

THE
CHURCHMAN

FEBRUARY, 1904.

ART. I.—THE EASTWARD POSITION: A ROMAN
INNOVATION IN SPAIN.

IN the January CHURCHMAN Canon Meyrick wrote: "The eastward position at the celebration of the Holy Communion was unknown in Spain till the eleventh century." This statement, when repeated, usually excites surprise, and appeal is made to the very striking rubric in the Migne edition of the Mozarabic Missal—a rubric textually reprinted from the original (in more senses than one) rubric in the Ximenes Missal of 1500: "In ista Missa et in aliis non vertitur sacerdos ad populum, nisi quando dixerit. Adjuvate me fratres in orationibus vestris."¹ "It is impossible," say the critics, "that the eastward position should be unknown in Spain when the old service-book so strongly emphasizes the position as the only one adopted. In the Roman Mass the priest turns six times to the people, in the Spanish only once."

Pamelius (1571) is even stronger, for he says in the Mozarabic Mass there is "nulla conversio Sacerdotis ad populum. Quamdiu sacris operatur numquam se convertit ad populum."² Further confirmation of this view may be found in a manuscript volume, which I carefully read, in the National Library, Madrid. Its author is Francisco de Pisa, Chaplain of the Mozarabians in Toledo. In 1593 he wrote and published "Cum Permissu Superiorum," a compendium giving an account of the Mozarabic Mass. The work does not exist in the

¹ Ed. Migne, p. 120.

² Pamelius, "Liturg. Eccl. Lat.," vol. i., pp. 642, 643.

library in book form, but the manuscript is exceptionally valuable, as it gives the earliest account, in Spanish, of the origin of the service-book, and the position of the writer ought to make his testimony at once important and interesting. He states : "The priest does not turn his face to the people in all the Mass. Not even when he says 'adjuvate me fratres in orationibus vestris' is he accustomed to turn, although in this particular the Mass permits him ; before this his face is always turned to the altar, in order not to lose sight of it." If this alone were the evidence forthcoming, it would at once be concluded that the CHURCHMAN article was in error, and that, so far from its having been primitive Spanish custom to ignore the eastward position, no Church more consistently maintained it at the altar.

A careful scrutiny of the rubric and the two commentaries awakens suspicion, for it is seen that the Toledan priest asserts that a change had been deliberately made between 1500 and 1593, and in addition remarks : "Some wish to say that the custom of not turning to the people originated from the fact that anciently the altars were so arranged that the people came to be before the priest, where the reredoses (*retablos*) now are, as is the case to-day with the altar de prima in the choir of this holy church." This paper will show that the *obiter dictum* of the chaplain is a statement of fact, and that the development from 1500 to 1593 is simply the natural result of a perversion of history stereotyped by the Ximenes Service-Book of 1500. It will be proved that the old manuscripts differed from the printed editions of Roman Catholic editors, and that as the primitive Liturgy came from the East—the cradle of the faith—it preserved the Eastern custom of the westward position, and that even in the Roman Church of to-day the influence of primitive Spanish custom is to be seen in Spanish-founded churches.

The Mozarabic Missal, called by patriot writers a "column and cement of the faith," was the service-book of the National Spanish Church, which existed in complete independence of Rome until the close of the eleventh century. It is so called in consequence of its use by the Mozarabs,¹ or Christians, who lived under the protection of the Moors. The Spanish Moors, unlike their modern co-religionists, practised religious toleration, and from the time the country was fairly settled "a Christian Spaniard not only enjoyed personal liberty, but he attended the public administration of his own priests."² According to all liturgiologists, it is closely allied to the

¹ Mozarab is a participial form of the verb root *arb*, signifying one who has become Arabized (Burke, "Hist. of Spain," vol. i., p. 115 n.).

² Burke, *op. cit.*, vol. i. p. 118.

Ambrosian (Milan) and Gallican uses, and is undoubtedly of Oriental origin, coming from Ephesus through Lyons (according to some) or through Milan (according to others) to Spain.¹ It is unnecessary to decide whether Lyons or Milan be the channel of the transmission of the Liturgy, as the contending schools unite in an unquestioning belief in its Oriental origin. It was introduced into the West in the fourth century,² and naturally would preserve the customs of the land from whence it came. St. Isidore, the great seventh-century Bishop of Seville, considerably enlarged the Liturgy,³ and students of its evolution are inclined to lay great stress on his influence. It was known as his Liturgy, and even to-day it is indifferently called Gothic, Isidoran, and Mozarabic.

Rome never tolerated with gladness independent national uses. Under Pepin the Short (as seen in a Charlemagne decree of 789) Gaul surrendered her Liturgy, and very little of the use remains.⁴ Gregory VII.—the great Hildebrand—determined that the time had come for the Church in Spain “to emerge from infancy and to pass to perfect age.”⁵ In the tenth century the Spanish Service-Book and Breviary had been declared by a Pope and Council, after examination, to contain nothing to be condemned, censured, or altered.⁶ In the following century Gregory wrote to a Bishop of his own name, calling the supporters of the Spanish use “wolves and poisoners.” He recommended their persecution, even to the shedding of blood, in order that the books might be abolished and the Roman books substituted.⁷ He gained his end in 1085, when the Council of Burgos ordered the abolition of the Mozarabic Books, and the measure was completed in 1094 by the substitution of Latin for Gothic characters. It at once follows that if manuscripts survive written in Gothic characters, their date must be placed before the close of the eleventh century, for after that period no copyist would copy in any other letter than Latin.

By special grace the old rite was permitted to be retained in six Toledo churches,⁸ and the priests who said the national Mass were men accustomed to say the Roman Mass. After a time the custom became almost obsolete. At the close of the fifteenth century Cardinal Ximenes regretted the decay, and

¹ Duchesne, “Christian Worship” (S.P.C.K.), pp. 90-95.

² *Ibid.*, p. 90.

³ Meyrick, “The Church in Spain,” p. 342; Burriel, MS.

⁴ Duchesne, p. 103.

⁵ Guéranger, “Institutions Liturgiques,” vol. i. p. 268.

⁶ Meyrick, *op. cit.*, p. 344.

⁷ “Grande Encyclopédie,” vol. xxiv. (Vollet), and Guéranger, vol. i., pp. 268-278.

⁸ Meyrick, p. 349.

determined to restore the old rite and perpetuate its use by printing the manuscripts and appointing a chapel in the cathedral where Masses might be said. Ximenes entrusted the task of editing the manuscripts to Ortiz, with the result that the printed volume is an effort to reconstruct the old Liturgy in conformity with the Roman Missal.¹ From this printed book the eastward position rubric is taken, and we have to inquire, Is it taken from the manuscript, and if not, is it the record of a Spanish tradition ?

In the eighteenth century a learned and honest Jesuit scholar, Father Andres Marcos Burriel, devoted himself to the task of investigating, cataloguing, and copying the contents of the manuscript rooms of the Toledan Library. By the generosity of the venerable and erudite doyen of Spanish scholars, the Rev. Wentworth Webster, the writer possesses a valuable unpublished manuscript containing reports of Burriel dated 1752, 1754, and 1756, which give detailed accounts of the progress of his work. He narrates how he copied, and in some instances made, facsimiles of the Gothic manuscripts used by the Ximenes editor. These manuscripts date of necessity before 1094. He records that the manuscripts "differ much in substance and order" from the Ximenes volume, "which mixes some things modern and omits some things ancient." Of this there can be no doubt, for the printed volume contains Masses for the festivals of St. Francis, St. Dominic, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Anthony of Padua, and *Corpus Christi*²—festivals that arose long after the abolition of Gothic writing and the Mozarabic Missal.

Fortunately, the Madrid Library contains the manuscript volumes made by Burriel. They are clearly written, and the facsimile pages are extremely well executed. It is a pleasure to observe the care with which he carried through his work, and my detailed examination of the volumes revealed the fact that they do not contain a single rubric. The names of the Masses and Prayers are simply given, and in no instance is there one word of direction to the celebrant. This is what might have been expected in the case of manuscripts. Even the first printed Missals have scarcely any rubrics, and not until 1485 were the words and ceremonies of the Mass set out together at length.³ The Ximenes Book in 1500 followed the new plan, and rubrics were added by men who knew only the Roman use,⁴ and had perhaps some ancient traditions, more or less corrupt, to guide them in some details. This at once

¹ Meyrick, p. 349 ; *cf.* Duchesne, pp. 192-204, ed. Migne, pp. 29-40, and on a similar process in Ambrosian Liturgy, Duchesne, p. 89, Hammond, "Liturgies," p. lxxxv.

² *V.* ed. Migne.

³ "Cath. Dict.," Addis and Arnold ; art. "Rubric." ⁴ Ed. Migne, p. 12.

disposes of the value of the rubric, relied on to prove the eastward position as the traditional use of the Spanish Church.¹

The Missal is of Eastern origin, and preserves several striking Oriental peculiarities (*e.g.*, the division of the host). Scudamore in "Notitia Eucharistica" (p. 275) remarks: "Everywhere in the primitive Church, as still among the Greeks and Orientals, the seats of the Bishops and Presbyters were against the east wall, and therefore behind the altar. Hence the celebrant officiated with his face toward the people." The following facts prove the retention of this custom in the primitive Spanish Church:

1. Canon XVIII. of the fourth Council of Toledo, held in 633 under the presidency of Isidore, now a very old man, reads: "In future after the Pater Noster the Bread and Chalice shall be united (mixed), then the people blessed, and then only the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord received, and this by the celebrant and the Levites before the altar, by the Clergy in the choir, and by the people outside the choir."² The plain interpretation of this canon is that at the benediction the celebrant faced the people, for it would certainly be strange if he blessed the people with his back towards them.

2. The architectural arrangements of Spanish churches is in favour of the westward position being traditional. "The *Coro*, instead of beginning to the east of the transepts, is, like the *Chorus Cantorum* of the early basilicas, extended into the nave, and the central lantern tower is called the *Cimborio*, in memory, doubtless, of a time when it served as the *Cimborium* of the high altar now placed in the elongated choir, or, as it is called by the Spaniards, *Capilla Mayor*."³ In the old cathedral of Salamanca, dating from the eleventh century, the apse contains the altar in the middle, with seats all round for the clergy.

3. Cardinal Lorenzana, known in Spain as "the great and good Cardinal," took a deep interest in the rite, and in 1770 published in Los Angeles, Mexico, an edition of the Mass *Omnium Offerentium* with the title "Missa Gothica." The Mass contains a number of prayers which I could not find in the Madrid manuscripts. At the close of these prayers the rubric reads: "Quo facto dat bene dictionem in unitate Sancti Spiritus (vertat se ad populum dicendo Benedicat vos

¹ For a discussion of the character of the printed rubrics, see Migne, pp. 29-40.

² Hefele, "Councils," vol. iv., p. 451.

³ "Dict. Eccl. Antiq.," art. "Church," vol. i., p. 384.

Pater et Filius."¹ In his Commentary the Cardinal, discussing the non-turning of the priest to the people, says: "It is permissible to remark that only in this benediction and in the offertory, when the priest goes somewhat away from the altar, the priest turns himself to the people in the Mozarabic Mass. The principal reason of this is the antiquity of the Mozarabic rite, for in the first ages of the Church the altar was placed towards the faithful and the priest looked at the people, wherefore it was not necessary for him to turn when he saluted, as it is necessary to-day, for the people stand behind."² Lorenzana built a special Mozarabic Chapel in Toledo Cathedral, where I heard the Mass; but he did not place the altar at some distance from the east wall. In this he failed to preserve the old custom, for even now in the sister rite of Milan the altar stands at a distance from the east wall, and is censed all round by a deacon.³

4. In the edition of the Mozarabic Missal used in the Mozarabic Chapel, Salamanca, we have additional evidence. Its editor is Francisco J. Hernandez de Viesain, who was Chaplain in 1772. In the course of his Spanish commentary he translates with approval Lorenzana's remarks, and thus shows his acceptance of their meaning.

5. A most striking and unexpected confirmation of this early custom has been brought to our notice by the Rev. W. Webster, who is as ready to give help as he is indefatigable in his efforts to elucidate truth. South America was discovered and colonized by Spain. Its churches were founded and ministered to by Spaniards full of the enthusiasm of the Golden Age of Spain, and to this day the ancient custom of consecrating facing the people is preserved in some of the churches. Not only is it preserved, but in the report (p. 876) of the Latin American Congress held in Rome in 1899 we find Papal permission for the continuance of the custom.

From this short investigation it can be concluded that the East is the source of the Spanish Service-Book; that Spanish Churchmen before the subjection to Rome in 1085 preserved the primitive westward position at the consecration of the elements; and that in churches founded by Spaniards the custom still exists, although the founders of the churches were subject to Rome. Thus the appeal to antiquity confirms the statement of the historian of the Spanish Church, and once more proves that what is Roman is not of necessity Catholic, but is merely a local development, forced, it may be, on an unwilling people to further centralized domination at the expense of doctrinal truth and national freedom.

¹ Lorenzana, "Missa Gothica," p. 68.

² *Ibid.*, p. 132.

³ Webb, "Continental Ecclesiology," p. 204.

[Additional authority for the position of the officiating priest in primitive times is to be found in Bingham, "Eccles. Antiq.," vol. iii., pp. 89, 90; Fleury "Mœurs des Chrétiens," p. 150; Guéranger, *op. cit.*, vol. i., p. 31; Webb's "Continental Ecclesiology," pp. 204, 302, 303, 480, 485; cf. Mivart, "Essays and Criticisms," vol. i., pp. 192, 195.]

THOS. J. PULVERTAFT.

ART. II.—PRESENT-DAY PREACHING IN THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

DURING the last few years the attention of the public has been called from time to time in the newspaper press to the question of preaching in the Church of England. The subject was selected as part of the programme of the Folkestone Church Congress, and was ably dealt with by Canon Twells, the Deans of Norwich and Rochester, Mr. Justice Grantham, and other speakers. We shall agree with the opening words of Canon Twells: "The efficacy of preaching in the Church of England is not what it ought to be, not what it might be"—and we shall each one echo his aspiration—"not what I hope and believe it ere long will be." I shall not waste moments by speaking of the attitude of the laity of the present day as listeners to sermons. Mr. Justice Grantham, in his speech at Folkestone, said he "believed that the laity listened as well, if not better, than they did years ago, if sermons were good." Canon Twells, on the other hand, expressed his "decided opinion that, while the average standard of preaching has materially improved of late years, the habit of listening has materially deteriorated." One thing is apparent, viz., that the times are changed since the sainted Henry Venn wrote to a friend: "On Sundays I am still enabled to speak six hours at three different times."

I purpose in this paper to state what I believe to be some of the reasons why present-day sermons are not what they ought to be: then, with bated breath, and with fear of disapproval if the cap should happen to fit the head of any reverend brother, speak of some of the faults of preachers; and, lastly, indicate some remedies for the improvement and development of present-day sermons.

I. WHY ARE SERMONS, SPEAKING GENERALLY, NOT WHAT
THEY OUGHT TO BE?

I do not think that any clerical reader will contest the statement involved in the question. Bishop Barry, in a