

## LITURGICAL COMMENTS AND MEMORANDA.

## IV

A FRIENDLY enquiry as to a point that will not come under consideration here leads me to resume this series of 'Comments', which I fear must be always of an occasional, or even spasmodic character. I propose to take up the question of the place of the diptychs in the Constantinopolitan Liturgy at the stage at which it was left at pp. 109-111 of the Appendix to Dom Connolly's *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, and carry the subject to a conclusion.

(A) At pp. 109-111 I raised the question of the correctness of Mr Brightman's reconstruction of the pre-anaphoral part of 'the Byzantine Liturgy of the Seventh Century' given in Appendix P in his volume (pp. 535-536). Mr Brightman would have the order thus: (1) Great Entrance (the processional carrying of the bread and wine to the altar); (2) the Diptychs; (3) the Kiss of Peace; (4) the Creed; (5) the Anaphora. I pointed out that whilst the evidence adduced in support of this order was of the slenderest, the order itself runs counter to the order described by the contemporary St Maximus of Constantinople, who in a formal exposition of the liturgy of that Church three times gives the order of the parts of the liturgy up to the anaphora but makes no allusion to the diptychs; and I adduced as witness John, patriarch of Constantinople, who, in a letter dated 7 September, 518, expressly states that the diptychs were said 'at the time of the consecration'; which indeed is the place where they are recited in the Byzantine liturgy at the present day.

Dom Connolly soon after his book was published pointed out to me a testimony on this point, which of itself, and independently of anything said in *Narsai* pp. 109-111, is decisive. It occurs in the Epistle of the Monophysite James of Edessa (who lived A.D. 640-708) expository of the mass followed by him and his coreligionists. I would add in passing that the Monophysites (according to my experience of them) were a people who appear singularly well informed, and also curious, about the rites of other Churches. The following (Br. 492. 37-493. 11) is the passage in question. So that there may be no chance of misunderstanding I give in square brackets an explanatory gloss, reducing James's words to our modern ritual forms of speech:—

'And it is right that I should speak to you about the variations found in the kurōbho [=the anaphora, the canon; see James in Br. 491. 22 to 492. 11]. There are two orders which are found in this ministry of the kurōbho—one affecting the kurōbho and the celebration

of the mysteries themselves [=one part concerned with the specifically consecratory prayer] and the other affecting the commemorations [=the other part is (what we modern ritualists call) "the Great Intercession"]. And those who dwell in the imperial city [that is, Constantinople] and in the provinces of the Greeks, in like manner as we offer they also make the commemorations: so that first they offer and then forthwith make the commemorations [=in their anaphora or mass-canon the consecratory part comes first and the Great Intercession follows it]; some commemorate many and others few and those specified. And therefore the priest says: "remember, O Lord, those whom we have mentioned and those whom we have not mentioned" [see this in the Syriac St James used by the Monophysites in Br. 91. 36-37; cf. also lines 32-34, and the Greek St James, Br. 56. 18-19]. But the beginning of the order of the commemorations is when we say: "Moreover we offer unto Thee this same fearful and unbloody sacrifice for Sion the mother of all churches" [Syriac James, Br. 89. 30-90. 2; Greek James, Br. 54. 24-27], which is the church of Jerusalem . . . But the Alexandrine Fathers [i.e. the liturgies of Egypt] offer after another sort in that they first perform that order of the commemorations [see St Mark, Br. 126. 12-131. 15; Coptic St Cyril, Br. p. 166 seqq.], and then, after this, is the order of the holy kurōbho' [i.e. the consecratory part of the prayer: Mark, Br. 132. 11, &c.; Coptic St Cyril, Br. 176. 5, &c.].

The account given by James of Edessa of what was done at Constantinople in his day is precise and shews unmistakably that at that time the diptychs came after the consecration. This entirely confirms what I may call the negative evidence supplied by Maximus of Constantinople when in describing the pre-anaphoral part of the liturgy of that church he is silent as to the diptychs.

It seems, then, there can be no doubt as to the place of the diptychs in the Byzantine Liturgy of the seventh century, and that the order in Br. Appendix P should be amended thus: (1) Great Entrance; (2) Kiss of Peace; (3) Creed; (4) Anaphora.

(B) In Br. Appendix O, 'The Byzantine Liturgy before the Seventh Century' (p. 528), is the following order in the 'Mass of the Faithful': (1) Great Entrance; (2) Kiss of Peace; (3) Creed; (4) Diptychs; (5) Anaphora. In support (so far as the present subject is concerned) two passages are adduced, one from the Council under the Patriarch Mennas in 536 (p. 530 note 2), the other from one of the series of homilies of Chrysostom on Acts delivered at Constantinople in 401 (p. 532 note 11). The former passage comes really from the Acts of a council held at Constantinople in the year 518, the *procès-verbal* of which is embodied

in the acts of the later council, and it relates to the events of that year. It will be convenient to consider the case of each period—the early years of the sixth century, and the first years of the fifth—separately.

First for the text of A. D. 518. In order duly to appreciate the meaning and value for the history of diptychs of the text cited it is necessary to have in mind some idea as to the council itself—or whatever name we may give to this particular set of bishops' meetings—and of the circumstances in which it was held. Here only the briefest and most necessary indications will be given.<sup>1</sup>

On 9 July, 518, died the Emperor Anastasius, if not precisely a Eutychianizing suspect yet a fautor of Severus of Antioch and no favourer of pure Chalcedonianism. Justin was proclaimed his successor on the same day. The orthodox began to breathe freely and felt that now at last their time was come. On Sunday, 15 July, on the occasion of an assembly of bishops presided over by the Patriarch John, the populace of Constantinople, ever passionate in their religious zeal, gave clear expression in the Great Church to their expectations; if indeed it would not be more correct to say, began to lay down their terms. This intervention of the people would seem, so far as the mere recorded *Acts* go, the main part of the conciliar proceedings. So soon as the patriarch appeared on the ambo the crowd broke into cries of: 'Proclaim the Council [i. e. of Chalcedon] at once. Proclaim it now, at once. The faith of the orthodox is victorious. Proclaim the Council of Chalcedon.' Then came menaces; followed by the encouraging shouts: 'Justin reigns. Whom do you fear?'; and at length the threat that they would close the doors, and thus the patriarch would be unable to leave until he had done what was demanded of him. The specific demand was a celebration, the very next day, in honour of the Council of Chalcedon. They were finally promised that to-morrow memory should be made of the 'Fathers of the Four Councils'; and with a further promise by and by that Severus of Antioch should be anathematized the proceedings of the first day came to an end. The next day on the reassembling of the conciliar Fathers in the Great Church, the people were ready with more demands, more shoutings: Euphemius and Macedonius, former patriarchs, had been exiled by the late Emperor Anastasius and had died in exile; their bodies (so the populace cried) must be brought back, their names inscribed in the diptychs. It is unnecessary to detail what follows: but at last, after long shouting—*ἐπὶ πολὺ*—as on the day before, and no satisfactory compliance having been obtained, the people carried out their threat of the preceding day and closed the doors. On this the patriarch fairly capitulated.

<sup>1</sup> As usual Fleury is good to refer to; but in this particular case for a due impression the very instructive *procès-verbal* itself should be perused.

lated; for 'the most holy and most blessed Archbishop and Oecumenical Patriarch John (so say the Acts), taking the diptychs, ordered the four General Councils to be enrolled on them, and the names of the deceased archbishops of the imperial city, Euphemius and Macedonius of worthy memory, and of course of Leo, late archbishop of Rome, also'. Then the people as with one voice sang out the first verse of the *Benedictus* (Luc. i 68) and continued for a long time singing it antiphonally from side to side (ἐπὶ πολλὴν δὲ ὥραν ἀντιφωνούντων ἑκατέρων τῶν μερῶν) until at last the cantors began the Trisagion,<sup>1</sup> when all the people kept quiet and listened to the Trisagion; and after the reading of the holy gospel, the divine liturgy proceeding in the usual way, and the doors being shut and the holy creed as customary said,<sup>2</sup> at the time of the diptychs the whole body of the people quite quietly made haste to surround the altar, and as soon as there were read out by the deacon the names of the said four holy councils, and of the Archbishops, of holy memory, Euphemius and Macedonius, and Leo, all cried out with a mighty voice, 'Glory be to Thee, O God', and after this the divine liturgy was finished in all good order.

I should not myself have gathered from this narrative that we are

<sup>1</sup> The Trisagion in the Constantinopolitan mass is a song preparatory to the lections; and the beginning of the Trisagion by the cantors was a sign to the people that the noise on their part must cease and the mass itself must now begin.

<sup>2</sup> It is to be observed of course that the creed is by no means immediately sequent on the shutting of the doors. The introduction of the creed into the mass is involved in obscurities. That it was so introduced at Constantinople in the time of the patriarch Timothy (511-518) is on all hands agreed. But what creed? The ancient discussions on the subject may be neglected and we may come at once to the most recent. Opinion on the subject depends on verisimilitudes, congruities, and nice conjecture. Kattenbusch, whilst declining a formal discussion, is of opinion that the creed introduced by Timothy was the genuine Nicene text, implying that this was done with distinct anti-Chalcedonian intent, and that C (= 'Constantinopolitanum', the 'Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan', which is produced in the Acts of Chalcedon) first came into the mass at Constantinople in 518 (*Das apostolische Symbol* II note 20 pp. 739-740, and 232 note 71). Kunze on the other hand considers (and Kattenbusch agrees that it is not impossible) that Timothy introduced C. The title 'creed of the 318' used at that date does not of itself settle the question. It is easy indeed to see how in such a case this might (without loss of principle) be a polite concession by Timothy to the current of feeling of the people and monks of Constantinople which soon after his death was to carry everything before it. On either view it is the countenance given to C at Chalcedon around which interest turns, and it is easy to see how in this account of the triumph of Chalcedonianism the writer of the Acts of 518 should specially mention the creed. As usual Krazer (*De antiquis eccl. occid. liturgiis*, 1786, pp. 444-445) conveniently sums up and discusses the views of the earlier writers. He definitely states, what seems to be in Kattenbusch's mind, that it was at the very mass we are considering that C was introduced. If so, there is an obvious reason for the special mention of the creed by the redactor of the Acts of 518.

here in presence of an account of parts of the liturgy immediately sequent on each other. I should have gathered indeed just the contrary; for there is, in the circumstances detailed in the narrative as a whole, a perfectly natural and obvious reason why the recital of the creed and of the diptychs in particular should be selected for special mention;—simply because they are the parts of the celebration of the Mass of the Faithful which *are* pertinent, and the intervening parts are *not* pertinent, to the writer's special purpose.

But we can go further than this. The letter of the Patriarch John, of the date 7 September 518, mentioned above (p. 384), relates precisely to this scene, to this particular mass, described in the *procès-verbal* of the Council; and he expressly states that the diptychs were recited *tempore consecrationis* (see John's letter in Thiel *Epp. Rom. Pont.* p. 833; and, I suppose, in any of the editions of the Councils published in the eighteenth century).

We may, then, so far as I can see, safely and certainly indulge in the positive assertion that as in the middle of the seventh century so in the early years of the sixth the diptychs in the Byzantine Liturgy were recited, as they are now, just after the Epiklesis; and Br. Appendix O is to be corrected accordingly.

(C) It remains to see if the passage from homily 21 of St Chrysostom on Acts delivered at Constantinople in A. D. 401 witnesses to a different practice at that date. Mr Brightman says that he refers this passage 'to the diptychs with some hesitation' (p. 532. 57), and that it 'may refer to the litany during the fraction' (p. 533. 3).

As so often in cases of this kind, it will be convenient for the moment to dismiss as a 'text' in 'proof' the passage cited by Mr Brightman (p. 532 note 11), and come to it as found in its context, considering it in relation to that context. In homily 21 on Acts Chrysostom had been impressing on his people the utility of prayers generally, of alms also to the poor, and finally of *προσφοραί* for the dead, especially for those who had not been much good in themselves, or done much good for themselves, in this world. And then he says: 'It is not in vain that the deacon calls out: "For those deceased in Christ, for those who cause memorials to be made for them" (*καὶ τῶν τὰς μνείας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελουμένων*). He goes on to explain the surroundings, the conditions, in which this diaconal proclamation is made: 'The sacrifice is engaged, and all things are set ready; angels and archangels are present; the Son of God is present; all [i. e. the clergy and people] stand with great fear; they [i. e. the angelic choirs, an evident allusion to the closing words of the preface] stand by crying aloud, all (else) silent. Think you these things are for nothing? . . . and what is offered for the Church,

for the priesthood, and for the generality?'<sup>1</sup> Then he passes on to the commemoration of the martyrs and says that it is a great honour for them 'to be named whilst the Master is present' (*ὀνομασθῆναι τοῦ δεσπότου παρόντος*) . . . Chrysostom proceeds to enforce and illustrate his point by two examples thus: how whilst the emperor is sitting on his throne what the petitioner asks for he may obtain, but after the emperor has risen he will speak in vain. Thus, too, it is a subject of the greatest honour to all to be thought worthy of remembrance<sup>2</sup> whilst the Mystic Things lie set out (*ἕως ἂν πρόκειται τὰ τῶν μυστηρίων*) . . . For as in an imperial triumph the companions in victory are triumphantly acclaimed [cf. the parallelism of the martyrs] and also those in chains are in consideration of the occasion set free, but when the time has passed he who has then obtained nothing gets nothing; so too here: this is the occasion of the festal triumph: for it is said 'as often as you eat this bread you shew forth the death of the Lord'.

Let us take into account the various elements thus put before us by Chrysostom: first his general considerations on prayer and especially intercessory prayer; and then the scene he pictures, all silent in the presence of the Son of God Himself save for the voiceless song of the angelic choirs; the illustrations he gives in order to enforce the lesson he would wish his people to take to heart as to the specially acceptable time for prayer and petition, the king on his throne, the emperor, amid his companions in victory, in his triumphal progress; the emphasis laid on the honour to the martyrs in being named, name by name, in the presence of their Master; and all this to enforce his teaching as to the value of intercessory prayer for the dead to which the proclamation of the deacon specially summons the people. Taking all this into account I should not of myself—without some strong and clear arguments or reasons on the other side—have been disposed to infer that 'the tone' of St Chrysostom here 'reflects a moment of expectation like that immediately before the anaphora' (Br. p. 533. 1-2). Quite the contrary: if I had from the tone and matter of this homily to infer anything as to the place of the diptychs in the time and church of the preacher, I should have said, and with some feeling of assurance, that it was some point between the consecration and the communion. If, of course, there were evidence that subsequently to the date of the homily, A. D. 401, the diptychs in the liturgy of Constantinople were recited in the pre-anaphoral part of the mass, this I conceive would be an argument or reason such as is mentioned above. Seeing, however, that

<sup>1</sup> *καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ πληρώματος*. Cf. in the Clementine Liturgy, in the lityny after the canon: *ὑπὲρ . . . παντὸς τοῦ πληρώματος τῆς ἐκκλησίας* (Br. 23. 31).

<sup>2</sup> It is well in passing to note the distinction between this expression (*τὸ μνήμης ἀξιοῦσθαι*) and that used (*ὀνομασθῆναι*) in regard to the martyrs just above.

at the present day and ever since the end of the eighth century (cf. the Barberini MS of the liturgy of St Chrysostom of that date), that in the middle of the seventh century, and that in A. D. 518, the diptychs were said just after the Epiklesis, I think the only reasonable inference from Chrysostom's homily is that in A. D. 401 the names of the martyrs were in the liturgy of Constantinople said, and the deacon's proclamation made, after the consecration.

As a conclusion of the whole matter it is, I think, certain, so far as evidence exists on the subject, that at no time, from the beginning of the fifth century, were the diptychs said at Constantinople in the pre-anaphoral part of the Mass but only in the anaphora itself and after the consecration.

This ends what I have to say, at all events for the present, as to the diptychs in the Byzantine Liturgy. But I think it will be well before leaving this question to sum up in a few brief statements some of the conclusions expressed, indicated, or implied in Observation III of the Appendix to the *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* as to the use generally of the diptychs (or public recital of names at the mass) in Western Europe and the East; Africa being for the time left out of account. I will endeavour by the form of phrasing adopted to indicate the conclusions which seem to me (to use the words of a recent and illuminating writer) warranted by 'knowledge-knowledge' as distinguished from those arrived at on 'belief-knowledge'. The statements are as follows:—

(a) So far as I can see—and the case seems to me *clear*—the practice of reciting at the altar the names of 'offerers' [i. e. of bread and wine to be used at the altar] is in the West a practice attested as already well established—for Spain, that is—so early as the very first years of the fourth century; and such attestation continues up to the ninth in other regions of the West also. On the other hand I recall how I have not been able to find in the East any secure liturgical attestation of this at all.<sup>1</sup>

(b) The recital of names of persons deceased is first attested among the

<sup>1</sup> See, however, the *Testament* i 19. Rahmani (p. 189) already called attention to this passage, and considers the provision there made the 'origin of the diptychs'. From which I infer he was little informed as to the history of diptychs generally. He also calls attention to the fact that this recital of names of 'offerers' is not mentioned in the liturgy of the *Testament* (i 23); and, indeed, as we read the anaphora of that liturgy (translation by Dr Cooper and by the Bishop of Moray, pp. 71-75), it does not appear, though the formula is wordy, where the commemoration of the 'offerers' can come in; it can hardly be in the Invocation (*ibid.* p. 74 ll. 1-4). The note (*ibid.* p. 151, cf. p. 204) suggests that this is a 'commemoration of benefactors', 'probably the deacon's litany'. But this, too, seems to require explanations and elucidations which I do not find given.

(Greek-speaking) Eastern Christians—Jerusalem, Upper Egypt—about the middle of the fourth century. So far as there is any indication on the subject at all, the practice would seem to have been at that date a novelty.

(c) There seems then, so far, a clear distinction between East and West, inasmuch as the earliest attestations in the West are connected with the living, in the East with the dead; and, indeed, in Eastern, but still Greek-speaking, Syria even at as late a date as the end of the fifth century the names of dead persons only were recited.

(d) And there is this further distinction. In the Churches of Gaul, Spain, and Italy alike the names of the living mentioned at this early period as recited at the altar (or 'in the mass') are a defined and specific class—'offerers'. This is a permanent tradition witnessed to (particularly in Gaul) in the still extant official mass-formulae. Though information as to what determined in the East the recital at the altar of the names of living persons is slight and unsatisfactory, one thing is certain, namely, that these were not the specific class so consistently attested in the European West.

(e) But it may be said that the practice of the offering by the laity of the bread and wine of sacrifice disappeared in the East (at least in the Greek-speaking Eastern Churches) generally before the end of the fourth century. Quite so. But it still remains true that the entire absence in the East (so far as is known to me; cf. (a) above) of record or evidence of the recital of names of 'offerers' (i.e. of the bread and wine for use in the mass) is significant as in its bearing on (b) above so also on the distinction drawn in (c) above between the early practice of East and West as to the recital of names generally.

(f) Moreover, there is something else that I ought to note in passing: namely, that whilst the early documents of the three West-European regions mentioned are in agreement and consistent as to recitals of the names of 'offerers', differences are as a fact observable in their liturgies as regards recital of names of dead. In Gaul ordinary dead persons only, 'our dear ones', are specified in the 'nomina' prayers.<sup>1</sup> In Spain the names of 'saints' also are recited, and in the prayers in which this is attested<sup>1</sup> the same sort of distinction is specifically drawn between 'saints' and the ordinary dead as was drawn by St Cyril of Jerusalem. In Rome the names of dead recited in every mass were those of 'saints'; whilst our earliest evidence on the subject—confirmed by the omission of the ordinary '*Memento* of dead' in some of our earliest manuscripts,

<sup>1</sup> I conceive that such mention of saints as is found in the 'nomina' prayers of e.g. masses iv and xi of *Richenov.*, masses v, vi, &c. of *Goth.*, are quite different in idea and purpose from e.g. that in *Mos.* (ed. Lesley), 27. 83, 345. 9; and that the mention of a saint in the Gallican prayers cited has (obviously) nothing to do with the question of the diptychs.



and (as I think) by the tenor of the present Roman canon itself—tells us that this '*Memento* of dead' was not said on the days precisely of regular public assembly and the solemn mass, that is Sundays.

I should prefer, provisionally at all events, to think that these variations in regard to recital of names of the *dead* in the three regions named of the West, as compared with their common agreement in a singular practice, namely, the recital of names of *offerers*, points, so far as the former is concerned, to a later and independent adoption in these regions of a practice imported or suggested from elsewhere.

#### V

So far then for the question of the diptychs. But the homily of St Chrysostom reviewed under IV (C) above, may not be thus easily dismissed. It is worth while to look at it again and observe its import; for the questions it raises will, if I mistake not, prove to be of crucial importance for the development of Christian liturgy, and to touch the very principles of divine worship and the rationale of the eucharistic service itself.

As said elsewhere—and I think this is worth repeating again and again—the true promise and even necessary condition of the solid progress of liturgical studies (in the state in which these studies are at present) is the examination and treatment of particular questions of detail, of practice, one by one—isolated as it were—each in and for itself, without concern for the bearing which the results of each particular enquiry may have on other questions. By and by will come the time for synthesis, and it will be seen if and how the results arrived at along various lines of enquiry fit into each other. An incidental advantage of this course lies in the opportunity of our individual progress, each one for himself, in the art of distinguishing between our actual state of knowing and not knowing, which the broad treatment of large subjects, or the summary treatment in gross of documents individually complex, can never afford. But, above all, this method gives promise, if duly observed, of some corrective to our liability to view questions of early liturgy through the mists of inter-confessional Christian disputes instead of in the dry light of mere unimpassioned historical enquiry and critical investigation.

In the present case, however, so far from approaching on this plan the little problem I propose next to investigate, and excluding from the mind the idea of results and their bearings, I intend in this Comment to try first of all to bring out as clearly as I can how the enquiry bears on the general question of the principles of divine service as exemplified in the Christian Eucharist, the Liturgy, or Mass.

The great problem presented by the history of Christian worship at

large—looking at the matter especially from the point of view of the people and their relation to the service—is surely this: how is it that the primitive Christian Eucharist described by St Paul, the character of which the very abuses reproved by him only serve to emphasize, has become the High Mass of the basilicas of Rome or of the cathedrals of St Petersburg? <sup>1</sup> I know it is easy to make summary answer to such a question, for instance, thus: because the eucharistic service is of its nature a service of laud and thanksgiving. But an answer of this kind does not solve the historical question or explain the actual concrete facts. If we are to come to an understanding of the matter, we must never, as I conceive, dissociate it in our minds from the worshipping people, what they are doing, what they are thinking; what effect words and actions proceeding from the clergy are having on them, in them. What a recent writer has said of another and even more momentous problem of Christian history holds good of traditional worship. The development it has undergone does not proceed from definite and considered design; it takes its own course irresistibly as though by a natural law but always without breach with the past. In spite of the intervention of this or that great personality here or there, at this time or that, the development is really dominated by the religion of the many, of the mass of the common Christian people, pressing forward as if instinctively, and it combines an unceasing slow progress of change with a tenacious holding fast of what has been inherited. The change whilst thus irresistible and ever in progress comes without observation, without any suspicion perhaps, and certainly without conscious anticipation of the broad results that will ultimately manifest themselves. Where early liturgy is concerned generally, but especially in matters that the lapse of ages shews to be of most decisive and weightiest import, the change too is most commonly without regular and clear contemporary note or record.

But, on the other hand, though it is very real, we must beware of exaggerating this latter difficulty. We have at least three early sets of formal addresses to newly-baptized Christians delivered within the ensuing Easter week; and fortunately, too, a good part, indeed the greater part of our best material consists of homilies, sermons, popular addresses. In order, however, duly to understand and appreciate these

<sup>1</sup> Of course on the principles of Fr Baumgartner for whom here the critical passages of St Paul do not relate to the Eucharist, or of Dr Probst for whom the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions was substantially the Liturgy bequeathed to the Church by the Apostles, or of Bishop Rattray for whom the Liturgy of St James substantially was just as primitive, the question put in the text does not arise. I do not understand what would be the position of the Bishop of Moray (see his *Ancient Church Orders* pp. 62 seqq.) on the question discussed by Father Baumgartner.

in regard to worship and the needs of the many, and what the many make of them, we must come down out of the sanctuary, even from the steps thereof, and from any high places whatsoever; we must, so to speak, disinterest ourselves in what is merely technical, ritual, professional, and taking our stand in the nave listen, as becomes those stationed there, with willing and receptive mind to the words of the eloquent preacher or easy and familiar instructor. Moreover, in the present case, the scene being Constantinople and the preacher Chrysostom, we must recall the peculiar religious disposition of the people (and the religious temper of the Christian people of Antioch was much the same kind), easily and well affected to what a recent writer has called, speaking of Constantinople at a later period, 'la dévotion raffinée et élégante'. It was too the ready and fluent word that suited them, not close argument; the easiest appeal was to religious sentiment, not the reasonable mind; whilst with Chrysostom, it was the moral lesson, the pious affection that lay near to his heart, and his concern was not with the niceties of dialectics, or doctrinal discussion.

The general drift and the points of his homily 21 on Acts have been recapitulated above (p. 389). The point for consideration now is what must have been the natural effect on his hearers of all this falling from the lips of their pastor, their bishop—the effect on the minds of the willing, the good, the pious among them? For it must be remembered that the cold, the unwilling, the indifferent in the earlier course of change (however they may act as a conservative force and a drag by and by) do not count as an active factor in the development of Christian worship.<sup>1</sup> What must the pious and devout, then, have felt to be the lesson they were intended by Chrysostom to draw from his insistence on the special efficacy of intercessory prayer τοῦ δεσπότου παρόντος, now whilst *πᾶρεστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*? I do not know whether Mgr Duchesne may have had this particular homily in mind, or only the drift of Chrysostom's general eucharistic teaching<sup>2</sup>; but if that writer's words may seem to come somewhat harshly and rudely on the ear, he yet, as I believe, justly and correctly sums up the inevitable result of that teaching on Chrysostom's well-disposed hearers when, in describing 'the Syrian

<sup>1</sup> I should like to refer here to the last dozen lines of a paper on 'The Doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence and the Anglican Divines' printed in the *Dublin Review*, October 1898, p. 336: 'But if we are to understand,' &c.

<sup>2</sup> See Observation II ('Fear and Awe') in the Appendix to Dom Connolly's *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*. In that place only the barest indication of the liturgical and religious value of the subject could be given. It ought to be worked out on a systematic examination of Chrysostom's homilies, and presented with a due sense of what this particular feature of Chrysostom's teaching must have meant for his people, and of the results which the spread of the ideas embodied in such teaching must inevitably, and eventually did in fact, produce.

Liturgy of the fourth century', he writes thus: (after the consecration) 'The prayers are resumed, but directed now to the present and invisible God' (*Christian Worship, its origins and evolution*, first English Edition, 1903, p. 62). It is not to the point to object, or reflect on, St Chrysostom's personal mind and intention—say, in regard to what is frequently called nowadays non-communicating attendance. The future was hidden from his eyes; and doubtless (to judge from other utterances of his) the eventual resultant was the last condition of things that he would have desired to bring about. But (as Mgr Duchesne so well sees) in Syria, already *le pli est pris*; and we have in the great preacher of Antioch and later bishop of Constantinople, in principle already, that type of Christian worship which (clothed in differing forms suited to the differing mental tone and religious temper of East or of West) has in the great traditional Churches of East and West alike become all-dominant, and is justly as well as conveniently indicated by the expression 'the devotion of the Mass'.

And now we can come to the particular question which I propose to submit to examination. It is this: What was the place in the eucharistic service of the 'Great Intercession'<sup>1</sup> in the earlier ages of the Church? In the light of what has been said above, the bearing of this enquiry will I think sufficiently appear if we take two alternative cases. First, a service in which the passage from the consecration to the communion is direct and without intervening 'Great Intercession', such prayers as the people hear from the lips of the celebrant between the two acts of consecration and communion relating to and bearing on the communicants themselves and their approaching act of communion. Secondly, a service in which the consecration is followed by a 'Great Intercession'; whilst hearing this long-drawn prayer for all sorts and conditions of men, the mind of the people, at least those who are attending to and following the service, must naturally be drawn off from the direct thoughts of their own impending act of communion. Of these two types of eucharistic service, which would be the more likely to facilitate and induce that particular type of worship indicated by Duchesne which, as pointed out above, is actually all-dominant in the traditional Churches of East and West alike? To say so much is, I think, to say all that is needed here, and sufficiently shews that the enquiry as

<sup>1</sup> This is the name given to the prayer in question by the liturgical systematists of this country; in Germany the term adopted by some is 'allgemeines Kirchengebet', by others 'Gemeindegebet', or even 'Fürbitten' merely. If the expression were not clumsy to use the best title would doubtless be: 'Prayer for all sorts and conditions of men.' I should prefer, as at once practical for use and fairly descriptive, the term 'General Intercession', but think it best, for avoidance of confusion, to acquiesce in the chosen terminology of the systematists.

to the place of the 'Great Intercession' in early liturgy is not otiose, or a mere subject of curiosity as to indifferent matter of fact. When the enquiry is closed and its results are before us, further observations and reflexions may appear called for. But that it may be entered on generally without risk of ambiguity or vagueness, and that the survey I propose to make of the liturgies may not be interrupted by the examination of one subordinate question, two points must be dealt with, in the briefest and most elementary way. These are: (1) the mutual relations of the 'intercession' and the 'diptychs'; (2) the relations of the anaphora of the Ethiopic Church Order and the Abyssinian Liturgies. What has to be said on these two points shall be thrown into a separate Comment.

## VI

(1) The non-expert may say something of this sort: 'When I read the printed liturgies (see Br. pp. 93-95, 169, 224, 228-230, 275-284, 438-442) I am at times puzzled to know whether I am reading "intercession" or "diptychs". What, pray, is the relation and difference, in origin and meaning, between them?' This is not, I think, a vain question, nor a captious one. A further question may be asked: Mr Brightman prints pp. 501-503 a diptych of Jerusalem of the twelfth century, p. 503 a modern diptych of the same church, p. 552 a Byzantine diptych of the fifteenth; are we to understand that these were the sort of diptychs that were to be heard read out by the deacon in church in the fourth and fifth, or even sixth and seventh, centuries? Elsewhere I have called attention (*Narsai* pp. 121 seqq.) to Le Brun's mistake in regard to the silent recitation of the anaphora and the effect of Justinian's *Novella* on the subject. It is to be assumed then that, except in a few places, the priest in the fifth and sixth centuries, within the limits of his empire, recited the anaphora no less than the rest of the service so that he could be heard by the people. The intercession was part of the celebrant's prayers; the diptychs were said by a deacon. The question then is whether after the priest had said aloud the relative parts of the intercession and stopped for the reading of the diptychs, the names (as in the printed diptychs mentioned above) were prefaced by and as it were framed into liturgical formulae resembling those the people had already heard from the lips of the celebrant; or whether it is more reasonable to suppose that the deacon read out a mere list of names at the place or places in the intercession where the priest stopped that this might be done? Slight as are the extant records they all point to the conclusion (see footnote 1) that in the earlier period, and until the spread of the practice of silent recital of the anaphora (canon), the diptychs consisted of a mere list of names,

the only addition being (since the names were read out in separate categories, bishops, priests, laymen; dead, living) a simple title indicating each category.

So far, then, as the earlier period is concerned there can be no chance of mistake or confusion between 'intercession' and 'diptychs'. The one is an integral part of the prayers said aloud by the celebrant, the diptychs a mere list of names read by the deacon.<sup>1</sup>

(2) In Observation VI of the Appendix to the *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* attention was called (p. 144) to the very general neglect in England of the labour bestowed on the early Church Orders by the late F. X. Funk of Tübingen. This was done with special reference to the anaphora contained in the so-called Ethiopic Church Order. In so doing I had no intention of implying any sort of assent to his opinions or views so far as concerns purely technical questions of liturgy. It must, I think, be said that this great scholar, this master of 'those

<sup>1</sup> (a) That only names were recited: see for Upper Egypt c. 350 Serapion (*Narsai* p. 101); for Rome, the *Gelasianum* for such time as the book was in use there (*Narsai* p. 100 note 2). (b) That the names were prefaced by a bare indication of 'category': Mopsuestia in the sixth century (*Narsai* p. 107); Constantinople in the middle of the seventh (*Narsai* p. 104 note 1). (c) On the other hand the Sicilian diptych, now in the Mayer Collection at Liverpool, which I should rather think of the time of Adrian I (772-795), has a liturgical setting; so, too, the diptych from Upper Egypt of about the middle of the seventh century, published by Mr W. E. Crum (*J. T. S.* xi 67). This may well indicate the adoption of the silent recital of the anaphora. (d) The text of the Barberini diptych, now in the Louvre, is of course quite of another class, and is, I conceive, the kind of document referred to in texts of the Roman canon like that of the Bobbio Missal, where it is said: 'quorum animas ad memorandum conscripsimus vel quorum nomina super sanctum altarium scripta adest evidenter.'

The question may be asked how it comes about that in some of the liturgies referred to at the beginning of this Comment the priest secretly says what is clearly 'diptychal' matter. The answer doubtless is that this is one of those parallel developments found in East and West even though separated in communion. The priest by and by was not content simply to stand silent and listen to those parts of the service that fall to others, but must needs repeat to himself secretly what others said aloud.

Before dismissing the intercession and diptychs I may make one further remark. The Bishop of Moray (*Ancient Church Orders* p. 39) speaks of (what is evidently meant for) the Intercession as 'a litany-like series of petitions'. This expression may prove quite useful if we keep in mind the points in which 'litany' and 'intercession' differed and agreed. The differences were: (a) that the 'intercession' was said by the priest, the 'litany' by the deacon; (b) that the priest's words in the intercession are addressed to God, the deacon's words in the litany to the people; (c) that as both were said aloud, the intercession and litany could not in accordance with decency and order be said at one and the same time. The point of likeness lies in the general sameness of subject-matter. It may be well also, when describing the intercession as 'litany-like', to be on our guard against any implication that the 'intercession' was modelled on and derived from a pre-existing litanic form of prayer.

who would know', whose word is so weighty, whose sense is so safe, in what concerns the beliefs, discipline, and history of the Church of the first five or six centuries does not, where questions of pure liturgy are concerned, maintain his usual level; and the fault, as I conceive, does not wholly or even mainly rest with him. I had already determined to take the anaphora of the Eth. Ch. O. for a text on which to attempt the elucidation of more than one problem of earliest liturgy. At present only a very simple matter is in question. Mr Brightman has long since in his volume of the *Eastern Liturgies* (p. lxxv ll. 28-31) called attention to the relations subsisting between this Church Order and the anaphora of the Normal Abyssinian Liturgy. But these few lines of small print seem easily overlooked, or perhaps forgotten, especially in view of the interest excited by the 'Lost Church Order'.

All that I propose to do here is to repeat, but with more (it may perhaps be thought altogether excessive) particularity and in tabular form, Mr Brightman's statement of correspondence between the two documents mentioned; together with references to the corresponding portions of the Abyssinian Anaphora of our Lord and of the Liturgy of the *Testament* in the version of these two last given in *The Testament of our Lord* by Dr J. Cooper and the Bishop of Moray (1902) pp. 245-248 and 71-75. It will only then remain to draw briefly the conclusions required for the purpose immediately in hand.

<i>Ethiopic Church Order.</i>	<i>Anaphora of</i>	<i>Abyssinian Normal Liturgy.</i>
(Br. pp. 187-192.)		(Br. pp. 228-244.)
(1) Br. p. 189 line 19 word 1 to line 23 word 3.	=	Br. p. 228 l. 17 word 1 to l. 21 word 5. [Cf. <i>Anaphora of our Lord</i> : p. 245 lines 8, 10-11; 246 lines 21-22. <i>Testament</i> : p. 71 l. 32; 72 l. 2-4.]
(2) p. 189 l. 23 w. 4 to p. 190 l. 1 w. 3.	=	p. 231 l. 6 w. 4 to l. 7 w. 5. [ <i>A. O. L.</i> 246. 22-23; <i>Test.</i> 72. 29-31.]
(3) p. 190 l. 1 w. 4 to l. 2 w. 10.	=	p. 231 l. 11 to l. 12 w. 5. [ <i>A. O. L.</i> 246. 34-35; <i>Test.</i> 72. 31-73. 2.]
(4) p. 190 l. 2 w. 11 to l. 8 w. 4.	=	p. 232 l. 6 w. 2 to l. 12 w. 2. [ <i>A. O. L.</i> 246. 36-39, 42, 43 to 247. 2; <i>Test.</i> 73. 2-6, 8-12.]
(5) Recital of Institution p. 190 l. 8 w. 5 to l. 12.	=	largely developed p. 232. 12-13, 17-22, 27-31, and 35. [ <i>A. O. L.</i> 247. 3, 4, 5-6, 8; <i>Test.</i> 73. 13-17.]
(6) p. 190 l. 14 to l. 18 w. 9.	=	p. 233 l. 5 to l. 10. [ <i>A. O. L.</i> 247. 12-19; <i>Test.</i> 73. 19-20. 21-23. Embodying the anamnesis and prayer of offering which in

- these two documents are addressed to the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity.]
- (7) p. 190 l. 18 w. 10 to l. 21 w. 7.<sup>1</sup> = p. 233 l. 26 to l. 29 w. 1.  
 [For correspondence see *A. O. L.* 248. 13-16; *Test.* 73. 26-74. 5 and 75. 5-6.]
- (8) p. 190 l. 37 to p. 191 l. 3. = p. 233 l. 15 to 20.
- (9) p. 191 l. 7 to 11. = p. 234 l. 33 to p. 235 l. 3.
- (10) p. 191 l. 14. = p. 235 l. 12.
- (11) p. 191 l. 16 to l. 23 w. 10. = p. 235 l. 14 to l. 22 w. 11.
- (12) p. 191 l. 27 to p. 192 l. 5. = p. 237 l. 14-20 and 22-25.
- (13) p. 192 l. 10 to l. 16.<sup>2</sup> = p. 243 l. 11 w. 6 to l. 17.

It now only remains to draw the necessary conclusions :—

(a) The anaphora of the Ethiopic Church Order, in the state in which it is now found, is (as will be seen on verification by aid of the foregoing table) the basis of the anaphora of the Normal Abyssinian Liturgy.

(b) This latter simply *is* the former enlarged, enriched, and brought up to the level of (Greek-Eastern) Catholic practice. It is derived directly from the Ethiopic Church Order and without any intermediary. These two documents embody the ancient genuine and native tradition of the Ethiopic (Abyssinian) Church.

(c) A further observation has to be made. It has been stated (Cooper and Maclean *Testament, Notes* p. 167) that the Abyssinian Anaphora of our Lord 'is specially interesting as being the connecting link between the modern Abyssinian liturgy and the Testament'. This, in so far as it may imply that the Anaphora of our Lord is earlier than the Normal Abyssinian anaphora, is a misapprehension and historically a mistake. When the four documents used in the foregoing tables are drawn out into parallel columns, one conclusion—and one only—will I believe appear admissible to those familiar with textual investigation; namely, that the Anaphora of our Lord, so far from standing between the *Testament* and the Normal Abyssinian anaphora, is the anaphora of the *Testament* enlarged and enriched with materials drawn from the Normal Abyssinian anaphora. It is necessary to say so much in order not to be embarrassed in the survey to be made of Egyptian liturgies by a text

<sup>1</sup> To end of l. 23 is a doxology; in connexion with which, and the doxologies p. 191. 9-11, 24-25; p. 192. 14-16, I hope to give a detailed review of doxological history and practice in East and West in the third and fourth centuries. Page 190 lines 24-35 are a blessing of oil to which of course there is nothing to correspond in the Normal Abyssinian anaphora.

<sup>2</sup> The prayer of the Eth. Ch. O. with the title 'Dismissal' Br. 192. 25-33 evidently lies behind or is connected with the prayer in the Normal Liturgy Br. 243. 20-31 with the title 'The Inclination'. The 'Dismissal' prayer in this liturgy (p. 244) is quite different.



which, however useful or interesting when resolved into its constituent elements, has no claim to be regarded as a liturgical witness for the place of the intercession in the early ages of the Church. The 'Anaphora of our Lord' therefore falls out of account. The relations between the anaphora of the Ethiopic Church Order and that of the *Testament* is a different question; but one that is of no concern here, and we may in the next Comment go forward with the investigation itself as to the place of the intercession in the eucharistic service.

## VII

Since the foregoing Comments IV–VI were in type, and indeed had received their corrections for the press, I have had the advantage of reading Mr Brightman's remarks (pp. 319–323 above) on my Appendix to Dom Connolly's *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*. They shew me that it is desirable to give some further explanations on three points in order that my view of the case may be the better understood. The three points are:—(A) on St Chrysostom's Hom. 21 on Acts (see IV C above); (B) on the expression *tempore consecrationis* in the first letter of John of Constantinople to Hormisdas of Rome; and (C) on the *κοινὰ εὐχαί* of St Justin Martyr (p. 322 above).

(A) When returning the proofs of Comm. IV–VI, which I had asked him to look over, Dom Connolly called my attention to Chrysostom's Homily 41 on 1 Cor. (a series delivered at Antioch in, so Bardenhewer suggests, 392) as parallel to Hom. 21 on Acts delivered some ten years later at Constantinople. I begged him to draw up a note on the subject; he complied with my request. That note, which I now print with his permission, is as follows:—

'On reading the proofs of your "Liturgical Comments and Memoranda", no. IV C, I was at once reminded of a similar passage of St Chrysostom which I had recently read in Syriac. This I soon found in an Appendix of Bedjan's *S. Martyrii, qui et Sahdona, quae supersunt omnia* pp. 870–871; and it turned out to be a Syriac translation of a passage from St Chrysostom's homily 41 on 1 Cor. (delivered at Antioch). The Greek of it is to be found in Migne *P. Gr.* lxi col. 361. As perhaps you have not a copy of Chrysostom's works by you, I have copied out and enclose the relevant part of the passage:—

'. . . Οὐ γὰρ ἀπλῶς ταῦτα ἐπινενόηται, οὐδὲ εἰκῆ μνήμην ποιούμεθα τῶν ἀπελθόντων ἐπὶ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν πρόσμιεν, δεόμενοι τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ κειμένου τοῦ λαβόντος τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἵνα τις ἐντεῦθεν αὐτοῖς γένηται παραμυθία· οὐδὲ μάτην ὁ παρεστὼς τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ τῶν φρικτῶν μυστηρίων τελουμένων βοᾷ· Ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἐν Χριστῷ κεκοιμημένων, καὶ τῶν τὰς μνείας ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐπιτελούντων. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ

ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν αἱ μνείαι ἐγένοντο, οὐδ' ἂν ταῦτα ἐλέχθη. Οὐ γάρ ἐστι σκηνὴ τὰ ἡμέτερα, μὴ γένοιτο. . . . Μὴ δὲ ἀποκάμωμεν τοῖς ἀπελθοῦσι βοηθοῦντες, καὶ προσφέροντες ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εὐχάς· καὶ γὰρ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης κείται καθάρισιον. Διὰ τοῦτο θαρροῦντες ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης δεόμεθα τότε, καὶ μετὰ μαρτύρων αὐτοὺς καλοῦμεν, μετὰ ὁμολογητῶν, μετὰ ἱερέων· καὶ γὰρ ἐν σῶμά ἔσμεν ἅπαντες, κἂν λαμπρότερα μέλη μελῶν· καὶ δυνατὸν πάντοθεν συγγνώμην αὐτοῖς συναγαγεῖν, ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχῶν, ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δώρων, ἀπὸ τῶν μετ' αὐτῶν καλουμένων . . .

'This passage is worth bringing into connexion with the one from homily 21 on Acts. By the phrases τοῦ ἀμνοῦ τοῦ κειμένου and τὸ κοινὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης κείται καθάρισιον St Chrysostom at Antioch seems to imply that the names of the departed were read, "with the martyrs, confessors, priests", after the consecration. And I see that the passages in which these phrases occur are in fact cited by Mr Brightman (see his Appendix C, "Liturgy of Antioch from the Writings of St Chrysostom", p. 474, 30-32, 26-27) as indicating a time (here for the Intercession) after the consecration. In view of this, is it possible that St Chrysostom at Constantinople uses ὀνομασθῆναι τοῦ δεσπότου παρόντος with reference to a point of the service earlier than the consecration? Of the two homilies I should say that no. 21 on the Acts is the more pointed, and less open to doubts on the question whether St Chrysostom is thinking of the actual eucharistic presence of our Lord or not.'

With the exception of what is said below in footnote,<sup>1</sup> I do not know that I need add anything to Dom Connolly's words; and I now pass on to the next question.

(B) In reference to the letter of the patriarch John to Hormisdas (see above pp. 384, 387) Mr Brightman writes:—'It looks plausible, but one would like to know what was the Greek represented by *tempore consecrationis*' (p. 321).

First it is necessary to state in clear terms what is the *dubium* that we have to deal with. I should, however, say that I am not quite clear what is the exact point Mr Brightman aims at in taking his exception; but I presume it is of this kind: that the expression *tempore consecrationis* may be no evidence for any order, and may mean no more than 'what time the mass is celebrated', 'at mass'. Our *dubium* then I should

<sup>1</sup> In addition to what Dom Connolly says I should like to point out that the deacon's proclamation in both homilies, that on 1 Cor. at Antioch and that on Acts at Constantinople, is the same formula (cf. p. 388 above). It would seem then that if this proclamation is to be assigned at Constantinople in 401 to a point of the service before the anaphora begins and at Antioch some ten years earlier to a point after the consecration, some clear reason for this difference of treatment should be given.

venture to state thus:—‘Is there reasonable ground for supposing that the Greek words rendered by the translator “tempore consecrationis” meant simply “at mass”; or (if it be granted that some definite point of the mass is alluded to) designated some point in the service not in the anaphora at all but immediately before the anaphora began and immediately after the creed (see Mr Brightman’s reconstruction, p. 528. 27–529. 5)?’

As regards the former alternative I may observe that, so far as my knowledge goes, among the various terms used by Latin writers in the first six centuries to designate the mass as a service (or even the canon of the mass) ‘consecratio’ is expressly not to be found, whether at Rome or elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> And whatever this word would naturally imply to one who knew Latin and no Greek, one thing it would not mean to him, the ‘mass’ in a general and vague sense as a ‘service’.

We come then to the second alternative.

In *Homilies of Narsai* p. 111 I had said:—‘Although the original Greek is not extant, the fact that the letter is contained in the *Collectio Avellana* may preclude any exception that might be raised as to the translation.’ By this remark I hoped to obviate the objection which Mr Brightman has made. But as I did not succeed in my aim, and as there is no probability, or indeed chance, that the original Greek of John’s letter will ever be found, I must give reasons for my belief that the circumstances attending the preservation of the Latin version of this letter offer some guarantee for the accuracy of the translation.

The *Avellana* is a canonical collection, the latest document of which is of the year 553. Nos. 1–104 of the 243 pieces of which it consists fall into five well-defined sections covering the period 366–514 along with a dozen documents of c. 533–553; Nos. 105–243 all relate to the short pontificate of Hormisdas (514–523). Maassen in 1877 (*Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akad. d. Wissensch.*, Phil.-hist. Cl., 85 pp. 249–250) pointed out that this second part of the *Avellana* could only have been put together by some one who had access to the archives of the Roman Church and actually used them. Since Maassen wrote great advance has been made in knowledge as to the history, condition, &c., of the

<sup>1</sup> It may be said for purposes of mere nicety that the nearest semblance of approach to such use that I know of is in canon 2 of the 7th Council of Toledo of 646 in which does occur the expression ‘consecrationem coepti officii’ (cf. canon 14 of the 11th Council, 675). But this provides for the case of a priest falling ill whilst saying mass and for the completion of the service; the word ‘consecratio’ (even in the Spanish Latinity of that date) does not here mean ‘mass’ or ‘service’ at all. Of course the curious enquirer will, on the general question of ancient Latin names for the mass, consult, if he please, the liturgists, as for instance Bona *Rer. liturg.* lib. i cap. 3.

archives of the Roman Church from the fifth century onwards. Otto Günther, the recent editor of the *Avellana*, has put the whole question, so far as the period of Hormisdas is concerned, in a clear light, pointing out that the section relating to that pontificate (Nos. 105-243) stands on an entirely different footing from the rest of the collection; that its compiler had actually used—'durchblättert' is the term he employs—Hormisdas's register throughout; and indeed shewing that this section of the *Avellana* is unique in giving us a close insight into the practice of the Papal Chancery. Any one who wishes really to understand the general question as to the source or authenticity of the text of the particular letter with which we are concerned must read pp. 1-66 of O. Günther's 'Avellana-Studien' (in vol. 134 of the *Sitzungsberichte*). The following are the considerations that concern us here. In the case of John's letter we have not to deal with a chance translation made we do not know when by we know not whom, a translation made by a private person for his pleasure, by one responsible to nobody for any blunders he may commit; but the translation was made by a regular official of the Chancery whose duty it was to understand his business, the translation being intended doubtless for the use of the Pope in *his* current business, and certainly by and by for permanent record in the register of his pontificate. Next, simple as the letter may seem if we do not remember the circumstances, it was in reality a highly important document, as the first letter that had been addressed (so far as is actually known, and may be conjectured) by a patriarch of Constantinople to a pope of Rome for more than five and twenty years. Moreover the item concerning the diptychs was perhaps the most important item in the letter, for this act was (so far as the public was concerned) the outward sign and seal of a reintegration of amity, and a herald of the close of the schism which had for so long separated Rome and Constantinople, the first practical step indeed towards peace.

There is also another point of view: the order of the Constantinopolitan mass which (as Mr Brightman's Appendices O and P—and, may I add, these Comments also—sufficiently shew) has to be so laboriously reconstructed to-day, must have been, indeed was, matter of common knowledge in Rome in the year 518. Although patriarch did not write to pope or pope to patriarch there was continual passing—and that by envoys, messengers, agents of all sorts—to and fro between Rome and Constantinople on ecclesiastical business.<sup>1</sup> From whatever point of view it be looked at this particular letter in the translation that

<sup>1</sup> The evidence of this is in the body of documents relating to the papal history of 500-520; for the time of Hormisdas generally, O. Günther's 'Beiträge zur Chronologie der Briefe des Hormisdas' in *Sitzungsberichte* vol. 126 may be consulted.

has come down to us is *prima facie* as little open to suspicion as well can be.<sup>1</sup>

It now remains to enquire whether there be any positive ground or reason for assuming, or inferring, a mistranslation at the point 'tempore consecrationis'. I know of none except Mr Brightman's reconstruction of the Constantinopolitan Liturgy in his Appendix O. The only evidence which Mr Brightman gives us for his theory that the diptychs at Constantinople were said in the sixth century between the creed and the beginning of the anaphora is a short extract from the 'Conc. sub Mennâ'. This passage I have endeavoured in Comment IV B above to place in its proper historical setting, and so regarded it does not seem to me to justify the inference Mr Brightman draws from it.

All this may seem a very long and serious discussion of trifling points. But a now prolonged experience has all gone to teach me the lesson that in the study of the history of early Christian worship small points may be the pivot on which grave questions may turn, and it was necessary for me to deal with this point in order that in the progress of an enquiry to be taken in hand later I may not appear to have ignored the authority of *Eastern Liturgies*, Appendices O and P. With this in mind I sum up here in precise terms what I conceive to be, on the evidence, the just view of the case, and state the position I take up, thus: at no time, from the beginning of the fifth century, were the diptychs said in the Constantinopolitan mass at any other place than that to which they are assigned in our earliest manuscript of that mass (a manuscript of about the close of the eighth century), viz. just after the consecration.

(C) Now for the *κοινὰ εὐχαί* of Justin Martyr. This involves some consideration of the question of mass-litanies in general. I propose to divide what I have to say into two parts or periods, the historical and the prehistoric. The first named is that for which we possess documentary evidence in the strict sense of the term; it begins, therefore, with the second half of the fourth century; the prehistoric period comprises all that goes before.

In introducing the present series of 'Comments' I said (*J. T. S.* x p. 447) that my writing 'must be in an informal way . . . degenerating possibly sometimes into the tone of a mere chat or gossip as the mood

<sup>1</sup> Besides these general considerations I may as well mention a point—a minute point—of detail. There is an expression in the *Acts* of 518 pertinent here: viz. *τῷ καιρῷ τῶν διπτύχων* (see Mr Brightman's extract p. 531. 4), which shews us (from a document relating to the very same scene; an expression designating a particular point of the service) a (?the) Greek phrase for the 'tempore' of the translation.

of the moment may dictate'. I now take this liberty of freedom to be expository or to lapse into the didactic, nor shall I feel any scruple at incurring the reproach of being 'autobiographical', whilst I feel bound to add that the elucidation of the early history of litanies in Christian worship involves work tedious enough and dull enough to satisfy the most exacting and conscientious disciple of Dryasdust. For it is exclusively concerned at present with the criticism of erudition or 'external criticism'. But 'let us never be tired of repeating that "external criticism" is wholly preparatory; it is a means to an end; the ideal state would be that it had already been so generally applied to the documents that are the source of [liturgical] history that we could dispense with it for the future. If it is a necessity, it is, after all, but a provisional necessity'.<sup>1</sup>

We cannot make a more convenient beginning than with Mr Brightman's remark in regard to the concluding portion of my 'Observation IV' (on mass-litanies) in the Appendix to *Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*: 'I do not find this at all convincing,' he says. I must ingenuously confess to a certain surprise that any part of that 'Observation' should have been found convincing at all, for none of it was written with the idea of carrying conviction to the mind of anybody. It consists of not quite four pages (pp. 117-121), whereof the first three are devoted to exposing the *status quaestionis* in such a plain and simple way that the statement could be understood by any one without 'expert' liturgical knowledge. The concluding portion (less than a page) consists of the expression of *my opinion*, in sum, on the whole subject. I cannot here enter into details (were my words), but 'may indicate in a few words what seems to me to have been its history [i.e. of "the litanic form of prayer in the mass"] as evidenced by documents' (p. 120).

What I propose now is this:—to detail and explain what was done by me before penning that concluding portion (less than a page) of Obs. IV in *Narsai*, and what was in mind whilst it was in course of writing. If I lapse into the form of describing a programme, it is to be

<sup>1</sup> I must be excused for quoting myself, *Downside Review*, July 1899, vol. xviii p. 105. I should like to refer generally to this paper, 'Historical Critics and the Critical Art', which, derived as it is from, or inspired by, M. N. V. Langlois, seemed to me in the writing (and has seemed since in the reading) to touch on many of the things which to my mind we liturgiologists, so far as we occupy ourselves with ancient Liturgy, may very well take to heart. At the same time I would mention as full of important and fruitful hints for this particular class of *érudits* the booklet, marked by a *finesse*, lightness of touch, and grace characteristically French, of M. Paul Desjardins, *Catholicisme et Critique* (1905). This indeed is concerned with and owes its existence to the *affaire Loisy*; that is now liquidated; what specifically concerns it can be neglected, and the general observations can now be taken in the full measure of their simple instructiveness.

understood as a programme of work already done. This work had already in the spring of 1905, after going through the preliminaries of draft upon draft, reached the stage of a paper settled and completed in a form such as might appear in this JOURNAL. Still I was not content and withheld it, and reworked the whole over again in a renewed survey of the documents, taking into account every class of Greek litany, in whatsoever rite occurring, and not merely those in the mass, as well as the documentary evidence in the Latin liturgies—whatever the form, litany or prayer—the subject-matter of which is cognate with the Great Intercession of the Greek liturgies. The Greek section was taken in hand for detailed examination because it appeared, on a survey of the liturgies generally, that in it lay the key to the particular history of the mass-litany.

First of all it was necessary to fix limits of time: in the case of the Greek litanies (in which class of course the mediaeval Latin translations are included) it soon appeared that the later limit was the close of the twelfth century; in the case of the Latin documents the middle of the ninth. The litanies of two or three Greek manuscripts of the thirteenth century (among which Goar's Pyromalus, see p. 322 above) were *pro maiori cautela* added as 'extravagantes'. It then appeared (so far as the Greek section was concerned) that material supplied from some five and twenty MSS, dating from the end of the eighth century to the end of the twelfth, had to be taken into account, over and above the litanies of the Clementine Liturgy, the litanic material afforded by St Chrysostom, and the mass-litanies of the four texts of 'St James' as given by Dr Swainson.

If we take in hand the Greek material relating to mass-litanies and put aside for the moment Dr Swainson's litanies of 'St James' (the oldest MS of which, however, is not earlier than the tenth century) the point where the difficulty lies is soon apparent. For the eleventh and twelfth centuries our material is good and abundant; and we can, I think, constitute a sufficiently reliable text, even down to minutiae, of the Constantinopolitan mass-litanies then in use. Unfortunately the earliest of our MSS to which a date can be assigned is of the year 1041 (Goar's 'Cryptoferrat. Arsenii'; Dr Swainson's G 1, see his p. xxiii), from which Goar has given some readings. Any one of the MSS assigned in general terms to the 'eleventh century' may perhaps be, perhaps not be, a few years earlier. But such minutiae do not affect our difficulty, which is this: there is nothing to bridge over the chasm between the mass-litanies in the (Clementine) liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions of the later part of the fourth century and these texts of the eleventh—a gap of over six hundred years.

As mass-litanies fail us we must turn elsewhere. The Barberini

(Constantinopolitan) Euchology—a MS commonly assigned to the end of the eighth century—contains indeed no mass-litanies, but it has litanies in other rites, baptism, ordinations, &c. How many of such litanies the MS contains I do not know; but nine of them, so far as my knowledge goes, have actually appeared in print. After an examination of these texts it has appeared to me that, though they enable us to say in a few cases that this or that particular suffrage shews the same text as the eleventh-century MSS, these litanies give us no effectual help for ascertaining what was the state or form of the Constantinopolitan mass-litanies at the time when the Barberini Euchology was written.

Foiled here we turn to Western documents. The Mozarabic and the Ambrosian litanies, and the litany of the Stowe Missal entitled the 'Deprecatio S. Martini', have long engaged the attention and interest of scholars,<sup>1</sup> whose remarks on the subject, however, so far as known to me, are not of use for our present purpose. But there is a document which has hitherto (so far as my knowledge goes) been quite overlooked, but which (in combination with the *Stowe* litany) will, when duly investigated, give us precisely the help we are in search of. It comes from our own domestic, that is to say English, stores. In his *Officia per ferias* Alcuin incorporates a litany to which he gives this curious title: 'Deprecatio quam Papa Gelasius pro universa ecclesia constituit canendam esse.' The reader is at once struck by the difference of style between this 'Deprecatio' and that in *Stowe*; whilst in expression *Stowe* is simplicity itself, even to bareness, the style of Alcuin's document is rotund (though not inflated) yet grave, and distinctly aims at literary form.<sup>2</sup> Indeed the mere style itself of this latter raises some sort of presumption that Alcuin may be right in attributing his document to a Roman source. Moreover—a matter too often forgotten, on which the late Ludwig Traube has more than once insisted—in the eighth century and the earliest decades of the ninth, that is in Alcuin's days, the manuscripts in use of the Fathers and early ecclesiastical documents were quite commonly, indeed ordinarily, of the fifth and sixth century, although that great age of rescription, the Carolingian renaissance, was soon in the event to be fatal to the preservation of these ancient codices generally. Unless there be positive grounds for thinking otherwise, the presumption then would be that the actual manuscript in Alcuin's hands

<sup>1</sup> Cf., for example, for the last named the Rev. F. E. Warren *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church* pp. 251-255; Dr M<sup>c</sup>Carthy's Introduction to his edition of the *Stowe Missal* pp. 199-201; and Mgr Duchesne's *Origines* in the account of the Gallican mass, § 6.

<sup>2</sup> For instance, whilst *Stowe* has: 'Pro his qui in sancta ecclesia fructus misericordiae largiuntur', Alcuin's has: 'Pro operariis pietatis et his qui necessitatibus laborantium fraterna charitate subveniunt.'



from which he copied his litany was rather of the sixth century than of the seventh or eighth.

But the document itself contains an indication which, in my opinion, confirms Alcuin's attribution of the piece to a Roman origin, and enables us to assign that origin to a period between c. 460-470 and c. 540-550; in other words there is not merely no improbability, but there is an actual *prima facie* probability, in Alcuin's attribution of it to the time of Gelasius I (492-496). The sixteenth<sup>th</sup> suffrage reads thus:—'Pro refrigerio fidelium animarum, praecipue sanctorum Domini sacerdotum qui *huic ecclesiae* praefuerunt *catholicae*, Dominum spirituum et universae carnis Iudicem deprecemur.' Duly to illustrate this a somewhat large excursus would be necessary, and one, as I think, that would prove an interesting example of a phenomenon writ large over the broad page of history whether of Church or State: how compliments come to crystallize into formalities, and formalities are by and by clamped and worked into effective usage. I throw together a few items in a footnote,<sup>1</sup> and without thinking of elaborated development in 'proof' proceed.

<sup>1</sup> What we are concerned with is primarily mere matter of ecclesiastical etiquette. First of all it will be well to run the eye over the beginning and ending of the papal letters of A.D. 400-440 in Coustant or the delightfully handy little Schoenemann: nothing can be more simple than the official form designating (whether on his own part or on the part of others) the 'bishop of Rome'. Exactly the same impression is derived from those imperial documents derived from the *Avellana* so conveniently brought together by that veteran worker Wilhelm Meyer (now of Göttingen) in his capital appendices to the Göttingen Index Scholarum of 1898 and 1899; although here a favourite designation is 'pope of the city', quite simple. So much for the ecclesiastical and civil upper circles. The first intimation (known to me) of the complimentary change interesting us is in a document addressed to the emperors by the inferior clergy—the (? parish) priests—of Rome in favour of Boniface as their bishop in succession to the deceased Zosimus (A.D. 418): 'Post abscessum sancti Zosimi (they say), papae ecclesiae catholicae urbis Romae...' (W. Meyer's second Programme, 1898-1899, p. 18; in Coustant, he says, p. 1007; Schoenemann, p. 712). The next instance of this 'style' that I have come across is the signature of an underling again, one Siricius, a notary, in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus (431), who, instead of using the form common in the Acts for Roman clerics, viz. τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καθέδρας, subscribes himself as τῆς ἀγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας πόλεως Ῥωμαίων (Harduin *Concil.* i coll. 1466, 1468). At the Council of Chalcedon (451) this form is used by the representatives of the Pope themselves (*ibid.* col. 1799; cf. ii 465, 467). The first case in which I find the style formally adopted (unless I have overlooked it in too summary a glance at Leo's letters which have not been gone through by me formally for the present purpose) and specially used by the Pope for his signature to and approval of a solemn and official act—a *Constitutum*—is the Roman Council under Hilary in 465: 'Hilarus episcopus ecclesiae catholicae urbis Romae' (Harduin ii 799); by the time of Vigilius (middle of the sixth century) the word 'sanctae' is added to the formula (Harduin iii col. 46, cf. col. 8); cf. Pelagius II, *ibid.* col. 414). Gregory the Great in 594 (see de Rozière's edition of the *Liber diurnus* p. 15) fixed the form

The next step—with the body of Greek litany texts before me—was to investigate the source of these two Latin litanies, to see if it is possible to identify, 'fix', the documents which their compilers actually used, and attempt an answer to questions like these:—Whence did they derive their models? Was it from Constantinople? Was it from Jerusalem? or from both? or from elsewhere? This, of course, was the most troublesome, the nicest, part of the whole enquiry; and on the justness of its conduct the value for practical purposes of all depends. This was the point to which the article above mentioned as ready prepared for this JOURNAL in the spring of 1905 was directed. But at this date, now six years later, I confess to looking rather ruefully at this special 'investigation' again; and wonder who would care for it, who would endure it? Frankly, I think it fairly well complies with the requirements of that critical, yet detached, and eminently non-specialist observer already quoted, M. Paul Desjardins, where he speaks (as of an acquirement particularly desirable for at least some 'jeunes clercs' in these days) of 'le goût sévère et la constance, comment conduire honnêtement une recherche. Discipline qui n'est pas si triviale, parmi les libres penseurs non plus' (*Catholicisme et Critique* p. 101; cf. p. 19).

Here I am going to trouble no one with such 'severities', but intend only to formulate in categorical statements what is my opinion on the questions involved—mere statements of opinion, to be appreciated or depreciated, taken or left, according to individual preference.

(1) The compilers of the two Latin litanies drew their materials and inspiration from Constantinople and the mass-litanies there, not from Jerusalem or other places, or (say) from the litanies in the (Clementine) liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions.

(2) The text of the Constantinopolitan litanies which they used was in an earlier stage than that shewn by our texts of the eleventh and of subscription at: 'episcopus sanctae ecclesiae catholicae atque apostolicae urbis Romae'; see this form in the Acts of the Roman synod under Martin of 649 *passim*. Of course to understand the case 'historically' and estimate what was really *en jeu*, it is necessary to follow up the contemporaneous stylistic development (to, say, 520) of the archbishop of Constantinople into the Oecumenical Patriarch; and along with these two main currents which issue in serious events there are side enquiries that must not be neglected, rivulets as it were that lose themselves and disappear in the sands of the desert: the use, for instance, by commonplace and inferior bishops of the form 'bishop of the Catholic Church'; or 'holy Church'; or 'the holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of God' in such and such a place (for instance at Ephesus). Though even here we must distinguish between such sort of subscription as is found (say) in the Acts of the Conference with the Donatists in 411 and the use in the East. But all these subordinate enquiries in their results only confirm and emphasize the singularity and uniqueness of the Roman bishops' domestic official form of c. 466-540 which finds its echo in the terms of our litany: 'the bishops of *this* Catholic Church.'

twelfth centuries—a stage evidencing in some details resemblances to the litanies of the Apostolic Constitutions that had disappeared by the eleventh century.<sup>1</sup>

(3) I have no doubt whatever that the litany preserved by Alcuin is a litany compiled and written for use in the church of Rome; and I see no sound reason whatever for doubting that the title he gives to it preserves to us the name of the pope (viz. Gelasius I) under whom, and consequently the date at which (viz. 492–496), it was written.<sup>2</sup> That Gelasius prescribed the use of this litany by the ‘universal Church’ (i.e. the West), as is said in Alcuin’s title, is doubtless a fiction; but the statement has so much of truth in it that, when once on the track, we find traces (of course hitherto unnoticed as the document itself has been unused) of its use and influence in quarters so diverse, that it is certain that in Alcuin’s day the documents must have been widely known, although in his day too it was on the eve of falling into disuse and long oblivion through the growing popularity and the enlargements of the new-fashioned ‘Litany of the Saints’.

(4) Different as is the style of the two litanies—that of Alcuin and of *Stowe*—it appears that there must have been, somehow, some relation, some connexion of origin, between the two documents.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> At this point a *dubium* suggested itself, viz. is such change in the text of the Constantinopolitan mass-litanies, between, say, the end of the fifth and the eleventh century, likely or not? This doubt was most conveniently settled by the examination of a parallel case. Fortunately what we are in want of in the case of mass-litanies, namely a set of texts that represent various periods extending over three or four centuries, we possess in the litanies of the Constantinopolitan baptismal office: in regard to these latter we can account for the time from the end of the eighth century to the twelfth. Investigation of these texts is the subject of another excursus; with a result that is certain; namely, that in the course of that period the baptismal litanies were undergoing a process of modification without losing, however, their original and native character and substance generally. We may then readily allow that, in the long period for which we have no evidence as to the text of the Constantinopolitan mass-litanies, the same sort of process of change was going on.

<sup>2</sup> All liturgists are familiar with Mgr Duchesne’s theory according to which the attribution of liturgical documents (specifically the Sacramentary) to Gelasius I is a mere ninth-century school dogma; that is, a school-theory, an invention of the doctors and teachers of that age. (The English translation (1st ed.) has it that the Gelasian Sacramentary was ‘a subject of teaching in the schools’.) But this is no more than an example, of which I find not a few in the very brilliant and instructive *Origines*, of Mgr Duchesne’s insufficiency of detailed knowledge in more obscure or difficult matters, and, it may be added, his somewhat undue readiness in affirmation.

<sup>3</sup> This will appear, I think, from the following considerations:—

(a) Mgr Duchesne has already pointed out that the first suffrage and response of the *Stowe* litany (and the same is to be said of the simpler form in Alcuin’s) are the same as those of the litany said at Constantinople between the Gospel and the Dismissal of Catechumens (Br. 373).

(b) The same response (ἐπάκουσον καὶ ἐλέησον—‘exaudi et miserere’) is used for

(5) My next observation is cautionary; but it needs a rather tedious proem. In a dissertation printed nearly a dozen years ago (*Downside Review*, Dec. 1899, March 1900; and in a separate print) I pointed out that (so it seems to me) the litany response 'Kyrie eleison' was introduced into the European West first in Rome in the second half of the fifth century, and thence early in the sixth into Gaul, &c. I pointed out too how what is now the simple 'Kyrie eleison', &c., of the mass was, in the time of St Gregory the Great and at least on high days, merely the response to suffrages of the same type as those in the present Greek mass-litanies. Finally, adducing two parallel passages, one from the 'Gelasian' Sacramentary, the other from the Rule of St Benedict, I pointed out (*Kyrie eleison*, separate print, p. 21) how it would be 'unsafe' to conclude from St Gregory's famous letter to John of Syracuse that it was Gregory himself who at the end of the sixth century first introduced the Kyrie into the Roman mass. To all this I now add the following:—that in my opinion (as a dozen years ago, so too now) not only the simple 'Kyrie eleison', but suffrages also of the type of those in Greek mass-litanies, were in use in the Roman mass a century (more or less) before Gregory's time; and that when in his Rule St Benedict speaks of 'the *supplication* of the litany, *that is* "Kyrie eleison"', he has in mind just the same phenomenon, familiar to him in his boyhood days in Rome, as that *visé* by the writer of the rubric in the 'Gelasian' Sacramentary when he says:—'the "Kyrie eleison" *with* the litany'; and that both writers knew what they were speaking of.

the greater part of both Latin litanies (in *Stowe* 12 out of 16 suffrages; Alcuin 17 out of 21), although in the Greek litanies from which the suffrages themselves are derived the response may be only *κύριε ἐλέησον*.

(c) The concluding suffrages (13-15 of *Stowe*; 17-20 of Alcuin) both have the response of the Constantinopolitan litany after the Great Entrance: *παράσχου κύριε*; but in this form: 'Praesta, Domine, praesta.'

(d) Moreover, allowance being made for a slight inversion in disposition (suffrages 9 and 10 of Alc. = suffrage 10 of *Stowe*; 11 of Alc. = 9 of *St.*) where the subject-matter of the two litanies is common, both litanies present the same order and sequence in their suffrages. As to this see remark below on the Fulda text.

When these peculiarities are taken together, and it is further observed that (so far at least as my knowledge goes) they are found in combination in these two documents only, it seems clear that all this cannot be merely a matter of accident.

I have to add here that for the confrontation of the two Latin litanies with their Greek originals, and due comparison with each other, I have found it desirable to utilize for the constitution of the *Stowe* text G. Witzel's text of the same litany (taken by him from a now lost Fulda MS), and for Alcuin's to take account of some variant readings supplied by documents which (as stated above under (3)) I find or consider to have utilized it. In my opinion (and this was Dr McCarthy's view) Witzel's (Fulda) text is more generally correct or genuine than that in the missal; indeed the presumption is that the lost Fulda MS would be older than our extant MS of the missal.

This long proem is to lead up to a quite simple, but I hope useful, remark, viz. that whatever the 'possibilities' (*sensu largo et largissimo*) of the case, we have no ground for asserting that the suffrages of the Roman litany preserved by Alcuin were the suffrages said along with the 'Kyrie' of the mass in the time of St Gregory, or at any earlier period up to and including the pontificate of Gelasius. In a word, we *know* nothing on the subject; and in this connexion, as well as in not a few others, it is, in the present condition of liturgiological science, well to remember that if we are to seek above all for 'knowledge-knowledge', and may usefully aspire to well-grounded 'belief-knowledge', there is one thing which we shall do well to guard ourselves against to the utmost of our capacities—*per fas et nefas* it may be almost said—viz. 'make-believe-knowledge'.

(6) The paper in this JOURNAL (October 1905) entitled 'The Litany of the Saints in the Stowe Missal'<sup>1</sup> was really a piece of the general enquiry as to the early history of the Litany sketched in the present 'Comment' and in Observation IV on *Narsai*, a piece detached, as it were, from the outer fringe of the subject. What has now been said induces me to give answer, in brief form, to some of the questions asked in that article (pp. 131, 132), any suggestion as to which I said must be deferred 'until something has been done to clear up the obscurities of the earliest history in the Western Church of that form of prayer which we call a "litany"' (p. 132).

In my opinion the two litanies of Alcuin and *Stowe* date from the late years of the fifth century or the early years of the sixth, and, as said above, I see no reasonable ground for hesitating to credit Alcuin's title in so far as it attributes (or seems to attribute) the origin of the Roman document to the pontificate of Gelasius I; on the point of anteriority, if I must make a choice between the two documents, I should say that this 'Gelasian' document is the earlier of the two, and just as the 'Kyrie' spread from Rome to Gaul so too this 'Gelasian' litany—this 'Deprecatio Gelasii'—gave the hint, and the idea of the general framework, on which a Gallican imitator (who kept, however, both as regards selection and use of material, his own freedom and individuality) fashioned the *Stowe* 'Deprecatio S. Martini'; and probably the compilation of the two falls within a very few years, 10, 20, 30, of one another.

(7) Finally, in my opinion these two documents are—whether for

<sup>1</sup> On looking over it again I see that it is 'stiff reading'; thirty pages, with *inter alia* a full print of texts, would have been better than fifteen. Since it was written I have obtained an actual text of 'the Gallic, the Italian, and the Roman' litanies (see p. 133 of that number); and they form, be it said in passing, just the text for quite a pretty introduction giving the 'origins' of that form of high liturgical compliment commonly called the 'Laudes', but by some 'the litany of Hincmar'.

mass or other service—the *beginning* in the European West of the ‘lity’, i.e. in the usual sense in which we employ the word for formulae like the litanies of the Greek liturgies, the lity of the Saints, Luther’s lity, the lity in the Book of Common Prayer, &c. But this remark brings me up straight, and face to face with the ‘pre-historic period’ (see p. 404 above), and the *κοινὰ εὐχαί* of Justin Martyr. The consideration of this subject must, however, be reserved for a later continuation of this Note.

EDMUND BISHOP.

### ‘TRANSFORMARE’ AND ‘TRANSFORMATIO’.

DR FELTOE, in his recent ‘Study of some Eucharistic Phrases in the West’ (*J. T. S.* xi 575–579), cites the following words from a blessing in the *Ordinatio Presbyteri* of the so-called *Missale Francorum*, ‘ut . . . [per obsequium plebis tuae] corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformet’ (Mur. ii 668 and Migne *S. L.* lxxii 323 A); and, comparing them with the ‘ut . . . [in obsequium plebis tuae] panem et unum in corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformet’ of the present Roman pontifical, gives it as his opinion that—except for words in each which I therefore enclose with square brackets—the two passages are substantially identical, and that there is ‘no difficulty as to the meaning originally intended’, the meaning, that is to say, of ‘corpus et sanguinem transformare’. In other words, he equates the two phrases ‘corpus et sanguinem transformare’ and ‘panem et unum in corpus et sanguinem transformare’. I think that Dr Feltoe is mistaken, because, inasmuch as the Person of our Divine Lord is the subject-matter of *transformatio* in the earlier passage, while bread and wine are the subject-matter of *transformatio* in the later, I suspect that the verb *transformare* had not the same grammatical sense and was not intended to connote the same theological idea in the one phrase as in the other. I also think that he is in error in his interpretation of the words ‘per obsequium plebis tuae’.

The document which contains the older and shorter of the two phrases, though known by the name of *Missale Francorum* is, as to its first half, a sacramentary and, as to its second, a missal; and there is good reason for believing (i) that, as now known to us, the former moiety is the resultant of numerous amplifications which, from time to time in the course of fully a hundred years, had accrued to a nucleus of Roman origins; (ii) that the literary history of this moiety resolves itself into three stages, the first Roman, the second Gallo-Roman, the third