

VIII

HOLY COMMUNION:

I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE
HISTORIC RITES

I. IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

SINCE THE MIDDLE of the second century, the eucharistic liturgies of the Christian churches throughout the world display the evolutionary development of a single definite and universal rite. Under all the diversities of their manifold historic forms, they all possess a unanimous fundamental tenor of a central Prayer of Consecration: consisting typically of a Thanksgiving to God for the Redemption, a narrative account of Christ's Institution, an Oblation of the sacrifice of the New Covenant in formal Commemoration of Christ's Passion, and an Invocation of the power of God to bless the Gifts for the benefit of the partakers.

Until quite recently, this impressive universal unanimity throughout great diversities has caused every one to assume that this type, which we may call the Historic or "Catholic" Liturgy, has always been the only form for celebrating the Eucharist which has ever existed, and that it might almost be regarded as resting ultimately upon a consensus of the College of Apostles from the very day of Pentecost.

Of late, however, evidence has been accumulating from the literature of the earliest period of the Church, which indicates that at that time there was current another form in at least partial possession of the field, which represents an entirely

different liturgical tradition from that of the Catholic Liturgy. This form consecrated the Eucharist by some adaptation of the Jewish table-blessings.

As long as this evidence was drawn chiefly from heretical sources,¹ it might safely be ignored; but with the discovery of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*,² and the establishing of the early date, wide circulation, and unassailable orthodoxy of that document,³ it became necessary to reconsider the whole question. What was the nature of the Last Supper itself, which seems to be so closely copied in this form of Liturgy, yet to which the Catholic Liturgy also appeals as its authority? What is the relation of the Catholic Liturgy to the Last Supper; and what is the source of this form which later so completely swept the field?

As to the Last Supper, modern critics seem rather generally to have come to the conclusion that the chronology of our Lord's Last Week in the Fourth Gospel is correct. But if so, the Last Supper did not occur at the Passover, but as some sort of *Kiddush* or sacred meal in preparation for that festival.

If, however, the Last Supper was not the Last Passover, did this observance stand as much alone and apart as has been presumed? May it not have marked a customary procedure of Jesus in the circle of his disciples? Such evidence as exists certainly points in that direction. The "Miraculous Feedings" are hardly to be understood nowadays unless they were cultus-meals; the recognition at Emmaus, when he was "known in breaking of bread"⁴ by followers not present at the Last Supper, surely implies an habitual rite.

¹Chiefly Gnostic; see below *n.* 9.

²*Cf.* p. 17.

³It was cited by St. Athanasius (*Festal Epistle* 39, P.G. 26. 1437), incorporated in the *Apostolic Constitutions* vii. 1-32, and remained current as late as Nicephorus (+828). Phrases from its liturgical forms were assimilated into the *Anaphora* of Serapion.

⁴Luke 24:35.

There has been much misconception as to the nature of the rite of the Last Supper. It is natural that attention should have been centered upon the words of Jesus which are quoted in the narrative of the Institution, and not upon those which are not quoted. The words "This is my body," "This is my blood," are cited by the Catholic Liturgy as the primary warrant for the observance of the rite. It may even be legitimate to say that they are what the scholastics called the definitive "Form" of the Sacrament, since for us they determine its meaning. In later ages, in some quarters they were magnified into an essential formula of consecration. Yet they were employed by our Lord at the most as *words of administration*.⁵ The actual *consecration* at the Last Supper consisted of those prayers which Scripture does not record and the historic Liturgy does not rehearse, when Jesus "blessed" or "gave thanks."

These two terms were absolutely equivalent to the Jews. Over food of any sort they recited a Thanksgiving: which, however, was always in the form "Blessed be God," rather than "Bless this food." This difference warns us at once that we have to do with concepts on quite a different plane from our modern idea of a "table-blessing," as an objective and "ministerial" benediction of material things.

To the Jew, all food was potentially sacred, since it was God's gift for the life of man. It was not permissible to partake of it save as a religious action. Man's part in that action was conceived as strictly limited to rendering thanks for God's bounties. The correlated divine action of blessing those bounties to man's use was implied, not expressed. Nevertheless the Jew believed unquestioningly that the result of his Thanksgiving was a real *consecration*.

⁵In Mark 14:24 not even that; the words regarding the Cup are represented as spoken *after* the participation.

Thus every meal was in some degree both sacrifice and communion. It contained implicitly all the elements of a sacrificial action, since in it fruits of the earth were offered to God as a "sacrifice of praise"; they were hallowed by the divine acceptance; and they were given back from the hand of God to be the food of the faithful. The simplest meal was capable of expressing the most exalted ideas of worship; it might be a Passover, a Lord's Supper, a Eucharist.

Although, as we have said, the Thanksgiving with which our Lord blessed the holy meal has not been preserved either in Scripture or in the Catholic Liturgy, it seems that its substance is nevertheless recoverable. The book of *Berakhoth* ("Blessings") in the *Mishnah* prescribes these forms of blessings at table:⁶

What Benediction do they say over fruits? Over the fruit of trees, one says, [*Blessed art thou . . .*] *who createst the fruit of the tree*: except over wine; over wine one says, . . . *who createst the fruit of the vine*. Over the fruits of the earth, one says, . . . *who createst the fruits of the earth*: except over bread; for over bread one says, . . . *who bringest forth bread from the earth*.

Now the baptismal Eucharist of the *Didaché* gives these forms of eucharistic consecration:⁷

Concerning the Eucharist: thus shall ye give thanks:

First, for the Cup:

We thank thee, our Father, for the holy Vine of David thy servant, which thou hast made known unto us through Jesus thy servant: to thee be glory for ever.

And for the broken bread:

We thank thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou hast made known unto us through Jesus thy servant: to thee be glory for ever. For as this broken bread was scattered over the

⁶*Berakhoth* vi. 1. in Danby *The Mishnah* [Bib. 54], 6.

⁷C. 9: Quasten, *Monumenta* [Bib. 14], 10.

mountains, and gathered together to be made into one, so may thy Church be gathered from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom: for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever.

It is obvious that these prayers are messianic adaptations of the traditional table-prayers recorded in the *Mishnah*. Some form of them would be quite conceivable in our Lord's mouth. Indeed, it is entirely possible that the *Didaché* has preserved approximately the actual Prayers of Blessing used by Jesus at the Last Supper. It looks very strongly as if exactly this ritual tradition was known to the author of the Fourth Gospel: since the distinctive application of the "Vine of David" may well have been the text for the unique passage on the Vine and the Branches in John 15, the "life and knowledge made known through Jesus" for the eucharistic exposition in John 6, and the Gathering together of the Church for the Prayer for Unity in John 17.

In any event, it appears that the "Lord's Supper" was originally a sacred meal of fellowship which Jesus was accustomed to keep with his disciples; its ritual differing only slightly, if significantly, from that of any Jewish meal.

It further appears probable that this observance was continued in pretty much the original form for some time in Palestine. The habitual "breaking of bread" is continually mentioned in the Acts in terms consistent with such a rite of holy fellowship rather than with a "Mass," or an explicit commemoration of the recent Passion.⁸ The early Gnostic Acts⁹ cite formulæ of eucharistic consecration which also are forms of table-blessings, with nothing in common with the

⁸E.g.: "And they, . . . breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people."—Acts 2:46 f.

⁹Woolley, *Liturgy of the Primitive Church* [Bib. 17], 53 ff., 138 ff.; Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl* [Bib. 57], 240 ff.; Macdonald, *Christian Worship in the Primitive Church* [Bib. 58], 125 ff.; Quasten, *op. cit.*, 339 ff.

tenor of the Catholic Liturgy—yet they certainly regarded themselves as orthodox, and as certainly proffered forms in general accord with contemporary use.

It will be noted that all this evidence (including the *Didaché*) comes from Syrian regions where the Pauline influence was least.

Now none of these conclusions deny the probability that a new and even higher meaning had been given to the Holy Meal by the circumstances of the Last Supper. The concepts of communion in Christ's Body and Blood may date from that observance; or if there had been some previous instruction of the nature of that set forth in John 6, a full realization of its meaning could only have been attained after that event.

There were also other ideas latent in the circumstances of the Last Supper: and these it seems to have been the contribution of St. Paul to make explicit. St. Paul presents his account in 1 Cor. 11 not merely as a tradition of men, but in some sense as a revelation which he had "received of the Lord" (v. 23). But when we compare his statements with those of the Synoptics,¹⁰ the chief new element is the idea, twice repeated in words attributed to our Lord, and underscored by St. Paul's added comment, that this is to be done "in remembrance" of Christ.

Thus it appears that St. Paul was the first to relate the Last Supper to the Passion which followed it, as he was also the first to realize the *triumph* of the Cross. A commemoration which in the first days after the Crucifixion could have seemed only painful to those who had known and loved the Lord in the days of his ministry, St. Paul saw transfigured in the light of the Resurrection. He also helped to fix the identification of the Last Supper with that Passover which

¹⁰Here one must bear in mind that Luke 22:19b-20 is not original, but an interpolation from the Pauline text.

HOLY COMMUNION

was never held, by his enthusiastic "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast." (1 Cor. 5:7.)

Clearly St. Paul was the author of the idea of a eucharistic *Anamnesis* or explicit commemoration of Christ's Passion, as voicing the ultimate significance of the observance. It is likewise hardly to be doubted that his prayer also included, as the basis for this commemoration, the narrative of the Institution which he quotes as of great importance, a formula "received" and "delivered."

It also seems reasonable to attribute to St. Paul a further expansion of the idea of the *Thanksgiving* itself. The Thanksgiving over daily bread, which blessed it to the use of the partakers, had already been sublimated to higher mystic meanings in the *Didaché's* version of the "Lord's Supper," in the mention of the "Vine of David," and the "life and knowledge through Jesus." It was a logical further step to an explicit Thanksgiving for the benefits of the Redemption. And it is probable that St. Paul found a model for this Thanksgiving in the *Mishnah's* ascription of praise, which followed the biblical rehearsal of the deliverance out of Egypt, in the accustomed ritual of the Passover observance:

Wherefore it is our bounden duty to confess, praise, glorify, exalt, celebrate and bless, extol and magnify, him who wrought for our fathers and for us all these wonders. He brought us forth from bondage to liberty, from misery to rejoicing, from grief to festival, from darkness into great light, from subjection to redemption; and therefore we say before him, *Hallelujah!*¹¹

By some such process as this, and presumably by the hand or following the influence of St. Paul, the original type of "Lord's Supper," which repeated the observance of Last Supper itself as closely as possible in the manner in which

¹¹*i.e.* the "Hallel" Psalms (113-118). *Pesahim* x. 5, in Danby, *op. cit.*, 151.

THE FIRST DESCRIPTION

it was first celebrated, evolved into a basic form of all subsequent historic liturgies. These, though they also faithfully repeat the Last Supper as a *rite*, in their *ritual* make an objective commemoration of the Institution, rightly recognizing the fact that the Last Supper in its own way was an event as unique as Calvary.

It is easy to see how this developed ritual must have commended itself to all who heard it, and how it quietly supplanted the formlessness of the earlier use. It was far more adequate to the full cycle of Christian ideas about the Sacrament; far more natural, as well as significant, as a spiritual action by Christ's ministers, since the words which he used could not seem sufficient or effectual in any other mouth than his. Though the primitive form of the "Lord's Supper" lingered on for some time in Jewish-Christian circles, it was the Pauline type of eucharistic Thanksgiving which was the rootstock of the liturgies of the Universal Church.

2. THE FIRST DESCRIPTION

About the year 148 we have the first systematic description of the Liturgy in the *First Apology* of St. Justin Martyr. Although this was an explanation of Christian rites addressed to the pagan Emperor, not a "Church Order" or directory of the service for the guidance of officiating clergy, it is surprisingly exact and complete. Its omissions of features known later must be received subject to other evidence. It may, for instance, be mere inadvertence which makes no mention of psalmody—an element apparently attested still earlier by the Letter of Pliny.¹² On the other hand, Justin is probably right in not including mention of the *Sanctus* and of the Lord's Prayer. As far as it goes, its descriptions would apply with approximate accuracy to all subsequent liturgies down to the

¹²*Ep.* x. 97.

present day. In other words, the general principles and order of the service as a definite rite had been fully developed and fixed by the time of Justin.

This writer indicates a distinct division between the *Pro-Anaphora*, the common Morning Service characterized by the Ministry of the Word, and the *Anaphora* or celebration of the Sacrament. The first portion included the General Intercession for All Conditions, just as we find to be the case later¹³ when the Morning Service was used separately from the Liturgy proper; but the juxtaposition of this Intercession with the ensuing *Anaphora* had already formed an unbreakable connection of thought, so that when the *Pro-Anaphora* was displaced by the ceremonies of a Baptism, the Intercession was still included in the combined service.

The *First Apology* is supplemented by other writings of Justin, to show that the *Anaphora* as he knew it contained a Prayer of Consecration comprising a Thanksgiving to God for the creation and redemption of mankind,¹⁴ the recital of the Institution,¹⁵ and an explicit *Anamnesis* or commemoration of the Passion, accompanied by an Oblation.¹⁶

Although Justin affords us a definite structure and order of the rite, he explicitly intimates that the tenor of the prayers was "according to the ability" of the celebrant.¹⁷

¹³*A.C.* viii. 36-39 (P.G. i. 1137 ff.; Funk I. 542 ff.); *Pilgrimage of Aetheria* 24 (Heræus 28 f.; McClure 45 f.).

¹⁴"We both thank God for creating the world with all that is therein for the sake of man, and for delivering us from the evil wherein we were born, and for utterly bringing to nought the principalities and powers through him who was born to suffer according to thy will."—*Dial. Tryph.* 41 (P.G. 6. 564; Quasten, *op. cit.*, 338).

¹⁵*I Ap.* 66 (P.G. 6. 429; Quasten, *op. cit.*, 18).

¹⁶"The bread of the Eucharist which our Lord Jesus Christ taught us to offer for a Remembrance (εις ἀνάμνησιν) of the Passion which he suffered," *Dial. Tryph.* 41 (P.G. 6. 564; Quasten, *op. cit.*, 337); see also *c.* 70 (P.G. 6. 641). "Christians have received commandment to offer prayers and thanksgivings even in a memorial sacrifice (:at ἐκ' ἀναμνήσεως) of solid and liquid food, wherein a Remembrance is made of the Passion which the Son of God suffered for them," *c.* 117 (P.G. 6. 745 f.; Quasten, *op. cit.*, 339).

¹⁷*Cf.* p. 17.

3. THE FIRST TEXT

About the year 217, we have the earliest known text of the complete *Anaphora*, in the *Apostolic Tradition* of St. Hippolytus of Rome.¹⁸

This form is prescribed to be said by a Bishop at his own consecration; and the Thanksgiving for the divine Redemption seems to be designedly phrased so as to bear witness to the orthodoxy of the new Bishop. It is natural therefore that we should find that some of the more individual of its expressions were ignored by subsequent rituals. Nevertheless this form is properly *basic* to the history of the Liturgy. There is little doubt that it encouraged the fixing of liturgical formulæ, and it certainly influenced profoundly their content and expression. It underlies the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and strongly colored that of St. Basil; and indeed its effects are traceable in every other historic rite.

This earliest landmark is as follows, in a slightly emended translation:

The Lord be with you all.

And with thy spirit.

Lift up your hearts.

We lift them up unto the Lord.

Let us give thanks unto the Lord.

It is meet and right.

We give thanks unto thee, O God, through thy dearly-beloved Servant Jesus Christ, whom in the last days thou didst send unto us as a Saviour and Redeemer, the Angel of thy counsel; who is thy Word, inseparable from thee; through whom thou madest all things by thy good pleasure; whom thou sentest from heaven into the womb of the Virgin, and who, dwelling within her, was made

¹⁸*Ed.* Easton [Bib. 7], 35 f. Unfortunately, we have only the Latin and Ethiopic versions for this portion; the liturgical prayers having been dropped from the other editions of this Order as being in conflict with current use.

flesh, and manifested as thy Son, born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin: who, fulfilling thy will, and gaining for thee an holy people, stretched forth his hands, when he suffered to free from suffering those who have believed in thee:

And when he was betrayed to his voluntary Passion, that he might destroy death and break the bonds of the devil and trample hell under his feet and enlighten the righteous and establish a bound and show forth his Resurrection,

Taking bread, he gave thanks unto thee and said: Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you. Likewise also the cup, saying: This is my blood which is shed for you. As oft as ye do this, ye shall do it in remembrance of me.

Wherefore having in remembrance his Death and Resurrection, we offer thee the bread and the cup; giving thanks unto thee for that thou hast counted us worthy to stand before thee and to render unto thee priestly ministry.¹⁹

And we beseech thee to send thy Holy Spirit upon the sacrifice²⁰ of thy holy Church; that thou wouldest grant it to all together who partake thereof in holiness, unto fulfilling with the Holy Ghost, unto confirmation in true faith; that we may laud and praise thee through thy Servant Jesus Christ:

Through whom be unto thee glory and honour in thy holy Church, both now, and world without end. *Amen.*

This *Anaphora* is a single uninterrupted prayer. It totally lacks *Sanctus*, postconsecration Intercession, and Lord's Prayer—all items which other evidence indicates to be subsequent interpolations. On the other hand, it contains an explicit invocation of the Holy Spirit more than a century earlier than most recent students have been wont to admit that such was possible.

It should be further noted that the primary theme of this Thanksgiving is the benefits of the Redemption in Christ. Apparently it was Hippolytus' *incidental* mention of the

¹⁹ἱερατεῖον in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (LEW 21.2).

²⁰Latin, *oblationem*; A.C. θυσίαν (LEW 21.6).

work of the Logos in Creation which gave the cue to the extensive elaboration of this theme in the Eastern rites. But in the light of this fundamental form it is clear that the Western Prefaces, which mainly confine themselves to phases of the Redemption, varying according to the Christian Year, faithfully represent the original meaning and intent of the Eucharistic Thanksgiving; the influence of the Christian Year has not, as formerly thought, emptied them of a supposed *essential* content of the rendering of glory to God the Creator.

4. THE EASTERN LITURGIES

In the fourth century for the first time we begin to have abundant data for the history of the rite. The era between the Freedom of the Church through the Edict of Milan in 313, and the capture of Rome by the Visigoths in 410, was the great creative and formative period of the Church's worship. This time saw the richest flowering of Greek devotional genius, and the definite fixation of the regional rites in forms which they have ever since retained.

About the year 350, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the most fully developed of all the "Church Orders," offers the earliest complete text of the service. It displays a length, and a rhetorical wealth, equalled in no other liturgy, but entirely characteristic of the taste of the time; and virtually every part of it is thoroughly authenticated in manifold detail by the voluminous allusions of fourth-century writers, especially St. John Chrysostom and St. Cyril of Jerusalem.²¹ It represents the use of the region of Antioch.

The *Tract* attributed to Proclus (†446)²² probably records a true tradition, in stating that St. Basil at Cæsarea (†379) and

²¹Collected in LEW 464-481.

²²P.G. 65. 849; translation in Warren, *Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene Church* [Bib. 16], 197 ff.

St. Chrysostom at Constantinople (397-407) successively revised the current Syrian liturgy from a very lengthy form analogous to that of the *Apostolic Constitutions* to the relative brevity of the *Anaphoræ* which bear their names, and which are still the standard services of the Byzantine rite.

At some time in the same period, a similar simplification at Jerusalem, then a suffragan see of Antioch, was carried out in a form which ere long completely supplanted the original order throughout the Antiochene patriarchate.

Thus the three liturgies of Asia Minor, designated by the titles St. James, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, are children of a common parent. They constitute the Syrian type. They are characterized by a highly developed "Great Intercession" within the Prayer of Consecration, following the Invocation. They also possess a distinctive device for handling the problem of Bidding to Prayer, in the form of the "periodic" structure of a diaconal Litany.²³

The East-Syrian or "Nestorian" liturgy, contrary to prevailing opinion hitherto, is of little importance, being wholly secondary and derivative in character. It originated in the expulsion of Nestorius from the see of Constantinople in 435, taking with him an altogether unique liturgy, composed by actually *conflating* the two parallel Byzantine *Anaphoræ* of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom.²⁴ This peculiar literary *tour de force* constituted the parent *Anaphora of Nestorius*, whose subsequent recensions under the names of *Theodore* and of *The Apostles Addai and Mari* are successive degenerative abbreviations.²⁵ The only real significance of the Nestorian rite lies in the testimony it affords for virtually all the salient phrases of the Byzantine orders, as having been fixed in the year 435 in the form in which we still find them.

²³Cf. p. 125 f.

²⁴Renaudot, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio* [Bib. 20], II. 620.

²⁵*Ibid.* II. 581 ff.

Egypt on the other hand had developed a quite different national type of rite. This is first exemplified in the "Sacramentary" of Serapion,²⁶ which furnishes a probably provincial, certainly highly individual, but significantly formative stage of this rite about the year 350. The *Dér Balyzeh Papyrus*,²⁷ a fragment containing most of the *Anaphora*, is also attributed to the fourth century; and another papyrus²⁸ of perhaps still earlier date is known, giving a germinal form of the Intercessions. The standard liturgy of this region is found in the Alexandrian rite under the name of *St. Mark*.

These Alexandrian types are all characterized by a distinctive *preliminary* Invocation, before the Institution, in addition to that normally found. This rite also differs from the Syrian in the Biddings to Prayer, using the principle of "parallelism" of alternate Biddings and Collects, like the Western forms. And though the later Alexandrian use borrowed extensively and *verbatim* from the fruits of Syrian devotional eloquence, it refused to admit the Syrian development of a postconsecration Intercession, adhering to a peculiarity of its own, which duplicated its own proper Prayers of the Faithful, enriched with Syrian material, actually *within the Preface*, in conjunction with some emphatic phrases of Oblation which existed there before this strange interpolation.

The schisms of the fifth century reduced the adherents of the Orthodox patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria to vestiges, dependent upon the imperial see of Constantinople; and their own liturgies were first partly assimilated toward, and by the twelfth century entirely supplanted by, the Byzantine rite. They remain as living rites, however, in some-

²⁶*Ed.* Brightman in *J.T.S.* I. 1. 88; Funk II. 158-195; Quasten, *op. cit.*, 49 ff.; English tr., Wordsworth, *Bishop Serapion's Prayer Book* [Bib. 12].

²⁷Woolley, *op. cit.*, 120; Quasten, *op. cit.*, 37.

²⁸Andrieu and Collomp, "Fragments sur papyrus de l'anaphore de saint Marc," in *Revue des sciences religieuses* VIII (1928), 489; Quasten, *op. cit.*, 44.

what altered vernacular translations, in the native schismatic churches. Throughout the Orthodox East today, the Liturgy of Constantinople in many languages completely holds the field.

The dominant characteristic of all the Eastern liturgies is their invariability. Lections and chants indeed vary with the day; but the text of the prayers throughout the service remains unaltered on every occasion. The creative spirit of liturgical invention was forced into the channel of composing entirely new *Anaphoræ*, inserted into the common framework of a rite: of which, for example, the Egyptian and the Nestorian had three, the Abyssinian fifteen, the West-Syrian more than sixty.

5. THE WESTERN LITURGIES

In fundamental contrast with the fixity of Eastern uses, in the West the properly *extempore* spirit and method long survived. Even after the services were written down, they remained essentially an Order rather than a Text. There was a definite structure, and a prescribed sequence of parts, each of which had its proper purpose and theme; but virtually every part might vary with each occasion. The whole service was a series of variable collects.

The original form of this use once universal throughout the West has been preserved in the so-called "Gallican" texts. These are found in a pure form in the fragmentary but considerable survivals of the Gallican proper,²⁹ from France, and

²⁹The chief texts are the *Missale Gothicum* (Mabillon [Bib. 31], 188 ff.; *P.L.* 72. 225 ff.; ed. Bannister [Bib. 29]); the *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* (Mabillon, *op. cit.*, 329 ff.; *P.L.* 72. 339 ff.); and the Reichenau Fragments (*P.L.* 138. 863 ff.); together with the *Ordo* of St. Germain of Paris (*P.L.* 72. 89 ff., and Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, Chap. VII.). A convenient critical outline is collected in Lietzmann, *Ordo missæ romanus et gallicanus* [Bib. 30]. See Leclercq's article in *DAL* VI. 473-493, and Thibaut, *L'ancienne liturgie gallicane* [Bib. 33].

complete rituals of the fundamentally identical Mozarabic,³⁰ which is still a living rite locally in Spain. Later "mixed" books presenting a Roman Canon fitted to a distinctively "Gallican" framework, from Milan³¹ and Bobbio³² in North Italy, the British Isles,³³ and elsewhere, show the extent to which this use once held sway. After the eighth century, both Gallican and Mozarabic rites suffered a rapid decline from the desire to copy the current customs of the Apostolic See; being completely extinguished in France save for a few minor local details, and in Spain continuing only at Toledo and Salamanca.

The original "Gallican" Rite, alone among known texts, retained the entire Great Intercession in its primordial place³⁴ between Sermon and Offertory. Like the Eastern liturgies, it put the Kiss of Peace at the beginning of the *Anaphora*. It showed direct Eastern influence subsequent to the fourth century in the adoption of the rite of *Prothesis*, preparing the Elements before the beginning of the service, and bringing them in with an imposing procession, like the Greek "Great Entrance," at the Offertory; together with a number of other Eastern importations, such as *Kyries*, the Byzantine *Trisagion*,³⁵ litanies of Syrian type and phrase, and the like. The Lord's Prayer was separated from the Consecration Prayers by the ceremony of the Fraction.

All of these features stand in some contrast to the present Roman rite, and attempts were formerly made to attribute to the "Gallican" liturgies an Eastern origin independent of the

³⁰The text of Cardinal Ximenes (1500) is in *P.L.* 85. See also Bib. 41, 42.

³¹The living "Ambrosian" rite; in Ferrari, *Missale Ambrosianum* [Bib. 45].

³²Under the title, *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*, in *P.L.* 72. 447-580; best edition, *The Bobbio Missal* (H.B.S., London, 1917-24) [Bib. 38-40].

³³The Stowe Missal, in Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church* [Bib. 35] and Warner, *The Stowe Missal* [Bib. 34].

³⁴P. 160.

³⁵LEW 35.25.

Roman. This hypothesis has not stood examination. It is virtually certain that the Roman rite was once identical with the "Gallican" in the position of the Intercessions, the Kiss of Peace, and the Lord's Prayer. As to Eastern importations, they affected the Roman rite to much the same degree as the "Gallican"; though *Prothesis* and "Great Entrance" never secured admission.

A comparison of "Gallican" and Roman types as a whole shows that both are of essentially the same structure, in their framework of lections, chants, collects, and all the ritual details which take little space in the text, but bulk large as the effective turning-points of an enacted ceremonial. In fine, students have increasingly been coming to the conclusion that both types are a single rite of common origin, which in all probability radiated originally from Rome.

The chief problem is to account for the origin of the Roman "Canon" or sequence of fixed Prayers of Consecration. Exactly as in the "Gallican" exemplars, this Canon consists not of a single prayer, but a chain of collects.

The first ray of light on the Canon is the quotation of a single unmistakable phrase during the papacy of Damasus (366-84).⁸⁶ The first text occurs in the tract *De Sacramentis*, which is a report of catechetical lectures delivered by St. Ambrose of Milan, probably in the year 387.⁸⁷ This document possesses unusual importance, since it comprises precisely the portions of the present Canon which there is no reason to suspect of being subsequent interpolations.

This tract contrasts the *Pro-Anaphora* or preliminary part of the service with the *Anaphora* or Consecration Prayer:

Now all the other things which are said in the previous por-

⁸⁶P.L. 35. 2330; cf. Fortescue, *The Mass* [Bib. 68], 128.

⁸⁷Thompson and Srawley, *St. Ambrose "On the Mysteries" and the Treatise "On the Sacraments"* [Bib. 15], xvi.—Text in P.L. 16. 435, and Quasten, *op. cit.*, 137; Eng. tr., Thompson and Srawley.

tions are spoken by the priest—praises are rendered to God, prayer is offered for the people, for kings, and the rest;—but when it comes to the consecration of the adorable Sacrament, the priest no longer uses his own words, but uses the words of Christ. (IV. 4. 14.)

While this has been generally taken as alluding to the Preface, followed by the intercessory Collects *Te igitur*, *Memento*, *Communicantes*, and *Hanc igitur*, as in the present Canon, it is perhaps more probable that this matter of the ancient Prayer of the Faithful had not yet been assimilated into the Canon, but preceded the Preface.

Later, the *De Sacramentis* quotes these Prayers of Consecration:

Make this oblation to be approved, ratified, reasonable, acceptable, for us, for that it is the figure of the body and blood of Jesus Christ:

Who, the day before he suffered, took bread in his holy hands; looked up to heaven to thee, holy Father, almighty, everlasting God; giving thanks, he blessed, brake, and gave the broken [bread] to his apostles and his disciples, saying: Take, and eat ye all of this; for this is my body, which shall be broken for many. (IV. 5. 21.) Likewise also after supper, the day before he suffered, he took the cup; he looked up to heaven to thee, holy Father, almighty, everlasting God; giving thanks, he blessed, and gave it to his apostles and his disciples, saying: Take, and drink ye all of this; for this is my blood. (5. 22.) As oft as ye do this, so oft shall ye make a remembrance of me, until I come again. (6. 26.)

Wherefore, having in remembrance his most glorious Passion, and Resurrection from the dead, and Ascension into heaven, we offer unto thee this unspotted, reasonable, unbloody sacrifice, this holy bread and cup of everlasting life: and we pray and beseech thee to receive this oblation on thine altar on high, by the hands of thine angels, as thou didst vouchsafe to receive the gifts of thy righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our forefather Abra-

ham. and the offering of thy high-priest Melchizedek. (6.27.)

We have here typical examples of "Gallican" *Post-Sanctus* and *Post-Prædic* prayers, accompanying an early form of the Institution narrative—a complete "Gallican" Canon. The *Post-Sanctus* is in the form of a prayer for divine acceptance of the sacrifice; and is of identical origin with the same prayer in Serapion.³⁸ The *Post-Prædic* contains three of the four possible elements of this prayer (Commemoration, Oblation, Invocation, Fruits of Communion), all of which appear in every Eastern rite, and any selection of which may occur in any "Gallican" mass. It happens however that instead of a direct expression of the effect of the consecration, such as characterizes most formal prayers of Invocation, there has been substituted the idea of a mystic—and metaphorical—sublating of the oblations to the Heavenly Altar: a form of supplication originally devised with perfect appositeness for the offering of incense, later less felicitously adopted into many prayers of oblation.³⁹

It seems that it was around this nucleus that the other prayers of the Roman Canon accumulated. It is a curious and fortunate fact that to this day the text of the Canon preserves a number of seemingly adventitious and liturgically unjustified "*Amens*," each of which marks the end of a constituent block of matter of different dates and origins. The details of this process are obscure. It is however hardly to be doubted that the first group of prayers, from *Te igitur* to *Hanc igitur*, represents the ancient Prayers of the Faithful, which in some

³⁸"Fill also this sacrifice with thy power and thy participation: for we have offered unto thee this living sacrifice, this unbloody oblation: to thee have we offered this bread, the likeness of the body of thine Only begotten." (Brightman, *J.T.S.* I. 1, 105.27; Funk II. 174.5-11; Wordsworth, 62.) Cf. also this *Post-Prædic* prayer in the old Mozarabic rite: "Whose oblation do thou vouchsafe to make blessed, ratified, and reasonable, which is the image and likeness of the body and blood of Jesus Christ thy Son, our Redeemer." (Ferotin, *Liber Ordinum* [Bib. 42], 321.)

³⁹Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, 90 ff.

form originally followed the mysterious "Let us pray," with no prayers to follow, which still remains at the Roman Offertory;⁴⁰ and that by the beginning of the fifth century they had been transferred to a place after the Preface for the reasons which Innocent I (†417) alleged with such insistence⁴¹—*i.e.*, in order that they might be drawn into closer association with the central action of the rite.

The other addition, comprising the *Memento etiam* and *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*, composes precisely the paired supplications for the Departed and for Those who Offer for them, which seems to have been the first portion of the Intercession to secure a place within the *Anaphora* in the Eastern rites, as we find in Serapion's liturgy,⁴² and which is always embedded, as an inseparable combination, in every post-consecration Intercession.

During the latter half of the fourth century, then, the Roman Canon was crystallized out of a fluid order displaying extreme variability in detail, by a process of arbitrary selection among alternative formulæ current at the time. It shows marks of Alexandrian affinities or influence, and represents a stage of development equivalent to the liturgy of Serapion. Like Serapion, it is relatively impoverished of ideas and bald of expression; it is careless of form and order; it is distinctly a provincial and "back-country" product, drawing its materials ultimately from distant creative centers, and presenting them imperfectly transmitted and retained.

It was in fact unfortunate that the Canon should have been so summarily and unalterably arrested at a time of so little literary ability in the West, and so little liturgical knowledge

⁴⁰Duchesne (*Christian Worship*, 172) suggested that the *Orationes solemnes* of Good Friday represent the ancient Roman Prayers of the Faithful. Their distinctive style, however, is Gallican, not Roman.

⁴¹*Letter to Decentius*, Ep. 25. 2 (P.L. 20. 554).

⁴²*J.T.S.* I. 1. 106. 25-37; Funk II. 176.10; Wordsworth, 64.

of the organic meaning and purpose of certain portions of the rite. But jejune, abrupt, ill-articulate, and often obscure as it is, it does contain everything that is essential, and most of what is desirable, in a Christian liturgy. It has a noble simplicity, a rugged vigor, and a cogent brevity which compare favorably for practical purposes with the far more elaborate, ambitious, and verbose efforts of the oriental and the Gallican mind. It seems a perfect expression of the Roman genius, in the beauty of strength, careless of minor discords or extrinsic adornment.

6. SUBSEQUENT ELABORATIONS

Though the structural outlines, and the text of the central Canon or *Anaphora*, were pretty well settled for all rites in the course of the formative fourth century, for twelve hundred years thereafter there was continuous elaboration of the scheme, by embellishment with decorative detail.

Some of these hardly concern our purpose, and may be briefly dismissed. Such are the Eastern and Gallican development of a *Prothesis* and "Great Entrance"; and the Dismissals of various classes not in full communion before the *Anaphora*, the memory of which now survives only in the term *Missa* (= *Missio*, dismissal), by which the Liturgy is called in the Western Patriarchate.

The use of liturgical Litanies, after Syrian precedent, is, as we have seen, something that has come and gone in the West, leaving as vestiges in the Roman rite since the sixth century its responds of *Kyrie eleison*, and its terminal Collect.

The Lord's Prayer appears not to have been used at all in the Liturgy in the time of Justin, Hippolytus, Serapion, or the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The earliest texts which contain it show that it was inserted in a most peculiar manner, actually as a manifest interpolation *within* the prayer said at the Frac-

tion or Breaking of Bread.⁴³ The extant patristic evidence would be satisfied by the hypothesis that the Lord's Prayer was first added to the Liturgy at Jerusalem about the year 340.

All rites evolved choral parts of the service along mutually parallel lines, and to a similarly high degree. The earliest of these is probably the Gradual Psalms between the Lessons. This was explicitly referred to by Tertullian (†ca. 230)⁴⁴ and may have been the "song" mentioned in the Letter of Pliny in 112. Duchesne claimed that it was as old as the Lessons themselves.⁴⁵

The *Sanctus* seems to have been added to the Liturgy about the year 200 in North Africa; the *Benedictus qui venit* to have been appended to the *Sanctus* in Syria about the beginning of the fifth century.⁴⁶

Of the other musical portions of the Roman rite, the Introit, Offertory, and Communion anthems were designed to accompany and cover ceremonies that had grown elaborate. The *Agnus Dei* at the Fraction is a Roman specialty, dating from the papacy of Sergius I (687-701).⁴⁷

Various rites developed other canticles, sung, like the *Sanctus* and the Gradual, as an end in themselves, and applied to the adornment of the *Pro-Anaphora*, to express a joyful and "eucharistic" note rather lacking in the introductory portion of the Liturgy. Such were the Byzantine *Trisagion*,⁴⁸ adopted in other Eastern uses, and in Gaul; the Gallican use of the *Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel*, and the *Benedicite*; and the Roman *Gloria in Excelsis*. This last originated in Syria as a hymn at Matins, where it is employed in the Byzantine offices to this day. The first version of its text is found

⁴³See appended Note at the end of this chapter.

⁴⁴*De Anima* 9 (P.L. 2, 701; CSEL 20.310).

⁴⁵*Christian Worship*, 168.

⁴⁶See Note.

⁴⁷Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis* (Paris, 1886-92), I, 376.

⁴⁸Dating from the time of Proclus (*sedes* 434-446).

in the *Apostolic Constitutions*;⁴⁹ it was first mentioned by St. Athanasius (†373);⁵⁰ translated by Hilary of Poitiers (†366);⁵¹ its use at Matins in Gaul attested by Cæsarius of Arles (469-542);⁵² and introduced at Rome by Pope Symmachus (498-514)⁵³ at a bishop's mass on Sundays and Holy Days, its use being gradually extended until by the eleventh century all priests used it on festivals and on Sundays outside of penitential seasons.

The Creed, originally a baptismal formula, was included in the Liturgy under the provocation of controversies. In the East, it was first introduced at Antioch by Peter the Fuller in 471, at Constantinople by Timothy in 511. The Emperor Justinian (527-65) ordered it sung in all churches. In the West, the Third Council of Toledo in 589 inserted it in the Mozarabic rite as a protest against the Arians. Thence it spread to France; but it was not admitted to the Roman mass until the year 1014.⁵⁴ To this day it is a festal addition rather than a daily essential of the Roman service.

Another great source of elaboration of liturgical texts lay in the natural instinct of devotion which prompted the celebrant to say prayers of his own to accompany ritual actions. At such points as the Preparation, the Censings, the Offertory, Fraction, Communion, and Departure from the altar, these private supplications eventually assumed definite form, and solidified into stated features. Some of these developed rather early in the East, and were copied or paralleled in "Gallican" regions; from whence they invaded the Roman rite. Yet none of these were in evidence in Rome before the eleventh century; they were not in general use in their pres-

⁴⁹vii. 47 (P.G. I. 1056; Funk I. 454).

⁵⁰*De Virginitate* 20 (P.G. 28. 275; Funk I. 455 ff.).

⁵¹Fortescue, *op. cit.*, 241 n. 7.

⁵³Duchesne, *Lib. Pont.*, I. 263.

⁵²*Reg. ad mon.* 21 (P.L. 67. 1102).

⁵⁴Fortescue, *op. cit.*, 288.

ent form until the fourteenth; and they were not formally admitted to the rite and required throughout the Roman obedience until the Missal of Pius V in 1570.

Thus though at an early date the Roman rite supplanted the luxuriant exuberance of the varying Gallican rituals with the austere unalterable simplicity of its Canon, in the end the Gallican enriched the Roman with an ornate setting of significant ceremonial, and graced it with devotions imbued with inspired feeling.

The services of the Church of England at the time of the Reformation were of this resultant Gallico-Roman type then prevalent throughout the West. There being as yet no authoritative Roman standard imposed *urbi et orbi*, in England the diocesan, monastic, and regional "Uses" varied in minor detail. Of these the rite of the see of Salisbury possessed the widest influence, so that the term "Sarum" is commonly employed for the English norm in the few particulars where the national customs differed from the Roman. Such were somewhat less elaborate personal prayers of the celebrant at beginning, Offertory, etc.; a medieval use of a Kiss of Peace at the Preparation; a few "Gallican" survivals such as the Bidding Prayer at sermon-time, and the priest's extending his arms to form a living cross at the *Anamnesis*; and the once universal benediction before communion retained at a bishop's mass.

NOTE ON THE LORD'S PRAYER AND THE FRACTION

In the earliest state of the Liturgy, the Fraction, or breaking of the One Loaf of the oblation for the communion of the people, occurred as a necessary action immediately after the Consecration. At first this was done in silence. Later, it attracted ritual words to accompany the action. In the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the Frac-

HOLY COMMUNION

tion was performed during the diaconal Litany which introduced the Bishop's blessing of intending communicants—the original "Prayer of Humble Access." The next step appears in Serapion, in a special Prayer of the Fraction: which, like all later prayers for this purpose, simply duplicated the communion-time themes of the Humble Access prayer. The Ethiopic rite illustrates the ensuing development, with the Lord's Prayer interpolated between two halves of the Fraction Prayer. The Coptic order shows the final stage, with the second part of the Fraction Prayer assimilated to the concluding "But deliver us from evil" of the Lord's Prayer, to constitute the so-called *Embolismus* (Interpolation).

Subsequent degenerations in the great rites obscured this process, and made its development difficult to identify. The original Fraction Prayer was wholly assimilated everywhere to its new office of introducing the Lord's Prayer. The East and West Syrian rites interpolated a new Prayer of Fraction before the altered old one. The Byzantine, followed by the Armenian, and by the Greek St. James and St. Mark, displaced the Fraction to a place immediately before the Communion. The Byzantine eliminated the *Embolismus*; and the Western rites reduced the introductory Prayer to a mere proëm.

NOTE ON THE *SANCTUS* AND THE *BENEDICTUS* *QUI VENIT*

We have seen that the *Sanctus* does not occur in Hippolytus' single unbroken Prayer of Thanksgiving. It could not be inserted therein save as a violent interruption of the continuous narrative—which is exactly what happens when the Abyssinian rite attempts to adapt Hippolytus' form to an Egyptian framework.⁵⁵ All the Eastern rites show the same quality of interruption, with considerable awkwardness;⁵⁶ and no two examples choose precisely the same place for the insertion. Obviously the *Sanctus* was interpolated into the Eastern liturgies *after* Hippolytus' pregnant

⁵⁵LEW 231.

⁵⁶Except the Greek St. James, where the Thanksgiving has been rewritten especially in order to lead up to the *Sanctus*.

THE "SANCTUS" AND "BENEDICTUS"

phrases had been expanded into a systematic account of both the Creation and the Redemption of mankind.

The fact that as late as the sixth century the Council of Vaison (529)⁵⁷ had to order the *Sanctus* to be used in *all* masses, even "early services, in Lent, and at requiems," is further indication of an innovation only gradually becoming universal.

The first unquestionable allusion to the liturgical use of the *Sanctus* is in the *Acts of Perpetua*, written in North Africa at the beginning of the third century.⁵⁸ The next is in Tertullian,⁵⁹ in the same region. Possible references may be reflected in Clement of Alexandria⁶⁰ and Origen.⁶¹ As the first citations come from the vicinity of Carthage, and the next from Egypt, the birth of this feature is, as above, attributed to North Africa, not far from the year 200.

Now all the Eastern liturgies, including Serapion, with the exception of St. James, introduce the *Sanctus* by a scriptural quotation which conflates Dan. 7:10 and Isa 6:2. Precisely this conflation is given by Clement of Rome in his *First Corinthians*, about the year 95: "For the Scripture saith: *Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him, and thousand thousands ministered unto him* (Dan. 7:10); *and cried, Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Sabaoth; the whole creation is full of his glory.* (Isa. 6:2.)"

But the allusion is avowedly to *Scripture*, and cannot conceivably cite an as yet unwritten Liturgy. Nor is it possible that Clement can have quoted the liturgical use of Rome in his time, only to have Hippolytus, standing in the same Greek tradition of the same center, display entire ignorance of it something more than a century later.

It seems very probable however that the man who first introduced the *Sanctus* into the liturgical Thanksgiving deliberately adopted for the purpose the formula of introduction which Clement had produced as a purely *literary* allusion.

⁵⁷Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, II. 1114.

⁵⁸C. 12; Srawley, *Early History of the Liturgy* (Cambridge, 1913), 138.

⁵⁹*De orat.* 3 (P.L. I. 1259; CSEL 20.182).

⁶⁰*Stromata* vii. 12 [78.5-6] (P.G. 9. 512; Stählin 56).

⁶¹C. *Cels.* viii. 34 (P.G. 11. 1565 f.; Koetschau 249).

The frequent use of the *Sanctus* in Jewish rituals may have influenced this addition to the Liturgy.⁶²

The *Benedictus qui venit* is found in all liturgies subsequent to the *Apostolic Constitutions*, except the Egyptian in all its forms; raising a presumption of Syrian origin at a date when the Alexandrian rite had become so fixed as to refuse admission to this feature, but before the Nestorian schism in 435.

The cause which instigated this supplement was the abrupt ending of the *Sanctus*, to which even Jewish forms had some tendency to make additions,⁶³ and to which the *Apostolic Constitutions* appended a concluding "Blessed for evermore."⁶⁴ It seems to have occurred to some one, perhaps at Jerusalem, to amplify this rudimentary *Benedictus* to the acclamation of Matt. 21:9, some form of which had often been used at the communion-time ever since the *Didaché*.⁶⁵ The Syrian Thanksgiving at this period commemorated the Creation in the "Preface," the Redemption in the *Post-Sanctus*; and the original *rationale* of the change seems to have been to reflect this balance of thought in the choral response, joining the two Covenants by adding this Hosanna to the Redeemer to Isaiah's angelic song of praise to God the Creator.

It is interesting that the Anglican order of 1549 translated its second *Hosanna* by conflating Luke 19:38 to the original text; and that this conclusion was left appended to the *Sanctus* when the rest of the *Benedictus* was excised in 1552: leaving very much the dimensions and effect of the germinal form of this development in the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

⁶²Eisenhofer II. 161 §1; Warren, *Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene Church* [Bib. 16], 215 §7.

⁶³Eisenhofer II. 161 §2.

⁶⁴εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. LEW 19.2.

⁶⁵*Didaché* c. 10 (Quasten, *op. cit.*, 12); cf. LEW 24.27, 396.2.

HOLY COMMUNION:

II. ANGLICAN RITES

I. THE FIRST ENGLISH LITURGY

THE ROMAN RITE throughout is characterized by a very strong *sacrificial* color, the theme of Oblation being dominant in almost every prayer of the Canon. Nevertheless, the Sacrifice thus indicated is in the strictest sense *Eucharistic*—it is distinctly a Thankoffering of Fruits of the Earth, Bread and Wine, asking that God may bless them for the communion of the faithful. Strictly construed, there is not one word which could reasonably be forced to denote a ritual Immolation of Christ; not one word which necessitates a notion of Transubstantiation in preference to any other form of belief in the Real Presence.

Yet it is notorious that medieval times distorted the Canon with interpretations, and cumbered it with ceremonial, which were utterly alien to the plain meaning of the text. Against these perversions of the primitive faith, the Reformers desired to restore the Eucharist to its own original purpose, for the use and benefit of the people, that they might once more participate in the Holy Communion, instead of being merely spectators at its celebration.

The first step toward this restoration was obviously the rendering of the service from Latin into the tongue "understood of the people." Without waiting for the completion

of the entire English liturgy, with its elaborate apparatus of Propers, in 1548 a royal proclamation in accordance with an act of Parliament set forth *The Order of the Communion*. This comprised a prior "warning" of the celebration; and provision that after the priest's communion in the Latin mass, the Sacrament should be administered in both kinds, with an Exhortation, the Invitation, Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, and Prayer of Humble Access, Administration, and a Blessing, all in English.

These formulæ are nearly those that still survive. Some of their details were suggested by German sources;¹ but the plan itself was not as revolutionary as might appear. As we shall see later,² the structure of the primitive order of communion-time devotions had degenerated, and become assimilated to or supplanted by the priest's personal devotions, until it was really inadequate for the people's use: so that the custom had already grown up, whenever there was a general communion, to insert into the mass at this point an interpolated ritual of much the same nature as that given in the *Rituale Romanum* to this day.³

The following year, the First Prayer Book presented the whole service in English, with the title *The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called The Mass*. This caption gives an excellent idea of the nature of Archbishop Cranmer's recension. It was an attempt to return to what were believed to be the standards of the Primitive Church, and the intent of her founder, regarding the rite and purpose of this Sacrament; and at the same time to retain, actually and recognizably, the traditional and immemorial use of the Church of England.

¹E.R. I. lxxiii-lxxvi.

²P. 213.

³The *Ordo administrandi sacram communionem*. For instances of pre-Reformation forms for this purpose in English, see E.R. I. lxxii.

The dominant aim seems to have been to preserve the external appearance of the rite and the accustomed order of its ceremonial, at the sacrifice of no *noticeable* particular.

Thus the traditional eucharistic vestments were retained;⁴ the ritual postures were expressly permitted;⁵ in general it was assumed that the celebrant should follow the rules and actions of the old service, without which the new rubrics were quite inadequate to enable any one to perform the rite.⁶

The entire musical framework of the mass was preserved. The five fixed elements—the ninefold *Kyries*, *Gloria in Excelsis*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnes Dei*—were unaltered, and their simple traditional music was promptly adapted to the English words.⁷ The variable Introit, Gradual, Offertory, and Communion anthems, and the Proper Prefaces, were considerably simplified in scheme for facility of use, as Cranmer in his struggles with the problems of the Breviary had lost patience with the turning up of mere shreds of *propria*; but it is safe to say that no member of the congregation would have been aware of the difference.

But all the late accretions of private prayers accompanying ritual actions, at Entrance, Censing, Gospel, Offertory, Fraction, Commixture, Pax, Ablutions, and conclusion, were never properly a part of the public service, and were without uniformity even among the various English uses. They might well be left again to private devotion. So in 1549 the only survival of all this material was the priest's Paternoster and Collect for Purity at the beginning. For the most part

⁴In the "Ornaments Rubric": E.R. II. 638.

⁵The Elevations were forbidden (E.R. II. 694); otherwise, the observations in "Certain Notes" specify: "As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures: they may be used or left, as every man's devotion serveth, without blame." (E.R. II. 926.)

⁶Even the terminations of the Collects, and of the Trinity Sunday Preface, were left to this customary use.

⁷In Merbecke, *The Book of Common Prayer Noted* (1550); cf. Proctor and Frere, 65.

the ceremonies themselves were left undisturbed—*e.g.*, there was a perfectly explicit Offertory Rubric, directing the preparation of the Elements and the manner of their presentation upon the altar—but the whole “Lesser Canon” of the offertory prayers was abolished.

In the matter of the Canon,⁸ Cranmer firmly and sharply parted company with German influences. Luther’s method of dealing with its problems was to abolish it totally, and instead of a Prayer of Consecration to read merely the narrative of the Institution over the Elements. But Cranmer was imbued with a proper reverence for this central, majestic, and indispensable action of worship, which from the time of Gregory the Great had been known as *The Prayer*⁹ of the liturgy. He produced what Dr. Brightman¹⁰ aptly calls an “eloquent” paraphrase of the Canon. It was a liberal translation, rather than a new composition; a recension, not a substitution. Some small details of the original were suppressed; some few cognate expressions conflated into it from other sources;¹¹ some crabbed and enigmatic phrases expanded into free renderings which were eminently evangelical, inspiring, and practical; and the spasmodic and ill-connected order reduced to an intelligible sequence and movement by certain rearrangements.

All this was effected with such a confident hand, and such an effortless finish of style, that few Anglicans have given the texts the minute study necessary to establish the fundamental underlying identities with the parent order, and that

⁸This title was explicitly given at the end of the office for the Communion of the Sick: *ER.* II. 844.

⁹*Ep.* ix. 12 (*P.L.* 77. 956).

¹⁰*E.R.* I. cvi.

¹¹These comprised the Liturgy of St. Basil; matter from other portions of the Sarum Use; and Reformation documents both Catholic and Lutheran: see *E.R.* I. lxxii–lxxvi, civ–cxii; II. 638–718. In sum, while the Catholic sources contributed appreciably to the clarification of doctrine, the Protestant yielded little beyond some sketchy structural outlines and incidental phrases.

Roman critics, not unnaturally perhaps, have found themselves unable to recognize them at all. Yet unquestionably Cranmer’s sole aim was to present the vital meaning of the traditional Latin service of the Church of England, sacrificing no detail, even the most minute, which possessed spiritual truth and value, but setting it forth in the clearest and most affecting language.

The chief change of order was the segregation and consolidation of all the Intercession-material both for the Living and the Departed into one prayer “for the whole state of Christ’s Church,” following the *Sanctus*.

The ensuing Consecration Prayer was virtually unaltered in sequence. This left in a very prominent place the *Quam oblationem*, which constituted the peculiar “preliminary Invocation” which has always characterized the Roman and Egyptian rites. The proper Latin Invocation, the prayer *Supplices te rogamus*, was not at this time recognized by any one as being an Invocation—indeed, it is very falteringly admitted as such to the present day; so it is not surprising that Cranmer converted it to other purposes, and concentrated the theme of the Invocation of the power of God to consecrate the Sacrament, at this place before the Institution; conflating into it the words *Hear us . . . we beseech thee: . . . thy holy spirit . . . bless and sanctify these thy gifts*, from the Liturgy of St. Basil.¹²

There were moreover some modifications of doctrinal emphasis. Prayer for the Departed and commemoration of the Saints were retained; but the two mutually supplemental lists of Names,¹³ representing the vestiges of early local Roman Diptychs, were eliminated, as was the mention of the “merits and prayers” of the Saints.

¹²*LEW* 329a.26.

¹³In the prayers *Communicantes* and *Nobis quoque peccatoribus*.

To meet the medieval distortions which had interpreted the Latin Canon's innocent and primitive expressions of the Eucharistic Sacrifice into an implication of the reënactment of Calvary, Cranmer felt he had no choice but to eliminate *every* expression of direct verbal Oblation of the Holy Gifts. All such phrases were carefully transmuted so as to refer not to the Elements, but to the devout aspiration of those who offered them, or to Christ's "One Oblation" of himself which gave them a divine meaning. As a result, the Eucharistic Sacrifice was represented as a fourfold Commemoration of the Offering upon the Cross, a Sacrifice of "praise and thanksgiving" for the benefits of the Passion, the Church's corporate Oblation of its members as "a living sacrifice," and the presentation of their prayers in union with the Heavenly Intercession.¹⁴

This omission of a *verbal* Oblation of the Gifts in the text did not of course alter the fact that they were actually offered in the rite. Indeed Cranmer's interpretation simply made explicit the inherent significance of the sacrificial Action, both in its Godward and its manward aspects, and gave a powerful, brilliant, and deeply spiritual rendering of the essential meaning of the Latin Canon.

Thus Cranmer's resolute boldness in the handling of non-essentials, and his wise conservatism toward essentials, provided the First Prayer Book with a normal Catholic liturgy, complete in all vital parts. In spite of some alterations in the proportions of its emphasis, it has every claim to comprise a

¹⁴The last two represent a dual development of a single item in the Latin original, the mystical prayer whose source we have noted in the *De Sacramentis*; in the Roman Canon reading, "bid that *these* (*hæc*) be brought by the hands of thy holy angel to thine altar on high." Medieval liturgiologists, perplexed for a factual explanation of this difficult language (seeing that the mysterious *hæc* could not be literally predicated of the Elements), offered two divergent explanations: one, that they were the Church's prayers; the other, that they were Christ's Mystical Body the Church itself. Cranmer accordingly incorporated both versions into his text.

full equivalent of the parent order from which it was derived, and with which it stands in a living continuity. At the same time, both text and rubric were cleared of any expressions or ceremonies which symbolized medieval perversions, not merely of a hypothetical faith and practice of the Primitive Church, but actually of the fundamental import and genius of the Latin rite itself.

2. THE SECOND PRAYER BOOK OF 1552

The Liturgy of the First Prayer Book should have been an admirable platform of comprehension for all "men of good will" on both sides. Cranmer had caught the very accent of the Great Liturgies, in that his English was rich and forceful, rather than narrowly precise; and it was open then, as it has been ever since, for people of markedly differing points of view to embrace his liberal language *ex animo* as embodying a "pious sense" of their own beliefs. And in fact it was reasonably acceptable to moderate men of both parties. Unhappily, at that troubled period of change, moderate men were few. In particular, the Continental divines who had found refuge in England were bitterly outspoken against everything that bore even a reminder of the old customs.

It is possible that Cranmer might have withstood these assaults, if it had not been for what no doubt seemed to him the suspicious complacence of the conservative party. The new "mass" roused on the whole no more opposition from their side than might have been expected toward *any* English translation;¹⁵ and the more intelligent exponents of the Old Learning, while naturally regretting every alteration of the form they had known all their lives, were nevertheless con-

¹⁵The rebels of Devon who demanded the return of the Latin services, declaring, "We will not receive the new service, because it is but like a Christmas game," unquestionably would not have been a whit better pleased by a literal translation, word for word, of the Latin mass. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico!*

strained to admit that it was a sufficient Catholic liturgy. Indeed Bishop Gardiner, the ablest of them, openly confuted Cranmer and maintained his conception of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist *on the basis* of the Prayer Book service.

This cut the ground from under Cranmer's feet, and left him defenseless from the insistence of those who had been demanding a root-and-branch reformation of the Liturgy, to whom the acceptance of the new rite in any degree by even moderates on the Catholic side was intolerable. Therefore Cranmer, while still resolved to retain the essential substance of the traditional Christian rite, set himself so to alter its form as to satisfy his supporters.

So in direct contrast to 1549, in 1552 the apparent intent was to make the service *look* as different as possible. Most of its decorative detail was swept away: the eucharistic vesture of the "Ornaments Rubric," the permission for devotional "gestures," the rubrics directing the offering of the Elements, and the Manual Acts; the ornamental framework of the musical portions, the Introit, Postcommunion Anthem, *Benedictus qui venit*,¹⁶ *Agnus Dei*, *Gloria Tibi*, "Christ our Paschal Lamb," the provision for the singing of the Creed, and the Prologue to the Lord's Prayer; even such *minutiae* as the recurrent salutation, "The Lord be with you," before the Collect, Preface, and Postcommunion Thanksgiving, and "The peace of the Lord be alway with you" after the Consecration.

The actual theological objections which Cranmer had to meet were on the whole surprisingly slight: though his attempts to deal with them resulted in some radical reconstructions.

¹⁶The *Benedictus*, however, left behind the paraphrase of its second *Hosanna*—"Glory be to thee, O Lord most high:" *cf.* p. 178.

Naturally the foreigners had brought with them Luther's objection to any sort of prayers for the dead: hence the commemoration of the Departed was excised from the Prayer for the Church, and the limiting description "militant here in earth"¹⁷ added to its Bidding.

Their only other important stricture was against the Consecration Prayer. No one at this time had the faintest doubt about the Real Presence *in the Holy Communion*—*i.e.* of the fundamental reality of the spiritual experience of devout receivers of the Sacrament; but the foreigners took exception nevertheless to the idea of the Consecration as directed *to the Elements* or as entailing any *objective* effect upon them.

Therefore the Invocation was modified to favor a "receptionist" interpretation. Moreover, it was felt that the long interval between the definitive Words of Institution and the actual reception of the Sacrament ministered to the idea of an objective presence. If, as Peter Martyr said,¹⁸ "the words belong rather to men than either to bread or wine," this aim should be achieved by stopping the Canon at the Institution, and proceeding to the Communion with no interposition whatever.

This was the bombshell exploded under the heart of the Canon in 1552, which sent its *disjecta membra* flying to distant and sometimes peculiar parts of the service. But though it might seem to the historical student that the traditional Canon was thereby blown to fragments, it is interesting how Cranmer contrived to "gather up the fragments, that nothing be lost."

The Oblation and proper conclusion of the Consecration Prayer was set—not very happily—as an alternative to the Postcommunion Thanksgiving. The *Anamnesis* or com-

¹⁷The phrase was derived from the Sarum *Hore B.V.M.*, published in 1514; *cf.* *E.R.* II. 662.

¹⁸Proctor and Frere, 77.

memoration of the Passion, dropped from the transferred Prayer of Oblation, was reinserted in an abbreviated form¹⁹ in the Invocation—a really skilful substitution, so adroit as to have escaped the notice of commentators, and coming in very effectively in close sequence to the commemoration of the One Oblation.²⁰ The Lord's Prayer was put at the beginning of the Postcommunion, where it balanced the like commencement of the "Ante-Communion." The Exhortation, Invitation, Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words were placed before the Preface, and the Prayer of Humble Access after the *Sanctus*. This offered these devotions as a preparation for the whole Action, instead of merely the Communion; and lightened the service of a heavy anticlimax after the Consecration.

The excisions from the Canon left the Consecration Prayer reduced to the narrative of the Institution, introduced by a kind of *Anamnesis* of the Passion and an Invocation. If the General Intercession had been left before this abbreviated prayer, the whole structure would have been out of balance. Moreover, Gardiner had stressed the sacrificial meaning of the Intercession within the Canon—which was enough to banish it. By a singularly happy exercise of judgment, it was transferred to precisely the position after the Sermon which it had first occupied in the Primitive Church. Disused in that place for twelve centuries at Rome, it had survived as a living liturgical tradition in the "Gallican" sphere of influence, in the form of the *Prone* or "Bidding Prayer," which was a usual Sunday devotion in England. Thus brought once more

¹⁹"According to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion."

²⁰When, however, the original Scottish Canon restored the *Anamnesis*, and transferred the Invocation to an "Eastern" place following the Institution, the *Anamnesis* was actually left in duplicate forms in close succession. The present Scottish (and proposed English) rites have removed this duplication; though the derived American order has not.

into conjunction with the Offertory, the words "to accept our alms and" were added to its exordium.

One new addition to the rite caused yet another dislocation. The contemporary orders of Pullain and Laski²¹ may have influenced the insertion of the Ten Commandments—though at least since the thirteenth century the Decalogue had been a stated feature of the vernacular devotions at high mass in England.²² By assimilating the ninefold *Kyries* as responses after each Commandment, this form acquired much the quality of a penitential litany.

But this penitential introduction to the service was quite incompatible with the joyful *Gloria in Excelsis* immediately to follow it. Just as the interpolation of the *Gloria* in the sixth century on festal occasions banished the liturgical use of the Litany, reducing it to the vestige of its final *Kyries* on all occasions, so now the reconstitution of the *Kyries* to a litany-form banished the *Gloria* from this place. Cranmer transferred the *Gloria* to the only possible place it could appropriately occupy in the service, namely that following the Postcommunion Thanksgiving.

There were a few further changes to meet the views of the foreign reformers. "*The Altar*" was supplanted by "*the Table*" in the rubrics, coincidentally with a Royal Injunction demanding a real table, "with legs," which the rubric directed to be brought down at the communion-time to "stand in the body of the Church, or in the chancel, where Morning . . . and Evening prayer be appointed to be said," *i.e.*, in view of the congregation, not hidden by the choir-screen, and put lengthwise in the aisle, with the celebrant standing "on the north-side." New sentences of Administration, which carefully avoided calling the Sacrament directly the body

²¹*E.R.* I. clvii and clxi.

²²*E.R.* II. 1040.

and blood of Christ, were adopted, seemingly from Laski;²³ and the elements were to be delivered into the communicants' hands, not their mouths as in Sarum and 1549. At the last minute an Order in Council, with no synodical authority, added to the book the famous "Black Rubric," the Declaration on Kneeling.²⁴ Apparently designed to make it impossible for any one to profess belief in the Real Presence in the Elements, it did definitely exclude the theory of Transubstantiation by insisting that "the Sacramental bread and wine . . . remain still in their very natural substances"; but apart from that, all its intentionally harsh and disagreeable language actually contained no statement with which St. Thomas Aquinas would have disagreed.

Finally, there were a few emendations. The Churchwardens were to gather the alms, instead of having the givers come up individually. The Bishop, if present, was to pronounce the Absolution and Benediction. Octaves were directed for the Proper Prefaces. The use of the "Ante-Communion," which 1549 had prescribed for the ancient "Station-Days" of Wednesdays and Fridays, if there were none to receive the Sacrament, was now extended to Holy Days. The clause, "whose kingdom," etc., unaccountably missing from the Creed in 1549, was restored. In the *Gloria in Excelsis* was inserted the "superfluous" repetition of "Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us." This, sometimes taken as a printer's dittography,²⁵ was perhaps a deliberate addition, inserted for the purpose of preserving the banished *Agnus Dei* intact *within* the *Gloria*, whence it was conceived to have been derived. The transfer of the *Gloria* may indeed have moved Cranmer to drop the *Agnus*, as the

²³E.R. I. clxii.

²⁴E.R. II. 721.

²⁵Such was the argument for its removal from the American book in 1928.

nearly identical forms were now close together in the service.²⁶

We have discussed this Liturgy of 1552 with some fulness, because it is of primary importance in the history of Anglican rites, since it was the form that has survived to this day in England, with alterations only in *minutiæ*, and since it was the living stock from which subsequent revisions sprang.

It is true that the remarkably clearcut structure of the first English liturgy was impaired in this recension, and its order of parts strangely dislocated. The position of the Humble Access prayer was indefensible. The curtailing of the Canon was highly regrettable: since in spite of all the attempts to protestantize the service, the net result was that it was ultra-Roman in the predominant emphasis on the formula of the Institution, and by its very structure symbolized medieval theories more absolutely than any other liturgy that has ever existed.

And yet little that was valuable and nothing that was essential was actually lost out of the rite. The new penitential preface was entirely seemly. The Intercession was back in the primitive place, and on the whole the best place. The Confession, etc., formed a noble approach to the altar. The *Gloria in Excelsis* was a magnificent conclusion.

Though it has long been fashionable to deprecate and deplore the rite of 1552, and though subsequent revisions have wisely reverted to the standards of 1549 in many details, yet the Second Prayer Book established the fundamental structure of a distinctive Anglican type, some of whose arrangements it may never be wise to alter. In general, it has survived because it was worthy to survive. Neither British conservatism nor the very real legal difficulties in the way of

²⁶An opinion to this effect was expressed in the *Lambeth Judgment*, p. 61.

change, which proved insurmountable even in 1928, could have preserved for four hundred years a rite which was not organically sound, and adequate to express the devotional needs of the people.

3. SUBSEQUENT ENGLISH REVISIONS

The Second Prayer Book, which had hardly come into general use before it was outlawed by the Marian reaction, was restored with few changes in the Elizabethan book of 1559. The sentences of Administration of the communion in the books of '49 and '52 were combined. The Ornaments Rubric of the First Book was reenacted by reference, but proved wholly unenforceable, and remained a dead letter until the ceremonial revival of the nineteenth century. The "Black Rubric" was omitted.

The ill-fated Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, though utterly rejected at the time in the country for which it was intended, has had great influence on subsequent revisions.

Most of the changes adopted in the present English Prayer Book which has been in use since 1662, date from this book of 1637. These comprised, first, an attempt at a more precise rubric, such as the directions for the priest to turn to the people at the Ten Commandments, for the people to stand at the Gospel and Creed, for the minister who leads the General Confession to kneel,²⁷ for the covering of the consecrated elements with the Postcommunion Veil, and for their consumption after the Blessing. Rubrics for the Offertory and the Manual Acts, dropped in 1552, were restored. Titles were given to the components of the service in the rubrics: of which *The Collect*, *The Absolution*, and *the*

²⁷Implying that the celebrant was to remain standing, as is still the custom in England when there are assistant ministers.

Prayer of Consecration, were adopted in the English book. A more reverent phraseology spoke of the "holy" Gospel, and the "holy" Table.²⁸ The Epistle was finished off like the Lessons with "Here endeth the Epistle."²⁹ A Commemoration of the Departed was reinserted in the Prayer for the Church Militant.³⁰ The Collect for the King was placed before that of the day—regrettably; but it avoided turning back in the book, and kept the Collect of the day in immediate sequence with the Epistle. The congregational *Amen* was reinstated at the end of the Prayer of Consecration.³¹

Other features of the Scottish book which did not get into the English were the restoration of the Invocation, *Anamnesis*, and Oblation, and proper conclusion of the Consecration Prayer as in 1549, and the *Gloria Tibi* before the Gospel, all of which were adopted in the American Prayer Book of 1789; also the *Laus Tibi* after the Gospel,³² the Lord's Prayer with its Prologue after the Canon, and the Prayer of Humble Access before the Communion, which were accepted in our revision of 1928.

A few additions were made in 1662 which were not in the Scottish book. Notices and announcements were put before the Sermon instead of afterward. A rubrical change transferred the meaning of the word "Offertory" from the old *Offertorium* anthem, as in 1549, to the act of oblation. "And oblations" was added to the "alms" of the Church Militant

²⁸The latter is found in the English books only at the Offertory.

²⁹A similar termination for the Gospel in the Scottish book was rejected in the English; it has been conjectured, for the somewhat mystical reason that the proclamation of Christ's Gospel never comes to an end! Cf. Hart, *The Book of Common Prayer* [Bib. 78], 180, and Dowden, *Annotated Scottish Communion Office* [Bib. 130], 192.

³⁰The form was taken from a Bidding Prayer issued by Royal Authority in 1559; cf. E.R. II. 664.

³¹Cf. I Cor. 14:16.

³²This seems to be a borrowing from modern Roman use; it is not found in Sarum.

prayer.³³ The Doxology of Matt. 6:13 was appended to the Lord's Prayer.

As a result of one of the meticulous *Exceptions of the Ministers*, the Manual Acts were amplified with further detail of the "mimetic" gestures which have always tended to invade this point of the service; not very happily perhaps: the simple acts of designation of 1549 should have been sufficient.³⁴

Directions for a second consecration "if the consecrated bread or wine be all spent before all have communicated" were inserted along the lines of the *Order of Communion* of 1548 and the Canons of 1604: *i.e.*, by the use of the bare formulæ of the Institution, without prayer of any sort. This is easily the worst feature of the book.

The "Black Rubric" was reinserted at the instance of the Presbyterian party; though the Bishops rightly remarked that there was not "any great need of restoring it, the world being now in more danger of profanation than of idolatry." But it was rewritten to disclaim "Adoration" not of "any *real and essential*" but of "any *corporal* presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."

The use of the "Ante-Communion" was now finally extended to Sundays, it having long proved impossible to maintain even a weekly Eucharist with communions in the average parish; and even for large churches the book found it necessary to require the assisting clergy to communicate at

³³Originally, *alms* meaning offerings for charitable purposes, the term *oblations* was added to comprise offerings for all other purposes, not to indicate the Elements, though of course including them constructively. However, a popular interpretation of the "oblations" as *denoting* the Elements is probably as old as the rubric; and this was definitely adopted in the American book of 1928. Cf. Proctor and Frere, 482 *note*.

³⁴Especially the direction to "break the bread" at this point introduced an unhistorical and illogical place for the ancient ritual Fraction; serving to underscore the medieval idea, of which Cranmer unfortunately did nothing to rid the English rite, that the recital of the Institution is the instrument of consecration.

least on Sunday, in order to assure a weekly celebration there.

By this path the great attempt of the Reformation to restore the people's frequent reception of the Sacrament resulted in abolishing even the regular celebration of the service. In 1571 Archbishop Grindal of York had ordered the "accumulation" and continuous recitation of Morning Prayer, Litany, and Communion or "Ante-Communion"—which in practice almost invariably meant the latter, thanks to the rubric which forbade the celebration unless at least three communicants³⁵ had *previously*³⁶ signified their intention to receive. Grindal's custom had promptly become general; and the rubrics of 1662 simply recognized the existing practice of the Church. The tide did not turn until the "Oxford Movement" emphasized again the paramount importance of the Eucharist in Christian worship, and effected its restoration by the simple process of securing a very general ignoring of the requirement of prior notification of intention to communicate.

4. AMERICAN RITES

The abortive American book of 1785 followed the current English use closely. But the custom of "accumulated" services had become so fixed, that it was simply assumed that the Holy Communion would never be used separately. Hence the Communion Office was printed directly after the daily services; and the prefatory Lord's Prayer and the Creed were completely omitted, to avoid a "vain repetition" of those already said in Morning Prayer. The word "Minister" was substituted for "Priest" in the rubrics throughout the service. The "Ante-Communion" ended with the Gospel.

The first authentic American book in 1789 preserved the

³⁵E.R. II. 715.

³⁶E.R. II. 638 f.

plan of 1785 by allowing the omission of the first Lord's Prayer and the Creed, *if* Morning Prayer preceded immediately; the rubric referring back to the text of Morning Prayer for either Apostles' or Nicene Creeds, neither of which was reprinted in the Communion.

The great feature of this book was the Consecration Prayer, adopted through Bishop Seabury's diocesan use of 1786 from the Scottish order of 1764. It begins with the splendid exordium, "All glory be to thee" (first in 1755), which binds the *Post-Sanctus* to the conclusion of the *Sanctus*³⁷ by the repetition of the word "glory," just as the Syrian rite does with "holy" and the Egyptian with "full." The Alexandrian-Roman-English feature of a "preliminary Invocation" was removed, the Invocation being placed in connection with the Great Oblation, where alone it has ecumenical warrant. Its phrasing however conflated the current English and Scottish forms. The remainder of the Consecration Prayer followed the structure of 1549; the Scottish transfer of the Intercession and the Preparation for Communion to follow the Consecration being rejected.

Other Scottish features of the service were the Summary of the Law, made a permissive addition to the Decalogue; the Collect for grace to keep the Commandments,³⁸ finishing off the recitation of the Decalogue as a true penitential Litany, made complete by this proper Litany-collect; and the *Gloria Tibi* after the announcement of the Gospel, as in 1549.

New details were a simple alternative Preface for Trinity Sunday; and permission to sing a hymn after the Consecra-

³⁷In its present form, *i.e.* of the paraphrased *Hosanna* left behind by the excision of the *Benedictus qui venit*.

³⁸First in 1764. From the "Occasional Collects" of 1549 following the Communion Office; originally from the Sarum commemorations known as "*Pretiosa*" at the reading of the Martyrology following Prime.

tion Prayer, and to substitute a hymn for the *Gloria in Excelsis*.

The rubrics used "Minister" through the collection of the alms, and "Priest" from the presentation of the Elements: thus implying that the "Ante-Communion" might be said by a Deacon.

In 1892, the Nicene Creed was printed in the Communion service, retaining the permission to omit the Creed from the Communion if said before in Morning Prayer, and allowing either Creed in either office, except that the Nicene must be said on at least the five great festivals. The Decalogue must be said once a Sunday—otherwise the Summary and *Kyries* might be substituted—and the Collect of the Commandments was made optional. The Long Exhortation was required only once a month. The "Warnings" of an ensuing celebration were dismissed to the end of the service. A new rubric aimed at wilful "mass without communions" directed that "sufficient opportunity shall be given to all present to communicate." Five new Offertory Sentences were provided—the last two for use at the presentation of the Alms and Oblations. Addressed to God, they adequately fill the place of the old *Secreta* Collect.

In the last revision of 1928, the Communion Office was removed from the end to the beginning of the book of Collects, Epistles, and Gospels. This brought it next the section of the Choir Offices, not for mere convenience as in 1785, but that it might be associated in the minds of the users of the book with the general and habitual services of the Church, not with the "Occasional Offices," before which it formerly stood, and with which some writers had even classified it.

The "canonical" rubrics about repelling unworthy communicants were relegated to an inconspicuous position in

the new section of "General Rubrics" at the end. The obsolete directions for the place of the Holy Table and the posture of the celebrant were replaced by "the Priest, standing reverently before the Holy Table"—approximating the "standing humbly afore the middes of the Altar" of 1549.

Other reversions to the standards of the First Prayer Book were the Salutation *The Lord be with you* before the Collect of the day—but, inconsistently, not also before the *Sursum Corda* and the Postcommunion Thanksgiving, turning-points which needed to be signalized in the traditional way even more than the Collect; the inclusion of a suffrage for the Departed in the Prayer for the Church, and the deletion of the limiting term "Militant" from its Bidding; the restoration of the Lord's Prayer, with its ancient Prologue, to follow the Canon, and the placing of the Prayer of Humble Access immediately before the Communion; and the removal of the "superfluous" repetition from the *Gloria in Excelsis*.⁸⁹

Twelve of the Offertory Sentences of 1892 were dropped; chiefly those exhorting the people to support the clergy, and those implying "unworthy" motives for almsgiving, such as an apparent "bargain with God"; and the two new Sentences for missionary collections were added.

Additional flexibility of use was secured by permitting the omission of the prefatory Lord's Prayer at discretion, an optional use of the Decalogue in shortened form, and the omission of the Long Exhortation at any time except the first Sundays of Advent and Lent, and Trinity Sunday.

The desire for special "votive" intercessions (hitherto met by interpolating collects after the Collect of the day or before the Blessing) was provided for by permitting special prayers

⁸⁹This amendment was first made in the Scottish book of 1755.

after the Creed or at announcement-time, and special Biddings prefixed to the General Intercession.

While the word "Priest" was restored throughout the rubrics, a special provision permits a Deacon, "in the absence of a Priest," to say the service "to the end of the Gospel." But in this book the use of the "Ante-Communion" on Sundays and other Holy Days when there is no communion is permitted, not required, by the rubrics.

X

HOLY COMMUNION:

III. THE PRESENT AMERICAN RITE

I. STRUCTURE

HISTORICALLY, THE DIVISIONS of the Liturgy are the service of the Catechumens; the service of the Faithful; the consecratory Canon; and the Communion.

The Catechumens' service is entirely general, and mainly didactic, and may be profitably attended by any human being. Technically, in our rite it ends with the Gospel, though there is no break of any kind in the text, save in the separate use of the "Ante-Communion," which concludes at this point. Today, however, the dismissal of the Catechumens before the secret "Mysteries" known only to the initiate has been disused for over a thousand years. The whole service is primarily the Liturgy of the Faithful—though equally open to any auditor who chooses to attend it. The Anglican position of the Creed immediately after the Gospel and before the Sermon is witness that the ancient distinction has been forgotten; the natural turning-point of the service is at the Offertory, where the sacrificial action begins: and the general order, introductory to the eucharistic oblation, may be regarded as extending up to this point.

The service of the Faithful traditionally includes the Creed and the Intercession; which latter was originally *par éminence* the "Prayers of the Faithful." The Creed, as we

THE GENERAL ORDER

have said, is now in the preceding division. The Anglican rites have added to the service of the Faithful the devotions of preparation for communion.

The Canon comprises the Preface and the long Prayer of Consecration, concluding with the congregational *Amen*. The remainder of the service beginning with the Lord's Prayer is the Administration, to which medieval times gave the significant title of the "Canon of the Communion."

2. THE GENERAL ORDER

The initial Lord's Prayer and Collect for Purity are survivals of the priest's preparation in the Sarum rite. Tradition has maintained the principle that the people should not say the Lord's Prayer with the priest.¹

The use of the Decalogue, introduced in 1552, has never proved entirely satisfactory—perhaps because its purpose has not been clearly understood. Its quality as a form of Litany seems to have been felt in 1764, at which time it was finished off with a true Litany-Collect for grace to keep the commandments. Yet we still retain the rubric of 1637, directing the priest to face the people for its recitation, as if it were a fixed Old Testament Lesson. Some of its expressions pertain only to primitive Hebrew conditions: and the book of 1637, followed by the recent Scottish, English, and South African revisions, felt constrained to explain in the rubric that its terms should be applied according to a "mystical" or "spiritual" interpretation. The Commandments are chiefly negative in form: and the Nonjurors' book of 1718, with the Scottish 1764, the American books, and the recent British revisions, offer our Lord's "Summary" in positive and universal terms as a complement. Moreover they are lengthy,

¹In the rubric on p. 7 of the Prayer Book, "divine service" is technically used to indicate Morning and Evening Prayer, and hence has no application to this place in the Communion Office.

a distinct element of tedium in the service, and that at a most injudicious place, when the order of worship is just getting under way: hence all the latest revisions have presented them in an optionally or absolutely abbreviated form, similar to that of *The Institution of a Christian Man* of 1537, *The Necessary Doctrine* of 1543, and Cranmer's Catechism of 1548. The American book of 1892 allowed them to be supplanted altogether by the Summary and *Kyries*, except once a Sunday; the 1928 book requires them only once a month.

The inherent *rationale* of the Decalogue-Litany is that it corresponds to, and may have been designed in some measure to replace, the old preliminary *Confiteor* of the Latin mass. Its intent is plainly to serve as the basis for an examination of conscience, which shall provide a real content of contrition to the General Confession made later in the service. It happens however that so few people have been, or are, in the habit of making private confessions, that this use of the Decalogue in preparation for a confession has been largely forgotten; and it is very doubtful if many communicants recognize this as a part of the service which calls upon them for a most earnest and active spiritual participation. Without such recognition, the Decalogue becomes merely something to be endured until it is over; and there is little wonder that it has been progressively eliminated from use.

Further experience will tell whether the measures adopted in the latest Prayer Books are sufficient to stay this trend, or whether new ones must be found. We have, for example, the method of flexible alternatives, which was hardly available in the sixth century, or the sixteenth. It might be quite practicable now to restore the *Gloria in Excelsis* to this place, as a joyful beginning of the service on festal occasions, to be replaced by the Decalogue-Litany in penitential seasons. The Decalogue could be provided with a Bidding which should

make clear its purpose, and arouse the people's devout cooperation, and might be emphasized in its quality as a Litany by directing that it be said kneeling before the altar.

At present, it is not to be recommended that the Collect of the Commandments be said except after the Decalogue, though the rubric permits it in any combination. Saying the Summary, then this Collect, then making a fresh start with "The Lord be with you," followed by the Collect of the day, is distinctly awkward.

The use of the Creed in immediate sequence with the Gospel is an Anglican peculiarity; so (in the West) is its required use on all occasions, while in the Latin rite and in 1549 it was purely festal. But the closer the connection of the Creed with the Gospel, the more patent is the justification for its liturgical use: the proclamation of the Gospel is answered by the declaration of our personal and intelligent assent; and the formulation of the Church's official faith is presented as a systematic summary of the scriptural narrative, as things that really happened. The Creed may (not must) be omitted if Morning Prayer has immediately preceded.

The present Prayer Book has some entirely new and really organic provisions for the use of special intercessions. But though the rubrics are perfectly clear, they do not seem so far to have been very well understood in practice. On p. 71, the direction after the rubric on Notices, *Here, or immediately after the Creed, shall be said the Bidding Prayer, or other authorized prayers and intercessions*, plainly means that any desired *special prayers* should be used at the reading-desk at announcement-time at a principal service where there are formal Notices before the Sermon; but that they may be read at the altar directly following the Creed at a "low celebration." But on p. 74, *Here the Priest may ask*

the secret intercessions of the congregation for any who have desired the prayers of the Church, certainly indicates special Biddings—not interpolated Collects—prefixed to the Bidding of the General Intercession.

It may be mentioned that the use of the Bidding Prayer is hardly desirable at a celebration of the Communion, for it constitutes an absolute duplication of the substance of the General Intercession which follows so closely in our rite. The Bidding Prayer may however be admirably employed in connection with the "Ante-Communion."²

3. THE DEVOTIONS OF THE FAITHFUL

The Offertory Sentences, which Cranmer originally designed to have sung as liturgical Anthems (*Offertoria*), now serve only to announce the beginning of the act of Oblation; and one of them is read whether or no there is any "collection" to be taken up. Another rubric provides for an independent "Hymn, or an Offertory Anthem," to be sung "when the Alms and Oblations are being received and presented." The descriptive phrase, "in the words of Holy Scripture or of the Book of Common Prayer," establishes a standard, though perhaps hardly so rigid a one as to prohibit the use of anthems of equivalent quality which do not conform to the absolute letter of those categories; the further proviso that they should be "under the direction of the Priest" being apparently designed to restrain ambitious choir-directors who tended to depart too widely from this standard.

The "Minor Oblation" so dreaded in 1552 has been explicitly restored: the priest is told to "offer and place upon the Holy Table the Bread and the Wine," following Scottish use since 1735. The intercalation in the Intercession is re-

²We may note that the use of a Collect or Invocation before sermons is a survival of the traditional use of the Bidding Prayer at that point before the Reformation.

duced to "accept our [*alms and*] oblations." This makes it clear that the elements themselves are oblations, and constitutes the Intercession as a corporate offertory prayer. The entire action, beginning here, is sacrificial; and this part is quite as integral to it as the later "Major Oblation" which pleads the sacrifice before God.

The sense of a corporate and vital act is accentuated by the new rubric directing this connection for preferring the special petitions of the offerers who have desired the Church's prayers.

In 1549 the First Prayer Book ordered that at the offertory-time the intending communicants should gather in the choir, and all others depart out of it—which, in a large church with a heavy chancel-screen, meant that they must get out of sight and hearing of the altar, and naturally resulted in their leaving the church altogether; in effect a "Dismissal of Catechumens and Penitents." No Prayer Book since has continued this rubric in any form: but the English books since 1552 have ended the "Ante-Communion" with the Prayer for the Church; and the custom has survived to our day in many places in all branches of the Church for non-communicants to leave at this point.

Unsanctioned by rubric, and undesirable from the point of view of the communicants, whose devotions it interrupts, this custom is sometimes a practical necessity, especially in city churches. It is in fact a survival of the very ancient and entirely valid distinction between communicants and auditors; and while the Church no longer expels the latter from the celebration of its Mysteries, they do have the right to withdraw at their own option from a portion of the rite of which they are not actually participants.

After all, it really is the fact that the Invitation, Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words constitute a new

movement in the service. They concern not a mixed congregation, but those who propose to receive the Sacrament. And as now prefixed to the Consecration, instead of to the Communion only, as in 1549, they have accentuated the sense of a united sacrificial action of the Church. They form an effective introduction to the solemn Prayer of Consecration; they symbolize the chancel steps by which the communicants "draw near with faith" to the inner shrine.

4. THE CANON OF CONSECRATION

The term "Preface" is purely Western. In the East, it is properly the "Thanksgiving"; and as such is not only integral to the central *Anaphora*³ (as appears in the first text of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*, where it is an undivided part of the Consecration Prayer), but indeed is the portion from which the term "Eucharist" takes its name.

The Anglican Prefaces are all in line with the "basic" Hippolytan rite in rendering glory to God for phases of the Incarnation. Their number was judiciously enlarged at the last revision, with provisions for Epiphany, three festivals of our Lord, and All Saints'. Future ages may see this part of the service still further adorned; but it is a perilous task, demanding supreme expression. Some of the new Prefaces in other recent Prayer Books are distinctly pedestrian. The English and Scottish books however offer the somewhat attractive feature of extending the use of some Prefaces from Octaves only to some whole seasons every day of which is of equal honor: that of Christmas until the Epiphany, that of Easter until the Ascension, that of Ascension until Whitsunday, that of All Saints' to Saints' Days generally.

Our Consecration Prayer is a rich heritage. Roman schol-

³As late as the eighth century, texts of the "Gelasian" Sacramentary still counted the Preface as part of the Canon; cf. Fortescue, *The Mass* [Bib. 68], 315, and Eisenhofer II. 152b.

ars, humanly offended where we have abandoned their undeniably venerable but undeniably crude and obscure standards, have tended to dismiss it as a synthetic product. But it comes to us as the result of an organic evolution, a legitimate inheritance from the valiant Laud, the learning and devotion of the Nonjurors who embraced exile for conscience' sake, the tenacity of the faithful remnant in Scotland, and the faith which ventured to found the Episcopate in the New World.

The Liturgy of Jerusalem which rightly attracted eighteenth-century minds by its supreme literary quality, and wrongly, as the supposed apostolic rite of the Cradle of the Faith, was in fact not as primitive as the Roman; but in the matter of the Invocation of the power of God to consecrate the Sacrament it did faithfully preserve a more ancient tradition which the Roman had once possessed, in the time of Hippolytus, but had so obscured as virtually to have lost. Once again the Anglican rites have restored what the most recent Roman scholars have reluctantly come to admit to be the rightful meaning of their own cryptic formulæ.

Though there has been some tendency in certain quarters in England to conform to Roman ideas of the meaning, formula, and moment of consecration, yet both the English and South African revisions, together with most of the local rites of the missionary dioceses, have accepted the historical evidence, urged by the eminent Scottish liturgiologists, and adopted the same Scottish structure of the Consecration Prayer which the American Church has had from its beginning.

Two Roman criticisms are that our narrative of the Institution is Lutheran, and our Invocation "receptionist."

It is true that the Institution is very close to the Brandenburg-Nürnberg *Kirchenordnung*, reproduced in the Nürn-

berg Catechism of Justus Jonas, which was translated and adapted in Cranmer's Catechism of 1548. But the fact is of no significance. The Roman narrative of the Institution is a conflation of all four scriptural accounts, *plus* certain rhetorical embellishments.⁴ The Nürnberg and English forms castigate the Latin text of the non-scriptural additions, and further conflate into it three phrases from the Pauline tradition. Yet the Mozarabic rite, which at some unknown time underwent a precisely similar revision,⁵ made almost identically the same excisions from the Roman, and the same additions from St. Paul.⁶

As to the Invocation, there is really a certain hollowness in the controversies between proponents of subjective and objective ideas of the Consecration. Obviously it is not possible to "receive" anything which is not in some sense objectively real; and on the other hand, it is of no importance what the Elements may be alleged to have been made in themselves, unless they are subjectively realized within the soul of the communicant.

Besides, even the most extreme form of 1552 was intrinsically not a bit more "receptionist" than the "ut *nobis fiat*" of the Latin original. The Invocation of the Roman liturgy, like that of every other, even the frankly "metabolist" formula of St. Chrysostom,⁷ ends by expressing a *worthy communion* as the objective of the whole consecratory action.

The present American rite expresses adequately the idea of an objective Consecration by returning to the First Prayer Book for the form then borrowed from St. Basil—"vouch-

⁴For the widely varying forms of the narrative of the Institution in the historic liturgies, cf. Neale and Littledale, *Translations of the Primitive Liturgies*, Appendix I, 193-247, and Arthur Linton, *Twenty-five Consecration Prayers* (S.P.C.K., London, 1921).

⁵Certainly at one time it began *Qui pridie*, like the Roman and Gallican, since the following prayer is always entitled the *Post-Pridie*—though its present narrative of the Institution now begins quite differently.

⁶Compare all the parallels in E.R. I. cvii ff.

⁷LEW 330b. 5, 9.

safe to bless and sanctify with thy Word⁸ and Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine"—while retaining the Second Prayer Book's safeguard for the equally vital subjective realization, "that we receiving them . . . may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood."

Since the appearance of the 1928 book, two criticisms of the Consecration Prayer have been heard with some frequency.

The first concerns the emphatic designations of Christ's "one Oblation of himself" at the beginning. In origin, these were distinctly *Protestant* phrases, designed to safeguard the uniqueness of the Cross against medieval ideas of repeated immolations of Christ in the repudiated "sacrifices of masses." This danger having long been forgotten, the objection now is that these terms are too close to concepts of a substitutionary Atonement which have been very generally superseded in the minds of modern men. It may be admitted that there is something in this contention—certainly "satisfaction" is one word too many.

Every ancient liturgy contains archaic phrases, once held in interpretations now outgrown, which we do not so hold or interpret. Bringing the language up to date is sometimes very difficult—it has so far proved impossible in the case of the Apostles' Creed. Recent suggestions are not acceptable which would omit the essential content of this part of the Consecration Prayer, or water it down inconclusively. This

⁸Cranmer's original "holy spirit and word" was doubtless intended to combine Eastern and Western theories of the consecration, designating the Holy Spirit as the agent, and our Lord's "word" (of Institution) as the means. The Scottish 1764 spoke of the "Word and Holy Spirit," *i.e.*, the personal Word or *Logos*, coworking with the creative Spirit, and in some sense to be included and identified with Him: cf. John 14:18; 2 Cor. 3:17-18; Gal. 4:6; Phil. 1:19; or in other words it is Christ, the Eternal Priest, who Himself, through the ministry of the Spirit, consecrates the Sacrament: cf. the Invocation in Serapion (*J.T.S.* I. 1. 106.13; Funk II. 174.28; Wordsworth, 64); St. Athanasius quoted in *P.G.* 26. 1325; and St. Chrysostom in *1 Cor. Hom.* 24. 2 (*P.G.* 61. 200), and in *Mat. Hom.* 82. 5 (*P.G.* 58. 743).

weighty, solemn, and for the most part directly scriptural language is in fact a restoration of the primitive *Post-Sanctus* in rites both Eastern and Western, consisting of a narrative of the Redemption as an objective historical fact, and forming an indispensable introduction of the Institution as a narrative equally objective and historical, rather than as a magic formula of consecration. Its balance should not be destroyed, nor its force weakened, in any future alteration.

The other criticism is of the conclusion of the Prayer, following the paragraph entitled "The Invocation." There is a distinct lag in the service at this portion, with some tendency to wandering of mind.

Some of the phrases here are really superfluous now, as the transfer of the Prayer of Humble Access to a closely adjacent position has revealed certain duplications of ideas concerning the fruits of communion.

What is fundamentally the trouble with this passage is that historically it is composed of odds and ends of Collects from the Latin order, from which their substantive, concrete, and *interesting* elements have been eliminated.⁹ On the other hand, our prayer contains some valuable and distinctive phases of the Christian sacrifice, notably the Church's corporate oblation of *itself*, which ought not to be lost. It ought to be possible to reduce this paragraph to elements not expressed elsewhere, providing a dignified but brief conclusion.¹⁰

This growing desire to terminate the Prayer of Consecration as soon as may be after the Invocation, is an instance of the sound instinct which caused the first American book

⁹E.g. the patriarchal sacrifices from the *Supra quæ*, the Heavenly Altar from the *Supplices*, and the part and lot with the Saints from the *Nobis quoque*.

¹⁰For instance: "And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offenses, through Jesus Christ our Lord; etc."

of 1789 to reject the use of Scotland since 1735 and Bishop Seabury's form of 1786, which followed Syrian precedent by appending the General Intercession after the Consecration, succeeded by the Preparation for Communion as in 1549.

An anticlimax is an essential part of every art-form—after the soaring upward rush of the spirit there must be a return to common earth—but it is an artistic necessity that such an anticlimax be *as brief as possible*, else the whole effect is ruined. The sharp descending limb of the parabolic curve, which is the scientist's graph for the wax and wane of any natural phenomenon, should be our guide for any artistic form, whether it be the emotion of a sonnet, or the spiritual movement of a liturgy.

Structurally, the Scottish arrangement is a mistake; and the tedium of its inordinately lengthy anticlimax may probably account for the fact that it has never been able entirely to supplant the rite of the Church of England in Scotland itself. Historically, it is no less a mistake, for, as we have seen, the Syrian and Scottish place for the General Intercession is not primitive, while the English and American location is.

5. THE CANON OF THE COMMUNION

(a) Structure

The consummation and objective of the whole Liturgy is the act of Communion. Unlike the *Pro-Anaphora*, which at various times and places has varied widely, in ways of considerable interest but little fundamental importance, the concluding portions of the rite from the earliest examples to the latest have possessed and preserved a structural framework more definite, more primitive, and more resistant to alteration, than even the consecratory Canon itself. The

medieval liturgiologists who called it the "Canon of the Communion" were imbued with a sound instinct. But it can hardly be said that any modern student has hitherto given it even his serious attention. The *rationale* of this part of the service has been, and is, so little understood, and even so misunderstood, that the treatment of its history and principles has been deferred to this point for examination in detail.

The first available texts in the fourth-century *Apostolic Constitutions*¹¹ and the possibly still earlier *Ethiopic Church Order*,¹² present this structure in the clearest form:

1. A Prayer of the Fraction or Breaking of Bread.¹³
2. The Bishop's Blessing of intending communicants.
3. The so-called Elevation (really the bringing out of the Elements ready for reception with a word and gesture of invitation).
4. The Act of Communion.
5. The Postcommunion Thanksgiving.
6. A Commendatory Prayer over the congregation.
7. The Dismissal.

In the medieval Roman rite this lucid order was somewhat obscured. The original One Loaf of the oblation had been supplanted by separate wafers, ready for the communion of the people, so that the ancient "Breaking of the Bread" survived only in the form of a ritual Fraction of the Priest's Host; and the Prayer of Fraction was reduced to a vestige, the Prologue to the Lord's Prayer, and its original Prayer to form the so-called "*Embolismus*."¹⁴ The "Elevation" remained informally, in the celebrant's turning to the

¹¹LEW 24 ff.

¹²LEW 190.37 ff.

¹³This was the prayer into which the Lord's Prayer was afterward interpolated; cf. p. 154D.—Found in the Ethiopic, not the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

¹⁴*i.e.* "Interpolation," as a supposed insertion between the body of the Lord's Prayer and its scriptural Doxology—though on the contrary it was the Lord's Prayer itself which was the interpolation.

people and holding up the host, saying, "Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world." The Thanksgiving after receiving was represented by the Postcommunion Collect, variable with the day: but while usually with some reference to the Sacrament received, in most instances it had lost the note of thanksgiving, which had been absorbed in the priest's private prayers at the Ablutions. The Commendatory Prayer over the congregation ("*Super populum*") is found in nearly all masses in the Leonine Sacramentary, in most in the Gelasian, from Septuagesima to Easter in the Gregorian, and has finally been confined to the weekdays of Lent in the present Missal of Pius V: vanishing *pari passu* with the development of a declarative sacerdotal Benediction at the end.

The Blessing of Communicants disappeared from the Roman rite very early, because the bishop's Salutation, "The peace of the Lord be alway with you," which originally introduced it, by the beginning of the fifth century had attracted to itself the Kiss of Peace from its former location at the beginning of the *Anaphora*.¹⁵ But this Blessing survived in the Gallican rites, and remained as a Gallican inheritance in England down to the Reformation, with numerous formulæ, varying with the season, in the Sarum Pontifical. But priests did not use it; and we have seen¹⁶ that in England as elsewhere a Confession and Absolution were interpolated here to supply the psychological lack of some immediate conclusion entirely assimilated to the last clause of the Lord's preparation for communion.

Nearly all of this rational order for the Administration of the Communion in the primitive liturgies has been restored

¹⁵Cf. Fortescue, *The Mass*, 370 f.—The Roman signing of the Chalice with a particle of the Host at this point is a last ritual vestige of the former Blessing of Communicants.

¹⁶P. 180.

in substance in our present service—intuitively, we may say, and by an instinctive feeling for liturgical principles; since neither Cranmer nor any subsequent revisers possessed a historical knowledge of what the primitive scheme was.

There is now, indeed, no Prayer of the Fraction, as a legitimate evolution has absorbed this supplication into a setting for the Lord's Prayer. But our latest revision restored the Lord's Prayer to its place of primary honor and greatest significance immediately after the Consecration, and provided it with the ancient Prologue to introduce it with proper dignity. This Prologue contains a touching reminder of the *disciplina arcani* of the days of persecution, that reserved the knowledge of this most sacred of all prayers from the uninitiate. The old tradition, which the Roman rituals still preserve intact, was never to repeat the Lord's Prayer aloud in any of the offices of worship, except at the moment of baptismal initiation into the Christian Mysteries, and at this place in the Communion.¹⁷ Here, at the consummation of the Christian Sacrifice, with all alien ears excluded, the faithful rightly "are bold to say" the Lord's own words.

The recent restoration of the Prayer of Humble Access to the position before the act of communion, for which it was originally designed, fills a real need. Both in tone and content it is a full equivalent of the bishop's Blessing of those about to receive in the Eastern rites, from which, in St. Basil's version, Cranmer took the idea for this prayer, and some of its expressions.¹⁸ The ceremony only is different, the cele-

¹⁷The original form of the Hours of the Breviary, for example, never gives more than the beginning and ending of the Lord's Prayer, the rest being recited silently. The Benedictine rule, however, introduced the custom of saying it aloud at Lauds and Vespers; and this monastic use survived in the *Preces Feriales* employed at these Hours in the Roman Breviaries since the twelfth century; cf. Eisenhofer I. 173; II. 525, 527.—For possible still more ancient roots of the reserve in the use of the Lord's Prayer, cf. Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* §23.14 (ed. Easton [Bib. 7], 49), and note (*ibid.* 95).

¹⁸*E.R.* II. 698; I. lxxv.

brant now identifying himself with the worshipping congregation, and kneeling with them to make this preparation for himself as well as for them, instead of pronouncing it over them in benediction.

The Postcommunion Thanksgiving also reverts to Eastern standards¹⁹ in being a fixed prayer, instead of a "Gallican" variable Collect. It should be noted that this is properly our own—and only—"Postcommunion."

Instead of a blunt word of dismissal by the Deacon, the service now ends with a priestly benediction in the Name of God. The Sarum rite had not yet acquired the final Benediction of the present Roman;²⁰ and it appears that Cranmer turned from the untranslatable Latin "Ite, missa est," to the Byzantine "Let us depart in peace,"²¹ where he found the suggestion for the beautiful use of Phil. 4:7 to introduce the Blessing.

Thus it appears that the only missing elements of the primitive structure are some sort of immediate Invitation to Communicants, and a final Commendatory Prayer "over the congregation."

Cranmer had something of the nature of the Invitation in his "Christ our Paschal Lamb" in 1549;²² but this was dropped in 1552, and never restored in any form. The matter is hardly important; but a small awkward pause at this juncture sometimes bears witness of this ritual link that has dropped out, and indicates that such an Invitation might be of value to start a diffident congregation toward the altar-rail. At a choral service, this is sometimes virtually supplied by the Hymn at the communion-time, corresponding to the

¹⁹*LEW* 342.16.

²⁰The Benediction seems to have grown out of the Bishop's custom of blessing his people as he went out in the recessional. When adopted as a formal feature, it borrowed the minimum form previously employed for the benediction before communion.

²¹*LEW* 397.20.

²²*E.R.* II. 696.

Ambrosian Anthem *Ad Accedentes*—i.e. "For those who draw nigh" to receive the communion.

The Commendatory Prayer "*Super populum*" has completed the process of degeneration which it underwent in the Roman books, by being entirely absorbed in the invariable use of Phil. 4:7 which ushers in the final Benediction, and which indeed represents its essential content. It survives separately and unmistakably, however, in the three services in the Ordinal. The three prayers there are not in any sense "Postcommunions"—they have no allusion to the Sacrament received—they are precisely Commendatory Prayers over the newly ordained clergy and the congregation, for enabling grace in time to come.

The Ordinal of 1550 directed these prayers to be said *after the last Collect, and immediately before the benediction*. Now in 1550 this "last Collect," which normally occurred "immediately before the benediction," was in fact the fixed Postcommunion Thanksgiving. But when in 1552 and all following books the *Gloria in Excelsis* was transferred to the place "immediately before the benediction," the rubric in the Ordinal—*which stands unaltered to this day*—became quite inaccurate: and this misleading reference gave rise to the mistaken hypothesis that these final Commendatory Prayers in the ordination services were themselves Postcommunion Collects, and that their rubric implied the habitual use of a "last Collect" in the normal service.

Hence the use of so-called "Postcommunions" at the option of the celebrant now has the prescription of a long tradition, and indeed has been explicitly authorized in the recent Scottish and English revisions. We have seen that our book of 1892 allowed the Occasional Prayers to be used at this place,²⁸ and that the amended rubric of 1928 was

²⁸P. 150.

not quite definite enough to bring this practice to an end. But the fact is that Anglican use has displayed an unanalyzed confusion of three quite different types of prayer, and misuse of two of them in this place: special intercessions and commemorations, which have no appropriateness here; Postcommunion prayers and thanksgivings, of which there is only one possible example in our Prayer Book, that in the text of the service; and final Commendatory Prayers over the congregation. It seems that the old rule for terminating the "Ante-Communion" with General Collects, and the present custom of "Table Prayers" appended to Morning Prayer and Sermon, have kept alive the sound liturgical instinct of the early Church to conclude the Communion with some comprehensive supplication for perseverance in righteous living. It is this last, though under the wrong name, which the British books have sanctioned, and which will probably continue to prevail in our own.

(b) *Music*

To all this essential structure of the Administration of the Communion, there has been added an adequate musical adornment. The "Hymn" which 1789 provided after the Consecration, now naturally follows the Prayer of Humble Access, and accompanies the Breaking of Bread and the Communion. The proposal to restore the *Agnus Dei* at this point was narrowly defeated in 1928; but the *Agnus* may be described as a "hymn," and hence has continued to be sung with some color of liturgical authorization, as it long has been in England with none.²⁴

The provision of a Hymn as a substitute for the *Gloria in Excelsis* was introduced in 1789 because of the frequent difficulty of getting the *Gloria* sung under pioneering condi-

²⁴But compare p. 190.

HOLY COMMUNION

tions. The alternative is useful now in replacing the *Gloria* in penitential seasons, at least in a choral service; at an early celebration it can hardly be said that the singsong repetition of a metrical hymn is edifying. The English use of 1928 follows 1549 in permitting the *Gloria* to be simply omitted on weekdays. Historically, the *Gloria* was an interpolation on festivals; and there seems little reason why it should not be recognized and treated as such.

The Ablutions come after the Blessing in our rite. This seems, and indeed was, sheer afterthought, as this provision was not made at all until 1637; the first three Anglican Prayer Books having taken it for granted that the Priest would make the Ablutions in the wonted place for them, immediately after the Administration. It was only as the memory of this tradition died out, and Puritan clergy threw out any of the consecrated elements that were left over, or took them home for domestic use, that explicit directions for their disposal became necessary. It may be noted that the rubric refers only to any overplus inadvertently left over from the Communion: it has no application to a portion of the elements which has been intentionally set aside for the later communion of the sick or absent. Canons and customs of the Church regulate the question of "Reservation"—not this rubric.

The Ablutions, occurring now after the Benediction, entail an awkward pause, and are a distinct drag on the smooth conclusion of the service. It is interesting to observe how, extra-rubrically, they have attracted to themselves the singing of the *Nunc Dimittis* or some other musical *morceau*—yet another instance of the old instinct to accompany silent ceremonial actions with musical ornament. But it might seem desirable to restore the Ablutions to their natural location at the end of the act of communion.