
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

EARLY LITURGIES.

By the Rev. Harold Smith, D.D., Tutor, London College of Divinity.

MUCH attention has of recent years been directed to Early Liturgies; and while much remains obscure, there is general agreement of scholars on many points, on which the views of older writers are now abandoned.

The term "Primitive Liturgies" is decidedly misleading; it connects with the idea, now almost universally abandoned, that these liturgies were drawn up in the time of the Apostles or their immediate followers, perhaps being forms of some common Apostolic liturgy. As a matter of fact, fixed liturgies were of very gradual growth; the great liturgies did not come into existence in a full shape till the fifth century, and seem for some time to have admitted of additions and modifications even in important parts; in the case of the bulk of Eastern liturgies our existing MSS. are of much later date. It does not therefore follow that, because some element in a liturgy can be traced to an early date, the whole or even the bulk of it belongs to that date.

We can trace several stages in the development of liturgies. As in non-liturgical services now, there grew up a usual phraseology of praise and prayer. Meanwhile the service was acquiring a fixed order, various elements occurring in a definite sequence. "There existed at first no more than a mere outline, to be followed out in general by all who celebrated, but to be filled in in detail at the discretion of the individual celebrant."[1] Next came fixed formulas or items in the service, surrounded by much that was still fluid, left to the discretion of the officiant; and finally all became fixed.

About A.D. 95 Clement wrote his letter in the name of the Church of Rome to that of Corinth. Near its close he offers a long prayer (three chapters). Lightfoot has shown this prayer to be full of echoes of the prayers of the Synagogue and Temple, and of coincidences with the language of Christian liturgies. It is "an excellent example of the style of solemn prayer in which the ecclesiastical leaders of that time were wont to express themselves at meetings for worship."[2]

[1] Procter-Frere, p. 435. [2] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 50.

We find a few fixed forms in the " Didache " (" Teaching of the Twelve Apostles "), which however stand quite apart from anything in later liturgies. The date and origin of this work are still under discussion ; the present tendency is not to regard it nearly so high as on its first discovery, but to assign it, or at least the latter part of it, other than the " Two Ways," to some " backwater " in the second century. (The importance of new discoveries is usually exaggerated at first.) In it the Eucharist seems still joined with the Agape. Three thanksgivings are provided—first, " for the Cup," then " for the Broken Bread," then " after having been filled." But it is added, " Let the prophets offer thanksgiving as much as they desire."

We get our first clear outline of the Christian Sunday service in Justin Martyr (about A.D. 150). " On the day called that of the Sun all who live in cities or in the country gather together, and the memoirs [1] of the Apostles, or the writings of the Prophets, are read as long as time permits. Then when the reader has ceased, the president gives by word of mouth admonition and exhortation to follow these good things. Then we all rise together and offer prayers ; and when we have finished the prayers, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president offers prayers and likewise thanksgivings to the best of his ability, and the people assent by saying ' Amen.' Then comes the distribution and each one's participation in the elements over which thanksgiving has been offered, and portions are sent through the deacons to those not present." (A collection is made and left in the hands of the president for the benefit of widows, orphans, sick, prisoners and strangers ; " he is the guardian of all who are in need.") [2]

We have here a fixed outline of service, though apparently not fixed forms. There are lessons, sermon, general prayers, special eucharistic prayer by the president, communion. Elsewhere [3] Justin adds the kiss of peace, at the close of the general prayers and before the elements are brought in ; and he gives the subject of the eucharistic prayer, " Praise and glory to the Father of the Universe through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," for the creation of the world and all in it for man's sake, and for deliverance from evil and redemption through the Passion.

We notice the distinction between the earlier part of the service

[1] I.e., the Gospels. [2] *Apol.* I, 67.
[3] *Apol.* I, 65 ; Dial. 41 ; see Srawley, *Early History of Liturgy*, 34.

and the Eucharist itself. Elsewhere we find these were sometimes separated.

We get from Fathers of the end of century II and of century III various details of the services, both of the preliminary and popular one, later known as the "catechumens' service," answering in character very closely to our Morning Prayer; and of the Eucharist proper, "the service of the Faithful." In Cyprian we first meet with the common liturgical formula, "Sursum corda. Habemus ad Dominum." "The priest (sacerdos) in the preface preceding the Prayer, prepares the minds of the brethren by saying, 'Lift up your hearts'; that while the people reply, 'We lift them up unto the Lord,' they may be reminded that they ought to think of nothing else besides the Lord." [1] Side by side with liturgical development went doctrinal development; Irenaeus regards the Eucharist as an offering to God of the firstfruits of the earth; but Cyprian definitely conceives of it as the sacrifice of the Lord's Body and Blood.[2]

In the fourth century we find developed liturgies and full accounts of the main (not the preliminary) service, especially in Syria. We have a Sacramentary of Sarapion, Bishop of Thmuis, a friend of Athanasius, who addressed to him his work on the Holy Spirit; it was probably written about 350, but was only lately discovered in a MS. of century XI at Mt. Athos.[3] We have a long account of the Eucharist in Cyril of Jerusalem's Catechetical Lecture XXIII, about A.D.347. The Pilgrimage of Silvia (or rather Etheria) gives a full account of services at Jerusalem near the end of the century, though without an outline of the liturgy itself. We have also belonging to this period a number of "Church Orders," some of which contain a liturgy. The best known of these, and the only one about whose approximate date there is general agreement, is the "Apostolic Constitutions," written not long before or after A.D. 375; the liturgy here given is often called "the Clementine," because these Constitutions were supposed to be published through Clement. It is clearly of the Syrian type.[4] But within the last few years the view has gained wide acceptance that a writing (or writings) of Hippolytus (about 220) is best preserved in some earlier "Church Orders," extant in Egyptian and Ethiopic, with consider-

[1] Lord's Prayer. xxxi (22). [2] Srawley, 133.
[3] Edited by Bp. J. Wordsworth, *Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book*.
[4] Trans. in Ante-Nicene Christian Library; also Warren, *Liturgy and Worship of Ante-Nicene Church*.

able Latin fragments. The Ethiopic Church Order includes a liturgy; as the liturgical elements in the other sources are considerably less, this probably did not form part of the original work, but is clearly of very early date. The value of the liturgies in the "Church Orders" is that, unlike those in current use, we can be reasonably sure they have remained unaltered; while other sources (e.g., Cyril's lectures and many notices in Chrysostom) show they were not pure works of imagination.

Combining these sources, we find the general outline of the liturgy in century IV to be as follows. Probably it was largely the same, though rather simpler and less fixed, in the latter part of century III.

I. The preliminary—"Catechumens'"—service, consisted of lessons from all parts of Holy Scripture, with Psalms or Canticles sung between them; a Sermon; and Prayers, including at the close special prayers for each class of persons who might not remain for the later service.

II. The Eucharist itself began with Prayers, usually including a Litany said by the Deacon. Then came the Offertory—the presentation of the elements and other offerings of the people; and the Kiss of Peace. This was followed by the most solemn part of the service—known as the "Anaphora." It began with a Salutation, either "The Lord be with you," or "The Grace of our Lord . . ." Then comes the "Sursum Corda," etc.; then a long Prayer, beginning "It is truly meet and right before all things to sing praise unto Thee," and speaking of the work of Creation, which usually leads up to the "Ter Sanctus," and of Redemption, which includes the account of the Institution of the Eucharist. Then comes the Oblation with the Anamnesis, e.g., "Remembering therefore His Passion and Death, Resurrection and Ascension, and Future Coming, we offer to Thee our King and our God, according to His institution, this Bread and this Cup." Then the Invocation or Epiclesis—a prayer that the Holy Spirit may come upon the elements, that the communicants may be sanctified and receive grace; [1] or, apparently a later development, to make the Bread and Wine the Body and Blood of Christ. Then the Intercession, a prayer for all Christ's Church; and the Lord's Prayer. Then came the Communion, followed by Thanksgiving. In this latter part, after the conclusion of the long

[1] Cp. the American Office.

prayer, our authorities vary considerably; it was probably not fixed till after the rest.

But while this is a general outline, there were many variations, and all parts did not occur everywhere. Thus the Sanctus does not occur in the Ethiopic Church Order; nor the Words of Institution in the East Syrian Liturgy,[1] which is probably the earliest, or at least the least altered, of the Great Liturgies. The Anamnesis, or Commemoration of the Passion and Resurrection, is not found in Sarapion, nor in the East Syrian Liturgy. Again, variations and developments are found in the Epiclesis or prayer for the coming of the Holy Spirit. We find evidence from all quarters from Irenaeus downwards of the presence of some such invocation; but in some cases, e.g., Sarapion and apparently Irenaeus and Athanasius, it is for the coming of the *Word* rather than the *Spirit*. Again, in the Ethiopic Church Order, and in the East Syrian Liturgy, the Invocation is primarily "a request for the divine intervention, that the blessings of the Sacrament may be secured to the worshippers"[2]; but in Sarapion, Cyril, the Apostolic Constitutions and later liturgies generally, it is a prayer that the elements may be made (Cyril) or become (Sarapion), or be shown as (Apostolic Constitutions) the Body and Blood of Christ. This is of course consistent with simple views of the nature of the Sacrament, but leads easily to extravagant ones. In the East this Invocation has usually been regarded as the point of Consecration, not the recital of the words of Institution. In the Roman "Canon," though there is no direct mention of the Holy Spirit in this connection, there are two paragraphs which seem to answer to the Epiclesis; one of them is of the older type—a prayer that "these things" may be "carried by the hands of Thy Holy Angels to Thy altar on high, in the sight of Thy Divine Majesty; that as many of us who have received, by this participation of the altar, the sacred Body and Blood of Thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace." In an earlier paragraph there is a prayer that God would make the offering blessed and acceptable, "that it may become to us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ."[3]

[1] They may have been left to the memory, as now.

[2] Srawley, 209; cp. 235.

[3] But "De Sacramentis" (N. Italy) has, "because it is a figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Cyril of Jerusalem is the first to speak of the elements being changed or converted by consecration; this language was adopted also by Chrysostom.[1] "To this new development we may attribute the more explicit forms of invocation which appear in the later liturgical prayers. To the same cause we may attribute the 'localizing' tendency exhibited in Cyril of Jerusalem and Chrysostom, which emphasizes the solemnity of the moment following upon the consecration." We see the same fourth-century development in conception of the Eucharistic sacrifice. In Clement, the Didache and Irenaeus it is primarily eucharistic. In Justin, combined with this, we have special emphasis on the memorial of the Passion. Cyprian is the first definitely to speak of the eucharistic sacrifice as an offering of the Body and Blood of Christ. The liturgical forms of this period do not advance beyond the eucharistic and commemorative aspects in the general terms of their language. But in the language of Cyril of Jerusalem and Chrysostom we find a much more advanced conception. The Eucharist is "the holy and awful sacrifice," "the sacrifice of propitiation." "We offer Christ sacrificed for our sins, while we propitiate the living God on behalf of the living and the dead."[2]

The Great Liturgies belong to the fifth century, though of course their main structure and many of their component parts are earlier. "We cannot appeal to what are often called the 'Ancient Liturgies' as a proof that a certain custom is Apostolic; for the great liturgies date from not before the fifth century; even with the latest discoveries there are, by comparison, not many customs which can be *proved* to be earlier than the time of Constantine. While the fifth century was very active in the development of liturgies, the fourth century also saw great development."[3] "Even when we have reduced them to their most ancient form . . . these liturgies are still far from having the simplicity of the fourth century."[4] And for some time even the central portion admitted of occasional additions, while the outlying parts have undergone more extensive changes, spread over a much longer period. Ceremonies in particular have had a tendency to multiply. Therefore it does not follow that a liturgy known to exist at a certain date had taken by then its present shape.

[1] Srawley, 235–6. [2] Srawley, 236–7.
[3] Maclean, *Early Christian Worship*, 124.
[4] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 82.

Extant liturgies fall into several families—best classed as four Eastern and two Western. In the East the liturgies, or at least the anaphoras, are commonly called by the name of some saint, with which the church using them claims connection; except perhaps in the case of some of the later ones, the connection of the saint with the liturgy amounts to nothing more than this. E.g., the liturgy of St. James belonged to Jerusalem, the Church of St. James; that of St. Mark to that of Alexandria, traditionally founded by St. Mark; but these liturgies were not in existence till long after the days of those saints.

I. The West Syrian family, connected with the churches of Jerusalem and Antioch, has as its oldest representative the Liturgy of St. James. This was originally the normal one in these patriarchates, but is now, in its Greek form, superseded by the Byzantine, being in use only on St. James' Day, October 23, at Jerusalem, Cyprus, Zante, etc. It is first mentioned, as the work of St. James, in a canon of the council of 692; but Jerome quotes a liturgical phrase found in it; and the fact that the Jacobites, who finally separated from the Orthodox Church in the middle of the sixth century, have kept its anaphora in Syriac as their fundamental one, shows it must have been consecrated by long use before this separation. The Syrian Christians of St. Thomas in S.W. India now use the Jacobite rite. There are a number of other Syriac anaphoras. None of the MSS. of the Greek Liturgy of St. James is older than the tenth century; most are much later.

II. The Egyptian family has as its oldest representative the Greek Liturgy of St. Mark. Of this, three MSS. are known, from the twelfth century onwards. Some papyrus fragments, of century VII–VIII, seem to give an earlier form of it. It has long been superseded in the Orthodox Church by the Byzantine rite. There are, however, also various Coptic and Ethiopic liturgies, the oldest of which agree substantially with that of St. Mark. Thus while the ancient Greek liturgies of the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem are now dead, or nearly so, they survive in other languages among the Jacobites—the West Syrian among the Syrians, the Egyptian among the Copts and Abyssinians.

III. In the Orthodox Church the Byzantine family—springing from the churches of Cæsarea (in Cappodocia) and Constantinople, but ultimately a descendant of the West Syrian—has now set aside

all others. Its representatives are the Liturgies of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and the " Presanctified." These are used not only in Greece and at Constantinople, but in the national churches, e.g., of Russia, Roumania, and Serbia. The ecclesiastical language in such countries may be Slavonic, Roumanian, Georgian, or Arabic, but the rite is the same. (Here appears a marked contrast with the Roman Church, with its tendency to keep to Latin ; though it too in the Uniat Churches of the East allows the native ecclesiastical language.) The Liturgy of St. Basil was originally the normal one ; it is now used only on certain days, e.g., Sundays in Lent, Easter and Christmas Eves ; on ordinary occasions that of St. Chrysostom is used. The Liturgy of St. Basil is quoted several times early in century VI, as by Basil of Cæsarea. There has been some assimilation between the two main liturgies. Cranmer had the 1526 edition of these liturgies before him : he drew from them not only our " Prayer of St. Chrysostom," which now comes in the early part of that Liturgy, but probably originally belonged to St. Basil's, but also the " Invocation " in the Prayer of Consecration, 1549 (omitted 1552), and perhaps some phrases in the Litany.

IV. The East Syrian family, springing from the Churches of Edessa, Nisibis and Seleucia, has Syriac for its original language. We often forget how important the ancient Persian (Nestorian) Church was, spreading over Central Asia and sending missionaries even to China, till crushed in the thirteenth century between the Mongol hammer and the Moslem anvil. The chief liturgy of its surviving representatives, the Assyrian or Chaldean Christians (and of the Chaldean Uniats), is that of " The Apostles, Addai and Mari." (Two other anaphoras, called after Theodore and Nestorius, are used by them certain times in the year.) The Christians of Malabar (S.W. India), being of Nestorian origin, used the same liturgies ; but at the Synod of Diamper, 1599, when these Syrians accepted the Roman obedience, the later liturgies were destroyed, as named after heretics, and the main one revised and expurgated, to remove all traces of Nestorian error. As the records of the Synod tell us precisely what changes were made, we can reconstruct the liturgy as it was before this, and find it practically identical with that of Addai and Mari, as used in Assyria. (As revised, it is still used by the Syrian Uniat Church in Malabar.) The only important difference is that while the Chaldean liturgy omits the words of Institution, which

are now in practice repeated from memory according to the other liturgies, the Malabar one had them in another form. See Dom Conolly's article in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. xv., 396, 569; at the close of the second article Mr. Edmund Bishop points out the value of the liturgical forms of this church. "Whilst the liturgy of Addai and Mari, the normal liturgy of the East Syrian Church, is quite eastern in character, it is conservative of its ancient form and spirit, and will well enable us, thanks to the preservation (with other documents) of the Ethiopic Church Order, to get behind the existing Greek liturgies and to measure the wide difference which separates these last . . . from the primitive types."

The two Western families are the Roman and the Gallican.

V. The Gallican (or Hispano-Gallican) has two (or three) subdivisions: (*a*) The Gallican proper—the liturgy of the Church of Gaul down to the time of Pepin and Charles the Great. That of the old British and Irish Churches, as far as we know it, was a variety of this. No MS. books of purely Celtic origin survive except the "Bangor Antiphoner"; all the rest are of mixed character, in which the Roman elements predominate.[1] Even from Gaul no complete Mass of a purely Gallican character has survived; we have to reconstruct the order of service from scraps of mutilated service-books, notices of Gallican writers (esp. Germanus of Paris) and the analogy of the Mozarabic Liturgy.[2]

(*b*) The Mozarabic, used in the Visigothic Church of Spain, and lasting during the Arab domination, but after the reconquest of Toledo in 1085 gradually superseded by the Roman rite. At the beginning of the sixteenth century Cardinal Ximenes, in order to preserve it, had its books printed, with supplements from Roman sources, and founded a college of priests at Toledo to perpetuate its use. Its use just survives in chapels at Toledo and Salamanca. From it Cranmer seems to have drawn the service for the consecration of the water for Baptism (most of it was taken into the main baptismal service in 1552); and the form in which the Words of Institution are given in our Communion Office is at least extraordinarily close to that of the Mozarabic, differing considerably from the Roman.

(*c*) To these may perhaps be added the Ambrosian, of Milan and N. Italy. This lies between the Gallican and the Roman, and is

[1] Procter-Frere, 9. [2] Swete, *Services and Service Books*, 91.

sometimes classed with the latter. But it may well have been originally essentially Gallican, but gradually assimilated to the Roman. It is still in use at Milan.

The Gallican rite, besides having a much larger number of variations than the Roman, has also a distinctly Eastern element, of which there are two explanations. We must set aside two ideas still commonly found in popular books, but rejected by scholars. The first is that the Gallican service came from Asia Minor in the second century, at or before the time of Irenaeus, and that it may be called the Ephesian Liturgy, or the Liturgy of St. John. But there is no evidence whatever for this, and the Liturgy has a fourth or fifth century look, not one of the second. The other is that the English pre-Reformation use was essentially Gallican rather than Roman; the reverse is the truth. The Celtic (= Gallican) practice was rejected at the Synod of Whitby (664) and the Council of Cloveshoo (747). The later Roman use had indeed adopted a number of Gallican elements, and the various English uses, which differing among themselves, also differed from that of Rome; but the differences were confined to minor points, in particular not extending to the Canon (the central portion of the Mass—the Prayer of Consecration); and local variations were then allowed everywhere. "All the existing English Service-books are of the Roman type, with at most some small Gallican or Celtic features adopted into them; and it is from such books that the Prayer-book is derived."[1] "The only known liturgy of the English for nine hundred years before the Reformation was the Roman Missal, with local variations of "use," which were then customary throughout the Roman Communion."[2]

The two explanations now offered of the Eastern elements in the Gallican Liturgy are (1) that a wave of Eastern influence passed into the West in the latter part of century IV, affecting Milan and the Church of Gaul and Spain; but not Rome, which was essentially conservative.[3] The other view (2) is just the reverse, that the oldest Roman service was of much the same type as the Gallican, but underwent a revision about century IV.[4] The language of the Church of Rome was certainly Greek till the time of Hippolytus, well into the third century, and perhaps later still. An objection to this view is that the African liturgy is practically identical with the Roman,

[1] Procter-Frere, 10.
[2] Upton, *Outlines of P. Book History*, 21.
[3] See Duchesne, 93.
[4] See Procter-Frere, 508.

and that we have no hints of such a revision. But the whole early history of the Roman rite is keenly debated, and can only be touched upon here. Connected with this is also the question of the Ambrosian liturgy, which some maintain preserves the ancient Latin rite, of which the Roman is a degraded form. There comes in also the question of the origin of the work "De Sacramentis," probably of the beginning of century v, which may give the earliest form of the Ambrosian liturgy, or may belong to some Church in N. Italy (e.g., Ravenna), where the usages of Rome and Milan were combined; or may preserve the oldest form of the Roman service.[1] Its most striking divergence from the Roman Canon is that, in place of "that it may become to us the Body and Blood of Thy dearly beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ," it has "because it is the figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."

VI. The Roman rite is the great rite of the West, having set aside all others, just as the Byzantine has ousted all others in the Orthodox Church. The oldest part of it, the Canon, has probably been only slightly altered since the fourth century; its list of martyrs closes with some obscure Roman ones of the middle of that century. We read only of slight additions and changes made to the Canon by Leo the Great and Gregory the Great, but there may well have been others on a small scale—e.g., the phrase, "the glorious ever-virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ," looks as if it might have received some fifth-century expansion. And the intercession for the dead did not form an essential and regular element of the Canon before the ninth century. For other possible or probable changes see Upton, pp. 48 ff. But taken as a whole "its language testifies to a primitive stage of development, and shows little trace of the more developed ideas current in Greek circles at the end of the fourth century."[2]

The three best known types of the Roman Sacramentary are known by the names of three great Popes, Leo (*d.* 461), Gelasius (496), and Gregory (604), but in each case by no means accurately. That of Leo, though it may proceed almost from his time, and is a local Roman book, is merely a collection of variable forms (Collects, "Secrets," Post-Communions, Prefaces) made by some ecclesiastic for his own use; the only MS. containing it (at Verona) is incomplete, and does not include the Canon. The Gelasian Sacramentary is

[1] See Srawley, 172. [2] Srawley, 192.

really the Roman rite as current in France before the middle of the reign of Charles the Great; as its Canon contains the additions made by Gregory, it cannot proceed from Gelasius. This king asked Pope Adrian I to send him from Rome the Sacramentary drawn up by St. Gregory; this was done some time between 784 and 791. This Sacramentary was at once largely copied in France—many copies about this time are still extant. But in copying it was at once supplemented (perhaps by Alcuin) by much from the Roman Sacramentary previously current in France. But even in the book as sent by Adrian there are elements which must be later than the time of Gregory.[1] Thus neither of these books actually goes back as a whole to its alleged author; and while the basis of both is Roman, they have come to us through Frankish hands. Later on, various Gallican elements came into the Roman Liturgy as used in the Emperor's chapel; this composite liturgy spread through the Frankish empire, and finally established itself even at Rome. Thus the Roman rite from century XI onwards includes a number of Gallican elements.

There is some advantage in comparing the structure and contents of the Roman Anaphora with that of the usual Greek Liturgy. (The Anaphora includes the Sursum Corda, Preface, Sanctus, as well as the Canon.) We find important points of difference. "The Intercession has been inserted in two places. Hardly anything has survived of the commemoration of the Work of Redemption, except the commemoration of the Institution; while the Invocation," to which the greatest importance is attached in the East, "has been greatly obscured."[2] This must be borne in mind before condemning any part of our English use as unliturgical; the Roman rite is by no means correct by a Greek standard; ours is not to be condemned simply for its departures from this.

The English Communion Office of 1549 was, like our other services, based on the framework of the Sarum Office. In the part preceding the Canon there was scarcely anything new as a whole; the Lord's Prayer, Collect for Purity, Introit, Kyrie, Gloria in Excelsis, Collect, Epistle, Gospel, Nicene Creed, Offertory, Sursum Corda, Preface, Sanctus—all come from the old rite, which was simply somewhat shortened. But not only was the Layman's Preparation—from the Order of Communion—inserted between Consecration and Communion, but the Canon was completely rewritten; here and there

[1] See Duchesne, 123 B. [2] Procter-Frere, 445.

it remains close to the old form, but it more often is completely different.[1] Yet "the Canon which Cranmer substituted was on the whole founded upon the Gregorian; it was one long prayer ending with the Lord's Prayer, and containing the three elements of intercession, commemoration and oblation, which the Roman liturgy shared with all ancient liturgies whether Eastern or Western."[2] But in 1552 this service took quite a new form. Apart from ritual changes, the introduction of the Commandments, and the removal of the Gloria in Excelsis to the end, the most important were (1) the Preparation Service from the "Order of Communion" was put before Consecration instead of after; (2) the Canon was completely cut up, only about one-third of it, including the commemoration of Redemption, with the Words of Institution, being left in its old position: the Intercessions were put earlier in the service; the Invocation, introduced from Greek liturgies in 1549, was omitted, while the Oblation, with the omission of the Anamnesis and other elements, was put, with the Lord's Prayer, after Reception. All the few places in which the wording of the Canon of 1549 was close to the Missal were struck out, except for the closing words of the Prayer of Oblation, "not weighing our merits . . ."[3] Dr. Swete's comment on these changes is valuable. "The Communion Service of 1549 was on the whole a revised Sarum; it belonged to the Roman family of liturgies. This can scarcely be said of the present English liturgy; while it makes large use of Sarum and other ancient materials, in its structure it follows an order peculiar to itself. In other words, it heads a new liturgical family. . . . There is no reason why English Churchmen should regret the fact, or pine for a restoration of the Roman Mass. . . . It would have been a grave misfortune if the great English race had been tied for all time to customs and forms which rest ultimately upon the local traditions of an Italian Church."

There is thus no sufficient case for regarding any variation of our office from the structure of early liturgies as *ipso facto* self-condemned; it should be considered on its own merits, scriptural and devotional, with full recognition of the fact that it has approved itself to a number of generations of English Churchmen. Why should liturgical formation, like church building, be bound to con-

[1] See comparison in Procter-Frere: many of the resemblances marked are of thought rather than words.

[2] Swete, 117. [3] P. 126.

form to ancient or mediaeval designs? Our service is no doubt capable of improvement—though opinions may differ as to such improvements; we might here and there enrich it from ancient liturgies or by following their precedents. But these precedents are not binding. We must not exaggerate the importance of these liturgies; they cannot be regarded as at all primitive. The earliest complete ones belong to century v, a time farther from the Apostles than we are from the Reformers, and they have often admitted later elements. Their elaboration, too, is hardly a recommendation. In particular, they, as a rule, reflect the decided development of eucharistic doctrines and language which arose in the middle of the fourth century, which many of us will regard as a departure from primitive simplicity and truth.

HAROLD SMITH.