

## NOTES AND STUDIES

## LITURGICAL COMMENTS AND MEMORANDA.

## VIII

DOM CONNOLLY's paper as to the 'Book of Life' (*J. T. S.* xiii p. 580) made me take out and again look at papers written by me in the spring of last year on this subject.

To say the truth, with mind intent at that time on clearing just one little item—the place of 'the diptychs' in the Liturgy of Constantinople—it was not until Comment VII was finally out of hand that I so much as noticed those three or four lines of Mr Brightman forming the text for Dom Connolly's article, in which (*J. T. S.* xii p. 321) on the strength of remarks of the Jacobite Barsalibi in the twelfth century Mr Brightman reconstructs for us a section of the pre-anaphoral part of the mass at Jerusalem in the fourth (?) century. My attention once alive to this brief sentence, I lost no time in testing (so far as I knew how) its validity; and on full consideration of the case, so far as information was then available, came to the conclusion that the practice among the Syrian Jacobites of reading the 'Book of Life' in the pre-anaphoral part of the mass was not a survival among them of a practice once observed in Jerusalem in the fourth (?) century and abandoned there, but was a native East Syrian one borrowed from the usages of the region (see *Homilies of Narsai* pp. 107–108, 112) in which these Jacobites dwelt, and imported by them into their Liturgy of 'St James'. I then dismissed the case from my mind.

Now, however, that Dom Connolly has exhaustively treated the question from the Syrian Jacobite writers themselves, it has seemed to me that it would be useful to print such part of what I wrote last year as embodies general considerations relating to the practice whereby mention came to be made in the course of the public mass, or eucharistic service, of the names of particular persons as specific subjects of public prayer. I therefore give this section practically *verbatim* (up to p. 28 n. 1 below), and then go on to say the things for the sake of which alone I originally took the trouble to deal in *Narsai*, Obs. III, with the subject of 'the diptychs' at all: things which last year I left in the state of inchoate jottings intelligible only to me, but here drawn out in full in a way I hope intelligible to others also.

---

Mr Brightman writes (*J. T. S.* xii p. 321) as follows:—

‘It is true that its diptychs [i. e. of the Greek “St James”] are now within the anaphora; but no doubt this is only a Byzantinism, for in the Jacobite rite [i. e. in the Syriac “St James”] the *Liber vitae*, when it was in use, was recited before the kiss of peace (Barsalibi *Expositio* 8).’

This sentence is composed of (a) a statement (‘no doubt’); (b) the reason or basis on which the statement stands. The statement under (a) when fully expressed is this: that in the rite of Jerusalem, the recital of the diptychs took place *outside* the anaphora, and that by and by, at a date not indicated, the recital of the diptychs at Jerusalem was, in imitation of the practice prevalent in the rite of Constantinople, transferred from some point outside the anaphora to a point *within* the anaphora, i. e. in the Great Intercession (which comes immediately after the Invocation) where we now find them.

Not being aware of any previous treatment in detail of this particular question (which, indeed, is new to me), and therefore being at a loss what to think of it, I propose to draw out the considerations occurring to me as having a bearing upon it and proper to illustrate it. This is done not in the idea of advancing any particular view of the subject, but in the intention of eliciting such detailed treatment of the case as may either solidly establish or render probable the view formulated above.

The examination I propose to make falls naturally into two parts: (1) a consideration of the conditions under which ‘the diptychs’ found an introduction into Christian public worship, in order to see, if possible, whether this may indicate any *prima facie* probability in favour of their use in one part rather than another of public divine worship; (2) a consideration of what Barsalibi says as to the *Liber vitae* (*Expositio* ch. 8). [This is omitted here; but it seemed to me that *Expositio* ch. 8 could be duly understood and appreciated only when treated in combination with ch. 15 on the diptychs; and it is in this way that I dealt with the case.]

To begin with a matter that may at first sight seem trifling. ‘The Diptychs’ is the later technical term for what in its beginnings simply was, and was simply called, ‘the Names’, or ‘recital’, ‘suggesting’, of the Names. ‘The Diptychs’ are this simple recital formalized, ritualized; a process completed by the early years of the fifth century (before which date, to my knowledge, this ritual term is not evidenced), with results which I have indicated elsewhere (*Hom. of Narsai* p. 102). But it is not a question of mere distinction of words; in the fifth century the interest centring round the subject of the public recital of names in the mass had become definitely ‘ritual’, ‘ecclesiastical’,

'formal', whilst in the earlier period, in its origins, such recitals of names are purely *religious*; and in dealing with those origins it is with *religious questions* that we are primarily concerned. It will be well also to make clear our limits: for place we are mainly concerned with the Greek-speaking East; for time with the fourth century or earlier. Moreover, what is ritually called 'the diptychs of the dead' alone will come into consideration; 'the diptychs of the living' may be dismissed.

As regards the practice of prayers for the dead in the early Christian Church, so far as these find expression in a liturgical service, there is a distinction to be borne in mind. We are particularly well informed as regards Africa in the third century<sup>1</sup>; and there we find the system of special masses (anniversaries) for and in the name of specified dead persons, which friends or relatives instituted in their behalf; but these were of the nature of private celebrations, and had nothing to do with the ordinary public worship and common assemblies. In these 'private celebrations' the whole point and business of them was concerned with a definite individual person (or it might be more than one) of interest to those who had the service celebrated. But in the public prayers and common worship, in the public worship of the assemblies, at the 'Sunday mass' of the 'congregations', the commemoration of the departed was in general terms only, or at most with specification of groups and categories. This, indeed, is an inference from the system (it was no less) so indubitably and abundantly witnessed to, so far as Africa is concerned, of private, if we may so speak, 'domestic' celebrations for the dead on the one hand, on the other the entire absence of any indication at this period of 'recital of names' of dead at the public masses, taken in combination with a matter immediately to be adverted to. Moreover, there is, to my knowledge, in the first three centuries *nothing* to be found in the documents *of the nature of appropriation of the common and public mass service to private and personal intentions on behalf of particular and specified dead persons.*

The recital, indeed, of particular names in the public mass which we find by the middle of the fourth century already existing, at least in the Delta<sup>2</sup> (that is in a region not far south-west of Palestine), of which Serapion gives us a specimen, is quite a different thing; it is a new

<sup>1</sup> At the risk of seeming insistent I must again refer in this connexion to Dr F. Wieland's *Mensa und Confessio* (Lentner, Munich, 1906), and not merely to pp. 161-163 but to his whole treatment of the case of the African Church; adding that I think a knowledge of it is now a *sine qua non* for those who would deal with the ancient liturgy of that Church. Those who would wish to understand the matter in its full liturgical bearings will also peruse and consider (and it can only be with profit) the later controversy between Dr Wieland and Fr Dorsch, S.J., tedious and tiresome as this course may seem to be. (1912.)

<sup>2</sup> In *J.T.S.* vol. xii p. 391 and p. 397 n. 1 for 'Upper Egypt' read 'Lower Egypt'.

departure, and that not merely in a matter of form, but in religious idea. Here we find the religious mind, zealous on behalf of its dead, no longer content with the mere generalities of the prayers of the public liturgy, but the very public liturgy of the church and the common prayer of all the assembly, the mass now in course of being celebrated, is, by the introduction of a public recital of particular and individual names of dead, viewed as, and in some way intended to be, specially appropriated to the particular benefit (over and above the common scot and lot provided for by the traditional practice) of a few select and specified individuals. In what particular sense this innovation was conceived by its promoters it is not important, and might be vain, to define; the common experience of pious movements in all ages tells us that the very persons who initiate such kind of novelties are precisely those not in the habit of first thinking out the meaning of what they do and induce others to do. Certain it is that the introduction of the practice interesting us here has introduced also ambiguities and complications as to the *rationale* of the matter which the keenest theological wits have, up to the present, not been able quite fairly to smooth out.

Before we go further, it may be well that we should observe that the recital of names of 'offerers' existing in the fourth century in the West stands on quite a different footing, and has quite other implications than those attaching to the public recital of the names of a few select dead persons in the public mass.

This recital of names of dead persons at such public and common service could, it is obvious, have been made conveniently and suitably at many points of the service, or even before the service began, or else before the mass of the faithful. As a matter of fact the extant liturgical texts of churches of that region in which the recital of names of particular dead persons in the public eucharistic service or mass is first evidenced—I mean the region whose shores are washed by the waters of the Eastern Mediterranean—all agree in assigning this recital to one and the same place; namely that point of the General Intercession at which is made a commemoration of the dead in general terms, whether that Intercession be found (as in 'Mark') before the consecration, or after it.<sup>1</sup> In a word, in these liturgies the 'names', 'the diptychs', appear

<sup>1</sup> When writing Observation III on *Narsai* (1909) I said (p. 111) that there seems to be no evidence which would allow us to say positively at what point of the service 'the diptychs' were read at Antioch. But at the point which we have now reached (see *J.T.S.* April 1911, pp. 400-401; and, I may add, the present Comment) in clearing the history of 'diptychs' (a question which I did no more than open in that Observation), the reservation made in 1909 is no longer necessary, and I feel that we may now assert with some confidence that the diptychs must have been in use at Antioch by the close of the fourth century, and that their place was at the point of the Great Intercession indicated above in the text. (1912.)

as an extension (in another sense, as a special orientation) of that general commemoration of the dead in special classes or categories found in the liturgical forms of 'Great Intercession', and expressed in a summary way by Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. myst.* v 9) as 'for the deceased holy fathers and bishops and in a word all of ours who have already fallen asleep' (ἀπλῶς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν προκεκοιμημένων)—all *our* dead.

As regards this combination of the diptychs of the dead with the Great Intercession, the contrast afforded by Serapion is, I think, of special interest in view of the unanimity on this point of the other Greek Liturgies.<sup>1</sup> And this contrast is heightened in that Serapion is the only one of those Liturgies in which the Great Intercession falls outside (and also before) the anaphora. Moreover, in Serapion instead of one continuous 'Great Intercession' there is a series of separate prayers (Nos. 22–27) for different classes of persons; and no General Intercession is embodied in Serapion's 'canon' or 'anaphora' (εὐχὴ τοῦ προσφύρου it is called in Serapion, title at p. 4, cf. p. 21 l. 1, Wobbermin's edition in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, N. F. ii 3<sup>b</sup>, 1899). These separate Prayers of Intercession (or of blessing) were, according to the order of Serapion's liturgy, all said *before* the 'canon' or 'anaphora'; and in order that there should be no mistake about this there is that rarity in earliest liturgical books,<sup>2</sup> a special rubrical direction on the subject: 'All these prayers are performed before' the 'anaphora' (πρὸ τῆς εὐχῆς τοῦ προσφύρου p. 21); this is one of only two rubrics in the book; the other relates to the recital of the names of the dead in that clause of the anaphora which is a prayer for the dead.

In the 'anaphora' of Serapion, immediately sequent on the Invocation for the descent of the Logos on the gifts, comes a prayer for communicants; thus:—

'That the cup may become the blood of the Truth' [S. P. C. K. volume, p. 63; with these words ends the Invocation; the text then

<sup>1</sup> In what follows I adopt the translation of the lately deceased Bishop of Salisbury: *Bishop Serapion's Prayer-Book*, Brown & Co., Salisbury, 1899, a reprint 'in a limited issue', and with a 'tentative Introduction' (pp. 3–14), from the *Salisbury Diocesan Gazette*; and eleven years later (1910), with the advantage of mature consideration, and other help, the second S.P.C.K. edition in the series of 'Early Church Classics'; the Introduction occupies pp. 7–59. What follows in the text is written with the little S.P.C.K. volume always in hand and under my eye. I would specially mention in this connexion the following:—The titles or headings within square brackets, whatever the type used, pp. 63–64, 83, 89, introduced with a view to bringing the prayers under the scheme of Liturgical Systematics; and in the Introduction the fully elaborated *schema* for Serapion at pp. 36–41. (1912.)

<sup>2</sup> It is worthy of notice that in the 'Clementine' Liturgy the 'rubrics' are (comparatively speaking) both numerous and full.

proceeds:] 'and make all who communicate to receive a medicine of life for the healing of every sickness, &c. . . . For we have invoked thee, the uncreated, through the only-begotten in holy spirit. Let this people receive mercy . . . let angels be sent forth as companions to the people for the bringing to naught of the evil one and for the establishment of the Church' [then comes the clause of prayer for the dead; and then the 'anaphora' proceeds:] 'Receive also the thanksgiving [εὐχαριστίαν] of the people, and bless those who have offered the offerings and the thanksgivings [τὰ πρόσφορα καὶ τὰς εὐχαριστίας], and grant health . . . of soul and body to this whole people through the only-begotten Jesus Christ' &c. (doxology). (S. P. C. K. volume, pp. 63-64.)

What are we to think of these two pieces of prayer which are disjoined by the prayer for the dead? Who are the subjects of it? Who are those described as 'this people', 'the people' (twice), 'this whole people'?<sup>1</sup> The question may be asked: do the two portions of text, disjoined by the clause of prayer for the dead, really relate to one and the same class of persons, and those persons the people present in church, the communicants?

Before attempting to frame an answer to this question, the following considerations occur as necessary to be borne in mind:—

(1) Any one acquainted with the Greek Liturgies, 'James' and 'Basil', 'Clement' and 'Chrysostom', and the Egyptian 'Mark', will recall how there comes immediately sequent on the Invocation for the 'making', &c., the Body and Blood of Christ by the descent of the Divine Spirit, the Holy Ghost, a formal prayer for communicants.

(2) Moreover, it is important to recall the earliest history of the practice and duty of holy communion, how it was (at all events up to Serapion's time) an incident, an inevitable incident, of attendance at the ordinary Sunday service of divine worship; how all those baptized and in full enjoyment of church fellowship present at the service were actual communicants, even the children.

(3) There is a third point, and it needs to be dealt with at some length, namely, that 'congregationalist' sense (if I may so speak) characterizing the Christian life and the Christian assemblies and the Church services, which is clearly perceptible in documents of the second and third centuries, the expression of which, however, is singularly weakened by the close of the fourth. A ritual sign of this 'sense' which should appeal to the liturgist is the stress laid on the offerings of the people, especially of the bread and wine for the communion. A living and convincing expression of what I have called the 'congregationalist' sense in early Christian church life is given by the Syriac Didascalia.

<sup>1</sup> What follows has been written this year after I took out the old papers to look at again. (1912.)

'There is', says H. Achelis, who had studied the book more carefully, perhaps, than any one else, 'a particular charm in drawing out the picture of Christian life which the Syriac *Didaskalia* affords us; for there is no other ancient Christian document from which we are able in anything like so complete a way to gain such accurate information as to all sides of the congregational life (*Gemeindeleben*)' (*Die syrische Didaskalia* p. 266). In his second dissertation on the work he has carefully gathered together for us all the details; yet, to gain a due and just impression of the life, the book itself (from, at all events, ch. 10, that is) must be read. It is true that a sense of the 'Catholic Church', and of a Catholic communion, is present as a living and real idea, as the sum and expression of the one communion and common belief of the Christian churches throughout the world, but not yet that organized realization of the idea, that 'Catholic and Apostolic Church', that 'Catholica', exclusive and proscriptive, as found subsequently to the legislation of Theodosius I by the closing years of the fourth century. Full as is the account of 'Church life' in the *Didascalia*, we look to it in vain for a description of the Church services themselves, their details, and the kind of prayers said at them; of the Eucharist itself what is said is indeed curiously meagre; although—and this (for a reason already indicated) is, I think, quite significant—the most important and interesting passage relating to the subject deals with the question of the offering of the bread and wine by the people.

I venture to think that so far as the Eucharistic Service is concerned, at least from the Eucharistic (or Consecration) prayer to the end, the Prayer-Book of Serapion (after allowing for certain Egyptian or Alexandrine features which can be distinctly specified and perhaps circumscribed) presents us accurately with a specimen of the sort of prayers said in this part of the Eucharistic Service in the quarter where the *Didascalia* was written; not, I hasten to add, of course, verbally the same, but in spirit (I might almost add, as if in date) identical. We have not, indeed, textually the anaphora of the *Didascalia* community, but the next best thing, a veritable own brother. However it may be with such an obviously personal 'view', one thing will be clear to the attentive reader of Serapion: namely, that it is the dominantly 'congregational' phase of Christian development which still finds full religious-ritual expression in his 'Prayer-Book', late as is its date. Of this I think no one will entertain a doubt who will compare the first six items of the 'Prayer-Book' (= the consecration and communion prayers) with the corresponding portion of (say) the 'Liturgy of St James', whether in its Greek or in its Syriac form (*Br.* pp. 50 sqq., 85 sqq.). In the prayers following the consecration prayer in 'Serapion' (No. 1 of the Book) we have the same sort of mention of

'the people', 'this people', in the obvious sense of this congregation, the people here present, a congregation of communicants (Wobbermin, p. 7 ll. 1-3, 5-6, 13-14; p. 8 ll. 7-8). When, then, it is said in the concluding portions (Wobbermin, p. 6 ll. 5-12, 15-24) of the consecration-prayer of Serapion (separated as they are by the clause of prayer for the dead, ll. 13-15): 'let this people receive mercy' (l. 10), 'let angels be companions to the people' (ll. 11-12), 'receive the eucharist of the people' (l. 18), 'grant health . . . and advancement of soul and body to this whole people' (ll. 20-21): the kind of people which the composer of this prayer has in mind when writing, is (so it seems to me) one and the same in both of the parts of the prayer which are now separated by the 'dead' clause; namely, those here present and about to be receivers of that Eucharist upon which the blessing of God had just been invoked.

It appears to me, then, that to treat the concluding portion of the 'eucharistic' (or consecration-) prayer of Serapion which follows the Invocation (as is done in the late Bishop of Salisbury's little volume<sup>1</sup>) as if it were an incipient 'General Intercession', a first elementary sketch of this sort of prayer, is not merely to obscure, or even to obliterate, the real nature of this part of Serapion's eucharistic prayer, but it is also to introduce a wrongly conceived suggestion, calculated to lead the reader astray in regard to that particular detail in the eucharistic service of this 'Prayer-Book' which is, if not the most singular, yet precisely the most important liturgical feature of this precious relic of Christian antiquity. The most singular feature, that which seems chiefly to attract our attention to-day from its bearing on disputes, is doubtless the Invocation of the Logos; but the feature which is most important for the history of Greek liturgical development in the critical period (that is, the fourth century) is the placing of the Intercession in the service before the canon, with an express rubric on the subject. For by this the 'Prayer-Book' preserves the earlier order of the eucharistic service antecedent to the development found e.g. in the Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions; an order (as I consider) which must have been universal in the third century. I mean one 'in which the passage from the consecration to the communion is direct and without intervening "Great Intercession"', the intervening prayers (if any) 'relating to and bearing on the communicants themselves and their approaching act of communion' (*J. T. S.* xii p. 395). Such order is preserved for us still quite clearly in the Anaphora of the Ethiopic Church Ordinances

<sup>1</sup> See the titles lettered D E F pp. 63-64, and cf. also pp. 40-41. It will be observed that the references given at this latter place to the liturgies of 'Mark', 'Coptic Jacobites', and 'Abyssinian Jacobites', are references to quite other parts of the service.



(Br. pp. 189 sqq.), and (if I may venture to refer to a document which seems so greatly, or even generally, discredited among the liturgical experts) the Roman Canon.<sup>1</sup> This is also substantially the case (though not so obviously) in the primitive and native liturgy of the East-Syrian Church, called the Liturgy of Addai and Mari or of the Apostles (Br. pp. 288 sqq.). It is the case also with the liturgies of Gaul and Spain.

If I had then to give a name to and classify the concluding part of

<sup>1</sup> The precise character of the (now proverbial) 'dislocation' of this prayer can be expressed in a simple formula which will make the case obviously clear. On the revival of liturgical studies consequent on the Oxford movement, the late Dr J. M. Neale gave two specimens of parallelizing the Liturgies: in the *Tetralogia Liturgica*, 1849; and (in translation) in the *Introduction to the History of the Eastern Church*, 1850. In the former work he printed in parallel columns 'St Chrysostom', the Mozarabic, 'St James' and 'St Mark'; in the latter (pp. 380-459), for the preanaphoral part of the liturgy, 'St Chrysostom', the Armenian, 'Coptic St Basil', and, 'as the connecting link of the Eastern and Western Rites' (p. 379), the Mozarabic; for the anaphora (pp. 530-703) eight texts are given: 'St Chrysostom', the Armenian, 'St James', 'St Basil', 'St Mark', 'Coptic St Basil', the Mozarabic, and, as representative of the rite of the Eastern Syrians, the Liturgy of 'Theodore', which hitherto had 'never appeared in English' (p. 529). The *Tetralogia* seems to be now a forgotten book, and the *Introduction*, besides being rather scarce, seems, so far as the translation and parallelizing of the liturgies are concerned, in much the same plight. But they both seem to me still very useful to the liturgical student, and not the less so inasmuch as they present so much mere white paper. In the preface to the *Tetralogia*, with that simplicity and candour of his which altogether counterbalances all the ignorances and errors which at this time of day may be easily objected to him, Dr Neale expresses the results on his own mind of the task he had undertaken: 'At quam primum me huic operi accinxi (he says) vix dici potest quam paene molestiarum undique molibus obruebar . . . tam immane inter se differunt Liturgiae Orientales ut vix communis ratio conferendi eas inveniri possit' (pp. xl, xli); and on this note he continues to the end of the Preface. A generation later another method was entered on, that adopted by the Rev. C. E. Hammond in *Liturgies Eastern and Western* (Oxford 1878). This method consisted in cutting up the Liturgies into sections (to each of which a more or less technical name was given), eighteen in all, designed to exhibit the 'Rationale of the Service', the sections being (for purposes of formulation) designated by the letters A to T. The portion corresponding to the Roman Canon in the correct formula is: L + M + N + O. The Roman Canon on this system results in the formula:

$$O(a) + [?N] + L + M + [?N] + O(b).$$

The only difficulty that I find in this newer method, which evidently shews the 'dislocation' of the Roman Canon at a glance, is that it proceeds on the basis of a late development in the history of Liturgy; and hence, however convenient for the delivery of a 'Lehre der Liturgik', or a 'System of Liturgick' in the lecture-room of a theological seminary, when used as a Ductor Dubitantium through the obscurities and perplexities of the earlier history of the Eucharistic service, I must confess, judging from my own experience, that it positively increases those perplexities as we try to thread a way through the mazes of that history.

the Eucharistic Prayer of Serapion (Wobbermin, p. 6 ll. 5-12, and l. 15 to the end; S. P. C. K. volume, p. 63 l. 17 'and make all' to p. 64 l. 6, and l. 16 to end of page) I should describe it as Prayer for the Communicants, instead of, as in the Bishop of Salisbury's volume: 'C. [part of] Invocation'; 'D. The Intercession for the Living'; 'F. Prayer for those who have offered.'

Before going on to consider Serapion's clause of intercession for the dead I should like to make two remarks.

1. First for some words as to 'the diptychs', and I should like to think of them as the last I shall have to write on this particular subject. No one can be more sensible of its dull and wearisome character than I, no one can be more thoroughly tired of it; though it is also true that the subject has a side of human interest, which would prove attractive to the philosophic mind of cynical tendencies. But, liturgically, there was absolute necessity to put 'the diptychs' in their right place in the service in the different rites, before it could become so much as possible to deal with a firm hand with a matter of vital importance for the true appreciation and understanding of the early history and development of Christian liturgy, namely, the place of what the systematists call 'the Great Intercession' in those rites. Looking round now I think that, so far as I can see, the question of 'the diptychs' has been cleared, with a single exception; that is, 'the diptychs' and Serapion. In turning to the Bishop of Salisbury's volume I find at No. 27 (one of the pre-anaphoral intercession prayers, p. 89) this title in brackets: 'Prayer and fixed diptychs on behalf of those who make offerings', and a dozen lines below, between these words of the prayer 'Receive us, O God of truth' and 'Receive this people', the following sub-title inserted in brackets: 'Fixed diptychs'; see also the *schema* in the Introduction, p. 39 (B). I find in the volume no explanation of any kind whatever of this title and sub-title, and thus am thrown back on myself to find the meaning or justification of them. This being so, I observe (*a*) that there is no ground or evidence whatever in Serapion's Prayer-Book itself for supposing that any 'diptychs' were said in the course of the pre-anaphoral intercessory prayers; (*b*) that the general history discountenances any such idea as the use of 'diptychs' in Serapion's days, inasmuch as the recital of names at this time was in the still elementary stage of a practice of piety and devotion, whereas the ritualism of 'the diptychs' is unknown to history until the fifth century. My intention, however, is not to criticize but to do something else. Needless to say that any treatment of the subject of Serapion and 'the diptychs' in which evidence, or reasons that will bear reflexion and examination, may be adduced, will receive from me careful and respectful consideration. But meantime I would—may

I say, as a layman writing in a journal professedly theological?—earnestly and most respectfully beg that questions of this kind or novelties proposed, in a subject so difficult and obscure as Early Liturgy, may not be treated as the case of the diptychs is treated in the late Bishop of Salisbury's little volume.

2. I should like to observe that the considerations which have been developed in this Comment generally are not such as concern merely those persons commonly nowadays designated by the name of liturgical experts. On the contrary, they are a matter of concern to all enquirers who are interested in and pursue the study of the early history of the Christian Church, and in particular of early Christian religious life; whereof public worship and the church service is an item of (as I believe) primary importance. And I would add that it is precisely this class of enquirers, in touch with many sides of early Christian feeling, thought, and belief, to whom in the last resort it will fall to pass a definitive judgement on the sort of questions and ideas—essential part though they are of the strictly liturgical 'discipline'—that have been dealt with above.

Duly to understand the questions that arise out of Serapion's Intercession for the departed, which comes in so abruptly in the middle of a prayer for the communicating congregation, there should come in here a preliminary enquiry on one point, one small point, of detail, namely, *the manner and style of formulation* in the Greek Liturgies of the items and clauses of the '*Great Intercession*', and the form of words introducing each clause, but more especially the first. But I prefer to hold over this enquiry to form the subject of Comment IX. That enquiry will be concerned with a mere comparison of texts, and may be felt to delay the 'action' of the present argument unduly; and so I come at once to give the reader my 'view' or 'conclusion' in regard to *the place* of the clause of intercession for the dead in Serapion's Eucharistic Prayer, with its specification of names of individual persons. But here it is necessary to say that I can do no more than offer my opinion, my 'view', and explain how I come by it; for no means exist, so far as I can see, for applying to the case any process that can justly be termed a real *verification*. I would add, however, that slight and unimportant as on the surface the matter to be enquired into may seem, it is on this one matter of prayer for the dead in the Eucharistic service that the actual line of development taken in Christian Public Worship depends more than on any other single factor.

What I have now to say falls under three heads: (1) a passage of St Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech. Myst.* v 9-10), as to which see already in *Narsai* p. 101 n. 3; (2) the conditions and circumstances in which we

find the Intercession for the dead in Serapion ; (3) the position held by the Church of Jerusalem in the mind and esteem of the new 'Christian World' when Constantine had built the church of the Holy Sepulchre there.

1. In *Narsai* (*loc. cit.*) it was said that Cyril had not in view in the passage there quoted 'an objection to prayers for the dead as such', and that 'no word of condemnation or disapproval comes from him of the "many"' whose objections he undertakes to meet. In this connexion it will be instructive to compare and weigh the treatment of the case of prayer for the dead by Epiphanius *Haer.* 75, against Aërius. Of course, I need hardly say that the whole of this section, this 'heresy', must be read and considered before we are in a position to profit by that part of it which concerns us ; and that we must bear in mind Epiphanius's habitual tone and temper which come out remarkably well in *Haer.* 75. Two points stand out as of interest : (a) the way in which, the words by which, he introduces the subject ; (b) the way in which he meets the objection made. As regards (a) : Epiphanius represents Aërius as making his objection thus : *τίνι τῷ λόγῳ μετὰ θάνατον ὀνομάζεστε, φησίν, ὀνόματα τεθνεώτων . . .* (Migne *P. Gr.* xlii 502 A) ; and when he comes to the confutation of Aërius, Epiphanius introduces the case thus : *Ἐπειτα δὲ περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματα λέγειν τῶν τελευτησάντων . . .* (col. 513 B). From the statement of both the objection and the case it would seem clear that the occasion, the cause, of the objection being taken was recital of *names*. As regards (b) : in comparing the manner in which the two apologists meet objectors, we find Cyril and Epiphanius agree in classifying the dead of whom *ποιούμεθα τὴν μνήμην* into two classes, though in the latter writer the distinction is not made with the same sharpness and clearness of point as in the former. One class is the class of 'sinners', our brethren deceased for whose salvation we hope, and these we make mention of that we may entreat the mercy of God on them ; the other class we mention is that of 'the just' : fathers and patriarchs, prophets and apostles, &c., that we may glorify God on account of them. It is in the reasons given by the two writers that the contrast between them is so significant. To Epiphanius (whilst, of course, insisting on the profit to dead brethren of our prayers for them) a chief and principal recommendation of the practice, that which he puts in the forefront, is that it helps to strengthen the belief of the survivors in the communion of saints, of which St Cyril says nothing ; whilst on the other hand Epiphanius is entirely silent on the point of the consideration which Cyril puts forward, namely, that such prayer is of the greatest service *μεγίστην ὄνησιν* to the dead if made when the Holy and Awful Victim is lying there and then on the altar after the consecration (*ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡ δέησις ἀναφέρεται, τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικωδεστάτης προκειμένης θυσίας*) (*Catech. Myst.* v 9).

It is only he, having delivered this point of definite teaching in a positive and simple manner to the new converts, that St Cyril lets them know they must be prepared to hear 'many' who do not share this point of view; and will hear it said: 'What is the profit to a soul departed from this world in his sins, or even without sins'—not, be it observed, if we pray for him or her, but—'if mention be made of him in the prayer?' (ἐὰν ἐπὶ τῆς προσευχῆς μνημονεύηται). Is the προσευχή here 'prayer' in a general way? or that prayer whereof it is said 'intra in cubiculum tuum', &c. (Matt. vi 6)? or is it prayer said in the Christian assembly for public worship? Seeing that this lecture of St Cyril to the new converts is exclusively designed as, and is devoted to, an explanation of public worship, of what these new Christians will see and hear in the celebration of the mass, it seems to me more reasonable to suppose that when he says ἐπὶ τῆς προσευχῆς, what Cyril means is public prayer, is, indeed, the 'canon' itself of the 'mass' which he is actually explaining. And on a consideration of §§ 9 and 10 of *Catech. Myst.* v, it will be seen 'that we are in fact here in Cyril in presence of those ideas possessing the mind of Chrysostom at Antioch and Constantinople a generation later', for which see *J. T. S.* xii pp. 394-395, 400-401.

Indeed, left to myself, and until the whole case, with all its conditions taken into account, is otherwise and better explained to me, I consider that the phrase of Cyril τί ὠφελείται ψυχὴ . . . ἐὰν ἐπὶ τῆς προσευχῆς μνημονεύηται refers not to prayer for the dead, in general and as such, but to what Aërius (in Epiphanius) means when he says ὀνομάζετε ὀνόματα τεθνεώτων, and Epiphanius when he says περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματα λέγειν; and that it finds its due explanation in the assumption that already at this date the names of persons recently deceased and known to the congregation were read out at this point of the mass in the church of Jerusalem.

2. But I feel indefinitely strengthened in such an idea on consideration of the case of Serapion's Eucharistic Prayer. The clause of intercession for the dead occurs, as it were wedged in, without connexion, either verbal or by suggestion in thought, with what goes before or after; it occurs, as already pointed out, between two parts of the prayer for one and the same living 'people', the congregation, communicants. Moreover Serapion's is a service in which prayer of *intercession* is over and done with before the specifically eucharistic part of the service so much as begins; and his service is the liturgy of a church (Thmuis) dependent on and in the near neighbourhood of an Apostolic Church, Alexandria, which, even in the later development of its liturgy, when it had freely adopted elements derived from the liturgy of Jerusalem, admitted no intercessory prayer after the consecration,

but from that point onwards is concerned only with communion and the communicants.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, this clause of Serapion particularly arrests attention inasmuch as it, for the first time in Christian antiquity, evidences, and that in a clear and unmistakable way, the recital of particular names in the intercession for the dead. It seems to me then that the indications all point to one thing, namely, that the Intercession for the dead as found nearly at the end of Serapion's Eucharistic Prayer is an interpolation; a novelty introduced from without, a practice not in accordance with the tradition of the region in which Thmuis is situated, that is the Alexandrine patriarchate. But, if so, whence was this novelty derived, from what church was it borrowed? This brings us to our third point, a consideration of what the church of the Holy Sepulchre built by Constantine meant for the Church of Jerusalem and (to use a modern expression) for the Christian World of that day.

3. Whatever we may be disposed to think of Dr Heisenberg's reconstruction of Constantine's church of the Holy Sepulchre, his volume is of the highest value and importance for the way in which he brings out the 'epoch-making' character of that edifice in the history of the Christian religion and Church.<sup>2</sup> This was the case in two respects. First, because this edifice, a marvel of splendour in the eyes of all the world, was by its very site, as the builders themselves (cf. Eusebius) and the immediately succeeding generations (cf. Jerome) were loud to declare, an outward and visible sign of the triumph of the new religion on the spot of an actual sanctuary—a temple of Astarte, of the Syria

<sup>1</sup> It might be well here simply to read 'St Mark', Br. 134. 22-139. As to the scrap of diaconal (intercessory) litany, pp. 138. 20-139. 6, left-hand columns, I need hardly add that this is in my opinion no part of the native and authentic 'Markan', that is Alexandrian, rite. Everything cannot be done at once; I hope to give to the subject of 'litanies' consideration and treatment in due time and place, when a few other questions have been dealt with and in some measure (I trust) cleared.

<sup>2</sup> *Grabeskirche und Apostelkirche, zwei Basiliken Konstantins*, J. E. Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1908, vol. i. The directly relative portions for the present question are: pp. iv-v; the 'Introduction', pp. 1-4; the section on Eusebius, pp. 16 sqq.; cf. p. 46; and the final chapter, pp. 197-235. There is in this last much to be found that will be distasteful or even repugnant in respect of the author's view, emphasized with repeated insistence, how, on this spot so specially holy in Christian eyes and to the Christian sense, the old, the non-Christian, survived, and is, in a way, represented in the new; and how it is here, once again, a case of the infusion of new ideas into old and enduring forms. Readers quite naturally, justifiably, may stop for very impatience, or even pain; but it may be useful to remember that this, at bottom and in principle, is but a manifestation, however displeasing it be *in casu*, of that idea of continuity which within the last fifty years or so has come to affect, in some respects to dominate, our fundamental conceptions. I mention all this because such patience with Dr Heisenberg in pursuing his favourite ideas is a necessary condition of really profiting (for our present purposes) by his book.

Dea—of the older and native Palestinian cult in its most characteristic manifestation. But there is another feature of the case, and of enduring interest: the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was the starting-point for a new religious development in Christianity itself; it was for the great body of Christians, and in reference to the ordinary and traditional Christian mind, the embodiment of a new idea—it was a pilgrimage-church. And, from the very site itself, the pilgrimage was one with which no other could by any possibility compete.<sup>1</sup> We are in these latter days so much accustomed to the idea of Christian pilgrimage to holy places that it may perhaps be somewhat hard for many of us to realize all that this pilgrimage-church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem means in the history and development of Christian piety and devotion. Those who can recognize and realize what have been the effects in the past half-century in the Roman Catholic Church as a whole of the pilgrimage of Lourdes in the region of devotional ideas, thoughts and notions, will be on the road to enter into an understanding of the effects of the new Church in Jerusalem in respect of the piety and worship of that day. There is a third consideration which must not be lost sight of here. The church of the Holy Sepulchre was an embodiment and expression too of the ideas and feelings in regard to cult and public worship of Constantine himself and of so many other converts, that class of persons of rank and influence who in the course of the fourth century 'joined the Church', became sometimes, indeed, main pillars and chief protectors, without, however, formally taking upon themselves the responsibilities implied by Christian baptism. In many senses, then, this church of the Holy Sepulchre was a new creation.

Now at the very beginning of the Intercession of 'St James' we meet (so it seems to me) with an indication of the presence in the Liturgy itself of the new cultural spirit. It begins not with prayer for the Catholic Church as in the 'Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions' (Antioch) and in 'St Mark' (Alexandria), but thus: 'We offer (them) also to Thee, O Lord, for Thy Holy Places which Thou hast glorified by the divine manifestation of Thy Christ and by the advent of Thine

<sup>1</sup> We may here usefully recall how it was not until the glory of the Holy Sepulchre church had departed on the taking of Jerusalem in 614, that the vogue of pilgrimage to the church of St Peter in Rome, for the west, fairly began; and how it was not until the early years of the seventh century that there began to make their appearance those Pilgrims' Guide Books for Rome illustrated by G. B. de Rossi in vol. i of his *Roma Sotterranea*, and those collections of Roman inscriptions brought together in vol. ii of his *Inscriptiones*. To these latter must now be added the inscriptions (four, or seven?) found by Professor Levison in the Cambridge MS Kk. iv 6 of the *Liber pontificalis*, printed by him *Neues Archiv* xxxi pp. 352 sqq. (1910), and conveniently brought together with remarks by Mgr Mercati, *Rassegna Gregoriana* 1910, coll. 47-50, as having 'a most special interest for us Romans'.

All-holy Spirit, especially for the glorious Sion, the Mother of all churches' (Br. 54. 24-27); and the Intercession only then has: 'And for Thy holy Catholic and Apostolic Church throughout all the world' (*ibid.* ll. 27-29).

Whether this kind of localism is in accord with the tone and temper of the Christian mind and piety as exhibited in the writings of the second and third centuries, is a question the decision as to which falls to be made, not to the liturgical specialist, but rather to those who have given their attention to the history of the Christians, in its widest sense, during that period. For my own part, until better instructed, I cannot but think this localism accords neither with the general character of the Christian religious sense or Christian piety generally in those centuries, nor with the case of Jerusalem in particular; and that it is a novelty. However that may be, one thing is certain, namely, that this feature of the Intercession of 'St James' entirely agrees with the spirit manifested in the *Catecheses* of St Cyril, which are full of a doubtless pardonable local self-consciousness and, it may be permissible to add, self-complacency. To me it appears that this item of the Intercession in which Jerusalem is put in the forefront as being the place glorified by the footsteps of God made Man, of the Redeemer of Mankind, and 'Sion' (whatever precisely this word was understood by the composer of the prayer to mean) as the Mother of all churches, is itself a speaking witness to and exemplification of what I have called elsewhere 'the new sense, feeling, religious sentiment induced by, or following on, the triumph of the Church' ('On the History of the Christian Altar', *Downside Review*, July 1905, pp. 160-161; separate print, pp. 9-10).

When novelty meets us (as in the case of the rubric in Serapion as to recital of names of dead in the Consecration Prayer and after the consecration) I should be naturally disposed (especially in view of St Cyril's *Catech. Myst.* v §§ 9-10) to ask myself whether Jerusalem may not have been the source of inspiration to Serapion for this novelty. We know how at once (the Pilgrim of Bordeaux of A.D. 333 is speaking testimony as to matter of fact here), whilst it was in course of building (326-336) and before it was yet quite complete, this new church in Jerusalem excited both deep admiration and piety through the Christian world. For its dedication troops of bishops came from all parts, from the Nile Delta as well as from elsewhere; and for men like Serapion of Thmuis this New Jerusalem was a church close at hand and was visited.<sup>1</sup> As said above, it is possible in a case like the present one to do no

<sup>1</sup> We can recall e.g. the visit of St Athanasius to Jerusalem (see *Itinera Latina* ii pp. 54-55, Société de l'Orient Latin); St Athanasius and the Council of Tyre 337, with a phalanx of 49 Egyptian bishops (Tillemont *Mém.* vii 34-35, Venice ed.).



more than give a conjecture, propose a hypothesis, and leave it for what, on a consideration of all the circumstances, it may be considered worth. If I must express an opinion in regard to the immediate subject of our enquiry, I should say that both the presence of a clause of intercession for the dead at the close of the consecration prayer in the Egyptian liturgy of Serapion, and the prescription of the recital of particular names, are an imitation of what the person responsible for this clause and rubric had seen and observed at Jerusalem.

Having thus far dealt with the question of *the place* of the clause of intercession for the dead in Serapion's Eucharistic Prayer, I now proceed in a separate Comment to consider the question of *the manner and style of formulation* in the Greek Liturgies of the items and clauses of the Great Intercession, and the form of words introducing each clause, but more especially the first. And this mere formal, verbal, enquiry will, if I mistake not, be found to lead up naturally into the very heart of the questions which await solution as to the developement of the Greek Liturgies in the centre and principle of their life, namely, the Epiklesis.<sup>1</sup>

## IX

In a previous Comment (see *J. T. S.* xii 394-395) attention was called to the importance in the story of liturgical developement of the place of the 'Great Intercession' in the Eucharistic service; and I had proposed to submit this particular question to a detailed examination so far as the first three centuries are concerned (*ibid.* pp. 395-396). But on reflexion I consider that, thanks to the labours of two of those invaluable persons, our forerunners—I mean Probst and Theodor Kliefoth—this is really not necessary; that the time and space required for such examination are much better given to other matters; and that a brief statement of conclusions will really be enough, when supplemented by such a list of references to the pages of these writers as will enable any one who has at hand the two books referred to, with a set of the Fathers and writers of the first centuries, to investigate the subject and come to a conclusion for himself. But in order to do this a few words here as to these writers themselves and their respective attitude as ecclesiastics (and theologians) in regard to the ancient Church and its worship, are desirable and perhaps necessary.

Probst was the restorer of liturgical studies among German Catholics. Brenner and Binterim were men of the old school, and they left no successors; Probst had to make his own way for himself as best he could in the days of renewed ecclesiastical learning of all kinds in

<sup>1</sup> This is the only occasion on which I use the word 'Epiklesis' in these two Comments. When I resume—as I hope to do shortly—No. X will be a brief memorandum on the words 'Epiklesis' and 'Invocation' and their use.

'We beseech Thee to . . . and to . . .'. The same simple method of formulation is observed in Nos. 22, 23, 24, 25; whilst No. 26 has imperative forms only, the first whereof is 'receive this supplication'.

On the foregoing this observation has to be made: that a form of prayer of this kind, and these prayers, as found in Serapion, are in place not merely in any part of the Eucharistic service but also at any other time of assembly of the faithful for purposes of worship; or, indeed, even in private worship also. By their terms they import no special connexion with the Eucharist at all.

II. *The Liturgy of 'St James'*. In this Liturgy the prayer for the communicants follows, as usual, at once on the Invocation: 'that it may be to those that partake of them for the remission of sins, &c. . . for the bringing forth good works'; but this usually simple prayer is in 'St James' complicated with another, a general and impersonal idea, for it continues: 'for the confirmation of Thy Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church', and for its deliverance from all heresies, &c., although prayer for the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church is found at the beginning of the immediately ensuing Intercession itself, making thus a sort of doublet.

Next, the form of the Intercession is now quite regular: it is as if quite ritualized; and it is in the wording of this form—in the initial words of the clauses and especially the first—that the importance of the Intercession of 'St James' (when compared with Serapion) consists. It begins: Προσφέρομέν σοι δέσποτα καὶ ὑπὲρ κτλ. (Br. 54. 24); and throughout the prayer each subsequent section begins with the invariable formula: 'Remember, O Lord', this or that class of persons.<sup>1</sup> What precisely are we to understand by this word introductory to the whole Intercession: 'We offer'; 'offer' what? The Syriac 'St James' extends the phrase thus, the priest saying: 'Wherefore we offer unto Thee, O Lord, this same fearful and unbloody sacrifice for', &c. (Br. 89. 30-32); and the deacon at the same time addresses the people thus: 'Let us pray and beseech our Lord and our God at this dread and holy moment for', &c. (*ibid.*); of course this diaconal utterance is a later and local addition, but it is not without significance for the particular 'genius' of the Liturgy of 'St James'. The late Dr Neale (*Hist. of the Eastern Ch.* i 591) has in his translation of the Greek 'St James': 'We offer them also to Thee, O Lord, for', &c.—'them' being the just consecrated gifts, the Sacred Body and Blood of our Lord. Both extensions are really one and the same thing; and fortunately we have in St Cyril (*Catech. Myst.* v 10) a touchstone whereby we can test for ourselves what is the genuine or original sense and meaning and

<sup>1</sup> Or once or twice: 'vouchsafe to remember.'

intention of the verb *προσφέρωμεν*, with object left unexpressed in the Greek text of the Liturgy. I have no intention of drawing out here in detail what (it appears to me) is the full sense and value of the words of St Cyril addressed to his neophytes,<sup>1</sup> those 'converts' of his who had just two or three days before been for the first time admitted to the full 'communion' expressed and enjoyed in the Christian Eucharistic Service. This must be reserved for another occasion and a different connexion—an occasion, however, to which the present Comments directly lead up. It is enough here to say that Cyril's explanation of what (in the Liturgy) 'we offer' is that it is 'Christ, who has been slain as a victim' (*Χριστὸν ἐσφαγιασμένον*), and that 'we offer' Christ so slain to be 'propitiatory' (*προσφέρωμεν ἐξιλειούμενοι . . . τὸν φιλόνητον Θεόν*) for others as well as for ourselves (*ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἡμῶν*).<sup>2</sup>

I hasten to add that I (for one at all events) must express a sense that Cyril herein is not typical (so far as I can see)—not typical even when his words are attenuated as far as possible—of the religious sense and feeling of the time, about A.D. 350, when he delivered these lectures of instruction; that he is (as was the Liturgy used by him, and evidenced in our 'St James') in advance of his age; that his expressions in the point both of the Eucharistic Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice are an 'early anticipation' of the *quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, not that was but that was to be. The Great Intercession as described in St Cyril pleads as 'propitiatory' the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ lying on the altar (cf. bottom of page 34 above).

III. *The Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions* ('St Clement'). Here we find as usual (Br. 21. 9-13) the prayer after the Invocation solely concerned with the communicants; and the anaphora passes thence directly to the 'Great Intercession' with the simple connexion: \*Ἐτι δεόμεθά σου Κύριε καὶ ὑπὲρ . . . (Br. 21. 15), as if it were formally a mere continuation and extension to other classes of persons of the prayer for the communicants, and without any special reference, so far as concerns those others, to the Eucharist or to the Sacrifice at all. But further on there is a significant variation. The Intercession consists of ten clauses; clauses 2, 3, 7, 8, 10 begin like the first \*Ἐτι παρακαλοῦμέν σε καὶ ὑπὲρ

<sup>1</sup> See Supplementary Note B, p. 57 below.

<sup>2</sup> I think it good, however, to add here Dr Darwell Stone's translation (*History of Doctrine, &c.* i 114) of St Cyril's text: '... we also, when we offer our supplications to Him on behalf of those who have fallen asleep . . . offer Christ sacrificed on behalf of our sins, propitiating the merciful God for them as well as for ourselves.' Provisionally I have ventured on an attempt to give the sense of St Cyril as it must have been understood by his hearers, and (what is to the point here) seems required by the Liturgy as understood by those who used it; but, as said above, I shall have to return to this matter in a later Comment.

(the 6th equivalently with Ἐτι ἀξιωδμέν σε καὶ ὑπέρ); whilst the 4th, 5th, and 9th begin Ἐτι προσφέρομέν σοι καὶ ὑπέρ . . . In other words the Intercession of 'St Clement' offers a combination of the form of Serapion and of that found in 'St James'.

IV. *The Liturgy of 'St Basil'*. The Invocation (Br. 329, 330. 1-11) is as usual at once followed (ll. 13-20) by prayer for communicants, the Intercession proper beginning at p. 332 l. 3. The mode of passage from prayer for communicants to Intercession (i.e. the transitional clauses, Br. 330. 21-331. 10) deserves attention. The terms used are ' . . . but that we may find mercy and grace with all the saints who have been well-pleasing to Thee from the beginning of the world, the forefathers, fathers, &c., . . . in faith made perfect, especially . . . our Lady the Mother of God and ever-Virgin Mary, the holy John the forerunner . . . and all Thy saints through whose prayers do Thou look down upon us, O God'. And then comes the Intercession, the first clause of which (for dead) begins thus: 'And remember all those who have fallen asleep in hope . . .' (p. 332. 3); the second clause begins: 'Again we beseech (δεόμεθα) Thee remember, O Lord . . .' (p. 332. 6). Then follow seven more clauses each of which is introduced by the simple word 'Remember', as in 'St James'. But with this the resemblance to 'St James' ends; and the text of the Intercession of 'St Basil', when looked at from the standpoint of 'St James', in tone, style, conception is seen to be (in spite of the identity of fundamental subject-matter) something quite different.

Of course we can, if we like, understand as 'implicit' in the Intercession of 'St Basil' what is found 'explicit' in that of 'St James'; that is, all that is involved in the προσφέρομεν as interpreted in St Cyril (see above, p. 43). But this idea is entirely absent from the text of the redactor of the Intercession of 'St Basil'; which is in itself as independent of Eucharistic connotation as, say, the pre-anaphoral Intercession prayers of Serapion (see p. 42 above).

But, I should like to go further and illustrate the case of 'St Basil' by an analogous case; and I must be excused (for the purposes of the present explanation only) if it be drawn from the Roman Canon; a text, however, which has the advantage of being known and indeed familiar to every one seriously interested in liturgical enquiries. But first it is necessary that I should repeat once more that the clause of intercession for the dead 'Memento etiam . . .' was in Rome not recited in the public masses of Sundays; that is those masses which in particular had to be attended by the people in fulfilment of their elementary religious duty; but it is an intrusion into the text as it were from without: not originally an essential and regular element of the Canon; and it came into regular use in Rome, in every mass as now, not before the ninth

century.<sup>1</sup> This elimination made, the last part of the Roman Canon will be found, in the combined general character and sequence of the two ideas expressed, a case parallel to that of 'St Basil'. In the Roman Canon, however, the second 'idea' of fellowship with the Saints (the 'Nobis quoque peccatoribus' clause) is (so commentators seem, with rare exceptions, to agree, and I think with reason) particularly appropriated to the clergy, whilst in 'St Basil' these fall under the term of the generality *ἡμῶς δὲ πάντας . . . καὶ μηδένα ἡμῶν* (Br. 330. 13, 17): a differentiation which such readers as are students of that most important

<sup>1</sup> The case has been set out in the *J. T. S.* iv 571 sqq., cf. xii 391 (e). I now carry this matter back further and also approach it from another side. In the Penitential of Theodore (a source for the history of liturgy which has not yet been exhausted; or perhaps the value of which is not yet fully recognized), lib. ii cap. v, De Missa Monachorum § 4, is found this somewhat enigmatical pronouncement: 'Missae (or "missas") quoque monachorum fieri per singulas septimanas et nomina recitare mos est' (Haddan and Stubbs *Councils* iii p. 194). In the so-called 'Canones S. Gregorii urbis Romae', first edited by Kunstmann (*Die lateinischen Pönitentialbücher der Angelsachsen*, Mainz 1844, p. 129), is a canon (No. 108 p. 138) which runs thus: 'Missam monachorum per singulas septimanas nomina recitare. Secundum Romanos die dominico nomina mortuorum non recitantur ad missam.' Kunstmann edits these Canons of St Gregory from a St Emmeram MS, which he describes (p. 29) as written in 'Anglo-Saxon' script, and he assigns it (p. 28) to the end of the eighth, or at latest, the beginning of the ninth century. Whether this MS be with the other St Emmeram MSS now at Munich I cannot tell, and it is clear that H. J. Schmitz, who had searched so sedulously for MSS of Penitentials, had never seen it, and speaks only after Kunstmann (*Die Bussbücher und das kanonische Bussverfahren*, Düsseldorf 1898, p. 522). This piece was reprinted by Wasserschleben (*Bussordnungen* 1851), p. 160, from Kunstmann's text with collation of another copy, Paris MS 2123 s. ix, which, however, he considers affords a less authentic text than the MS used by Kunstmann. From Wasserschleben's edition of the 'Canones' it appears that this whole document is to be referred, canon by canon, for its original and source to Theodore; to which its text also affords at times a useful explanation or gloss, inasmuch as the script of the St Emmeram MS, no less than the title itself of the document, shews that it must have been drawn up in England and at a date certainly not far removed from the redaction of the document known to us as Theodore's Penitential. That the Canon 108 is an authentic and trustworthy gloss of the relative text of Theodore I do not, for myself, in view of the other testimonies as to the non-recital of names of dead in the Sunday mass at Rome, see any ground for doubting; and England, in the first, or even second, half of the eighth century would be as good and trustworthy a source of information in regard to Roman liturgical practice as could possibly be found.

The meaning attached by the person responsible for the redaction of 'Theodore's Penitential' to the passage quoted from it above is quite another matter; but I would suggest that the tenor of the enquiry put to Theodore was of this kind: 'The monks say masses for the dead every day of the week, and recite the names of dead, Sundays included, which the Romans do not do; what are we to say as to the continuance of this local, this English, practice?' And Theodore's answer was to the effect: 'Leave the monks in peace and let them go on in their own way.'

but rather neglected subject, the history of the Roman Church in Rome, may be not disinclined to view as characteristic.

It is to be clearly understood that I do not mean to imply or suggest that there is a historical connexion between the two texts, that one was borrowed from the other; but I do think that as they stand they both proceed from the same stage of liturgical idea and developement. I would put the case summarily thus: When the necessary eliminations have been made (that is the Memento of dead in the case of the Roman Canon, and of course all question of names in both documents are set aside) the Eucharistic prayers in 'St Basil' and the Roman Canon end in the same way; but in 'St Basil' a 'Great Intercession', without organic connexion with that ending, has been pieced on.<sup>1</sup>

V. *Liturgy of St Chrysostom.* This Constantinopolitan liturgy, in the substitution in its Invocation of the word *ποίησον* for the *ἀναδέξαι* of 'St Basil' (also Constantinopolitan), gives us already a warning note of that perfecting of the Greek liturgical developement which is evidenced by the addition to the Invocation of the decisive and explicit words 'changing them by Thy Holy Spirit'.<sup>2</sup> We cannot be surprised therefore at finding a distinctly marked modification in the initial words of the Intercession also. 'St Chrysostom' passes straight to this latter part of the prayer for communicants without any transitional text as in 'St Basil', and the Intercession begins: Ἐπι προσφερόμέν σοι τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην λατρείαν ὑπὲρ κτλ. (Br. 331. 12-13). What was in the mind of the composer of this liturgy when he wrote these words? what, of what kind, was the 'reasonable service' we are here supposed to be 'offering'?<sup>3</sup> Unfortunately we have not at hand in this case, as in the case of 'St James', a faithful commentator like St Cyril who will give us assurance of the real and intended sense, import, and value of the vague text of the prayer. In these circumstances we are left to do the best we can for ourselves and then can attain perhaps to no more than a 'view' or opinion. The words are also found in the (earlier) Constantinopolitan liturgy of 'St Basil'; in this latter, however, not after the consecration, not as introductory to the Intercession, but only in the Preface: καὶ σοὶ προσφέρειν ἐν καρδίᾳ συντετριμμένη καὶ πνεύματι ταπεινώσεως τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην λατρείαν ἡμῶν (Br. 322. 7-10). When we look at and consider the text itself of that Preface as a whole, the only 'reasonable service' found to be evidenced therein is a 'sacrifice of praise' and of

<sup>1</sup> The case receives some further illustration, and a point of the Liturgy of 'St James' is brought into connexion with it, in Supplementary Note C.

<sup>2</sup> Of course in writing as I do of the 'Liturgy of St Chrysostom' I do not forget fasc. 35 in Dr Lietzmann's series of texts.

<sup>3</sup> The same formula is verbally repeated at the beginning of the fourth clause of the Intercession (Br. 332. 25-26).

thanksgiving; and from the point of the text just cited (Br. 322. 7-10) onwards, and through the long-drawn consecratory prayer, it is not until we come to the ritual formula of offering in the Anamnesis (Br. 329. 14 seqq.) immediately preceding the Invocation that we find any allusion to, any suggestion of, the idea of sacrifice, and then it is unmistakably eucharistic: 'taking courage we draw near to Thy holy altar, and presenting the antitypes of the Body and Blood of Thy Christ we pray and beseech Thee . . .' (Br. 329. 21-26).

When then the 'Liturgy of St Chrysostom', for the first time in the history of the rite of Constantinople (some time probably in the later sixth century or more probably in the seventh), introduces its Intercession with the words: 'We offer to Thee this reasonable service on behalf of' &c.,—does the writer here mean: 'We offer to Thee the reasonable service of *our* praises and thanksgivings'? Each enquirer into the earlier history of the Christian Divine Service in its gradual development must be left to answer this question in his own way; but for my own part I have no doubt that the composer of the Intercession in 'St Chrysostom', though retaining a text traditional in the liturgy of Constantinople, intended to express here neither more nor less than what we have already found to be meant in the Hierosolymitan Liturgy of 'St James' at as early a date as the middle of the fourth century (see pp. 42-43 above).

The subordinate clauses need not delay us here; but the details are thrown into a footnote.<sup>1</sup>

VI. With *The Liturgy of 'St Mark'* we come back at length to the region in which Serapion composed his own Eucharistic Prayer. It is a commonplace to say, but it is useful to repeat, that the 'Great Intercession' of 'St Mark' is at the beginning of that prayer, and comes before not only the consecratory part thereof, but even before the *Sanctus* is approached. It is lengthy (Br. 126. 12-131. 16); but this only makes the great simplicity of its construction the more remarkable. It begins with a form and in a style we have already found so common in Serapion: *καὶ δεόμεθα καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν . . . Κύριε*. This in 'St Mark' is never repeated; but regularly thereafter (except in the section Br. 130. 7-26, of which presently) to the end, its clauses are formulated in the 'imperative mood'; there are between seventy or eighty of these 'imperatives': not with a continual recurrence of one and the same word like the *Μνήσθητι* of 'St James', but they are words of the most varied character: indeed the Intercession of 'St Mark' makes use of a *natural* style, and does not run like 'St. James' into a regularized and so to speak ritualized formulation of prayer.

<sup>1</sup> The Intercession of 'St Chrysostom' consists of eight clauses. The incipit of the first and fourth have been already mentioned above (in text and in note 3 p. 46). Nos. 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 begin *Μνήσθητι*; No. 3, *\*Ἐτι παρακαλοῦμέν σε μνήσθητι*.

of a general character. I think it desirable to emphasize the value—the extraordinary value—and importance of the extant formal liturgies, Oriental, Greek, Latin, that have been so long in print, inasmuch as I seem to have observed in some quarters a tendency to throw them in a body as it were over the border into the fifth century, as material practically negligible (for one reason or another) for the reconstruction of the liturgical history of the first four centuries, and to rely upon Church Orders, &c.

Elsewhere (Obs. VI on *Narsai* p. 128) it has been said how the liturgies of the Eastern rites exhibit 'unmistakeable marks of development; yet the detailed stages of that development commonly escape us from its very rapidity and the want of adequate and contemporary materials from which to reconstruct the details of a complex and lost history'. But even if we confine our attention to the narrow range of the Greek Liturgies only, when the texts are carefully examined and their differences noted and such differences made starting-points of special enquiries, it is remarkable (such at least is my experience) how much of that 'lost history' is still to be detected on record in them. When, of course, to the investigation of the Greek Liturgies in themselves is added a further comparison with the Oriental and Western forms, I for one feel no doubt that in time, as investigation proceeds, that 'lost history' will be recovered;—so much of it, that is to say, as is best worth knowing, all perhaps that it really 'matters' to know.

EDMUND BISHOP.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE A.

(See p. 41 n. 1.)

The references are as follows: Kliefoth (*Liturgische Abhandlungen* iv, Schwerin 1858): Justin pp. 296–297, cf. p. 323; Tertullian pp. 372–374, cf. p. 384; Cyprian pp. 430 seqq.; Origen pp. 432–433; *Ap. Const.* ii 57 p. 470. Probst, not more interested in this question than Kliefoth, but with a thesis to prove and obvious difficulties in the way of it, goes much more elaborately to work (*Liturgie der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, Tübingen 1870): Clement of Rome pp. 56–58, 62; Ignatius of Antioch pp. 72–73, 83–84 (§ 3); Martyrdom of Polycarp pp. 73–74; Justin pp. 94–98, 111–114; Irenaeus pp. 125–129; Clement of Alexandria p. 140 (cf. p. 136 top of page); Tertullian pp. 192–196, 201–204; Cyprian pp. 221–223, 226–228; Origen pp. 154, 155, 167–170, for due understanding of which, however, it is necessary to consider also pp. 141–152.

One point calls for special notice. From a passage in Cyprian *Ep.* lviii (ed. Baluze = *Ep.* lxi ed. Hartel) Kliefoth infers (p. 432) that besides



the Gemeindegebet or Great Intercession in its traditional place at the beginning of the Mass of the Faithful there was a novelty in Cyprian's liturgy, a second Intercession, which, with a reference to *Const. Ap.* ii 57 he places just before the Eucharistic or Consecratory Prayer (cf. pp. 431, 439, 473). This seems to me a very forced conclusion from Cyprian's words, but quite in accord with Kliefoth's notions, which he elaborately explains in and out of season, as to the gradual development of the idea of sacrifice in the celebration of the Christian Eucharist, and in accord with the view of so many German and especially Lutheran writers that Cyprian is, if not responsible for, yet the first witness to the Eucharistic service as a sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. Moreover, this inference of Kliefoth from Cyprian's *Ep.* lviii is (so far as I know) peculiar to himself. But in any case such second Intercession as he assumes was made before the Consecratory Prayer so much as begins.

But the order of service described in *Ap. Const.* ii cap. 57 and referred to by him in dealing with Cyprian is a much more serious matter. To this part of the chapter there is nothing corresponding in the Didascalia (see Funk, pp. 164-167). That order of service is as follows: prayer after the dismissal of the catechumens;—collecting, seemingly, the gifts; and after monition by the deacon, kiss of peace;—*καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο προσευχέσθω ὁ διάκονος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης καὶ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ μερῶν καὶ ἐκφορίων, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς καθόλου εἰρήνης* (Funk, § 18);—then with a blessing the anaphora is entered on.

It will be seen that this is a different order from that of the Liturgy of the Eighth Book of the Constitutions (see Br. pp. 9-14). It is interesting to observe how this matter has been dealt with by the writers. Kliefoth examines it carefully (pp. 470-473) and concludes: 'This form is therefore a transitional form'—a sort of half-way house between the old and traditional place of the Great Intercession at the beginning of the Mass of the Faithful and the place in which it is found (i.e. after the consecration) in the Eighth Book. Probst (p. 175) mentions the order in the shortest way, but has nothing to say on the subject. Schmiedel (*Lehrbuch der Liturgik* vol. i 1900, pp. 282, 283 top of page, and p. 286 (m) end of small print) just ignores the difficulty. Funk (*Const. Ap. et Didascalia* 1905, i p. 166 foot-note) says that the order of the liturgy is not accurately given in ii 57 and that the kiss of peace nowhere else comes before the Prayers of the Faithful. I observe, however, that in the liturgy of Narsai and in that of the Areopagite the names are read after the Kiss of Peace, and that in the 'Liturgy of Addai and Mari' (Br. 281. 30 seqq.) there is in the same place a quasi prayer of intercession. It seems to me, however, evident on the surface of things, when we read the two texts together, that the order described

in *Ap. Const.* ii 57, so clearly different from that in the Eighth Book, deserves more attention than is accorded to it by writers on these subjects.

As the opportunity may not easily occur again, and the point has been dealt with by Kliefoth in view of its bearing on the place of the Great Intercession in the service, I take advantage of the present occasion to consider the case in some detail and on its merits. *Ap. Const.* ii 57 is printed, and with numbering of lines, in Mr Brightman's volume (pp. 28-30) at the end of the Liturgy of the Eighth Book, so that the task of exact reference to both documents is greatly facilitated and any reader who wishes to follow what has to be said can easily do so.

As already indicated, there is nothing whatever in the Syriac Didascalia (of which this part of the Apostolic Constitutions is a re-write) corresponding to what is printed Br. p. 30 (the page that will occupy our attention) except for the last five words of line 3, and the quotation *προσευξάσθωσαν . . . ἀνατολάς* lines 4-6 (which comes from the Didascalia, Funk, p. 162 ll. 1-2).

Probst puts the difficulty that concerns us clearly and simply. At the end of cap. 11 of the Eighth Book (he says, p. 276) the giving of the kiss of peace is minutely described; then with cap. 12 just before the beginning of the Thanksgiving (= Preface) occurs this proclamation of the deacon: 'Let no one (have aught) against another, let none (be) in hypocrisy'<sup>1</sup> (Br. 13. 30). This is obviously a monition in preparation for the Kiss of Peace. But the Kiss of Peace among the people has already taken place; there is therefore something wrong here. He concludes that the whole passage as to the Kiss of Peace and the long rubric after it (Br. 13. 5-23) is a later interpolation and no part of the genuine document. The case being thus opened other critics followed and new difficulties were pointed out; an account of these discussions may be found in Br. pp. xliii-xlv; they need not be noticed here; but one point is really of moment; namely, that in this connexion *Ap. Const.* ii 57 is not so much as mentioned<sup>2</sup> (but cf. Br. p. xlv 39), although it might reasonably have been anticipated that this is the first quarter to

<sup>1</sup> I do not know why Mr Warren (see note 2) translates (p. 268): 'Let no hypocrite remain.'

<sup>2</sup> I have not read the articles of Brückner and Kleinert (1883)—see Br. pp. xliii-xlv—though I well remember the flourish of trumpets (from some camps) that accompanied their publication. It is, I think, much more important, however, to bear in mind and attend to two little popular works issued by the S.P.C.K.: Mr Cresswell's *The Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions* in the series 'Early Church Classics' (in which I think pp. 5, 12, 25-26, 27-28, 31, with 51-53 interesting to note for the present purpose) and the Rev. F. E. Warren's more important book *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*, 2nd ed. 1912 (see pp. 254-

which recourse would be had in any attempt to elucidate the case and solve the difficulties that had suggested themselves. I therefore propose to see what, if any, light may be thrown on the question from this quarter. It will be convenient to give the order of service of the two accounts in parallel columns.

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Ap. Const. viii</i></p> <p>I. dismissal of catechumens Br. 5. 29. dismissal of energumens Br. 7. 2. dismissal of φωτιζόμενοι Br. 7. 26. dismissal of those in penance Br. 9. 21.</p> <p>II. long diaconal litany Br. 9. 25– 12. 8.</p> <p style="padding-left: 2em;">and prayer of the bishop Br. 12. 10–13. 3.</p> <p>III. Kiss of Peace.</p> <p>IV. rubric as to duties of deacons in regard to (a) collecting offerings of people (this is implied by Br. 13. 20– 21 combined with Br. 30. 33– 34) ;</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Ap. Const. ii</i></p> <p>I. μετὰ τὴν τῶν κατηχομένων     καὶ τὴν τῶν μετανοούντων ἕξο- δον Br. 30. 4.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>II. προσευξάσθωσαν τῷ Θεῷ . . . Br. 30. 4–5 (κατὰ ἀνατολὰς Br. 30. 3).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">. . . . .</p> <p>III. duties of deacons in regard to (a) collecting offerings of people Br. 30. 10–11<sup>2</sup> ;</p>
---	--

259). Such books as these really deserve attention, as it is by them that ordinary educated opinion among clergy and laity too is really formed.

<sup>1</sup> It will be observed that in *Ap. Const. viii* there are four separate dismissals, of four different classes of persons; in *Ap. Const. ii* only two are mentioned, of catechumens and of penitents. In the 19th Canon of the Council of Laodicea (between 343–381), in which is given a brief description of the order of the Eucharistic service, dismissals of catechumens and of penitents alone are specified. It may be added that from an interesting document written between 532 and 538 recently published in translation (*Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* xiv, 1909, pp. 47–48, and in separate print, Fasc. III of abbé Nau's *Ancienne Littérature Canonique Syriacque*, Paris, Lethielleux, 1909, pp. 47–48, with lithograph of Syriac text), it would appear that at that time there existed still in the liturgy of the church of Constantinople dismissals of two classes, catechumens (called in translation 'auditeurs') and penitents, and the prayers are given.

<sup>2</sup> οἱ μὲν τῇ προσφορᾷ τῆς εὐχαριστίας σχολαζήτωσαν ὑπηρετούμενοι τῷ Κυρίου [al. Χριστοῦ] σώματι μετὰ φόβου (Funk, p. 165. 22–4; Br. 30. 10–11), and cf. *Didascalía* p. 162. 2–5: 'Diaconorum autem unus semper adstet oblationibus eucharistiae . . . et postea, cum vos offeretis, simul ministrent in ecclesia.'

*Ap. Const. viii*

(b) ordering the people Br. 13.  
16-19;

(c) guarding the doors Br. 13.  
19-20.

V. Five proclamations by the  
deacon Br. 13. 24-32 (the  
fifth is as opposite).

. . . . .

VI. salutation (blessing) by the  
bishop Br. 14. 8-13.

VII. The anaphora begins.

*Ap. Const. ii*

(b) ordering the people Br. 30.  
11-12.

IV. Λεγέτω δὲ ὁ παρεστὼς τῷ ἱερεὶ  
διάκονος τῷ λαῷ Μὴ τις κατα-  
τινός, μὴ τις ἐν ὑποκρίσει Br.

V. Kiss of Peace Br. 30. 16-17.

VI. diaconal litany of intercession  
Br. 30. 19-23. See p. 51  
above for text: 'Funk, § 18.'

VII. salutation (blessing) of people  
by the ἀρχιερεὺς Br. 30  
24-28.

followed by another by the  
bishop Br. 30. 28-31.

VIII. The anaphora: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα  
γενέσθω ἡ θυσία ἐστῶτος παν-  
τὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ προσευχο-  
μένου ἡσυχῶς Br. 30. 34-35.

In the order of service presented in the right-hand column (Book ii) none of the difficulties occur that trouble Probst and the other critics after him; it proceeds in a reasonable and intelligible way; after the expulsion of the catechumens and penitents (I) the Mass of the Faithful begins with prayer (II); then comes a direction what the deacons are to do to make all things ready for the sacrifice: to collect from the people the gifts to be used at it, and to see that they stand in a decent and orderly manner (III); the deacon specially assistant on the celebrant (?) gives them a monition for a due ordering of their minds also (IV) in preparation for that sign of Christian communion, fellowship and charity, the Kiss of Peace, which now follows (V); the monition and the Kiss of Peace are therefore here in their right place. There is said what seems evidently a diaconal litany (VI) to cover (as it seems reasonable to presume the time of the collection of gifts and the Pax. Then come salutations of blessing on the people (VII) and the anaphora begins.

When so much has been observed other points begin to attract our attention, further comparisons suggest themselves.

For instance the origin of a piece of rubric in *Ap. Const. viii* is clearly to be traced back first to *Ap. Const. ii* and thence to the Syriac Didascalia; thus:—

<i>Book viii</i> (Br. 13. 17-19) * καὶ ἄλλοι διάκονοι . . . σκοπεῖτωσαν τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ὅπως μὴ θύρῳβος γένηται καὶ μὴ τις νεύσῃ ἢ ψιθυρίσῃ ἢ νυστάξῃ.	<i>Book ii c. 57</i> (Br. 28. 26-27) ὁμοίως ὁ διάκονος ἐπι- σκοπεῖτω τὸν λαὸν ὅπως μὴ τις ψιθυρίσῃ ἢ νυστάξῃ ἢ γελάσῃ ἢ νεύσῃ.	<i>Didascalia</i> (Funk, 166. 2-3) similiter diaconus provideat ne quisquam susur- ret vel dormitet vel rideat vel nutet.
--	--	---

Again it has been pointed out by the critics that the first two of the five monitions of the deacon (see above in Table, *Ap. Const.* viii No. V): 'Let none of the catechumens, none of the hearers, &c., stay. Ye who have prayed the former prayer depart' (Br. 13. 26-29), are out of place here; the catechumens have been dismissed long ago (Br. 5. 29), and there is no dismissal or expulsion here to which such words could apply. It is to be noticed also that the third diaconal monition or proclamation reads as at the least an odd element in a liturgical service (though it may prove of value in an eventual estimate of the personal character and idiosyncrasies of the redactor of the Clementine Liturgy); it runs: 'Mothers, take up your children' (τὰ παῖδια προσλαμβάνεσθε αἱ μητέρες Br. 13. 29). But here again we can refer the redactor's work to its sources, the same as those above. Book ii in describing the way in which the deacons are to range the people says: τὰ δὲ παῖδια ἐστῶτα προσλαμβάνεσθωσαν αὐτῶν οἱ πατέρες καὶ αἱ μητέρες (Br. 28. 21; Funk, 165. 4-5); and this again goes back on the *Didascalia* (Funk, 164. 4-5): 'pueri autem stent seorsum [cf. with this Br. 13. 16], aut patres ac matres eos ad se assumant.'

Other points might be dwelt on, but they cannot be exhibited at length here.<sup>1</sup> Those persons, however, who will take the trouble to compare the details of the rubrical portion of Br. 13. 5 to 14. 10 with what is to be found of a correspondingly preceptive nature in Book ii c. 57, Br. pp. 28-29, and this again with the corresponding text of the *Didascalia*, Funk, pp. 158-166, will, I think, find material for instructive meditation on a subject which is of primary importance in all historical enquiry into the developement of Christian Liturgy, namely, the process and stages whereby the primitive form of a *rationabile obsequium* was, in some churches at least of the Greek-speaking portions of the Patriarchate of Antioch, by the close of the fourth century coming to assume the character of a ritualized function.

Here I can make only two or three brief remarks applicable to the particular enquiry made in Comment IX on the subject of the Great Intercession.

<sup>1</sup> For instance, the question of the deacons guarding the doors so that they should not be opened and no one should go out during the anaphora (Br. 13. 19-21), &c.

(1) However attractive Kliefoth's theory that the Intercession prayer in Book II of the Apostolic Constitutions (VI in the Table above) marks a stage of transition may appear, it is, I think, not admissible; for there is nothing to shew that the prayer No. VI of the Table (lib. ii c. 57) was the Great Intercession at all; rather it would seem to be merely a diaconal litany; and accordingly so far as the text of *Ap. Const.* ii 57 is concerned, there is no ground for asserting that in the liturgy there described the Great Intercession was not said after the consecration as in the Liturgy of the Eighth Book.

(2) Moreover, it would be rash to-day to venture to assign (as did Kliefoth quite excusably in his day) the liturgy described in Book ii c. 57 to as early a date as the third century at all. As a matter of opinion, and as at present advised, I should personally think it better to assign it to some time in the fourth century rather than to any time in the third.

(3) Those who are acquainted with the liturgical literature of the last thirty years will have observed how often Egypt is made (largely through 'Church Orders') a source of liturgical inspiration for other lands. To me, I must own, it has appeared that the contrary is rather the case, and it is Egypt which is the recipient—the rather late recipient—of liturgical documents originating elsewhere. Be this as it may, I would at least point out here an example of what I mean from the 'epoch-making' articles of Brückner and Kleinert. The latter considered that the redactor of the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* Book viii had before him as one of his documentary sources (see Br. xlv. 6–8) 'a rubrical scheme reproduced by the Egyptian document Append. A 1, which is prior to *Ap. Const.*' This presumed-earlier document Append. A 1 is (see Br. 462 sqq.) a 'Mass at the consecration of a bishop' in cap. 64 of the 'Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons'.<sup>1</sup> And certainly the rubrics of the Liturgy of the *Ap. Const.* viii, Br. 13. 10–21, and those of the presumed-earlier mass, *ibid.* 462. 24–463. 2, are a translation (with a very few slight variants or additions) one of the other. Which, then, is the original, and which is the translation? It has been explained above that we can find some of the rubrics of *Ap. Const.* viii actually in the making, inasmuch as they can be referred first to *Ap. Const.* ii 57 and thence finally back to the Syriac Didascalia of the third century. In these circumstances, there surely can be no doubt that here the mass in the Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons is merely translating the mass in the *Apostolic Constitutions* Book viii. Needless to say that in the former mass the absurdity of the diaconal proclamation: 'Mothers, lay hold of your children' (Br. 462. 11), is duly reproduced.

<sup>1</sup> Called in Mr Horner's volume the 'Saidic Text' of the 'Statutes of the Apostles': see this mass at pp. 342–343.

## SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE B.

(See p. 43 n. 1.)

I think it necessary to insist on this point (cf. *J.T.S.* xii pp. 393-394 : 'But on the other hand', &c.). I have somewhere read of St Cyril's Catecheses as being representative of the normal teaching for educated people and the more thoughtful clergy of the times ; as if (to put the case in a modern way) a series of lectures at a Summer School of Theology at one of the Universities, or of higher class Divinity Lectures in one of our great towns. This of course is a point of view which may deserve consideration, but I think it is a completely mistaken one ; and that for two reasons. Elsewhere I have said that the Hierosolymitan piety represented by St Cyril is the last quarter in which I should look for a true and untroubled rendering of the tone and spirit of Christian piety of the first three Christian centuries ; and this, in my opinion, holds good in regard to the doctrinal level and contents of the Catecheses,—so far, that is, as concerns what is particularly characteristic of them, and differentiates them from any writings that have survived of the period up to c. A. D. 350. I would emphasize most distinctly that so far from being a course of instructions for the more thoughtful clergy and the educated laity, they are in spirit, intention, form and fact what they give themselves out to be,—namely, instructions in Christian belief and practice designed for intending converts, and for those who had just but two or three days before been admitted for the first time to Christian communion ; and this from their tenor, their simplicity and their positiveness is particularly clear in the five Mystagogic Catecheses with which alone we are immediately concerned at present. Of course their doctrine throughout is 'high' doctrine ; so 'high' that it is, and (short of some unexpected discovery) it must always remain to some extent a subject of wonder that such discourses could have been delivered in the middle of the fourth century ; and there seems some cause to feel a certain sort of sympathy with, or compassion for, those Protestants who (like André Rivet and Aubertin) said they could not be productions of the fourth century but were of a later date (see Toultée's *Diss.* 2<sup>da</sup>, cap. iii).

As the question is important I take leave to consider the matter a little more at length, and to refer to St Basil's treatise on the Holy Ghost, which is classical, and has been well called supreme for its age and value. This case has been otherwise, and, as I conceive, also justly, touched on by the Bishop of Moray, when he says it 'may be called a treatise on the doxology' (*Ancient Church Orders* p. 126). I would add further that its full drift, meaning, and value is to be duly estimated only when it is taken in conjunction with, and is set in the

background supplied by, a full and detailed review of doxological history and practice in East and West in the third and fourth centuries (*J.T.S.* xii 399 n. 1); for it is only so, to begin with, that we can come to recognize St Basil's embarrassment shewn in this lengthy attempt to justify himself in the eyes of, at all events, some of his own people; for this,—and not the composition of a set theological treatise in a genuinely theological manner as by a Gregory of Nyssa,—was St Basil's immediate object. The points indicated in another connexion (see *Narsai* p. 140 notes 1 and 2) are to the purpose here. I wrote those notes because in at least some quarters qualified to speak, the essential conditions of St Basil's case seem not to be realized. Thus Dr Schermann (a man whose training has been first-rate, and who has since shewn how well qualified he was to profit by it) writes (*Die Gottheit des heiligen Geistes nach den griechischen Vätern des vierten Jahrhunderts*, Freib. im Br. 1901, p. 95): 'Basil never in his sermons or writings distinguished the Holy Ghost with the predicate "God"'; and for this he refers to Harnack's *Dogmengesch.* II<sup>2</sup> p. 280.<sup>1</sup> But this precisely was what Basil had done, and in a distinct and emphatic way, in his earlier days, in 360; in a letter only indeed, but a sort of open letter, and not addressed to a mere private individual. When he came later to deal with the matter with the experience and responsibilities of a bishop, and also of a theologian, there came, too, his well-known reserve, and also the anger of his lay friends. An Essay by the late Cardinal Newman, which missed its mark at the time and in the circles concerned, and if mentioned to-day is probably little, if at all, read, is however of the highest value in regard to the case we are considering. He points out how, amidst the hesitations or the fears of bishops and theologians, it was the laity who were at bottom the efficient means of the full triumph of the full Nicene doctrine. As I have said elsewhere, the laity though thus practically effective (and effective perhaps for this very reason) are not unnaturally apt to overlook difficulties in a situation that are perceptible or clear to the eye of the theologian; one, that is, who bears in mind the *données* of what is called nowadays 'Positive Theology'. This was the difficulty—a difficulty as regards the production of testimony and witnesses from the past—that was present to St Basil's mind (cf. *Narsai* p. 141 latter part of note 1).

<sup>1</sup> I must own that I cannot find this in Harnack; who, however, does say (2nd ed. 1888, p. 282): '... im Grunde sind sie (the 'Cappadocians'), wenigstens Basilius, auch schon mit der Anerkennung zufrieden, dass der Geist kein Geschöpf sei', and *ibid.* note 2 that Basil by and by when bishop (that is after 370) 'sich hütete den h. Geist öffentlich "Gott" zu nennen'; but all this is a different matter. These statements are simply repeated in the 3rd ed. (1909) p. 292, and note pp. 292-293.



The very great value of the Catecheses of St Cyril generally seems to me to lie rather in this, that we have in them a specimen of the kind of teaching in some quarters imbibed by such persons as those zealous lay friends of St Basil a little later, who felt so greatly scandalized at him; a kind of teaching, however, which in the case of St Cyril, so far as some parts of the Mystagogic Catecheses are concerned, I for one cannot conceive of as, at the date *c.* A.D. 350, 'normal',—in the sense of the *quod ubique*. But they explain very well how there existed an 'informed' laity, a very effective laity, a sort of advance-guard. In the formulation of his teaching in regard to the idea of the Eucharistic Presence, St Cyril for his age stands alone; there is (I think I am safe in saying) no other text that can be put beside his from antiquity. To me—a plain and simple transubstantiationist without shadow of minimism, and one who has reason to know from within what Transubstantiation is and what it is not, and what it means both in its religious sense and in its theological conception—St Cyril's teaching—in the terms in which it stands in his text, and therefore in terms which must be supposed to say what he means—is neither more nor less than what a Roman Catholic recognizes, cannot but recognize, as simple Transubstantiation. I know, in reading the Fathers, when the doctrine which I believe is fully and adequately expressed; or when the language used is such as to be reconcilable with that doctrine. St Cyril's teaching had to be mentioned and it will come for consideration later as a starting-point in view of its bearing on the matter that concerns us—the liturgical developments of the fourth century.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE C.

(See p. 46 n. 1.)

It is worth while to put the substantial portions of the two texts referred to at pp. 44–46 (those, namely, of 'St Basil' and the Roman Canon) in parallel columns.

##### 'St Basil'

and cause that no one of us  
partake | of the holy Body and  
Blood of Thy Christ unto con-  
demnation, |

but that we may | find mercy  
and grace | with all the saints  
well-pleasing to Thee from the  
beginning, forefathers, &c.

##### Roman Canon

ut quotquot ex hac altaris par-  
ticipatione | sacrosanctum Filii tui  
Corpus et Sanguinem sumpseri-  
mus omni benedictione caelesti et  
gratia repleamur. | Nobis quoque  
peccatoribus | . . . partem aliquam  
et societatem donare digneris |  
cum tuis sanctis apostolis . . . et  
omnibus sanctis tuis . . .

Here we are not concerned with verbal coincidences. We have two presentments of a common idea, or rather of a succession of two ideas, not a case of literary borrowing; and what is profitable to note is the tenor of the two prayers, their place in the service, the sequence of ideas and the note on which both end: that those who partake of the Body and Blood of Christ may have mercy, grace, blessing, and be admitted to the society of the saints, all and particular.

If we turn now to the Liturgy of 'St James', we find, both in the Greek and in the Syriac (Br. p. 65. 25 sqq. right-hand column; p. 104. 27 sqq.), a prayer which is the precise equivalent of these two prayers given above from 'St Basil' and the Roman Canon. It also is a prayer for the communicants; but to be said after the communion instead of before it, and the verbs referring to the reception of holy communion are in the past tense instead of the future. Let us first take the Syriac form which begins: 'We give thanks unto Thee, O Lord our God, and especially we give thanks unto Thee for the abundance of Thy great and unspeakable mercy and love towards mankind, O Lord, who hast accounted us worthy to partake of Thine heavenly table. [Thus far is thanksgiving; the prayer goes on:] 'Condemn us not by reason of the reception of Thine holy and immaculate mysteries but preserve us, O good, in righteousness and holiness that being worthy to partake of Thine Holy Spirit we may find a portion and a lot and an inheritance with all the saints who have been well-pleasing unto Thee since the world began.'

The Greek has not those words at the beginning which are expressive of thanksgiving (namely, 'We give . . . heavenly table'); and adds at the end (after 'began') 'in the light of Thy countenance'.

When this prayer in 'St James' is compared with that from 'St Basil' above, in its full text Br. p. 330. 13-24, I think it will appear that in this case there is something more than an agreement in mere thought and ideas. The two prayers have every appearance of being in historical and literary relation to one another. The same scripture phrases are utilized: the communion of the Holy Spirit (Eph. iv 4; 2 Cor. xiii 14); judgement and condemnation for unworthy reception of the Eucharist (1 Cor. xi 34); the saints who from the beginning (*ἀπ' αἰῶνος* Lk. i 70) have been well-pleasing. 'That we may find mercy and grace' (Heb. iv 16) in 'St Basil', is represented by an exactly parallel scripture phrase, 'That we may find a portion and a lot' (Col. i 12), in St 'James'.<sup>1</sup>

It may be matter of opinion whether this substantially identical prayer for the communicants is more at home and comes more naturally

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also 'St Mark' Br. p. 129. 17-19. This is noted here merely as 'record': the case of 'St Mark' is not to be mixed up with the case we are discussing, which in its turn is not to be complicated by 'St Mark'.

before the communion, as in 'St Basil' and the Roman Canon, or after it, as in 'St James'. For myself I should be inclined (in view of what has already been said in the text) to give the preference to those rites which place it within the anaphora or canon, rather than to that rite which uses it in the place of a thanksgiving after communion; and my 'view' is that the prayer as it appears in 'St James' has been removed from its original position immediately after the Invocation, and has been worked up into the form of a thanksgiving after communion by the simple expedient of changing the reference of the verbs from the future to the past time. Attention has already been called (see p. 42 above) to the fact that in 'St James' the prayer for communicants immediately following the Invocation seems in some way to have been tampered with. There is certainly trouble of some kind there, something that needs explanation.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand it is certainly singular, it seems something requiring explanation, that in this same Liturgy the 'thanksgiving' after communion should take the form precisely of such a sort of prayer for communicants as is to be found elsewhere just after the Invocation. Have these two facts anything to do with each other? My own 'view' (so far as I am at present informed) is already stated above.

E. B.

<sup>1</sup> The passage of 'St James' in question is that beginning *εις στηριγμὸν τῆς ἁγίας σου καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἣν ἐθεμελίωσας κτλ.* (Br. 54. 16-21). It may perhaps be possible even to see how this passage came into the prayer for communicants after the Invocation in the Liturgy of 'St James'. In the corresponding passage of Serapion are these words (quoted above p. 28): 'Let this people receive mercy . . . let angels be sent forth as companions to the people for bringing to nought the Evil One and for establishment of the Church (*καὶ εἰς βεβαίωσιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, Wobbermin, p. 6 l. 12; Bishop of Salisbury, p. 64). As already explained 'the Church' in the mind of the writer in Serapion appears from the tenor of the prayer to be not the Catholic Church diffused throughout the world, but 'the Church', the congregation, the people in assembly here present. The question arises whether, at the time when the Intercession was first being removed from the pre-anaphoral part of the service to a place after the Invocation and its accompaniment the prayer for communicants, this last in the Liturgy of 'St James' did not contain a passage for the establishment, confirmation, upbuilding, or what not, of 'the Church' (like that now found in Serapion), which at the period of liturgical revision in Jerusalem served as a cue for the present text . . . 'for the confirmation of Thy holy Catholic and Apostolic Church', &c.

I only mention this in passing; but it may serve as a specimen of the sort of enquiries which will frequently arise, a work of 'internal criticism', when the main lines of early liturgical history have been laid open and made clear.