which required that vested as a deacon he should read the Gospel *Exiit edictum* on Christmas Day.

It is perfectly true, on the other hand, that canon law repudiates this doctrine, and not without a certain roughness. Why then does lay law say one thing and ecclesiastical law say another? The answer is that, prior at any rate to the eleventh century, there does not seem to have been any ecclesiastical opposition to the approximation of the royal and clerical character, as is shown in *Sta et retine*, the address made when enthroning the King, where the Archbishop used to draw a parallel that just as Christ is the mediator between God and man, so the King was mediator between clergy and people.[2] If he could not be called *pontifex*, he was at any rate *pons*, and it is little distance (if any) from this to the doctrine of *persona mixta*. But when the investiture contest began, the Hildebrandine papacy was quick to realise what a formidable weapon this doctrine was in the hands of its Imperial opponents, and repudiated it *toto corde*,[3] and Grosseteste, when consulted on this question by Henry III, replied that an anointed king was of greater dignity than others, but carefully warned Henry against any doctrine that a sacerdotal character was conferred. Anyhow, before the Church took up a decided line on the matter, it is clear that opinion was definite, for if the Coronation Service is of the nature of an ordination, how can it be reconciled with the practice of re-coronation? Yet this was comparatively frequent. We know that Edgar was crowned at

[1] In France, while retaining its similarity to the *chlamys* by being clasped on the shoulder, the mantle falling over the King's left arm and being raised upon it led to the denomination of the 'coronation chasuble.' In this connection we may also remember that the King of France at his coronation communicated in both kinds, like a priest.

[2] Quatenus mediator Dei et hominum te mediatorem cleri et plebis in hoc regni solio confirmet . . . Iesus Christus Dominus noster.

[3] The whole matter is learnedly set out by Eduard Eichmann, *Königs- und Bischofsweihe* (Sitzungsberichte d. Bayerischen Akad. d. Wissenschaften), Munich, 1928, to which I am deeply indebted in the above sketch. The late Dr. Brightman was kind enough to put this tract into my hands, but I need not say he is in no way responsible for any opinions I have here expressed.

least twice, and if Dr. Robinson's theory be correct, the last coronation was something of peculiar solemnity of which the rite of anointing formed an integral part. Later on in the Middle Ages there was clearly no insistence on anything like the indelibility of orders. Captivity, for instance, was a disaster that seems to have deprived the King of his royal 'character,' for Richard Cœur de Lion was crowned a second time after his ransom from Austria, and in like manner, Henry III, crowned in the first instance at Gloucester, was crowned once more at Westminster after the expulsion of Louis of France. It may be that the Church welcomed the opportunity thus offered to deal a blow at the theory of an ordination; it is more likely that on the lay side the full implications of the theory were never worked out, and that the inconsistency of a second coronation with the idea of ordination was never realised.[1]

One final point. With the monarchy and its succession limited by Parliament are not we, like the believers in divine right, in danger of depriving the ceremony of all significance? That there is such a danger we may frankly recognise, and yet this service, the structure of which is based on the idea of a contract, is not in theory alien to the constitutional monarchy under which we live. Even if we admit that the contract is more feudal than modern, it can scarcely be denied that this 'great and glorious solemnity,' irrespective of time, and disregarding the current theories of absolutist kings or oligarchical factions, the fancies of the ages of faith and the coldness of ages of indifference, has steadily borne witness to those very political ideas which appeal to us to-day as of real value, by reminding King and people alike that power is subject to law and that the brightest ornaments of sovereignty, in whose hands soever it may lie, are piety, courage, honour, justice, mercy and peace.

[1] Of course these coronations are quite different from the Norman *curiæ coronatæ* held thrice a year, which were more of the nature of a *levée* at which business was transacted.

THE CONSECRATION OF CHURCHES AND OTHER OCCASIONAL SERVICES

By THE EDITOR[1]

A TITLE is difficult to find for this article. 'Pontificals' would be the obvious title, but the Confirmation Service forms a part of all Anglican Prayer Books, with which also the Ordinal is bound up. 'Diocesan Services' would be suitable if our attention were confined to England, but is inappropriate here in that the most important services to be discussed form part of Prayer Books used elsewhere. So we fall back on the present cumbrous title.

The Pontifical is the Bishop's book, containing the offices, blessings, etc., which he alone can use. These are found in the Sacramentaries and *Ordines*. The earliest extant collection of them is the Pontifical of Egbert, Archbishop of York (d. 766), which is in three parts: (1) Ordination Services, Confirmation, Consecration of Churches and Churchyards, Benediction of Fonts and other holy objects, Reconciliation of holy places; (2) Benedictions, pronounced by the Bishop during the Mass; (3) Benedictions of various states of life, Service for a Synod, Reconciliation of Penitents, Consecration of the Holy Oils, etc. The present Roman Pontifical is substantially that of Clement VIII (issued in 1596), and its contents correspond to the first and third divisions of Egbert's book.

Of these various rites only Confirmation, which had formed part of the Sarum Manual, found its way into the 1549 Prayer Book. The Ordinal was bound up with the Prayer Book of 1552, and in 1662 was mentioned on the title-page. The rubrics suggest that the Bishops have a slight power of varying the prescribed order. Thus the Ordinary may prescribe the saying of the Litany on additional days (1552 and onwards), or, like the King, may enjoin that proclamations be made in church (rubric at the Offertory, 1662). The Elizabethan Bishops had to a limited extent the power of ordering additional services or prayers.[2] The following are examples of episcopal authority only.

[1] The preliminary research in connection with this article was done by Canon Sydney Cooper.

[2] See *The Chronicle of Convocation* of Canterbury, 1870, Report to the Lower House; and a Report to the Lambeth Conference of 1897 (*The Six Lambeth Conferences*, p. 274). Both accounts are based on the Parker Society volume of Occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the reign of Queen Elizabeth (1847).

1560. An order of prayer for seasonable weather, 'to be used . . . by the discretion of the Ordinaries within the Province of Canterbury.'

1563. Archbishop Parker prescribed prayers in the city of Canterbury, 'not enjoining the like to the rest of my diocese, nor to the rest of my province, for want of sufficient warrant from the Prince or Council.'

1564. Thanksgiving for the cessation of the Plague, 'set forth by the Bishop of London to be used' in his diocese.

1565. A Form to be used on Wednesday and Friday in the Diocese of Salisbury, on behalf of Christendom attacked by the Turks.

1565. Thanksgiving for victories over the Turks, set forth by the Archbishop of Canterbury for his province.

1585. 'An Order of Prayer and Thanksgiving for the preservation of the Queenes Majesties life and salftie,' to be used in the Diocese of Winchester; it consists of a prayer and a psalm following the sermon.

Early seventeenth-century forms for consecrating churches, etc. are discussed below. In 1640 Laud proposed to the Upper House of Convocation the preparation of a uniform rite for consecrating churches, but no action followed. Cosin at the Restoration prepared a form, but apparently it was too late to be added to the Prayer Book. Queen Anne in 1711–12 and George I in 1715 gave Letters of Business to the Convocations to enable them to prepare such forms; but they were never officially promulgated, owing to the silencing of the Convocations. However, the Bishops based their diocesan forms on those drawn up by the Convocations at that time. Thomas Deacon's *Compleat Collection of Devotions* (the Non-jurors' Prayer-book, published in 1734) contains a number of special offices, such as prayers for consecrating oil, milk and honey at Baptism, the consecration of chrism and oil for the sick, and the Ordination of Deaconesses.

When the Convocation of Canterbury resumed its deliberations it was hoped that a Pontifical might be framed.[1] A Report to the Lower House in 1870 concludes that the Bishops have the power of authorising special forms of prayer. The Elizabethan services (mentioned above) are probably only a few out of many. They seem to show that in the sixteenth century the Act of Uniformity was intended to provide for uniformity in the ordinary services and to prevent recurrence to the unreformed services. That the Crown has issued services supports this interpretation. Certainly the Act of Uniformity of 14 Charles II contemplates no additional services, put forth by either Crown or Bishop. But the Prayer Book services do not exhaust those actually used. Commemora-

[1] Warren, *Synodalia*, p. 93.

tion of founders and benefactors,[1] enthronisation of Bishops and installation of Deans, are allowed by custom. To these the Coronation Service, the Maundy Service at the Chapel Royal, and possibly some other public forms are to be added. 'Moreover, the Bishops have their own forms of Consecration of Churches and Churchyards, set forth in their several Dioceses by their own authority.' It has been the custom for the Crown to order the observance of a day of thanksgiving or a public fast, and then to direct the Archbishop to prepare a service. 'The long disuse of this power of ordering special services by the Bishops and by the Archbishop, unless in obedience to the commands of the Crown, may perhaps be thought to throw some doubt on the lawfulness of its exercise now.'

This seems to be the last treatment of the problem that can in any sense be called official. It has been argued that Canon 36, as amended by the Convocations in 1865, by which the minister engages to 'use the form in the said Book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority,' refers only to the statutory services and their possible future revision; that, so long as these are said, additional services may be freely used at the discretion of the parish priest. But there seems to be no historical justification for this view. The Act of Uniformity Amendment Act of 1872 did, however, give authority to the Ordinary to approve special forms of service, provided 'there be not introduced into such service anything, except anthems or hymns, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or Book of Common Prayer.' A period of hesitation on the part of the English Bishops ensued. Successive Lambeth Conferences revealed that Bishops overseas were much bolder in exercising their liturgical powers, and in 1897 Resolution 45 of the Conference recognised 'the exclusive right of each Bishop to put forth or sanction additional services for use within his jurisdiction, subject to such limitations as may be imposed by the provincial or other lawful authority.' 'Or other lawful' safeguarded the English Episcopate from a possible charge of defying the Act of 1872, but by that time it had fallen into desuetude so far as the excluding of phraseology not derived from the Bible or Prayer Book was concerned. As no protest has been raised by the State, the Act is for practical purposes obsolete.[2]

[1] Such as Laud sanctioned in Oxford College chapels.

[2] The quotations in the 1870 Convocation Report are valuable as showing the degree of initiative possessed by the Archbishop.

1563. Archbishop Parker to Sir William Cecil, July 23.

'I thought it good, upon my private consideration, to call upon the mayor and his commonalty on Friday last to meet with me at the cathedral church. . . . And, for hereafter, have appointed them Fridays so to be used with prayer and preaching, prescribing that common prayer that was appointed in the Guise's time (altering a few words in the same) [not enjoined to the rest of the diocese

Between 1914 and 1918 rules were greatly relaxed. Naval and military chaplains claimed the right to devise and use any service that seemed to edify the men. As most of their services were not held in churches the Act of Uniformity was not relevant. But it was impossible to draw a hard-and-fast line between services held within and without a consecrated building. Civilian churchgoers also became accustomed to drastic changes. Some chaplains after 1918 wished to continue the experiments which had commended themselves during the War and parish priests generally were inclined to use their discretion to a hitherto unprecedented extent, especially as regards prayers after the Third Collect at Evensong. The proposed measure authorising the Permissive use of the Revised Prayer Book, as published in 1923, included a clause providing that 'the House of Bishops [*i.e.* of the Church Assembly], or the Convocations of Canterbury and York' should have power to 'issue such supplementary forms of service as they may consider best adapted to the fuller satisfaction of the exigencies of public worship.'[1] The Church of England may be held to be agreed in asking for the repeal of the restrictions of the 1872 Act. We now proceed to discuss the services separately.

The Consecration of Churches and Churchyards.

The Dedication[2] of Christian churches arose naturally from

---

or to the province] . . . And, although ye may say we by our vocation should have special regard of such matter, yet, because we be holden within certain limits by statutes, we may stand in doubt how it will be taken if we give order herein, and therefore do not charge the rest of my diocese with injunction, as leaving them to their own liberty, to follow us in the city for common prayer if they will. If I had your warrant, I would direct my precepts, as I think very necessary, to exercise the said public prayers.'

1563. The Queen to the Archbishop. August 1.

'. . . understanding that you have thought and considered upon some good order to be prescribed therein, for the which ye require the application of Our authority for the better observance thereof amongst our people, We . . . command all . . . Our subjects, to execute, follow, and obey such godly and wholesome orders as you, being primate of all England and Metropolitan of this province of Canterbury, upon godly advice and consideration shall uniformly desire, prescribe, and publish. . . .'

The principle is clear. The Archbishop can authorise additional services; he may not *prescribe* them with the authority of the Crown.

The numerous services put out by royal authority are outside the scope of this survey. The materials for a history of them are for the most part in Lambeth Palace Library. The custom has been apparently to consult the Archbishop of Canterbury, as a member of the Privy Council, or, failing him, the Bishop of London, acting in the same capacity. Such services are issued by the King's Printer. During the years 1914–19 two services were thus issued, at the outbreak of war and to commemorate the signing of the Peace Treaty.

[1] In 1927–28 'the archbishop and bishops of each province' was the phrase used; the Convocations were not mentioned.

[2] Strictly speaking, churches are *dedicated* to Almighty God, in honour of a Saint or in special commemoration of a mystery of redemption, such as Christ the Incarnate Son, or the Annunciation. *Consecration* is used of sacred objects, *benediction* of persons. But the terms are often interchanged.

that of the Jewish Temple by Solomon as recorded in 1 Kings: 'So the king and all the children of Israel dedicated the house of the Lord' (by prayer and sacrifice, viii. 63). The re-dedication of the Temple in 165 B.C. was still fresh in Jewish tradition in the time of our Lord.[1] When 'the peace of the Church' allowed the erection of substantial buildings for worship it was natural that a rite based on the Jewish prototype should develop. So Eusebius says: 'After this there was brought about that spectacle for which we all prayed and longed: festivals of dedication in the cities and consecrations of the newly-built houses of prayer.'[2] Much space is given to the dedication of the church at Tyre in 314. Unfortunately for our purpose, Eusebius gives his own sermon in full and describes the ceremonies only in general terms. 'Our leaders conducted perfect ceremonies, and the consecrated priests performed the sacred rites and stately ordinances of the Church, here with psalmody and recitation of such other words as have been given us from God, there with the ministering of divine and mystic services; and the ineffable symbols of the Saviour's Passion were present.' St. Athanasius found it necessary to defend himself to Constantius against the charge of the Arians that he had celebrated in an unconsecrated church. The occasion was Easter; the Lenten congregations in the other churches had been so dense as to endanger life; even larger crowds were expected at Easter. He had seen an unfinished church used in the same way both at Trèves and Aquileia. His words exclude the idea that celebration of the Eucharist in itself constituted dedication: 'we kept no day of dedication (it would certainly have been unlawful to do so, before receiving order from you).'[3]

The rites of the Eastern Orthodox Church are elaborate.[4] The founding of a church is reserved for a bishop or his delegate. Relics are deposited below the cross depicted on the corner-stone, though this ceremony may be omitted.[5] The Rector censes the trenches. Water and oil are blessed and put on the corner-stone, the oil with special reference to Jacob's stone. The foundations are sprinkled with holy water, 'and the workmen shall immediately begin their labours with speed, in the name of the Lord.' The consecration of a church is always performed by a bishop. The altar ceremonies are numerous. Wax-mastic is laid on a column of the altar in the form of a cross; it hardens rapidly and is made firm with nails. The altar is washed, then anointed with red wine mingled with rose-water. Then the coverings are laid on and sprinkled. The whole church is censed. The walls are

[1] See 1 Macc. iv. 36: 'Let us go up to cleanse the holy place, and to dedicate it afresh'; John x. 22: 'it was the feast of the dedication.'

[2] *H. E.*, x. 3. [3] *Apologia ad Constantium*, 14, 15.

[4] See I. Hapgood's edition, pp. 479 ff.

[5] Special provision is made for the case of a wooden church.

sprinkled with holy water and anointed over the doors. Then after prayers candles are lighted and relics are fetched from another church. The Hours follow, and after them the Liturgy is celebrated.

The Latin rite of Dedication has an exceptionally interesting history.[1] Its component parts are Roman and Gallican, each with its distinctive *rationale*.

(*a*) Before the sixth century a Roman Church was dedicated by the saying of Mass in it, relics, if any, having been first deposited. When a ceremony came into use it was virtually identical with the translation of relics. The Bishop solemnly placed the relics in the cavity of the altar-stone, representing the tomb, which he then anointed, inside and out, and sealed. Every church was thus brought into line with the cemetery chapels of the early Roman Church.[2]

(*b*) The Gallican rite 'follows the line prescribed for initiation into the Christian mysteries. Just as the Christian is dedicated by water and oil, by baptism and confirmation, so the altar in the first place, and the church in the second, are consecrated by ablutions and anointing.'[3]

In the present Roman rite, the Blessing and Laying of the Foundation Stone is the first stage. A wooden cross is set up on the site of the future altar, and the corner-stone, representing Christ, is prepared. The Bishop (or priest authorised by the Bishop), after sprinkling the site of the altar with holy water, goes to the stone, which is let down into its place with accompanying prayers. He then traverses the site of the church and its foundations, with lustrations and prayers.

A simple ceremony of Benediction, which may be performed by a priest, precedes the saying of Mass in the completed church.

The actual Consecration may be long deferred. The church must have a fixed altar, detached from the wall, and the places of anointing must be of stone. For some reason or other, even cathedrals have remained unconsecrated.

The ceremony takes place in the morning. The church is completely bare of ornaments, seats, etc. The Bishop is met in the church by the clergy, and a procession is formed to fetch the relics from a neighbouring chapel (or hall); a deacon remains behind. On its return the procession makes a threefold circuit of the exterior, the Bishop sprinkling the walls. After each circuit he knocks at the door and is answered by the deacon, the dialogue being taken from Psalm xxiv. The third time, the door

[1] See Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, pp. 403 ff.

[2] It would be too much to say that the importance attached to relics was a Christianisation of the widespread custom of human sacrifice to ensure the stability of a building (cf. 1 Kings xvi. 34); but the Christian custom at least meets the demands of a persisting human instinct.

[3] Duchesne, p. 413.

is opened and the procession enters. The alphabet ceremony follows: the Bishop traces a St. Andrew's Cross with ashes right across the nave, on which he proceeds to print with the end of his crozier the Greek and Latin alphabets.[1] Lustrations and anointings follow, and the 'initiation' of the church is complete. The translation of the relics follows, and the censings and anointings of the altar; the twelve 'consecration crosses' are anointed in this part of the service. Finally, Mass is sung.

The rite described is an example of symbolism developed to its utmost extent. We are not surprised, therefore, to find it condemned unsparingly by the Puritans, to whom it seemed 'conjuring' and 'juggling of Antichrist.'[2] The question was not pressing in the reformed Church of England, since the number of churches was ample and only rarely was a new church required for a long time to come.[3] The examples, collected by Dr. Wickham Legg, are very few. In 1564 Bishop Grindal and in 1597 Bishop Bancroft dedicated rebuilt churches *per alios*. The first post-Reformation consecration was of a chapel at Croydon, by Bishop Bancroft, commissioned by Archbishop Whitgift. These services are very simple, belonging as they do to a type in which the prayer of consecration is said on entering the church, and special prayers are provided after that 'for the clergy and people' and in the Communion Service. Relics under the altar being now impossible, the guiding principle was that the word of God and prayer, and the celebration of Holy Communion, consecrated the building. The surrender of the land and building by the owner or founder was an indispensable preliminary. Dr. Legg associates this type with the name of Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln.

Bishop Andrewes' form, used for the consecration of Jesus Chapel, Peartree, near Southampton, in 1620, is far more interesting and edifying. The petition of the founder is read outside the church. 'In the name of God then let us begin,' says the Bishop. Psalms xxiv and cxxii follow. Entering the church the Bishop says: 'Let us dedicate and offer unto God this place, with the same prayer that King David did offer up his.' Next comes a perambulation of the church with appropriate prayers

[1] The cross, the Greek X, recalls Christ; the alphabet 'I am Alpha and Omega.' The secular antecedent is the ceremony by which Roman surveyors measured land. The Bishop takes possession of the land in the name of Christ and marks out its boundaries. Like the neophyte in baptism, it is signed with the cross (Duchesne, p. 417).

[2] See Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, v. 12 ff. for a reply to the Puritans.

[3] What follows is based mainly on J. W. Legg's *English Orders for Consecrating Churches in the Seventeenth Century* (Henry Bradshaw Society, XLI). See also Bp. J. Wordsworth's Lecture, *On the Rite of Consecration of Churches* (Church Historical Society, LII); E. C. Harington, *On the Consecration of Churches* (1842); R. W. Muncey, *A History of the Consecration of Churches and Churchyards; Hierurgia Anglicana*, Vol. I, revised edition.

at each place—baptistery, pulpit, lectern, Holy Table, place of matrimony, pavement (for interments). When the Bishop reaches the chancel the congregation is admitted. The idea is to have as many services as possible. In Mattins, Litany, and Holy Communion special prayers are inserted. There was a churching, but no baptism or marriage was convenient. In the Holy Communion the Bishop says the prayer of King Solomon, reads the Act of Consecration, and prays for the founder.

The Convocations in 1662 and again in 1663 discussed the providing of an official form.[1] The Irish Form of Consecrating Churches (1666) was, so Dr. Legg thinks, that compiled by Bishop Cosin for the 1662 Prayer Book. In the first half of the eighteenth century it used to be bound up with the larger Irish Prayer Books, on the authority of the printer, so Archbishop King wrote in 1718. It provided lessons to be read in different parts of the church, a dedication of the altar and a presentation of ornaments, a prayer from the Epistle of St. Clement, and a 'Euphemism,' that is, a cento of verses from the Psalms.

In England a form was approved by both Houses in 1712. In 1714, in response to Letters of Business issued by George I, it was revised, but it never received synodical authority. Based on Bishop Andrewes' form, it was, however, impoverished; the prayers were shortened and the procession to different parts of the church was omitted, the appropriate prayers being said from the altar. This form, with slight modifications, was generally used by the bishops up to the middle of the nineteenth century at least. When evening services became the general rule, some bishops, desiring to have as large a congregation as possible, omitted the Eucharist, or postponed it until the next morning.

The services in current use in the Anglican Communion may conveniently be treated under three heads: (*a*) the Irish, American, and Canadian forms; (*b*) the Scottish form and two English forms (Oxford and Salisbury); (*c*) notes on other English forms.

(*a*) Irish.	American.[2]	Canadian.
Petition to consecrate received at entrance of church, and read.		—
		'Prevent us, O Lord, ...'

[1] T. Lathbury, *History of the Convocation of the Church of England*, pp. 252, 259. In 1640 'some other things there were in proportion and design that never ripened into acts of execution,' *e.g.* a Pontifical, including new offices to be bound with Confirmation and the Ordinal in a separate volume (p. 232, quoting Heylin's *Cyprianus Anglicus*, life of Laud).

[2] This is a revision of the form first put in the American Prayer Book in 1799, which was based on the English 1712 form.

(*a*) Irish.	American.	Canadian.
Psalm xxiv in procession.	—	—
Presentation of deeds [which are laid on altar].	—	—
Bishop's allocution.	—	—
Prayer: 'O eternal God, mighty in power . . .'	—	—
Prayers concerning Baptism, Confirmation, etc., said from Sanctuary.	—	—
Reading of Act of Consecration.	—	—
Morning Prayer, with proper Psalms and Lessons, and prayer for donors.	Prayer for donors. [Morning or Evening Prayer may be said.] ['When there is a Communion.']	[Not specified whether Morning or Evening Prayer.]
The Holy Communion, with proper Collect, Epistle, Gospel, and post-Communion Collects.	—	—

(*b*) Scottish.	Oxford.	Salisbury.
THE PETITION.[1]		
Petition received.	—	—
THE PROCESSION.		
Circuit of the Church, weather permitting.	—	—
Psalms lxxxiv, cxxii.	Litany.	Psalms lxviii, lxxxiv, cxxi, cxxii, cxxvii, cxxxii.
THE ENTRANCE.		
'Lord, have mercy, etc.'	—	—
'Prevent us . . .'		Prayer: 'O Lord, our King and God. . .'
The Bishop knocks three times.	—	—
'Open me the gates . . .'	Dialogue and Prayer.	Dialogue.
'Peace be to this house . . .'	—	—
Psalm xxiv.	Circuit of church within. [Litany or] Psalm lxviii or cxxii.	Psalm xxiv.
Petition read and accepted.	—	—
Keys and title-deeds handed to Bishop.	—	Keys laid on altar.
Prayer.	—	Prayer and *Veni Creator*.[2]

[1] The capitals represent the headings of the various divisions of the service; a peculiarity of the Scottish form.

[2] This was meant by Bishop Wordsworth to represent in the 'initiation' of the church the part played by Confirmation in the initiation of the Christian.

(*b*) Scottish.	Oxford.	Salisbury.
THE LITANY.		
In the Eastern manner.	—	—
Prayer: 'O God, sanctifier of all things . . .'	Prayer: 'O God, who hallowest the places . . .'	Very long prayer, ending in sung ascription of praise, Blessing of font.
THE PRAYER OF DEDICATION.		
Sursum corda and a very long Preface.	—	—
	Preface, shorter and different.	Hallowing of altar and ornaments. Psalm xlii.
BENEDICTIONS.		
Of the font, etc.	[Optional, printed elsewhere in the book.]	—
[These may be said from the Choir.]		[From choir, omitting font and altar.]
	Psalm xliii.	—
	Two prayers.	
THE SENTENCE OF CONSECRATION.		
'Let this house be hallowed and consecrate, in the Name . . .'	—	—
'By the authority committed unto us . . . we set apart for ever . . .'	'By virtue of our sacred office . . . we do now consecrate . . .'	'I declare it to be dedicated. . .'
Prayer of St. Chrysostom.	'Now unto the King . . .'	—
THE HOLY EUCHARIST.		
Proper Collect, etc.	—	—
The keys and title-deeds are presented at the Offertory.		
Proper Preface: 'Who in temples made with hands buildest up for thyself a spiritual temple made without hands. Therefore . . .'		

(*c*) The other English forms for the most part occupy an intermediate position between the simple (*a*) type and the more elaborate (*b*). The following features may be noticed.

'Then shall the Bishop, proceeding to the north side of the sanctuary . . . mark one of the stones with the consecration cross' (Portsmouth). The special benedictions may be omitted (Portsmouth). 'At the first celebration of Holy Communion, in completion of the consecration of the church . . .' (Southwark). It is desirable that a fragment from the Cathedral be built into the wall (Southwark). A service of thanksgiving later in the day, with a baptism, is recommended (Portsmouth). No Holy

Communion is mentioned in Birmingham (1928). The services used at the consecration of Truro (1887) and Liverpool (1924) Cathedrals were very elaborate and impressive.

Laying the Foundation Stone of a Church.

The Canadian Church has included this Office in the Prayer Book. Drawn mainly from the Winchester form, it is simple and impressive. After the Invocation and Versicles and Responses, Psalm lxxxiv is sung and Ezra iii. 10 read. More Versicles and Responses follow, then the prayer 'O Lord Jesu Christ . . .' shortened from the corresponding one in the Roman Pontifical. The words accompanying the laying of the stone, and the Bishop's announcement ('Here let true faith, the fear of God, and brotherly love ever remain. This place is set apart . . .'), also keep closely to the Pontifical. Various prayers conclude the service. The English forms are very like the Canadian. Truro divides the Office into four sections—the Praises, the Prayers, the Stone-laying, the Final Prayers. Salisbury recommends an adaptation of the alphabet ceremony to the Laying of Foundation Stones of a Church, five in number. Four corner-stones of the nave are to be laid by four persons; αωAZ are to be marked on their upper surface. The fifth stone is to be laid by the Bishop at the east end.

Kindred forms to Consecration and Laying of a Foundation Stone are the Dedication of a Mission Chapel; the Consecration of an Altar (by a Bishop only—Oxford, Southwark, etc.); the Benediction of Bells, Organs, Windows, or ornaments of a church; the Reopening of a Church after restoration. Some of these have an interesting history, since their use during the Laudian revival exasperated the Puritans. The consecration of an altar at Wolverhampton in 1635 was referred to in the Puritan Petition of the City of London; also of altar-cloths, 'as they said, to the glory of God'—after the sermon four ministers 'kneeled down and prayed over the cloth and the other consecrated things.' About 1640 a font in Canterbury Cathedral 'was consecrated by the Lord Bishop of Oxford . . . who went about it reading in a book.'[1] In 1637 plate was consecrated in St. George's Chapel, Windsor, by the Bishop of Winchester. 'The prelate with his hand touched every piece severally, as on God's part receiving them'; and then made prayers of Consecration and Benediction of donors. In the same year the Rector of St. Mary Axe, authorised thereto by the Bishop of London, received Communion plate, saying: 'I . . . do put them into His possession' [*i.e.* of

[1] The separate consecration of a font is liturgically important, in view of the baptistery's having been originally separate from the church.

Jesus Christ]; 'at the saying of these words, *and do put them into His possession*, the flagons were set on the Communion-table.' [1]

The Church of St. Werburgh, Bristol, polluted on June 11, 1624, was kept locked till July 11, when it was reconciled by the Bishop. The reopening after restoration, and reconciliation after pollution, of Lichfield Cathedral in 1669 was a very elaborate ceremony.

The Consecration of Churchyards.

In the mediæval rite of Consecrating a Churchyard, found as early as the Pontifical of Egbert, crosses were erected at the four corners of the ground, and a fifth one in the centre. The Bishop went in procession while Psalm li and a Litany were sung, visiting the crosses, which he sprinkled with holy water, and saying prayers at each. The prayer of consecration was said at the central cross and Mass followed. The seventeenth-century forms, given by Dr. Legg, are for the most part short additions [2] to the Consecrations of Churches; in only one case (Dublin, 1667) is the churchyard consecrated independently of the church. The Convocation forms of 1712 and 1715 provide for the reading of the service of the day in church, after which the Bishop goes to the churchyard, the instrument of donation is read, and a prayer said.

The present Irish and Canadian Prayer Books include forms. The Irish provides three psalms and some prayers, followed by the reading of the Act of Consecration. The Canadian has a perambulation of the ground. Among the English diocesan forms the following may be noted: the *Sursum corda* and a Preface precede the consecration in Salisbury, Truro, and Chichester; Chelmsford orders the singing of the hymn 'Abide with me'; Truro restores the ceremony of the five crosses of wood, or, alternatively, five crosses cut in the ground.

Institution and Induction.

According to Professor E. W. Watson, the parish priest in Teutonic countries was originally the man of his secular lord. After the Norman Conquest a Church feudal system was built up in England. The parish clergy 'became the Bishop's men, in the feudal sense, and so they have continued. The promise of canonical obedience and the act of institution are thoroughly feudal.' This change strengthened the position of the clergy, which became more of a freehold than before. The new status of the Bishop was justified by a legal fiction, which was historically

[1] These examples are taken from *Hierurgia Anglicana*, as are those in the next paragraph.

[2] Bishop Andrewes' form (1620), however, is long and divided into two parts by the reading of the Act of Consecration.

baseless. 'It was asserted that parishes had arisen from the delegation by the Bishop of his pastoral duty in parts of his diocese. That was true enough of the towns around the coasts of the Mediterranean, where the churches had originally the Bishop for their one pastor, and the parishes had been separated off one by one. It had never been true of Western Europe. . . . But feudal thought, which assumed that the relation between lord and man began in a grant by the former, was compelled to postulate such a grant from Bishop to priest.'[1]

The ordinary mediæval method,[2] which continued until well within living memory, was for the presentee to come to the Bishop or his delegate, usually at some central or convenient place, and receive admission, usually conveyed *per traditionem bireti*,[3] after taking the oath of canonical obedience in the presence of witnesses. His letters of institution, following a stereotyped form, which varied, however, in different dioceses, were delivered to him, and a mandate for induction was issued to the archdeacon or his official, or the rural dean, or sometimes to special commissaries. There is no hint of any liturgical accompaniment, and this in itself is significant, as no mediæval bishop would have added prayers to such an act unless he had some set form to guide him.[4] I think it probable that, where the act took place, as it generally did, in one of the Bishop's manor-houses, it was in the chapel, which was the normal scene of acts belonging to his spiritual office; and the vicar-general of the Archbishop of York habitually sat for this purpose in the Minster. But it could be performed anywhere, and any itinerary of a mediæval bishop who lived much in his diocese shows that candidates for institution frequently intercepted him at any place on his route from one of his houses to another.

The practice of Archbishop Kempe, a constant absentee from the diocese of York for more than a quarter of a century,

[1] *The Church of England*, pp. 40–42. Cf. H. W. Cripps, *The Law Relating to the Church and Clergy* (6th ed., 1886, p. 465): 'Institution by the ordinary was introduced about the time of Richard I or John'; it replaced investiture by the patron.

[2] Information kindly supplied by Prof. A. H. Thompson. Further valuable help has been given by Canon Christopher Wordsworth, extracts from whose letter is given in the notes.

[3] Nov. 29, 1296, Archbishop Winchelsey's Commissary said: 'Admittimus et te rectorem instituimus ac per birettum nostrum canonice investimus' (Reg. Winchelsey, p. 149). Archbishop Peckham once instituted a vicar 'per librum,' but more usually gave seisin by using his own ring (Register, pp. 122, 129–34), a practice which prevailed in the Cambridge Law School within living memory [Wordsworth].

[4] Canon A. T. Bannister writes that he knows of no evidence in mediæval registers of any liturgical accompaniment.

witnesses; none are more proper than the Bishop's servants; he should take their names. 'The Archdeacon does rarely in person Induct the Clerk, but issues out his warrant *to all Clerks and letter'd Persons* [1] *within the Archdeaconry*, empow'ring them, or any of them, to do it in his stead.' The inductor was usually a neighbouring clergyman. The tolling of the bell was not universal; merely to take hold of the door-handle was enough. 'It has been held sufficient, that the Clerk did, within the time limited, read the *Common Prayer* and *Thirty-nine Articles* in the Church-Porch.' So that there was no reason to say 'that it was done clandestinely; therefore the tolling of the Bell is no insignificant ceremony.'

H. W. Cripps in his *The Law relating to the Church and the Clergy* (pp. 459–480) adds but little to the above account. There are four stages: (1) Presentation; (2) Admission (the Ordinary's approval of the presentee as a fit person); (3) Institution; (4) Induction. The clerk must make the declaration of assent to the Prayer Book and Articles, and the Declaration against Simony, and take the oaths of allegiance and canonical obedience. The Institution may take place outside the diocese. After Institution the clerk is responsible for the cure of souls; he enters on the temporalities, but cannot sue for them until he is inducted. Induction is 'delivery of possession' ('feudum sine investitura nullo modo constitui potest'). It arose at a time when writing was seldom practised, and a public and notorious act was required.

It seems, therefore, that Institution and Induction are by origin two parts of a purely legal ceremony. The modern view, that Institution is the conveyance of the spiritual charge, may seem to be supported by the traditional phrase at Institution,[2] 'Accipe meam curam et tuam,' but is not borne out by the older interpretation of the phrase. These are presumably the words of Institution, 'out of a written Instrument, drawn beforehand for this purpose,' to which John Johnson refers.[3] It was prepared beforehand in the diocesan registry. The direction to kneel, holding the seal appendant, suggests a legal rather than spiritual ceremony. Archbishop Sancroft, one of the most devout of the seventeenth-century prelates, after 1688, merely sent the

[1] Does this suggest that the original purpose of the Mandate of Induction was to ensure that the man who turned up, say, in an Oxford village was the man who had been actually instituted in far-off Lincoln, and that the essence of the ceremony was his identification?

[2] Cf. Sir Simon Degge's *Parson's Counsellor* (1677), where the form is given as: 'Instituo *A. B.* rectorem Ecclesiæ *C.* cum cura animarum: et accipe curam tuam et meam.' Institution is to the benefice, to which the cure of souls is generally attached. But there were sinecures.

[3] *Op. cit.*, i. 81.

message 'Fiat Institutio, W. C.' to his Vicar-general.[1] We now proceed to trace the transformation of both Institution and Induction into impressive services designed to edify both clerk and congregation.

The American Church in 1804 accepted an Office of Induction as an addition to the Prayer Book. It was based upon the Office adopted by the Diocese of New York in 1802. An earlier form was adopted by the Diocese of Connecticut in 1799, possibly going back to some form used in Maryland, where the clergy had claimed the right of Institution and Induction. Canon XVII of 1789 refers to the Induction and Institution of ministers. The 1804 Service was normally taken by a Presbyter appointed by the Bishop, who transmitted a Letter of Induction, which included these words: 'We . . . hereby do Induct you into said Parish, possessed of full Power to perform every Act of sacerdotal function . . . so we authorise you to claim and enjoy all the accustomed Temporalities appertaining to your Cure.' Morning Prayer was said by a visiting priest. After the congregation had been given an opportunity of objecting, the Letter of Induction was read and the Senior Warden handed the keys to the new Rector, who accepted them 'as the pledges of my Induction, and of your parochial recognition.' An Office followed, including a prayer which referred to 'the Ministers of Apostolic Succession.' After a Sermon the new Rector 'shall proceed to the Communion Service, and to administer the holy Eucharist to his Congregation.' A new Canon in 1804 made the right to vote in the Diocesan Convention dependent on Induction.

In 1808, to avoid conflict with the laws of certain States and the rights of some Vestries, the word 'Institution' was used instead of 'Induction,' and the Office was made optional. In 1814 the above-mentioned provision of the 1804 Canon was repealed and election by the parish, duly notified to the Bishop, gave the minister the rights hitherto conveyed by Institution. 'For many years the Office was rarely, if ever, used. Its revival was in the main brought about by Bishop H. C. Potter of New York. He once said that Dr. William Smith (of Connecticut), the compiler of the Office, drew upon Bishop Andrewes. This is the nearest clue we have to its origin.'[2] The present (1929) Book supposes that the Bishop will normally be the Institutor. The Service is substantially as in 1804, but may be used in conjunction

[1] In 1887 the Archbishop of York (Thomson) instituted Canon Vashon Baker to the Rectory of Brandesburton, in a London office; he said that there was nothing spiritual about the ceremony, which was purely legal. The only religious feature we have been able to find in England prior to 1871 is in the Works of Bishop Wilson, v. 217 (Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology), where there is a prayer before Institution, which may have been said with the clerk.

[2] Information kindly supplied by the Rev. E. R. Hardie of New York, who has helped in this section.

with Morning or Evening Prayer, or with the Eucharist, or separately. The newly-instituted priest blesses the congregation, even when the Bishop is present.

The earliest instance in England of a desire for a service seems to be the printing in Warren's *Synodalia* (1853, p. 433) of the Service for the Induction of Ministers to their Cures used in the Diocese of Fredericton. It is the ordinary service with special Psalms, Lessons, Collect, etc.; Institution and Induction apparently being not distinguished. In 1875 a Committee of the Lower House was appointed to prepare an Order of Service, which was commended to the Upper House.

Meanwhile [1] the first Institution and Induction Services had been issued in 1871 by the Bishop of Winchester (Wilberforce), followed by a Lichfield form in 1873 (Bishop Selwyn). Further information is given by the debates in the Lower House in 1876 and 1879. By 1876 Lincoln, Peterborough, and Oxford also had Services of Institution. The Archdeaconry of Sarum had introduced the practice of inducting inside the church. The Archdeacon of Totnes (afterwards Bishop Earle, of Marlborough) had since 1872 used a form which included the perambulation of the church with appropriate lections and prayers at different places.[2] Lord Alwyne Compton, as Archdeacon of Oakham (Peterborough), more than once used a form of Institution and Induction, having been commissioned by the Bishop to institute.[3] Archdeacon Hessey (London Diocese) in 1879 said: 'When I inducted the son of our much-respected Archbishop, his Grace after the service came into the vestry and said, "I never saw anything of this sort before. . . . I approve of this public service most heartily."'

In 1905, Report No. 394 of a Joint Committee revealed a bewildering variety of practice. In its revised form (No. 398, 1906), signed by Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury, it recommended that 'Induction may take place in a purely legal form, without any public service,' or before Morning or Evening Prayer, or as part of a separate service. In 1907 the Report was deferred *sine die*.

[1] In 1873 a Committee appointed by the Lower Houses of Canterbury and York presented a Report containing proposed Canons. No. X was: 'Of the Manner of Instituting or Collating to a Benefice with Cure of Souls.' It provides, for the edification of the laity, that Institution shall always take place in the parish church concerned, after the ordinary service. If the Bishop is unable to be present, he shall issue his commission to another 'spiritual person.' The Induction shall follow 'as soon after as conveniently may be.'

[2] This was evidently inspired by Bishop Andrewes' form of Consecrating Churches. No effort has been spared to trace the origin of this now familiar form; no positive evidence has been found for its composition by Dr. Earle, but that he composed it seems probable.

[3] *E.g.* on April 19, 1877, Institution and Induction of Canon Christopher Wordsworth to the Rectory of Glaston.

The current practice in large rural dioceses is for the Bishop to institute in his private chapel, the Archdeacon or Rural Dean inducting. In dioceses of manageable area the Bishop generally visits the parish to institute in person, and Induction by the Archdeacon or Rural Dean follows immediately. The perambulation of the church usually takes place when the Induction is held alone, but is often omitted when it is combined with Institution.[1]

The Scottish Church has an Office of Institution, in which the Bishop grants and conveys 'the charge and spiritual jurisdiction' over the church to the Rector. The service is mainly taken from the Ordering of Priests. The Irish Prayer Book has a Service of Institution taken by the Bishop. Neither Scotland nor Ireland has any Induction. The Canadian Prayer Book borrows from the American Service the presentation of the Bible and Book of Common Prayer and the delivery of the keys. It distinguishes carefully between 'Institution into the Cure of Souls' and Induction into the Incumbency 'with all the rights and emoluments thereto belonging.'

We have seen Institution, a legal transaction peculiar to Western Europe, turn into a purely spiritual act in Canada. In Scotland it is assimilated to Ordination; in the United States it is little more than a Recognition of Ministers, described as Institution or Induction indifferently. Theoretically a combined Institution and Induction Service is open to objection, for the clerk should not be in the church at all before he is admitted at the door. And the logical form for an Induction Service to assume is the conducting of a Prayer Book service by the newly-inducted clerk, at which the Archdeacon would naturally preach. But 'special services' are popular and the modern English custom is undeniably edifying.[2]

[1] Two other details may be mentioned. A form of combined Institution and Induction, both taken by the Bishop, was published in the fourth edition of *The Priest's Prayer Book* (1870), as part of a Pontifical drawn up by Dr. R. F. Littledale at the request of Bishop Jenner (consecrated for Dunedin in 1866).

'Perpetual Curates,' *i.e.* ministers of most modern parishes, were never instituted or inducted, but were simply licensed. An Act of 1869 gave them the designation of Vicar. Soon afterwards, bishops began to give them the choice of being instituted or licensed. Convocation debates reveal that Institution involved much higher fees.

[2] In the *Codex Juris Canonici* four methods of 'provision' of offices are distinguished: Collation, Institution (after presentation by a patron, or nomination), Confirmation or Admission (after election or 'postulatio'), or simple Acceptance of the elect in cases where Confirmation is not necessary; see Can. 148. Patrons have considerable rights; benefices are called *curata* or *noncurata*, according to whether or no they have the cure of souls annexed to them (1411).

The Making of Deaconesses.[1]

Phœbe is the typical deaconess in the New Testament (Rom. xvi. 1, R.V. Margin). Pliny in his letter to Trajan (*c.* 112) refers to 'ancillæ quæ vocantur ministræ.' After that, evidence for the continued existence of the order is lacking until the third, or even fourth, century. Deaconesses stood in a special relation to the Bishop as regards his dealings with women, assisted at the baptism of members of their sex, visited sick women and took the Eucharist to them, taught women, and acted as doorkeepers on the women's side of the church. In the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 18, 19) the Bishop ordains the deaconess by the laying on of his hand. The later Eastern rite is assimilated to the Ordering of Deacons; the Bishop puts the diaconal stole round her neck, and after Communion gives her the chalice, which she immediately restores to the altar. The Office became obsolete in the Middle Ages. In the West a rite suitable for blessing widows or nuns survived, which has features suggesting its origin in a form for the Ordination of a Deaconess. The modern Roman Pontifical has a rarely used form for blessing a consecrated nun, between the Epistle and the Gospel, which also goes back to the Ordination of a Deaconess.[2]

The modern order of deaconesses originated in the desire to meet practical needs, which it seemed could best be done by reviving the institutions of the Apostolic Church. As early as the sixteenth century there were sporadic instances of deaconesses, but the first important move was the founding of the Kaiserswerth Deaconess House (Lutheran) in 1836. In 1862 Archbishop Tait admitted Elizabeth Ferard to be the first duly ordained deaconess in the Church of England. The American Church had anticipated this step, for a Deaconess House had been opened in Baltimore in 1855. In 1875 Dr. Tait stated in Convocation that he had been in the habit of praying when ladies were set apart for this work. Asked if they were a distinct office, he replied, 'hardly as yet.' The forms used prior to the Lambeth Conference of 1920, which marked an advance in the position given to the Office, may be consulted in *The Ministry of Women*, the Report of a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. In a typical English form (London), the Bishop lays his hand 'on the head of the person to be made deaconess,' blesses her, and says: 'N—, I admit thee to the office of deaconess. In the Name, etc.' In

[1] In the first form of the proposed English Book of 1927 the 1925 Service (see below) was included. Later, however, it was omitted owing to technical difficulties in the presentation of the Book to Parliament. The position of deaconesses in the Anglican Communion is not yet sufficiently established to justify our including them in the chapter on the Ordinal.

[2] For the rather obscure history thus summarised see *The Ministry of Women* (S.P.C.K., 1919).

the American form the Bishop says: 'Take thou authority to exercise the office of a Deaconess in the Church of God, whereunto thou art now set apart.' The order is formally recognised by the Canons of the American Church.

The Upper Houses of Canterbury and York in 1925 adopted a 'Form and Manner of Making of Deaconesses,' in which the following points deserve notice. The form, which comes between the Epistle and the Gospel, follows that for the Ordering of Deacons very closely, its essential features being prayer and the laying on of hands. The Bishop's words are: 'Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deaconess in the Church of God committed unto thee. In the Name, etc.' The work is defined thus: 'It appertaineth to the office of a Deaconess in the place where she shall be appointed to serve, in things both temporal and spiritual; to minister to the welfare and happiness of those to whom she is sent; to give instruction in the Holy Scriptures and in the Christian Faith, and to help the Minister of the Parish in his work of preparing candidates for Baptism and Confirmation; to assist at the administration of Holy Baptism; to advise and pray with such women as desire help in difficulties and perplexities; to intimate the names of those who are in need, sickness, or other distress unto the Minister of the Parish, and to be at his disposition in the work of relief and succour to the parishioners. Will you do this gladly and willingly?'[1]

The Admission of Readers.

To read the Scriptures at a meeting of the faithful was an important function from the first (see Mark xiii. 14; 1 Tim. iv. 13). The president would call upon anyone to read, as he thought fit. But the lectors' status soon became an Office, which was reckoned as a minor rank of the clergy. According to Duchesne,[2] the superior ranks of the minor orders—subdeacon and acolyte—are differentiations of the ministry of the deacon, being concerned with the altar. The other three minor orders are exorcists, lectors and doorkeepers. The subdeacons absorbed the functions of the exorcists, and the lectors constituted the real first order for young clerics. When the special work of reading the lections, other than the Epistle and Gospel, ceased with their disappearance, there was no longer any need for adult lectors, and the juniors who constituted the order were largely identical with the *Schola Cantorum*. The English Church at the Reformation abolished the minor orders, but the 'clerks' of the Prayer Book rubrics are in a sense the representatives of the former 'readers.'

[1] The form for Ordaining Deaconesses in the Nonjurors' Prayer Book of 1734 testifies to a desire to revive primitive institutions, but its interest is purely antiquarian.

[2] See *Christian Worship*, pp. 345 ff.

The modern revival of the Office dates from the appointment of Scripture Readers in town parishes at a period when the masses were largely illiterate and could only know the Bible if it were read aloud to them. The gradual regularising of their position, as shown in the method of admitting them to office, is described in the Chronicle of Canterbury Convocation for 1875. The Archbishop (Dr. Tait) explained that the first stage was the giving of a verbal commission by Bishop Blomfield (London). He himself, when Bishop of London, prayed with the Scripture Readers in his study. His successor transferred the prayers to his chapel. A form had been drawn up some years previously after a meeting at which the four Archbishops (of the United Church of England and Ireland) and nearly all the Bishops were present. It had been generally accepted, and was used by the Bishops in their private chapels.[1]

In 1921 the English Bishops put out a common form. The Readers are presented by 'the Warden,' who testifies that they are 'meet for the duties that will be required of them.' The Bishop delivers a New Testament into the hands of each, with the words: 'I admit thee to the Office of a Reader. In the Name, etc.' The 'duties' are not defined. This vagueness reflects the prevailing uncertainty as to their position and usefulness in the Church of England. In many overseas dioceses their work is of great importance. It should be noted that traditionally they rank below the laymen whose work is connected with the altar, but according to Anglican practice they, being the only laymen admitted to office by the Bishop, would logically come next to the clergy in spiritual precedence.

Admission of Dignitaries to Office.

(a) *The Enthronisation of Bishops.*—This until recently was a mere ceremony, As late as the 1896 edition of Dean Hook's *Church Dictionary* it is contrasted with the 'religious ceremony' of the installation of a Knight of the Garter. A correspondent at Canterbury informs us that 'on several occasions the Archbishops were enthroned by proxy, and the service became almost formal.' The beautiful service at which the present Archbishop (Dr. Lang) was enthroned was composed by Archbishop Lord Davidson, Dr. Bell (the Dean, now Bishop of Chichester), and others. The heart of an enthronement service is the solemn *Te Deum*, which should follow immediately upon the actual enthronement.

(b) *The Installation of Deans.*—Most cathedrals have a service prescribed by the Statutes, whether mediæval as at Lincoln, Marian as at Durham, or modern as at Truro; and all use some authorised form.

[1] Where the Act of Uniformity did not apply.

(c) *Canons, etc.*—In most cathedrals other officials are admitted with prayer and ceremony. The Salisbury Diocesan Service Book has a form in which the Bishop collates to the Prebend or Canonry, saying, 'Accipe curam meam et tuam.'

(d) There is no form, we are told, for institution of Rural Deans before the sixteenth century. It was by 'oral declaration or nomination, and traditional of the decanal seal.' [1] 'There was no great solemnity in appointing men to execute the declining office.' [2]

Reception of Penitents.

The preparation of a form was contemplated in 1640.[3] In *Hierurgia Anglicana* [4] a Form of Receiving Penitents is printed, dating from 1704, put forth by Bishop Wilson for the Diocese of Sodor and Man. In 1713 the Letters of Business included the preparation of an official form; this was done, but the form was not authorised.

The Reception of Schismatics.

In 1854 a desire was expressed in Convocation for a service for admitting converts from the Church of Rome. That prepared by the Upper House of Convocation in 1714 was recommended by the Committee on Church Services, with a few modifications. A form was put out by Bishop Creighton for the Diocese of London in 1898, based on that which had been before the Upper House in 1891. It provides that such reception is not 'necessary in the case of foreigners in Catholic Communion who shall desire to become Communicants of the Church of England.' The lesson is the Parable of the Lost Sheep. The 'penitent' is asked: 'Dost thou renounce the errors of thy former conversation?' [5] Another form, published by the S.P.C.K., is entitled 'A Form for receiving Lay-persons already confirmed into the Church of England.' The applicant is merely questioned as to the baptismal vows, and whether he intends 'to abide in the Communion of the Church of England in faithful membership.' [6] This was superseded by 'A Reception Office,' issued by the Bishops in 1932, which has more searching questions.

Rogationtide Devotions.

In Queen Elizabeth's reign Royal Injunctions ordered the perambulation of the parish at Rogationtide to be continued, with

[1] Dansey, *Horæ Rurales Decanicæ*, i. 132–4.
[2] White Kennett, *Parochial Antiquities*, ii. 358.
[3] T. Lathbury, *History of the Convocation*, p. 232. [4] iii. 89 (1904 edition).
[5] Church Historical Society (old series), No. XLIX.
[6] Reception of a person from a non-episcopal communion naturally takes the form of Confirmation.

certain proper psalms. As late as 1581 Bishop Chaderton of Chester found it necessary to forbid 'banners, crosses, handbells, or any such-like popish ceremonies' in these processions.[1] In their secular form of 'beating the bounds' of the parish the perambulations have continued down to our own time. In some places a devotional observance, with litanies, etc., has been revived, and authorised diocesan forms have been put forth. However, Archbishop Tait's words to Convocation in 1875 seem to hold good. He had been asked about a service for the launching of a ship. But it is not held in church, so the Act of Uniformity does not apply; 'a clergyman is at liberty to use any service he pleases.'

Healing.

Hierurgia Anglicana [2] prints a form of 'Prayers at the Healing.' Mark xvi. 14 ff. is read; at the words 'they shall lay their hands, etc.' the infirm persons are presented to the King upon their knees, and he lays his hands upon them. Then John i. 1 ff. is read; at 'that light was the true light' they are presented again, 'and the King puts his gold chain about their necks.' In Queen Anne's reign a form for touching for the King's Evil (scrofula) was printed at the end of the Prayer Book; the subject, however, was never discussed in Convocation.[3]

Parochial Offices, etc.

It is sufficient to remark on the distance travelled between the time when a Harvest Thanksgiving Service was held to be illegal[4] and Children's Services were painfully designed to conform to the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act[5] to the year 1920, when Bishop Burge wrote his preface to the Oxford Diocesan Service Book. He sanctions the use of Dr. Eck's *Parochial Office Book*, and adds: 'It is not necessary to obtain any sanction for non-liturgical services, in which no set form is used, such as Prayer Meetings, Mission Services, Services of Intercession, the "Three Hours' Service," provided such services are in accord with the standard of the Prayer Book. Such services should be conducted elsewhere than in the chancel, and may be conducted without a surplice.'

Among other forms put out by Diocesan authority may be mentioned: The Opening of a Synod of Clergy, a Bidding Prayer,

[1] W. P. M. Kennedy, *Elizabethan Episcopal Administration*, I. xliii, lxxv.
[2] iii. 176.
[3] Lathbury, *History of Convocation*, p. 361.
[4] See *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1863.
[5] See p. 787.

Episcopal Benedictions [1] (Salisbury); the Benediction of a Vicarage, including the garage (Portsmouth); and a Service for Ringers (Oxford). Many services for occasional needs, such as Armistice Day celebrations, are put out by the S.P.C.K., sometimes with the approval of the Archbishops, sometimes on the initiative of the Society. Whether they may be used in church depends entirely on the individual diocesan.

Our concluding remarks, like much of the foregoing, apply to the Provinces of Canterbury and York only, though other Churches and Provinces may learn from our wisdom and our mistakes. If some of our diocesan forms have given a lead to the whole Anglican Communion, we have clearly suffered from an excess of individualism. It cannot be a good thing for the 43 English dioceses to set to work on building up Diocesan Service Books. This is a waste of energy and uneconomical; besides, it would be too much to expect the requisite liturgical knowledge to be available in each diocese. Again, it is open to objection when, as sometimes happens, a new Bishop embarks on a revision of the existing forms in accordance with his private views shortly after they have been carefully revised by his predecessor.

If we may be allowed to suggest a policy, something like the following would seem desirable.

In the first place, let a large number of services be recognised as best left to the discretion of the clergy, at any rate for the present. For example, no good purpose is served when a diocese puts out an official Children's Service, thus stereotyping what should be flexible.

The remaining Services and Forms are either proper to the Bishop, in which case they will be the nucleus of a Pontifical, or belong to the parish priest's Manual of Supplementary Offices. The Pontifical is solely a matter for the Upper Houses of Convocation. The Order of Making Deaconesses has already been authorised. It would be a simple matter to add from time to time authorised forms of collation and institution, consecrating of churches and churchyards, the opening of a synod, admission of converts in holy orders, etc.

The Manual would be compiled and promulgated by the Convocations, and would contain material needed by the parish priest in his pastoral capacity. But a word of warning should be given. For the purposes of this chapter the whole of the records

[1] A number of Benedictions are printed in *The Priest's Prayer Book*. The Preface says: 'Although some of the Benedictions are properly episcopal, they are so as a matter of order, and not of essential right.' For the modern Roman Benedictions see *Liturgia*, pp. 787–90. Thirteen are reserved to the Ordinary or his delegate; 66 have some other limitation; 70 others, varying from bees to a seismograph, are within the competence of the parish priest.

of Convocations since 1852 have been studied. A perusal of them shows that a great deal of energy has been wasted in producing prayers and services which have not come into general use. They have been far too 'official' in tone to have any chance of acceptance. The co-operation of liturgical scholars and working parish priests is necessary. It would be better for the Convocations to aim at a small output of services likely to be permanently useful than to try to cover the ground. The submission of proposed forms to the Diocesan Synods of Clergy for their suggestions would help the Convocations to avoid repeating past mistakes.

ANGLICAN ADAPTATIONS OF SOME LATIN RITES AND CEREMONIES

By K. D. MACKENZIE

(a) *Ceremonies belonging to special occasions in the liturgical year.*

One of the chief effects of the Oxford Movement has been an increased sense of the value of the liturgical year. Puritanism detested the cycle of festival and fast, which seemed to fly in the face of St. Paul's rebuke of the observance of 'days and months and times and years.' If the Puritans had had their way there would be no Christmas, no Easter, no Pentecost. The Anglican Reformers refused to bind themselves by such rigid scripturalism, and accepted the position that 'the Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies' (Art. XX). At the same time they claimed that "every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, or abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority' (Art. XXXIV). Abolition was in the air, and the watchword of the Anglican reforms was, for doctrine, 'Back to the Scripture, as interpreted by the Fathers,' and for ritual, 'Back to the primitive Church.' The result was that, though in theory the Reformers advocated the retention of old ceremonies which were edifying (see Cranmer's Preface, *Of Ceremonies*), the result in practice was something like a clean sweep of all the distinctively mediæval ritual. Nearly all the special ritual observances of the liturgical seasons were of mediæval growth; and therefore the consequence of the application of Anglican principles in this matter has been, to put it frankly, that the official Anglican ecclesiastical year has a very monotonous character. To take a striking example, there is no ritual or ceremonial difference between Good Friday and Easter Day, except that the variable parts of the service bear on the subjects of the day, and that there are three Collects on Good Friday, while on Easter Day a special canticle takes the place of the *Venite*. The only special service for a special day is the somewhat forbidding Commination on Ash Wednesday.

But the position which the Tractarians had to face was more depressing still. Hanoverian sluggishness had almost effected what Puritan zeal had failed to produce, and the observance

even of Lent, Holy Week, and the feasts of the Saints had well-nigh disappeared from ordinary Anglican Church life. No doubt the deadness of the times must not be exaggerated; the very fact that Nelson's *Companion to the Fasts and Festivals of the Church* continued to appear in new editions during the whole of the Hanoverian period must to some extent modify what has been said. Still, on the whole it is true to say that one of the first tasks of the Tractarians was to revive what had been left to Anglicanism of the light and shade of the Christian Year. The name of Keble springs to the mind in this connection.

But when all had been done, and even when the unauthorised revival of hymnody had infused a little more life and variety and some of the power of religious association into the observance of the seasons of the Church, it remained true that sixteenth-century iconoclasm had made it difficult to enter into the full and beautiful variety with which the mediæval Church had adorned individual fasts and festivals. When once the ceremonial revival had begun, it was inevitable that men should look back with envy upon the historic observances of Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, and Holy Week, and should ask whether it was not possible to have these powerful aids to devotion restored within the English Church. Obviously this depended on whether the principle that omission is equivalent to prohibition is a true one or not. If not, there is no reason why they should not be revived or borrowed, simply on the ground that if we see a good custom anywhere we cannot do better than adopt it, unless such adoption actually conflicts with obligations which we are bound to observe.

On examination it was found that most of these ceremonies were, in fact, external to the actual liturgy of the day, and it therefore seemed to an increasing number of the clergy that there could be no more harm in performing them than there was in holding any other service, such as a Prayer Meeting or a Harvest Thanksgiving, which did not conflict with the authorised ritual of the Book of Common Prayer. It was recognised, of course, that the bishop's *jus liturgicum* would give him the right to forbid them, if he chose so to do, but, failing such action on his part, it seemed allowable to make the experiment.

Some of the clergy therefore attempted a direct revival of the mediæval customs, others simply translated the modern Latin rites into English and used them in full, others adapted them by drastic abbreviation.

The origin of the ceremonies.—There have been two districts in which, at different periods, dramatic ceremonial has enjoyed great popular favour in connection with the rites of the Church. One was Jerusalem. From the first moment at which the peace of the Church allowed Christianity to come out into the open,

the Christians of the holy city delighted to observe the times and places of our Lord's life and sufferings by yearly ceremonial acts of recollection. A document known as the *Peregrinatio Etheriæ* gives an interesting account of the customs of the Church of Jerusalem towards the end of the fourth century. From this we learn that there was a procession on the Feast of the Purification, a special commemorative service at Bethany on the eve of Palm Sunday, and on the afternoon of the day itself a procession from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem with palms and the anthem 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' In the same way the faithful followed the story of the Passion, moving from place to place according to the narrative of the Gospels. On Good Friday morning at the actual site of Golgotha the whole assembly, having already kept vigil in the garden of Gethsemane and visited the column of the Flagellation, passed one by one in front of the relic of the holy Cross and kissed it with great devotion.

At a later date the churches of North-Western Europe were the great homes of dramatic ceremonial. The Gallican rite always tended to greater elaboration and complexity than the Roman, and even after it had been almost everywhere abandoned in favour of the latter, the Gallican affection for the florid still lingered in its ancient homes. Thus for our present purpose it is interesting to notice how in the Sarum rite on Candlemas Day an image of the Child Jesus met the procession as it entered the church, so as to reproduce as far as possible the scene in the Temple at Jerusalem. So at Canterbury, as early as the eleventh century, the Blessed Sacrament was carried in the procession on Palm Sunday. The Easter sepulchre, of which the remains are to be found in so many English churches, represents also a far more dramatic symbolism than anything that has ever been known in Rome. A Host was 'buried' on Good Friday, and brought back to the Altar with great solemnity on Easter Day. This ceremony was carried out in addition to that which will be described below, and should be carefully distinguished from it.

The influence of Rome until quite modern times has always been in the direction of curtailing ceremonial. It is perhaps worth drawing attention to this point, in view of the frequently used argument that the floridity of Italian taste is unsuited to the cold austerity of the Northern temperament. As a matter of fact, none of the symbolical ceremonies of the liturgical year is of pure Roman origin, with the possible exception of the Candlemas ceremonies, which may have had some connection with the pagan Ambarvalia.[1] They are all non-Roman decorations

[1] The washing of feet as a ceremony distinctive of Maundy Thursday may also be of Roman origin. See below, p. 736.

which, with some purging, have been admitted into the Roman rite.

So far as the author is aware, no attempts have been made to introduce into Anglican churches what may be called the ultra-dramatic mediæval ceremonies, even in those churches which in the main base their ceremonial arrangements on the Sarum rite.

Candlemas.—The observance of this feast by a special procession had spread to Rome by the seventh century, but the blessing and distribution of candles, which is the distinctive feature of the present ritual, cannot be traced further back than the eleventh. The symbolism is direct, obvious, and very beautiful; the Candlemas procession is the entry of the true Light into the world, and the gradual illumination of the whole world by Him. This is expressed by the lighting of the candles from each other until they are held by the whole congregation, and also by the carrying of the lights into every part of the church during the procession.

The candles at the beginning of the service are placed on a table near the south corner of the Altar. The celebrant, accompanied, if possible, by deacon and subdeacon, approaches the Altar wearing a violet cope. He recites certain prayers of blessing, and sprinkles and censes the candles. These two actions may be taken to represent ceremonially the result of the blessing of anything for a sacred purpose. The sprinkling represents the negative result, a holy object is one which is purified from all lower associations: the censing represents the positive result, a holy object is one which is sanctified for a religious purpose. It is not to be supposed that the sprinkling and censing themselves produce these results. They merely express symbolically the effect of the prayer of blessing which has just been uttered.

After the blessing of the candles they are distributed to the congregation, who come and kneel for the purpose at the Communion rail or at the entrance to the chancel. The choir meanwhile sing the *Nunc Dimittis*, treating verse 4 as a refrain after each of the other verses. Finally, the candles are lighted and carried round the church in procession.

This service takes place on February 2nd in any case, even though (through one of the three Sundays before Lent falling on the same day) the observance of the feast may be postponed. If, however, as normally happens, the procession takes place on the Feast of the Purification, the celebrant changes into white vestments as soon as it is over and proceeds to the celebration of the Eucharist. In this case the candles are again lighted and held at the Gospel, and from the beginning of the canon to the end of the Communion.

This ritual is often used in its entirety in Anglican churches, the only change being that it is translated into English.

Ash Wednesday.—The observance of Lent, as the Commination Service reminds us, is originally connected with the system of public penance. From about the seventh century those who had committed serious sins, and were prepared to submit to public penance, were sent into a monastery at the beginning of Lent for their penitential exercises and did not emerge until just before Easter. In Rome such penitents were ceremonially presented with a hair shirt on Ash Wednesday in token of what was in store for them.

A little later, with the decay of public penance, the idea grew up of the whole Church putting itself to penance during Lent, and already we find the connection of 'ashes' with the title of the first day of Lent in the eighth century. Ælfric, *c.* 1000, recommends the pouring of ashes on the head in token of penitence at this time, and the Council of Beneventum (1091) seems to assume it as a general custom.

The present Latin custom is to bless the ashes in church and immediately afterwards to touch with them the foreheads of the congregation one by one. The service in the *Missale Romanum* is very like that for Candlemas Day. The ashes are blessed, sprinkled and censed; and the people kneel to receive them as they do to take the candles in the Candlemas ceremony; but there is, of course, no procession. This service, like the other, is often merely translated into English and used in Anglican churches without alteration.

Palm Sunday.—The ceremonial of Palm Sunday is in its essence far more ancient than that of the two solemnities we have hitherto considered. We have already seen how even in the fourth century there was a procession with palms in the Holy Land. The mere fact that the observance always fell on a Sunday meant that the ceremonial could always be carried out with some pomp and dignity, and its position as the inauguration of the most solemn week of the year naturally gave it a prominence beyond that of less important days.

We notice at once that the service for the blessing of palms, unlike those for the blessing of ashes and candles, has a complete liturgical structure of its own. It is a service, not a mere blessing of something to be used in a service. As we shall see, it has a form very like that of the Mass itself; and some have thought that it is the relic of a Mass said in the early morning, in addition to the usual mid-morning Sunday liturgy. It is perhaps more probable that it represents a service which took place at another church than that in which the great Mass of the day was to be celebrated. The palms would thus be blessed at the close of service in one church, and carried in procession to the other.

The service, as it stands in the Latin rite to-day, begins with an antiphon which reminds us of the introit of the Mass. This is followed by a Collect, a lesson, a chant (corresponding to the gradual or tract) and a Gospel. All these are recited with the same solemnity as the corresponding features of a High Mass, except that the celebrant wears a cope instead of a chasuble. A Eucharistic preface follows with Sanctus and Benedictus: then, corresponding to the canon of the Mass, comes the blessing of the palms in a form similar to the blessings used on Candlemas and Ash Wednesday. The palms are distributed, carried in procession, and held at the Gospel. The procession on this day goes outside the church, if possible, and a station is made outside the principal entrance. Meanwhile the hymn *Gloria, laus et honor* is sung by cantors within the church and the rest of the choir outside answers with the refrain. At the end of the hymn the subdeacon strikes the door with the end of the processional cross, the door is opened and the procession enters the church. (In the Sarum rite three other stations were made: one for the reading of the appropriate Gospel, one before the Rood, and a final one before the Altar.) Then Mass begins and is sung as usual, with one very striking variation. The greater part of the Gospel is not sung with the usual ceremonies, but chanted dramatically by three deacons, while the choir sing the words which belong to 'the multitude.' The last few sentences of the Gospel are sung by the deacon of the Mass in the usual way, except that the acolytes do not carry their candles. Usually they hold palm branches instead.

The whole of the Palm Sunday service is of the most exquisite beauty, and there seems no reason why its special ceremonies should not be used in their completeness in Anglican churches. For the most part they fall outside the official service of the Book of Common Prayer, and the singing of the Passion by three deacons and the choir is no more than a technical breach of the rubric which says 'then shall *he*' (*i.e.* apparently the celebrant) 'read the Gospel.' (The rubric in the English 1928 Revision is as follows: 'The Deacon or Priest that readeth the Gospel . . . shall say . . . And the Gospel shall be read.' The same revision allowed the whole of the Passion according to Matthew to be used on Palm Sunday, instead of only the 27th chapter, as provided in the Book of Common Prayer, and recognised the distinction between the 'Passion' and the 'Gospel.') It must be acknowledged, however, that the service is a very long one, and in many churches the preliminary service for the blessing of the palms is considerably curtailed.

Maundy Thursday.—From the earliest times this day has been kept with great solemnity in commemoration of the Last Supper and the institution of the Holy Eucharist. It is natural, there-

fore, that it should have always been a day of general Communion. So also in the early Middle Ages was Good Friday. But because the whole weight of tradition has always been against the idea of actually celebrating the Eucharist on Good Friday, it was necessary to reserve the Blessed Sacrament against the Communion of the following day. Hence comes the most notable peculiarity of the Maundy Thursday Mass, the fact that the Consecration is deliberately arranged to provide for Communion on Friday as well as on Thursday. The custom of concluding what Anglicans call the 'Ante-Communion service' by a public Communion with the previously consecrated Sacrament has been common in the Church from the earliest times, and not only on Good Friday. The Quinisext Synod (692) approves it as already ancient. In the East to the present day it is the regular official form of service for all Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent. But in mediæval times in the West this rite was only used on Good Friday, and thus on Maundy Thursday attention was vividly called to the fact that the service was, so to say, to be continued on the morrow. A second Host of suitable size was consecrated and reserved conspicuously in a place of great dignity. (In the Sarum rite *two* additional Hosts were used, one being required for the Easter sepulchre.) By the close of the Middle Ages frequent Communion had quite died out, and in consequence no Communion was contemplated for Good Friday on the part of anyone except the celebrant. No special reservation was therefore made for a general Communion.

In the Roman Church there is normally only one Mass in any one church on Maundy Thursday, a reversion to the archaic custom that all should usually assemble together to feast on the Bread of life.[1] The rite is celebrated in white vestments, and concludes with the solemn placing of the Holy Sacrament in what the Missal calls a *locus aptus* until it is needed for the Good Friday Communion. It is usual to ring the bells and play the organ at the singing of *Gloria in excelsis*, and neither are heard again until the first Mass of Easter. In the course of this Mass, in cathedrals, the bishop consecrates the three holy Oils for the use of his diocese during the succeeding twelve months: the *Oleum Infirmorum* during the canon, the Chrism and the *Oleum Catechumenorum* after the Communion.

After the service the altars are stripped, and in some places the

[1] But curiously enough in the primitive Church Maundy Thursday was an exception to the general custom. St. Augustine testifies to two Masses on that day, the earlier for those who wished to take a bath, the later for those who desired to fast all day. In Rome about the sixth century there were three Masses, one for the reconciliation of penitents, one for the blessing of the oils, and one for the commemoration of the Last Supper. See Schuster. *The Sacramentary*, Vol. II. pp. 13–20, 199; Cabrol, *Liturgical Prayer*, p. 165.

mediæval custom of washing them with wine and water is still retained.

Later in the day all bishops and abbots perform the ceremony of the Maundy, or feet-washing. The name of Maundy Thursday seems to be derived from the *Mandatum* given on that day by our Lord: 'Ye also ought to wash one another's feet.' But there does not seem to be any clear evidence of the date when the solemn ceremonial action of the *pedilavium* was first performed. A Council at Toledo in 694 enacted that all superiors were to wash the feet of their subjects, but says nothing about the day on which this was to be done. In the latter half of the twelfth century the custom was already established in Rome as part of the regular routine of Maundy Thursday. After Mass the Pope used to wash the feet of twelve subdeacons, and again after supper the feet of thirteen poor men. It is said that the number of thirteen originated in a miraculous appearance of our Lord Himself when St. Gregory the Great was performing the action. If this story has any historical basis it of course provides a far earlier date.

Modern Latin practice confines the ceremony for the most part to prelates, but in theory it can be performed by simple priests, or even, unliturgically, by lay people of either sex.

The liturgical rite is short and simple. The celebrant wears violet vestments, the deacon and subdeacon white. The deacon sings the appropriate Gospel with the usual ceremonies. Then the celebrant removes his cope and girds himself with a towel. He kneels before each of thirteen poor men,[1] washes his right foot, wipes and kisses it. Alms are distributed. The celebrant then resumes his cope and finishes the service at the Altar with the Pater Noster, versicles and responses, and a prayer.

In mediæval times emperors and kings delighted thus to express humility. The King of Spain continued to do so until 1931. Indeed we have here a unique instance of a special Holy Week ceremony which survived the English Reformation; for it was regularly performed by the Sovereign until the time of James II. William III and his successors discontinued the practice, as is not surprising.

At Westminster Abbey the Sovereign, by the hands of his representatives, the Lord High Almoner and the Sub-Almoner, makes a gift of money to selected poor men and women, the number of the recipients equalling the years of his own age. The ceremonial contains many reminiscences of earlier customs. The Almoner still removes his cope and girds himself with a towel, as though about to perform an actual *pedilavium*. The long thongs of the purses were originally meant for fastening into the towel, or into the girdle of the alb. Those who conduct the

[1] Or, alternatively, thirteen canons, according to the *Cærimoniale Episcoporum*.

ceremony are provided with bunches of flowers and foliage. These are a survival of the fragrant herbs with which the Yeomen of the Laundry perfumed the water in which they carried out a preliminary ablution. It has even been suggested that the red and white colours of the purses which contain the alms have their origin in the gift of three red and three white herrings given by the munificence of Cardinal Wolsey in 1530! Until the nineteenth century actual clothes and provisions were given as alms as well as money. At the present day an additional sum of money is given in lieu of these. In 1932 King George V gave the purses of money in person.

The actual service consists of psalms, anthems and prayers, and does not bear any similarity to the Latin rite.[1]

A few Anglican bishops have now revived the blessing of the holy Oils during the course of the Maundy Thursday liturgy; but it is obvious that there are more difficulties in adapting some of the special ceremonies of the day to the Anglican rite than in the cases of Candlemas and Palm Sunday. The little ceremony of the bells and the organ loses all point if the *Gloria* is sung at the end of the service. The white vestments accord very ill with the story of the Passion which is assigned as the Gospel of the day. The former ceremony therefore has to be omitted unless the priest thinks himself justified (just for once) in having the *Gloria* sung in its traditional place. Probably all priests who use vestments wear white ones on this day; and a way out of the second difficulty might be found by having the story of the Passion sung by three deacons with violet stoles and maniples as on the earlier days of Holy Week, and supplementing the rite with a Gospel borrowed from the Missal, for which the white dalmatic would be suitable. But of course there is no authority for this.

Good Friday.—The chief service of this day has from the very earliest times been what Anglicans call the Ante-Communion. That is to say, it has consisted of readings, psalm-singing and prayers. The first part of the so-called Mass of the Presanctified in the Roman Missal is perhaps the most primitive thing which it contains, if we except the bare essentials of the sacrificial action. To this from very early times two additions have been made. One is the veneration of the Cross. In origin, as we have seen, this was the veneration of an actual relic kept at Jerusalem, but it was not long before the desire to live in spirit in Jerusalem on this day caused the custom to grow up of venerating a representation of the Cross at the end of the ordinary service of the day. In the ninth century the affecting chant known as the Reproaches began to be sung while the veneration was in progress. The other addition is a Communion made with the

[1] The writer is indebted for this information to the courtesy of Mr. Egbert Ratcliffe, of the Royal Almonry.

previously consecrated Sacrament. The Missal provides for both of these additional rites. At the end of the solemn Collects (probably the last survivors of the primitive 'Prayer of the faithful') the celebrant removes from the cross the Passiontide veil, singing, as he does so, the chant *Ecce lignum crucis*. The cross is then laid on a cushion and all who so desire come up and reverently kiss it.

The veneration ended, the Holy Sacrament is solemnly brought to the Altar, incense is offered, and the Lord's Prayer is sung with the Embolismus (an ancient prayer which takes up the last clause of the Pater Noster and proceeds *Libera nos, quæsumus Domine, ab omnibus malis*, etc.). The celebrant then communicates and the service at once comes to an end.

It will be seen that this service also seems to require a certain amount of adaptation in order to fit it in with the Anglican rite. But when once it is recognised that the first part of it is simply the Latin form of the Ante-Communion service, it will be seen that the Anglican form can be substituted without impropriety. As soon as this is over we can proceed to the Veneration of the Cross. The act of Communion at the end of the service is perhaps the most moving ceremony of the whole liturgical year. No one who has not experienced it can realise what a climax it makes to the observance of Good Friday, or how near we are brought in spirit to the Divine Victim of the Cross. In theory perhaps we ought to wish for a restoration of the *general* Communion of Good Friday, but in practice the very fact of abstinence from Communion is felt by many to enhance the essential feeling of the day, that the Bridegroom is taken away from us.

Holy Saturday.—The ancient way of observing Easter Eve and Easter Day was to treat the former as a solemn fast without public worship until the evening. Then began the great Easter vigil service lasting all night, and culminating in the Baptism and Confirmation of neophytes and the great Easter Mass, which began about dawn. The present Holy Saturday function of the Roman Missal is simply the Easter vigil and Mass anticipated. It is, in fact, an attempt to keep a vigil without sitting up all night! If this is to be done, and if the Mass is still to be kept as the climax of the vigil without a night interposing, it is clear that either the Mass must be sung on Saturday night, or else the vigil service must be brought a long way forward. The former course is practically excluded by the rule of the fast before Communion, and thus the custom has arisen of celebrating both the vigil service and the Mass on Saturday morning. To some this appears to be an entirely indefensible arrangement, and some Roman Catholic authorities criticise it severely; others, however, regarding it as a development which has seemed good

to the Church and has now a long history behind it, find no difficulty in accommodating their minds to it, and simply beginning their Easter on the morning of Easter Eve. They would argue that in practice *everything* is anticipated in Holy Week. The Palm Sunday procession really took place in the afternoon. The Maundy Thursday Mass and the Good Friday function are liturgically afternoon services, and in collegiate churches are not celebrated until after the service of None (anticipated like everything else). Mattins and Lauds are commonly said in the afternoon or evening before the day to which they properly belong, and in Holy Week this is always done in the most marked and ceremonious manner, in the service known as Tenebræ. Thus the only important service which is proper to the daytime of Easter Eve has already been said on Good Friday, and the forestalling of the Easter vigil and Mass is merely a still more extreme case of that anticipation which the Church allows as a concession to bodily weakness.

The Holy Saturday service in the Missal is fivefold. It begins with the blessing of the new fire. The actual origin of this ceremony is probably mixed. In part it seems to be a revival of the ancient daily custom of prayer at the lighting of the lamps, a custom attested by the well-known hymn ' O gladsome Light.' It may also be connected with Celtic pagan customs. But as a piece of Paschal symbolism it is most beautiful and stirring. All lamps in the church have been extinguished and a fire struck from a flint burns in the church porch. This fire is blessed by the celebrant, and from it is lighted a triple taper which is carried up the church by the deacon, wearing a white dalmatic. Three stations are made, at each of which are sung the words *Lumen Christi*. On arriving at the sanctuary the deacon sings a magnificent chant announcing the Paschal victory. During the course of this he lights the great Paschal candle which burns at all liturgical services during Eastertide. Then all the lamps are lit.

Why this festival feature comes so early in the service it seems impossible to say; for when it is finished the deacon resumes his violet vestments, and the vigil service begins. This consists of twelve lessons from the Old Testament, each followed by a prayer. Next comes the blessing of the font, or rather of the baptismal water. The night of Easter Eve is the ancient time for Baptism, and the Latin custom is to bless the water on this occasion (and on the vigil of Pentecost) and let it serve, so far as possible, for all future baptisms. It is possible, of course, to bless baptismal water at any time, but it is not, as with us, a regular feature of the administration of the Sacrament. Baptism and even Confirmation still take place occasionally as part of the service of Holy Saturday, but in any case every church which

possesses a font is obliged to have the blessing on this occasion. The procession then returns to the sanctuary singing a litany. On arriving there the celebrant and sacred ministers remain prostrate until the litany is nearly over. Then they retire to the sacristy to vest for the Easter Mass. The final Kyrie of the Litany is treated as the Kyrie of the Mass. There is no introit, and Mass begins at once with the *Gloria*, during which, as on Maundy Thursday, all the bells are rung. Also during the *Gloria* the Passiontide veils are removed from all pictures and images in the church.

This Mass has several peculiarities. It has an archaic character. With the exception of the *Gloria* (inserted for obvious reasons) all chants except the most ancient are omitted. There is no introit, nor creed, nor Offertory antiphon, nor *Agnus Dei*, nor Communion antiphon. Only the chants before the Gospel, and the *Sanctus*, are sung. Strangely enough the immemorial kiss of peace is omitted. Immediately after the Epistle, *Alleluia*, silent since Septuagesima, returns to the liturgy. The celebrant sings it three times, answered by the choir. The end of the Mass is very curious, incorporating into itself Vespers in miniature. Instead of the Communion antiphon one psalm (of only two verses) is sung, followed at once by the *Magnificat* and by a Collect which serves both for the post-communion prayer and for the Collect of Vespers.

This service has not been so widely adopted in the Anglican Communion as the Holy Week ceremonies properly so called. Many priests feel that they cannot bring themselves to anticipate Easter in this way. Moreover, the great length of the service certainly makes it a most exhausting finale to Holy Week. On the other hand, its beauty and historical interest have led others to revive it, and it must be remembered that the first Mass of Easter, the climax of the Easter vigil, is liturgically the greatest service of the year, and it is in every way suitable that it should be marked by special observances.

It might be thought that some attempt would have been made to restore the service to something like its proper time. This could be done in various ways, either by separating the vigil service from that of Easter, and holding the former on Saturday evening, and the latter, beginning with the litany, on Sunday morning; or by beginning the service at, say, 10.30 p.m. and singing the Mass at midnight, a course which might be thought to require the permission of the Ordinary; or by beginning at about 4.30 a.m. and so restoring the Mass to its original character as a service for the dawn. Some churches have established a custom of blessing the new fire and lighting the Paschal candle after Evensong on Saturday, but no attempt seems to have been made to restore the vigil as a night service.

Tenebræ.—The service known by this name is simply the Mattins and Lauds of the last three days of Holy Week, sung by anticipation in the afternoon or evening of the preceding day. In parish churches of the Latin rite these are the only occasions on which Lauds is ever sung publicly. In consequence these three offices have come to hold the position of special Holy Week services. They are accompanied by a remarkable ceremony. A triangular stand of candles is placed near the Altar and one candle is extinguished at the end of each psalm, until only one is left alight. Then, during the *Benedictus*, the Altar candles and any non-ceremonial lights are put out. Finally, the one remaining candle is concealed behind the Altar while the *Miserere* is said or sung. Then, after the Collect of the day, there is a time of silence, broken at last by a *strepitus* (any kind of harsh noise) which is the signal for departure. The remaining candle is then brought out and left alight at the top of the stand.

The symbolism of all this points very clearly to the death of our Lord with the physical and spiritual darkness and disturbance which accompanied it. The one candle concealed yet still alight seems to typify the descent of His Soul into Hades, and its restoration to the top of the candlestick may be a foreshadowing of the Resurrection.

It is obvious that there is no proper place for this service in the Anglican rite. It is an integral part of the regular course of the Latin offices which continues throughout the year. If it is taken over it must be simply on the pragmatic ground of its beauty and its associations. In other words, it must be treated as though it were really a special Holy Week service, and of course it must be recited in addition to the regular Anglican Morning and Evening Prayer. Used in this way it is liturgically a solecism, but that does not prevent it from having its peculiar beauty and appeal.

A very praiseworthy attempt has been made to provide an Anglican Tenebræ, by grafting on to the appointed order of Morning Prayer some of the most striking features of the Latin office, and in particular the lessons from the Lamentations which the Book of Common Prayer has rather strangely relegated to the earlier part of Holy Week.[1] It is recognised by the compilers that this service could only be substituted for the regular office by special permission of the bishop; but it is thought that some bishops might consider themselves justified in giving such a permission. This experiment does not, however, seem to have been tried in many places.

[1] See *Holy Week Book* (published by the Society of SS. Peter and Paul).

(b) *Extra-liturgical services in connection with the Blessed Sacrament.*

I. *Origin.*—The thirteenth century was a time of much Eucharistic controversy. The earlier disputes as to the nature of the change effected by Consecration seemed to have been settled by the official adoption of the word Transubstantiation, but the development of sacramental doctrine was not yet by any means complete. In particular there were two points on which a new stress was beginning to be laid.

First, far greater importance was coming to be attached to the presence of the Person of Christ under the forms of bread and wine. The identity of the Eucharistic mystery with the Body and Blood of Christ had been unquestioned from time immemorial. But the inference that the Blessed Sacrament mediates a special presence of Christ Himself, in His human Soul and in His Divinity, however implicit in the earlier doctrine, hardly seems to have found its way explicitly into the general consciousness of the Church. It was not, of course, denied. It seems implicit in our Lord's own equation of 'I' and 'my flesh' in St. John vi. It is clearly enunciated by St. John Chrysostom. It seems to be taught by the very early addition of *Benedictus qui venit* to the *Sanctus*, and by the famous 'Let all mortal flesh keep silence' sung at the Great Entrance in the Liturgy of St. James (fifth century?).[1] So also it is implied by the rubrical directions for genuflexion and adoration in connection with the processions of the Blessed Sacrament in the eleventh century. But it cannot be said that it is prominent either in the ancient theologians or in those of the early Middle Ages.

The second point was the doctrine that either part of the Sacrament by itself mediates the whole Christ. This again, which is known as the doctrine of Concomitance, was implicit in the early practice of Reservation in one kind, but it was left to the thirteenth century to make it part of the dogmatic teaching of the Western Church.

A less important matter must also be mentioned, the dispute as to the 'moment of Consecration.' Was the Consecration of the bread a separate action from that of the wine, or did both take place at the same moment? If, as was the prevailing view, the two actions are separate, it follows from what has been said that the theologians of the thirteenth century would wish to emphasise the fact that adoration must be paid to the sacramental and personal presence of Christ immediately after the Consecration of the bread without waiting for that of the wine. This emphasis was expressed by the new ceremony of elevating the Host before the eyes of the people immediately

[1] 'He goeth before us to be sacrificed and given to the faithful for their food.' The translation in *The English Hymnal* is very free.

after it had been consecrated. There can be little doubt that this new practice of elevation after Consecration also stimulated the people's devotion to the Person of Christ as mediated by the Sacrament. The fact that the Blessed Sacrament could actually be seen was felt to be a special call to adoration. Indeed the earlier idea of the meaning of the elevation was forgotten, and the showing of the Sacrament to the people for their adoration came to hold an altogether disproportionate importance in the popular mind. From being a didactic gesture it came to be thought of as though it were the central action of the Mass. This, no doubt, was a very serious corruption, and engendered not a little superstition. Yet we may perhaps call to mind that *abusus non tollit usum.* The mediæval abuse undoubtedly was connected with a false emphasis, yet it seems to testify that the actual sight of the Blessed Sacrament has a valid appeal to the heart of the believer.[1]

However this may be—and this is not the place to argue it—there can be no doubt that we can trace during the next three centuries the development of the devotional idea of the adorability of Christ personally present in the Sacrament, coupled with a strong sense of the privilege and blessing to be enjoyed by actually gazing on the sacred Mystery. Both the doctrine and the cult have been immensely affected by the theology and still more by the hymns of St. Thomas Aquinas, and it would be difficult to over-estimate the influence of *O Salutaris* and *Tantum ergo* in the formation of the Western attitude towards the Sacrament of the Altar. *Adoro Te devote* is a still more striking identification of the Eucharist with Christ Himself. In the fourteenth century we find the beginning of an attempt to continue the elevation, so to say, by the practice of exposing the Host in a transparent vessel, which gradually came to take the form known to-day as the monstrance. The elaborate Sacrament-houses of Germany seem to have been built for this purpose, as well as to afford some protection to the Blessed Sacrament against that over-familiarity which already seemed to be a danger.

The service known as 'Benediction of the most holy Sacrament' seems to have originated in the fourteenth century and to have been well known in Germany and Switzerland in the fifteenth. From that time until the nineteenth century it has grown more and more popular: but at the present moment there are some

[1] This also was foreshadowed many centuries earlier. See the Liturgical Homilies of Narsai, which are evidence for the devotional practice of Syrian Christians at the end of the fifth century. 'Look upon him that is now mystically slain upon the altar,' 'Look, O men . . . look steadfastly upon the bread and wine that are upon the table' (*Texts and Studies*, viii. 10, 11, 56, with E. Bishop's remarks in the Appendix, p. 90).

signs of a reaction against it under the influence of the Benedictine liturgical movement.

The origin of this form of public extra-liturgical devotion to the Blessed Sacrament appears to be threefold. (1) It had become customary to hold a popular service in the evening, chiefly in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and, in order to stimulate devotion, a further custom grew up of (2) exposing the Blessed Sacrament while this service was going on. Finally, (3) it seemed natural, when the service was over, to bless the people with the Blessed Sacrament as it was put back into its place. We might compare the very common custom of making the sign of the cross with a particle of the Sacrament over each communicant just before reception. It seems to have been in this almost casual way that the most popular, and perhaps the most useful, of modern Roman devotions grew up.

In later times the emphasis again became altered. The presence of the Blessed Sacrament became the centre of devotion instead of being little more than an adjunct to the veneration of the Blessed Virgin. (It seems, however, that the term *Salut*, which is the usual name for the service in French-speaking countries, still points to its original connection with our Lady.)[1] Finally, the closing benediction, though having no clear theological significance, became the most striking feature of the service, so that both in Latin and English it provides the official name of the whole ceremony.

II. *Modern Latin practice.*—In modern times the service of Benediction, though actually extra-liturgical, has a semi-liturgical character. It is obvious that a ceremony connected with the Blessed Sacrament could not be left altogether to individual fancy. More variation is tolerated than in the case of the Mass; but the ceremonial is carefully laid down by rubrical directions, and there are also certain invariable ritual features. On the other hand, much of the service is left to the discretion of the priest, and so long as he uses forms which have a general authorisation for use in church, he has a certain freedom of choice. In this completely unliturgical portion of the service the use of the vernacular is allowed.

Benediction takes two forms, solemn and simple.

Solemn Benediction requires the permission of the Ordinary except on the feast and during the octave of Corpus Christi. The officiant wears a cope, and may be attended by deacon and subdeacon. The Blessed Sacrament, enclosed in a monstrance, is placed high up over the Altar on a 'throne,' the Altar cross being removed. The service begins with the singing of *O Salutaris*, during which as a rule the officiant censes the Blessed Sacrament. Then may follow popular devotions, such

[1] See Hedley, *The Holy Eucharist*, p. 270.

as hymns or the litany of Loretto, according to the discretion of the parish priest. Then comes the quasi-liturgical core of the service. *Tantum ergo* is sung while the officiant again censes the Sacrament. Then comes a versicle and response:

℣ *Panem de cælo præstitisti eis.*
℟ *Omne delectamentum in se habentem.*

and the well-known collect of St. Thomas, *Deus, qui nobis sub Sacramento mirabili.*[1] The officiant then has a white silk veil placed on his shoulders, and enveloping the monstrance with the ends of it makes the sign of the cross with the Blessed Sacrament over the people. The Sacrament is then put back into the tabernacle while the psalm *Laudate Dominum* (cxvii according to the English Bible) is sung with the antiphon, *Adoremus in æternum sanctissimum Sacramentum.*

Simple Benediction may be given without special permission in any church in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved. The monstrance is not used, nor the 'throne.' The officiant wears only surplice and stole, and incense is not necessary. The door of the tabernacle is opened at the beginning of the service, so that the worshippers may see the ciborium which contains the Blessed Sacrament, but the vessel is only taken out for the purpose of the actual Benediction, and immediately replaced. The words of the service are the same as in the solemn form. It will be seen that this little ceremony is not unlike the 'Vesper hymn' and blessing with which the Anglican evening service is often concluded.

Other devotions connected with the Blessed Sacrament are Exposition and Processions.

Exposition is employed by permission of the Ordinary on any occasions of special solemnity. A frequent case of it is the devotion of the Forty Hours, by means of which a chain of continuous adoration is supposed to be kept up from one church to another during a period which nominally lasts for that time in each church, but is in practice somewhat longer.[2]

Processions of the Blessed Sacrament are specially characteristic of the Feast of Corpus Christi, but are also used, by permission, on other great occasions.[3]

[1] A translation of this prayer is found in the Prayer Book as proposed in 1928 as the Collect for the service in Thanksgiving for the institution of Holy Communion. *Deus* is strangely translated 'Lord.'

[2] In practice actual continuity from church to church seems only to be attained in great ecclesiastical centres such as Rome or Milan.

[3] Such Processions *within* the Liturgy are of very great antiquity. See the Liturgical Homilies of Narsai, in which we are told that 'The Sacrament goes forth with splendour and glory, with an escort of priests and a great procession of deacons. . . . All the sons of the Church rejoice, when they see the Body setting forth from the midst of the Altar' (*op. cit.*, pp. 27, 28).

III. *Anglican adaptations.*—Something must be said as to the motives which have led some Anglican priests to adopt, or adapt, the Latin customs which have just been described. Many of them have felt that there was a crying need of some simple public devotion by means of which we could approach our Lord as closely as possible, short of actual sacramental Communion. They have observed Roman practice and been convinced that our brethren have been allowed to evolve something really valuable. Magnificent service as we all know the Anglican Evensong to be, these priests have come to the conclusion that its somewhat cold, intellectual character does not give a full outlet to the emotions and to the faculty of adoration, and that it needs supplementing with something warmer, and more personal. Some of them have had the needs of simple people chiefly in mind. They have tried Evensong, and they have tried mission services, but they have found that neither of them has the same appeal, or the same converting efficacy, or the same power of drawing out devotion, as a service definitely connected with the sacramental presence of our Lord. Others have had their most devout and best instructed communicants in view. These have been taught to pray before the tabernacle, and have learned to find in such prayer a very special incentive to adoration, contemplation and intercession, and not unnaturally feel the desire to give corporate expression to that which they have experienced as individuals. Others have felt that the emphasis which the earlier leaders in the Catholic revival placed on acts of adoration to the Presence of our Lord during the actual course of the Eucharistic service had a tendency to distort the true intention of the rite. Eucharistic worship had come to mean for some people that the adoration of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament was the chief reason for which they came to the Liturgy, and the offering of the sacrifice tended to be obscured. This was specially noticeable where the custom had grown up of singing 'O Lamb of God' *immediately* after the Prayer of Consecration, as though the chief object of our Lord's sacramental Presence was to invite our worship to Himself. Others again felt constrained to lead their people in adoration as a corporate recognition of the fact of Christ's Eucharistic Presence implied by the reservation of the Holy Sacrament. It seemed to them impossible to have the Sacrament in church and not testify to their faith in the real Presence by definite acts of devotion.

With such objects in view a considerable number of priests in different parts of the Anglican Communion have deliberately borrowed either the whole or a part of the Latin customs of which we have spoken. A very few have adopted the whole service of Benediction, generally, however, translating all the prayers and hymns into the vernacular.

Dr. Neale was probably the first to do so, in 1858 or possibly earlier. His example was followed by Fr. Ignatius and Dr. Littledale; but there is probably no instance of it in a parish church until about 1875, when it was introduced at St. James the Less, Liverpool. A few years later it became customary in certain churches in Plymouth.

These are isolated instances. In recent years this type of service has become far more common, but the actual benediction with the Blessed Sacrament has usually been omitted in deference to the wishes of the authorities. It is recognised, moreover, that though this is the emotional climax of the Latin service it is not really its most important feature.

When no benediction is given it is obvious that some other name must be found for the service, and various names have in fact been applied to it. Devotions, Adoration, Worship, Salutation have all been used, but no differences can be detected which in any way correspond with the different names.

There is, however, an extraordinary amount of difference in the ways in which the service has been conducted. Sometimes the monstrance or the veiled ciborium has been set on a 'throne'; sometimes the tabernacle door has been opened; sometimes it has been left shut. Sometimes the Blessed Sacrament is censed, sometimes the censer is merely swung from side to side, sometimes no incense is used. Some priests wear a cope for the purpose, some surplice and stole, some only the surplice. Sometimes the skeleton of the service is the same as in Roman churches, sometimes something totally different, such as a part of the English Litany, is used. Very often the greater part of the service consists of intercession. The only constant feature is that the officiant kneels in front of the altar where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, and that the prayers and hymns are said and sung with consciousness of the sacramental presence of our Lord.

One reason for these differences is the fact that the Anglican bishops are not all of one mind on the matter. Some of them wish to suppress the whole extra-liturgical cultus of the Blessed Sacrament altogether: some are content if it be drastically modified: others would prefer not to interfere with it: on the other hand, a few overseas bishops have established the full service of Benediction in their dioceses.

Anglican priests take different views of the authority of the bishop in this matter. Some hold that no service may take place in church without the bishop's permission, others that any service may take place which he does not actually forbid; others hesitate to handle the Blessed Sacrament (except for purposes of Communion) without a direct licence to do so; others, in the absence of Anglican canon law on the subject, hold themselves free to conduct any service which does not imply false

doctrine, in virtue of their jurisdiction as parish priests, and without reference to the bishop, so long as these services are strictly additional, and are not substituted for those of canonical obligation.

The English Book 'as proposed in 1928' has a rubric in the Alternative Order for the Communion of the Sick: 'There shall be no service or ceremony in connection with the Sacrament so reserved, nor shall it be exposed or removed except in order to be received in Communion, or otherwise reverently consumed.' It must, of course, be remembered that this Book has never received canonical status.

The other, and more ancient, non-liturgical observances in connection with the Blessed Sacrament are rare within the Anglican Communion. Both Exposition and Processions of the Blessed Sacrament are known, and for the revival of these also Dr. Neale and Fr. Ignatius seem to have been responsible. But in England and Scotland they have usually been suppressed by authority.

MODERN PRAYERS AND THEIR WRITERS

By E. MILNER-WHITE

THE Oxford Movement revived and transformed the prayer-life of England. Much of its architecture in this sphere went unobserved and unassailed. Its achievement can be clearly seen now, if we compare the devotional temper, the liturgical understanding and the ideals of worship to-day with those of one hundred years ago. Since the days of the Caroline and Restoration divines nothing had been added to devotional practice but the hymn: much had been lost. The Tractarians first recovered, then added.

The Revival—so far as the development of prayer can be outwardly traced—set three streams aflow.

In the first place, it brought wholly new powers of appreciation to the Prayer Book, and to the work and aims of those who had fashioned it. A Liturgy which had become 'incomparable' through old associations, the Tractarian leaders found to be so under a searching criticism and on grounds of far deeper importance. If now we find lack or blemish in detail in the 1662 Book, it is only because we have relearned from itself, and desire to express more fully, all that the Book had stood for, silently, immovably, through three hundred unsympathetic years. In the Prayer Book the Tractarians saw an invincible foundation for their Catholic theology. Again, it gave them a basis for a richer and wider devotional life, of which hitherto full advantage had not been taken. Not to mention the Eucharist, the affection felt for Mattins and Evensong placed the understanding and power of ordered liturgy behind all advance in worship. The common prayer-life of no other people was so firmly founded on ancient structure, or so permeated by the sense of liturgical form.

The large Tractarian scholarship at once turned to liturgiology. It is not a branch of study which has appealed to other sections of the English Church, and only the sheer force of learned result has compelled recognition of its necessity and practical usefulness. Liturgies are the documents and registers of the history of Christian prayer, and to refuse to learn from a history so rich were folly.

To comprehend the Prayer Book, and to justify or even to perceive its deeper excellences, meant that the whole field of liturgy, Eastern and Western, must be mastered. The names of Palmer, Maskell, Forbes, Neale, Wordsworth, Blew, Legg, Frere, Brightman, and the volumes of the Henry Bradshaw and other liturgical societies witness to the splendour of the toil. It is happy to think that in this field of scholarship Anglican and Roman doctors work and dwell together in unity. The result has been that the only standards of formal prayer, whether corporate or private, which the Anglican Church will tolerate, are those of œcumenical, not local, Christianity.

In the second place, the more Catholic outlook of the Tractarian leaders, and their passion to base their movement upon personal as well as corporate devotion, led at once to an emphasis on wider and better devotional reading. Dr. Pusey edited a series of devotional manuals, followed by Bishop Forbes in Scotland. So came translations of Scupoli's *Spiritual Combat*, Nouet's *Life of Jesus Christ in Glory*, Avrillon's *Guide for passing Lent holily*, Arvisenet's *Memoriale Vitæ Sacerdotalis*, Pinart's *Meditations*, Merlo of Horst's *Paradise of the Christian Soul* and *The Nourishment of the Christian Soul*. The *Imitatio* bounded into new popularity in unexpurgated editions. Nothing has been more impressive in the last century than the streams of editions of devotional classics, and they cease not. Fresh stimulus came at the turn of the century when Dr. Inge on the intellectual side, and Miss Underhill on the devotional, popularised the study of the Christian mystics. The library of ascetical theology now accessible in England to the most modest purse embraces nearly all the works of Christian piety worthy of survival and use. And they are used. The English Church can never again become insular, because its private life of prayer has become in the best sense cosmopolitan, that is to say, Catholic. It has reached a point where it is completely and intimately at home with the devotional classics of all ages and peoples, and has secured both spiritual experience and spiritual discrimination. This marks a great expansion which makes naught of external lines of division. Its mind, for instance, accepts and freely uses the spiritual output of the Counter-Reformation, of St. Theresa, St. John of the Cross, St. Francis de Sales, Augustine Baker; but not less does the excellent strength of these together with its liturgical training make it regret and refuse the more ecstatic and sentimental directions into which much modern Roman devotion has strayed.

And thirdly, in the *expression* of its devotional mind the Church of England has found an individual manner which is both noble in itself and also reinforces and exalts its standards of splendour and awe in prayer. We owe this to the exceeding magnificence of the English tongue in Tudor and Stuart days, and, not less

to a race of divines supremely capable of wielding it. They fall into two groups: the Henrican, which was responsible for the Great Bible (1539–41, Coverdale presiding), which still gives the Prayer Book its Psalter, for the Litany (Cranmer, 1544) in its markedly English form, and for the first Prayer Books, which settled the English manner of Collect and Prayer for ever; and the Caroline, responsible for the Authorised Version, for the revision of 1662, and for the final establishment of the diction of English worship by its sermons and private devotions.[1]

Thus the Church gained a tongue meet for celestial service; and away from the language of Bible, Prayer Book, or some approximation to their standard, the Englishman is never comfortable for long in public prayer. It has not been so generally noticed that this feeling has influenced private devotion also, and that here again the Carolines set a decisive example. The devotions of Laud and of Cosin are both marked by a terse 'Prayer Book' atmosphere. They consist largely of definitely constructed prayers. Their liturgical type and descent from the mediæval Primers are further emphasised by provision for daily observance of the 'Lesser Hours,' Cosin's with a series of complete Offices, Laud's with a group of three prayers for each 'Hour.' Laud again builds his devotion pre-eminently upon the Psalms. Cosin, who prepared his Manual at King Charles' request for the ladies of the Court, states definitely the liturgical ideal, 'that men, before they set themselves to pray, might know what to say; and avoid, as near as might be, all extemporal effusions of irksome and indigested prayers . . . subject to no good order and form of words.'

But above these, influential as they have proved, towers the greatest book of private devotions that Christian and Catholic piety has begotten, the *Preces Privatæ* of Lancelot Andrewes. The history of its editions, translations and arrangements has been troubled and unsatisfactory; what must surely be its final form in English, despite the admirable partial versions of Newman and of Neale, only arrived in 1903, with the edition of Dr. Brightman.[2] But even in bad and imperfect editions, its influence upon the greater men of prayer and upon modern manuals of devotion has been vast. It marries together the liturgical sense of fine order trained by the Prayer Book, and the sanctities of expression which Andrewes' own age—and pen—gave to the Bible. It brought new wealth by the inclusion of passages from the Greek liturgies in such a way as to preserve their accent while banishing anything alien in their position or

[1] The Elizabethan period is in liturgical diction strangely turgid and unsatisfactory.

[2] This edition, published by Methuen, is out of print. It is most regrettable. No abridged edition can take the place of the whole.

sound. 'The solid matter of the *Preces Privatæ*, the beauty of their materials, the picturesqueness and imaginativeness of treatment,' are welded together by 'the originality and pointedness of their structural form' in a way which sets the unofficial prayers of the Church a standard of order and content which is unsurpassable. The Church of England has been slow to recognise consciously its supreme devotional classic. Many Englishmen might hear with astonishment the verdict of the Scottish presbyterian, Dr. Alexander Whyte. 'There is nothing in the whole range of devotional literature to be set beside Andrewes' incomparable *Devotions*.' They 'stand alone and unapproached in the literature of the closet and of the mercy seat. . . . Every page pierces us, solemnises us, and subdues us to tears and to prayer and to obedience as no other book of its kind has ever done. Every page, almost every line, of the *Private Devotions* has some strong word in it, some startling word, some selected, compounded and compacted word, some heart-laden clause, some scriptural or liturgical expression set in a blaze of new light and life, and ever after to be filled with new power as we employ it in our own prayers and praises.' [1]

Building both on the writings and on the spirit of the Carolines, the Tractarian leaders in the first flush of their movement turned their attention to forms of devotion. We must try to trace the development. In 1845, after a proposed Union for Prayer for Unity had been snuffed out by a timid Archbishop and Bishop, Keble, Pusey and Marriott circulated some short prayers for use at the traditional Hours. Which of the three was actual author we do not know, but it is a glorious doubt. The series deserves to be printed in full as the simple herald of a vast development of prayer.

I.

PRAYER FOR THE THIRD HOUR

(9 a.m.)

THE HOUR OF THE DESCENT OF THE HOLY GHOST

℣. Jerusalem is built as a city
℟. That is at unity in itself.
O pray for the peace of Jerusalem.

Collect.—Vouchsafe, we beseech thee, Almighty God, to grant unto the whole Christian people, *and especially to thy servants in* [*N.*], *and all for whom our prayers are desired*, unity, peace, and true concord, both visible and invisible, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

[1] Whyte, *Lancelot Andrewes and his Private Devotions*, pp. 31–59.

II.

PRAYER FOR THE SIXTH HOUR
(12 p.m.)

THE HOUR OF THE CRUCIFIXION

℣. Turn us, O God, our Saviour,
℟. And let thine anger cease from us.
O let the wickedness of the ungodly come to an end.

Collect.—Almighty God, we beseech thee to hear our prayers for such as sin against thee, or neglect to serve thee, *especially those in* [*N.*], *and others for whom our prayers are desired,* that thou wouldst vouchsafe to bestow upon them true repentance, and an earnest desire to serve thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

III.

PRAYER FOR THE NINTH HOUR
(3 p.m.)

THE HOUR OF THE DEATH OF OUR LORD

℣. Thy God hath sent forth strength for thee.
℟. Stablish the thing, O God, that thou hast wrought in us.
They will go from strength to strength, and unto the God of gods appeareth every one of them in Sion.

Collect.—Vouchsafe, we beseech thee, O Lord, to strengthen and confirm all thy faithful, *especially those in* [*N.*], *and all others for whom we are desired to pray,* and to lift them up more and more continually to heavenly desires, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

With the italicised passages omitted, and the antiphon placed before instead of after the ℣. and ℟., these prayers, by way of the *Cuddesdon Office Book* and *Prime and Hours,* have now a permanent place as Memorials at Terce, Sext and None, not by reason of their authorship, but by their merit. They possess in full the terseness, distinction and nobility natural to a Cranmer collect, and it was a loss to the English Church that the 1928 Book did not include among its Occasional Prayers these for unity, for the conversion of sinners, and for the spiritual growth of the faithful.

A few years later (1852) 'J. D. C.' published *The Psalter or Seven*

Ordinary Hours of Prayer, a translation of the 'framework and many of the particulars' of the Sarum Breviary. To bring the name of John David Chambers from oblivion is a grateful task; devoted layman, sound lawyer, hymn-writer inferior only to Neale, he did yeoman service to the revival. Some details of his liturgical work are likely to survive by reason of its eventual inclusion in the important work next to be mentioned.

The Cuddesdon Office Book appeared when the movement had scarcely recovered from the departure of Newman, and the bold experiment of theological colleges had barely begun. The first edition (1856) bore the title *Hours of Prayer for Daily Use*, and contained the offices of Prime, Terce, Sext, None and Compline; its compiler, the first Vice-Principal, Liddon, had already produced for the students a series of devotional helps: *Hours of Prayer* (1854), *Private Prayers* (1855), *Prayers before and after the Blessed Sacrament* (1856). To the Church of that day the book was novel; to its devotion it proved decisive. The enemy fell upon it. To the charge that it was 'concocted from the seven Canonical Hours of the Romish Church,' the Principal with no less truth could reply: 'It has been ascertained on a more careful examination that the Book of Devotions . . . consists (with the exception of a few Collects) of extracts from the Bible and Prayer Book, of prayers taken from Bishop Cosin, and some few from original sources. It is confidently affirmed that the keenest eye can detect no trace of Romish error in them as they stand.' Bishop Wilberforce appointed his archdeacons a commission to examine this with other complaints. They reported: 'We have examined the prayers and hymns and think them not only unexceptionable, but highly valuable. The Book . . . has, however, been cast in a form which bears an unfortunate resemblance to the Breviary of the Church of Rome; and we think it would be much improved if the compilers would abandon the title of Antiphon, and the obsolete designation of the Hours, rearrange the order and number of the services and remodel the whole book.'

The compilers bowed to the finding. A modified edition was issued in 1858. The Antiphon was called 'the Text.' The Hours were reduced to three, entitled Morning Service, Midday Service, Evening Service. Not till the third edition (1880) were the original five Offices and their proper titles restored. But the deed had been done, and to the Cuddesdon Office Book belongs the honour of restoring the lesser Hours to the devotional life and the affections of the Church in England.

The example was soon followed, and *The Day Hours of the Church of England* (1858) followed the more complicated Sarum Use in preference to Liddon's free abridgment of the Breviary. This book, revised and enriched from time to time, and others of

a similar character, are used chiefly by religious communities. A simpler Sarum tradition has passed into more general employment by way of *Prime and Hours*, the first and best-known section of *The Priest's Book of Private Devotion*, compiled in 1872 by Dr. Oldknow and the Rev. A. D. Crake. Each edition made the provision for the Hours more complete, and at the eighth (1897) the prayers from the Cuddesdon Office Book and the *Litany of Foreign Missions* from the Cuddesdon *Intercessory Manual* were included *en bloc*, and became thus the familiar possession of the Church.

Offices, of course, can never constitute the main devotion of a praying Church. They are one link between official liturgy and wholly personal prayer. Their use is confined to priests, religious, and those whose first interest is the devotional life; powerful as foundation and discipline for less formal prayer, and as instruments of the 'pause unto God' at frequent times during the day. The sense of ordered, liturgical prayer evoked by the Oxford Movement was indeed sometimes carried to extremes. In *The Priest's Prayer Book* (Littledale and Vaux) a liturgical 'office' was provided for every conceivable emergency, even 'For an unmarried mother after childbirth' and 'After an attempted suicide.'

Before leaving the Cuddesdon Office Book we must notice its good work in another direction. The genius of Liddon set a standard, worthy of the Prayer Book, in the form and language of its prayers. Some he borrowed from Cosin: others he wrote himself. Most of the latter are specialised to the life of a theological college, but the prayer *For the inward life of Jesus Christ* [1] is the noblest Eucharistic prayer of modern days, and of an evangelical type too little represented in the Prayer Book. The well-known *Litany of the Holy Ghost* traces back to his *Private Prayers* of 1855: he prepared a wholly new one for the 1858 edition of the Office Book; the two were fused together by Edward Francis Willis, who edited the 1880 edition. This quiet and devout Vice-Principal, who afterwards led out the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, must himself be numbered among the writers of prayers that endure. His is the *Litany of Intercession for Foreign Missions* in general use. His adaptation of the prayer, 'O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, who at the hour of Compline didst rest in the sepulchre . . .' was recited beside the fallen in Flanders, and has passed into the 1928 Prayer Book in the Order for Compline. But part of the credit for this, and the whole for the Terce Collect, 'O Lord Jesus Christ, who at the third hour of the day wast led forth to the pain of the

[1] Quoted in *Occasional Prayers Reconsidered*, S.P.C.K., p. 27. It is a free translation of a prayer of Fr. Condren of the French Oratory, and his spiritual son M. Olier, founder of the Sulpicians.

Cross . . .' should be given to Chambers, who had followed up his earlier work by a translation of the Sarum *Encheiridion* (1860), a little book which had small popular success at the time, but proved to be a well from which many later manuals drew.

The eminence of Liddon in the history of English prayer has never received its due meed of honour. And his liturgical initiative, already so full of result, did not cease. When harried into resigning his Vice-Principalship, he became pioneer in another province by inspiring and helping P. G. Medd of University College, Oxford, to prepare a no less influential work, *The Priest to the Altar*, 1860. This book was the father of the numerous unofficial missals by which Anglican devotion supplemented and streamed over the text of the 1662 rite. Thus began an extraordinary chapter in the history of liturgy in England, ranging from the sober and strong *English Liturgy*, which contented itself with the provision of additional Collects, Epistles and Gospels for black-letter days and occasional fasts and festivals, to a number of missals reproducing the modern Western rite in varied and often puzzling combination with that of 1662. The difficulties to ecclesiastical order caused by this phase cannot be hidden: what is often neither seen nor valued is the increase of devotion and the appreciation of devotional quality of which it is the sign and the solace. Apart from its Preparations and Thanksgivings, *The Priest to the Altar* provided for the priest's private devotion, Secrets, Post-Communions and Benedictions mainly from the Gregorian Sacramentary, enough to show, to eyes that could see, the new wealth that was entering into practical devotion through the study of the ancient service-books.

For congregations a similar expansion came with the publication of a large number of manuals, mainly Eucharistic, but covering also the daily life of prayer and penitence. *The Treasury of Devotion*, sponsored by Canon Carter of Clewer, appeared in 1869: *Before the Throne* in 1886. *Catholic Prayers*, for which the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline recommended the removal of Father Stanton's licence, in tone and content was very 'Latin,' Dr. Dearmer's *Sanctuary* no less English: attempts to control this flood were made by the *Convocation Book of Private Prayer*, 1893 and 1907, a book deserving wider success than it won. These manuals made familiar such devotions as *Anima Christi*, the Divine Praises, the Angelus, Litanies of many kinds, besides helping the faithful to understand and enter into the Eucharistic action more deeply: so that their sense of liturgy grew apace. At the same time a stronger and more objective note was coming into English hymnody whether by translations of the Latin and Greek hymns (Neale's especially) or by the doctrinal hymns of Dr. William Bright; the Evangelical hymn,

which is the voice of the believer, began to give way to the liturgical hymn, which is the voice of the worshipping Church.

Of enduring influence, moreover, were three manuals designed to serve the purpose of richer and wider intercession. The first in time was Dr. Bright's *Ancient Collects* (1861). The majority of the prayers which he translated came 'from Western rituals older than Anglo-Saxon Christianity . . . the merest gatherings from an ample and splendid storehouse—a few drops from a cup filled to overflowing.' The Preface went on to say: 'Many of the Collects . . . seem quite equal in depth and beauty to those well-known specimens of their class which the child's ear so readily welcomes and the man's heart finds so inexhaustible.' Bright translated literally and not as Cranmer; but his success in opening up a magnificent portal of prayer was complete. In an appendix he contributed some collects of his own constructed on the ancient model, including one of great beauty based on the traditional antithesis 'between *via*, the pilgrim's path in this world, which is the region of faith, and *patria*, the heavenly country which is the region of fruition':

> O God, who hast brought us near to an innumerable company of angels, and to the spirits of just men made perfect: Grant us during our (earthly) pilgrimage to abide in their fellowship, and in our (heavenly) Country to become partakers of their joy; through Jesus Christ our Lord.[1]

The Manual of Intercessory Prayer arranged by Father Benson, founder of S.S.J.E., systematised intercession for all sorts and conditions of men and occupations by a collection of some 300 prayers, most of them in strict collect form with antiphon, versicle and response. The well-known 'Before a Retreat'[2] is typical of the intense scriptural fervour which pervades this large assemblage, reasserting in the approach to modern needs the Caroline tone, grave, rich and strong. *Sursum Corda* (1898), compiled by Dr. Frere and Mrs. Illingworth, carried system further by arranging subjects and collects for each day of the week. Of even greater importance was its series of intercessions and thanksgivings in litany form, inspired by the *Private Prayers* of Lancelot Andrewes. *Sursum Corda* is indeed a most distinguished manual. By it, after fifty years of revival, the treasure bequeathed by Andrewes begins to bear full interest, and the creative and original note sounds once again in Anglican devotion.

Two other names deserve similar honour. Archbishop Benson had a genius for the ordering of ceremony and service,

[1] *Occasional Prayers Reconsidered*, p. 29. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

One inspiration, half original, half revival, presented Truro Cathedral with the 'Nine Lessons with Carols' for Christmas Eve. This exquisite devotion, full of movement, meaning, colour and Christmas atmosphere, is winning way, year by year, though it is often marred by lessening the lections and increasing the carols. And Canon Bullock-Webster, apart from the services he has rendered to missionary prayer by the Quarterly Intercession Paper, did a pioneer work when, in the *Churchman's Prayer Manual*, he brought together a number of Acts and Litanies suitable for use in church. Through it the private manuals gave their fruit to corporate devotion, and if, since the war, the book which effected this seems to have been superseded, it would be both mistake and ingratitude to overlook its part in the history of English public prayer.

Here for a moment let us pause and sum up. By the turn of the century both liturgical knowledge and liturgical sense had been recovered. A large output of devotional manuals and ascetic writings witnessed by their large sale to the burning desire for better prayer. In judging the religion of a movement, a church or an age, no testimony is so sure as its books of devotion. In England public and private prayer kept close together, continually interacting; and while the Prayer Book standards of form, aided by the language of the Bible and the piety of the Carolines, maintained their authority, the Prayer Book as a manual of public and private prayer was supplemented from many sources, Eastern and Western, new and old, legitimately, inevitably. There were some people, indeed, who could not understand that the Roman Missal is an ancient liturgy to be drawn and learned from as any other ancient liturgy; that a prayer or form of prayer is not bad merely because a Roman Catholic prays it. There were others who on loftier ground, for the sake of their poor, yearned for forms and language simpler and warmer; and, availing themselves of the only matter ready to hand and in wide use, sought to acclimatise the more emotional and exotic popular devotions of Rome. But such books as we have mentioned mark the main line of advance, gradually making clear an English and Catholic tradition, which was both solemn and full, which drew freely from Scripture and ancient liturgy, yet served both modern need and modern intelligence, and though as yet only at the beginning of its history, of highest devotional promise.

All these tendencies, gathering and combining force, put the Prayer Book in a new position. Supreme still in quality, it had become, by the working out of its own good influence, too small in range. Old age, new yearning and liturgical scholarship together destroyed its authority, not its beauty. In 1907 Convocation began, in response to Royal Letters of Business, to

consider its revision; but progress was slow until the Great War opened a new chapter in the history of Anglican prayer.

Then, suddenly, it became manifest to all that the 1662 book was out of date.[1] It gave no help to the memorial services of a mourning people. The Burial Office itself, needed for tens of thousands, could not be used as it stood. Cold and distant in such a world seemed Mattins and Evensong; and Englishmen had not learned to use the Eucharist for their needs and sorrows. It became plain, and chaplains in the field felt it most, that the country had no semblance of a popular, familiar devotion except the General Confession and Lord's Prayer, followed by extracts from Evensong. The Prayer Book did not seem able to reflect the lineaments of the Lord Jesus Christ, thereby failing to minister the love of God to souls desperately wistful. It may not be a test which comes often to a service-book, and the fault may lie less with the book than with the unsacramental tradition of its use. But with the return of controversy we are in danger of forgetting that in days of no controversy, but of bitter need, it was generally recognised that public worship must be re-ordered, its scope widened, its accent shifted from might to love, its bareness clothed upon with the preciousness of many a discarded ancient form, with sympathy toward the searches and strivings of modern life, and with evangelical colour. The devotions, private and public, connected with the Reservation of the Sacrament have always this to their credit, that they represent one effort to meet a need proven and existing. Others we shall mention presently.

The change of outlook became apparent in the books issued by two dioceses for occasional services, the Salisbury *Book of Occasional Offices*, 1917, and the Oxford *Diocesan Service Book*, 1920. We cannot here describe or criticise these works in detail; they derive great importance from the fact that they are official supplements to the Prayer Book in two large dioceses; and they deserve it. Both maintain strict liturgical standards; reintroduce ancient and excellent forms, such as antiphons, versicles and responses; make open prayer for the dead; add Collects, Epistles and Gospels for seasons and holy-days unprovided for in the Prayer Book; include new prayers of high merit. The Salisbury book, particularly, gives a series of Collects for lesser Saints' days, many from the pen of Bishop John Wordsworth.[2] No modern Collects have shown more strength, originality and distinction; we may instance those of St. George, St. Hugh, St. Alban, St. Martin, St. Clement of Rome. The Bishop's Commemoration of the Departed has found place in the 1928 Prayer Book.

It is scarcely a digression to suggest that the revival of the

[1] Cf. *The Church in the Furnace*, Essays VII and VIII.

[2] Cf. *Sermons and Selected Prayers*, by John Wordsworth (Longmans).

historical sense in the Church, of great value to personal piety and to that common heritage in the Saints which makes both for inspiration and for unity, renders it desirable to use particular Collects for particular Saints, and not a common, wherever possible. Only so can the manifold lessons of the rich history of heroic Christianity pass into the Church's prayer. Thanks to Bishop John Wordsworth and others, among whom the Rev. A. Campbell Fraser must receive special mention,[1] there seems to be no reason why Collects for many of the lesser feasts of the Calendar should not be provided for all in the Prayer Book, rather than for a few in Diocesan books.

But the new outlook was naturally more clearly marked in unofficial than in official books. A spirit of liturgical initiative arrives. On its conservative side it is represented by such a manual as *Cambridge Offices and Orisons;* on its radical, by the so-called *Grey Book*, the first serious attempt of the more liberal Evangelicals to enter the liturgical field;[2] on its romantic, by the remarkable ceremonies and services of Toc H; on its missionary, by the development of broadcasting.

The *Grey Book* attempted to influence the revision of the Prayer Book by putting the Church year to a new use, and by modernising the orders of service, and the prayers, by inclusion, by exclusion, by re-arrangement and by re-wording. The intention was more excellent than the result. Its hand bore heavily upon the most dearly-loved beauties of the Prayer Book, and flung away recklessly both the sanctities of familiar use and the safeguards of liturgical history. Few pages are without something distasteful, in diction, in construction, in theology, in common sense. The claim for greater freedom and variety is not advanced by a cornucopia of doctrinaire schemes. Nor usually can devotions that consist of words enter the solemn liturgy of the Church unless they illustrate or are accompanied by appropriate action. The aim of liturgy is not to evoke the interest of the passer-by, but to achieve a common prayer before God of which the worshipping Church cannot tire. The experiments of Liverpool Cathedral will be valuable if they teach discrimination between devotions borne on the passing winds of novelty or special occasion and those which have catholic substance and endurance.

The Toc H schemes stand on firmer ground. Here action and words combine for an end of very definite meaning. The idea behind the symbolism of Toc H is real and rich, and based on historical event and clear purpose. So it can legitimately employ the high language of comradeship, pilgrimage, adventure

[1] *Collects for the Black-Letter Days* (Elliot Stock, 1917), *Memorial Collects of Saints and Worthies* (Mowbray, 1921), and *A Book of Prayers* (Blackwell, 1932).

[2] The widely used *Acts of Devotion* also deserves mention.

and battle; and it does so with the daring imagination which has become its tradition. Its search for novelty has its own great dangers; the high-flown is not the sublime; yet Toc H is writing a chapter in the history of English devotion which may leave a mark on service-books which we cannot yet foresee. That depends upon its power of building the permanent and divine upon the past event; upon its success in re-lighting, by unashamed remembrance of the sacrifice and fellowship of a bygone war, the flame of Christian gallantry in the daily conflict, and the Catholic faith in the Communion of Saints. It is enough now to be grateful for the loftiness of its aspiration, and for the originality of the forms of prayer which it creates or selects.

Broadcasting must eventually influence beyond measure English prayer and service-books. At present the guiding hand is that of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, which mingles ancient and modern, order and freedom, with judgment. *Services for Broadcasting* (1930) shows a new model in process of creation, 'the humble adaptation of existing forms to the necessary requirements of a new medium.' The conditions indeed are important. These are devotions to be heard only, not heard and seen. They must be non-denominational, 'a universal act of worship,' the preface states. There is a third, though perhaps a minor danger, that the beauty of voice be allowed to conceal a low standard of form and expression. B.B.C. responsibility is great and grave, not only to its immediate listeners, but to the whole dignity and honour of the worship of God.

In 1927 the 'Deposited Book' registered the results of a century of development in public prayer. Here we have no concern with its disciplinary problems, or with its rejection by the House of Commons: these things make not the least difference in its testimony to the march of prayer. The Book was rightly and rigidly conservative, as befits the mother-manual of a large Communion. Most of its additions and even its rare experiments went back for origin far behind 1662. It yielded to no temptation to modify the superb diction of former days, even though its attempts to reproduce it were not always successful. The influences which damaged it came not from any issue of living prayer, but from the suspicions and thraldoms of theological controversy. The rejection, however lamentable from other points of view, is no set-back to the Book itself, which will continue to count just for what it is worth—which is much: it only means a further period of thought and work which will reveal any weaknesses, and give opportunity for the ferment of liturgical initiative since the war to make its contributions with the authority which comes from experience, and not from generous impatience.

Not the least important factor in the post-war developments

we have left to the last. And that is, that the influence of the Tractarian revival has affected not only the Church of England and its venerable Prayer Book, but all English-speaking Christianity. So far this influence, writes an American critic, 'has been liturgical rather than doctrinal. None of the non-episcopal churches has revised its doctrine of church and sacrament under pressure from Oxford, but all of them have modified their worship.'[1] Scottish Presbyterianism has produced a *Book of Common Order*. Following upon Sir Henry Lunn's *The Love of Jesus*, 1911 (full of Bishop Andrewes), and Dr. Orchard's *Order of Divine Service for Public Worship*, 1921 (full of the Prayer Book and Bright's *Ancient Collects*), the Free Churches are bringing forth service-books, unofficial and experimental, no doubt, but significant. For they do not bear witness only to an appreciation, contrary to all their history, of corporate worship on ordered lines, but to an appropriation, in the change of view, of the riches of ancient, historic and catholic devotion. Thus gradually, inevitably, the quality of prayer rises; its range widens; and liturgy continues to make its silent and immense contribution to the fullest worship of God, and thereby to the movement, along the deepest channels of all, to Christian unity.

[1] L. F. Benson, *The English Hymn*, p. 573.

EXTEMPORE PRAYER

By CHARLES HARRIS

This essay strictly limits attention to Extempore Prayer in connection with the Public Liturgical Services of the Church, including the Visitation of the Sick, which, according to not only primitive and mediæval, but also Reformation ideas, was a public, not a private ministration, conducted with considerable pomp and ceremony, and involving (whenever possible) the attendance of assistant ministers and a congregation [1] (see, in addition to the authorities already mentioned,[2] the 1549 *Clerk's Book*, edited with valuable annotations for the Henry Bradshaw Society by Dr. J. Wickham Legg).

It may be stated that the Parish Clerk regularly attended the Parish Priest when he visited the sick until long after the Reformation (in some places as late as the middle of the eighteenth century), in order to lead the responses, and in other ways to act as the Priest's 'minister' or server.

Sick Visitation.

It is probable that from the beginning not only extempore exhortation, but also extempore prayer was freely employed by the presbyters in their ministrations to the sick; but it is a remarkable fact that only in two or three instances do the early and mediæval Offices for the Sick *explicitly* recognise extempore prayer. Even the exorcisms were as a rule learnt by heart, and repeated verbatim, as is still the case in the Orthodox Church. Nevertheless, reading between the lines, it seems safe to conclude that extempore ministrations were fairly frequent. For example, when the formulæ prescribed to accompany Unction and Imposition of Hands were extremely brief and vague (as was sometimes the case), the Priest was almost certainly intended to supply their deficiencies by extempore prayer, suited to the patient's condition. It was certainly the usual custom for the Priest to allude in his prayer to almost every detail of the sick person's physical, spiritual, and mental condition, and to bless, exorcise and anoint

[1] Among modern Anglican Offices for the Sick, the *American* explicitly recognises the presence of a congregation. It contains a prayer on behalf of 'all present at the Visitation.'

[2] In article 'Visitation of the Sick.'

almost the entire body, particularly the seat of the disease, or the place of greatest pain.

The 1549 and 1552 Books recognise only extempore exhortation and instruction, not extempore prayer. On the other hand, Canon 68 of 1604 permits 'preaching' ministers to substitute extempore ministration for the entire Visitation Office ('The Minister or Curate . . . shall resort unto [sick persons] to instruct and comfort them in their distress, according to the order of the Communion Book, if he be no Preacher, or if he be a Preacher, then as he shall think most needful and convenient.') This Canon governs the interpretation of the 1661 Visitation Office, which nowhere *explicitly* authorises extempore prayer; and indeed, if narrowly interpreted, excludes it. The 1928 Visitation Office explicitly recognises extempore prayer ('The Curate . . . shall minister to the sick person after the form following, *or in like manner*'). All the Reformed Anglican Books (including that of 1928) exclude extempore prayer from the Communion of the Sick, and it is not likely that the vaguely worded Canon of 1604 was intended to permit it.

The following modern Anglican Visitation Offices also allow extempore prayer:—the *Scottish*, 1929 ('The Priest shall minister to the sick person after the Form following, or *in like manner*'); (2) the *Canadian*, 1918 ('But, if necessity so require, nothing in this Order prescribed shall prevent the Minister from edifying and comforting the sick by instruction or prayer, as he shall think meet and convenient, in place of the Order here set forth'); (3) the *Irish*, 1927, which contains a similar rubric, but adds, 'but if the sick person shall require it, he shall use this Office, or some portion of it.'

Neither the revised *American* (1929) nor the revised *South African* (1930) Visitation Office recognises extempore prayer—indeed, according to a rigid interpretation, they exclude it.

The Eucharist.

The Eucharistic Liturgy, commemorating as it does the historical event of the Institution of the Sacrament by our Lord at the Last Supper, as a memorial of Himself, and particularly of His Redemptive Death, has always had a fixed nucleus, consisting of the recital, either singly or in combination (usually with some amount of devotional amplification), of the scriptural narratives, Matt. xxvi. 26–28; Mark xiv. 22–24; Luke xxii. 19–20; 1 Cor. xi. 24–25. This nucleus has always determined and limited the general character of the Canon, even in those ages in which considerable liberty of extempore prayer has been accorded to the celebrant.

Fixed forms of liturgical thanksgiving, for use before and after Communion, are already provided in the *Didache* (10), a docu-

ment of uncertain provenance and date, but probably not much later than A.D. 100.[1] As they contain no allusion to the historical Institution,[2] and are entirely devotional, they probably formed no part of the consecratory Canon recited by the celebrant. Under ordinary circumstances, they were probably led by one of the celebrant's assistants, and repeated by the communicants. If, however, prophets were present, extempore prayer was offered by them, either in addition to, or in substitution for, the two forms provided: 'But permit the prophets to give thanks as much as they desire (εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν).' Since fixed forms were provided for the use of the communicants, it is at least probable that a rudimentary form of Canon was provided for the use—or at least for the guidance—of the celebrant. In many cases he would adhere to the form provided, but if he were a 'prophet,' or possessed of the gift of extempore prayer to an unusual degree (the two qualifications usually went together), he would probably expand the form, or improvise another.

The *Didache* contemplates the possibility of a distinguished itinerant prophet settling permanently in a local Church and becoming its high- (or chief-) priest (ἀρχιερεύς). In this case he would become the normal celebrant of the Eucharist, and would usually *extemporise* the Canon, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit (see ch. 13).

According to the *Didache*, the Eucharist is normally celebrated by 'bishops' (ἐπίσκοποι), assisted by deacons. To secure such celebration (οὖν), the congregation are to appoint (χειροτονήσατε not *ordain*) for themselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, and these are not to be despised (chs. 14, 15).

The above interpretation of the obscure directions of the *Didache* seems the most probable in itself, and is obviously that adopted by the compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (*c.* A.D. 375), who reproduces, in an expanded (and more definitely orthodox [3]) form the devotions prescribed in the *Didache* for the communicants, adding this direction, 'Permit also your *presbyters* to give thanks,' evidently extemporaneously, after the manner of the 'prophets' of the *Didache* (Bk. vii, chs. 25–26).

[1] The *Didache* clearly belongs to some remote group of Churches, outside the main stream of apostolic tradition, peculiar in their constitution and environment, and undeveloped in respect of their theological—and especially their Christological—doctrine. It is impossible that it can have emanated (as Streeter suggests) from Antioch, the Church of St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. Ignatius.

[2] The author's acquaintance with the usual tradition of the Institution is undoubted, for he frequently quotes St. Matthew's Gospel, and when speaking of Baptism prescribes the Matthæan Trinitarian formula (Matt. xxviii. 19), and emphasises it by directing triple immersion (ch. vii.).

[3] The writer's own orthodoxy, however, hardly seems to reach—in expression at least—the full Nicene standard.

In the *Apostolic Constitutions* the Bishop (not the presbyters) is the celebrant, and the Canon to be used by him is set forth at length in the eighth book, chs. 5–15.

In the days of Justin Martyr (*c.* A.D. 155), the Eucharistic prayers of the celebrant, who was almost certainly the Bishop, followed a fixed order, and were probably already to a considerable extent stereotyped. The exact meaning of the words, 'The President offers prayers and thanksgivings over the bread and wine, ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ,' has been much debated. Their literal significance is probably 'with all possible energy or fervour,' which is certainly the meaning of ὅση δύναμις in 1 Ap. 13. But such an expression is much more natural if the Canon was—in part at least—extemporised, than if it was entirely read from a manuscript. Considering that in the Church of Rome (to which Justin belonged at the time of writing) extempore prayer was certainly permitted to the celebrant in the next generation, considering also (for what it is worth) the evidence of the *Didache*, it seems safe to conclude that the same practice also prevailed in Rome in Justin's time.

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus.

The first entirely unambiguous evidence for extempore prayer at the Eucharist in 'the great Church' is supplied by the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, which belongs to the early third century (see pp. 629 ff.). The original Greek is not extant, but the Latin Verona Fragment, the Ethiopic and Coptic versions of the 'Egyptian Church Order,' and the 'Canons of Hippolytus' (the last by implication only) concur in permitting the celebrating Bishop, if properly qualified, to extemporise.

The Coptic (which transliterates the Greek term εὐχαριστεῖν) runs as follows:—'Now the Bishop shall give thanks (εὐχαριστεῖν) according to the things which we said before (*i.e.* the Canon). It is not altogether necessary for him to recite the same words which we said before, as if learning to say them by heart in his thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία) to God; but according to the ability of each one he is to pray. If indeed he is able to pray sufficiently well with a grand prayer, then it is good; but if also he should pray and recite a prayer in (due) measure, no one may forbid him, only let him pray being sound in orthodoxy.'[1]

The Ethiopic reads: 'And it is [not][2] necessary that he should mention the things which we have already said, [but] that he should recite clearly and carefully,[3] and give thanks to God as it is proper for each to pray. And if there was one who could pray

[1] G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles*, 1904, p. 309.

[2] The negative has been accidentally omitted.

[3] We have evidence here that in the age of Hippolytus the Canon was still said aloud.

with devotion or use (make) a grand and elevated prayer, and he himself being good; and if he prayed and speaks praise with moderation, no one shall be prevented from praying, who is truly right (in his faith).' [1]

The Verona Latin Fragment only *explicitly* gives permission to the Bishop to extemporise when blessing the Oil of the Sick at the close of the Canon, but doubtless the permission is indeed to apply to the entire Eucharistic Service (for the text and translation of this Blessing, see above, p. 500).

The evidence, therefore, is complete and definite, that in Rome in the second and third centuries, and in Eastern Churches also, the gift of extempore prayer was greatly valued, and was allowed to be exercised by competent persons even in the Eucharistic Canon, although even at this early period written liturgies (of a somewhat meagre type) already existed.

The Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions.

We possess in the 8th Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, chs. 5–15, an instructive specimen of 'a grand and elevated prayer' for the Eucharistic Offering, such as Hippolytus would have approved. It is very much longer and more elaborate than the Anaphora of Serapion, or even than the highly developed Anaphora of the Greek Liturgy of St. James, which Dr. Brightman believes is quoted by St. Cyril of Jerusalem (in 348), and which was therefore compiled in the early fourth century, though it has received considerable later additions, as even a cursory inspection makes clear.

Accepting, then, the view that the co-called 'Clementine Liturgy' of the *Apostolic Constitutions* was not intended for actual use—at any rate on an ordinary Sunday—but is rather an 'ideal' production, representing the kind of Eucharistic Prayer which (in the opinion of the compiler) a newly-consecrated bishop ought to offer as a public demonstration of his facility and fervour in extemporising, we have evidence that, even in the latter half of the fourth century, extempore prayer at the Eucharist was not only permitted, but (on important occasions) even encouraged, although such extemporisation was based upon a traditional (and usually written) scheme.

If, however, this view be taken of the Eucharistic Liturgy, then numerous other prayers contained in the *Constitutions* must also be regarded as 'ideal' productions—suggestive models to be followed (in the spirit, not in the letter) by offerers of extempore prayer, and compilers of local Liturgies, Service Books, and Manuals of Devotion.

In the early Eastern Liturgies, not only the celebrant, but also the deacon was entrusted with an important ministry of public

[1] G. Horner, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

intercession. Having in mind the value attached to extempore prayer even in the fourth century, it is hardly possible to read the Litanies and the elaborate 'biddings' or invitations to prayer assigned to the deacon, without feeling certain that not only were these 'biddings' enlarged *ad libitum* to suit the circumstances of the place and time, but also that the deacon, after the prescribed 'bidding,' added suitable extempore prayer of his own.

Traces of Extempore Prayer in Liturgies still in use.

After the fourth century, the tendency was for public worship to become more stereotyped, and more strictly confined to written forms. But even the existing Services of the Eastern and Western Churches contain a few opportunities for extempore prayer definitely provided for by rubric.

The Canon of the Roman Mass contains two rubrics, directing short pauses, during which the celebrant is to pray by name for such of the living and the dead as he wishes. Similar rubrics occur in the Liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil. In the primitive period, when the entire Service was performed audibly, audible extempore prayer would have been offered at these points by the celebrant.

The Liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil have a similar rubric referring to the deacon: 'The deacon censes the Holy Table in a circle, and commemorates [the diptychs of] such of the living and dead as he wills.'

The Bidding of the Bedes (i.e. 'the praying of the prayers'[1]).

In the present Roman *Ordo Missæ*, there occurs at the Offertory the word *Oremus*, without any prayer following.

All ancient Liturgies either have or have had at some time in their history, a series of intercessions (often in Litany form) at or near this point. Such intercessions followed the Sermon, or the Gospel if there was no Sermon.

Already in the eighth century, for some unexplained reason, the original Roman intercessions were confined to Good Friday, the word *Oremus* only remaining as an indication of their original occurrence at this point. The Roman Missal gives the following directions for the saying of these Intercessions at the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday. '*Then the Priest, standing at the horn of the Epistle, begins thus in a distinct voice, with his hands folded.* Let us pray, ye who are most dear to us, for the most holy Church of God, that our Lord and God may vouchsafe to give peace and unity to it, and to protect it throughout the world, subjecting to it principalities and powers, and to grant that we, living a

[1] The words 'bid' (to command) and 'bid' (to pray) are entirely distinct. Originally to 'bid' prayers meant not to 'request' them, but to *say* them.

quiet and tranquil life, may glorify God the Father Almighty. *Then the deacon says*, Let us bend our knees [*originally the people here knelt for silent prayer*]. *The subdeacon responds*, Arise [*originally the people rose*].' Then the Priest, with hands extended, chants a prayer for the Church and the Pope. Here once succeeded another pause for silent prayer (the people kneeling). Then follows prayer for bishops, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, door-keepers, confessors, virgins, widows, and all the holy people of God. The Priest then asks for prayers for ' our most Christian Emperor, that our Lord and God may subject to him all barbarous nations '; also for catechumens, for heretics and schismatics, for ' the perfidious Jews, that our God and Lord may remove the veil from their hearts '; and for pagans, that, ' forsaking their idols, they may turn to the living and true God, and his only Son Jesus Christ our God and Lord ! ' Prayer was also offered against famine and pestilence, and on behalf of prisoners, travellers, the sick, and voyagers.

The loss of these moving petitions from the Roman Liturgy was apparently felt.[1] At any rate, as early as the ninth century it became customary for the Priest after his Sermon at Mass on Sundays and Festivals to admonish the people to pray for all orders of men in Church and State, and for the faithful departed. The Priest mentioned a subject for intercession, and then left a space for silent prayer, or himself led the intercessions of the people, with the use either of a suitable Collect or of extempore prayer. The preacher was always and everywhere allowed a free hand to vary the form and manner of ' bidding ' at his discretion. Regino of Prüm (died 915), who enjoins this custom, quotes as authority for it 1 Tim. ii. 1 ff., and adds, ' and let the Priest solemnly recite (*expleat*) prayers conformable thereto.'

In England and France it became the custom for the Priest ' to bid the bedes ' before, instead of after his sermon.

That the preacher was allowed to extemporise his ' bidding of the bedes ' in the period immediately before the Reformation is shown by the short original form of bidding attached to John Colet's famous Convocation Sermon of 1512,[2] and by Latimer's Convocation Sermon of June 9, 1536 (published by the Parker Society). Fuller details are given in H. O. C[oxe], *Forms of Bidding Prayer*, 1840.

Bidding Prayer of 1604.

Canon 55 enjoins the use of a Bidding Prayer almost identical with that prescribed by the Elizabethan Injunctions of 1559. ' Before all Sermons, Lectures, and Homilies, the Preachers and

[1] See Brightman, *The English Rite*, pp. 1020 ff., to whom this section is principally indebted.

[2] See J. H. Lupton, *Life of John Colet*, p. 294.

Ministers shall move the people to join with them in prayer in this form, *or to this effect*, as briefly as they conveniently may: Ye shall pray for Christ's Holy Catholic Church . . . always concluding with the Lord's Prayer.'

This Canon requires a Bidding Prayer to be used before all sermons, including of course those preached at the Eucharist, where alone the 1559 and 1661 Books required a Sermon (or Homily) to be delivered.

The words '*or to this effect*' obviously permit extempore prayer by the Minister in substitution for the form given. This has been contested on the ground that the form directs the congregation (not the Minister) to pray. But the last clause runs, 'Finally let *us* praise God (*not* ye shall praise God) for all those which are departed,' etc.; nor is there any suggestion that the Minister's prayer should be silent.

Dr. Brightman states that this Canon has been widely understood, not only by Puritans, but also by definite churchmen, as authorising direct extempore prayer by the minister;[1] and it has even been urged (in arguing against Dissenters) that 'the Church of England permits extempore prayer before Sermon.'[2]

After the Restoration, the fear of undesirable extempore effusions from Puritan and anti-royalist ministers caused both Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury strongly to desire to replace the traditional 'bidding of the bedes' by a prescribed prayer before sermon (the Upper House also desired one after). But though the project was discussed for sixty or seventy years, nothing ultimately came of it; and Canon 55 of 1604 is still theoretically in force, though it is little observed, except at University Sermons and on important civic occasions. As a matter of fact, most of the ground covered by the prescribed Bidding Prayer is also covered by the Prayer for the Church, which since 1549 has been fully intelligible to the people. In these days a comprehensive Bidding Prayer at the Eucharist is hardly needed. If one is used, great care should be used to avoid 'vain repetition.'

When a sermon is preached apart from a service, it should be introduced by a comprehensive Bidding Prayer of the kind prescribed. Now that the practice of prayer for the departed has again become general, it is desirable at the close of the 'bidding,' not merely to praise God for the faithful departed, but also to pray for them, as was the original custom.

[1] Among other authorities, this is definitely stated by Peter Heylin in a tract written in 1636, but first printed in his *Ecclesia Vindicata* in 1657.

[2] *E.g.* by Dr. John Scott in *A Collection of Cases and other Discourses to recover Dissenters to the Communion of the C. of E.*, 1698.

Modern Revisions of the Prayer Book.

The 1928 Communion Office (England) places the following rubric before the 'Prayer for the Church':—'The Priest may here *bid* special prayers and thanksgivings.'

If the traditional and etymological interpretation of 'bid' be adopted, the Priest is here permitted *to offer* special prayers and thanksgivings, either extemporaneous or precomposed. On the other hand, if the more usual modern interpretation of 'bid' be adopted, the Priest is not here allowed himself to offer prayer but only to request the people to pray silently. A third alternative is, that the compilers deliberately used 'bid' in an indeterminate sense, with the object of permitting both practices. Upon the whole, the last interpretation seems the most likely.

Since the 1604 Canon requires the bidding of prayers and thanksgiving to take place, not before the Intercession for the Church, but *before the sermon* (or after the Nicene Creed), the 1928 rubric ought to be transferred to this position. A Canon cannot be repealed by a Liturgical Book which has not as yet been authorised by any 'synodical act' of Convocation.

Extempore prayer on an extensive scale is authorised by the following rubric of the 1928 Book, which occurs at the end of the Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings. '*Note, that subject to any direction which the Bishop may give, the Minister may, at his discretion, after the conclusion of Morning or Evening Prayer, or of any Service contained in this Book, offer prayer in his own words.*'

As Morning and Evening Prayer close in the 1928 Book (as in that of 1549) at the third Collect, any prayers after this depending entirely upon the 'discretion' of the Minister, it follows that the 1928 Book allows the whole of the devotions after the third Collect (if there are any) to be extemporaneous. To understand by the 'conclusion of Morning and Evening Prayer' the conclusion of the Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings, which are not organic parts of Mattins or Evensong, nor of the Litany and Communion Service at which also they are permitted to be said, would be extremely unnatural.

The words 'subject to any directions the Bishop may give' are to be understood as meaning 'directions for the proper regulation of extempore devotions,' with a view to greater reverence and edification. To understand such 'directions' as including power to prohibit extempore prayer altogether would be extremely unnatural, though perhaps not quite impossible grammatically.

No other Church in the Anglican Communion gives anything like this ample scope for the exercise of the gift of extempore prayer. It is to be hoped that this great privilege—fraught with danger as well as blessing—will not be widely abused. Its importance,

in view of possible reunion with Protestant Nonconformity in a future still remote, is obvious and needs no emphasis.

Hitherto Anglicanism has unduly emphasised rigid liturgical uniformity, Nonconformity extempore prayer. Impartial judges in these days are for the most part of opinion that the complete triumph of neither principle is desirable, but that what is needed is a judicious combination of both. To achieve this synthesis is the most urgent liturgical task of the modern Anglican Communion.

The American Prayer Book (1929) contains a Bidding Prayer 'to be used before Sermons, or on Special Occasions,' in the use of which the Minister is allowed a certain amount of discretion ('the Minister, in his discretion, may omit any of the clauses in this Prayer, or may add others, as occasion may require'); but he receives no permission to use extempore prayer. Only the Congregation (not the Minister) are directed to pray, but mental prayer by the Minister is implied in the words, 'And now, brethren, summing up all *our* petitions,' etc.

Before the Sermon at the 'Eucharist' other authorised prayers and intercessions may be substituted for the Bidding Prayer.

The Scottish Communion Office has this rubric immediately before the Offertory: '*The Presbyter may here bid special prayers and thanksgivings.*' If 'bid' here means 'pray,' extempore prayer is directly authorised; even if not, it is not excluded.

The new South African Communion Office (1927) has the following rubric: 'When Intercession or Thanksgiving is to be offered for any special object it shall be provided for by a Form of Bidding either here [before the Prayer for the Church] or before the Offertory.'

If 'bidding' here means, not 'prayer,' but 'requests for prayer,' *extempore* prayer is not excluded. The Priest would first announce the subject of the prayer, and then actually offer it.

Interpolations in the Communion Office.

The interpolations in the Communion Office to which least objection can be made are those which are sometimes used in the Prayer for the Church. To insert the names of the Archbishop of the Province, of the Bishop and assistant Bishop of the diocese, of the sick and afflicted persons for whom prayers are desired, also of the patron Saint of the Church or of the day, and in certain cases to mention some special need of national or local importance, gives warmth and colour to the Prayer, and is justified by practical needs and primitive precedent.

Interpolations in, or unauthorised additions to, the Canon (even when entirely inaudible) raise a more difficult problem. Objection to them is widely—and not unreasonably—felt, and the 1928 Revisers attempted to suppress them by inserting the

following rubric: '*The Order here provided shall not be supplemented by additional prayers, save so far as is herein permitted; nor shall the private devotions of the Priest be such as to hinder, interrupt, or alter the course of the service.*'

In connection with this difficult question, two points ought to be remembered: (1) That it is not disloyal to desire a better and fuller Canon. The Laudian School as a whole preferred the Canon of 1549 to that of 1552, and, had political and ecclesiastical circumstances been propitious, they would have restored it (or something like it) in 1661. (2) That the primitive Church permitted (and indeed encouraged, when the Bishop possessed in unusual measure the *charisma* of extempore prayer) the expansion of the somewhat jejune and uninspiring Canons which were at first committed to writing (*e.g.* that of Hippolytus) by the extempore devotions of the celebrant. The Church of the later fourth and fifth centuries removed the need of extensive interpolations by the celebrant, by gradually expanding and improving the existing Canons, until they embraced nearly every important aspect of Eucharistic worship, and nearly every human need. The Eucharistic Canon ceased to be interpolated to any considerable extent, mainly because *it no longer needed interpolation*—it had achieved (relative) perfection.

The difficulty is that the new Canon provided in 1928 has not proved acceptable to the majority of those for whom it was intended, with the result that interpolation continues. The 1928 Revision was wrecked by the decision to construct a new Canon, instead of authorising the alternative use of that of 1549. The 1549 Canon is Cranmer's greatest liturgical achievement. It skilfully combines the standpoints of the Old and of the New Learning. It is definitely a Reformation document, and yet a conservative like Gardiner could use it and praise it. Its Epiklesis recognises the truth contained in the Eastern theory of Consecration, and yet does not abandon the Western, as the Epiclesis of 1928 seems to many to do. It was used by the entire Church of England by the joint authority of Convocation and Parliament, and its supersession has been regretted by a long line of distinguished divines from the Elizabethan age to our own: Overall, Cosin, Laud, Heylin, Sancroft, Taylor, Thorndike, J. Johnson, Archbishop John Sharpe, Bishop Wilson, Brett, Whiston, Wheatly, and many more. Dr. Brightman shortly before his death reiterated his desire that in any future Revision the alternative Canon be that of 1549, with only a single change, viz., the transference of the Intercession to the Offertory, in accordance with Gallican precedent, and that of the 1637 Scottish Book. He approved the form and position of the 1549 Epiklesis.

LITURGICAL SILENCE

By CHARLES HARRIS

In a liturgical work it would be inappropriate to discuss at length either the general question of the devotional value and use of silence, or its psychology. Such subjects as the use of silence as a philosophic discipline (as among the Pythagoreans), or as a part of monastic discipline; or in connection with retreats, missions, prayer meetings, and private devotion, lie beyond our province. Still less need we consider the devotional value attached to silence in the religions of the middle and far East, *e.g.* by Hinduism and Buddhism. What we propose to deal with exclusively here is *Liturgical Silence*, more particularly silence at the Eucharist.

Among Protestants, the religious body which has most fully explored (and in some periods even abused to the neglect of the Ministry of the Word) the practice of silent worship is the Friends or Quakers.

Among Western Catholics, a similar instinctive appreciation of the value of silent worship led in the early Middle Ages, if not to the establishment,[1] at least to the continual extension and increasing popularity of Low Mass. At the present day not a few Latin Catholics definitely prefer Low to High Mass, partly, it would seem, on account of its brevity and simplicity, but still more on account of the devotional effect of the mystical or subdued voice employed by the celebrant even in those portions of the service intended to be audible. Similarly not a few Anglicans prefer a quiet service, conducted in a subdued voice, to the Choral Eucharistic Service with Sermon or Homily which alone the rubrics expressly prescribe or contemplate.[2]

In Eastern Christendom the Holy Eucharist is always chorally rendered with full ceremonial, as it originally was in the West also. But inasmuch as many of the prayers are said in a low or inaudible voice, ample opportunities are afforded for silent worship, even though, according to present and long-standing

[1] Probably the desire to multiply Masses, arising from a belief in the separate and distinct efficacy of each Mass, was the main productive cause of the system of Low Masses.

[2] The rubrics direct the Nicene Creed, and the *Sanctus* (with its introductory Preface), to be 'sung' or 'said'; the *Gloria in excelsis* to be 'said' or 'sung.'

use, the Priest's inaudible prayers are largely accompanied by the singing of anthems by the choir.

Sufficient information on the general subject of religious silence (with a few references to its liturgical use) will be found in the instructive volume of Essays by T. Hodgkin (Quaker), L. V. Hodgkin (Quaker), Percy Dearmer, J. C. Fitzgerald, and the late Cyril Hepher (editor), entitled *The Fellowship of Silence* (1915); in its sequel *The Fruits of Silence;* and in Rufus Jones's article 'Silence' in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.*

With regard to the psychological processes involved, it is sufficient here to say that the effect of silence (or of subdued or whispered speech) is to lull the outward senses into a receptive condition; to induce tranquillity, repose, and inward peace; to relax the tension of the nervous system; and gradually to induce a state of restful waiting upon God, which opens the 'subconscious' or 'unconscious' mind to the influence of grace and religious suggestion.

Eucharistic Silence.

It is practically certain, and generally admitted, that in the earliest period the entire Eucharistic Office, including the Canon or Prayer of Consecration, was recited in an audible voice. Justin Martyr (see above, p. 544) mentions that the people expressed their assent to the President's Eucharistic Prayer by responding *Amen.* Similar testimony is given by Tertullian, *c.* 200 (*De spectaculis*, xxv.); and the author of the *De Mysteriis* (ix.), who was probably St. Ambrose. Dionysius of Alexandria (*c.* 255) speaks of a man who '*listened to* the [Eucharistic] thanksgiving, and joined in answering, *Amen*' (Eusèb., *H.E.*, vii. 9). Still more decisive is the fact that the celebrant in primitive times was allowed a certain liberty of extemporising, even in the Canon, which plainly indicates that his words were audible to the congregation (see *Extempore Prayer*, pp. 759 ff.).

Nevertheless, at an early but undetermined date, it gradually became customary, both in the East and in the West, to recite certain of the most solemn Eucharistic prayers, particularly the greatest part of the Canon, in a very low or inaudible voice. Such recitation was termed 'mystic' (μυστικός), an epithet which sufficiently indicates its significance. It expressed on the part of the Priest, and was designed to evoke in the laity, a religious emotion compounded of awe, reverence, and fear. It evinced just such an overpowering sense, not merely of humility, but even of 'abjection' and 'nothingness,' as befits a creature admitted to the immediate presence of its Creator. What R. Otto calls 'creature feeling,' 'creature-consciousness,' and 'numinous feeling' was powerfully experienced by the ancient Church at the celebration of the Eucharist; and it was this

humble abasement which tended to find expression in a subdued or inaudible tone of voice, which seems to have been adopted by the celebrant in some places as early as the fourth century.

There are obvious disadvantages, both of a devotional and of an intellectual kind, in the silent recitation of the Canon or Anaphora. On the other hand, it can hardly be denied that the 'mystic' prayer of the celebrant has been a prime factor in creating that thrilling atmosphere of rapt adoration which has been the distinctive feature of Catholic worship throughout the ages; and which the more intellectual, instructive, and 'edifying' worship of modern Protestants seems unable to evoke. One of the most important tasks which lies before the Anglican Communion at the present moment is to produce a working synthesis between these two distinct, but not really incompatible, ideals and systems of public worship.

Origin of Liturgical Silence.

Stress upon mystical awe (which found instinctive expression in 'mystical' prayer) is specially characteristic of the Eucharistic teaching of St. John Chrysostom (*c.* 345–407). It is also a most prominent feature in the Greek Liturgy which bears his name, and 'with the composition of which [he] may have had something to do, or he may not' (Brightman). But even from the beginning of Christianity some degree of awe and dread accompanied the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, as is clear from the language of St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 26–33).[1]

A fixed date for the beginning of the emphasis on awe and dread, which (in the writer's judgment) led quickly to the 'mystical' recitation of the most solemn prayers, is afforded by the Catechetical Lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem (delivered in A.D. 348), and by the early Liturgy of Jerusalem (the primitive form of the Liturgy of St. James), which is freely quoted by St. Cyril. This Liturgy, as we now possess it, has been interpolated with the object of expressing not only the consubstantiality of the Son (which probably found expression in its oldest form), but also that of the Holy Ghost (defined by the First Œcumenical Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381); also of giving adequate recognition to that greater reverence for the Blessed

[1] It may be that over-emphasis upon the awe-inspiring and 'fearful' aspect of the Mysteries accounted in part for the increasing reluctance of the laity to communicate, the beginnings of which were already noticed and rebuked by St. Chrysostom (*Hom. iii. de Incompr. Nat. Dei*, 6: *Hom. iii. in Epist. ad Ephes.* 4; etc.).

Beyond doubt the terrifying language of the first and third Exhortations in the Anglican Communion Office has scared from the altar thousands of devout but timid and scrupulous souls, who ought to have been regular communicants. Though these are now seldom read, their effect remains.

Virgin, which naturally resulted from the official ascription to her of the title 'Mother of God' by the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431).

Dr. Brightman shows clearly, by a careful comparison of St. Cyril's quotations with our present text (see *Eastern Liturgies*, pp. 464 ff.), that St. James's Liturgy already existed in substantially its existing form as early as A.D. 348. But since its devotional attitude towards our Lord's Person is emphatically 'Nicene,' its date of composition must fall later than A.D. 325, and may be fixed approximately at A.D. 330–35.

An atmosphere of mystical awe pervades the whole of this Liturgy. The worshippers are said to be 'full of fear and dread' while they offer 'this fearful and unbloody sacrifice,' which is further described as 'a fearful and awe-inspiring (φρικτῆς) ministration.' After consecration, the elements are spoken of as 'hallowed, precious, celestial, ineffable, stainless, glorious, terrible (φοβερῶν), dreadful (φρικτῶν), divine (θείων).'

Cyril's own language is equally emphatic. For him the offering of the Anaphora is 'the hour of greatest trembling (τὴν φρικωδεστάτην ὥραν)'; and the consecrated gifts, as they lie before the Priest on the altar, are 'the holy and most tremendous (φρικωδεστάτης) sacrifice.' The communicant approaches the altar to receive them 'in the manner of adoration and religious reverence (σεβάσματος),' making his left hand a 'throne' for his right hand, because the latter is about to receive a 'king.' No crumb must be dropped, for each fragment is more valuable than gold and precious stones (*Catecheses*, 22 and 23).

We have quoted this ancient Liturgy with St. Cyril's comments at some length, principally to fix approximately the beginning of 'mystical' liturgical prayer, partly also to demonstrate how baseless is the statement recently made by Prof. Karl Adam, and repeated by several English writers, that religious awe and fear at the celebration of the Eucharist scarcely antedates the pastoral activity of St. John Chrysostom, who was ordained deacon in 381, priest in 386, and died in 407. 'This transformation,' says Adam, 'set in with . . . St. John Chrysostom . . . Now for the first time in the history of the Eucharist is there talk of the "awful sacrifice," the "awful bread," and of the "fear and trembling" with which we should receive the Body of the Lord,' etc. (*Christ our Brother*, 1931, pp. 46 ff.).

There is truth in Adam's contention that the conflict with Arianism led to the Divinity of Christ being unduly emphasised to the neglect of His humanity; also that one result of this was the heightening of the awe and dread with which the Eucharist was received. But our quotations prove conclusively that such sentiments were widely entertained a whole generation before Chrysostom; and 1 Cor. xi. 28 ff. is proof positive that the attitude

of the Apostolic Church towards the consecrated gifts was very similar.[1]

Hardly less emphasis on awe and dread is found in the *Liturgy of St. Basil*, of which the Anaphora is pronounced by Dr. Brightman to be 'almost certainly the work of the great Basil of Cæsarea' (*c.* 330–379). A sense of 'numinous' awe pervades this Liturgy, which speaks of the Mysteries as not only 'divine, holy, spotless, immortal, heavenly, and quickening'; but also as 'tremendous' or 'fearful' (φρικτῶν, literally 'to be shuddered at').

The rubrics of this Liturgy, which prescribe that nearly all the Anaphora should be recited 'mystically,' are doubtless of much later date; but they probably embody a long-standing tradition. At any rate the psychological and devotional attitude of St. Cyril, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom towards the Holy Eucharist was such, that it would be no matter of surprise if already in their day the mystical recitation of the Anaphora had begun in their cathedral churches. St. Chrysostom's remarks on 1 Cor. xiv. 16 (*Hom. xxx. in 1 Cor.*) are far from conclusive evidence to the contrary. All that they clearly indicate is that *part* of the Anaphora was recited audibly, in particular the concluding words 'for ever and ever,' which gave the cue for the people's response, *Amen*. Even as at present used in the Orthodox Church, the Liturgies of St. James, St. Chrysostom, and St. Basil direct that our Lord's words concerning both the Bread and the Cup, also the concluding words 'for ever and ever,' should be pronounced aloud, and be followed in all three cases by the people's *Amen*.

The earliest direct and absolutely undeniable evidence for

[1] From very early days the Eucharist was 'the holy thing' or 'things' (τὸ ἅγιον, τὰ ἅγια, *sanctum, sanctissimum, sancta*). Thus the *Didache* (*c.* A.D. 100) applies Matt. vii. 6 to the Eucharist, as also do Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, 26, and Athanasius, *Fragment* on Matt. vii. 6 (*P.G.*, xxvii. 1380). The following passages also testify to the deep reverence with which the Eucharist was regarded in the period before Chrysostom: Tert., *De Cor.*, 3; Hil. Pict., *C. Constant.*, 11; Optatus, *De Schism. Don.*, 8. 13–17; Ambrose, *De Spir.*, 5. 3. 80; Amb. *apud Thdt. H.E.*, 5. 18.

The *Apostolic Constitutions*, which, though compiled about A.D. 375, represent a pre-Nicene type of devotion, give similar testimony. They represent the deacons as 'ministering the Lord's Body with fear,' and the laity as 'approaching with reverence and holy fear as to the Body of their King' (ii. 57, cf. viii. 13).

Hippolytus's direction in his *Apostolic Tradition* (E.C.O. 8): 'The Body of Christ is to be eaten by believers, and is not to be despised,' is evidence *against* (not for) Adam's contention. It refers to the reception of the Eucharist, not publicly in church, but privately at home. The Roman artisan who carried the Eucharist home with him from church in a cheap box, and stored it in a not very suitable place in his mean and crowded dwelling, required to be reminded that familiarity with holy things may breed contempt, and that it was his duty to show not less reverence to the Eucharist in his own home, than in the cathedral church.

liturgical silence at the Anaphora comes from a Nestorian source, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*.[1] Narsai died in A.D. 502. His Liturgy seems to have been a revision of an earlier Persian rite attributed to Addai and Mari.

From Hom. xvii we learn that, after the *Sursum corda* and before the *Sanctus*, 'all the ecclesiastical body now observes silence, and all set themselves to pray earnestly in their hearts. The Priests are still, and the deacons stand in silence . . . the whole people is quiet and still, subdued and calm. . . . The Mysteries are set in order, the censers are smoking, the lamps are shining, and the deacons are hovering and brandishing [fans] in likeness of watchers [*i.e.* angels]. Deep silence and peaceful calm settles on that place: it is filled and overflows with brightness and splendour, beauty and power. The bright [-robed] Priest opens his mouth and speaks in secret with God, as a familiar friend.' After the *Sanctus*, which is said aloud, the church 'returns to silence' for the Prayer of Consecration, which is said silently till after the Words of Institution, when the Priest 'raises his voice at the end of his prayer, to make it audible to the people. He makes his voice heard, and with his hand he signs the Mysteries that are set [on the altar], and the people with *Amen* concur and acquiesce in the prayer of the Priest.'

The Epiklesis, by which consecration is declared by Narsai to be effected, is apparently pronounced inaudibly, the Priest worshipping, 'with quaking, and fear, and harrowing dread.' But the exact moment of it is proclaimed to the congregation: 'Then the herald of the church cries in that hour, "In silence and fear be ye standing: peace be with us. Let all the people be in fear at this moment in which the adorable Mysteries are being accomplished by the descent of the Spirit."'

In Narsai's Liturgy, as in those of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, the whole Anaphora, with the exception of a few phrases, is said in silence. Nor is there any reason to suppose that this was a Nestorian peculiarity, adopted later by the Orthodox. There are good though not decisive grounds for believing that the practice originated more than a century earlier among the Orthodox.

Justinian's Legislation.

In Justinian's day the silent recitation of the Anaphora was common, but far from universal. The Emperor, and a certain number of the laity, objected to the practice, which was forbidden in the year 565 by civil legislation.[2] Justinian states or implies

[1] Edited by Dom. R. H. Connolly in *Texts and Studies*, Vol. VIII. 1, 1909. I am assuming that Homily xvii is authentic.

[2] The original Greek text of the *Novella* is printed in the *Corpus Juris Civilis*, edited by Mommsen and others, Vol. III. pp. 695-99.

that the audible recitation of the Anaphora has been 'canonically established by the holy Apostles and Fathers,' but refrains from mentioning to what particular Canons he is referring. He appeals with more cogency to the Epistle to the Romans and to 1 Corinthians. His actual directions are as follows: 'Moreover, we order all bishops and priests to say the prayers used in the Divine Oblation and in Holy Baptism not inaudibly, but in a voice that can be heard by the faithful people, that the minds of those who listen may be excited to greater compunction. . . . It is fitting that the prayers made to our Lord Jesus Christ, our God, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, in the Holy Oblation and elsewhere should be recited aloud (μετὰ φωνῆς). Those who refuse must answer at the judgment-seat of God, nor will we, when we find this to be the case, leave them unpunished.'

Upon this 'Novel' of Justinian, Edmund Bishop makes the following strange comment: 'In the year 565 the recital of the Canon aloud was the traditional and still universal practice through the regions comprised in Justinian's wide dominions.' Even what is here quoted of Justinian's language shows perfectly clearly that such audible recitation was very far from universal.

Scudamore claims that Justinian's legislation resulted in a 'compromise,' but in reality it seems to have produced no permanent effect. The *Pratum Spirituale* of Joannes Moschus, published between 600 and 622, states that because the presbyters *in some places* said the Anaphora aloud, the children knew it by heart.[1] Obviously the practice was not general (see *P.G.*, lxxxvii. 3082).

By the close of the eighth century the 'mystical' recitation of the Anaphora was the established and official use, as is shown by the ancient Barberini MS. of the *Euchologion* (of that date), which contains the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom practically in its present form. The practice of the separated Eastern Churches in this matter is similar to that of the Orthodox Church.[2]

The Western Church.

In the modern Roman Church the entire Canon of the Mass, except the two following short phrases, is said inaudibly:—*nobis quoque peccatoribus* (at which the voice is slightly raised), and *Per omnia sæcula sæculorum*, which is the signal for the response, *Amen* (this is spoken with an 'intelligible voice,' or sung). Only at ordinations of priests and consecrations of bishops, when 'concelebration' is directed, is the voice of the chief celebrant slightly raised, in order to secure coincident consecration.

[1] He tells a story about bread and wine, over which the Anaphora had been recited by children playing at celebrating the Eucharist, being struck by lightning, which stunned, though it did not kill the children.

[2] For the details, see Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, Pt. 2, ch. vi., sect. iii.

The practice of silent recitation goes back at least to the eighth century, as *Ordo Romanus II*,[1] our earliest witness of certain date, testifies. How much more ancient the practice is, we have no means at present of knowing.

In Gaul, the name given to the prayer immediately following the Recital of the Institution was 'post secreta' or 'post mysterium,' which implies that at least the actual consecration was silently performed. In the ancient Gothic rite this prayer is called 'post pridie,' so that it affords no evidence as to the method of recitation of the Canon.

Silence in the Anglican Prayer Books.

The 1661 Book contains only one direction for silence. In the Ordering of Priests, after the public examination and answers of the candidates, this rubric occurs: 'After this, the congregation shall be desired secretly in their prayers to make their humble supplications to God for all these things, for the which prayers there shall be silence kept for a space.'

The 1928 Book prescribes intervals for silent prayer in all the Ordination Services.

In the Occasional Prayers this rubric occurs: '*If it is desired to pray for other needs, it shall be sufficient to say*, Let us pray for . . . *and silence shall be kept for a space. Then shall follow*— ℣ Lord, hear our prayer; ℟ And let our cry come unto thee.' A similar rubric occurs at the end of the thanksgivings. In the new Introduction to Morning or Evening Prayer, the Minister may omit the preliminary exhortation and say instead: 'Let us humbly confess our sins to Almighty God. *And thereupon silence shall be kept for a space, all kneeling.*'

In the revised Scottish Prayer Book (1929) the principle of liturgical silence in connection with the Anaphora is recognised by the following rubric occurring after the Eucharistic Lord's Prayer of the Scottish Liturgy: '*Here the Presbyter shall break the consecrated bread, and silence may be kept for a brief space.*' Silent prayer is also directed in all the services of the Ordinal.

The South African Alternative Liturgy has the following rubric after the Canon and Lord's Prayer, and just before the Prayer of Humble Access: '*Then shall silence be kept for a space.*'

The 1661 Book contains no rubric explicitly directing the Prayer of Consecration to be said audibly; but its inaudible recitation would be a manifest departure from the entire spirit of the vernacular Liturgy. The 1928 Book inserts this rubric: '*The Service following shall be said throughout in a distinct and audible voice.*'

An audible voice need not be a loud voice. It is possible to obtain the full 'mystical' effect of silence by reciting the Canon

[1] Printed in Mabillon's *Musæum Italicum*, ii. p. 48; also in Migne, *P.L.*, lxxviii.

in a very low and subdued voice, fully audible to every careful listener in the church, and yet expressive and suggestive of the deepest religious awe. It is not desirable, for the sake of one or two partially deaf persons, to raise the voice, and thus impede the devotion of the general congregation, which is fostered and augmented by the use of a subdued tone of voice. The Canon should in all cases be succeeded by a short period of absolute and unbroken silence, as is directed in the new South African Liturgy and is permitted in the Scottish. On no account should the organ (however softly played) be allowed to break in upon this most precious period of silent worship. It is of great importance that the *Agnus Dei* should not be sung until full time has been given for the effect of the Prayer of Consecration to sink deeply (during the interval of silence) into the minds of the congregation:—'The Lord is in his holy temple: let all the earth keep silence before him' (Hab. ii. 20).

What has been said has, of course, no reference to the variable portions of the service (*e.g.* Collect, Epistle, and Gospel), which should always be read in a resonant and penetrating voice.

PRAYER BOOK REVISION SINCE 1662

By THE EDITOR

In the following sketch England will be found claiming a space which may seem to some readers disproportionate. The reason for this is the present complication in the relations of Church and State, which might cause confusion, especially in the minds of overseas readers, if the narrative were too condensed.

A drastic revision of the Book of Common Prayer was proposed in 1689, after the accession of William and Mary, with a view to reconciling religious differences.[1] A Commission of ten Bishops and twenty divines prepared a series of proposals, by which not only would the style of the Prayer Book have been altered for the worse, according to our modern view,[2] but the standard of Churchmanship would have been appreciably lowered. They included the following changes: the alteration of the word 'Priest' to 'Minister' in many places; the removal of Black-letter Days from the Calendar; the making of the surplice optional; the substitution (apparently) of Psalms for the *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis;* the dispensing of those who had conscientious objections from the necessity of using the sign of the cross in Baptism; the reordaining of priests ordained by the Roman Rite;[3] etc. The proposals had an unfavourable reception and were never formally presented to Convocation. The resistance came mainly from the Lower House.

The general atmosphere of the eighteenth century and the fact that many of the clergy with liturgical knowledge were Nonjurors prevented the question of revision from being seriously raised until the revival of Convocation in 1852. It will be convenient to consider the line taken by the Lambeth Conference subsequent to that date before we trace the course of events in the Provinces of Canterbury and York.

1867. Resolution 8. '. . . each Province should have the right to make such adaptations and additions to the services of the Church as its peculiar circumstances may require. *Pro-*

[1] See Procter and Frere, pp. 206–21. [2] See p. 810.

[3] Roman Catholicism was a proscribed religion and its priests often went under assumed names; this made their letters of orders valueless for purposes of identification.

vided, that no change or addition be made inconsistent with the spirit and principles of the Book of Common Prayer, and that all such changes be liable to revision by any Synod of the Anglican Communion in which the said Province shall be represented.' [1]

1888. Resolution 10. '. . . no particular portion of the Church should undertake revision without seriously considering the possible effect of such action on other branches of the Church.' [2]

1897. Resolutions 45, 46 recognise the *jus liturgicum* of the Diocesan Bishop [3]—'the exclusive right of each Bishop to put forth or sanction additional services for use within his jurisdiction, subject to such limitations as may be imposed by the provincial or other lawful authority'; and [46] 'of adapting the Services in the Book of Common Prayer to local circumstances . . . subject to . . . lawful authority, provided also that any such adaptation shall not affect the doctrinal teaching or value of the Service or passage thus adapted.' [4]

1908. The Conference laid down the following principles which should be kept in view by a competent authority revising the Prayer Book (Resolution 27) : [5]

(*a*) The adaptation of rubrics in a large number of cases to present customs as generally accepted;
(*b*) The omission of parts of the services to obviate repetition or redundancy;
(*c*) The framing of additions to the present services in the way of enrichment;
(*d*) The fuller provision of alternatives in our forms of worship;
(*e*) The provision for greater elasticity in public worship;
(*f*) The change of words obscure or commonly misunderstood;
(*g*) The revision of the Calendar and Tables prefixed to the Book of Common Prayer.

1920. The Fourth Report to the Conference recommended that 'it should be recognised that full liberty belongs to Diocesan Bishops not only for the adaptations and additions alluded to above [*i.e.* by previous Conferences, as here quoted] but also for the adoption of other uses.' [6]

The last words do not appear in the Resolutions, which run thus:

[1] Abp. Davidson, *The Six Lambeth Conferences* (1929), p. 56. The idea of a supreme Synod with power over the Provinces does not recur in the utterances of later Conferences.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 121.
[3] See p. 4.
[4] *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, p. 207.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 323.
[6] *Ib.*, Appendix, p. 88.

'36. While maintaining the authority of the Book of Common Prayer as the Anglican standard of doctrine and practice, we consider that liturgical uniformity should not be regarded as a necessity throughout the Churches of the Anglican Communion. . . .'

'37. Although the inherent right of a Diocesan Bishop to put forth or sanction liturgical forms is subject to such limitations as may be imposed by higher synodical authority, it is desirable that such authority should not be too rigidly exercised so long as those features are maintained which are essential to the safeguarding of the unity of the Anglican Communion.'

Resolution 38 requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Committee of students of liturgical questions which would be ready to advise any Province or Diocese on these matters.[1]

In 1930, Resolution 50 recommended that this Committee need not be reappointed, since the Consultative Body, 'calling in expert advisers at its discretion,' existed to give advice on all such questions. It may be surmised that the usefulness of such a Committee (or such experts) would in practice be realised chiefly by an isolated missionary diocese under the direct supervision of the See of Canterbury. The histories of the Scottish, American and Canadian Revisions do not mention any reference to the Committee appointed in 1920, nor was there any suggestion during the discussion of Prayer Book Revision in England that advice should be sought from the self-governing Churches in Communion with Canterbury.

To return to the situation in England when the sittings of the Convocation of Canterbury were resumed.[2] The outstanding problem was the Sunday Morning Service, which had to comprise Mattins, Litany, and Holy Communion, in this order and none other, if the Act of Uniformity was obeyed. But in many places the three services had fallen into desuetude (1857); there was no compulsion to follow the Prayer Book in noblemen's chapels, nor did the Bishops necessarily do so in their own chapels (1858). The clergy were all but unanimous in desiring a change (1857). But the Bishops were slow to move. Permission to have an early Communion Service was given only 'by tacit connivance' (Bp. of Winchester, 1859); strictly speaking it was illegal. If a church was reopened after restoration, 'all we can do to meet such a case is to use the ordinary Offices of the day, it may be with lessons singularly inappropriate' (Bp. of Oxford,

[1] *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, Appendix, p. 36.

[2] York did not meet till 1861, *i.e.* in more than outward form. For practical purposes it is sufficient to use the records of proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury. The authority for the statements that follow will be found in the Chronicle (or Journal) of Convocation for the years in question.

1859).[1] Faced by this situation, Convocation in 1854 presented a report by which the Bishop would be empowered to authorise a division of the Morning Service, such as was already found in unconsecrated buildings (1852); but no action followed. In 1855 it was agreed that the Prayer Book had better be left intact, additional services being provided. An Address to the Queen in 1859 refers to the attempts to revise the Prayer Book. 'The recently authorised use of the Litany as a separate service' has removed one argument in their favour. 'We declare our conviction that the supposed advantages of a revision of the Book of Common Prayer are far outweighed by the manifest disadvantages of such a course.' But the controversy over Prayer Book revision had begun. Three utterances of 1860 may be quoted which might have been made in 1927–28. 'There is the greatest excitement out of doors on subjects connected with the Prayer Book' (Dr. McCaul). 'As this is a new course for the Church to enter upon, I need not, I am sure, say how important it is that every step we take should be taken with the utmost caution' (Bp. of Oxford). 'The attendance of the poor in our churches has gradually died away' (Dean of Norwich).

Discussion arose next over a Harvest Thanksgiving Service, petitions for which had been presented. The Archbishop thought that there was no precedent for putting forth a service of this description for one Province only, and that York and Ireland would have to be consulted. But he agreed to ask if the Queen would see fit to order by royal proclamation the use of a special service of Harvest Thanksgiving in the United Church of England and Ireland. To this the Lord Chancellor replied that it was doubtful whether the Crown had any such power, and that the Queen ought not to be advised to reply (1863). In 1867 a Royal Commission was appointed to consider the rubrics concerned with ritual; its scope was enlarged in 1869. As a result of its Reports a revised Lectionary was published in 1871 [2] and the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act was passed in 1872. By it shortened services were allowed on week-days, designed unfortunately on non-liturgical lines; any of the three Morning Services could be used separately; and additional services could be used on special occasions, if approved by the Ordinary, provided they were entirely derived from Holy Scripture and the Prayer Book.[3] In the same year Letters of Business were issued to the Convocations to confer and report on a revision of the rubrics on the basis of the fourth and final report of the Royal

[1] It is interesting to note that an exception was made for the rite of Consecrating Churches. 'The existing form has been so long used as to have obtained the character of prescription' (Prolocutor, 1860); see p. 710.

[2] See p. 297.

[3] This Act is the only legal authority for certain universal deviations from the strict letter of 1662.

Commission. The next few years were devoted largely to this task, and in 1879 a Report was presented to the Crown with a draft Bill for facilitating changes in the services. *The Convocation Prayer Book, being the Book of Common Prayer with altered rubrics*, in accordance with the Report, was published in 1880.[1] No action followed the presentation of the Report.[2]

The next quarter of a century can be treated very briefly. Reference is made to the distress caused by irregular services in church, especially in connection with Temperance Societies (1886); but two forms of Children's Services, both conforming to the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, are stated to have been published (1888). In 1896 a resolution of the Lower House affirmed that the time was not opportune to seek powers to revise the rubrics. In 1898 a Joint Committee was appointed to revise the Accession Service, and, in deference to a petition signed by leading theologians at Oxford and Cambridge, a new form was adopted which departed from the model of Mattins and Evensong. This with the concurrence of the Convocations was authorised by Royal Warrant in 1901.[3]

The Proposed English Revision.

A new chapter begins with the Report in 1906 of the Royal Commission appointed in 1904 to inquire into the alleged breaches of the law of the Church. The Commissioners declared that 'the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation. . . . It is important that the law should be reformed, that it should admit of reasonable elasticity . . . above all, it is necessary that it should

[1] Some of the features are interesting. 'A Table to regulate the service when two Feasts or Holy-days fall upon the same day' came into general use. The preliminary tables include the movable feasts from 1500 to 2000, an exceedingly valuable addition for students of history. Canterbury amended the Ornaments Rubric to prescribe surplice with stole or scarf and hood, or, in preaching, gown with hood and scarf; 'no other ornament shall at any time of his ministrations be used by him contrary to the monition of the Bishop of the Diocese.' York kept the rubric unaltered. Provision is made for laymen reading the lessons. At the Holy Communion the Collect for the Queen may be omitted if the service is said with Mattins or Litany. A pause is to be made for non-communicants to withdraw.

[2] We learn that some clergy were in the habit of shortening the Holy Communion by beginning at the Offertory (1872), and that so long ago as the days of Bp. van Mildert (1826–36) shortened Daily Services were held in Durham Cathedral with the Bishop's authorisation. Uniformity can never have been so strictly observed as might be deduced from the Proceedings of Convocation. It should be remembered that the Bishops, as members of the House of Lords, were part of the legislature and in close touch with the law officers of the Crown. Convocation had only recently been revived, and it was natural that the Bishops, if they had to choose between their obligations to Parliament and their obligations to Convocation, sometimes laid more stress on the former.

[3] See art. 'Consecration of Churches, etc.,' for an account of the labours of Convocation during the period 1852–1906 on additional services.

be obeyed.' On November 10, 1906, Letters of Business were issued to the Convocations with instructions to prepare a new rubric regulating the vesture of the clergy in church and to frame modifications in the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service, with a view to their enactment by Parliament. The end was stated to be ' to secure the greater elasticity which a reasonable recognition of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and of its present needs seems to demand.' From this date to 1920 the work of Convocation went on continuously. Three General Elections, involving the re-election of the Lower Houses, as well as the war, contributed to the slowness of movement. The Convocations finished their work on April 29, 1920, and sent their answer to the Crown. The Convocation of York dissented from Canterbury in respect of the proposed Canon in the revised Communion Service. The Archbishop of Canterbury stated on April 27 that, had the answer been sent two years earlier, the matter would have rested with the Crown, or Parliament, including the Bishops in the House of Lords, to decide what the next step should be. But now that the Church Assembly had been set up, the pledge given in 1909, that the Representative Church Council (including the Houses of Laymen) should have an opportunity of saying Yes or No ' to its [the new Prayer Book's] principles, and perhaps to the larger details,' naturally involved consulting the Assembly.

In view of what happened subsequently, the proceedings in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury on February 12, 1920, are significant. The Alternative Order of Holy Communion was discussed. It was stated that it ' would not be used by the High Church party.' Dr. Wace, Dean of Canterbury, the veteran leader of the Evangelicals, said that ' several of them . . . were willing to accept the proposal, provided that it would satisfy those who belonged to the opposite party in the Church, and consequently would make peace. . . . If it was not a final settlement, the only reason for those who thought with him accepting it was gone.' [1]

The procedure in the Assembly when any Measure dealing with Doctrine or Ritual is concerned is as follows. The Measure is introduced by one or other of the three Houses (Bishops, Clergy, and Laity) and receives General Approval. The Clergy and Laity sitting separately revise the Measure in detail. It is then laid before the House of Bishops by each of the other two Houses. The Measure is revised by Bishops and laid before the Assembly as a whole, ' and shall then be either accepted or rejected by the Assembly in the terms in which it is finally proposed by the House of Bishops.' If accepted it goes before the Legislative Committee for submission to Parliament.

[1] See *Chronicle of Convocation*, pp. 154, 155, 160.

In November 1920 the Assembly appointed a Committee to review the proposals of Convocation. Its Report was received in June 1922, when it was agreed that 'certain changes and additions should be embodied in another volume or schedule to be sanctioned by authority for optional use for such period as may hereafter be determined.'[1] Next year the House of Bishops introduced the 'Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923.' General Approval was given, and the Houses of Clergy and Laity began the work of revision. By this time an extraordinary amount of interest had been aroused. The English Church Union published an alternative revision, known popularly as 'The Green Book.' A group anxious for more thoroughgoing adaptation of services to modern needs published 'The Grey Book,' and a critical review of all the proposals was put out by a group of liturgists—it was called 'The Orange Book.'

The amendments of the two Houses were carefully considered by the House of Bishops, sitting in private on many occasions. The result of their deliberations was published early in 1927, in the form of a Composite Book, containing, with a few exceptions, the whole of the old services as well as the new matter. Its official title was 'The Deposited Book,' since the standard copy, referred to in the Measure, was signed by the Archbishops and deposited with the Clerk of the Parliaments.

In March consent was given by the Convocations to the book's being laid before the Assembly for Final Approval (268 votes to 36). In July Final Approval was carried in the Assembly by 517 votes to 133. The Archbishop of Canterbury promised that, should the Measure receive the approval of Parliament, it should be brought before the Convocations for synodical sanction before the Royal Assent was given.

The Measure came before Parliament in December 1927. During the previous six months an almost unprecedented agitation had been carried on in the country, chiefly based on a conviction that Protestantism was in danger. The Measure was passed by the House of Lords, but the House of Commons rejected it by a small majority (238 to 205), the opposition of the Scottish and Irish members being sufficient to outweigh a small majority of English members in favour of the Measure. The debate was largely concerned with the Reservation rubrics. The Bishops then decided on a new Measure, in which some misunderstandings would be removed, notably in respect of the rubrics dealing with Reservation. The majority in the Convocations sank, the votes being 196 to 73, and the final figures in the Assembly were 396 to 153. The minorities, as in 1927, were composed partly of Evangelicals, partly of Anglo-Catholics. In June 1928 the Prayer

[1] An instalment of revision came into force in 1922, in the shape of an Alternative Lectionary; see p. 298.

Book Measure was defeated in the House of Commons by an increased majority, 266 to 220.

In July the Archbishop of Canterbury stated, on behalf of the diocesan Bishops, who concurred: 'It is a fundamental principle that the Church—that is, the Bishops together with the Clergy and the Laity—must in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its Faith in Him and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its forms of worship.' No further Measure, he said, was possible at present.

At the end of 1928 'The Prayer Book as Proposed in 1928' was published as an ordinary book in many different editions.

In July 1929 the Archbishop of Canterbury moved a resolution in the Upper House of Canterbury, which was carried by 23 votes to 4. The resolution stated that the Bishops in nearly every diocese had consulted the clergy and laity and, in the light of the information gained, resolved to 'consider the circumstances and needs of parishes severally, and give counsel and directions.' In so doing they would conform to the following principles:

1. In view of the approval given by the Convocations 'to the proposals for deviations from and additions to the Book of 1662, as set forth in the Book of 1928,' and of the Final Approval given by the Assembly, the Bishops 'cannot regard as inconsistent with loyalty to the principles of the Church of England the use of such additions or deviations as fall within the limits of these proposals.'

2. 'The Bishops, in the exercise of that legal or administrative discretion, which belongs to each Bishop in his own diocese, will be guided by the proposals set forth in the Book of 1928, and will endeavour to secure that the practices which are consistent neither with the Book of 1662 nor with the Book of 1928 shall cease.'

3. Permission to use matter from the 1928 Book will be conditional on 'the goodwill of the people as represented in the Parochial Church Council,' and as regards the Occasional Offices on the consent of the parties concerned.

At the time of writing, therefore, the 1662 Book remains the official standard, with the 1928 Book as a supplementary Book from which services and prayers may be drawn if required. The Occasional Offices are widely used. So are the revised Selection of Psalms, the additional Collects, Epistles and Gospels, and the Occasional Prayers. The Alternative Order of Holy Communion has made but little headway. The many years of discussion have not been wasted. The English people have received an education in liturgical matters which otherwise would have been impossible. What seemed incredible actually came to pass. The holiest mysteries of the Faith were discussed

in Parliament, but with such sincerity that cavilling was silenced. The controversy echoed round the world, but some continental observers, at least, were not shocked but rather admired a country where the people were moved by matters of such moment, and said: 'We envy you your controversies.' The clash of Church and State, predicted by many, has not taken place. Much of the material collected by English scholars has found a place in Revised Prayer Books overseas. What seemed at the time a blow to the Church of England may wear a very different aspect in the eyes of future historians.

The Scottish Prayer Book.

The Scottish Prayer Book of 1637,[1] over which Laud took so much trouble, did not come into use at the Restoration. After 1688 the Episcopal services, which had been hardly distinguishable from the Presbyterian, gradually became liturgical, as the English Book made its way. But the Communion Service of 1637, from 1724 onwards, was printed separately, its popularity being fostered by the influence of the Nonjurors. The 1764 edition is regarded as the standard. In the nineteenth century the English Liturgy took the predominant place, and in 1863 the Canons ordered its use on official occasions, and in new congregations unless a certain number of the communicants desired the Scottish Office. The Dioceses of Edinburgh and Glasgow were the strongholds of the English Use.[2]

In 1909 the revision of the Scottish Liturgy was taken in hand,[3] and the Committee appointed by the Bishops was presently asked to prepare also a schedule of 'permissible additions to and deviations from the Book of Common Prayer.' This instalment of revision was sanctioned by the Provincial Synod in 1911 and published in the following year. In 1918 the task of revising the whole Prayer Book was begun, and the Committee's proposals were brought before the Consultative Council at intervals. The Provincial Synod of 1925 completed about half the book and then postponed further deliberation in order to await the results of Prayer Book Revision in England. In 1928 the Provincial Synod finished the work and the proposals were referred to the Diocesan Synods and the Consultative Council for acceptance or rejection. Acceptance was almost unanimous, and in March 1929 the Provincial Synod confirmed the approval of the new Book, which came into use at the end of the year. The approval took the form of passing Canon XXIII, which states that 'the authorised Service Books of this Church are—the Scottish Book of Common Prayer approved by the Provincial Synod of 1929, and the Book

[1] See p. 188.
[2] See Procter and Frere, pp. 143–51, 228–30.
[3] See W. Perry, *The Scottish Prayer Book* (1929), for recent history.

commonly called the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. . . .' Services from either Book may be used in their entirety. The English Alternative Order of Holy Communion (1928) is allowed, under certain conditions, 'if and when the Episcopal Synod is satisfied that it has been authorised in the Church of England'; similarly, the Scottish Communion Office of 1764 may be used.

The Scottish Prayer Book bears the mark of two scholar-bishops, Dr. Dowden and Dr. Maclean. It was drawn up under favourable conditions, for the Church is homogeneous in character and doctrinal controversies hardly affect it. The Book as a whole is clearly the best of the Anglican Prayer Books; it draws freely on the rich material provided by the long English debates and is also strongly national, especially as regards the Eucharistic Liturgy and the Calendar.

The Irish Prayer Book.

In 1662 the Irish Convocation accepted the revised English Book, the use of which was enjoined by the Irish Parliament in 1666. Additional services for the Visitation of Prisoners, the Consecration of Churches, and the Reconciling of the Lapsed or the Receiving of Converts, were printed with the Irish Book during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. From 1800 to 1870, as a result of the union between England and Ireland, the Churches of the two countries were united under the title of 'The United Church of England and Ireland.' When disestablishment took effect in 1871, the existing Prayer Book was accepted for a time, pending revision. The revised Book 'according to the use of the Church of Ireland' was published in 1878. The Preface, like that of the American Book, disclaims any intention of departing from the English standard, but, unlike the American one, implies that doubtful points have been interpreted in a uniform direction. The changes 'imply no censure upon the former Book . . . when it is rightly understood and equitably construed.' The concluding words—'what is imperfect, with peace, is often better than what is otherwise more excellent, without it'—reflect the difficulties experienced by the revisers.

The demand that phrases in the Communion Service, patient of a supposedly materialistic interpretation, should be removed was resisted, and the service remained practically unaltered. The same is true of the Ordination Services. In the Order for the Visitation of the Sick the form of Absolution is that found in the Communion Service. Additional services are provided for Harvest Thanksgiving, Consecration of a Church or Churchyard, and the Visitation of Prisoners; and a form of Morning Service is provided, to be used on the Sunday after Institution.

Outside criticism has been directed rather against the 'Con-

stitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical,' as decreed at Dublin in 1871 and 1877, which are printed with the Prayer Book, rather than against the changes in the Book itself. The sign of the cross is forbidden even to the laity; so also are bowing to the altar, a cross on the Communion Table, or on the covering thereof, and even the carrying of a banner in procession. The intention is to differentiate the Church as clearly as possible from Roman Catholicism.

In 1909 General Synod began to consider how best 'the Rubrics and Services of the Church might be adapted to the requirements of the present time,' 'without making any modification in doctrine or in the ritual Canons.' The plates of the Prayer Book were destroyed in the Dublin rising of 1916. Finally, the new Prayer Book was approved in 1926 and came into force in 1927. It has several interesting features. The Psalter follows the Occasional Prayers, and the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels follow the Holy Communion. St. Patrick and the Transfiguration are added to the Calendar. The Commination Service and the Visitation of the Sick are completely recast. A service for the Burial of Baptised Children is added.

The American Prayer Book.[1]

After the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, it became impossible to use the State prayers, and the parishes acting separately omitted them. When peace was signed, a general desire, expressed at several Conventions, was felt for a uniform book of worship, as near as possible to that of the Mother Church. On November 14, 1784, Dr. Seabury was consecrated as the first American Bishop by three Scottish Bishops, at Aberdeen; the next day he agreed to a Concordat by which he was to do his best to get the Scottish Eucharistic Service accepted in America. In August 1785 the Bishop met the clergy of Connecticut and a small Committee was appointed to consider necessary changes in the Prayer Book.

The first General Convention was held at Philadelphia in September and October, 1785; Bishop Seabury was absent, and there were no delegates from the New England States. A Committee was appointed to report on Prayer Book revision. Its Chairman, Dr. William White, in a sermon before the Convention referred to the principles governing the proposed changes, which were based on those suggested 'at the Revolution, that great aera of liberty, when in 1689 commissioners were appointed'; after this new Revolution in the New World, 'all these proposed alterations and amendments were in our hands, and we had it in power to adopt or even improve them.' The

[1] This summary is based on W. McGarvey, *Liturgiæ Americanæ* (1895), and E. C. Chorley, *The New American Prayer Book* (1929).

same Convention requested the English Bishops 'to confer the Episcopal character on such persons as shall be recommended by this Church.' In February 1786 the Bishops replied in favourable terms, but wished first to be told of the proposed changes in the Prayer Book. In April the 'Proposed Book' was published. The Preface declared that it was not the intention 'to depart from the Church of England, any farther than local circumstances require.' The proposals, which included the omission of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds and a complete remodelling of the Psalter, raised a storm of protest in America, and the English Bishops objected. In February 1787 Drs. White and Provoost were consecrated in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, the English Archbishops having received an assurance that 'whatever could be done towards a compliance with your fatherly wishes and advice, consistently with our local circumstances, and the peace and unity of our Church, hath been done.' [1]

General Convention met in 1789 and dealt with the Prayer Book. All references to English political conditions were omitted and prayers for the President and for Congress were inserted. The Athanasian Creed was omitted, 'with great reluctance' on the part of Bishop Seabury and the New England deputies. Many minor changes were made. The chief ones with possible doctrinal implications were that the sign of the cross in Baptism was made optional, and the personal absolution in the Visitation of the Sick was omitted, as were also the Thirty-nine Articles. In the Communion Service the Scottish form of Consecration Prayer, which went back to that of 1549,[2] was adopted substantially without opposition; it had already been incorporated in an Order of Communion put out by Seabury for Connecticut in 1786. Three new services were added: a form for the Visitation of Prisoners, based on one drawn up at Dublin in 1711; a form of Thanksgiving for the Fruits of the Earth; and Forms of Family Prayer, taken from a well-known compilation by Bishop Gibson, of London. The Ordinal was not printed.

In 1792 the Ordinal was formally adopted with a few changes, including an alternative to 'Whosesoever sins . . .', and henceforward bound up with the Prayer Book. The changes, taken as a whole, were not serious and must be judged in the light of the declaration in the Preface, 'that this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship.' In 1801 the Articles, slightly revised, were added. In 1799 a Form of Consecration of a

[1] The Proposed Book of 1785 was reprinted in London by J. Depret in 1789. The edition was of fifty copies only, and is stated to have been probably for the use of the English Bishops, who were considering the request of the American Church for the succession (see McGarvey, p. lv); but the dates do not fit.

[2] See p. 349 for the differences.

Church, and in 1804 an Office of Induction (since 1808 called Institution), completed the work of revision. The resulting Book remained the standard until 1892.

The task of revision was resumed in 1880. Twelve years of discussion revealed a strongly conservative spirit. The Convention of 1892 contented itself with unimportant changes, largely verbal, 'most of them made in accordance with the reading of the English Book, or for the sake of rubrical relaxation' (McGarvey, p. liii). It is not surprising that the devotional life of the Church outgrew the formularies and a situation resembling that found in England arose. So in 1913 a Commission was appointed to consider and report on 'revision and enrichment of the Prayer Book,' with the stipulation 'that no proposition involving the Faith and Doctrine of the Church be considered or reported.' Finally, a revision was approved in 1928 and came into use on Advent Sunday 1929.

Some of the special features of the present Book are noted elsewhere. Here it is sufficient to call attention to the statement in the Preface, that, besides the services ordered, other devotions 'set forth by lawful authority' may be used, or, under carefully defined conditions, 'may supersede Morning and Evening Prayer.' All passages of Scripture are taken from the Revised Version, and in some cases the marginal rendering is adopted.

The Canadian Prayer Book.[1]

A Canadian edition of the Prayer Book was first mooted in 1896, and in the autumn of that year the General Synod asked the Bishops to take steps towards the provision of supplementary services and prayers. At the next General Synod in 1902 a Committee was appointed to draw up an Appendix. Bishop Kingdon of Fredericton was the convener, and the report, which was submitted in 1905, and ran to 63 pages of printed matter, was largely his work. The general impression was that the proposals were too academic, and the House of Bishops deliberately shelved the whole matter. In 1908, the Canadian Hymn Book having been successfully completed, Prayer Book revision was taken up again; and in 1911 the decision was reached to revise the whole Book and not to be content with an Appendix. It was agreed that 'no change, in either text or rubric, shall be introduced which will involve or imply a change of doctrine or of principles, it being always understood that the Ornaments rubric be left untouched'; also that 'no change shall be made not in accordance with Resolution XXVII of the Lambeth Conference of 1908.'[2]

[1] See W. J. Armitage, *The Story of the Canadian Revision of the Prayer Book* (Cambridge, 1922), a chatty book which contains a good deal of information not readily obtainable elsewhere.

[2] See p. 784.

The Committee responsible for revision sent a form of inquiry, covering every possible aspect of the problem, to every clergyman in Canada, as well as to the lay members of General Synod, and a great deal of interest was aroused. A draft Prayer Book was prepared by 1915, when it was authorised by the House of Bishops 'for temporary or occasional use, according to the discretion of the Bishop, until the next meeting of this Synod.' In 1918 the Book in an amended form was once more approved, subject to the report of a Committee 'appointed to settle any details overlooked by the General Synod.' The 1921 Synod finally confirmed the new Book by adopting Canon XII, which made it legal. The Bishops were unanimous, the other Houses all but unanimous. The Book came into use at Easter 1922.

The Preface states the chief results of the revision to be: 'The adaptation of rubrics to customs generally accepted at the present time; the provision of directions for the combined use of the different services; the adaptation and enrichment of the Occasional Offices; the supplying of Forms for Additional Services in use throughout the Church though not provided for in the Book of Common Prayer heretofore;[1] the addition of many new Prayers for Special Occasions; the revision of the Calendar, the Lectionary, and the Psalter.' The Canadian Church may be congratulated on the smooth passage of a workmanlike revision on conservative lines. The Communion Service was virtually untouched, and so one cause of contention was eliminated. To some observers the new Book will seem an opportunity missed and a perpetuation of features in the 1662 Book which the twentieth century, with its fuller liturgical knowledge, might rightly wish to change.

The South African Revision.

This began in 1911 with the publication of a schedule of permitted modifications, which in fuller form was published in 1915 by Episcopal Synod. It should be noted that the work has been done by Episcopal Synod, which meets every year and has put out a number of tentative editions, inviting criticisms or suggestions, which they have adopted or not at their discretion. Provincial Synod, which meets every five years, has merely ratified the work of the Bishops without attempting to revise it. The Alternative Liturgy, which was revised several times, was generally approved by Provincial Synod in 1919 with a hope that further consideration be given to objections. It was once more generally approved in 1924 with a rider that 'this Synod . . . desires to affirm at the same time its continued loyalty to the

[1] Viz. for Dominion Day, Children, Missions, Thanksgiving for Harvest, Institution and Induction, Laying the Foundation Stone of a Church, Consecration of a Church, and Consecration of a Churchyard; with Family Prayers.

Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper in the Book of Common Prayer, and to its use, when retained, as a sufficient and completely catholic rite, endeared to multitudes of churchmen by the most sacred associations.' The 1929 Synod confirmed the approval given in 1924, and the Alternative Form is now legal in the same sense as the 1662 Rite. It is largely used in the Northern Dioceses, not so largely in the Cape Province.

In 1924 Provincial Synod authorised the English Revised Lectionary of 1922 as the only one allowed to be used.

Additional Occasional Prayers were bound up with the Constitution and Canons at least as early as 1904, and more have been added in later editions. None have been authorised since 1915. An Alternative Form of the Occasional Offices appeared in 1926, largely based on the English revision proposals. In 1930 this, in a new recension, was published in London by the S.P C.K. It contains additional Offices as follows: Form of Admitting Catechumens; a Form of Confession and Absolution; the Blessing of Civil Marriage; and Burial Services for a Baptised Infant, an Unbaptised Infant, and for cases where the Prayer Book Service may not be used. The 1930 Book also contains a revised Calendar. Provincial Synod has not so far discussed the Occasional Offices, which have been considered by Episcopal Synod only.[1]

No attempt has been made so far in Australia and New Zealand to revise the Prayer Book. In both countries the Anglican section of the population cherishes the link with the Mother Country provided by the 1662 Prayer Book, and in Australia the distances make Synodical action difficult. The Church of Wales has full liberty to revise the Prayer Book, but has up to the present shown no sign of wishing to do so. In other parts of the Anglican Communion the problem of revision overlaps with that of translation, which is treated elsewhere in this volume.

[1] This account is based on information kindly supplied by the Rev. C. Gould, of Cradock, S. Africa.

PRINTERS AND PRINTED EDITIONS OF THE PRAYER BOOK

By B. INCE

PRINTING, soon after its introduction into England, became there as elsewhere a concern of the State. The Crown assumed an unlimited right to regulate it, and continued down to the year 1640 to exercise a restrictive jurisdiction over printers, presses and all printed books.

The first King's Printer, William Faques, was appointed in 1503 and was succeeded in 1508 by Richard Pynson, who in turn was followed in 1530 by Thomas Berthelet, who held office till the death of Henry VIII in 1547. No peculiar privilege in regard to printing the Bible or the service-books of the Church then attached to the office of King's Printer, but Berthelet was given sole authority to print the Litany of 1544. The licence for the Primer of 1545, however, was granted jointly to Richard Grafton, who was not then King's Printer, and Edward Whitchurch, who never held that office.

On the accession of Edward VI, Grafton was appointed King's Printer, and he printed *The Order of the Communion* in March 1548. But authority to print the first Prayer Book, of 1549, was given not only to him but also to Whitchurch, to John Oswen of Worcester, and later (by the Lord Deputy of Ireland) to Humphrey Powell in Dublin.

Grafton and Whitchurch had been in partnership till 1541 but had then separated. By 1549 Grafton was printing 'within the precincte of the late dissolved house of the grey Friers,' while Whitchurch had moved into Wynkyn de Worde's old printing office at the sign of the Sun, on the south side of Fleet Street, opposite the entrance to Shoe Lane. Whitchurch would seem to have got his book out first, and to have helped Grafton with his; for the colophon at the end of Whitchurch's first edition (*British Museum, C.* 25, *l.* 14 (1)) is dated 7 March 1549, while the colophon at the end of the Communion Office in Grafton's first book (*British Museum, C.* 25, *l.* 12 (1)) is dated 8 March, and the rest of the book is made up of Whitchurch's sheets. Both books are black-letter folios, as were all the editions which came from either press that year. But, in regard to text, there are many

differences between the Grafton books and the Whitchurch books, and also between editions produced by one or other printer at different times.

The privilege given to John Oswen of Worcester was to print, for seven years from 1549, every kind of book set forth by the King 'concerning the services to be used in churches, ministration of the sacraments, and instruction of our subjects of the Principality of Wales and marches thereunto belonging.' Accordingly he printed, but in English, not Welsh, two black-letter editions of the Book of 1549, a quarto in May (*British Museum, C.* 10, *a.* 10 (1)) and a folio in July (*British Museum*, 468, *b.* 5). These again show variation of text when compared with any of the books of Grafton or Whitchurch. Powell, a London printer who had moved to Dublin in 1551 and there set up 'in the great toure by the Crane' the first printing press in Ireland, printed a black-letter folio that year, at the command of the Lord Deputy.

The second Prayer Book, of 1552, was printed by Grafton (several editions, all black-letter folios), by Whitchurch (some editions in folio and some in quarto, all black-letter), by Oswen (one edition only, a black-letter folio), but not by Powell, who printed Prayer Books no more. Again the books show considerable variation in text, and the first editions of Grafton (*Bodleian*) and of Whitchurch (*British Museum, C.* 21, *d.* 14) are both furnished with a list of 'Faultes escaped.'

Other printers continued to be licensed for smaller books. For instance, in 1553 an exclusive licence was granted to William Seres 'dwellyng at the West ende of Poules, at the signe of the Hedgehog' to print Primers 'set forth agreeable and according to the book of common prayers established by us in our high court of Parliament'; and to John Day, living over Aldersgate, to print the Short Catechism. Neither Seres nor Day ever held the office of King's Printer, Grafton continuing to hold the post till the death of Edward VI. Then he printed Lady Jane Grey's proclamation and his term came to an end.

John Cawood succeeded, but there was naturally no Prayer Book printing in Mary's reign, and Elizabeth on her accession appointed Richard Jugge his senior colleague. Jugge and Cawood, in partnership, and no doubt with authority, printed many editions of the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559. Grafton, by correcting the standing type from which one of his folios of 1552 had been printed, produced one edition, of which he printed several impressions. But after that Prayer Book printing was confined, or practically confined, to the Queen's Printers. Jugge and Cawood continued to print in partnership down to 1571, and after Cawood's death in the following year Jugge went on alone until 1577.

Then came a decisive change. In September 1577 Christopher Barker, who succeeded Jugge as Queen's Printer, obtained through Sir Thomas Wilkes a patent which gave him specifically the sole right to print the Bible in English, whatever the translation, the Book of Common Prayer, and (as he put it himself) 'in generall wordes, all matters for the Churche.' Twelve years later he secured a similar patent direct from Queen Elizabeth, this time for his own life and for that of his son Robert. As it happened, the patent remained in the Barker family for 132 years. The first Christopher or his deputies continued to print till 1600; Robert, the son, produced in 1604 the first edition of the Prayer Book of James I (*British Museum*, *C.* 25, *m.* 11); and Christopher, the grandson, with his partner John Bill, printed in his turn the Sealed Books and first edition of 1662.

When the Star Chamber was abolished in 1640 and the unlimited jurisdiction over printing ceased, the Crown still claimed the exclusive right to print certain books, including the Authorised Version of the Bible, the Book of Common Prayer and any other book which might be commanded to be used in churches. The precise origin of this particular prerogative may not be clear, but the existence and continuance of the right have long been placed beyond dispute by a series of decisions in the courts of law. So, save for the period of the Commonwealth, the King's Printer's privilege remained practically intact, and has so remained ever since, for all subsequent patents in England have followed the precedent set towards the close of the sixteenth century.

In 1709 John Baskett succeeded the last representatives of the Barkers, and he or his sons held the patent until 1769, when Charles Eyre, the predecessor of the present firm of Eyre and Spottiswoode, became King's Printer. Baskett was a man of large ideas and litigious habits. He extended his operations to Oxford, where he became printer to the University; he tried unsuccessfully to restrict the privilege of the Cambridge Press; he maintained his right to sell his books in Scotland; and he successfully disputed a corresponding claim by his Scottish colleague. In July 1716 he secured for himself, jointly with Agnes Campbell, a Scottish patent in which the right to print Bibles and books for Church use was specifically included.

In Scotland printing privileges had been bestowed as early as 1507, and in 1579 Alexander Arbuthnot, 'dwelling at the Kirk of feild,' had been appointed King's Printer, with special licence to print Bibles 'in the vulgar Inglis, Scottis, and Lateine toungis.' The first Prayer Book of the Church of England to be printed in Scotland would seem to have been an octavo edition (*British Museum*, 3406, *c.* 20) produced in Edinburgh in 1633 'by the Printers to the King's most excellent Majestie,' of whom

Robert Young was one. Young alone four years later printed, in folio, the two impressions of the unfortunate 'Booke of Common Prayer, and administration of the Sacraments, and other parts of devine Service for the Church of Scotland.' And in 1712 James Watson, who had been appointed joint Queen's Printer the year before, printed an octavo Prayer Book in Edinburgh, 'with the Psalms in Metre, translated by King James the VI.' But all along there had been unrestricted importation into Scotland of Bibles and Prayer Books printed by authority in England.

Baskett and Campbell, and their successors Alexander Kincaid and Charles Ker, did nothing to check the practice, which continued until 1821. By that time the King's Printer's patent had been for over twenty years in the hands of David Hunter Blair and John Bruce. Blair and Bruce, in 1821, successfully proceeded in the Scottish Courts against certain booksellers for importing Bibles from England; and, in 1824, took similar proceedings against the Edinburgh Bible Society. The Bible Society case was carried to the House of Lords, but Blair and Bruce won, and a practice which had existed since the Reformation was suddenly brought to an end. That result raised an outcry in Scotland.

There was, however, another reason for the ultimate non-renewal of the patent in Scotland. Like their immediate predecessors, Kincaid and Ker, Blair and Bruce held two separate patents; one as the King's Printers in Scotland and the other as His Majesty's sole booksellers, book-binders and stationers in that country. The second patent, it was conceived, had given them the right, and the sole right, to supply government offices in Scotland with all the goods and services of those trades. It could not always be an economical method to obtain limited supplies in this way; nor, it was suggested, had it been rendered any the less expensive by Blair and Bruce's scale of charges. The two Select Committees of the House of Commons which had the whole matter under consideration, in 1831 and in 1837–38, were undoubtedly influenced by these considerations; and, in the end, the old Printer's patent in Scotland, the final term of which expired in 1839, was not renewed.

Instead, in July 1839, the Lord Advocate and others were by Letters Patent appointed 'Her Majesty's sole and only Master Printers in Scotland,' and formally given 'the sole and only privilege of printing in Scotland Bibles, New Testaments, Psalm Books, Books of Common Prayer' and certain other things. To the Board so appointed, Royal Instructions were issued on 11 July 1839 directing that the free importation into Scotland should be permitted 'of all Bibles, New Testaments, Psalm Books and Books of Common Prayer printed by authority in

England or in Ireland,' and setting up an elaborate arrangement for safeguarding the printing of those books in Scotland. Any person desiring to print 'in exact conformity to an edition specified, being any one of the editions published by authority in Great Britain,' was to transmit a copy of the specified edition to the Board's Secretary, and to give bond to the Lord Advocate 'so framed as to secure the faithful execution of the work.' The Lord Advocate was then to authorise the printing, on condition that the work in course of its execution should be submitted for examination. If, by a month after the submission of the last portion, no objection were taken by the Board, the new edition might be published; and was then to be deemed to be printed and published under Royal Authority, provided that it bore on the back of the title-page a copy of the licence granted by the Lord Advocate.

These provisions governed such Prayer Book printing as there was in Scotland between 1839 and 1890. But on 29 November 1890 further Instructions were issued to the Board, revoking part of the Instructions of 11 July 1839 and directing that no further licences for printing the Book of Common Prayer should be issued in Scotland, and that free publication of the book there was not to be interfered with, provided that it did not purport to be made by Royal Authority. But only one firm of printers in Scotland has availed itself of the latitude thus allowed.

In England, on the other hand, there are three privileged printers, the King's Printers, whose title has already been sketched, and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The University privileges spring from ancient charters, very similar in wording and identical in effect. It is one of the many distinctions of Oxford to have possessed the second press in England; for Theodoric Rood printed his first book there only a year after Caxton's first dated book had come from Westminster, and more than forty years before John Siberch set up his press in Cambridge. But it so happens that the original printing charter granted to the University of Cambridge is considerably earlier than the corresponding charter given to the University of Oxford. So it may be convenient to give particulars relating more especially to the Cambridge privilege, merely repeating that the rights, as also the duties, of the two Universities are in this matter identical.

On 20 July 1534 Henry VIII by Letters Patent granted to the Chancellor, Masters and Scholars of the University of Cambridge the right to elect from time to time three stationers and printers or sellers of books, who were thereby empowered to print all manner of books ('omnimodos libros') approved of by the Chancellor or his vicegerent and three doctors, and to sell such books anywhere within the realm. A subsequent Act of Parliament, passed in the reign of Elizabeth (13 Eliz., c. 29),

confirmed the grant 'as amply, fully and largely' as if the Letters Patent had been recited verbatim in the Act.

In those days printers' licences, obtained directly or indirectly from the Crown, constituted the only available form of copyright protection. So the King's grant to Cambridge amounted, at the time, to an over-riding licence to print any approved book, whatever particular rights in it others might already have acquired or might afterwards acquire. It happened that there was no press at work in either University between 1534, the date of Henry's Letters Patent, and 1582. In the interval, Mary's charter of 1557 to the Stationers' Company had resulted in the complete discontinuance of provincial printing in England. The Stationers' Company, too, and certain of its members, had obtained grants of exclusive right to print particular books.

So when Cambridge, alone in the provinces, started to print again in 1582, both the justice and the wisdom of Henry's grant were questioned. Objectors appealed to the courts on material grounds, and to the Bishops on moral, urging the danger of a press 'farre from ordinarie research' and protesting 'it maie be thought we speake this for our pryvate proffitte, but it is not soe.' Still the press, though raided by the agents of the Stationers' Company, continued to print, and produced its first Bible in 1591.

Some years later both King (by Letters Patent of 6 February 1627/8) and courts definitely over-ruled the Stationers' contention. When, still later, the unlimited jurisdiction of the Crown over printers and printing ceased, the scope of the University privilege narrowed. But from the wide overriding licence to print any book, the Universities retained, and still retain, the right to print the King's own books, of which the principal were then and are now the Authorised Version of the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer. In 1732, well after the era of Copyright Acts had set in, the redoubtable Baskett, or rather his assignees in bankruptcy, possibly misled by the imposing terms of the prohibition addressed to 'all and singular the subjects of Us and all others whatsoever' which the King's Printer's patent contains, assailed the privilege of the University of Cambridge and filed a bill in Chancery. Twenty-six years later, in what it may be hoped was a sufficiently considered judgment, a decision was given in favour of the University. It was held that, though Baskett (by then dead for some sixteen years) had undoubtedly been given an exclusive grant, Cambridge had been 'intrusted with a concurrent authority.'

The privilege enjoyed by the Universities, and successfully maintained in this case as in later cases in the courts, carries with it serious obligations. To mention a lesser matter first, certain parts of the Prayer Book are subject to alteration on the

happening of any event which affects the names in the State Prayers. The practice, on such an event, is for the Privy Council Office to transmit to the University Presses and to the King's Printer an Order of His Majesty in Council declaring the changes to be made. The Presses forthwith make new plates and print cancel sheets for the parts affected. The pages with the new State Prayers are then substituted for the old pages in every Prayer Book, even in bound copies already in booksellers' hands. The cost of these substitutions amounts on each occasion to many thousands of pounds, and there have been eleven such occasions within the last hundred years.

A greater responsibility entailed is that of printing the Prayer Book in the most accurate form. In part this is a matter of the skill and care which are needed to secure the accuracy of any print; and a Prayer Book produced by either of the University Presses is set by skilled hands, and read and re-read by readers trained for the purpose. But there are special difficulties in the printing of Prayer Books. The primary authority for the text is the manuscript book annexed to the Act of Uniformity of 1662. This manuscript, known to have been copied in haste, probably by several hands, is inconsistent, in punctuation, spelling and the use of capital letters, not only with modern practice but with itself. For instance, two only out of the nineteen written versions of the Lord's Prayer are identical in regard to punctuation and the use of capital letters.

The Sealed Books furnish other authority for the text. Printed by John Bill and Christopher Barker the younger, examined and corrected by Commissioners, sealed with the Great Seal of England, and preserved for record in the Tower, the several courts at Westminister and the chapters of cathedrals, they were all of them certified as true and perfect copies; to be accounted, as the Act of Uniformity provides, as good records as the manuscript book itself. But there were some thirty-five of these printed books to be corrected and certified, and they were not all examined at one time; with the result that they were not in fact made absolutely identical one with another, or in every place with the manuscript book.

It follows then that in printing the Prayer Book some editorial discretion has to be exercised in regard to punctuation, spelling and capital letters. The separate exercise, in some cases, of this discretion accounts for the differences still to be found between Prayer Books printed at Oxford and those produced at Cambridge. Oxford, for instance, punctuates the Lord's Prayer in one way and prints 'The power, and the glory,' while Cambridge punctuates differently and prints 'the power, and the glory,' without the capital. In the first verse of Psalm xcix Oxford has 'impatient,' and in Psalm cxxxix. 15 'imperfect'; while Cam-

bridge retains the older form in both places and prints 'unpatient' and 'unperfect.' In Psalm xii. 5, and Psalm cvii. 27, where manuscript book and Sealed Books alike give 'troubles sake' and 'wits end' without any apostrophe, Oxford prints 'troubles' sake' and 'wit's end,' while Cambridge has 'trouble's sake' and 'wits' end.' In Oxford books the twenty-fifth verse of Psalm cv begins 'Whose heart turned so, that they hated his people'; in Cambridge books the comma is differently placed and the sentence reads 'Whose heart turned, so that they hated his people.' Other, though smaller, points of difference may be found in the Apostles' Creed, where there is a slight difference in punctuation, in Psalm x. 16, Psalm xviii. 10, Psalm xxi. 8, Psalm l. 6, Psalm lxi. 8, and in some other places; but, taking all the differences and the extent of the book into consideration, the points of difference are relatively few and unimportant.

THE PRAYER BOOK AS LITERATURE

By THE EDITOR

THOUGH in various places throughout this book reference is made to questions of style, it seemed desirable to put together some remarks on the subject in a separate essay. Since a very large proportion of the Prayer Book consists of passages from the Bible, something must first be said about the Authorised Version.

Few writers have appreciated the achievement of the Authorised Version so happily as Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. The translators, he says, had before them the work of Tyndale, a man of genius. But 'you have yet to face the miracle that forty-seven men [1]—not one of them known, outside of this performance, for any superlative talent—sat in committee and almost consistently, over a vast extent of work, improved upon what Genius had done. . . . That a large committee of forty-seven should have gone steadily through the great mass of Holy Writ, seldom interfering with genius, yet, when interfering, seldom missing to improve: that a committee of forty-seven should have captured . . . a rhythm so personal, so constant, that our Bible has the voice of one author speaking through its many mouths,' is surely a miracle.[2]

Sometimes the translators use monosyllables almost entirely: 'And Jacob served seven years for Rachel; and they seemed unto him but a few days, for the love he had to her.' Sometimes they achieve the grand style, as in the following passage, where after a quiet beginning presently the pace is quickened to correspond with the sense, and finally great rolling Latin polysyllables achieve an effect of awe and splendour: 'Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.' Sir Arthur points out that the mingled charm and grandeur of Biblical prose is largely due to the subtle inter-play of vowel-sounds. The sentence 'Arise, shine, for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon

[1] Actually fifty-four were nominated; see Westcott, *History of the English Bible*, p. 147.

[2] *The Art of Writing* (1916), p. 122.

thee,' illustrates this very happily. Four long *i*-sounds in succession produce a unique effect, since in ī English has a true vowel where other languages make shift with diphthongs. In the second half there is an equally characteristic broad *o*-sound. The first half ends with the decisive 'come,' the second with the tripping melody of five short vowels culminating in the long 'thee.'

Having said all this in praise of the Authorised Version, it is rather surprising that we should have to own its inferiority to the earlier version as regards the Psalms. In the 1662 Book the Psalms remained in the 1539 Great Bible form, itself based ultimately on Tyndale and Coverdale. It is not certain that the Puritans at the Savoy Conference asked that the A. V. should be used for the Psalms. In any case the Bishops discriminated between the Epistles and Gospels on the one hand and the Psalms on the other; the latter were to be said or sung in the form that had come to be recognised as most suitable for devotion. The A. V. of the Psalms, according to Bishop Dowden, is spiritless, the work of a committee rather than of a single translator of genius, whereas in 1539 we have English at its happiest, 'an instinctive avoiding of language that was either trivial or new-fangled.'[1] This suggests that the excellences of the A. V. are those of inspired revisers rather than of originators, and that the real 'miracle' is to be found in the sixteenth century. English then was new-minted and fitter to reproduce the sacred originals than at any subsequent time. The Prayer Book Psalter, like the A. V., has escaped the fate of most literature of the time and remains a living possession in the twentieth century. Just because it has been read so constantly its language has not, except for a few phrases, grown obsolete. The large number of obsolete words to be found in the headings of the Authorised Version, which are now either not printed or, if printed, seldom looked at, show us what would otherwise have been its lot.

The Collects and the Litany are generally considered the outstanding examples of literary merit in the Prayer Book. The former have an emotional tinge generally lacking in the originals. For example, an official Roman Catholic version of the Palm Sunday Collect runs thus: 'O almighty and eternal God, who wouldst have our Saviour become man, and suffer on a cross to give mankind an example of humility; mercifully grant that we may improve by the example of his patience, and partake of his resurrection'[2]—which is not to be compared with the Prayer Book version.

[1] *The Workmanship of the Prayer Book*, p. 179. This book contains the most satisfactory treatment of the subject in a short compass.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 123. The Gregorian original is: 'Omnipotens sempiterne deus, qui humano generi ad imitandum humilitatis exemplum salvatorem nostrum carnem sumere, et crucem subire fecisti; concede propitius ut et patientiæ ipsius habere documenta, et resurrectionis consortia mereamur.'

The exact part played by each of the compilers of the 1549 Book is unknown, though it is reasonable to suppose that Cranmer was mainly responsible. The hand that wrote the Litany in 1544 has been at work throughout the book. A happy illustration of his style is afforded by the petition, 'That it may please thee to succour, help, and comfort all that be in danger, necessity and tribulation,' a sonorous sentence in which eighteen English words represent eight words of the Latin original—'Ut afflictos et periclitantes respicere et salvare digneris.'

A particular theory has recently been propounded to account for the literary qualities of the sixteenth-century Prayer Book, namely, the survival of the *cursus*,[1] or flow of the cadence in prose. The beauty of Latin prose depended on the arrangement of long and short syllables, especially at the end of the sentence. Cicero's rules were continued and, with some modifications, taken over by the Christian Fathers and the compilers of liturgical prayers. In course of time the difference between long and short syllables ceased to be noticed and accent took its place. About the end of the seventh century the *cursus* was abandoned, to be revived in the eleventh century, quantity now being entirely ignored; it was used by Dante and Petrarch and finally given up in the fifteenth century. The *cursus* had three main forms: *planus*, with the accent on the second and fifth syllable from the end; *tardus*, on the third and sixth; and *velox*, on the second and seventh. The Annunciation Collect illustrates these: 'Gratiam tuam quæsumus domine mentibus nóstris infúnde (*planus*); ut qui angelo nuntiante Christi filii tui incarnatiónem cognóvimus (*tardus*), per passionem eius et crucem ad resurrectionis glóriam perducámur (*velox*).'

When the habit of writing consciously rhythmical prose was abandoned, the sound remained familiar in Church services, especially in Collects, and the rhythm, so it is held, was reproduced in the new English forms. So we get the *planus* effect in 'mártyr Saint Stéphen,' 'hélp and defénd us,' 'mércy and píty'; the *tardus* in 'thém that be pénitent,' 'contínual gódliness'; the *velox* in 'ríse to the life immórtal,' 'peóple which call upón thee,' 'lóse not the things etérnal.' In the Collects of 1549 about half the clause-endings conform to the *cursus* rules. Of the rest, some violate them, being in verse, such as 'pleáse thee bóth in wíll and deéd,' or ending with an accented syllable, *e.g.* 'desire or desérve.'

In the Psalms, according to Canon Richards, in 150 last verses, 97 final clauses are simple *planus*, *tardus*, or *velox*. The Litany

[1] This account is summarised in the main from three articles in *The Church Quarterly Review:* April 1912, 'Rhythmical Prose in Latin and English,' by J. Shelley; January 1929, 'Coverdale and the Psalter,' by E. Clapton; April 1930, 'Coverdale and the Cursus,' by G. C. Richards. A. C. Clark's *The Cursus in Mediæval and Vulgar Latin* is the standard English book.

yields many examples: 'hónour and glóry' (*planus*), 'shéw it accórdingly' (*tardus*), 'ángry with us for éver' (*velox*).[1] For the sake of clearness, nothing has been said about the modified forms of *cursus*. The three main forms 'become increasingly common, until finally, like Aaron's rod, they swallow up their competitors' (Prof. A. C. Clark). The more exceptions we allow, the weaker the case becomes. The chief objection to the theory of a conscious employment of the *cursus* is the radical difference between Latin and English. How could a system that suited Latin be thought to apply to English with its monosyllables, English that idiomatically represents 'insere pectoribus nostris amorem tui nominis' by the nine consecutive monosyllables of 'graft in our hearts the love of thy name'? But that instinctively and unconsciously the sixteenth-century writers used rhythmical prose, whether influenced by Latin analogies or not, is obvious. And modern prayer writers might learn something from a study of the principles underlying 'rhythmical prose.' As an illustration, we may take the new 'Prayer for Sunday Schools' in the English 1928 Book.

'Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who hast committed to thy holy Church | the cáre | and núrt | ure óf | thy chíld | ren: Enlighten with thy wisd | om thóse | who teách | and thóse | who leárn; | that, rejoicing in the knowledge of thy truth, they may worship thee and serve thee all the days of their life.'

Is the complaint that the new prayers do not read well connected in any way with the neglect of the *cursus* rules? In this case the first two clauses end in verse, and the last with an accented syllable; both are devices forbidden by the *cursus*.

Seeing that some critics take an unfavourable view of the Prayer Book Exhortations, judging them by 'Dearly beloved brethren,' which has grown stale by repetition, it is worth while calling attention to the beauty and impressiveness of some of them; the long address in the Ordering of Priests, for example, is almost overpowering in its effect. The long version of 'Veni Creator Spiritus' in the 1552 Book, best known in the amended form of 1661, proves that men whose achievements in prose were so great could fail conspicuously when they tried their hands at verse.

That the English Prayer Books of 1549–59 were happy in the date of their appearance is suggested by a perusal of the Parker Society volume of *Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*. Liturgical good taste decayed very rapidly. In a service published in 1589, 'thought fit to be daily used in the English Army in France,' there is a prayer of nearly 1000 words, with sentences like these: 'Avance thyself like a

[1] This is clearly a more beautiful pronunciation than when the accent falls on 'us.'

mighty giant with a swift and terrible judgment against them; frustrate the counsels of all their Achitophels . . . Finally, let them be as Oreb and Zeb . . .'

In 1661 the Anglican divines had no temptation to rewrite the Prayer Book. Its proscription had endeared it to their hearts and a conservative bringing up to date was all they desired. The new prayers are more flowing, but generally admirable in their own style; see, for instance, the General Thanksgiving and the Collect of the Sixth Sunday after Epiphany. In 1689 the restraining influences of 1661 had passed and abortive proposals were made for a further revision, marked by—to our taste—almost intolerable verbosity. After that, inertia and complacency combined with real appreciation of the merits of the 1661 Book to postpone revision until the twentieth century.

With great traditions to live up to, we look anxiously at twentieth-century additions to the Prayer Book. On the whole they are not unworthy. The Scottish Book, in general, is a model of careful phrasing. The English Book of 1928 is far the most ambitious revision and, as might be expected, the most open to criticism on literary grounds. The whole has been reviewed by Dr. Brightman with some severity,[1] and Mr. Milner-White has treated the Occasional Prayers.[2] In what follows an attempt is made to criticise two lengthy pieces of prose—'The Preface (1928)' and 'An Exhortation,' which comes last in the book. If the criticism is justified, these pieces are likely to be classed in days to come with the liturgical achievements of 1589 and 1689 rather than with those of 1549–52 and 1661.

The purpose of the Preface is to explain and justify the changes made in the 1661 Book as the 1661 Preface did in regard to those made in the 1552 Book. For example, the 1661 Book refers to 'the more proper expressing of some words or phrases of ancient usage in terms more suitable to the language of the present time,' and to the provision for new needs, such as prayers for those at Sea and the Baptism of such as are of Riper Years. So 1928 lays stress on the new 'facts and modes of English life,' 'new customs and forms of speech unknown before,' and the 'new occasions of worship' which men seek. The altering of a word like 'indifferently' to 'impartially' illustrates the change in the meaning of words, but there is very little in the new Orders of Service that testifies to 'new occasions of worship.' The statement that those who prefer the old ways of worship 'cannot quite so worship, because they cannot . . . be blind to what has been happening during two hundred and fifty years,' is surprising when it is remembered that the Latin Mass has remained unchanged for a longer period.

[1] In *The Church Quarterly Review*, July 1927.
[2] *The Occasional Prayers Reconsidered* (1930).

But we are concerned with literary expression rather than with sense. The style is not happy. 'Nothing save the English version of the Holy Scriptures [we are told] is enwoven so closely in the language . . . of our people.' 'Save' in this sense according to Trench is 'almost exclusively limited to poetry'; Mr. Fowler,[1] however, says that the rule is ceasing to apply owing to the influence of journalists. 'Enwoven in the language' is hardly possible. After 'inweave' the preposition 'with' may follow, but at best the verb is unnatural, as will be seen if the sentence is rewritten in the form 'I inweave the Prayer Book in the language . . .'[2] 'Since 1662 there has been a change almost *beyond belief*' is a loose use of 'belief,' since we do believe it. 'The rise of numbers' is a strange substitute for 'the increase of population.' These and other phrases which seem to have been approved with insufficient criticism make one wish that in the twentieth, as in the sixteenth, century a new Prayer Book had to stand the test of translation into Latin prose.[3]

A new feature in the 1928 Book is the 'Exhortation, whereby the people are put in mind of the Law of Christ,' for use in Advent and Lent. The choice of Scripture passages is admirable, the Exhortation in which they are embedded less so. The obvious principle to follow is that the style should be simple and dignified, in harmony with the Authorised Version, appropriate both to the twentieth and the seventeenth century, avoiding equally modernisms and archaisms. It is interesting to note the number of times the style conflicts with that recommended by modern authorities. 'So are we *bounden* . . . to remember'—this past participle of 'bind' is obsolete except in the phrase 'bounden duty' (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*). 'The law of Christ declareth unto us *no whit* less fearful a penalty, if we do not those that we ought; *to wit* . . .' To have two different words, with identical pronunciation in Southern English, so near together is objectionable. Mr. Fowler's comment on both in *Modern English Usage* is 'see WARDOUR STREET.' 'For unto us also by this his commandment sin is made exceedingly sinful' is an example of the inversion which with elegant variation is one of the vices of modern writing.[4]

In 'which sentences of his law' the antecedent of 'which' is 'admonitions,' half a page away. 'By his Apostle he *assigneth us that single reason* why . . .' is deliberate archaising. So is 'this *manner* of interpreting the Law he *leaveth us to fulfil* by help of . . .'; if the sentence is inverted we get 'I leave you to fulfil this manner.' 'Which parable, as it standeth last in the Gospel,

[1] See *Modern English Usage*.

[2] *The Concise Oxford Dictionary* does not give 'enweave.' However, the *New English Dictionary* does give one example, from Coleridge in 1817, of the use 'inweave in.'

[3] See p. 813.

[4] Fowler, p. 285.

so *it* shall be the end of our exhortation ' is a sentence which would not be passed in a schoolboy's essay. Finally, ' unto which life he vouchsafe to bring us all ' is impossible in modern English. The subjunctive without ' may ' survives in a stereotyped phrase like ' God grant you success ': ' he grant you ' cannot be substituted. However, this can be justified since it reproduces the conclusion of the Commination Service.

To some readers the foregoing analysis will seem hypercritical. But criticism of proposed liturgical forms, always necessary, is especially necessary in this case, since the proposed English Book was not intended to come up for revision and final authorisation after an experimental period.

There is another consideration. Sixteenth and seventeenth century English is a great inheritance. Our tongue has become a world-language. Its spoken varieties will tend to increase. An English lecturer in America is already heard with difficulty unless he makes a special effort to enunciate his words clearly. ' Pidgin-English ' is a recognised variety in the East. The English used as a means of communication by Indians may easily in the future develop peculiarities of its own. But literary English will probably continue to be uniform, owing to the influence of our classics. Teachers will inculcate standards which have been laid down long ago by our forefathers. If, in the Anglican Communion of the future, English is to hold its own as a vehicle for liturgical worship, not unworthy to be compared with Latin, our Prayer Book revisions must be watched very jealously on the literary side. As Mr. Milner-White has said: ' The English of the Prayer Book has exactly that value [of hieratic language, comparable to Latin, in the Holy Mysteries], with the gain that it does not sacrifice intelligence. It is a language unapproachable to-day, the national language alike of its birth and fine flower, contemporary—more or less—with the great Tudor writers, senior even to the Bible, and with it the norm and inspiration of English literature since, bringing at every turn nobility and discipline into the common speech.' [1]

[1] ' The Value of the English Tradition ' in *Theology*, March 1924.

PRAYER BOOK TRANSLATIONS

By THE EDITOR

In this chapter an attempt will be made (*a*) to summarise the history of Prayer Book translations, and (*b*) to give information about recent developments in the Mission Field. Until lately the ideal was to reproduce the English Book almost verbatim in other languages; this is now giving place to a desire for both enrichment and simplification. In so far as the desire takes concrete form, the story becomes one of Prayer Book Revision, and the line of demarcation between the chapter dealing with that subject and the present one is not very clear.

Latin.[1]—A version made by Alexander Aless, or Alane, for the information of the foreign reformers, was published in Leipzig in 1551; it was full of inaccuracies, which doubtless conduced to their unfavourable opinion of the 1549 Book. An official translation of the Elizabethan Prayer Book (1559) was published in 1560, for use in college chapels in the Universities, and for the clergy in their private devotions; it contained a number of divergences from the English Book. The intention was that those of the Irish clergy who did not understand English should use the Latin version. The 1560 Book was supplemented in 1571 by a new version closely following the original. In 1670 Jean Durel completed the version of the 1662 Book initiated by Convocation. The standard, though not official, version is now that of Drs. W. Bright and P. G. Medd (1865 and subsequent editions).

Greek.—The first translation was published in 1569; it contained parts only, in Latin as well as Greek, and was made by William Whittaker. The entire Book, translated by Elias Petley, appeared in 1638, at a time when Laud was interesting himself in the Eastern Church.

The standard Greek Prayer Book is that published by the S.P.C.K. in 1923. Dr. Brightman was the editor, but the whole Book was worked over and, where necessary, rewritten by Greeks. It is 'an entirely new translation, into neither "ancient"

[1] See Procter and Frere, *History of the B.C.P.*, pp. 116 ff.

nor "modern" Greek, but into ecclesiastical and liturgical Greek, the language of the Greek service-books, and with all attention that can be given to technicalities.'[1] The book is so little known that examples of its style may be interesting. The Collect for the 20th Sunday after Trinity is as follows:

'Ο Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ καὶ πολυεύσπλαγχνος, διὰ τὴν ἄφθονόν σου ἀγαθότητα πάντα τὰ ἡμῖν ἀντικείμενα, δεόμεθά σου, ἀπόφραξον· ἵνα ψυχῇ τε καὶ σώματι ἀνεμπόδιστοι γενόμενοι, τὰ σοὶ εὐάρεστα μετ' ἐλευθέρων ἐκτελέσωμεν διανοιῶν, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

The first two questions and answers of the last part of the Catechism appear thus:

Πόσα Μυστήρια κατέστησεν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ αὐτοῦ;

Δύο μόνον, ὡς καθόλου ἀναγκαῖα εἰς σωτηρίαν, ἤτοι τὸ Βάπτισμα, καὶ τὸ Δεῖπνον τὸ Κυριακόν.

Τί νοεῖς διὰ τῆς λέξεως ταύτης, Μυστήριον;

Νοῶ ἐξωτερικόν τι καὶ ὁρατὸν σημεῖον ἐσωτέρας καὶ πνευματικῆς χάριτος, δαψιλευομένης ἡμῖν, διαταχθὲν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς μέσον δι' οὗ τυγχάνομεν τῆς χάριτος, καὶ ὡς ἐχέγγυον βεβαιοῦν ἡμᾶς περὶ τούτου.

Latin and Greek versions were originally made for scholars at a time when classical studies flourished greatly in England. A number of translations now to be mentioned have served practical purposes within the British Isles.

Welsh.—The first translation was issued in 1567. Since then many editions have appeared. The Book now in use is popular and generally understood by the people. Since the separation of the Welsh Church from the Church of England in 1919 the attention of its leaders has been absorbed in the urgent tasks of reorganisation, and so far there is no movement to produce a revised Prayer Book, whether in Welsh or English, for the Church of the Province. Welsh Prayer Books have found their way to the Welsh settlements in Patagonia.

Manx.—Bishop Phillips of Sodor and Man completed a Manx translation by 1610. His clergy preferred to continue their practice of extemporising translations of the English Book, and the MS. remained unpublished until 1895. The first printed translation appeared in 1765 and was distributed gratis by the S.P.C.K. After 1825 Manx began to disappear as a spoken language and the later editions were produced for philological rather than practical reasons. The earlier editions prayed for 'the House of Keys' instead of for Parliament, and in the prayer for the Royal Family inserted the words: 'And with them the Lord and Lady, and Rulers of this Isle.'

[1] Dr. Brightman in Muss-Arnolt, *The Book of Common Prayer among the Nations of the World*, p. 51.

Irish.—In 1608 the first Irish version, a translation of the current (1604) text of the English Book, was published at Dublin. The 1662 Book was issued in Irish in 1712. The revival of the language since the establishment of the Irish Free State has made it desirable to have an official version of the present Irish Prayer Book. A Committee was appointed in 1929 to prepare it. The Book, when ready, will be used at a monthly service in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, and occasionally elsewhere.

Gaelic.—The first translation of the Book of Common Prayer into this language was published in 1794; an appendix gave the Scottish Communion Office. The last revision appeared in 1895. There is no prospect of the 1929 Scottish Prayer Book being translated. Two congregations only, at Glencoe and Ballachulish, now use the Gaelic Book.

French.—The need for this version was felt at once, that the king's subjects in Calais and the Channel Islands might use the national service-book. There is stated to have been an edition published in 1551, but the first one known with certainty appeared in 1553, a translation of the 1552 Book. The 1662 Book was first published in French in 1665, having been translated by Jean Durel. Outside the Channel Islands, a number of congregations of French refugees used it. At present the S.P.C.K. has two versions, one for general use and the other, slightly different, for the Channel Islands. The first is sold occasionally to the Continent and Canada, and regularly to Mauritius, the Seychelles, and the Rio Pongas Mission in French West Africa. Complaints have been levied against the Society for publishing a book in which the Almighty is addressed by the familiar 'Tu' of the Protestants instead of by the dignified 'Vous' of the Catholics. It is sufficient to say that the Churchmen of Jersey and Guernsey prefer to follow the English custom, and that a Book which used 'Vous' would find purchasers nowhere in the world. The American Church first published a French version of its Prayer Book in 1831. The existing edition is used in the missionary diocese of Haiti as well as in certain churches in the United States.

Hebrew.—A very remarkable Liturgy is used at the Church of Holy Trinity, Shoreditch, in the Diocese of London, compiled by the priest in charge, Dr. P. P. Levertoff. It is derived from early Christian and Jewish sources, and represents the kind of rite that might have been evolved by a Hebrew Christian Church of the first centuries that had preserved its national idiosyncrasies without drifting into Ebionitism. Its title is 'The Order of Service of the Meal of the Holy King.' The Ark with rolls of the Book and a New Testament stands at the right-hand side of the Altar. Ḥaloth (Jewish loaves) are used, except on the Passover, when they give place to Maṭzoth (unleavened bread). The

celebrant wears cassock, talith (prayer-shawl), skull-cap, and stole. The congregational responses are numerous. Lessons are read from the Law and the Prophets, besides the Epistle and the Gospel. Considerable use is made of the Old Testament, especially the Psalms and Isaiah liii. After communicating himself the priest says: 'This is the Bread of the Messiah. All who are hungry, let them come and eat.' The beauty and the impressiveness of the rite are beyond praise. Whether so drastic a departure from all other Liturgies past or present can be justified depends upon one's attitude towards the ideal of a Hebrew-Christian Church which Jews should be invited to enter. It may be argued that the case of the Jews is unique. But when everything has been said in favour of Dr. Levertoff's rite, which has elements of greatness, it remains a 'fancy Liturgy,' an archæological reconstruction without roots in history.

There have also been Hebrew versions of the 1662 Book, made in connection with missions to Jews.

Spanish.—The first version appeared, at the costs of John Williams, afterwards Archbishop of York, about 1617, at the time of the proposed match between Prince Charles and the Infanta of Spain. The 1662 Book was translated in 1707 for the benefit of Spanish merchants in London who conformed to the Church of England. Later versions were used at Gibraltar. The present Book is occasionally ordered for Spanish America. Thus Anglican negroes from Jamaica emigrating to Central America may come to speak Spanish in the second generation while still cherishing their British citizenship and membership of the Church of England. Various translations of the American Prayer Book have been issued, for Cuba, Porto Rico, Mexico, and the Philippines.

Portuguese.—In 1695 a version was published for Portuguese-speaking congregations in the East Indies. There have been later ones published by the S.P.C.K.; also versions in the debased form of the language spoken in Ceylon by descendants of Portuguese settlers who married native women. The American Church has an edition for its Brazil mission.

To complete the record, a short description of the Prayer Books of the Reformed Spanish and Portuguese Churches may be given, since information on the subject is not very accessible, and the future may see other such examples of small bodies affiliated to one or other branch of the Anglican Communion, which in this respect has acted independently.[1]

[1] The Archbishop of Dublin, Lord Plunket, with the Bishops of Clogher and Down, consecrated Señor Cabrera as first Bishop of the Reformed Church on September 23, 1894. Resolutions 15 (D) and (E) of the Lambeth Conference, 1888, had expressed a hope that the Reformers in Latin countries would 'adopt such sound forms of doctrine and discipline,' and 'secure such

The Prayer Books are Anglican in type with Mozarabic elements. In the Office of Baptism both use the sign of the cross. The Portuguese Book has the phrase, 'seeing that this child is regenerate and incorporated into the Church of Christ'; an alternative form is not in practice used. The corresponding Spanish Prayer gives thanks that 'by thy grace [this our beloved] has been admitted to the Sacrament of regeneration and of remission of sins.'

In the Communion Service the Portuguese Prayer of Consecration begins as in the 1662 English Book and ends: 'Therefore, O heavenly Father, we . . . eating this bread and drinking this cup according to the commandment of thy beloved Son, desire to show forth his Death, until he come again, remembering his blessed Passion, precious Death, mighty Resurrection and Ascension. . . . Grant us thy Holy Spirit that we . . . may be able to partake of this Holy Communion feeding by faith, spiritually and in a heavenly manner, on the most Holy Body and Blood of thy dear Son, who . . . bade us call upon thee, saying (Our Father).'

The Spanish Communion Service has many interesting features. The Preparation has the threefold Kyrie. The Introit varies with the season, so does the Offertory. The *Gloria in excelsis* is in the traditional place at the beginning of the service. The Prayer for the Church is partly Anglican, partly Mozarabic. After the *Sanctus* comes 'Hosanna to the Son of David; Hosanna in the highest!' and then the Consecration Prayer begins: 'Truly holy and blessed art thou, O God the Father Almighty, who didst send . . .' The recital of the Institution follows, then the Anamnesis, then an Epiclesis—'bless and sanctify for our use, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we receiving them . . . may be partakers of his blessed Body and Blood'; the 'Prayer of Oblation' concludes the Consecration Prayer.[1]

The Portuguese Ordination formula is that of the English Prayer Book, with an alternative: 'May Almighty God grant thee the gift of the Holy Spirit for the office and ministry of presbyter in the Church of God, which is now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands. And be thou a faithful dispenser

---

Catholic organisation as will permit us to give them a fuller recognition,' and had deprecated 'any action that does not regard primitive and established principles of jurisdiction and the interests of the whole Anglican Communion' (cf. *The Six Lambeth Conferences*, p. 123). In 1908 a Committee of the Conference welcomed 'the successful efforts which have been made by each of these bodies [Spanish Reformed and Lusitanian Churches] to bring its Liturgy into closer accord with Catholic standards' (p. 427).

[1] It is interesting to find, in a Liturgy composed under the direction of Irish Bishops, features which aroused much opposition in the English Revision during 1927–28.

of the Word of God and of his holy Sacraments.' The Spanish formula is identical with the Portuguese alternative.

A Mexican (Spanish) Prayer Book appeared in 1894 and 1895. 'We have here a Prayer Book that is at once individual, national, Catholic, and yet in essential accord with our American liturgy. It is not a translation; it is not even an adaptation. It has taken what it saw fit from Mozarabic and other sources, with the hope of adapting itself more completely to the temper of the Mexican people than any translation might do.' [1]

Italian.—Versions in this language were published in 1685, 1733, 1796, and later years. The American Prayer Book was translated in part and published in 1868 and 1874; a complete book appeared in 1886, and another edition in 1904. A *Liturgia* of the 'Chiesa Cattolica Riformata d'Italia' was published at Milan in 1903; it drew largely on the Book of Common Prayer.

This is a convenient place at which to discuss the principles underlying the production of translations of the Prayer Book into European languages, for the ecclesiastical impropriety, if such it be, of such undertakings is most conspicuous in the case of Italy. Frequently a need has arisen in connection with a small body of foreigners away from their homes seeking the ministrations of Anglican clergy. Where there has been no such practical use for a version, the motive has generally been the desire of a Chaplain resident abroad to spread information about the Church of England. Doubtless there has sometimes been a hope that the knowledge of such an excellent liturgy would guide the Reform movements on the Continent along the same road as that which the English Church took in the sixteenth century. At the present time the knowledge of English has spread so widely that intelligent foreigners can satisfy their curiosity by buying an English Prayer Book; and the desire to reform the Continent on Anglican lines no longer exists—it never existed except in the minds of irresponsible individuals.

The American situation is completely different. Large numbers of immigrants throw away the religious practices of their homeland, and if the Episcopal Church can help them by so doing it is bound to produce translations of its Prayer Book.

Dutch.—Archbishop Laud's efforts to enforce uniformity led to the preparation of a Dutch translation for natives of the Low Countries resident in London, which was published in 1645 after his death. A version appeared in 1710, devised for the Dutch of New York City; it was declared to be Socinian in tendency and was destroyed. Dutch Prayer Books are used in South Africa by 'coloured' congregations. A Book in Afrikaans, the officially recognised form of the language as spoken locally, exists in part,

[1] Muss-Arnolt, p. 99.

but has not superseded the older Book, which to the congregations using it seems more appropriate for a religious service.

German.—Frederick I of Prussia had the English Prayer Book translated by professors at Frankfort on the Oder; the Book was issued in 1704. The King hoped that it might prove a common meeting-ground for the two faiths of his realm, Lutheran and Reformed. In the early Hanoverian period relations between Germany and England were very close and six German-speaking congregations existed in London. During the eighteenth century German Prayer Books were used by exiles who had fled from religious persecutions to settle in Canada and the American colonies; also by disbanded German mercenaries in South Africa and elsewhere. The present Book seems to be used only by a congregation of converted Jews in Warsaw. Various translations of the American Prayer Book have been issued.

Other European languages.—A *Danish* Prayer Book was first published in 1849; it circulated in the Danish settlements of New Brunswick and in the Danish West Indies. Several *Swedish* and *Norwegian* translations of the American Book, in whole or in part, have been published. Other languages represented are *Modern Greek*, *Czech*, *Polish* and *Russian* (in 1855 for the benefit of Russian prisoners).

Arabic.—Edward Pocock, who had been chaplain to the 'Turkey Merchants' at Aleppo, and became the first Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford, made the first Arabic version, which was published in 1672. Several other versions have followed, also one in the *Maltese* form of the language. The present Arabic Book is used in Egypt and Palestine. The special problem which this language presents is its literary quality. A competent scholar will use classical Arabic, which is indeed eminently suitable for worship, but is little understood by the people. Another difficulty which exercised Committees of the S.P.C.K. in the nineteenth century was whether 'Sacraments' on the title-page should be translated by a dual or a plural.[1]

Other languages of the Near East in which the Prayer Book has been published are *Turkish* (both in Arabic and Armenian characters), *Armenian*, *Amharic*, *Persian* and *Pashtu*.

[1] H. W. T. Gairdner of Cairo had several talks with the writer on the subject of the Prayer Book. He made fun of the custom of translating the whole book, including prayers for 'Arabic Jack Tars going into battle.' Asked if he would have such parts omitted, he replied 'No'; the unused parts were of great value, being a revelation to Easterns of how religion could apply to every department of human life. He was anxious to see liturgical experiments made, especially in connection with the Eucharist. The Eastern rites did not appeal to the Arabic-speaking Christians of his acquaintance. The future lay with a modification of the English rite, which by its shortness and simplicity had won a place from which it could not be dislodged.

Indian languages.—The most important in this geographical area are *Bengali, Hindi, Marathi, Urdu* in North India; *Malayalam, Tamil,* and *Telugu* in the South; *Sinhalese* in Ceylon; *Burmese* and *Karen* in Burma. All these have their Prayer Books, as do a number of other languages. The problems arising in the newly-constituted 'Church of India, Burma and Ceylon' are so important as to justify more extended treatment.

So far back as 1883 the Bishops in a Pastoral Letter defined their policy as regards Indianisation. 'We do not aim at imposing upon an Indian Church anything which is distinctly English or even European. . . . In regard to the conditions under which [fundamental matters] are presented, the Church adapts herself, and we desire to see her adapt herself more and more, to the circumstances and to the tempers of every race of men; and from these, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, her forms of service, her customs, and rules and institutions will take an impress.' In practice, the Indian Church has been conservative; no surprise will be felt at this when the legal connection with the Church of England is remembered. In 1904 the Bishops passed the following resolutions, which still represented the official policy up to 1930.

'We desire to make or permit no alterations whatever in the Book of Common Prayer itself, either in its English form or in translations; but to keep it entire and unchanged, as the standard, to the teaching of which all new or adapted Offices or Forms of Divine Service must conform.

'The Book of Common Prayer being thus kept intact, we desire to recognise a wide liberty in the variations which each Bishop may see fit to allow; provided that such variations are made to meet needs which are specially felt in this Province, and not for the purpose of improving the contents of the Book of Common Prayer on purely liturgical grounds.'

As an example of a local need which might, on a wide interpretation of this principle, have been sanctioned, but which the Bishops have felt obliged to forbid, the giving of the *tali* (necklace) instead of a ring may be mentioned: the earlier prohibition has been officially maintained.[1] The Episcopal Synod has taken the greatest possible care in supervising vernacular versions of the Prayer Book. In practice some have been used tentatively pending the satisfying of the Synod's requirements.

If little progress has been made so far by the Indian Church in the task of adapting the Prayer Book to local needs, the foundations of future revision have been carefully laid in 'The Constitution, Canons and Rules of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon,' which came into force in March 1930.[2] Chapter XXI

[1] Though the practice has none the less made its way in South India.

[2] The Fourth Draft, September 1928, has been used.

is entitled 'Of the Services of the Church.' It begins (Canon I) with 'the following guiding principles concerning the development of public worship which the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon sets before itself:

'(1) It desires to work towards the development of forms of worship congenial to the nature of the Indian races;

'(2) It desires to give opportunities for great liberty of experiment in the direction of such development, but at the same time to safeguard provincial unity; and

'(3) It desires to preserve to the English residents in India the opportunity of worshipping in their own language in a manner as nearly as may be similar to that to which they are accustomed at home, and for this last point special provision is made in Chapter XXII.'

The *jus liturgicum*, here called 'liturgical authority,' of the Bishops is recognised, but it is to be exercised by them 'in consultation with each other, and in such a manner as not to endanger the harmony of the Dioceses and the unity of the faithful.' Assessors should sit with the Episcopal Synod when liturgical matters are discussed, and the General Council, of which both clerical and lay representatives are members, is 'to concur in the action of the Episcopal Synod in grave matters relating to public worship,' and its concurrence 'shall be required for the adoption of any Book of Common Prayer to be authorised for the Province as a whole, and for any change in such a Book when once authorised' (Canon II).

The Church has power to put out its own service-books, including an edition specially designed for Indian congregations by the side of the official Prayer Book of the Province (Canon IV). The respective powers of the Episcopal Synod and of the Diocesan Bishop are carefully defined. Nothing may be authorised if in the judgment of the Episcopal Synod 'in respect of the words employed in it or of the usages, practices or ceremonial accompanying the words, it is repugnant to or inconsistent with the doctrine expressed in the Book of Common Prayer of the Province and in other formularies recognised by this Church as standards of doctrine' (Canon X).

A note to Chapter XXI enumerates 'the modifications in the Book of Common Prayer prescribed or authorised by the Episcopal Synod previous to the date of severance' (of the Indian Church from the Church of England). These modifications differ little from those customary in England. It is sufficient to note the provision of an alternative form of (non-liturgical) service in place of Mattins or Evensong, 'provided that one of these services is used on the same day.' In a note to Canon XI the custom, practised in some dioceses, 'of substituting some other object for

the ring in marriage, and naming that object in the service instead of the ring,' is recognised. In Chapter XVI, Rule 17, the obligation of the clergy to say Mattins and Evensong daily is set forth, with the proviso that 'the Bishop may authorise any clergyman when saying these services privately to vary their forms with a view to finding forms more suitable for use in India, Burma and Ceylon.'

In 1930 the Episcopal Synod gave permission to use the English Book of 1928 with the exception of the latter part of the Alternative Liturgy and the provisions relating to the Reserved Sacrament. In 1932 the use of the whole 1928 Rite and of the Scottish Rite was sanctioned. In places throughout India the Prayer of Oblation has been said, with episcopal sanction, immediately after the Prayer of Consecration.

The instinct for self-expression on Indian lines has taken non-liturgical forms. Hymn-singing is greatly developed. The custom by which a sacred book is chanted and then explained by a Brahmin, a couplet (*e.g.* one of the *Puranas*) at a time, has been adapted by Christians. Thus the Life of our Lord has been put into verse, notably by N. V. Tilak, and treated in this way. Christian *Bhajans* are used, musical lyrics with a complicated system of repetitions, resembling the Antiphons of the mediæval Latin Church, the uneducated repeating the refrains which they know by heart. Bible stories are acted in musical plays. Even the Sacred Dance in honour of Shiva has been Christianised in places.[1]

As might be expected, the diocese of Dornakal under its Indian Bishop (Dr. Azariah) has done most to adapt the Prayer Book Services.[2] In that diocese there are three towns only, and the problem is one of village worship. Morning Prayer has been treated as follows. The *Venite* is freely rendered in the form of a Telugu lyric, the metre being chosen to fit a suitable air; the first seven verses are sung as an Introit as the clergy take their places. A two-minutes silence follows, ended by the Confession of Sins. The Psalms are arranged with many omissions and shortenings. A 'Village Lectionary' is in use in the diocese, arranged in a five-years cycle. Most characteristic is the treatment of the Canticles. Thus the *Jubilate*, freely rendered as a lyric, is farsed with a chorus, or antiphon, after each verse—'Jesus is God.'[3] Or, again, in the second part of the *Te Deum*, each verse ends with 'O Christ.' Similarly, the *Kyrie*, *Sanctus*, and *Gloria in excelsis* are rewritten to Telugu airs. The Eucharist is

[1] This paragraph is based on a conversation with Bishop Palmer, formerly of Bombay.

[2] What follows is derived from a conversation with the Bishop.

[3] This repeats in a different form what was said above. The descriptions given by two informants will help to make the point clear.

little changed. The chief need is to lengthen the service, since one that lasts half an hour is not in accordance with Indian ideas of seemliness; so long periods of silence are introduced. The 1929 Scottish Liturgy is used at week-day services in the towns and is much appreciated.

The service of Adult Baptism has a great appeal. In ordinary life the taking of a solemn covenant or oath is preceded by a bath. The vows associated with the baptismal waters assume great importance in Indian eyes, perhaps at the expense of the truths of the death unto sin and the new birth.

The Marriage Service is expanded to last at least an hour—two hours would be better for Indian ideas of fitness. The Espousals are made in the marriage pavilion, where the willingness to give the bride, and of the bridal pair to wed each other, is expressed. At this stage, too, the dowry is settled, presents are bestowed, the fee is paid and fifteen minutes are allowed for drum-beating. The ceremonies take place before the priest who is to conduct the service in church. The procession is formed, and the marriage ceremony is solemnised in church, the *tali*[1] being used instead of the ring, followed by the Eucharist, at which only the bridal pair, with their relations and near friends, communicate. Various Indian customs have been Christianised. A woman's *sari* is blessed by the priest before it is worn. Before harvest the sickles are brought to church to be blessed.

The problem before the Indian Church is how best, with due regard for tradition, to bring the principle underlying these movements into its liturgical services. The Indian clergy so far have been conservative and suspicious of anything resembling the heathen ways of the past. But the problem must be solved by Indians co-operating with missionaries firmly rooted in the Catholic past, but open-minded and sympathetic towards Indian ideas.

The only important Indian liturgical movement is that associated with Fr. Winslow and his colleagues at Poona. His book, *The Eucharist in India*,[2] deserves careful study. The preliminary essays define the principles animating the proposed Rite, which is in essence a condensation of the Liturgy of St. James, as used in the Syrian Church of Malabar. The Anaphora follows the general Eastern type, with the emphasis upon the Epiclesis. But, lest the Indian mind should be led to disregard historical fact, the Anamnesis is also emphasised. So is the Communion of Saints, special mention being made of St. Thomas. Stress is laid on the Preparation Service before communicating. The *Missa Catechumenorum* contains a full measure

[1] A necklace, generally of gold, and clasped behind with a minute screw; the bridegroom clasps it on the bride's neck.

[2] London, 1920.

of instruction, with its three lections—Old Testament, Epistle, and Gospel. The people's part is far greater than in the Anglican rite, and the attention is kept alert by frequent responses, often of fair length.

This Liturgy was sanctioned in 1920 for experimental use in Bombay diocese and has since been celebrated in several places—daily in the chapel of the Christa Seva Sangha at Poona. A small but significant ceremony has been added since the book was published, an Indianised form of the Asperges. The people are sprinkled with Holy Water with the help of a small bouquet of flowers, thus recalling the Hindu ceremony of *Udakashanti* (the Water of Peace).

'The most characteristically Indian service in Christa Seva Sangha is our morning and evening "sandhya"—the traditional twilight worship of India, answering to the original conception of Lauds and Vespers. We hold this in the open garden, sitting on the ground in a semicircle, facing the sunrise in the morning and the sunset at night. The worship includes prayers adapted from Hindu Sanskrit prayers; "Bhajans," viz. Indian hymns, sung to Indian music and instruments; readings from Scripture; and a long silence for quiet contemplation; ending with the three-fold "Shanti" (Peace! Peace! Peace!).'[1]

Attractive as this sounds to Western ears, it must be remembered that for Anglicans in India the natural link with the Catholic past is the Book of Common Prayer, and the Dornakal adaptations of that Book are probably more truly Indian, for India in its present stage of development, than the Poona experiments.

A tentative Ceylon Liturgy, compiled by a Committee of Ceylon priests, appointed by the Bishop of Colombo in response to a petition presented to him at the Diocesan Synod in 1927, was issued for criticism in 1931. It is a skilful blending of Eastern and Western forms.

In Borneo Prayer Books are needed in *Sea Dyak*, *Land Dyak*, *Malay* and *Chinese*. In Singapore diocese, *Tamil*, *Malay* and *Chinese* are the chief languages; the small Anglican mission in Bangkok is building up a *Siamese* Prayer Book by instalments. Translators in this diocese may use either the 1662 or the 1928 Book. In Borneo some use has been made of the Scottish Liturgy. But this diocese presents a problem which is likely to arise elsewhere in future and so deserves study. When a number of nationalities meet, as in a school, some common language must be found. This can only be English. Therefore an English Prayer Book is needed as a missionary instrument. But the 1662 Book is not suitable; the 1928 one is still less suitable, with its puzzling alternatives. What is required is a simplified Book which

[1] Letter to the writer from Fr. J. C. Winslow.

could be used by those of various races to whom English, though known, is a foreign language. But if each diocese produced its own Book, confusion would be caused. So a need would seem to arise for common action on the part of several dioceses with common problems.

Chinese.—Prayer Book problems in China have a distinctive character of their own. Though the classical literary language is understood by the educated everywhere, the colloquial differs in North and South, and there are a number of genuine dialects, such as Cantonese and Hakka. The Anglican Church, 'Chung Kua Sheng Kung Hui,' consists of seven dioceses founded by the Church of England (five C.M.S., two S.P.G.), three by the American Church, and one by the Canadian. Distances are so great and political conditions since 1911 have been so disturbed that common action has been difficult. Eight different versions of the Prayer Book are in use.[1] In 1921 the General Synod endorsed the principle laid down by the Lambeth Conference of 1920, by which liturgical experiments were encouraged in missionary dioceses, with a reservation as to changes in the Communion Service with possible doctrinal implications. The diocese of North China took advantage of this liberty and a Committee of five, three of them Chinese, was appointed in 1923 to revise the Prayer Book, with the following results.

Morning and Evening Prayer are printed together, with ingenious conflation. In them, as also in the Litany and Occasional Prayers, a good many changes are made with a view of securing variety and a wide range of subjects for intercession. In the administration of the Sacraments and in other services the alterations are those suggested by common sense. In the Marriage Service a new prayer meets the aspirations of the Chinese for a recognition of the good side of ancestor-worship; but its thought is wholesome doctrine for the Churches of the West too. 'O Gracious God, from whom alone cometh all we have, who also hast taught us to honour our parents, we therefore ought to remember at this time our forebears, and to thank thee for them. By thy grace these two people have been brought to be man and wife; grant them to build up their home in truth, both so doing their duty as to please thee and not shame their forebears.'

Bishop Norris in describing these changes says that the Chinese do not yet know what they really want. 'If we are wise we shall wait until there are Chinese liturgical scholars who can not only rightly appreciate the traditional elements of our Prayer Books, but also, by reason of their own unquestioned Chinese scholarship,

[1] What follows is derived from Bishop F. L. Norris' articles on Prayer Book Revision in China in *The East and the West*, April and July 1927.

can give form and beauty to such Chinese features as they wish to graft on the old stock.'

Experiments similar to those in North China, though more modest, have been made in the dioceses of Anking and W. China.

In 1931 the General Synod approved the preparation of forms of Morning and Evening Prayer for the whole Church, in the new vernacular literary style of the language.

Japanese.—The 'Japanese Church' in Communion with Canterbury, called 'Nippon Sei Kokwai,' like the Chinese is of both English (S.P.G. and C.M.S.) and American origin. From the first it has acted on provincial rather than diocesan lines. The first synod, held in 1887, dealt with the Prayer Book, and the resulting Book, based on both English and American originals, was published in 1891. An *Ainu* version, for the island of Yezo, was published in 1896.

The Prayer Book now in use embodies features of the English Book omitted in the American,[1] and *vice versa.* Literal translations of both Consecration Prayers are given, and either may be used at the Minister's discretion. The Prayer of Humble Access, by a recent decision of Synod, may be said after the Consecration Prayer. A Service of Preparation for Holy Communion is provided; it begins with the Lord's Prayer and the Collect for Purity, continues with a part of Mattins, always including the Old Testament lesson, and ends with a short Litany. The Apocrypha is not used in the Lectionary. The Appendix includes three characteristically national services: for the New Year, for the Emperor's Birthday, and for the Inauguration of the Church of Japan (Feb. 11).

Corean.—The English Church Mission in Corea is a small body, poor and understaffed, the members of which have given much thought to the problems connected with the planting of a Western branch of the Church in an Eastern land. The original version of the Prayer Book is destined to be superseded by a diocesan Liturgy and Service Book based on the best models, which has been practically ready for the press for some years. For a number of years a Liturgy differing little from that proposed has been used at Ordinations and Synod Masses. In 1932 the clergy assembled in Synod unanimously desired that the proposed Liturgy should be published.

Central Africa, the Universities' Mission Dioceses.

The liturgical situation in these dioceses deserves careful study. The customs of Anglo-Catholic churches in England being far from uniform, the inevitable result was chaos. Missionaries went

[1] In its pre-1929 form.

out, each with his own method, armed with this or that book, and continued in Africa what they had practised in England. The African priests were bewildered and some form of diocesan regulation was urgently needed. The solution found by the diocese of Zanzibar, to which this description is primarily applicable, is given in Bishop Weston's words in his Life.[1] 'The New [Swahili] Mass . . . is 1549 adapted, with Rome supplying the priest's [private] prayers: much as I suppose a "Catholic" in 1549 said the new service. . . . The rest of the book is, I think, all right: tho' there is more Rome in it than Convocation . . . would approve.' This Swahili Prayer Book, in the dioceses of Zanzibar and Masasi, has superseded the version of the Book of Common Prayer originally made by Bishop Steere, which, however, is used in the (C.M.S.) diocese of Central Tanganyika. A description of what is in reality a new member of the Anglican family of Liturgies may be useful to readers.

The Mass must be said without deviation, and the rubrics prescribing the loud and *sotto voce* parts of the service are enforced.[2] In the *Missa Catechumenorum* the Preparation is said by all aloud. The opening 'Our Father' disappears. The Prayer for Purity is said as the last part of the preparation as the priest goes to the Altar. Then follow the Introit, Nine-fold Kyrie, *Gloria in excelsis* when ordered (no Commandments), Collects, etc., Sermon (when preached), Dismissal of Catechumens and of Penitents. The *Missa Fidelium* begins with the Creed (when ordered). A variable Offertory is followed by the offering of the Oblation with prescribed private prayers and the secrets. The *Sursum corda* and Preface lead to an extended Prayer of Consecration including the Intercessions, as in Scotland; an *Amen* is said at the end of each section. The next part is the 1662 Consecration Prayer. Then comes the Prayer of Oblation, which draws largely upon Roman sources. The whole is said aloud and the congregation join in the Lord's Prayer. During the priest's private prayers the people come up into the chancel and say aloud a shortened Prayer of Humble Access and a Confession. By this time the priest is ready to give the Absolution. The Communion and the Ablutions follow, and the singing of the 'Communio.' The Blessing and the Last Gospel conclude the service. The Prayer of Thanksgiving is said by the congregation, usually led by a priest, before they leave the church.

Other features of the Prayer Book which deserve notice are these:—The Psalter is said twice a month at the four offices, obligatory for priests, of Mattins, Sext, Evensong, and Compline. Baptism falls into two parts. The first service, at which catechu-

[1] *Frank, Bishop of Zanzibar*, pp. 289, 290.

[2] English congregations in the dioceses use the 1662 rite, without addition or omission.

mens are set apart, is normally six months before the Baptism proper. The white garment is put on at Baptism, in N. Rhodesia and Nyasaland as well as in the Swahili-using dioceses. Full Christian marriage is always at Mass; married catechumens are given the nuptial blessing after Baptism, usually on the same day.[1]

The diocese of Northern Rhodesia uses the 1662 Book for English services, or alternatively the South African Rite. As a basis for vernacular service books a diocesan rite has been prepared, in which the following features may be noted. The Preparation is said by all. The *Gloria* comes at the beginning of the service. Catechumens are dismissed before the Creed. The Prayer for the Church is in its English position.

The diocese of Nyasaland also has a basic English rite from which versions have been made. The Preparation is said by all. After the offertory come 'Ye that do truly . . .,' a shortened Confession and Absolution, and the Comfortable Words; then an amplified Prayer for the Church, followed by 'Lift up your hearts,' leading to the Canon, which runs as follows:

'Truly thou art holy, O Almighty God and Heavenly Father, and to thee do we give thanks for that thou didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon him and to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption. Who made there one all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, and did institute and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death until his coming again.

[2] 'Hear us, O merciful Father, we humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy Spirit vouchsafe to sanctify these thy creatures

[1] In the diocese of Masasi (Southern Tanganyika) the initiation rites have been adapted by the mission. They fall into three parts:

(*a*) On the opening day the ground is blessed; 'the Cross takes the place of the "lupanda" tree; and the invocation of the Saints of Christendom replaces the appealing to the great ones of the tribal past. All this is done after dark on the vigil.' The all-night dance follows, then the Christian Sacrifice in church, the circumcision and the dance of rejoicing.

(*b*) The boys go to the forest camp for a period of four to six weeks under Christian teachers, whose instruction is supplemented by that of local chiefs. Truth, honour, purity, temperance, etc. are inculcated, and above all religious habits. 'On the day before the end each boy makes his confession, as in the heathen rite.'

(*c*) The boys then come to church with shaven heads and in new clothes, all things connected with the old life having been burned, and attend a Mass of Thanksgiving, where they are received into the Chancel as potential bridegrooms and given a special blessing. 'Then the priest takes the boys to the west door of the church and, amid a scene of wonderful enthusiasm, restores them to their waiting mothers and other relations.'

Similar rites are practised in the case of the girls, but their period of seclusion is ten days only, and the physical rite is not allowed. See Bishop W. V. Lucas in *Essays Catholic and Missionary*, pp. 141 f.

[2] Reconsecration, if necessary, from here.

of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, who in . . .

'Wherefore, O Lord and Heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, together with all thy holy people, having in remembrance the Blessed Passion of the same thy Son Christ Our Lord, as also his mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension, do offer unto thy Divine Majesty of these thy Holy Gifts, a pure and holy victim, this holy bread of eternal life, and this cup of everlasting salvation; beseeching thee to grant that by the merits . . . Passion. *Amen.*

'And here we offer . . . (almost as in 1662) . . . yet we beseech thee to command that this our Sacrifice, together with our prayers, may be brought to thy Holy Altar on high before the sight of thy Divine Majesty. . . .'

The Prayer of Humble Access follows, then the Communion, Thanksgiving, *Gloria in excelsis*, and Blessing.

West and East Africa.—The many Prayer Books prepared by the Church Missionary Society call for little comment. They are characterised by a faithful adherence to the English standard. This must not be taken to imply any lack of interest in devotional expression, but rather that missionaries have supplemented their service-books, where necessary, by free unliturgical forms. The most important books in the West are the *Yoruba* and *Ibo* (Nigeria). In the towns on the coast, in Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and the Gold Coast alike, English is the usual language.

In the diocese of Accra an English Missal giving the 'Western Use' is sanctioned, and has been translated into *Ga* and *Twi*.

In Uganda, *Luganda* and *Lunyoro* may be mentioned, in Kenya *Swahili*, *Kikuyu*, *Dholuo* and *Giriama*. The Southern Sudan also has its versions in the Nilotic dialects.

South Africa has versions of the Prayer Book in the four great native languages, *Sixosa* and *Zulu*, *Sesuto* and *Sechwana;* also in *Afrikaans*, *Chiswina* (S. Rhodesia), and various dialects of Portuguese East Africa. The Church of this Province has moved in a methodical and orderly way. Its liturgical history belongs to the chapter on Prayer Book Revision. Ultimately the S. African Revised Prayer Book will be translated into all the languages spoken in Anglican Missions. The cautious manner of advance is illustrated by the treatment of the Sesuto version of the S. African Alternative Order of Holy Communion. (1) It was printed as a separate service, which (2) was later bound up with the Prayer Book as a supplement. (3) The opportunity of a resetting of the Book was used to print the Alternative Service in the usual place, relegating the 1662 one to the end of the Book. (4) Ultimately, if the 1662 service should cease to be used in the Sesuto-speaking Missions, it would presumably be omitted.

Madagascar is generally reckoned with Africa. The *Malagasy* Communion Service has a Consecration Prayer closely resembling that in the American Book. It has an Epiclesis as follows: 'And we pray thee hear us, O merciful Father, and of thy goodness let thy word and thy Holy Spirit be the means of thy blessing and making holy these thy gifts, the bread and the wine, that they may be the Body and Blood of thy most beloved Son.'

The American Continent.—The first Indian version was in *Mohawk* (New York, 1715). The American Book has been translated into several languages for the benefit of Indians living in the United States, including Alaska. More important are the Canadian versions, especially *Cree* in its different varieties. In connection with the various *Eskimo* versions the overworked word 'romance' may fairly be used. It is with pleasurable surprise that one hears of Cranmer's work in an Eskimo dress being used daily in snow huts during the long Arctic nights.

In 1924 an *Ukrainian* version of the Canadian Prayer Book was published, for the benefit of immigrants from Poland and Russia who, lacking any ministrations from clergy of the Eastern Orthodox Church, were seeking help from the Canadian Church. Before the war such people were called Russians or Ruthenians, according to the political boundary, but they claim to be one nation, the Ukrainian.

The West Indies present great difficulties. The Church is handicapped by the isolation and poverty of the islands. The English language is used everywhere in the Anglican Missions, except in the dioceses of Guiana and Honduras. Common action on the part of the Bishops is difficult. Indeed, London is the most convenient meeting-place for the Episcopal Synod. Many of the clergy have come from England, and so the conditions of the Mother Church are reflected locally. No Prayer Book Revision has been undertaken, but divergences from the 1662 Book are allowed. In Nassau Diocese the 1549 Liturgy is the Diocesan Use. Antigua has a Diocesan Use for those who wish to deviate from the 1662 Book. It is a simple form of the 'Western Use' familiar in many English parishes. The priest's private prayers are prescribed, as also the ceremonies. The Preparation is said by priest and server. The service as said aloud is practically that of 1662. The Prayer of Oblation is said after the Prayer of Consecration, with a connecting 'Wherefore,' and the Lord's Prayer follows, introduced by 'As our Saviour . . . to say.'

In South America the *Lengua* and *Mataco* Prayer Books, used in Paraguay, deserve mention.

The Pacific.—No liturgical points of interest seem to arise in this division of the world. The *Wedau* and *Mukawa* versions in New Guinea, and the *Mota*, *Gela*, *Lau*, etc., versions in Melanesia, follow the 1662 Book; similarly the American Church Mission

in the Philippines has translated the Prayer Book of its home Church.

Through the kindness of the Bishop of New Guinea I have been allowed to see some interesting suggestions made by two of his priests.

Morning and Evening Prayer.—Long psalms to be split up. No section to exceed 20 verses. Lessons similiarly to be shortened. Provision to be made for a Saturday night service in preparation for Sunday.

Baptism and Confirmation.—More stress to be laid in the Baptism of Infants on the completion of the contract when years of discretion are reached. When that happens, those baptised in infancy to enter the class of catechumens and undergo the same instruction. The vows of renunciation, faith and obedience to be taken separately, perhaps on three consecutive Sundays. Baptism to follow after an interval, and Confirmation after another interval. A primitive people cannot be expected to take in more than one idea at once.

Visitation of the Sick.—Exorcism of the spirit of fear, and of the demons that are supposed to be causing the sickness, is required. Unction is of great value. Communion by means of the Reserved Sacrament is clearly necessary. The interior of a native hut is begrimed with wood smoke; except under the ridge-pole it is impossible to stand up.

No survey, however rapid, of the subject can avoid mentioning the work of the S.P.C.K., which as early as 1701 began to consider translations of the Prayer Book. By 1914 the number of languages in which it had published the Prayer Book had risen to 114.[1] Since then many new versions have been added. An exact computation is impossible, since some pioneer books have been issued in the mission-field by the Society's local representatives without the cognisance of its Home Office, and languages bearing different names may be for all practical purposes one and the same language. About 150 languages would be a fair estimate. These translations are controlled by a Foreign Literature Committee, appointed not by the members of S.P.C.K. but directly by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Until recently the Archbishop sanctioned the publication by the Society of no version unless he was satisfied with the answers given to a somewhat formidable schedule of questions. Many difficulties arose in early days in connection with translation problems. These have now virtually solved themselves. The greater part of every Prayer Book is taken from the Bible, the text of which in most areas is settled by an inter-denominational Committee; and technical words, for which equivalents are hard to find, are nearly always trans-

[1] The number given by the officials of the Society to Dr. Muss-Arnolt.

literated. But the watchful care of a succession of Archbishops has been an incalculable help to missionaries cut off from the centres of theological learning. In 1920 Archbishop Davidson informed the Society that he need no longer be consulted about new versions which had provincial sanction.

The desire of the Society and its President has not been to insist on literal translations of the 1662 Book for their own sake, but to ensure that a book professing to be a translation should accurately represent the original. The contents of a Prayer Book are the concern primarily of the Bishop responsible for it, not of any Society, however venerable. This leads us to consider the attitude taken up by successive Lambeth Conferences. In 1867 Resolution 8 declared that 'each Province should have the right to make such adaptations and additions to the services of the Church as its peculiar circumstances may require. *Provided*, that no change or addition be made inconsistent with the spirit and principles of the Book of Common Prayer, and that all such changes be liable to revision by any Synod of the Anglican Communion in which the said Province shall be represented.' In 1878 the Encyclical Letter included a Report which recommended the setting up of a Board in England and another in America, to which liturgical changes should be submitted; if the country concerned were under English rule, then only the English Board should be consulted. The 1908 Conference laid down principles—avoidance of redundancies, the provision of additions and alternatives, the seeking of greater elasticity, etc.—which should be observed in Prayer Book Revision. In 1920 the Conference maintained the authority of the Book of Common Prayer as a standard, but considered that 'liturgical uniformity should not be regarded as a necessity throughout the Churches of the Anglican Communion' (Res. 36). Resolution 37 ran: 'Although the inherent right of a Diocesan Bishop to put forth or sanction liturgical forms is subject to such limitations as may be imposed by higher synodical authority, it is desirable that such authority should not be too rigidly exercised so long as those features are retained which are essential to the safeguarding of the unity of the Anglican Communion.' The Archbishop of Canterbury was requested to appoint a Consultative Committee of liturgical students who would advise any diocese or province.

The 1930 Conference agreed that the Committee of Students of Liturgical Questions need not be reappointed; its work would be taken over by the Consultative Body, which, it was recommended, should at its discretion call in expert advisers. The Committee on the Anglican Communion reaffirmed two of the 1920 Resolutions dealing with the Prayer Book, but the 1930 Encyclical Letter and Resolutions were silent on this subject.

The importance of the whole question will be readily recog-

nised. The Roman Catholic Church takes the Latin Mass everywhere. Protestant Missions are at present little interested in liturgical questions. The provision of Liturgies in the vernacular is largely an Anglican problem. The ideal of uniformity has been abandoned and we now have a family of Anglican Liturgies and Offices, many of which are sufficiently established to have the forces of conservatism behind them. No body of men are more tenacious of the forms of prayer to which they are accustomed than the priests of a young Church. Far more than the foreign missionary they will cling to the present Prayer Books; they are inclined to resent any apparent concession to outworn heathen ways. The 1662 Book in all essentials has a long life ahead of it in the Mission Field. Eventually better services may supersede it, but not for many years to come in most places. The English Book of 1928 will be used as a quarry by revisers overseas, but it is unlikely to be required as a whole. Meanwhile supporters of missions in England will continue to help Churches in which many liturgical forms other than those of the Home Church are used. A realisation of this may help to soften English controversy. It would seem reasonable that the Mother Church, which cares for Provinces and dioceses overseas with so great a variety of liturgical practice, should herself tolerate a measure of divergence which might be inappropriate in a small self-contained Province.

Authorities.—Up to 1913 Dr. Muss-Arnolt's *The Book of Common Prayer among the Nations of the World* (S.P.C.K., 1914) is exhaustive. For information about current movements the writer was indebted to many correspondents, especially Archbishop Hutson (Antigua); Bishops Azariah (Dornakal), Embling (Corea), Foss (formerly of Osaka), Harden (Tuam—for Ireland, Spain and Portugal), O'Ferrall (Madagascar), Palmer (formerly of Bombay); Canon Spanton, for the Central African Dioceses; and Fr. Winslow.

THE SERVICES OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH[1]

By R. FRENCH

It is a commonplace to say that the Eastern Orthodox have a genius for public worship. *Orthodox* means 'right-believing,' but it is significant that the corresponding adjective used to describe the Orthodox Church by its Slavonic-speaking members (who are enormously predominant numerically) means 'right praising' (*Pravoslávny*).

'Worship,' says Evelyn Underhill, 'is the little human spirit's humble adoring acknowledgment of the measureless glory of God.' It is this that the Orthodox spirit understands so well. It is this that the Greek or Russian peasant 'goes to church' for. The strength of Orthodox Christianity lies in its sense of worship; worship which is offered with dignity and splendour but without fuss or regimentation, worship which is a vehicle for devotion but without sentimentality. It is in the Liturgy that the worshipping instinct of the Orthodox finds its pre-eminent and most characteristic expression. But the Liturgy lies outside the scope of this present article. An attempt will here be made to give some account of other Orthodox services of public worship, that is to say, of the Daily Offices and some of the Occasional Services.

The Daily Office.

The Hours of Prayer are in number the same as in the West: Vespers, Compline, Midnight Service, Mattins, Prime, Terce, Sext, None. Theoretically they are spread out throughout the day to form a ceaseless round of prayer and praise. But for practical convenience they are, at any rate in parish churches, recited in groups. None, Vespers and Compline form the evening service: the Midnight Service, Mattins and Prime, are said together as the morning service, while Terce and Sext are combined with the Liturgy at, say, about ten o'clock. On the eves of Sundays and Great Festivals the grouping of Offices differs to some extent, Vespers, Mattins and Prime being said together about six o'clock in the evening as the All-Night Vigil Service (Little Vespers and Compline having been said earlier).

[1] Other than the Eucharist, for which see Art. 'The Eucharist in East and West.'

In Monasteries, where everything is sung at length and slowly, this Service may literally last all night, but as said in parish churches it takes about a couple of hours.

Many English people who are quite at home in the Liturgy find themselves at a loss in the Orthodox Daily Office. The congregation does not 'stand to sing, sit to hear, and kneel to pray'; no directions are given or announcements of what is happening made by the officiant; the structure and shape of the Service are difficult to grasp. Even with a translation before him the reader is daunted by a bewildering variety of rubrics and sub-titles of portions of the Service. Certain details strike him at once as curious. The *Magnificat* is a morning canticle, for instance, and the *Te Deum* does not appear at all in the regular sequence of liturgical services. The *Gloria in excelsis* is said at Mattins and at Compline, and the Nicene Creed at the Midnight Service and Compline. There is also a richness, variety and flexibility about the Orthodox Offices in the highest degree contrasted with the sober regularity of our own.

The Anglican Office of Morning and Evening Prayer is built up round the orderly recital of the Psalter and the orderly reading of Holy Scripture. Let us take this as a starting-point in our examination of the Orthodox Office.

The Psalter.

The Psalter is used in three ways:

1. There are certain fixed Psalms said at each Office daily. Thus at the Midnight Office li and cxix (or on Saturdays lxv–lxx instead of cxix), and later in the service cxxi and cxxxiv. Mattins has xx and xxi, and later the 'Six Psalms,' iii, xxxviii, lxiii, lxxxviii, ciii, cxliii. Prime, Terce, Sext and None have three invariable Psalms each.

2. The whole Psalter is divided into twenty sections called *Cathismata*, and each *Cathisma* again into three *staseis*. The *Gloria* is said at the end of each *stasis*, not at the end of each Psalm. Thus arranged the Psalter is used at Mattins and Vespers, in addition to their fixed Psalms. For the greater part of the year two *cathismata* are said at Mattins and one at Vespers, so that the whole Psalter is recited in each week. At certain times the number of *cathismata* used is different. In Lent the Psalter is read through twice a week. From Maundy Thursday to the eve of Low Sunday the Psalms are omitted altogether.

3. Detached verses of Psalms, singly or in groups, are a frequently used element in the Offices. For instance, a *prokeimenon* is an example of such use. The *prokeimenon* consists of two verses (hardly ever consecutive) of a Psalm. It belongs properly to the Liturgy, where it is said before the Epistle, but the *prokeimenon* of the day is repeated in the Office also.

Holy Scripture.

Beside the Psalter and certain other portions of the Old Testament, the New Testament is of course read in the services of the Orthodox Church. The books of the 'Apostle' and the 'Gospel' are essential for the conduct of worship. The four Gospels are included in the latter, while the former contains the Acts of the Apostles as well as the Epistles. The Epistle and Gospel of the day are read at the Liturgy according to a fixed order, the Gospel is also read at Mattins. In addition to the usual division into chapters and verses the books are also portioned out into sections (in Russian *zachala*), and the order in which these sections are to be read is given at the end of the book. For each day of each week in the year, beginning at Easter, the proper section is shown Special lections are provided for Feasts of our Lord and the great Saints' Days, as well as for use at occasional services.

Such then roughly is the use of the Psalms and Lessons. The actual prayers in the narrower sense of the word, which are used in the Office, are many of them very beautiful. They are often long and couched in poetic phraseology, quite different in form from the concise and regular Western Collect. Frequently they are said secretly by the Priest while the choir are singing their part. Thus while the reader reads the six Psalms at Mattins, the Priest recites the twelve Morning Prayers, the first three within the Altar (*i.e.* in Western phraseology, the Sanctuary), and the remainder outside the Ikonostas, facing the Royal Doors. The same is true of the Seven Prayers of Light at Vespers. The following, which is said at all the Hours, may be given as an example:

> O thou who at all times and seasons in heaven and earth art worshipped and glorified, Christ our God, long-suffering, pitiful and all-compassionate, who lovest the righteous and pitiest sinners, who callest all to salvation through the gospel of thy coming kingdom, do thou, O Lord, receive our prayers at this time, and guide our lives in thy statutes. Sanctify our souls, cleanse our bodies, correct our thoughts, purify our hearts, and deliver us from all affliction, evil and pain. Defend us by thy holy angels, that, being guarded and guided by their ranks, we may come to the unity of the faith and the knowledge of thine unapproachable glory, who art blessed to ages of ages. Amen.

But the bulk of the Orthodox Services consists of ecclesiastical poetry. It has been computed that poetry comprises 80 per cent. of the vast contents of the service-books, and it is made up for the most part of short hymns. The word 'hymn' is not here

used in the modern and Western sense with its implication of metre and perhaps rhyme. They are rhythmical compositions in poetical language—hymns in the sense that the *Gloria in excelsis* may be so called. A general name which covers a large number of them is *troparion* (Slav. *tropar*), and the Orthodox Services are festooned with them, strung together with *Glorias* and broken verses from the Psalms like pearls on a string. The number of different sorts of *troparia* is large and the total of all sorts must run into many thousands. The deacon Romanus, who lived about A.D. 500, is credited with the composition of over a thousand *kontakia*. A *kontakion* is one of these short 'hymns' summing up the life of a Saint or giving the gist of the occasion for which it is used. This is the *kontakion* of Easter Day: 'Thou, O Immortal, thou didst descend into the tomb, yet didst thou overthrow the might of Hades, O Christ our God; and thou didst arise as Victor, saying to the Ointment-bearers—Hail! Thou didst give peace to thine Apostles, who dost cause them that are fallen to arise.' A *Theotokion* is a hymn about or addressed to our Lady: 'Formed wert thou to be the dwelling of light, pure and most holy Mother and Virgin, who didst give birth to Christ the King of all and the Enlightener of them that sit in darkness: whence with faith we bless thee.' A *Stauro-theotokion* is the same, but contains also a reference to the Cross: 'Standing by the Cross of thy Son and the Son of God, and beholding his long-suffering, with tears, pure Mother, thou saidst, Woe is me! Why sufferest thou thus unjustly, my Son, Word of God, for the race of men?'

These must suffice as illustrations of the three or four dozen different varieties of *troparia*. Many of them are of great beauty. A few have been translated, put into modern dress, and become favourites in our hymn-books. Thus the original of 'Hail, gladdening Light' is the *troparion* which occupies in the Orthodox Vespers the position which *Magnificat* holds in the West. 'Joyful Light of the holy glory of the Father, Immortal, Heavenly, Holy, Blessed, O Jesu Christ; we, having come to the setting of the sun and beholding the evening light, hymn God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. It is meet at all times that thou shouldst be hymned with auspicious voices, Son of God, Giver of Life: wherefore the world glorifieth thee.' It has been sung at Vespers at least since the time of St. Basil, who ascribes it to the martyr Athenogenes, about A.D. 175. 'The day is past and over,' 'Stars of the morning,' 'The Day of Resurrection,' 'Come, ye faithful, raise the strain,' 'Fierce raged the tempest,' and others are all examples of modern renderings of Orthodox *troparia*.

I have likened *troparia* to pearls on a string. One might also think of them as pieces of mosaic fitted together into an intricate pattern which can itself be picked up as a whole and placed here

or there as required. Such is that very important element in Orthodox worship known as a *Kanon*, some rough and generalised description of which is necessary in even this brief survey. There are *kanons* of the great festivals, most Saints' Days have their *kanons*, and some have more than one, and there are *kanons* in some of the Occasional Offices. One of the best-known composers of *kanons* is St. John Damascene, another is Anatolius, Patriarch of Constantinople in the fifth century, and many *kanons* are of great antiquity. Their structure is as follows: three, four, five or more *troparia* (the number varies) form an *ode*, and nine *odes* make a *kanon*. But in addition to their own subject-matter the *odes* are supposed to conform to, or contain some allusion to, their scriptural prototypes.

These are—

(1) The Song of Israel (Ex. xv. 1–21).
(2) The Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 1–44).
(3) The Song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 1–11).
(4) The Prayer of Habakkuk (iii. 1–19).
(5) The Prayer of Isaiah (xxvi. 9–21).
(6) The Prayer of Jonah (ii. 2–10).
(7) The Prayer of the Three Children. } From the Apocryphal addition to the third chapter of the Book of Daniel.
(8) The Benedicite. }
(9) The *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*.

These scriptural *odes* are taken as covering the whole field of religious emotional experience, and whatever be the occasion for which the *kanon* is written, its *odes* are skilfully constructed to carry the mind back to the corresponding scriptural *ode*, especially the second and the last three. It is to be noted that *Ode* 2, because of its denunciatory character, is always omitted except in Lenten *kanons*.

Further, each *ode* begins with a special sort of verse called a *heirmos* and ends with a *theotokion* (see above). Various other sorts of *troparia* are inserted at fixed places as the *kanon* progresses, and after *Ode* 6 there may be a whole group of them, beginning with a *kontakion*; and even a litany and a lection.

The *Ectine* or Litany is another element which enters freely into the composition of Orthodox Services. There are four forms of Litany used both in the Liturgy and the Offices: the Great Litany, the Little Litany, the Increased Litany (so called from its triple response) and the Petitioning Litany. To these may be added the Litany of the Catechumens which belongs to the Liturgy alone, and the Litany of the Faithful Departed which is said on occasion at the Liturgy, and in the Office for the Dead.

The Litanies are said by the Deacon standing before the Royal Gates. He holds the end of his stole in his right hand and crosses himself with it before he bows at the end of each petition. The Litany ends with an 'exclamation' by the Priest, which is the concluding phrases of the prayer which he has been saying secretly during the singing of the Litany. As an example the Petitioning Litany is here given (from King's translation of Vespers):

Deacon. Let us compleat our evening supplication to the Lord.
Choir. Lord, have mercy upon us.
Deacon. Protect us, save us, be merciful unto us, and preserve us by thy grace, O God.
Choir. Lord, have mercy upon us.
Deacon. Let us beseech the Lord that we may finish this evening in holiness, peace, and innocence.
Choir. Grant this, O Lord.
Deacon. Let us beseech the Lord for the angel of peace, the faithful guide and keeper of our souls and bodies.
Choir. Grant this, O Lord.
Deacon. Let us beseech the Lord for pardon and remission of our sins and offences.
Choir. Grant this, O Lord.
Deacon. Let us beseech the Lord for all things good and profitable for our souls and for the peace of the world.
Choir. Grant this, O Lord.
Deacon. Let us beseech the Lord that we may end the rest of our days in peace and repentance.
Choir. Grant this, O Lord.
Deacon. Let us beseech the Lord that the last period of our lives may be suitable to our Christian profession, without pain and confusion of face; that we may give a good answer at the dreadful tribunal of Christ.
Choir. Grant this, O Lord.
Deacon. In remembrance of our most holy, most pure, most blessed and glorious Lady, the Mother of God, and ever-virgin Mary, with all Saints, we commend ourselves and each other, and our whole life to Christ our God.
Choir. To thee, O Lord.

Exclamation.

Priest. For thou art the blessed God, the Lover of mankind, and to thee, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, we offer our praise, now and for ever, even unto ages of ages.
Choir. Amen.

The Trisagion.

This has its place at the beginning of the Daily Offices and of

many other services also. In its extended form it runs as follows:

O Holy God, O Holy Mighty, O Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us (*thrice*).
Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Christ, both now and for ever, even unto ages of ages. Amen.
O Most Holy Trinity, have mercy upon us; O Lord, purify us from our sins, and forgive us our transgressions, O Lord: O Holy, look down upon us, and heal our infirmities for thy Name's sake.

Lord, have mercy upon us (*thrice*).
Gloria.
Our Father.

It is not proposed to give here a list of the service-books of the Orthodox Church. But some idea of their complexity may be gained from the following facts. Beside the Liturgy, the Psalter, and the books of the Epistles and Gospels, some seven or eight other books are required. The Priest's part at Mattins and Vespers will be in one of them, the invariable choir parts at the Hours in another. The hymns, *kanons*, *stikhera*, etc., of the Daily Services will be found in one of three other books according to whether the season be Lent, Eastertide, or an ordinary day in the rest of the year. Proper of Saints has its own book, and another is devoted to the rubrics, tables of concurrence, and so on. It must be remembered that there are frequently two or three Saints commemorated on the same day, and the ecclesiastical season must, of course, be taken into account.

When these facts are borne in mind it will be appreciated that the fitting together of the variable parts of a Service for a particular day must often be a task compared with which the number and hardness of the rules called the Pie would seem trivial.

Some of the technical terms having been explained above, it may be of service now to give a rough outline of the structure of one of the Orthodox Offices. The following is such an outline of Mattins, no attempt being made to show the variation of the Service with the seasons of the Church year.

Mattins.

The *Trisagion* (in its extended form).
Psalms xx and xxi.
The *Trisagion* (repeated).
Prayers for Rulers of Church and State.

[*The whole of the foregoing is omitted if Mattins be said in conjunction with Vespers and Prime, as the All Night Vigil Service.*]

The Six Psalms.

[*While these are chanted by the Reader, the Priest says the Twelve Morning Prayers secretly.*]

The Great Litany.
Versicles.
The *Troparion* of the Day.
The First Part of the Proper *Kathisma* of Psalms.
The Little Litany.
The Second Part of the *Kathisma.*
The Little Litany.

[*The Kathisma and Little Litany are omitted in some churches.*]

The Royal Doors are now opened and the Priest and Deacon cense the Sanctuary, Ikons, Choir and people, and the whole church. The lamps at the shrines are lit during the singing of:

The Polieley (Psalms cxxxv and cxxxvi).
Troparia (on Sundays).
Hymn to the Trinity.

'Let us worship the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, the Holy Trinity in one Substance, crying with the Seraphim Holy, Holy, Holy art thou, O Lord. Both now and ever and unto ages of ages.'

Hymn to our Lady.

'In bringing forth the Life-Giver, thou hast, O Virgin, ransomed from sin and given joy to Eve instead of sadness; for the God and Man incarnate of thee has restored to life them that had fallen therefrom. Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia, Glory to thee, O Lord.'

The Little Litany.
Versicles.
The *Prokeimenon* of the Day.
The Gospel for the Day.
Hymn of the Resurrection (on Sundays).

'Having seen the resurrection of Christ, let us bow down before the Holy Lord Jesus who alone is sinless. We worship thy Cross, O Christ, and laud and glorify thy holy resurrection. For thou art our God and we know none other beside thee. We call upon thy Name. Come, all ye faithful, let us adore Christ's Holy Resurrection; for behold through the Cross joy is come unto all the world. Blessing the Lord continuously we hymn his Resurrection; for having endured the Cross for us he hath by death destroyed Death.'

The *Kanon* of the Day.

[*After the 3rd, 6th and 9th Odes, the Little Litany is sung. After the 8th Ode, the Magnificat and Benedictus, the former with a Refrain after each verse*, i.e. :]

'More honourable than the Cherubim, and beyond compare more glorious than the Seraphim, who undefiled barest God the Word, verily the Bearer of God, thee we magnify.'

Little Litany.
Verses from Psalms cxlviii–cl.
Stikhera of the Day (or another short hymn to our Lady).
The *Gloria in excelsis*.
A few detached Verses of Psalms.
Trisagion.
The Increased Litany (*i.e.* with threefold responses).
The Petitioning Litany (*i.e.* with response, 'Grant, O Lord').

After a few more verses and short hymns the Service closes with the Blessing.

Such a rough outline can give but little idea of the beauty of the Service and the richness of its symbolism in word and ceremony. For this and detailed explanation the reader may be referred to the more extended descriptions by Birkbeck, Shann and others, which are easily accessible.

We pass to a brief consideration of some of the Occasional Services.

Holy Baptism is not the first occasion on which a child of Orthodox parents will be brought into contact with the Church of which he is in due course to become a member. On the day following the birth the Priest comes to say prayers over the mother and child, and again a week later when the child is given his name. On the fortieth day from its birth the mother brings the child to church, when prayers are said first for the child, then for the mother, and then again for the child, and, if Holy Baptism has meanwhile been administered, the Priest carries the child through the church and (in the case of a male child) into the Sanctuary, reciting the *Nunc Dimittis*. But unless the child has been baptised at home, which is not infrequently the case, the latter ceremony will follow Baptism. And the prayers of the eighth day are now combined with those of the first day.

The rite of Baptism is preceded by exorcism and a short catechism of renunciation of Satan and acceptance of Christ, which concludes with the recitation of the Nicene Creed. In the case of converts from non-Christian religions, the catechumen will be required also to repudiate in explicit terms the particular errors of his previous religion.

The administration of the Sacrament itself begins with a

Litany said by the Deacon while the Priest prays secretly for himself and for the person about to be baptised. This is followed by a long prayer said aloud, in the course of which the water is blessed in words which frequently recall the phraseology of the Anglican rite; *e.g.* 'Grant that the person to be baptised therein may be thoroughly renewed, that he may put off the old man which is corrupt through deceitful lusts and put on the new man after the image of him that made him; that being planted in the likeness of his death by baptism, he may be partaker of his resurrection.'

Olive oil is then blessed, the surface of the water signed with it, and the child is anointed.[1] With his fingers dipped in the oil, the Priest signs the child on the brow, saying, 'The servant of God, *N.*, is anointed with the oil of gladness in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. Unto the healing of soul and body' (here the sign is made on the breast and back). 'Unto hearing the faith' (on the ears). 'Thy hands have made me and fashioned me' (on the palms). 'That he may walk in the way of thy commandments' (on the feet).

The child is then baptised with threefold immersion and the words, 'The Servant of God, *N.*, is baptised in the Name of the Father, Amen. And of the Son. Amen. And of the Holy Ghost. Amen.'

Psalm xxxii follows; and the child is clothed while this *troparion* is sung: 'Grant me the garment of light, O thou who clothest thyself with light as with a garment, O most merciful Christ, our God.'

The Baptism ended, Chrisom, which corresponds with the western Confirmation, follows immediately. It begins with an ascription of praise and thanksgiving for the baptismal gift, merging into a prayer for 'the seal of the gift of thy holy, and almighty, and adorable Spirit.' The child is then anointed in the sign of the cross on the brow, eyes, nostrils, lips, ears, breast, hands and feet; and at each anointing the Priest says, 'The seal of the Gift of the Holy Spirit. Amen.'

A triple circuit of the font is then made with lighted tapers by the clergy and the sponsors carrying the child. The circle thus made symbolises unbroken and eternal union with Christ.

After some versicles and responses, the Epistle (Rom. vi. 3–11) is read, and the Gospel (St. Matt. xxviii. 16–20).

The Service usually ends here, though a Litany and Blessing may follow.

Although this Sacrament (Confirmation) is in the Orthodox Church administered by the Priest, the Chrisom which is used in it is prepared by the Œcumenical Patriarch with elaborate

[1] It is to be noted that this is entirely distinct from the anointing with chrisom, which follows Baptism.

ceremonial during Holy Week once in every few years as required. He distributes it to the Orthodox world, and it thus becomes a symbol both of the primatial dignity of the Œcumenical Throne and of the unity of faith and love which binds the Orthodox Churches together. The Œcumenical Patriarch can, however, and does (*e.g.* in the case of Russia) concede the right to consecrate the Chrisom for their own use to the chief bishops of other Orthodox Churches.

In early times the newly-baptised person was brought to church again eight days later for Ablution (*i.e.* sprinkling with water and washing of the places where he had been anointed) and the Cutting of the Hair (in the form of a cross, as a symbol of service). But these ceremonies are now performed at the same time as the Baptism; the Reception of the Catechumen, the Baptism and Chrisom, the Ablution, etc., all forming one long service.

The Order for the Sacrament of Penance as given in the service-books contains the *Trisagion*, the 51st Psalm, a number of *troparia* and some long prayers said by the Priest as well as an explanatory exhortation to the penitent and an interrogation upon his faith (in reply to which he says the Nicene Creed) before the detailed confession of sins is made in answer to questions put by the Priest. In practice, all this is, of course, much shortened. At the end the Priest *prays for* the forgiveness of the penitent, but expressly on the ground of the commission, 'Whosesoever sins thou dost remit they are remitted unto them,' etc. And in the Slavonic rite a definite Absolution of the Western form is added: 'By his authority committed unto me, I absolve thee,' etc.

In the Orthodox rite of Marriage the distinction between the ceremony of betrothal and the marriage proper is very clear, although both are now performed continuously as one service.

The Betrothal Service opens with a litany of petition for the bridal pair, followed by a prayer that they may be blessed as Isaac and Rebekah were blessed.

Both bridegroom and bride have rings, and at this point in the Service the rings are blessed and exchanged, the Priest saying to the bridegroom, 'The servant of God, *N.*, is betrothed to the handmaid of God, *N.*, in the Name,' etc., and corresponding words to the bride, and then adding a long prayer referring to the purpose of marriage and the use of rings in Holy Scripture.

Then follows the actual marriage, called the 'crowning,' for the Orthodox Church has retained the custom of crowning the bridal pair, which goes back at least to the time of St. Chrysostom (end of the fourth century). Metal crowns for the purpose are kept in the church.

After Psalm cxxviii, with the response, 'Glory to thee, our God,' after each verse, and the sermon (if there be one), the Priest addresses the bridegroom, thus: '*N.*, hast thou a good, free and unrestrained will and firm intention to take unto thyself to wife this woman, *N.*, whom thou seest here before thee?' and 'Thou hast not promised thyself to any other bride?'

Similar questions are put to the bride. A litany of appropriate petitions follows, and three prayers full of scriptural references, after which the Priest crowns the bridegroom with the words, 'The servant of God, *N.*, is crowned for the handmaid of God, *N.*, in the Name,' etc. The bride is then crowned with the corresponding formula.

The Reader reads the Epistle (Eph. v. 20–33) and the Deacon the Gospel (St. John ii. 1–12).

Here follows another Litany for the bride and bridegroom concluded by a prayer, and the Petitioning Litany (see above, p. 839), followed by the Lord's Prayer.

The common cup, containing wine (and sometimes pieces of bread as well), is brought and blessed and the bridal pair are given to drink from it, after which with their attendants they follow the clergy in procession in a circle, which symbolises their unbroken union.

Two more prayers and the Blessing bring this part of the Service to an end.

The crowns are removed while a special prayer is said, a ceremony which used to take place on the eighth day afterwards, but is now performed at the close of the Marriage Service.

The Orthodox sanction second and third marriages reluctantly; but a special form is provided for a second marriage.

The Sacrament of Holy Unction is administered for both bodily and spiritual healing to those who are seriously ill but not necessarily at the point of death. If the sick person is able to leave his bed it will take place in church, but more usually the Service is held at his own home. It is very long, and the Unction should properly be administered by seven priests, but, if necessary, and indeed usually, one priest only is present. The Service begins with the *Trisagion*, followed by Psalms cxliii and li, between which come the Little Litany and certain *troparia*. Then the *kanon* and another Litany, after which the oil is blessed as follows: 'O Lord, who by thy grace and bounty dost heal the infirmities of both our souls and bodies, sanctify this oil to the healing of him who is to be anointed therewith, to the laying low of all passions and impurities of the flesh and spirit and of all other evil, that by him thy most Holy Name may be glorified, in the Name,' etc.

There follow seven Epistles and seven Gospels, *i.e.* :

1. St. James v. 10–16.	St. Luke x. 25 *ff.*
2. Romans xv. 1–8.	St. Luke xix. 1–11.
3. 1 Cor. xii. 27–xiii. 8.	St. Matthew x. 1–9.
4. 2 Cor. vi. 16–vii. 2.	St. Matthew viii. 14–24.
5. 2 Cor. i. 8–11.	St. Matthew xxv. 1–14.
6. Gal. v. 22–vi. 3.	St. Matthew xv. 21–29.
7. 1 Thess. v. 14–24.	St. Matthew ix. 9–14.

After each Gospel there is a different prayer, read (in theory) by a different priest, who then anoints the sick person on the brow, nostrils, lips, breast and both sides of the hands, while he repeats a prayer beginning, 'O Holy Father, Physician of our souls and bodies, who didst send thine only begotten Son Our Lord Jesus Christ to cure all diseases and to deliver us from death; heal this thy servant, *N.*, from the bodily infirmity under which he now labours and raise him up by the grace of thy Christ. . . .' When the seven anointings are ended, the other priests lay the Book of the Gospels on the head of the recipient of the Sacrament, while the principal Priest says this prayer: 'O Holy King, the merciful and gracious Lord, Jesus Christ the Son and Word of the Living God who wouldest not the death of a sinner but rather that he should be converted and live, I lay not my sinful hand upon the head of this sinner now returning to thee and begging by us forgiveness of his sins; but do thou stretch forth thy powerful and mighty hand through this thy holy Gospel held upon the head of this thy servant by my fellow-ministers. With them I implore thy goodness, which leadeth thee to remember our sins no more, O thou who art our God and Saviour; who didst grant repentance to David by thy Prophet Nathan, and didst forgive his sins; and didst receive the penitence of Manasseh; accept this thy servant with thy wonted goodness, who repenteth of his sins, and look not upon his iniquities. For thou art our God, who didst command that we should forgive those who offend until seventy times seven; for as thy greatness is, so is thy mercy; and to thee are due all honour and glory and adoration, now and for ever, even unto ages of ages. Amen.'

After another Litany and more *troparia* the Service ends with a Blessing.

The Orthodox Order for the Burial of the Dead varies somewhat for a bishop, priest, monk, layman, laywoman or child. There are also variations in the Service if the death takes place at Easter. But into these space will not permit us to enter. The general outline of the Order is as follows. The clergy go to the house, where the body is censed, and the *Trisagion* sung, followed

by *troparia*, litany and prayers. The body is then carried to church, and Psalms xci, cxix (in practice abbreviated) and li are said. The *kanon* follows, and eight beautiful *troparia* composed by St. John Damascene, a version of the first of which appears as Hymn 360 in the *English Hymnal*. Then come the Beatitudes interspersed with short hymns and prayers, and a hymn to our Lady, followed by the Epistle (1 Thess. iv. 13–18) and Gospel (St. John v. 24–30).

The Deacon now repeats a short litany and the Priest says this prayer: 'O God of all spirits and of all flesh, who hath destroyed death and trodden down Satan, and hast given life to thy world: grant rest, O Lord, to the soul of thy servant, *N.*, departed this life, in pleasant, happy and peaceful places; from whence pain and grief and sighing have fled away. Forgive every sin which he (*she*) hath committed by thought, word or deed, for thou art a good God and lovest mankind: for there is no man that liveth and sinneth not: thou only art without sin, thy righteousness is everlasting and thy word is truth.'

The last kiss is given while a number of verses are sung of which the following is an example: 'What is our life? A flower, a vapour, the early dew of the morning. Approach, therefore; with attention let us contemplate the grave! Where now is the graceful form? Where is youth? Where is the brightness of the eye, the beauty of the complexion? All, all are withered like grass, all are vanished. Come, and let us with tears fall down before Christ.'

Hymns to our Lady follow and the Prayer of Absolution is read.

The body is then carried to the grave, where the *Trisagion* is again sung.

Earth is cast on the body in the form of a cross, the Priest saying, 'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; the round world and they that dwell therein.'

Oil from a shrine-lamp and ashes from the censer are poured into the grave, which is then filled in while more verses are sung.

Prayers for the Departed occupy a prominent place in the worship of the Eastern Orthodox Church. To the Greek or Russian it seems altogether natural and fitting both that one should continue to pray for those one loves, just as much after they have passed the veil of death as before, and that one should likewise continue to ask for their prayers. The bonds which unite God's family are not conceived as broken by death. Thus the Orthodox Church has its yearly, weekly and daily commemoration of the Departed, and in addition, Services for the Dead may be held at any time, and in private houses or cemeteries as well as in church. They are always held on the third,

ninth and fortieth day after a death, and again upon its anniversary. Such a service in Greece is called *Lite* for the dead. In Russia the service is *Pannykhida*, and is celebrated as follows: [1]

On a small table placed in the body of the church stands the *Kolubon*, i.e. a dish of boiled wheat (a symbol of the resurrection) and honey (which typifies the bliss of eternity). A lighted candle stands in the middle of this dish. The Priest, wearing his chasuble and holding a lighted candle, stands before the table and the Deacon is by his side with the censer.

The service opens with the Great Litany of the Dead:

Deacon. In peace let us make our supplications to the Lord.

Choir. Lord, have mercy (*and so at the end of each petition.*)

Deacon. For the peace that is from above, and for the salvation of our souls, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

For the remission of the sins of those of blessed memory who have departed this life, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

For the servant of God, *N.*, of everlasting memory, that he may grant him rest, tranquillity, and a blessed memorial, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

That he may forgive him every sin, voluntary or involuntary, which he hath committed, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

That he may appear uncondemned before the dreadful throne of the Lord of glory, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

For them that mourn and are in grief, and look for the comfort of Christ, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

That he may be set free from every infirmity, and from sorrow and sighing, and that God may cause him to dwell in the light of his countenance, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

That the Lord our God may assign unto his soul a place of light, a place of refreshment, a place of repose, where all the just do dwell, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

That he may be numbered amongst those that are in the bosom of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

That we may be preserved from all tribulation, wrath, and necessity, let us make our supplications to the Lord.

Assist, save, pity, and protect us, O God, by thy grace.

Having prayed for him, for God's mercy and the kingdom of heaven and the remission of his sins, let us also commend ourselves and one another, and all our life, to Christ our God.

Choir. To thee, O Lord.

Priest (*aloud*). For thou art the resurrection and the life, and

[1] It is not very long, and is printed in full in an English translation and with an introduction in *The Christian East*, Vol. X, No. 4.

the repose of thy servant, *N.*, who is fallen asleep, O Christ our God; and unto thee do we render glory, with thine eternal Father, and thine all-holy, and good, and life-giving Spirit, now and ever, world without end.

Choir. Amen.

Some beautiful *troparia* and ascription of praise follow, interspersed with appeals for the intercession of our Lady, and the Little Litany of the Dead, which is said twice. Then comes the *kontakion*, which has become familiar to many English people:

'Give rest to the soul of thy servant, O Christ, with the Saints, where there is neither pain, nor sorrow, nor sighing, but life unending.

'Thou only art immortal that didst create and fashion men: but we mortals are formed of earth, and unto the same earth shall we come: even as thou didst ordain, that didst fashion me and saidst unto me, Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return. Thither shall all we mortals go, making a lamentation over the grave, even in the song: Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.'

There are more hymns, and another repetition of the Little Litany and then the Priest prays:

'O God of spirits and of all flesh, who hast trodden down death and brought to naught the power of the devil, and hast bestowed life upon this world of thine: do thou thyself, O Lord, give rest to the soul of thy servant *N.*, who is fallen asleep, in a place of light, in a place of pasture, in a place of refreshment, whence pain and sorrow and sighing have fled away. Every sin which he hath committed in word or deed or thought, forasmuch as thou, O God, art good and lovest mankind, do thou forgive: for there is no man that liveth and sinneth not; for thou alone art without sin, thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth.

'For thou art the resurrection, the life, and the repose of thy servant *N.*, that is fallen asleep, O Christ our God, and to thee do we render glory, with thine eternal Father, and thy all-holy, and good and life-giving Spirit, now and ever, world without end.'

Choir. Amen.

The congregation hold lighted candles until the end of the *kontakion.*

A very frequent act of Orthodox worship is a short service of prayer (called in Russian *molyebin*) which may be used at any time as an act of devotion to our Lord, or one of the Saints, and with some particular purpose. It consists of the *Trisagion*, versicles and hymns, and the Little Litany with an appropriate Gospel. Any member of the faithful may ask for such a service

to be said for some special object. It takes place at a movable lectern before the Royal Gates, usually after the Liturgy.

And here this brief sketch of Orthodox worship must close, although the whole field is by no means covered even in outline.[1] One would like to have given some description of services which belong to special occasions, such as the New Year; of the well-known Blessing of the Waters at Epiphany; of the Feet Washing on Maundy Thursday, and other intensely moving and beautiful acts of worship which belong to Holy Week and Easter: of the deeply impressive service at the Exaltation of the Holy Cross; and others.

Moreover, space has permitted but scanty reference to the ceremonial which accompanies worship, important though that is, for the Orthodox applies himself to worship with his whole being, body as well as soul, with his eyes as well as his ears and lips.

But enough perhaps has been said to convey an idea of both the beauty and the complexity of Orthodox worship. It is pervaded by a sense of the transcendent majesty of God, and the insignificance of man, the object of divine compassion, 'Lord, have mercy,' occurring again and again and at times in multiplied reiteration, is perhaps its most characteristic utterance. It is also intensely dogmatic; and the great truths of our redemption, the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, above all the joy of the Resurrection from which life and gladness flow out to all creation, flash through every expression of Orthodox worship like the reappearing facets of the one flawless jewel of Christian truth.

[1] For the Forms of Ordination of the various grades of Clergy (in the Slavonic rite), reference may be made to Miss Hapgood's *Service Book of the Holy Orthodox Catholic Church*, where they are translated.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

I

THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC

THE Act of Uniformity of 1559 contained the following proviso: 'Such ornaments of the church, and of the Ministers thereof, shall be retained, and be in vse, as was in this church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the sixth, vntil other order shall be therein taken, by the authority of the Queens Maiesty with the advice of her Commissioners. . . .'

The Book of 1559 contains the same direction, cleared from any possible ambiguity, in the form of a rubric; thus: 'The minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall vse such ornaments in the church as were in vse by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the VI, according to the Act of Parliament set out at the beginning of this book.'

The Book of 1661 reverts to the exact wording of the Act, as far as 'King Edw. VI,' except that it attempts to make it sound more grammatical by substituting 'as *were* in this church' for '*was*.' The revisers seem to have thought that the subject of the clause was 'ornaments': MacColl, however, points out that the Latin translation has 'quemadmodum mos erat,' and maintains, as against Bishop Gibson, that the translation is practically contemporary with the original, citing a document attributed to Parker and apparently anterior to the 1561 edition of the Book.[1] If this rendering stands, we might rightly paraphrase 'was' by 'matters stood.'

The difficulty of interpreting the rubric of 1661 is well known, and has been aggravated by controversy.

Five questions may be raised.

(1) What is the standard referred to—the Book of 1549 or the customs of the year before?

(2) In the former case are we limited to ornaments *mentioned* in the Book?

(3) In either case is the use of the ornaments so binding as to compel the practice of the ceremonies attaching to them?

[1] *The Roval Commission and the Ornaments Rubric*, c. ix.

(4) Was 'other order' ever taken?

(5) If so, was it overridden by the subsequent enactment of 1661 (Convocation) and 1662 (Parliament)?

(1) is a difficult question. On the one hand, the 'authority of Parliament' certainly suggests an *Act* which mentions certain ornaments, and it is difficult to see what Act can be referred to except that which authorised the Book of 1549. The state of affairs previous to the Act was regulated by Royal Proclamation, not by Act of Parliament. Moreover, the second Act of Uniformity refers to the first Act of Uniformity as 'made' in the second year of Edward VI, which suggests that, rightly or wrongly, it was supposed that the Act was passed (*i.e.* received Royal assent) in that year. On the other hand, it seems highly improbable that it was passed as early as this; and if it was not, the year referred to was completed before the Book had received any authority at all; for an Act has no authority until the Royal assent has been given. The question therefore arises whether it is not possible that the standard referred to may be that of the period immediately preceding the 1549 Book. It has been argued by MacColl that by 32 Henry VIII, c. 26, parliamentary authority was given to such documents as *The Order of the Communion;* and, further, that this Order was plainly held on contemporary evidence to be the direct result of 1 Edward VI, c. 1 (the Act for reception under both kinds).[1] The Order contained a rubric forbidding the alteration of any ceremonies except the Elevation. The same author draws a distinction between the 'making' and the 'passing' of an Act.[2] If this distinction will stand, the phrase in the second Act of Uniformity is justified; for the Bill was confessedly passed by Parliament on January 22nd, five days before the close of the second year of King Edward. In that case the argument from the wording of the Act loses its force. It appears, moreover, that Sandys, the Puritan leader and future Archbishop of York, believed the rubric to refer to the customs of the beginning of Edward's reign rather than to the provisions of his first Book. In a letter to Parker he writes as follows: 'The *last boke of service is gone thorowe, with a proviso* to reteane the ornamentes which were used in the first and second years of K. Ed. untill yt please the quene to take other order for them.'[3]

(2) The following are the instructions given as to ornaments of the minister in the Book of 1549.

'In the saying or singing of Matens and Euensonge, Baptizyng and Burying, the minister, in paryshe churches and chapels annexed to the same, shall vse a Surples. And in all Cathedrall churches and Colledges' the members of the foundation, 'beinge Graduates, may vse in the quiere beside theyr Surplesses, suche

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 144 ff. [2] *Ibid.*, c. viii. [3] Lambeth Palace MS. 959 (40).

hoodes as pertaineth to their seuerall degrees. . . . But in all other places, euery minister shall be at libertie to vse any Surples or no. It is also seemly that Graduates, when they dooe preache, shoulde vse . . . hoodes. . . .

'And whensoeuer the Bishop shall celebrate the holye communion in the churche, or execute any other publique minystracyon: he shall haue vpon hym, besyde his rochette, a Surples or albe, and a cope or vestmente and also hys pastorall staffe in hys hande, or elles borne or holden by hys chapeleyne.'

The celebrant at Mass is to wear 'a white Albe plain' (*i.e.*, presumably, without apparels) 'with a vestement or cope'; the assistant ministers who communicate the people, 'Albes with tunacles.'

The ornaments of the church actually mentioned are the following: Bible, Prayer-Book, Altar, Book of the Homilies, Poor Man's Box Corporas, Paten, Chalice, Font, Bell, Quire Door, Pulpit. The use of other ornaments is also implied: chrisom, Bishop's chair, cruets, oil-stock, credence, vessel for chrisom, pyx, lectern, seats for the people.[1] No instruction is given as to the dress of a bishop who is not taking an official part in the Service.[2] Nor is there any mention of the organ or of any stand or cushion for the Altar book, of the mitre, of an Altar cross, of candlesticks, of girdle and amice, of stole or maniple (unless these are included under the term 'vestement'),[3] of frontals for the Altar. The Book of 1661–2 orders the use of a Reading-Pew, a Flagon, two 'fair linen Cloths' and a 'decent Bason' for the alms. But even with these additions 'this list is so manifestly incomplete that it is clear that . . . the rubric . . . must be held to sanction other things besides those specified by name.'[4]

(3) If the rubric refers to the pre-1549 use, a long list may be compiled of ornaments known to have been in regular use at this period. A full list is given in the first of the Alcuin Club Tracts, *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, by J. T. Micklethwaite. Such a list includes, among ornaments of the church, images and pictures (provided they do not commemorate feigned miracles and have not been abused by superstitious practices, but are 'for a memorial only'), minor altars, reredos, altar shelf, canopy, dorsal, frontals, riddels, a hanging pyx with canopy, lights before the reserved Sacrament, Altar cloths, Altar cross, candlesticks (one or two on the Altar, and others round about), gospel book, cushion or stand for the Altar book, burse, humeral veil or sudary, censer with incense boat and spoon, bason and towel for lavabo, sacring bell, processional cross and candlesticks, monstrance, pax,

[1] Procter and Frere, p. 367.

[2] The use of the chimere in church apparently dates from the beginning of the seventeenth century.

[3] See p. 157.

[4] Procter and Frere, p. 367.

holy water vat and sprinkler, houselling cloth, gospel lectern, piscina, sedilia, rood with screen and loft, quire stalls, quire lectern, organ, pews, font cover, chrisom and essentials for the ceremonies of Baptism, vessels for holy water, shriving pew, pyx for carrying the Sacrament to the sick with purse, bell, and lantern for the same purpose, bier and other gear for funerals, canopy for Corpus Christi procession, lenten veil, Easter sepulchre, Tenebræ hearse, Paschal candlestick, banners. The litany desk does not seem to be covered by the rubric, but the Commination Service implies that there is some special place where it is 'accustomed to be said.'

The only alterations which had taken place universally and legally by 1548 were the abolition of all lights burning before images and pictures, and of the images and pictures themselves, if they ministered to superstition.

The ornaments of the ministers in use in 1548 would include the Eucharistic vestments, cope, surplice, *cappa nigra*, rochet, mitre, pastoral staff, *pallium*.

To maintain that the rubric compels the restoration of every ceremony in which any of these ornaments was employed would no doubt be too paradoxical, but if the second of the two constructions of the rubric is permissible, it is clear that under it a considerable amount of ceremonial apparatus is at least sanctioned as an accompaniment to the rites which still find a place in the Book of Common Prayer. In particular, this interpretation would imply that the permissive substitution of cope for chasuble was not implied by the rubric.

(4) The rubric of 1559 was certainly not obeyed.[1] The Puritan party never had any intention of doing so. 'Oure glose upon this text,' writes Sandys, immediately after the words quoted on p. 852, 'is, that we shall not be forced to use them, but that others in the meane tyme shall not convey them away, but that thei may remayne for the quene.' The 'glose' is remarkable, in view of the words of the Act of Uniformity, and, still more, of the 1559 rubric; but it seems to have been widely accepted.

The bishops made no serious attempt to enforce the ornaments of 1549, much less those of 1548. They were content to press for such an approximation to Catholic usage as is ordered in the *Interpretations* of 1560 and the *Advertisements* of 1566. The latter are quoted and apparently adopted in the canons of 1604.[2] It is, however, more than doubtful whether it can be validly maintained that this was a taking of other order, as contemplated by

[1] Beza complained of chasubles in 1566. *Zürich Letters*, II, ii, 77. But this seems to be the only evidence of the use of them.

[2] Canon xxiv. 'Previous canons had also quoted them, but in those published with the authority of Queen Elizabeth (1575) the quotation was cut out before publication was authorised.' Procter and Frere, p. 364.

the Act and the rubric. As we have seen,[1] the *Advertisements* never received the sanction of the Crown, and therefore, whatever ecclesiastical force they may have had through being adopted in the canon law, it seems impossible to suppose that they ever had statutory authority.

(5) In any case, so far from the Ornaments Rubric being changed to correspond with the undoubted practice of the times, it was actually re-enacted not only in 1604 but also in 1662. It seems certain, therefore, that whatever authority the *Advertisements* may be supposed to have had, either canonical or statutory, was overridden by the joint action of Convocation and Parliament in 1661 and 1662. It should be noted that the Puritans in 1661 asked that the rubric should be omitted, and the bishops declined to do so. It is true that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has twice decided that vestments are illegal on the ground that the *Advertisements* were a taking of other order and that the intention of the 1661 revisers was simply to continue the contemporary usage. But, quite apart from the fact that this court has no ecclesiastical authority, it must be pointed out that two of its members have criticised the second of these decisions[2] in the strongest language. Chief Baron Kelly described it as 'a judgment of policy, not of law,' and Lord Justice Amphlett as 'flagitious.'[3] K.D.M.

II

THE PREFACES TO THE PRAYER BOOK

THE first, entitled 'The Preface,' in the 1662 Book, was drafted by Bishop Sanderson, and refers to the troubles of the Commonwealth and to the recent revision and the principles on which it has been carried out. Changes have been rejected which strike 'at some established doctrine, or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of Christ'—a phrase which recalls the words of the title-page, 'Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the Use of the Church of England.' The Prayer Book is presented as having been 'examined and approved' 'by the Convocations of both Provinces.'

The next section, 'Concerning the Service of the Church,' was styled 'The Preface' in 1549 and 1552. It is based on the preface of Quignon's Breviary, and comes from Cranmer's pen. The statement about the seven portions of the Psalter, each called a Nocturn, is a mistake; after fixed Psalms had been allotted to the day offices the rest were divided into seven Nocturns. The Bishop's reference of doubtful points to the Archbishop was added in 1552.

[1] P. 185. [2] In the case of *Clifton* v. *Ridsdale*.
[3] Herbert Paul, *History of Modern England*, iv. 351 f.

'Of Ceremonies' dates from 1549, when it was put at the end of the Book. Since it has not been altered, except in position and spelling, and some trivial details, it must be interpreted in the light of the 1549 Book, which retains unction, crossing, etc. 'In these our doings we condemn no other Nations' recalls Canon 30: it was not 'the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like churches.'

The English 1928 Book prefixes to the others a new and ambitious Preface. The Scottish Book omits all Prefaces, perhaps wisely. In the Irish Book the English Prefaces are retained, a long Preface dating from 1878 is added, and a short one of 1926. The American Book has only the American Preface of 1789; the Canadian prefixes its own Preface (dated 1918) to the English ones.

III

A COMMINATION

In the Commination we have a relic of the public penance of the primitive Church, the restoration of which 'is much to be wished,' according to the Prayer Book; though there is general agreement that the later penitential methods of the Church are more wisely conceived.[1] The Service is prescribed to be used on Ash Wednesday and at such other times as the Ordinary shall appoint. The Sarum Manual, besides its Ash Wednesday Service, contained a declaration of curses for use four times a year. This, or a parallel form, is mentioned in the Paston Letters (Gairdner's edition, No. 609): 'Alas, alas! good lady, full little remember they what they do that keep us thus asunder; four times in the year are they a-cursed that let matrimony.'

The mediæval Ash Wednesday Service followed Sext. A sermon was preached, if the priest so desired. The clergy and clerks recited the seven Penitential Psalms prostrate before the altar. After suffrages the people were absolved, ashes were blessed and distributed, and a cross was marked with them on the brows of the people, the words 'Remember, O man, that thou art ashes and unto ashes shalt thou return,' being said to each.[2] Two Collects followed, and those under discipline during Lent were excluded by the Bishop.

In 1549, after Mattins, the bell is to be rung and the people collected. Then the Litany is said and the priest goes to the pulpit, where he reads the Exhortation. The distinction between

[1] But see the rubrics prefixed to the Communion Service and Canon 26 for the penitential system presupposed by the Prayer Book.

[2] Curiously enough, in *Under the Greenwood Tree*, Hardy's villagers sing this as a Christmas Carol.

the two services is obliterated in 1662. The Exhortation was intended for a clergy unused to preaching and may be considered unnecessary by the side of the special Lenten sermons of to-day. The priest and clerks say Psalm li, kneeling at the faldstool and around it ('in the place where they are accustomed to say the Litany'). The suffrages and prayers follow those of the old service; the general supplication, 'Turn thou us,' is based in part on the anthems sung at the distribution of the ashes in the mediæval service. The blessing was added in 1662, to conclude a service which up to then had no apparent conclusion, since the Holy Communion theoretically followed.

If the Exhortation is replaced by a sermon striking the same note for the present age, the Commination makes an appropriate service to inaugurate Lent. It would, however, be more in place in a supplementary book of non-Eucharistic devotions for the seasons than in the Book of Common Prayer, where it is the only service of its kind.

III

FORMS OF PRAYER TO BE USED AT SEA

WITH the *Directory for Public Worship*, put out by the Long Parliament in 1645, a supplement was issued, entitled 'A Supply of Prayer for the Ships that want Ministers to pray with them.' In default of such guidance the forbidden Book of Common Prayer was still being used. The Preface of the 1662 Book calls attention to the Forms, now for the first time provided. These, it is said, were composed by Bishop Sanderson. The prayer for use before a battle, asking God to take the cause into His own hand and judge between us and our enemies, in its humility and moderation contrasts favourably with some utterances during the war of 1914–18, and the Thanksgiving after Victory is equally happy. Indeed the intensity of hatred which marked the Great War seems to be a modern innovation, caused presumably by skilful propaganda. The revisions of the 1662 Forms call for no comment. The opinion may be ventured that in a future revision this section of the Prayer Book might be omitted. Normally, travellers in a great liner are safer than if they were walking on a main road, and presumably sailors, when engaged in worship, do not wish to be reminded of their special calling any more than do other classes of society.

IV

THE ARTICLES OF RELIGION

THE 39 Articles are no part of the Book of Common Prayer, as the form of clerical subscription shows: 'I assent to the 39

Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer. . . .' They are, however, commonly printed at the end of the Prayer Book, with the Table of Kindred and Affinity. In the eighteenth century the latter was sometimes printed but not the Articles. The Scottish Prayer Book omits the Articles; the Irish and American Books print them as an Appendix, the American in the version of 1801. The Canadian Church makes them an integral part of the Revised Book, No. 31 of the 42 sections.

W.K.L.C.

INDEX

The more important references are printed in black-faced type. The notes are not, as a rule, indexed.

ABBOTT, Abp., 573
Aberdeen, 588
Absolution, 138–43, 153, 164 f., 176, 186 f., 193, 270 f., **333** f., 490 f., 507–10, 520, 529 f., 539, 542 f., 551, 621, 651 f., 689, 844, 847
abstinence, 245–56. *See* Fasting.
Accession Service, 196, 274, 787
acclamation, 696
Act of Uniformity, 1549, **155**, 851 f.
—— 1559, **182** f., 186, 189, 563, 851 f.
—— 1662, 2, **193** f.
—— Amendment Act, 786 f.
Adamnan, 232
adolescence, 456 f., 527 f.
adoration, 13, **742–6**
Advent, 203, **211**, 246, **382** f.
Advertisements, **185**, 854 f.
Agape, 87, 102, **117**, 123
Agatha, 221
Agnes, 213, 215, 219 f., 223
Agnus Dei, 141, 154, 159, 176, **353** f., 370
agriculture, 43–5
Ahabah, 69
Aidan, 230
alb, 177, 853
Alban, 216, 227
Albertine-Saxon Order, 160 f.
Alcuin, 120 f., 133, 282, 668
Aldhelm, 226
Aless, 559, 563, 579, 813. *See* Prayer Book, Latin.
Alexander III, 538
Alexandria, 62, 66, 205 f., 209 f., 314, 546
Alfred, 233
All Saints, 149, **234**, **106**
All Souls, 234, 408 f.
almoner, 736
alms, 84, 86, 157, **320**
Alphege, 224
altar, 172, 175, **306–8**, 671
Ambrose, **116**, 119, 224, **280**, **418–20**, **448**, 462, 478
American Prayer Book. *See* Prayer Book, American.
ampulla, 671
Anamnesis, 118, 123, 158, 176, 344, **346–9**
Ananias, 446
Anaphora. *See* Canon.
Anatolius, 838
Andrew, St., 236, 402
Andrewes, Bp., 190, 243, 306, 593, **709** f., **717**, **751** f.
Anne, Queen, 229, 704
Anne, St., **229**, 241
Annunciation of B.V.M., 210, **224**, 247, 404
Anselm, 225
Anskar, 221, 242
anthems, 276, 295
Antioch, 211, 314, **450**
Antiochene Liturgy. *See* Rites.
Antiochus, 47
Antiphonary, 132, 134 f.
Antony, 219
Apocrypha, 186, 189, 268, **298–300**
Apollinarianism, 280 f.
Apostles' Creed. *See* Creeds.
Apostolic Constitutions, 108, 113, **118** f., 207–9, 259, 282, 322, 358, 477 f., **618** f., 627, 629, **765–8**
Apostolic Tradition, 78, **97–101**, 113 f., 253, **258** f., 335, 337, **418–20**, **447** f., **500** f., **629–33**, 678, **766** f.
Apostolicæ Curæ, 629, 666, 674
Aquinas. *See* Thomas Aquinas.
Archdeacon, 169, 648 f., **679** f., **716–18**
Arianism, 280 f.
Armenian Church, 250 f., 256, 540, **640** f.
armilla, 695
Articles, Ten, 146
—— Thirteen, 146
—— Thirty-nine, 146, 363, **857** f.
Ascension Day, 208, 396

Ash Wednesday, 138, 152, **166** f., 177, 189, 206, **389**, **733**, **856** f.
Ashes. *See* Ash Wednesday.
Assembly, Church, 298, **788** f.
Assumption of B.V.M., 132, **230**, 247, 408
Astrology, 202
Athanasian Creed. See *Quicunque Vult.*
Athanasius, 206, 225, 707
Atonement, Day of, 48
Attis-cult, 412
Augsburg Confession, 146
Augsburg, Interim of, 171
Augustine, of Hippo, **115** f., 120 f., 208, 230, 253 f., 306, 357, 368, 449, 617, 644
—— of Canterbury, **226**, 242, 426

Bainbridge, Abp., 654
Baldred, 222
banns, 318, **463** f.
Baptism, 139 f., 147, **160** f., 173, 177, 184, 186 f., 191–3, 195, 207 f., 242, 256, **410–30**, **443–51**, 455, **738–40**, 823, **842** f.
Barnabas, Epistle of, 96, 203
—— St., 216, 227, 404
Bartholomew, St., 230, 405
Basil, 8, 115, 227, 253, **259** f., 479, 639
Baxter, R., 193
beatification, 217, **239–43**
beauty, 21 f.
Becon, 583
Bede, 120, 216, **226**, 263, 483
bedes. *See* Bidding of the Bedes.
Bema, 636–8
Benedicite, 269, **273–5**
Benedict XIV, 493
Benedict Biscop, 263
Benedict, of Monte Cassino, 224, **261** f., 271 f., 274, 686
benedictio thalami, 471, 527
Benediction, 743–8
Benedictions. *See* Blessing.
—— Eighteen. See *Shemoneh 'Ezreh.*
Benedictus, 269, **275**, 292–4, 741
Benedictus es, 275, 293 f.
Benedictus qui venit, 8, 140, **337** f., 341
Benson, Abp., 757
—— R.M., 757
Bernard, 230
betrothal, 460–2, 844
Beza, 566 f., 574, 578 f., 581, 586
Bible, Authorised Version, 187, 192 f., 195, **806** f.
—— Matthew's, 289
Bible, Revised, 301
—— The Great, 147, 195, 289, 312, 807
—— The Bishops', 185
Bidding of the Bedes, Bidding Prayer, 139, 143, 145, **317** f., 324, **768–80**
Bishop (Archbishop), The, 99, 101–3, **418–20**, 443, **448–56**, 475–8, 484 f., 545, **605–7**, **626–82** *passim*, 692–701, 703–6, 712 f., 715 f., 724
Bishops' Book, 141, 147
Black Rubric, 179, 193, **195** f., **361–3**
Blasius, 221
Blessing, 81, 85, 159, 164, 277, 309, **359** f., 454, 488, 519, 524, 530, 534 f., 696, 703 f., 708, 727, 732–4
—— of the Font, 161, **416–24**
—— Nuptial, 163, **460** f.
Blood, 42 f., 56
Boisil, 231
Bonaventura, 533
Boniface IX, 660
Boniface of Mentz, 227
Bonner, Bp., 167 f., 172, 174
Brandenburg Order, 144 f., 164, 343
Bread, 102–23 *passim*, 158 f., 320, **343** f., **361**, 543–615 *passim*
Breda, Declaration of, 190
Breviary, 130 f., **134–7**, 215, **263–6**, 273 f., 301, 453
bride and bridegroom. *See* Marriage.
Bride, 220
briefs, 318
Britius, 234
Bucer, 141, 144, **171–3**, 178, 324, 330, 351, 423, 559 f., 573, 671 f.
Burial of the Dead, 165 f., 177, 193, **365–70**, **616–25**, 759, 847–9
burnt offering, 44 f., 55

Cæsarius, 273, 280 f., 647
Calendar, 156, 174, **201–43**
Calvin, 142 f., 171, 180, 564–6, 578 f.
Cambridge University Press, 802–5
Canadian Prayer Book. *See* Prayer Book, Canadian.
Candlemas, 146, 152, **221**, 403, 732 f.
Canon, Eucharistic, **98–101**, 108, 118 f., 123, 131, 141, 319 f., 323, **335–50**, 356 f., 663–8
Canon Law, 3 f., 255, 550, 607, 680
canonisation, 239–41
Canons of Hippolytus, 253, 477, 629
Cantatorium, 132
Canticles, 273–5
Carafa. *See* Paul IV.
Caristia, 213
Carthage, Councils of, 366, 547, 647

Cassel Order, 144
Cassian, 260, 271, 296
Catacombs, 213 f.
Catechism, 140 f., 162, 187, 193, 311, 429–42
catechumens, 122, 125, 316, 418–22, 429 f.
Catherine of Alexandria, 236
—— of Siena, 225
Cecilia, 235
Celestine I, 634
Censura. *See* Bucer.
ceremonies, 154, 167, 854–6
Chad, 222
chalice (cup), 81, 111, 353, 613–15, 667
chancel, 306–8
Charlemagne, 132, 635
Charles I, 188–90, 216 f., 220, 243
—— II, 190–7, 216
—— V, 149
Cherubic Hymn, 123, 329
children's worship, 436–9, 787
Choir Offices, 257–95
chrism, 241, 450 f., 483–5, 843, 853
Christ the King, 209
Christa Seva Sangha, 824
Christian Science, 473
Christmas, 173, 176, 201, 209–11, 237, 383 f.
Chrodegang, 264
Chrysom, 161, 427 f., 853
Chrysostom, 115, 220, 282, 328, 778
—— Liturgy of. *See* Rites.
—— Prayer of, 277, 285
Church Orders, 89, 247, 258 f. See *Didache*, *Apostolic Constitutions*, *Apostolic Tradition*.
Churches, Consecration of, 704–13
Churching of Women, 177, 425 f.
Churchyards, Consecration of, 714
Circumcision, Feast of, 218, 385 f.
citations, 318
Clement VII, 137, 266, 296
Clement of Alexandria, 204, 210, 236, 257, 461
Clement of Rome, 89, 215, 235, 318, 567
Cloveshoe, Council of, 139, 430
Collect, 37, 140, 143, 157, 312, 374–409, 552
Collectar, 132
Colman, 221
Cologne, Order of, 153
Columba, 227, 407
comes, 132, 379
Comfortable Words, 153, 165, 187, 195, 333 f.
Commandments. *See* Decalogue.
commendation, 165, 534
Commination, 160, 177, 856 f.
Communio, 354
Communion, 41, 87, 112 f., 124, 126, 141, 181, 330 f., 350–4. *See* Eucharist.
Compline, 150, 261, 263, 275, 685–9, 834 f.
concelebration, 92
Conception of B.V.M., 237, 409
concomitance, 610–13, 742
Confession, 141, 165, 173, 270 f., 333 f., 506 f., 509, 520, 529 f., 541, 797
Confirmation, 141, 162, 177, 186, 195, 425, 433 f., 443–57, 645, 703
Confiteor, 333
Congan, 233
Consecration, 3, 14, 105, 126, 176, 341–50, 742 f. *See* Churches.
Constantine, 366
Constantinople, Council of, 315
Consuetudinary, 131
contakion (*kontakion*), 367, 849
Convocations, 2, 136, 147, 150–2, 174, 180, 185, 187, 193 f., 239, 290 f., 297 f., 307, 431, 550, 553–607, 704 f., 720, 722 f.
cope, 177, 854
Coronation, 181, 307, 321, 690–702
Corporal Presence. *See* Black Rubric.
Corpus Christi, 209, 392, 397, 409, 744 f.
Cosin, Bp., 193, 216, 306, 314, 344, 681, 704, 751
covenant, 41, 80–2, 86, 96 f., 99, 105
Coverdale, 147, 154, 178, 289, 310, 807
Cranmer, Abp., 147–155, 171
Creed, Apostles', 160–2, 177, 194, 275 f., 281
—— Athanasian. See *Quicunque Vult*.
—— Nicene, 123, 139
Crispin, 233
Cromwell, Thomas, 147
Cross, Festivals of, 226, 231, 251, 408
—— Veneration of, 152, 207, 737 f.
Cuddesdon Office Book, 754 f.
cursus, 278, 808 f.
curtana, 692
Cuthbert, 223
Cyprian, 114 f., 231 f., 318, 366, 618, 642, 644, 685
Cyril, 223, 328, 418–20, 448, 776

Damasus, 288
dance, sacred, 49
David, of Scotland, 219
—— of Wales, 222
Day, Bp., 172, 174

De Burgo, 652
De Lugo, 614 f.
Deacon, 380, **626–32** *passim*
—— Thomas, 704
Deaconess, 636, **722** f.
Dead, Burial of. *See* Burial.
—— Litany of, 848 f.
—— Prayer for, 325, **367–70**
Deans, 724
—— Rural, 721, 725
Decalogue, 63, 139, 142, 178, **309–12**
Decentius, 455, 483
Decretum pro Armenis, 305
Dedication, Feast of (Christian), 179, 238, 407
—— —— (Jewish), 56, 210
—— of Churches, 706–713
Denys, 233
Deprecatio, 282 f.
Deposited Book. *See* Prayer Book, England, 1928.
Devenic, 234
Didache, 89–92, 204, 245, 257, 356, 418, 764 f.
Didascalia Apostolorum, 113, 117, 449
Directorium, 131
dirge, 57 f.
Donnan, 224
doubles, 223, 263
drama, 29–31
Drostan, 236
Dunstan, 226, 693, 698
duplication, 598
Durand of Mende, 653, 661
Durandus, 162
Durham Book, 193, 320, 354

Easter, **204–8**, 272 f., **393** f.
Easter Even, 189, 195, **208**, 393, **738** f.
Eastern Orthodox Church, **124–6**, **240** f., **250** f., **255** f., 420, 463, **479** f., **501–3**, 539 f., **607** f., **636–43**, 707 f., 780, **834–50**
Ebba, 230
economy, 4, **642**
ectine, 838 f.
Edgar, 701
Edmund, 235
Edward the Confessor, **233**, 694, 696
—— King of West Saxons, 223, 227
Edward VI, 151–79
effeta, 160, 421
Egbert of Rome, 620
—— of York, 654, 656
Eleusis, 412
Elizabeth, Queen, **180–5**, 231, 307, 561 f.
Ember Days, **237** f., 246, 401, **676**
Encheiridion, 160
Enurchus, **216**, **231**
Epiclesis, **3**, **118** f., **342–50**, 773
Epiphany, **209** f., 219, **386**
Epistle, 141 f., 176, 192 f., **312** f., **378–409**, 552 f.
espousals, **461–4**, 466, 904
Etheldreda, 233
Etheria, 207 f., 260, 731
Eucharist (and Holy Communion), 1, 7 f., 27 f., **78–129**, 130–97 *passim*, 209, **302–73**, **541–615**
—— Children's, 437 f.
Euchologion, 364, **501–3**
Eugenius IV, 454, 643
Eulogia, 81, 103
Evensong, 156, 175, 183, 195, **267–95**
Exhortations, 142, 159, 164, 176, 197, 270, **326** f., 423, 452, 465, 468, **809** f.
Exorcism, 177, **418–21**, **475–540** *passim*
Exposition, 745
Extempore Prayer, 763–73
Extreme Unction. *See* Unction.

Fabian, 213, **219**
Faith (St.), 233
Falling Asleep of B.V.M. *See* Assumption.
Farel, 171
Fasting, 245–56, 571–4
Feasts, Jewish, 201 f.
Feeding, Miraculous, 83 f.
Felicitas, 212, 222
Ferard, E., 722
Fergus, 234
Ferrar, Bp., 172, **662 f.**
Fillan, 227
Finan, 221
Finnbarr, 232
Finnian, 221
Firmilian, 642
first-fruits, 102, 318
Florence, Council of, 454
font. *See* Baptism.
Forbes, William, 587–9
Foundation Stone, 708, **713**
Francis, 232
Franciscan Office, 264 f.
Frankfort, 179
Freud, 472, 527
Friday, 203 f.
frigidity, 526 f.

Gallican Rite. *See* Rite, Gallican.
Gardiner, Bp., 149, 172, 174, 324, 340, 664
Gelasian Sacramentary. *See* Rite, Gelasian.
Gilbert, 224
Giles, 230

Gloria in excelsis, 140, 143, 159, 176, 179, 273, 292 f., 309, 316, **358** f.
Gloria Patri, **271** f., 274, 285, 292
Gnosticism, 414
Godparents. *See* Sponsors.
Good Friday, 196, **207**, **393**, 735, **737** f.
Goodrich, Bp., 172, 431, 662
Gorham Case, 428
Gospel, 32, 141–4, 157, 170, 187, 193, **312–14**, 370–3, **378–409**, 423, 552, 677
Grace, The, 277
Gradual, 313
Gregorian Sacramentary. *See* Rite, Gregorian.
Gregory the Great, 124, 132, 211, **223**, 238, 263, 455, 611
—— IX, 265
—— Nazianzen, 115, 226, 253
—— Nyssen, 116, 214
Grindal, Bp., 184
Grosseteste, Bp., 701
Guest, Bp., 174, 181
Gunning, P., 277

Hadrian I, 132, 499. *See* Rites, Gregorian.
Hallel, 55 f.
Hampton Court Conference, 186
Hands, Laying on of, **444–57**, **473–540** *passim*, **627–82** *passim*, 722, 726
Harchius, 569
Harvest Thanksgiving, 46, 201, **238** f., **407**, 786
Haymo, 265
Healing, **472–540**, 726
Heath, Bp., 172, 174, 663 f.
Heidelberg Catechism, 432
Henry III, 701 f.
—— VI, 700
—— VIII, **145–51**, 267, 691
Herbert, George, 434, 717
Hermann von Wied, **144** f., 153, 160–6, 327, **329** f., **333–6**, 341, 352, 359, 423, 465, 467, 577, 623
Hilary of Poitiers, 115, 219
Hilda, 235
Hippolytus. See *Apostolic Tradition*, Canons of Hippolytus.
Holy, The, 13–22
Holy Communion. *See* Eucharist.
Holy Order, 628–82
Holy Saturday. *See* Easter Even.
Holy Spirit, The, **8–10**, **111** f., **342–50**, **444–52**, 513, 628–82 *passim*
Holy Water, 495, 707 f., 732 f.
Homilies, Book of, 151 f., **248**, **317**
Homily. *See* Sermon.
Honorius of Autun, 652
Hugh of Lincoln, 235
—— St. Victor, 658
Humble Access, Prayer of, 338–40
Hymns, 822

Ignatius, **92** f., 221, **237**, 460, 545
Immersion, 417
impotence, 525–27
Induction, 714–21
Infant Baptism, 416
Ingathering, Feast of. *See* Harvest Thanksgiving.
Injunctions, 152, 183
Innocent I, 455, 483, 642
Innocents' Day, **214**, 237, 385
Insanity, 516–19, 523–5
Institution, 714–21
—— of the Eucharist, **79–88**, 99
Instruments, Tradition of, 659, 672
Intercession, 33, 122, **277** f., **322–6**, 618, 757
interpolations, 772 f.
interview, spiritual, 520 f.
intinction, 611–13
Introit, 309
Invitation, 327, **333** f.
Invocation. See *Epiclesis*.
Irenæus, **105–7**, 204, 228
Irish Prayer Book. *See* Prayer Book, Irish.
Isidore of Seville, 208
Ivo, 656

James I, 185–88
—— II, 699
—— St., **228**, 405, 508–10
Januarius, 455
Jerome, 232, 288, 660
Jerusalem, 207 f., 260, 731
Jewel, Bp., 583
John Chrysostom. *See* Chrysostom.
—— Baptist, St., 214, 227, 230, 404, **414** f.
—— Evangelist, St., 214, 226, 237, 384
—— of Wearmouth, 263
Joseph, St., 223
Jude, St., 233 f.
jus liturgicum, 4, 821
Justin, 89, **93–6**, 111, 203, 224, 227, 316, 412, 418, 447, 551, 561, 567, **768**, **775**
Justinian, 121 f.
Juxon, Bp., 188, **779** f.

Kaddish, 74 f.
Kempe, Abp., 715 f.
Kenneth, 233

Kentigern, 219, 407
Kessog, 222
Kiaran, 231
Kiddush, 86 f.
King, The, 276, 312, 325, 690–702
King's Book, 141, 147, **643**
King's Printer, 798–804
Kneeling, Declaration on, 361 f.
Knox, John, 178–180, 187, 361, 578
Korban, 46
Kyrie, 165, 178, 260, 262, **309–11**, **375** f.

Lambert, 231
Lambeth Conference, 4, **473–5**, 705, **783–5**
Lammas Day, 229, 239, 408
Laodicea, Council of, 547
Laski, John, 171, 178
Last Supper, 85–7
Lateran Council, 456
Laud, Abp., 188–90, 307
Lauds, 261 f., 274, 621
Laurence, 230
Lavabo, 319
lay healers, 482–4
lay ministry, 602 f., 723 f.
laying on of hands. *See* Confirmation, Ordination, Unction.
Lectionary, Lessons, 51, 61, 67, 75–7, 132, 137 f., 147, 150–2, **260–8**, **296–301**, **313**, **378** f., 723, 786, 836
Lent, 192, **204–7**, **245–52**, 274, 337, 389–91, 464
Leo the Great, 224
Leo X, 137
—— XIII, 629
Leonard, 234
Lerins, 280
Liber regalis, 698
licences, 464
Liddon, H. P., 754–6
Lincoln Judgment, 309
Litany, 61, 130, 138, 140, **148** f., 152, 160, 179, 181, 183 f., 192, 208, 269, 277, **282–7**, 293–5, 680, 693
Liturgical Movement, 127
Liturgies. *See* Rites.
Liturgy, 3, 31–3, 68, 305
Logos, 6 f.
Long Parliament, 190
Lord's Prayer, 75, 139–45, 176 f., 257, 267, 270, 276, **310** f., **355** f., 430–2, 453
Lucian, 219
Lucy, 236
Luke, St., 233, 406
Luther, 139, 178, 447, **577**
Lutheran Prayer Books and Rites, 139–42, 266, 309, 341, 343, 574–8
Lyndesay, Bp., 586 f.
Lyndwood, 129, 550, 716

Maccabees, 211, 229
Machar, 234
Machutus, 234
Maelrubha, 225
Magnificat, 156, 267, 269, 275, 292–4
Magnus, 224
Magic, 48
Mamertus, 208
Mandæans, 407 f.
Manual, 131, 134, 161, 423, 727
manual acts, 193, 343 f.
Maran atha, 91
Margaret, Queen, 227, **235**, 242, 407
—— V. and M., 228, 242
Mark, St., 225, 404
Marnan, 222
Marriage, Matrimony, **163**, 363–5, **458–71**, 823, 844 f.
Martin, 211, 228, 234, 264, 478
Martyrologies, 211–15
Mary, The Blessed Virgin. *See* Nativity of B.V.M., etc.
Mary Magdalene, St., 216, **228**, 241, 406
Mass. *See* Eucharist.
—— High, 12 f., 29
—— Low, 124
—— Nuptial, 363–5
—— Requiem, 365–70, 620–2
—— Votive, 371 f.
matriarchate, 459 f.
Matthew, St., 231, 405
Matthew's Bible, 289
Matthias, St., **221** f., 403
Mattins, 156, 175, **257–95** *passim*, 296, 476, 687, **840–2**
Maundy Thursday, **207**, 209, 272, **392** f., 437, 485, **487–9**, **734–7**
Messianic Banquet, 81 f., 87 f., 93, 97
Method of St. Sulpice, 435
Michael and All Angels, St., **232**, 405
Mid-Lent Sunday, 206, 390
Millenary Petition, 185 f.
Ministry of Healing, 473–540
Minor Orders, **648** f., 664 f., 675, **723**
Miracle, 24 f., 239 f.
missa catechumenorum, 309, 316, 827
Missal, 131, 134 f., 150
Mission Field. *See* Prayer Book, Missionary Versions.
Mithraism, 209, 412
mixed chalice, 322
Modernism, 6 f.

modernum officium, 264, 281
Moluag, 227
Monnica, 226
Monstrance, 743
Mothering Sunday, 206, 390
Mysteries, The, 412 f.
Mystery, The Mysterious, **16–28**, 33, 109 f., 120

Name of Jesus, 229, 408
Narsai, 779
Nativity of B.V.M., 231, 408
Ne Temere, 469
Neoplatonism, 5, 8
New Moon, 201 f.
New Year, 203, 385
Nicæa, Council of, 206, 545 f., 600
Niceta, 273
Nicolas, (St.), 236
Nicolas I, 461
—— III, 265
Nicomede, 227
Ninian, 231, 407
non-communicating attendance, 328–33, 355
non-fasting days, 251 f.
Nones, 261 f., **685–91**, 753
North side, 175, 190, 308 f.
Nowell, 187, 431
Numinous, The, 14–22, 28
Nunc Dimittis, 156, 267, 269, 275, 292–4

O Sapientia, 184, 216, 236
oath, coronation, 693 f.
Oblation, Prayer of, 344–50, 356 f.
Occasional Prayers, 187, 269, **277–9**
—— Services, 703–28, 759
octaves, 238, 265
Offerings, oblations, 45–8, 95–8, **101–7**, 110–12, 117, 120–3, 127, 166, 318–21, 371
Offertory, 318–23
Offices. *See* Prime, etc.
officium duplex, 263
oil, 419–22, **443–52**, 455, **472–540** *passim*, **691–5**, 735, 737, 843, 846
Olaf, 229
omnipresence, 26
Order of Communion, 153, 157, 159
Ordinal, Ordination, 64, 169–72, **177**, 194 f., 247, 444, 477, **626–82**
Ordinary, The, 306
Orleans, Council of, 162
Ornaments Rubric, 851–5
Oswald, 229
Otto, R., **13–28**, 775
Overall, Bp., 187, 431
Oxford Diocesan Service Book, 710–12, 759
—— Movement, 729 f., 749, 761
—— University Press, 800–5

Palladius, 228
Palm Sunday, 207, **391 f.**, **733 f.**
Parker, Abp., 181, 562, 564, 669, 704
Parliament, 152, 155, 169, 174, 178 f., 182 f., 190, 298, 595, **788–90**
Parochial Offices, 726 f.
Passion Sunday, 207, 337, 391
Passover, 40 f., 50, 56, **85 f.**, 201, 204
Patrick, 223, 407
Patronal Festival, 238
Paul, St., 5 f., **213 f.**, 220, 242, **403–5**, 446, 460, 487
Paul IV, 137
Paulinus, 233
Peckham, Abp., 139, 316 f., **550 f.**
penance, 733, 856
Pentecost, 45, 201, **208 f.**, **397 f.**, 418, 445
Perpetua, 222
persona mixta, 701
Perth, Synod of, 585 f.
Peter Martyr, 171–4, 327, 560, 573
—— St., **213 f.**, 228, 404 f., 487
Philip, St., 445 f.
Philip and James, SS., 225, 404
Philocalus, 213 f.
Pia Deliberatio. *See* Hermann.
Pie, The, 131
Pius IV, 136
—— V, 137, 266, 288
—— X, 138, 686
plainsong, 183
Poer, Richard le, 136
Polycarp, 220
Pontifical, 131, 626–82 *passim*, **703 f.**, 727
—— of Egbert, 674, 714
—— Leofric, 476, 484, 488
Portiforium. *See* Breviary.
post-communion, 159, **354 f.**
prayer, private, 35, 73, **685 f.**, **751 f.**
Prayer Book, English, 1549, **154–75**, 216, 267–89, 296 f., 302–73 *passim*, 422 f., 426, 431, 451 f., 551–7, 622 f., 764, 773, 798 f., 852
—— —— 1552, **172–9**, 216, 269, 279, 281, 302–73 *passim*, 424, 450, 557–61, 622, **664 f.**, 672, 764, 799
—— —— 1559, **181–4**, 216, 557–65
—— —— 1604, **187**, 286. *See* Durham Book.
—— —— 1661–2, 194–7 and *passim*
—— —— (1689), 269, 783, 810

Prayer Book, English (1927–8), 217, 248, **267–79** *passim*, 282, 286, 291, 302–73 *passim*, 427, 453 f., 468, 530 f., 599, **603–7**, 624, 761, **771–3**, **787–91**, 810–12
—— American, 189, 249, **292** f., 300 f., **302–73** *passim*, 427, 440–2, 453 f., 609, 624, 710 f., 719 f., **793–95**
—— Canadian, 218, 248, 295, 300, 427, 440, 453 f., 609, 625, 710 f., 713 f., 719, 764, **795** f.
—— Irish, 248, 294, 300, 427, 453 f., 624 f., 710 f., 714, 719, 764, **792** f.
—— Latin, 184, 813. *See* Aless.
—— Missionary versions, 815–33
—— Non-Jurors, **303**, 484, 704
—— Scottish (1637), **187–9**, 197, 248, 270, 276, 773
—— —— (later), 218, 248, 286, **293** f., 302–73 *passim*, 427, 440, 453 f., 467 f., 624 f., 711 f., 772, 785 f.
—— South African, 189, 249, 302–73 *passim*, 427, 453 f., 467, 625, 772, 796 f.
—— Welsh, 814
Preface (liturgical), 99, 118, 157, 176 f., **335–7**
Prefaces to Prayer Book, 156, 194, **268**, 810 f., 855 f.
presbyter, priest, 77, 170, 185, 192, 195, 442, 475–7, 484, 496, 502, 521–4, 602, 626–82 *passim*
presence (Real Presence), 12, 26–8, 83, 112, **114–16**, 328 f., 586, 742 f., 746
Presentation, 679
Prime, 263, **685–91**
printing of Prayer Book, 798–805
Prisca, 219
processions, processional, 131, 134, 148 f., 179, 183, 272, 283
proclamation, 636 f.
prohibited degrees, 470 f.
Prone, The, 139, 143, 178, 317
prophets, 107, 109, 313
proselytes, 410–12
Prymer (primer), 265 f., 430, 686
Psalms, Psalter, **51–9**, 74, 138, 151, 156, 195, 260–9, 271 f., **287–95**, 309, 618–22, **685–8**, 807, 827, **835**
Pullain (Pollanus), 171, 178, 573, 578 f.
Purgatory, 368 f., **537** f., 620
Purification of B.V.M. *See* Candlemas.
pyx, 551, 555 f., 559, 579, 583, 587

Quartodecimans, 204 f.
quasi-exorcism, 480 f.
Queen, Coronation of, 696 f.
Quicunque Vult, 138, 156, 194, **280–2**, 292, 294 f., 687
Quiñones (Quignon), 137 f., 150, 156, **266** f., 296
Quinquagesima, 206, 388 f.

Readers, 723 f.
Reception, Office of, 725
recognition of King, 692 f.
recusants, 175
Refreshment Sunday, 206, 390
regalia, 695 f.
Remigius, 232
requiem. *See* Mass.
Reservation, 361, **541–615**, **742–8**, 789, 831
rhythmical prose, 808
Richard, 224
ring, 186, 458, 461, 463, 466, 822 f., 844
RITES (Eucharistic):
(a) *Basic Hippolytan*. See *Apostolic Tradition*.
(b) *Eastern*, 104, 282, 307, 313, 322, 355, 766
—— Alexandrian, 122
—— Antiochene, 108, 122, 323, 767
—— Byzantine, 122–6, 323, 338, 342
—— Coptic, 343
—— East Syrian (Nestorian), 108, 779
—— Jerusalem (St. James), 122, 767, 776 f.
—— Serapion, 113 f., 503–5
—— St. Basil, 108, 113, 118 f., 339, 342, 545, 779
—— St. John Chrysostom, 108, 118 f., 284, 776, 779
—— St. Mark, 323, 545
—— Uniat, 3, 611
(c) *Western*, 78, 104, 120, 124 f., **302–73** *passim*
—— Ambrosian, 120, 313
—— Gallican, 3, 119 f., 731
—— Gelasian, 133, 164, 364, 368, 485, 547, 635, 647
—— Gregorian, 134, 364, 476, 484, **495–500**, 647
—— Hadrianum, 132 f., 635
—— Leonine, 134, 323, 335, 364, 647
—— Mozarabic, 119 f., 313, 368, 371
—— Roman, 108, 119 f., 132, 169, 307, 313, 322 f., 647, 731

Rites (Eucharistic) (*contd.*):
—— Sarum, 129, 157 f., 165, 176, **302–73** *passim*, 591
(d) *Anglican*. *See* Prayer Book.
Rogation Days and Prayers, 148, 183 f., **208**, 246, 248, 283 f., 287, 396, **725** f.
rubrics, 179, 183, 195, **279**, **305–9**, 318, 351, **360–3**, **423**, 425, 453, 463 f., 467 f., 498, **589–96**, **851–5**

Sabbath, 50 f., 202 f.
Sacramentaries. *See* Rites.
Sacrifice. *See* Offerings.
Saints, 78, 148, **211–43**
Salisbury Service Book, 710–12, 759
Sancroft, Abp., 699
Sanctorale, 131
Sanctus, 8, 14, 99, 123, 145, **176**, **543** f., 779
Sanderson, Bp., 855
Sandys, Abp., 852, 854
Sarum, Use of. *See* Rites; *and under* Choir Offices, Baptism, etc.
Saturday, 203
Savoy Conference, 190, 192 f.
Schismatics, reception of, 725
Scottish Prayer Book. *See* Prayer Book, Scottish.
Scottish printers, 800–2
scrutinies, 418–21, 430
Sea, Prayers to be used at, 194, **857**
Secreta, 319
semikhah, 64, 444
Sentences, 157, **270** f., **321**
Septuagesima, Sexagesima, 206, 388
Serapion, 619, 632. *See* Rites.
Serf, 225
sermon, 157, **316–18**
Sext, 261 f., **685–91**, 753
Shema', 63, **66–9**, 75 f.
Shemoneh 'Ezreh, 70–73
Sick, Communion of, 163–5, **541–615**
—— Visitation of, 163 f., **472–540**
silence, 774–82
Silvester, 237
Simon and Jude, SS., 233, 406
sin (forgiveness of sins), 33, 111, 408, 449, 452, 492 f., **497** f., **504–8**, 520, 539, 651 f.
singing, 149, 183, 309, **313**, 338, **476** f., 498
South African Prayer Book. *See* Prayer Book, S. African.
Sparrow, A., 583 f., 591–3
S.P.C.K., 727, 831–3
spiritual interview, 520 f.
sponsors, 423 f., 452
State Services, 196, **216** f.
Stephen, St., 214, 237, 384
sterility, 525–7
Stowe Missal, 283, 338
Strassburg, 141 f., 310, **565**
subdeacon, 300, 648
suffrages, 275 f.
Sunday, 92, 94, **202** f., 251
—— Schools, 435
surplice, 191 f.
Sursum corda, 123, 145, 309, **335**, 779
Swithun, 228
synagogue, 50 f., 160–77

Tabernacle, 550 f., 745
Tabernacles, Feast of, 46, 49 f., 56, 201
Table Prayers, 196
Tametsi Decree, 469
Tamid, 47
taurobolium, 412
Taylor, Jeremy, 190, 248, 254, **573**, 625
Te Deum, 138, 140, 147, 267, **273** f., 697, 724
Temple, The, **55–9**, 62
Ten (Thirteen, Thirty-nine) Articles. *See* Articles.
Tenebræ, 207, **741**
Tephillin, 66
Terce, 261 f., **679–85**, 753
Ternan, 227
Tertullian, **114**, 253, 257, 410, 412, 418, 447, 460, 626
Thanksgiving, Prayers of, 277, **354** f.
Theodore of Tarsus, 231
Thomas Aquinas, 222, 669
—— of Canterbury, 215, 237, **691**
—— St., 237, 300
Thorndike, 592 f.
Timothy, 220, 446
Titus, 221
Toc H., 760
totemism, 39
Tractarians, 749 f.
tradition of instruments, 659, **672**
Transfiguration, **229**, 241, 407
transubstantiation, **116**, **119–21**, 124
Trent, Council of, 137, 141, 468 f., 489, 535, 537, 579
Trinity Sunday, **209**, 264, 398
troparia, 837
Trullan Council, 547

Unction. *See* Oil, Confirmation, Visitation of the Sick.
Uniformity, Act of. *See* Act of Uniformity.
uses. *See* Rites.

Valentine, 221
Vatican Council, 431
veil (marriage), 458, 461
Veneration of the Cross, 207, **737** f.
Veni Creator, 34, 195, 275, 659, 681
Venite, 138, 156, 175, **272**, 292
Versicles, 271, 275
Vespers, 261, 476, 621, 837
Vestments, 122, 157, 177, 182, 184 f., 651, 679, 695, **853** f.
Viaticum. *See* Sick, Communion of.
Victor, 204
vigils, 202, **248** f., 248 f., 261 f., 272, 738 f.
Vincent, 220, 300
Visitation of the B.V.M., 228, 408
—— of the Sick, 163 f., **472–540**

wafer, 157, 159, 173, 176, 182, 184, **361**, 612, 615
washing of feet, 448, 736
water, **322**, **424**, 479, 493, **495**, 509, 843
Wednesday, 203, 237
Westminster Catechism, Confession, 432, 579
Whitgift, Abp., 573
Whitsunday. *See* Pentecost.
Wine, 320 f., 353, 361. *See* Chalice.
Wittenberg. *See* Luther, Lutheran.
Women, Churching of, 177, **425** f.
Wulfstan, 219

Ximenes, 162
Xystus, 204

year, the, 203
York Use, 163, 465, 620

Zebach, 40, 43 f.
Zequenim, 64
Zürich, 139, 143
Zwingli, 143

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY, LTD.,
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

L.B.S. National Academy of Administration, Library

मसूरी
MUSSOORIE 10158

यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।
This book is to be returned on the date last stamped

दिनाक Date	उधारकर्त्ता की सख्या Borrower's No.	दिनांक Date	उधारकर्त्ता की संख्या Borrower's No.

GL 264.03
LIT

264.03
Lit

अवाप्ति सं० 101158
ACC. No. 20836
वर्ग सं.
Class No.
पुस्तक सं.
Book No.
लेखक
Author
शीर्षक
Title Liturgy and worship.

निर्गम दिनाँक | उधारकर्ता की सं. | हस्ताक्षर
Date of Issue

264.03
Lit
20836

LIBRARY
LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI
National Academy of Administration
MUSSOORIE

Accession No. 101158

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double