

**THE  
EVANGELICAL  
QUARTERLY**

*A Theological Review, International in Scope and Outlook, in Defence  
of the Historic Christian Faith*

**Editor: I. Howard Marshall**

**Vol. LVI No. 3 July, 1984 ISSN 0014-3367**

# The Daily and Weekly Worship of the Primitive Church: Part II by Roger T. Beckwith

*In the first part of his article, published in the April issue of THE EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY, Mr. Beckwith investigated in detail the character of Jewish worship in the first century. In this second part he now investigates the nature of early Christian worship with special reference to its Jewish background.*

### III. THE TRANSITION FROM JEWISH WORSHIP TO CHRISTIAN

Having attempted to trace with as much accuracy as possible the state of Jewish worship in the New Testament period, and to avoid the mistakes often made on this subject even by responsible writers, we are in some position to trace the points of continuity and discontinuity with early Christian worship, though this also is less fully attested than one would wish, and is likewise subject to strange misrepresentations.<sup>38</sup> We are trying to see Jewish and Christian worship as a whole, with their natural points of contact, and will aim to avoid the practice of basing claims of dependence on vague and scattered similarities, or of 'augmenting' our knowledge by wild speculation about what is implied in the imagery of the Fourth Gospel or in the account of the heavenly worship (modelled on that of the Temple, not of the Christian congregation) given by the book of Revelation. Even careful and detailed studies, such as Cesare Giraud's *La struttura letteraria della preghiera eucaristica* (Analecta Biblica 92, Rome, Biblical Institute, 1981) remain less than convincing if they concentrate simply on the very general similarities of form between Jewish prayers and Christian, and do not ponder the occasions on which they were used and the manner of their use.

The centres of worship for Jewish Christians before A.D. 70 were the same as those for other Jews, namely, the Temple, the synagogue and the home. Since, as we have seen, the Jewish Christians attempted to maintain the ordinances of Judaism alongside their Christian counterparts, they doubtless observed the Jewish pattern of worship on weekdays and sabbaths, and on the annual festivals of Judaism as well, and did it in much the same way as other Jews, except where there were Christian truths to witness to. We see traces of this continuance of Jewish observances in Peter and John's visit to the Temple for the afternoon hour

139

---

<sup>38</sup> Few writers on early Christian worship, sadly, have any proficiency in Jewish studies. Even those who do can make extraordinary mistakes, for example, C. W. Dugmore, who holds that Jews and Christians alike held daily services from New Testament times onward, and that the Hagiographa were read in the synagogue (*The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office, ut supra*, 14, 111 etc.). Conversely, Jewish writers tend to know little of Christian worship: the most distinguished exception, probably, Eric Werner, shows too little discrimination in the use of Jewish evidence gathered from different ages as illustrative of early Christian practice.

of prayer, in Paul's agreement to offer the sacrifice for Jewish Christians who are accomplishing a vow, and in his permission to Jewish Christians to keep Jewish holy days (Acts 3:1; 21:23-26; Rom. 14:5). As long as Jewish Christians were not expelled from the synagogues, and the Temple was still standing, this doubtless remained the custom; and even when they *were* expelled from the synagogues, it was perfectly possible for them to form Christian synagogues, in much the same way as other groupings of Jews did (Acts 6:9). Their Christian allegiance, however, did not allow them to be content with Jewish worship alone. Their daily visits to the Temple became occasions of evangelistic preaching as well as prayer (Acts 2:46-3:26; 5:42); no doubt the same happened in the synagogue on the sabbath; and to the ordinary observances of the home there was added teaching and the breaking of bread (Acts 2:42, 46; 5:42), augmented, very likely, by various charismatic ministries. Because of the prevailing poverty of the Jerusalem church (Rom. 15:26; Gal. 2:10), which was probably due in part to the high cost of living in Jerusalem,<sup>39</sup> and which caused it special distress in times of world-wide famine (Acts 11:28-30), a high degree of community of goods and especially of food was observed there (Acts 4:32-5:11; 6:1f.), not unlike that practised by the Essenes, who had colonies in many of the cities of Judaea.<sup>40</sup> This was the rather unusual background of the daily agapes-cum-eucharists which the Jerusalem church seems to have held (Acts 2:42, 46), and which were held only weekly in churches less severely afflicted by poverty (Acts 20:7; cp. 1 Cor. 11:7-22); though in both cases the agape took the place of the festal meal at which the eucharist was instituted, and gave the eucharist its own much greater frequency. As the meals were held daily at Jerusalem, they would of course be held on the first day of the week as well as the seventh; and since it is probable that the observance of Sunday originated among the Jewish Christians of Palestine,<sup>41</sup> Christian worship as a whole on that day was probably modelled, from the outset, on sabbath-day worship, though without Additional Prayer (corresponding to the sabbath-day sacrifice exclusively), and using the house-church rather than the synagogue as the meeting place for the other three services. Some confirmation of this is provided by the Christian Tephillah preserved in a fourth-century Syrian compilation, *Apostolic Constitu-*

<sup>39</sup> See Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, *ut supra.*, 120-23.

<sup>40</sup> See Philo, *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 85-87; *Hypothetica* 11:1, 10-13; Josephus, *War* 2:124-27.

<sup>41</sup> See *This is the Day*, *ut supra.* 31-35. Note especially the Jewish name for Sunday in Acts 20:7; 1 Cor. 16:2; its implied connection with the Jewish week; the other name given to it by the *Didache*, in an Aramaic form; and the observance of Sunday by the less heretical party among the Ebionites.

tions 7:33-38. The Tephillah is in the sabbath-day form, but adapted for use on Sunday; that is to say, it consists of the first three and last three of the eighteen benedictions (though the very last is for some reason omitted), each with its proper theme, but applied in a Christian way; the third duly includes the Kedushah response, and in the authentic Jewish form, according to which Is. 6:3 is followed by Ezk. 3:12; while the middle twelve benedictions are replaced, as is customary on the sabbath, by the sabbath benediction, which here does not only speak of the meaning and value of the sabbath, but goes on to speak of the still greater excellence of the Lord's Day.<sup>42</sup> The other important passage of Scripture in the Jewish Tephillah, the Aaronic blessing, is omitted from this Christian form along with the related last benediction; but elsewhere in the work, at *Apostolic Constitutions* 2:57, it is used in a position parallel to the Jewish, at the end of the old eucharistic intercession.

An alternative approach to the Tephillah was to use in its place Jesus's tephillah, the Lord's Prayer. This is what we find in *Didache* 8, where Christians are directed to say the Lord's Prayer three times each day (just as Jews did in the case of the Tephillah). Originally, perhaps, both were said, in accordance with the Jewish-Christian practice of adding Christian observances to Jewish, and hence the Tephillah in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, at which we have been looking; but the *Didache*, though it originated in Palestine or Syria, and probably before A.D. 100, reflects in the very same section the growing antagonism towards the Jews, requiring Christian fast days to be substituted for those of the 'hypocrites'. In a similar way, it substitutes the Lord's Prayer for the Tephillah, and maintains the Lord's Day without mention of the sabbath. No doubt the Lord's Prayer was said individually at the three hours of prayer on weekdays, and corporately on the Lord's Day. Surprisingly, however, the Lord's Prayer does not appear in Christian liturgical texts until a late date. It is not at first found either in the daily offices or in the eucharist. Even today, it is not regularly included in the main Roman offices of morning and evening, Lauds and Vespers (though it is in Terce, Sext and None), and the late date of its introduction into the East Syrian (Nestorian) morning

---

<sup>42</sup> Attention was directed to this Christianized Tephillah by Kaufman Kohler (among others) in his article 'The Origin and Composition of the Eighteen Benedictions', published in 1924 and reproduced in Petuchowski's *Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy* (*ut supra*). The presence of the Kedushah in this Christian Tephillah perhaps accounts for the ancient inclusion of the Sanctus in the ante-communion of Greek liturgies: cp. Joseph Bingham, *The Antiquities of the Christian Church* (Oxford, The University Press, 1855 edn.) 14:2:3.

and evening offices is on record.<sup>43</sup> As for use at the eucharist, the Lord's Prayer is not in Hippolytus, which is admittedly not a complete text, but neither is it in the fourth-century Syrian rite (*Apostolic Constitutions*) nor Egyptian rite (Serapion), but is first mentioned in Cyril of Jerusalem's *Mystagogic Catecheses* 5:11-18 and Ambrose's *De Sacramentis* 5:4:24. So it was presumably a recent innovation. How is this to be accounted for? The likely answer lies in the problems which, as we saw, first-century Judaism was having with the three hours of prayer. These led the early Church to adopt the expedient of the Essenes and reduce the hours to two, morning and evening — a tendency no doubt accentuated by the destruction of the Temple, which removed the sacrificial rationale of Afternoon Prayer as a principal hour of prayer, and did the same for Additional Prayer on the sabbath. The Church had now two hours of prayer, observed individually on weekdays and corporately on Sunday — yet the Old Testament spoke of three daily hours of prayer, and the Church itself had been saying the Lord's Prayer three times a day. So three minor hours of prayer were developed, at the third, sixth and ninth hours, which, as Dugmore points out, were ordinary divisions of the day for worldly affairs,<sup>44</sup> and the Lord's Prayer was transferred to those hours. Tertullian (*On Prayer* 25) and Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 7:7:40) both attest the existence of these earliest three minor hours at the end of the second century, Tertullian adding that the main hours of prayer are, however, 'at the entrance of day and night'. The hours developed in time into fixed liturgical services, and we duly find the Lord's Prayer used at Terce, Sext and None, but not at Lauds nor (except on Sundays) at Vespers. However, the two main hours of prayer, at the beginning and end of the day, continued to be the two main ones, and for a long time the services of the minor hours were not used corporately except by monks.<sup>45</sup> An absence of the Lord's Prayer from corporate worship was obviously an anomaly, so in the fourth century we begin to see the Lord's Prayer being reintroduced into corporate worship, and this time not in the offices but at the heart of the eucharist.

With the destruction of the Temple and the expulsion of Jewish Christians from the synagogue, their situation became not unlike that of

---

<sup>43</sup> See Juan Mateos, *Lelya-Sapra: Essai d'interprétation des matines chaldéennes* (Rome, Pont. Inst. Orientalium Studiorum, 1959), 81-83. It was added in reaction to Monophysite criticism. The Lord's Prayer is in the present-day Matins (= Lauds) and Vespers of the Orthodox Church, but evidence for its inclusion does not appear to go back behind the Middle Ages.

<sup>44</sup> *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office*, *ut supra*, 66f. He appropriately quotes Matt. 20:3, 5 and Tertullian, *On Fasting* 10.

<sup>45</sup> See W. J. Grisbrooke, in *The Study of Liturgy*, *ut supra*, 365f.

Gentile Christians. In his Gentile mission, Paul had normally begun his work at the synagogue, and tried to build the church round a Jewish nucleus (Acts 9:20; 13:5, 14; 14:1; 17:1f., 10, 17; 18:4, 19; 19:8), only separating the disciples when Jewish opposition forced him to (Acts 19:8f; cp. Acts 13:44-48). There too, probably, the separated Christian congregations at first regarded themselves as 'synagogues', just as the congregations in Palestine and Syria did,<sup>46</sup> and modelled their worship on what they had been used to in the synagogues, though the prevalence of Greek-speaking Gentile converts caused the original Jewish character of their worship to be more rapidly obscured. In both areas, the separated Christian congregations probably met at first in homes (Rom. 16:5; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15; Philem. 2), as they had already been doing for purely Christian purposes (Acts 2:46; 12:12), or else in borrowed halls (Acts 19:9); and then, when numbers demanded and absence of persecution permitted it, they started buying or building synagogues or churches of their own.

As for those purely Jewish observances which Jewish Christians maintained, Gentile Christians had been exempted from them almost from the outset (Acts 15:1-35); and after the destruction of the Temple Jewish Christians also, probably, discarded them at an increasing rate, as the *Didache* indicates.

143

#### THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY OF THE WORD

Since the Tephillah has left its traces on Christian worship, one would certainly expect the more ancient Shema to have done the same. So indeed it has, but the evidence is disputed, and can more satisfactorily be presented later, after other relevant evidence has been surveyed. Another reasonable expectation is that the Scriptures would be read and expounded at the Sunday morning service, as at the sabbath morning service in the synagogue; and few practices of the early Church are in fact better attested than this. The earliest witness to it is Justin Martyr at Rome in the mid-second century, who says that at the Sunday morning ante-communion

'the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things' (*First Apology* 67).

Here Christian Scriptures can be read as an alternative to Jewish. In

---

<sup>46</sup> See *Shepherd of Hermas* (Mandate 11), and Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 63, written at Rome and Ephesus respectively. For the use of the term by Christians in Palestine and Syria, cp. Jam. 2:2; Ignatius, *To Polycarp* 4; Theophilus, *To Autolycus* 2:14.

144 Syria, however, they were treated as additional: in *Apostolic Constitutions* 2:57 there are two readings from the Old Testament at this service, and two, apparently, from the New, the Psalms of David being sung between the Testaments; and after all the lections, a series of sermons follows. As in Judaism, evidently, the morning service was no short one! The closest parallel of all to Jewish practice is provided by the East Syrian (Nestorian) liturgy, where the two Old Testament readings are normally (and especially on Sundays) a reading from the Pentateuch and a reading from the Prophets.<sup>47</sup> It is true that the 'prophetic' reading is occasionally taken from the Hagiographa, but this is because the Syrian and Palestinian Church, as far back as records go, was impelled, by the important testimony to Christ found in books like Psalms, Job, Proverbs and Daniel, to modify drastically the Jewish rule against the liturgical reading of the Hagiographa.<sup>48</sup> The Psalms were sung, not just read, but they too were used more freely by the early Church than in the synagogue, where it appears that only the Hallel (Pss. 113-118) was used, and this only on festivals (Mishnah Sukkah 3:9-11, Rosh ha-Shanah 4:7); whereas in the above passage from the *Apostolic Constitutions* we see Psalms being used every Sunday, and the practice may go back to New Testament times (1 Cor. 14:26; Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16). It was hardly influenced, however, by the use of the Hallel at the Passover meal (Mk. 14:26; Mishnah Pesahim 10:5-7), since this was only a festal usage once a year. Moreover, Psalms were used, as we shall see, at the agape. The whole Psalter was also to be recited, ultimately, in the daily offices, through monastic influence; and this too goes back to tenuous Jewish beginnings. For the fixed use of Pss. 148-150 at the old Roman Lauds, which is also found in Nestorian and Orthodox Matins, appears to be connected with a Jewish practice mentioned by Rabbi Jose in the Babylonian Talmud (Shabbath 118b) of saying the last six Psalms every day. This was a devotion of pious individuals which, having been brought into the Christian Church, was eventually given liturgical form in the daily morning office, both among Jews and among Christians.<sup>49</sup>

The teaching office in the local Christian congregation was assigned to men who bore the same title as the teachers in the synagogue, that of

---

<sup>47</sup> See A. J. Maclean, *East Syrian Daily Offices* (London, Rivington, Percival & Co., 1894), 264-281.

<sup>48</sup> See *Apostolic Constitutions* 2:57; F. C. Burkitt, 'The Early Syriac Lectionary System', in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 10, 1921-23, 301-338; and, for evidence from Palestine, Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses* 4:35; Athanasius Renoux, ed., *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121* (Patrologia Orientalis 35, 36).

<sup>49</sup> See Anton Baumstark, *Comparative Liturgy* (English translation, London, Mowbray, 1958), 37f. Baumstark's account is somewhat speculative, however.

'elder' (Gk. *presbuteros*), and who have borne it ever since. The 'elders' of Acts 20:28; 1 Tim. 5:17; Tit. 1:9, have teaching responsibilities (like those of the Jewish 'elders' in Philo, *Hypothetica* 7:13), as well as the responsibility of ruling *i.e.*, of pastoral oversight. They are not simply called by God but outwardly appointed (Acts 14:23; Tit. 1:5), apparently by the laying-on of hands (Acts 6:6; 1 Tim. 4:14; 5:22; 2 Tim. 1:6), which was also the original Jewish mode of appointment (Tosephta Sanhedrin 1:1). The abundance of spiritual gifts in the early Church meant that the congregational participation practised in the synagogue was maintained and indeed excelled: in 1 Cor. 14, not only is the congregational Amen mentioned, but many lay Christians are found helping to lead the service — in Paul's eyes *too* many, it may be, for the service lacks 'decency' and 'order'. The tendency to institutionalization, as well as the proper requirement of order, was destined to check this every-member ministry, and by the end of the second century we find Tertullian attributing priestly titles to the ordained ministry, which acted as a further check (*On Prescription* 41; *On the Veiling of Virgins* 9). The subject of the Christian ministry cannot, of course, be carried further here.

#### THE ORIGIN OF THE SUNDAY EUCHARIST

The background of the eucharist, as virtually all the great Christian students of Judaism maintain (Edersheim, Dalman, Strack-Billerbeck and the rest), and as Jeremias has maintained at length most recently,<sup>50</sup> was the Passover meal. It is impossible and unnecessary to rehearse all the arguments here. Suffice it to say that the Synoptic Gospels teach this, and that the main evidence to the contrary is Jn. 18:28. The independent historical value of the Fourth Gospel has been increasingly stressed by modern New Testament study, but this does not necessarily imply an ignorance, in its writer, of the synoptic tradition; and if, on the contrary, the writer assumes a knowledge of the synoptic tradition, this would probably make it possible for him to use the phrase 'eat the passover' in the broad sense suggested by Deut. 16:2f., as referring to all the feasting of the week of Unleavened Bread, without fear of being misunderstood. How the events of the Last Supper fit into the pattern of the Passover meal as set out in the Mishnah (Pesahim 10) is very lucidly explained by Strack-

---

<sup>50</sup> In *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (ut supra)*.

Billerbeck.<sup>51</sup> The only significant discrepancy is that Jesus seems to have interpreted the items on the Passover table at various points in the meal, as they came into use, not all together, and without being prompted by the son of the household's questions; but even in the time of the Mishnah the form of the interpretation was not fixed (Pesahim 10:5), and the absence of the questions is probably simply due to the absence of children, whose presence may not have been normal up to A.D. 70, when the celebration still involved a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.<sup>52</sup>

It is important to realize that, at the Last Supper, the eucharist was in two parts (the first 'as they were eating', Mt. 26:26; Mk. 14:22, and the second 'after supper', Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25), and that the two were integral to the Passover meal. The breaking of the bread, with its grace, and the Common Grace over the third cup ('the cup of the blessing'), would have been there anyway, and so would the accompanying acts of taking and distributing: such acts are regularly found in accounts of Jewish meals at this period, examples being the miraculous feedings in the gospels (Mk. 6:41; 8:6f.), the meal just before Paul's shipwreck (Acts 27:35) and the Passover meal as described in the Mishnah (Pesahim 10). Even interpretative words would have been used at the Passover meal: what was new was that in connection with the bread and the third cup Jesus gave an entirely unconventional interpretation, concerned with his own sacrificial death, and in each case commanded that what he had said and done in relation to that particular item of the meal should be repeated (Lk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24f.). At first, what he had instituted was repeated as two parts of a large meal — the agape or 'love feast' which, evidently for the benefit of the poorer Christians at Jerusalem and elsewhere (cp. 1 Cor. 11:17-22), took the place of the Passover meal, but was held daily or weekly, not annually. The eucharist was quite early separated from the agape, perhaps because the latter became an occasion not of love but of selfishness and strife, as at Corinth; but they are still combined in I Cor. 11, in *Didache* 9f. (as the phrase 'after you are satisfied' indicates) and in *Epistle of the Apostles* 15 (probably an Egyptian text). This

146

<sup>51</sup> *Kommentar, ut supra*, excursus 4, 'Das Passahmahl'. David Daube's contention that the Passover meal must have been rearranged after the time of the Mishnah, since the questions and answers about its meaning would not naturally come until towards the end of the meal (*The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, London, Athlone Press, 1956, 186-195), is hardly convincing. Since the questions and answers all relate to items of food, they would be appropriate as soon as the table was laid. Equally unconvincing is D. Cohn-Sherbok's strange article 'A Jewish Note on ΤΟ ΠΙΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΑΣ' in *New Testament Studies*, vol. 27 (1980-81), 704-09, which confuses hymns and benedictions.

<sup>52</sup> See J. B. Segal, *The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70* (London, O.U.P., 1963), 254, 257f., etc.

takes us up to about A.D. 125. There has been much discussion, largely pointless, on the question whether, while still combined, the eucharist follows the agape or the agape the eucharist, as if they were two different things (and on such an assumption the graces of the *Didache* have sometimes been supposed to be merely 'agape-graces'): actually, the eucharist was part, or rather two parts, of the agape — those parts in connection with which our Lord's unique interpretative words were said — and the two parts were probably often at separate points in the meal, as on the occasion of the Last Supper. Nor need they always have been at the same points. Though, at a Jewish dinner party, the breaking of the bread usually came first and the first cup of wine afterwards, there were other cups of wine later, and if there was an entrée, as at the Passover meal, the first cup of wine would precede this and so would come before the breaking of the bread.<sup>53</sup> Hence, no doubt, the first cup in the (longer) Lukan account of the Last Supper (Lk. 22:17); and hence, very likely, the reversal of the order of the bread and cup in the *Didache* (where the first cup and not the third has become the sacramental one), and the difference between the two texts of the *Epistle of the Apostles*, in one of which the agape (presumably beginning with an entrée) is mentioned before the eucharist, and in the other of which the eucharist is mentioned before the agape.

147

Since, as we saw, the Jews had their main meal of the day in the evening, it was natural for the agape to be held at this time of day, as indeed the Last Supper had been. When, in 1 Cor. 11:20, Paul calls the combined meal 'the Lord's Supper' (*kuriakon deipnon*), he is probably indicating that it was still held at this hour. Evening Prayer, observed corporately in the Gentile churches on the Lord's Day alone, since they did not observe sabbaths (Col. 2:16f.), was of course also held at this hour, and when prolonged by the unconventional addition of preaching it might postpone the meal into the night, as in Acts 20:7-12; but the Passover meal also was held after nightfall, so Paul would not have thought this anomalous.<sup>54</sup> *Didache* 14 speaks as if the combined meal is the first event of the Lord's Day, so it may be that in the Semitic circles to which the author is writing it was regularly held after nightfall, like the Passover meal, nightfall on Saturday being regarded as the beginning of Sunday. Again, when Pliny the Younger describes the Sunday worship of the Christians of Bithynia about A.D. 112 as consisting of two services,

<sup>53</sup> See Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar, ut supra*, excursus 4 and 24.

<sup>54</sup> I am assuming, on the grounds that daybreak is described as 'on the morrow' (verses 7, 11), that this service took place on the evening that ended Sunday, not on the evening that began Sunday; indeed, the author of Acts may be thinking of the day as beginning at daybreak rather than at nightfall, as he does in Acts 4:3, 23:32.

the second of them a meal (*Epistle* 10:96), he is probably speaking of a meal in the afternoon or evening, this being the time of the main meal among the Greeks and Romans, and evening being the time of the second Christian hour of worship as soon as they reduced the hours from three to two. In *Epistle of the Apostles* 15, the meal is said to be held as late as cockrow (03.00hrs.), but this is apparently a peculiarity of Eastertide, derived, according to Jeremias, from a Jewish-Christian practice of fasting during the Jewish Passover meal,<sup>55</sup> but more likely prompted by the apparent hour of the resurrection (Lk. 24:1; Jn. 20:1). It implies, like the *Didache*, a reckoning whereby Sunday begins at nightfall, and such a reckoning did in fact continue in the Egyptian church for centuries (see Cassian, *Institutes* 2:18).

#### THE ORIGIN OF THE EUCHARISTIC THANKSGIVING PRAYER

148

When the eucharist and agape were separated, it was natural for the eucharist to be moved to the morning. This is probably nothing to do with the Roman prohibition of clubs,<sup>56</sup> which would have abolished rather than changed the hour of the eucharist, and which did not even abolish the agape: the agape was still important enough in A.D. 692 to need regulating by canon 74 of the Quinisext Council. Rather, if the eucharist was to be moved away from the hour of the evening meal and evening service, the hour of the morning service was the one obvious time to which it could be moved, and a time of great significance too, since, in addition to the usual items of prayer and thanksgiving, corresponding to the Tephillah and Shema, the Scriptures were read and expounded then. This development brought together for the first time the full ante-communion and eucharist, as we see them at Rome about A.D. 155 in Justin Martyr (*First Apology* 67). At the Sunday morning service he describes, there are Scripture readings, a sermon and a prayer, just as at Jewish Morning Prayer on the sabbath, after which the eucharist follows. We learn from ch. 65 that the prayer is wide in scope and petitionary in character, like the Tephillah, though concerned with the Church instead of Israel, and that it precedes the eucharist even when the lections and sermon are replaced by a baptism. This close bond with the eucharist probably indicates that it was already used with the eucharist at the former evening hour when, on the Jewish pattern, the Tephillah would likewise have been said. What is missing is the Shema, which, to judge from synagogue practice, one would also expect to find at the morning

<sup>55</sup> *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, ut supra*, 216f.

<sup>56</sup> As Willy Rordorf supposes (*Sunday*, English translation, London S.C.M., 1968, 250-53).

and evening hour. Or is it missing? For an important effect of separating the eucharist from the agape was to bring the two parts of the eucharist together, so that the benediction over the bread and the Common Grace over the cup (and the separate benediction over the wine as well, if the items were reversed, as in the *Didache*) coalesced in a single thanksgiving prayer. This has already happened in Justin Martyr. Now, the Shema also, it must be remembered, was according to Josephus basically a thanksgiving, the themes of its benedictions being creation, revelation and redemption. The earliest form that we have of the single thanksgiving prayer at the eucharist is that of the Roman church, only vaguely described by Justin, but quoted in full in Hippolytus's *Apostolic Tradition* 4 (about A.D. 215), where the opening themes for thanksgiving are precisely creation, revelation and redemption *through Christ* (though the order is not strictly observed).<sup>57</sup> The prayer goes on, in the institution narrative, to give thanks for the institution of the eucharist, thus combining with the themes of the Shema the themes of the two or more graces here replaced — namely wine, bread and food (the thanksgiving for the land and the prayer for Israel and Jerusalem in the second and third benedictions of the Common Grace being omitted, as obsolete, or as covered by the earlier prayer for the Church). That this was the original function of the institution narrative is indicated by three facts:

149

(i). that in Hippolytus, as in the Syrian and Byzantine liturgies (but not in most of the later Western liturgies or in the Egyptian liturgies, where a petition for consecration has been intruded before it),<sup>58</sup> the institution narrative is itself the last of the themes of thanksgiving.

(ii). that in Sarapion the institution narrative includes the petition about the bread scattered on the mountains from the grace over the bread in *Didache* 9 (Sarapion is the earliest surviving form of the Egyptian institution narrative: in the Dêr-Balizeh Papyrus the petition has been moved to a more 'natural' position, immediately after the

---

<sup>57</sup> Justin describes the prayer as consisting of 'prayers and thanksgivings', as giving 'praise and glory to the Father of the universe through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit', as giving 'thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these things at his hands', and as 'the prayer of the form of words which is from him (Jesus)' (*First Apology* 65-67). All these four phrases fit Hippolytus's prayer, and the last two appear to allude to the institution narrative, appended in Hippolytus to the other thanksgivings. On the right mode of construing the fourth of the above phrases, see G. J. Cuming, Δι' Ευχης Λογου, in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 31, 1980, 80-82.

<sup>58</sup> This is true, regrettably, even of the new Roman canons (two of them based on Hippolytus and the Liturgy of St. Basil!), as it is of recent Anglican revisions also.

petition for consecration, and in the Liturgy of St. Mark it has been dropped altogether).<sup>59</sup>

(iii). that in the East Syrian (Nestorian) Liturgy of Addai and Mari there is no institution narrative: this at least suggests that the earlier part of the great thanksgiving and the institution narrative were drawn from two different sources.<sup>60</sup>

The first two of these facts, though not the third, could also be used in support of Louis Ligier's proposal, in his article 'The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer' (first published in *Questions Liturgiques* and translated into English in *Studia Liturgica*, vol. 9, 1973, 161-185), that the institution narrative originated as a festal addition to the Common Grace. But, even assuming that this addition *was* made in the first century at Passover, which is quite possible, it would have been made *only* at Passover, and as soon as the eucharist was brought into weekly or daily use — *i.e.*, at once — it would have been dropped. Dr. Ligier's article contains an excellent critical survey of earlier literature on eucharistic origins, notably the writings of Lietzmann, Dix and Bouyer, but his own hypothesis can hardly be correct.

150

The rest of Hippolytus's prayer can easily be explained, in principle at least, as soon as the great thanksgiving and institution narrative are explained. The anamnesis, stating that we are here and now remembering Christ and carrying out his institution, naturally follows on from the institution narrative; and the epiclesis, praying for the grace of the sacrament, is equally natural, especially when one recalls that it is the only petition which the prayer contains, and that the combination of thanksgiving with petition was frequent in Jewish liturgy and occurred in the Common Grace itself. Why the anamnesis takes the form of an oblation and the petition the form of an epiclesis are, of course, much more difficult questions, and one can here only express the opinion that they are due to Christian causes rather than Jewish. As to the final doxology, it corresponds to the 'seal' of a Jewish benediction, and will be examined in the discussion of prayer-forms at the end of this article. Hippolytus's prayer contains no intercessions, and since these existed separately both Rome (cp. Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 65, 67) and in Syria (cp. *Apostolic Constitutions* 2:57; 8:9-11), in a manner congruous to Jewish

---

<sup>59</sup> See C. H. Roberts and B. Capelle, *An Early Euchologium: the Dêr-Balizeh Papyrus Enlarged and Re-edited* (Bibliothèque du Muséon 23, Louvain, Bureau du Muséon, 1949).

<sup>60</sup> For the texts referred to in these three paragraphs, see especially F. E. Brightman and C. Hammond, ed., *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1965 reprint); Cipriano Vagaggini, *The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform* (English translation, London, Chapman, 1967).

practice, the duplication of them in the consecration prayer is probably a secondary development, though perhaps growing out of an early Syrian petition for the Church. The brief petition in question immediately follows the epiclesis in the (Nestorian) Liturgy of Addai and Mari and the older recension of the Liturgy of St. Basil, and may correspond to the third part of the Common Grace, the prayer for Israel and Jerusalem, which *Didache* 10, as we shall see, applies to the Church.<sup>61</sup>

How much the Shema has affected Hippolytus's thanksgiving prayer is shown by comparing it with the three graces in the *Didache*, which are simply related to the Jewish benedictions over wine and over bread, and to the Common Grace. In the *Didache*, the Jewish benedictions are indeed reinterpreted, so as to give thanks for spiritual blessings as well as material — 'life', 'knowledge', 'faith', 'immortality', 'spiritual food and drink'; and the Common Grace, which is still in three parts — each ending 'Thine is the (power and the) glory for ever and ever' — is rearranged, with the benediction for the land replaced, as being obsolete, and the petition for Israel and Jerusalem applied to the Church. And yet the contrast between these Christianized graces and the later Christian consecration prayer is striking. In particular, there is no account here of the historical course of redemption through Christ, such as we find in Hippolytus, and the probable origin of this is the culminating benediction of the Shema, which gives a long historical account of the redemption from Egypt at the Exodus, likewise in the form of a thanksgiving. What is more, the first benediction of the Shema, for creation, to which the Kedushah (beginning with Is. 6:3) is the response, is directly paralleled in the consecration prayers of the old Syrian liturgies. Here the Sanctus comes after the thanksgiving for creation (to which the *Apostolic Constitutions* adds an account of Old Testament history) and before the thanksgiving for revelation and redemption. The thanksgiving for revelation is somewhat attenuated, but the pattern seems clear, alike in *Apostolic Constitutions* 8:12, the Liturgy of St. James, the older recension of the Liturgy of St. Basil and the Liturgy of Addai and Mari.<sup>62</sup> If it be asked why there is no comparable Sanctus in Hippolytus, the likely answer is that the Kedushah in the Shema, though probably ancient, may not be quite as ancient as

<sup>61</sup> This correspondence is plausibly proposed by G. J. Cuming in *He Gave Thanks* (Grove Liturgical Study 28, Bramcote, Grove Books, 1981, 6). The older recension of the Liturgy of St. Basil is the Alexandrian recension: see J. Doresse and E. Lanne, *Un témoin archaïque de la liturgie copte de S. Basile* (Bibliothèque du Muséon 47, Louvain, Publications Universitaires, 1960). The original home of this liturgy is, however, Basil's see of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and it reflects the influence of neighbouring Antioch in Syria.

<sup>62</sup> The magnificent Sanctus in the Liturgy of Addai and Mari appears to be an early addition (see below), but its position is still significant.

that in the Tephillah;<sup>63</sup> and this would mean that, although it had appeared at the fountain-head of Jewish liturgy, in Palestine and Syria, by the beginning of the Christian era,<sup>64</sup> it had not yet been introduced at Rome.<sup>65</sup>

Other possible traces of the influence of the Shema in early Christian worship are provided by the *Didache* and Pliny. The Shema, it will be recalled, includes a group of passages from the Law of Moses, notably the Great Commandment, which in ancient times was preceded by the Decalogue. Now, the opening three sections of the *Didache* group together (with some elaboration) the Great Commandment, the Second Commandment like it, and the Decalogue, as 'the way of life'; and the fourth section concludes:

'Thou shalt never forsake the commandments of the Lord, but shalt keep those things which thou hast received, neither adding to them nor taking away from them. In church thou shalt confess thy transgressions, and shalt not betake thyself to prayer with an evil conscience. This is the way of life'.

The requirement of confession is repeated in section 14, as a preparation for the eucharist, so it may be due to Paul's warning about the peril of unworthy participation (1 Cor. 11:27-34). Possibly, in view of section 4, it was preceded by a recitation of the commandments, drawn largely from

152

<sup>63</sup> See Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud, ut supra*, 230-33.

<sup>64</sup> The apparent existence of Syrian consecration prayers without a Sanctus might suggest that the Kedushah in the Shema was not universal even in Syria. An alternative possibility, however, is that such prayers originated in the benediction for redemption alone, or in the benedictions for revelation and redemption, in which case the Kedushah (attached to the benediction for creation) would not be involved. The arguments used to show that the Sanctus is not original in the Liturgy of Addai and Mari (notably that the succeeding part of the thanksgiving is addressed to Christ not the Trinity, and that the linking phrases after the Sanctus are missing from the related Maronite Anaphora of St. Peter) throw doubt on the originality of the thanksgiving for creation, as well as that of the Sanctus appended to it. The other liturgy without a Sanctus, the Anaphora of St. Epiphanius, certainly does not have a thanksgiving for creation; and if this liturgy originated at Epiphanius's see of Salamis, it was within the area of the influence of Antioch. See E. C. Ratcliff, 'The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari', in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 30, 1928-29, 23-32; Bernard Botte, 'Problèmes de l'anaphore syrienne des apôtres Addai et Mari', in *L'Orient Syrien*, 10, 1965, 89-106; 'Fragments d'une anaphore inconnue attribuée à S. Epiphane', in *Le Muséon*, 73, 1960, 311-15.

<sup>65</sup> With regard to E. C. Ratcliff's theory that the Sanctus originally came at the end of Hippolytus's consecration prayer, which he deduced from supposed Syrian evidence, see the reply by B. D. Spinks, 'A note on the Anaphora outlined in Narsai's Homily XXXII', in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 31, 1980, 82-93. Ratcliff may be right in inferring from early Western references to Is. 6:3 that it was already employed liturgically, but we have seen that the Christian Tephillah contained it, so the consecration prayer is not the only place where it can have been used.

the Shema, with the merely ceremonial ones omitted. Stronger evidence of this is provided by Pliny's letter, where he says that the Christians of Bithynia

'bound themselves by a solemn oath, not to any wicked deeds, but never to commit any fraud, theft or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they should be called upon to deliver it up'.

This could well reflect a paraphrase of parts of the Decalogue, and the 'solemn oath' could be the 'taking upon oneself the yoke of the kingdom of heaven' and 'the yoke of the commandments', which the use of the Shema was understood to imply (Mishnah Berakoth 2:2). It is true that Pliny is speaking of the morning service not the evening service, as the *Didache* probably is, but the Shema was used by the Jews at both.

A further consideration is that the reason why the Decalogue was dropped from the Jewish Shema — which we saw was 'the insinuations of the heretics' — probably implies that the heretics (*i.e.*, the Christians) were themselves reciting, and not just emphasizing, it. Why they too ceased reciting it, as they must early have done, is a thought-provoking question. Their related confession must also have been early dropped, for in the paraphrase of the *Didache* included in the *Apostolic Constitutions* the words 'in the church' are omitted at the first mention of it, and at the second mention it is changed from a confession into a thanksgiving (*Ap. Const.*, 7:14, 30).

Lastly, in *Apostolic Constitutions* 8:38f., one finds the first and third of the morning benedictions of the Shema, Christianized and considerably altered but still recognizable, and the previous chapter prescribes that they be said at the morning hour of prayer every day (just as the Shema was).

#### THE ORIGIN OF THE SUNDAY EVENING SERVICE

The transference of the eucharist to Sunday morning left at the evening hour the agape, combined with elements of Jewish Evening Prayer. Justin makes no mention of it, perhaps not thinking it important enough, as never having contained a formal ministry of the word, and now not containing a ministry of the sacrament either. That it did not occur at Rome is not a necessary conclusion to draw, as is often supposed. Certainly, either in Rome or in North Africa the agape took place on the evening of 'a solemn day' (Sunday), as is indicated by Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 9, a work related to Tertullian's *Apology* and probably written before or soon after the end of the second century. Tertullian, *Apology* 39, gives an account of the meal, confirming that it was for the benefit of the poor, stating that it began and ended with grace, and speaking of the bringing

in of lights, followed by the singing of hymns, either from the Bible or newly composed. Those from the Bible were doubtless mainly Psalms, and Hippolytus, writing some twenty years later at Rome, speaks of the use of the Hallelujah Psalms (Pss. 104-06, 111-13, 115-117, 135, 146-150) at the agape, adding that the people are to respond 'Hallelujah' (*Apostolic Tradition* 25). *Apostolic Constitutions* 2:57 states that, in the psalm-singing at the ante-communion, the people are to join in at the ends of the verses, but Hippolytus shows they joined in with a Jewish response (cp. Mishnah Sukkah 3:10f., Sotah 5:4). Hippolytus also records the benediction said at the bringing in of the lights (*ibid.*), which we saw was a Jewish custom on the evening that began Sunday. It must have been transferred by Gentile Christians to the evening that ended Sunday, and later to weekday evenings, for in Hippolytus the agape, though still called 'the Lord's Supper', has been moved to weekdays — days suitable for fasting (*Ap. Trad.* 23, 27). The benediction he records interprets light Christologically. It is very similar to the old Greek Vesper-hymn *Phos hilaron* ('Hail, gladdening Light'), and was probably its source.

#### THE ORIGIN OF THE DAILY SERVICES

The gradual decay of the agape, and its removal to any weekday, left behind on Sunday evenings just the elements of Evening Prayer. Other changes, however, were already taking place. The hours of daily private prayer, augmented already by three minor hours to five, are further augmented in Hippolytus (*Ap. Trad.* 35, 41) and *Apostolic Constitutions* 8:32, 34 to seven or six, and in the monasteries finally became eight. An influential factor here was probably Ps. 119:164, 'seven times a day do I praise thee', taken literally; but as the hours were at three-hourly intervals, it was inevitable that asceticism should want to continue the pattern throughout the whole day and night, making eight in all. A further, and concurrent, development was that the two principal hours, at the beginning and end of the day, became corporate services, on weekdays and not just on Sundays: this has happened to Morning Prayer in Hippolytus (*Ap. Trad.* 39, 41) and to Evening Prayer as well in *Apostolic Constitutions* 2:59; 8:32, 34-39. A parallel development was occurring in Judaism: if A. Z. Idelsohn is right, the three daily hours of prayer in Judaism had become corporate daily services by about A.D. 100. He regards this as one of the trends brought to its completion by Rabban Gamaliel II.<sup>66</sup> Whether it had already started happening before the breach between Church and Synagogue was complete one cannot

<sup>66</sup> *Jewish Liturgy and its Development* (New York, Sacred Music Press, 1932), xviiiif., 27f., 118f.

actually be sure, but the ground had been prepared for it, perhaps unconsciously, in two ways, namely:

(i). The hours of prayer, and the actual prayers used, on the sabbath corporately and on weekdays individually, were the same, though items were added on the sabbath. This also appears to be true of the early Church, though with Sunday taking the place of the sabbath.

(ii). Already in Temple times, as we saw earlier, lay *maamads* (or embryo congregations) met on weekdays in selected synagogues in the two, or sometimes three, weeks of the year when the corresponding priestly course was serving in Jerusalem (Mishnah Bikkurim 3:2, Taanith 4:1-5, Megillah 3:4-6); and the Mishnah also speaks of services in some synagogues on Mondays and Thursdays (Megillah 1:3; 3:6-4:1).

The ground being thus prepared, the precipitating cause in the case of Judaism was probably the reorganization necessary after the calamity of A.D. 70, and the tendency to institutionalization which it brought; while in the case of the Church the precipitating causes appear from Hippolytus to have been the need of the clergy for a rule of life and the need of the laity for instruction (*Ap. Trad.* 39, 41), though institutionalization was doubtless a factor here also.

The form of these earliest daily offices doubtless gives some indication of the form of the private devotions which they replaced. In Hippolytus the form is prayer and instruction, for which the private substitute, when necessary, is prayer and Bible-reading. In *Apostolic Constitutions* 8:32, 34, instruction at Morning Prayer, and the private substitute of reading, are also mentioned, but the shape of the liturgical service is given in chapters 35-39 (cp. bk. 2, ch. 59) as follows:

The singing of the morning psalm (Ps. 63).

The bidding prayer from the Sunday eucharist (corresponding in function, though not form, to the Tephillah), with a special concluding collect.

The first of the morning benedictions of the Shema (Christianized).

The third of the morning benedictions of the Shema (Christianized).

The Dismissal.

The shape of the evening service is parallel to this:

The singing of the evening psalm (Ps. 141) at the lighting of the lamps.

The bidding prayer from the Sunday eucharist, with a corresponding concluding collect, perhaps derived from the fourth of the evening benedictions of the Shema (and further adapted, above, for the morning service).<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> The morning and evening collects are certainly closely connected, and as the *Apostolic Constitutions* puts the evening service first, it is credible that the former is based on the latter.

A thanksgiving, perhaps derived from the first of the evening benedictions of the Shema.

A blessing of the congregation by the bishop.

The Dismissal.

The links with Jewish worship at the same hours are here very apparent. So are the links with Sunday worship. In time, however, due to monastic influence, the morning office (Lauds, or eastern Matins) diverged further from the ante-communion and became an independent service, while the evening office (Vespers) remained the same service on Sundays and weekdays. Presumably the ante-communion, which from the outset incorporated unique features, was more resistant to monastic changes.<sup>68</sup>

#### THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN PRAYER-FORMS

156

Looking back upon the prayers which we have surveyed, it is possible to make a few general reflections about Jewish and Christian benedictions, as regards their similarities and differences of form. A formal comparison is attempted by J. P. Audet in his article 'Esquisse historique du genre littéraire de la «bénédition» juive et de l'«eucharistie» chrétienne',<sup>69</sup> where he draws attention to the Old Testament benediction formula 'Blessed be the Lord, who . . .' (Gen. 24:27; Ex. 18:10; I Kings 8:15ff. etc.), a formula also echoed in the New Testament Epistles (2 Cor. 1:3f.; Eph. 1:3ff.; 1 Pet. 1:3ff.). Heinemann pays tribute to Audet's study, but points out that the benedictions of the Jewish liturgy regularly address God in the second person, instead of referring to him in the third, and so begin 'Blessed art thou, O Lord our God'. Indeed, in Jewish liturgy the second person is practically reserved for God.<sup>70</sup> In Christian prayers similarly, both in the New Testament period and later, God is addressed in the second person (except for purely literary prayers like those in the Epistles, mentioned above).

A second point to note is that, in New Testament Greek, to 'bless' (*eulogein*) God and to 'give thanks' (*eucharistein*) to God are interchangeable expressions. This is clear from 1 Cor. 14:16 and from the accounts of the graces at the miraculous feedings and the Last Supper (cp. Mk. 6:41 with 8:6, and Mk. 14:22 with 14:23; Lk. 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24). In Semitic languages also, such an interchange is possible. The

<sup>68</sup> Dugmore gives a different explanation of how this came about (*The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office, ut supra*, 57f.), but his account is vitiated by his assumption that daily corporate services existed in the Church from the beginning.

<sup>69</sup> In *Revue Biblique*, 65, 1958, 371-399.

<sup>70</sup> *Prayer in the Talmud, ut supra*, chs. 3, 4.

Qumran *Hymns* occasionally begin 'Blessed art thou, O Lord', but normally 'I thank thee, O Lord/God'. Christian thanksgivings, starting with those of Christ himself (Matt. 11:25; Jn. 11:41), show a like preference for the form 'I/we thank thee'. This is how all the graces in *Didache* 9f. begin (whereas their Pharisaic counterparts would have begun 'Blessed art thou'); and the same is true of Hippolytus's consecration prayer. One of the benedictions of the Christianized Tephillah begins 'Blessed art thou, O Lord, King of the ages' (*Apostolic Constitutions* 7:34), but such a form is rare in Christian liturgy.

A third point is that, in transposing a prayer from Hebrew into Greek, a series of participles will become a series of relative clauses. Nothing is more striking in Hippolytus's consecration prayer, and derived prayers, than the long series of relative clauses which they contain: but comparable series of participles may be found in benedictions of the Shema and Tephillah.

A fourth point is that in Christian prayer, following the almost invariable practice of Jesus himself and his model-prayer for his disciples, God is customarily addressed as 'Father', and not simply as 'Lord' or 'God', as in Jewish prayer. This is another distinctive feature of the graces in the *Didache*; and the Fatherhood of God is implied in Christian prayers, even where it is not directly expressed, often by referring to Jesus in the third person or as God's Son (cp. Acts 4:27, 30 and Hippolytus's consecration prayer). The title 'Father' for God is by no means unknown in Jewish liturgy, where it goes back to the Old Testament teaching that God is the Father of Israel (Deut. 32:6; Is. 63:16; 64:8); but Jesus's sense of his unique Sonship, and his sharing of this privilege with his followers, has made the address 'Father' much more characteristic of Christian liturgy.

A fifth point is that, as we saw earlier, Jewish benedictions are normally 'sealed' by an individualized ending, in which God is blessed for his willingness to grant the particular benefit which has been requested, or for which he has been thanked, or is blessed under the character which has been ascribed to him in praise, in the course of the benediction. The seal is often all that justifies the name 'benediction' when the benediction is really petitionary, but in other cases it sums up the thanksgivings or praises that have been offered. There is one seal of this sort in the Christianized Tephillah: 'Blessed art thou for ever, O thou great Protector of the posterity of Abraham' (*Apostolic Constitutions* 7:33). In each of the graces of *Didache* 9f., however, one standard seal is used: 'Thine is the glory for ever and ever'. It is used four times in precisely that form, but is twice expanded, either to 'Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever and ever' or to 'Thine is the power and the glory for ever

and ever'. In this last form it is also added as a seal to the Lord's Prayer (*Didache* 8): hence the well-known conclusion of the Lord's Prayer in the Textus Receptus of Matt. 6:13. What this perhaps means is that, at the beginning of the Christian era, the individualizing of seals in Jewish benedictions had not as yet proceeded very far; and it was destined to make no progress in Christianity, because of the New Testament teaching that it is through, or in the name of, Christ that prayer and thanksgiving are acceptable to God (Jn. 15:16; 16:23-27; Rom. 1:8; Eph. 5:20; Heb. 13:15 etc.). The phrase 'through Jesus Christ' already appears in one of the above seals from the *Didache*, as it does at the end of several of the benedictions of the Christianized Tephillah (*Apostolic Constitutions* 7:35, 37f.); and this phrase was to grow into the sort of standard Trinitarian doxology that concludes Hippolytus's consecration prayer.

A sixth point is that the congregational response of 'Amen' to Christian thanksgivings (1 Cor. 14:16 etc.) is the same that was used with Jewish benedictions in the synagogue, as the Tosephta records (Tos. Sukkah 4:6), and the same that is found, still earlier, in the Old Testament (1 Chr. 16:36; Neh. 8:6).

158 A final point is that, both in Hippolytus's doxology and in the seals of the *Didache*, the word 'glory' (Gk. *doxa*, Lat. *gloria*) is evidently used as another equivalent of the Hebrew 'blessed' (*baruk*).<sup>71</sup>

This essay began by stressing the difficulties of the task it was attempting, and must end by disavowing any claim of finality for its conclusions. It will be obvious that the writer had benefited from the work of many earlier labourers in the field, and it may be that he ought to have benefited more; but if, with their help, he has done anything to lighten the labours of those who come next to the task, he will have achieved his aim.

---

<sup>71</sup> This equation is fully illustrated in Eric Werner, 'The Doxology in Synagogue and Church', published in 1945-46 and reprinted in Petuchowski's *Contributions to the Scientific Study of Jewish Liturgy* (*ut supra*).