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When the lessons have been concluded with the prayer of those assembled, and when all who are not fully competent members of the congregation have departed, it is possible to proceed to the main event in the celebration, the renewal of Christ's institution. The Master had inaugurated the eucharistic mystery under the tokens of bread and wine—bread, such as was to be found on the table of the Last Supper, and the cup which stood before Him, these He took and changed into the heavenly gift. Bread and wine must therefore be ready at hand when the celebration of the Mass is to begin.

This readying of bread and wine need not, of course, be a ritual action. It might be taken care of, some way or other, by anyone before the beginning of the ceremonies. In the most ancient accounts, in fact, we find no traces of a special stressing of this preparatory activity. As long as the Eucharist was joined to the fraternal meal there was scarcely any occasion for such special stress, because the gifts were already on the table. Even in Justin's description the matter is recounted simply and impersonally: bread is brought in, and wine and water. No particular formalities are observed, no symbolism introduced into the movement. This ties in with the strict aloofness which the nascent Church in the first two centuries showed towards material matters, preferring to emphasize, in opposition to pagan and Jewish sacrificial customs, the spiritual character of Christian cult.

Passing over the earthly bread and wine, the Church's attention focused on the spiritual, not to say heavenly, gift which proceeds from her Eucharistia, and on the thanks giving which pours out heavenward from the hearts of men—a worship which is indeed “in spirit and in truth.”

But near the end of the second century we begin to see a trend away from this severe attitude. To oppose the repudiation of matter, which was a doctrine of the growing Hellenistic Gnosis, it was necessary to stress the value of the earthly creation, even in divine worship. The peril then no

longer lay in the materialism of heathen sacrificial practices, but in the spiritualism of a doctrine that hovered just on the borderline of Christianity. So the Eucharist also appeared in a new light. The heavenly gift had an earthly origin; it was from the “firstlings of creation” that it proceeded.

In Irenaeus, as we saw, this point was emphasized for the first time. The approach towards God, this movement in which the Lord’s body and blood were offered up, begins to include the presentation of material gifts which were thus drawn into the liturgical activity. In Tertullian we see the faithful bringing their gifts, and their action is described as an offere directed to God. Similarly, in Hippolytus of Rome not only are the bread and wine (brought in by the deacons before the eucharistía of the bishop) called oblatio, but the consecrated gifts are designated oblatio sancta Ecclesia. In another place, describing the liturgy of Baptism, we see that the faithful—at least the newly baptized—“offer up” their gifts for the Eucharist.

By the time we reach Cyprian it has already become a general rule that the faithful should present gifts at the eucharistic solemnity. This is evident from Cyprian’s scolding a rich woman for her lack of charity: domini­cum celebrare te credis . . . quæ in dominicum sine sacrificio venis, quæ in dominicum sine sacrificio venis

---

* Tertullian, De exhort: cast., c. 11 (CSEL LXX, 146 f.): [he is addressing a man who had married a second time, in reference to his first wife] . . . pro qua oblata­ones annas reddita. Statib ergo ad Domini­um cum tot uxorisibus, quos in oratione commoratus? Et of­feres pro duabus, et commendabis illas duas per secerdotem . . . et ascendit sacrificium tuum libera fronte? Cf. for this Elves, Die Kirchenordnung Hippolytus, 294 f. 5
* Also in a prayer at the consecration of a bishop, there is a plea that the newly consecrated may προφέρεται καὶ τῶι δό­δας τῆι ἱερᾶι ης ἑκκλησίας (Dix, 5).

---

* These, say, “bring along no other ves­sel but that for the Eucharist; for it is fitting for each then to bring his gift (προφέρον).” Hippolytus, Trad. Ap. (Dix, 32; cf. Hieron, Neutestamentum. Apostrophíon, 579, 1194 f.; for it is fitting for what has been worthily accomplished then to of­fer up.” We are dealing here with a text to be derived from divergent oriental trans­lations). Besides, the terms oblatio and of­ferre or their oriental equivalents are often used in the “Apostolic Tradition” in a wider sense. The agape as a unit is called oblatio. Likewise within the plan of the agape the blessing of the cup by the in­dividuals is designated as offere (Dix, 46: calicem singuli of­ferent), and also the blessing of the bread at the beginning by the presiding cleric seems to be identified with an offere (Dix, 48: all should re­ceive the beneficio from his hands; cf. Dix, 46: qui of­ferit should remember the host). Obviously the word is used here to signify that these objects are bailed by the prayer of benediction and so in a way dedicated to God. It is possible, too, that in addition an offering was actually put into words, as in the following case: When the first-fruits are brought to the bishop (again the word of­ferre is used to express the idea; incidentally there is no connection here with the celebration of the Eucharist), the latter should offer them up (of­ferre) and for this purpose a formula is submitted: Gratias tibi agimus, Deus, et of­ferimus tibi primitias fructuum . . . (Dix, 53 f.; also preserved in Greek: προφέρομεν). But this of­ferre also has re­ference to the blessing of the fruit, as the continuation of the text shows: Benedictur qui­orum fructus, id est . . . (the enum­eration follows; Dix, 54). Furthermore the fact that these firstlings are brought to the bishop already implies a certain hallow­ing of the gifts, just as in the offering of bread and wine before the eucharistic pray­er, so that even this of­ferre acquires a re­ligious coloring.

Cf. J. Coppens, Les prières de l'offertoire (Cours et Conférences, VI; Louvain, 1928), 189-192; but the author does not pursue the connection between blessing and oblatio.

* Cyprian, De opere et eleemos., c. 15 (CSEL, III, 384). The same idea later in Cesarius of Arles, Serm. 13 (Morin, 63; PL, XXXIX, 2238). A detailed evaluation of some of the many references to the obligations of Cesarius in presented in a work (still in manuscript) on Cesarius as a liturgico­historical source, written by Dr. Karl Berg (Salzburg); I was able to look into and utilize this work.

---

The actual of­fertery procession is at­tended by the beginning of the 4th century by the synods of Elvira and Nicea; see infra, p. 20, note 108.

* Phil. 4:18. Cf. E. Peterson, Apostel und Zeuge Christi (Freiburg, 1940), 38 f.: The Church gets support not in the form of taxes but in the form of a gift to God, “a sacrifice that breathes out fragrance.”

In Hermas, Pastor, Simul. V, 3, 8, an

partem de sacrificio quod pauper obtulit sumus.” Apparently, then, the individual worshiper was bound not only to contribute to the community poor box (corban) but also to make an offering for the altar, and from Cyprian’s words it is quite clear that this offering was nothing more nor less than the bread and wine of the sacrifice.

The evolution must have been such that the offerings which had always been made for the needs of the Church and the poor were gradually drawn more closely into the liturgical pattern. The tie-in with the eucharistic celebration was all the easier since it had been customary to think of every gift to the Church and the poor as a gift to God, or even to designate it as an offering, an oblation. Thus, such gifts of Christian charity were joined to the offering of the Eucharist. It was, then, but a step to connect the offering made by the faithful with the ritual preparation of the gifts for the eucharistic sacrifice—a step which would be taken naturally in an age which was liturgically alive. Thus we find in almost all the liturgies

arms combined with fasting is called a θυσία and a λευτερογία pleasing to God.

The word operari (opus, operatio), which in the language of pagan worship was used in the sense of sacrar operari = sacrificari, and from which comes the German word of­feren, “to offer (up)” (the word must have been borrowed already at the begin­ning of the period of Roman missionizing, some time in the sixth century, as the sound-shaft indicates), was employed in the Latin of the Christian Church for the Christian work of mercy; cf. the title of Cyprian’s tract cited in the previous note. However, of­ferre (oblatio)—whence the Old English of­fran > of­fer—was also used in the same sense. Both expressions are found together in Tertul­lian, De idolol., c. 22 (CSEL, XX, 55). But it must be admitted that with regard to operari the basic meaning of opus bonum had a distinct influence; H. Janssen, Kul­tur und Sprache. Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung von Tertullian bis Cyprian (Nijmegen, 1938), 217-224; cf. 104-110.

* Ireneeus, Ad. haer., IV, 31, 5 (Harvey, II, 209); cf. Tertullian, De or., c. 28 (CSEL, XX, 198 f.); Ad.wsor., II, 8 (CSEL, LXX, 124).

From a later period, Augustine, Enchirid. c. 110 (PL, XL, 283): For the dead sacrificial sive altoris sive quas omnecunque eleemosynarum were offered up.

* G. P. Wetter, Alchchristliche Liturgien. Il. Das christliche Of­fer (Forschungen zur
almost every church of the Orient, the thought that Christ as represented by the consecrated gifts, is at present generally found next to the sanctuary or else is a table actually in the sanctuary, to the north of the altar. Brightman, 586.

II. The Prothesis, that is, the place for the preparation of the oblation gifts, is at present usually a square or rectangular space near the sanctuary. Meanwhile, in the procession the King of all, surrounded by hosts of angels unseen, is greeted and honored in song. Similar forms of the Eucharist offer a way of understanding these forms of the Eucharist, as they are still practiced in various parts of the world today.

Thus the direction in the Testamentum Domini, I, 19 (Rahmani, 23; Quasten, Mon., 250?)—Diaconom si sit a die xerarum invocate, the offering up of eucharistiae in oblationes qua efferentur postistern cerni. This diaconom corresponds to one of the παρασκευαζόμενα mentioned in the Apostolic Constitutions, II, 57 (Quasten, 181), although here the rooms have already been transferred to the vicinity of the sanctuary. P. Dionysius, Eccl. hierarch., III, 2 (Quasten, Mon., 294).

The Prothesis, that is, the place for the preparation of the oblation gifts, is at present usually found next to the sanctuary or else is a table actually in the sanctuary, to the north of the altar. Brightman, 586.

The Patriarch Eutychius (d. 565?), De Past., c. 8 (PG, LXXXVI, 2400 f.), had already expressed doubts about this proleptic veneration of bread and wine; others after him did the same. Hanssens, III, 286-289. It is possible to suggest that this veneration was originally directed to Christ as represented by the consecrated priest; but the sources give no hint of such a thing. A different explanation in Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, 264 f. Baumstark, Die Messe im Morgenland, 112; Hanssens, III, 272-277; 285-293.—In the Syrian area the thought that Christ thus makes his entry in order to suffer and die is offered up (eucharistiae in oblationes qua efferentur postistern cerni); only in Egypt was there question here rather of a procession around the altar; this took place at the start of the Mass and therefore did not necessarily involve a special place distinct from the altar for the preparation of the gifts; cf. Hanssens, III, 31-33.

The oldest account comes from Gregory of Tours, De gloria mart., c. 86 (PL, LXXXVI, 781 f.). The offertory procession is next mentioned in the Expositio of the ancient Gallican Mass (ed. Quasten, 172 f.). It is also found in the pseudo-Roman Missal of the 8th century, see Capitolares eccl. ord. and its monastic parallel (Silva-Tarouca, 206): After the reading the offerings are carried by the priest and the deacon in turrett-shaped vessels (called turres) and in the chalice from the sacrarium to the altar. Here the offerings are called obligationes, whereas the sources mentioned previously speak propheticly of the body of the Lord. During the transfer to the altar
special reference to the fact that the usage was traditional. The faithful made their offering before the service in the place set aside for this purpose. Similar arrangements must be presupposed in the Orient, too, wherever there is mention of offerings by the people. In the ancient Milanese and Roman liturgies, and probably also in the North African, the offering of the faithful was very closely bound up with the eucharistic sacrifice. From the last of these, the North African liturgy, we get our oldest accounts of the offering of the faithful, and the customs connected with it are quite fully expounded, especially in St. Augustine. In Africa it was possible to bring one's offerings to the altar day after day, as Monica was wont to do. The priest himself received what was offered by the people, and in turn he offered these things to God. Thus the offering and the oblation of the gifts was built into the very structure of the Mass. This is also certified by the report of the singing of psalms which was introduced at this time ante oblationem as well as at the communion. How the offertory was conducted at the papal stational service in seventh century Rome, we know in fullest detail. Here the gifts were not

The so-called zones was sung. For an explanation of the data, in part previously misunderstood, see Nicki, Der Anteil des Volkes, 37-42.

26 Can. 4 (Mansi, IX, 951): Proprietae deceruminum sit omnium dominicis diebus altioris oblatio ab omnibus viris et mulieribus solius anno quodam sancto.—Cf. Cesarius of Arles, Serm. 13 (Morin, 63; PL, XXXIX, 2238): Oblationes que in altario consecratur orifer. Erumbestrue debet homo idoneus, si de alia oblatione communicaverit.

27 Nicki, 36 ff. For this Nicki cites a story in Gregory of Tours, De gloria confessor, c. 65 (PL, LXXI, 875 C): For a whole year a widow had Mass said daily for her deceased husband and each time offered for this purpose a sixth of the best wine; however, the subdeacon who accepted the gifts cheated her, substituting cheap wine and keeping the good for himself, until one day the lady unexpectedly communicated and so discovered the fraud. It would hardly have been possible to perpetrate such a deception except in the sacristarium, a room apart, from which the oblation would be carried to the altar.

28 For Syria cf. supra, note 11. The side-room which was designated for the reception of the offerings of the faithful has become general throughout the Orient since the second half of the 6th century; Baumstatt, Die Messe im Morgenland, 109 f. Ambrose, In ps. 116, prol. 2 (CSEL, LXI, 4): Cfr. supra, p. 20, note 10.

29 Clear evidence of the faithfulness of the offering on the altar is given by Optatus of Mileve, Contra Parnen., VI, 1 (CSEL, XXVI, 142): The Donatists overturned altars in the cities and towns, placing with them gold and silver objects which were brought along. For the chalice, only the offering presented by the pope himself and his group was used, or perhaps a little was taken out of the large vessel containing the wine offered by the people, and this was poured into the calix sanctus. After the water, offered by the singing-boys, was commingled with the wine, the chalice was placed on the altar, to the right of the bread offered by the pope.

The general outlines of this oblation rite are still to be discerned some five hundred years later.

Of the many gifts which were thus gathered, we can readily understand that only a small portion could be used for the altar. What was done with the rest? Where, first of all, was it kept during the service? Amongst the gold and silver objects which the Lateran basilica acquired from Con-

the value, but reprints the pertinent passages.

Note that there is no documentary evidence of an "offertory procession" at Rome. See V. L. Kennedy, "The Offertory Rite," (Orate Fratres, 12 [1937-8], 193-198).

Drawing of amula in Beissel, Bilder, 317 f. These are special little flasks, ornamented with religious pictures, made for this particular purpose.

Regarding the number two, cf. Amalar, De eccl. off., III, 19 (PL, CV, 1130 D): unam [oblationem] pro se et alteram pro diacono.

Regarding this office, see Eichmann, Die Katerkrönung, 11, 246.
bishops, the Liber pontificalis lists altaria seepem ex argento purissimo. There was but one altar in any one church, as we know full well. These, then, must have been tables to hold the offertory gifts. The fact that they were seven coincides with the fact that there were seven deacons who were called upon "to bestow their care upon tables" as soon as the deacons did in Jerusalem. On these tables, which were set up somewhere in the forepart of the basilica, the gifts of bread and wine were laid as an oblation to God. Then, in so far as the needs of the clergy did not require them, they were set aside primarily for the poor, whose care was amongst the chief duties of the deacons.

95) also mentions offerings made during Rogation processions; to all appearances such offerings were laid principally on the mensa of a side altar. All these offerings were connected with a particular place, a particular altar, and a distinction was made between those which were to go sub altari and those which were to go desuper (Fischer, 52, 95 f.); the distribution to the clergy was made according to this distinction. Even a late Ordo like that of Petrus Amelii (d. 1403) = Ordo Rom. XV, n. 9 (PL, LXXVIII, 1278 D) contains this regulation for the papal service: quidquid offeretur sit ad manus pape vel pedes vel super alterius, capitellorum comun mensalium est, excepto pane et vino, que acolythorum est et quidquid venit per totam missam super alterius. Cf. Ordo Rom. XV, n. 70 f. (PL, LXXVIII, 1184, 1187). Therefore, beside the gifts which went according to the lot of the acolytes. For even when they were offered up at the altar they were no longer set down on the altar itself, but post alteras. For even when they still consisted of bread and wine, they were no longer intended for consecration. The reception of Communion had sunk to such a state that in the churches of the West, and more especially in the Roman liturgy after it was transplanted to Frankish countries, the obliteration was metamorphosed into an offertory procession of the faithful. After the Credo a line was formed, which wended its way to the altar. First came the men, then the women; the priests and deacons joined in after them, with the archdeacon bringing up the rear. Frankish interpreters compared the procession to the parade of the multitude that went out to meet and acclaim our Lord on Palm Sunday.

Here, too, bread and wine form the offertory gift of the faithful. The English Synod of Calchythe (Chelsea, 787) stresses the prescription that the offering should be bread, not cake. As a rule the bread was carried to the altar in a little white cloth; but mention is made also of woven baskets. The celebrant and his assistants went down to meet the offerers at the spot dictated by custom. We learn that the gifts were placed on a large pater carried by an acolyte. But even when they were offered up at the altar they were no longer set down on the altar itself, but post alteras. For even when they still consisted of bread and wine, they were no longer intended for consecration.
a minimum that the bread offered by the faithful was superfluous. Besides, usually only unleavened bread was used for the altar, and this was generally procured in some other way; in the years to follow, special regulations were made regarding its preparation. Nevertheless, the offertory procession survived for quite some time, or rather, to put it more correctly, an outgrowth and development of it now put in an appearance almost everywhere.

Granting the principle that, besides the Eucharist, material gifts also could be presented to God, it was not long before the offerings consisted of objects other than bread and wine. From the era of Constantine we have the mosaic from the floor of the large double church excavated at Aquileia; here is the representation of an offertory procession in which men and women are bringing not only bread and wine, but also grapes, flowers, and a bird. For that reason, it became necessary from early times to make regulations specifying in what manner these offerings could be made. A synod of Hippo in 393 says categorically: "At the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ nothing is to be offered except bread and wine mixed with water." About the same time the Apostolic Canons stipulate: "When a bishop or priest, contrary to the institutions of the Lord about the sacrifice at the altar, offers up something else: honey or milk, or, in place of [the right kind], wine turned to vinegar, or fowl, or any type of beast or vegetable, in opposition to the mandate, he should be deposed. Aside from ears of wheat and grapes in season and oil for the lamps and incense, nothing should be brought to the altar at the time of the sacrifice. All other fruits should (as firstlings) be sent to the bishop or priest; for washing the hands, which follows), but also appear as the customary offering in the ensuing centuries. Amongst the objects meriting the honor of being allowed to be brought to the altar, there appear, in addition to the oil for the lamps, especially wax and candles. Even at the present time, during the Mass of ordination, the newly ordained bring the bishop a lighted candle, which is presented to him.

Next we hear that in many churches pretiosa ecclesia utensilia destined for the church were laid on the altar at the offertory procession on great feasts. Even the transfer of immovable property was often executed by handing over a deed or voucher at the offertory. From the eleventh century on, the offering of money began to come to the fore. Peter Damian tells, as something still out of the ordinary, that two prominent ladies offered goldpieces at his Mass. But more and more the offering of bread and wine was made by the clerics alone, and in monastic churches by the clergy. These ordinances were repeated and expanded also in the West during the ensuing centuries. Amongst the objects meriting the honor of being

De synod. causis, I, 63-65 (PL, CXXXII, 204), and therefore they cannot be looked upon here as simply an expression of contemporary praxis, as Netzer, 226, considers them.

a At Rome even the oil which was consecrated on Maundy Thursday was taken from the offerings; Sacramentarium Gregorii, ed. Lietzmann, n. 77, 4; luvantur de quibus offeruntur populi.

b Cesarius of Arles, Serm. 13 (Morin, 13; PL, XXXIX, 228), makes mention of wax and oil, but without stressing the point that they were conveyed to the altar. On an Exultet roll from Gaeta there is a miniature which goes back to a much earlier design that illustrated the Exultet text in the earlier Gelasianum; it presents an offertory procession in which one of the front figures hands a small bottle of wine to the deacon who carries the chalice, while the other figure offers the bishop two rings of wax, apparently for the Easter candle; Th. Klause, "Eine röthische Exultetillustration aus Gaeta," Corolla, L. Curtius zum 60. Geburtstag dargebracht (Stuttgart, 1937), 168-176 (with illustration; also in A. Winter, Gestaltwandel der Curtius [Freiburg, 1939], 12-13). Klause refers to an Exultet text in a Florence missal (10th c.) which includes a petition for the offerer: cerereum, Dominine, quod tibi offert fumus tuae eterne; Ebner, 27.—A loaf and a candle also appear as the customary offering in the twelfth century in the legend of the buried miner who was saved from death by the weekly Mass at which his wife made an offering; Franz, Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter, 8. The legend, in turn, was a leading factor in the production of a change in the offertory gifts. Cf. also the section on candles and wax as offerings in E. Wohlaupf, Die Kerze in der Kirche (Forschungen zum deutschen Recht, IV, 1 [Weimar, 1940]), 29-35.—The offering of bread and a candle was so much a part of English parochial practice that it was revived in the time of Queen Mary; see Gaspard, Parish Life in Medieval England, 158.

c John Belch, Explicatio, c. 41 (PL, CCII, 50 D). According to a decree of the Congregation of Rites published on Jan. 26, 1658, it is still permitted to take up oblationes intitulation et calicis at the offertory: Decreta auth., SRC, n. 1052.

d Martene, 1, 4, 6, 2 (1, 385 C).—One Christmas, after presenting a precious relic to the monastery, Emperor Henry II made a further gift at the high Mass when, during the offertory, he laid on the altar a gift certificate for the property of Erwitte; Fita of Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn (ed. 1036), n. 182 (MGH, Scriptores, XI, 149).—Regarding this practice of making gifts by laying them on the altar, and the forms observed in so doing, see Bona, II, 8, 8 (703-706).

e Merk, Abria, 92 f.; ibid., 11, note 22, a charter from Vendôme dated 1046-49, in which someone transfers his own private church and along with it numorum etiam offerente mediacrum. —In Spain money offerings played a part already in the 7th century; see infra, p. 16.

the monks. Only in unusual circumstances was the presentation of the bread and wine by lay people continued, as, for instance, at the coronation of Kings, or at the consecration of virgins, perhaps also on certain great feasts and, in some instances, at the burial services for the dead. So, since the twelfth century, in explaining the offertory, the enumeration of offerings usually begins with gold: Some offer gold, like the Wise Men from the East, others silver, like the widow in the Temple, still others de alia substantia; only after that are bread and wine mentioned as gifts of the clerics, who have always formed the last in the ranks of offerers. In later writings, there is no mention at all of bread and wine in this connection. Only at an episcopal consecration does the Roman liturgy still contain a vestige of this practice: the newly consecrated bishop presents two altar breads, two small casks of wine, and two candles. And at a papal Mass, on the occasion of a solemn canonization, an offering is made of two breads, two barrels of wine and water, five of St. Denis in the year 1180: the former owner hands over, amongst others, omnia ad altare pertinentia cum offerenda panis et vini, lini, canapi et candele; Merk, Abriż, 13, note 27; cf. 87, note 11. A contemporary record from Tours mentions panis, vinum, denarios, candela as the usual offertory materials.

In Champagne even as late as the first half of the 19th century it was still a custom at a burial service for the next of kin to offer up a loaf of bread, a cruet, and wine in a special flagon, along with a candle; by 1860-70 instead of wine only an empty canister and money were presented. The rest of the ladies offered bread and candle, the men money. This information comes from the youthful memories of A. Loisy, as recorded in Wetter, Altchristliche Liturgien, I, 260, note 9. —The same custom is reported in the beginning of the 13th century in Orleans: de Moléc, 215 f.; there is also the example of a parish where on All Souls Day 50 to 60 ladies took part in his offertory procession; ibid.; cf. also 239, 408, 409, 410. —De Moléc, 173, 187, 427, also describes another procession, still current at that time in certain cathedrals, where the canons at a solemn service for the dead formed a procession with paten and chalice. Corbilet, 1, 225, witnesses to the custom, still in vogue in Normandy in his day (1885), where the respective family at a service for the dead presented a flag of vine and a loaf of bread which were then offered up by two altar boys at the offertory. Regarding the offering of bread or meal which in present-day Bavarian parishes is deposited on the altar-rail before a funeral Mass, and also regarding the custom of alms bread, cf. V. Thaulhofer-L. Eisenhofer, Handbuch der katholischen Liturgie, II (Freiburg, 1912), 121, note 3. I have been told about a Regensburg country parish where a tin cup is placed on the tumba and formerly a loaf of bread was set beside it (L. Schlosser, 1931). Another account comes to me from Kessen in the Lower Lm valley; here it is still the custom at solemn funeral services to set up a pan of meal and three tin pitchers which are filled after the Mass with gifts for the priest (P. Werner). —The rapport with the Mass is less close in other accounts of an offering of bread for the poor after a funeral service; such practices were customary even in our own century in places like my native South Tyrol.

Some 24. Another enumeration of the Mass offerings usual in the 12th century reads: Panis, vinum, denarios et candela; Martine, 1, 4, 6, 6 (1, 387A). —Pontificale Rom., De consecr. ep., similarly at the Blessing of an Abbot. Likewise in the Roman Pontifical of the 13th century and (also at the consecration of cardinal priests and deacons) in that of the 12th century; Andrieu, 11, 349, 364 f.; 1, 137, 151 f.—Even at present at the cathedral of Lyons the first two priests on each side of the choir bring bread and wine to the altar on the ferias of Lent; J. Baudot, Le Missel Romain (Paris, 1912), 101. Cf. de Moléc, 246. As late as 1700 the canons of Angers still conducted an offertory procession; ibid., 89.

The coronation book of Charles V of France (HBS, 16; London, 1899), 43: debet offerre panem unum, vinum in arce argentoe, tredecim bisantos aureos.—W. Maskell, Monumenta rituallia ecclesiae Anglicanae, III, (London, 1847), 42: The king offers bread and wine, and then marcam aurii (a late Middle Age direction).—According to the 12th century Ordo for the coronation of the emperor (Ordo C) the emperor offers at the throne of the pope panem simul et cereos et aurum, singillatim vero imperator vinum, imperatoriam aquam, de quibus debet ca die fieri sacrificium; Eichmann, Die Kaiserkrönung im Abendland, I, 178; cf. 215. According to Ordo D which was in use since the 13th century and goes back to Innocent III, the emperor offers only aurum quantum siti placuerit: Eichmann, I, 264; cf. 285; II, 273 f. This last arrangement is also prescribed in the Pontificale Romanum I, De bened. et cor. regis.

So in England even around 1500: Each of the virgins held her hand covered with a cloth. In the right she carried a paten with a host and in the left a crucifix with wine for the altar. She slippèd the host onto the paten which the deacon held, the crucifix she handed to the bishop, whose hand she kissed. The wine was put into a chalice and administered after the Communion. W. Maskell, Monumenta, II (London, 1846), 326 f.—The same rite was used for the coronation of the bishops. Each of the canons of the Piedmontese monastery of Fruttuaria (11th c.): Albers, Consuetudines, IV, 154. The precedents for this usage are already in St. Benedict's Rule, ch. 59.—The Pontificale Romanum I, De bened. et consecr. virginitum, recognizes only the offering of a burning candle.

Regarding the offering of bread and wine at a papal Mass, cf. supra, note 30. According to the Ordinarium of Nantes of the year 1263 luminarii were offered at the first Mass on Christmas, bread at the second and money at the third; E. Martène, Traita de antiqua ecclesiae diaconalium (Lyons, 1706), 90. Durandus, Rationale, IV, 30, 40, also mentions a similar offering of bread by the people on Christmas.—There is a comparatively late reference to an unrestricted offering of bread and wine in the cession of a church to the monastery...
candles, and three cages containing pigeons, turtle-doves, and other birds.

Shortly after this it was pointed out that clerics do not generally have an obligation to make an offering. Other means had long since been devised of procuring the elements of bread and wine, while in the offertory procession the chief concern was a domestic one, to obtain support for the clergy. This offering served, as they said, ut inde sibi victum habeant sacerdotes. And since money gradually superseded almost all other gifts, and since many objects were already excluded from the offertory proper because of the holiness of the place, there was soon no distinction at all, in intent and disposition, between free-will offerings and those made according to strict ecclesiastical prescription. And inversely, the latter offerings were all the more consciously drawn into the offertory process and all the more plainly considered as gifts made to God. Even the presentation of the tithes was designated as an offerte. Under the concept of oblation were listed all the products of rural industry and all objects of ecclesiastical and domestic use; and in regard to all of these, in so far as it was practicable, an effort was made to integrate them, in some way, with the offertory process.

Besides, one of the features of the older Gallican rite recurs again—offering up all sorts of things for the altar before the services. Because of the richness of such gifts, it so happened that—especially when the churches were privately owned—the landlord would lay hands on the offerings and even demand the majority for himself, claiming that he was already taking care of the church and its priests. As early as 572 the Synod of Braga had ordained that no bishop was to consecrate a church which
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Some landlord had built in order to snatch half the oblations. The struggle against these and similar claims went on for centuries. It even affected the altar oblation proper, which was now grounded on a much wider basis and whose ecclesiastical disposition, in its more ancient modest form, had hardly been imperiled.

In the interval during which the ancient offering of bread and wine was being displaced by the other objects at the offertory procession—the ninth and the tenth centuries—the effort was made to establish a strict distinction between the former offering and the latter. Only bread and wine are to be offered up according to the traditional form at the offertory of the Mass, while candles and the rest are to be presented before Mass or be

was customary on specified feast days, right down to modern times, to make offerings of flax and sheaves of wheat in church, while other products were brought to the churchyard. In one parish on Martinmas (Nov. 11) every farmer offered a goose, later (till 1903) a hen; the animals were kept in a cage near the cemetery during the church services and afterwards were auctioned off for the benefit of the parish treasury. G. Rückert, Altere Schenkungen, kirchliche Opfergebräuche im westlichen bayerischen Vorarlberg, "Volk und Volkstum," 1 (1936), 263-269. We hear of similar practices at present among Slovaks in the S rail valley and among a wedding service natural products are offered, like the wine which is blessed and handed to the married couple. At St. Jacob in Neuhau there is a special room next to the altar where on Sundays the offertory gifts which are presented before Mass are kept; after services they are auctioned off by the church treasurer. Few are the Sundays on which nothing—lamb's, sheep's, or fowl—is forthcoming. In some churches where these customs prevail the offering walks around the altar to symbolize that his gift is made to God. (From a notation by a former pupil of mine, chaplain Christian Schrader.)

Can. 6 (Mansi, IX, 840); cf. III Synod of Toledo (589), c. 19 (ibid., 998).

John of Orleans (d. 843), De inst. iaculi, II, 19 (PL, CVI, 204 f.); Synod of Ingelheim (948), can 8 (Mansi, XVIII, 421); Decretum Gratiani, III, 1, 10 (Friedberg, I, 1296).—In the course of a transfer of churches to monasteries and bishops, as we ascertain from source documents (deeds and charters) since the 9th century, the rights ceded often included the oblationes, offerentia or offerturae (the last especially is a regular designation for altar offerings; see Schreiber, Untersuchungen, 24 f., et al., French "offrande"), frequently with the stipulation that a specified number of the clergy who went with the transfer must be retained. Examples in Merk, Abras, 48 f.; G. Schreiber, "Mittelfränkische Abgaben" (Zeitschrift d. Savigny-Stiftung, 63 [1943], 191-299), 245 f.; 283, 289 note. (= Schreiber, Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters, 247 f., etc.; see ibid., 467 f., Index.)

Exact settlements between the canons-canons who worked in the church are continued, e.g., in the Liber Ordinaris of the capular church of Essen (14th c.), ed. by P. Aris (Paderborn, 1908), 126-128; cf. 200-204.

In the Const. Ap., VIII, 31 (Funk, I, 532 F) there is a clue to how the "Blessing" left over at the mysteries (synagogae in ecclesia) was to be distributed among the ranks of the clergy. Manifestly bread and wine are meant. Further instances from the Orient in Funk, loc. cit., Gregory the Great, Dial., IV, 55 (PL, LXXVII, 417 f.), tells about a priest to whom some +4...
fore the Gospel." As a matter of fact, the ensuing years witness a great deal of hesitancy regarding the proper place for this remodelled offertory procession. In Bavarian country parishes an offertory procession before at the Communion procession was also a common practice which continued for a long time. In Spain it was customary, even in earlier times, to offer money at the Communion procession, a custom which also existed elsewhere or was formed anew. And again there was repeated occasion for sharp prohibitions against simoniacal dealings. Later, in Spain, we meet with an offertory procession inserted between the priest’s offering of bread and wine and the washing of his hands. This is done in the Mozarabic liturgy, and even in the Roman liturgy this admission is added to a certain extent. The author of the Micrologus denounces this arrangement as inverted. As a rule, the offertory, even in its new dress, assumes its old place after the Oremus, while the officitorium is being sung, its gladsome tone spurring one on to joyful giving. It is presupposed as taking place in this spot in the Mass ordo of Burchard of Strassburg, printed in 1502, and here, too, it is to be found wherever the old custom still survives.

Burchard’s ordo, which always notes the rubrics with great exactness, also describes the rite for the priest in these circumstances. After he has read the offertory from the missal, he goes to the Epistle side, takes the maniple from his arm and extends it to each of the offerers to be kissed, at the same time blessing them with a special formula. The same rite is presupposed in Spanish Mass books of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In Spain the rite is an ancient tradition, and here, too, it has survived to this day, with the exception of the blessing which had to be sacrificed in 1881 as the result of a decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites. The main outlines of the rite are also to be found elsewhere up to
very recent times. In many places, instead of the maniple or the stole, the offerer (after handing over his gift) kissed the hand of the celebrant, or, in other places, the corporal and even an extended paten. Sometimes the offerer accompanied his gift with a word of blessing. According to a Mass of the fifteenth century the priest was finally to bless the people with the words: *Centuplum accipiatis et vitam aeternam possideatis, in nomine Patris...*

A very festive rite of offertory procession is still in use at the solemn papal Mass which is celebrated on the occasion of a canonization. The offerers step up to the pope's throne in three groups, each led by a cardinal. In each group two noblemen precede the cardinal and two other people follow—the four gift-bearers. The gifts borne by the nobles, two heavy candles, two breads, two cruets of wine and water, are handed to the Holy Father by the respective cardinal; in doing so he kisses the pope's hand and stole, and his Holiness in turn blesses the gifts and turns them over to his master of ceremonies. The other gifts (candles, cages with birds) are handed over by the bearers to the cardinal procurator; the latter hands them out to the pope for his blessing.

However, the general attitude of the later Roman liturgy towards the offertory procession, the attitude of reserve and even avoidance, has led to the very singular result that the celebrant as a rule takes no notice of the procession even when it still occurs. This conduct is to be found even earlier in the declining years of the Middle Ages. In such cases the people brought their gifts and laid them in a place or box standing near the altar. In other instances two places were set apart—perhaps for two different purposes—one on the Gospel side, the other on the Epistle; the faithful presented part of their gift at the first location, circled the altar (where this was possible), and then made their second offering at the second place.

Since the third century, then, it very quickly became a fixed rule that the faithful should offer their gifts at a common eucharistic celebration, but because of the close connection with the performance of the sacred mystery it was from the very start recognized as a right restricted to those who were full members of the Church, just like the reception of the Sacrament. In the Syrian Didascalia there is a long discussion outlining the duty of the bishops and deacons to watch out from whom they accept a gift in the place of the paten; Gavanti-Merati, II, 7, 5, XXI (I, 263).—In Upper Silesia it is (or was) the custom to kiss the foot of a large crucifix standing around the altar (which was generally part of the offertory procession); A. Stasch, SJ, 1947.

In the Missa Iliaca: Martène, I, 4, IV (I, 508 B) the offerer says the words: *Tibi Domino creatori nemo offerat hóstiam pro remissione omnium peccatorum mortuorum et cælorum fidelium tuarum vivorum ac defunctorum.* Two other formulas which voice a special intention, *ibi.* It stands to reason that phrases such as these would be generally observed only by the clergy. In the Mass ordi of Sézé (PL, LXVII, 248 A) it is actually designated only for the priest and deacon; similarly in later MSS, in Martène, I, 4, IV (I, 508) and in Ehnen, Quellen, 346. Also in the missal of Troyes (about 1050), where a second formula follows: *Hanc oblationem, eleemosyniæ Plenter, defero ad manum sacerdotis tuique, ut offerat eam tibi Deo Patri omnipotenti pro cuocitis peccatis meis et pro toto populi delictis.* Amen. Martène, I, 4, VI (I, 532 C).—The Sacramentary of Fonte Avellana (PL, CLI, 866), which could not have been written much before 1325, still introduces the first formula with the rubric: *Quando quis offerit oblationem prelato dicat.*


Brinktrine, *Die feierliche Pompmesse,* 55 f. Cf. supra, p. 13.—A similarly solemn cortege accompanied the king of France when he made his offering on coronation day; see Corblet, I, 225.

But even as cautious a rubricist as B. Gavanti thinks that the present rubrics do not require so narrow an interpretation: where it is the custom the prelate could present his hand to be kissed (except at Masses for the dead); therefore he could at least pause. But Gavanti deems the practice sometimes seen at First Masses where the neo-priest was wont circuire ecclesiam ad oblationem. Gavanti-Merati, II, 7, 5, (I, 260 f.).

This was understood, of course, when the procession started at the beginning of Mass; see supra, p. 15.

Thus often in Alpine countries; see, e.g., the account in the *Korrespondenzblatt*...
gift; the gifts of all who openly lived in sin were to be refused, whether they were the unchaste or thieves or usurers or even Roman officials who had stained their hands with blood. Similar regulations recur more than once in the ensuing years in both the East and the West. At the beginning of the sixth century the *Statuta Ecclesiae antiqua*, which stem from the neighborhood of Arles, insist that nothing is to be accepted from dissenting brethren, whether in *sacratario* or in *gazophylacium*. Penitents, too, were deprived of this right, and it was not restored to them until their reconciliation. Similarly, the gifts of those Christians who lived at enmity were refused. As late as the fifteenth century a preacher, Gottschalk Holten, made principles of this sort his own.

On the other hand, the congregation was expected to make an offering every Sunday, and the wish for even a daily offering found utterance. In monasteries, after the reform of Benedict of Aniane (d. 821), a daily offering was actually incorporated into the order of service. But for den katholischen Klerns, 54 (Vienna, 1935), 73.

Didascalia, IV, 5-8 (Funk, I, 222-228). To be sure, the chief argument proposed for prompting such action is that the widows supported by the donations could pray for obdurate sinners. But at the same time the gifts were also, at least in theory, linked with the altar; cf. IV, 7, 1, 3; IV, 5, 1, and the heading over the last of these passages in the parallel Greek text of *Codex Sinaiticus*: "With what care the Sunday contributions are to be received" (Funk, 222).

See a whole series of references in Funk, 225, note on IV, 6, 1; Bona, II, 8, 5 (693 f.); Corbel, I, 218 f.

Can. 93, al. 49 (PL, LVI, 834): Oble­ tiones discordantium fraetur neque in sacra­ rio neque in gazophylaco recipiantur. Those gifts which were destined for the altar were deposited in the sacristium.

Council of Nicea (325), can. 11 (Mansi, II, 673); Felix III, Ep. 7, al. 13 (PL, LVIII, 926 A; Thiel, 263).—The pos­sessed (in a wide sense) were also excluded: Council of Elvira, can. 29 (Mansi, II, 10). Cf. Dilger, Antike u. Christentum, 4 (1933), 110-137.

Can. 93. In the Spanish *Liber ordinum* (Férotin, 98) the prayer at the reconciliation of *Proletat deputati fratres sacram offerentes oblationem*. Further evidence for the zeal with which the oblation was made in these circles is found in the rules for recluses of Grimalich, Reg. (9th c.), c. 16 (PL, CIII, 594 B): The cell of the anchorite should be so designed that the priest can receive the oblation through the window. Under the influence of Chunj a custom grew up, lasting into the 12th and 13th centuries, that at the early Mass on ferial days all should make an offering, and at the principal Mass each halfl the choir alternately; of those who made the offering at the principal Mass a certain number were allowed to go to Communion. On feast days the superior alone made the offering; cf. *Capitulare monasterii Germon*, n. 33; 43 (Albers, V, 28; 47); William of Hirsau, Const., II, 30 (PL, CL, 1083); cf. Hilpisch, "Der Opfergang" (Studien u. Mitteilungen, 1941-42), 88 f. More de­tailed regulations determining when one, or two, or when half of the brethren or all (as on All Souls) should make the offering, found in the *Consuetudines of Farfa* (11th c.): Albers, I, see register, p. LVI. At Masses for the dead it was every­where customary for all the monks to take part in the offertory procession, probably to intensify the power of the intercession; Hilpisch, 90; 93. At a private Mass, accord­ing to William of Hirsau, Const., I, 86 (PL, CL, 1017), the server or someone else, si iste non vult communicare, should make the offering. In all these cases it is commonly the offering of hosts and wine that is meant; cf. supra, note 61.

Through my own occasional inquiries I have found that the Sunday offertory procession, in which the whole congregation takes part, is still customary along the northern borders of the Alps, especially in many parishes of Vorarlberg and Upper Bavaria, but also in the vicinity of Schneidenmüh. The processions belong to the church. In certain country parishes in the neighborhood of Freising (and likewise, I am told, in both the German and the French parts of Upper Bavaria) the offertory procession is also customary on weekdays; one of the members of the family for which the Mass is being celebrated starts the procession, the others follow, in the order and degree of relationship.—I have also heard of such processions being held on Sundays about twice a month in the rural parishes of the diocese of Zips in Slovakia, but here they are for a special purpose or under the auspices of a par­ticular society (the Rosary confraternity) whose members march around the altar with burning candles.—Krap, op. cit., 361, gives accounts of Sunday offertory processions in Spanish dioceses; in some places there the practice has undergone a certain change, in that only the village or city officials take part each Sunday. A similar custom of having the superiors offer the oblation in the community was to be found here and there in monasteries and convents even in modern times; Hilpisch, 93 f.

Can. 6 (Mansi, XIX, 908 f.)

Can. 12 (Mansi, XX, 510). Schreiben,
tradition as his endorsement. But no special day was mentioned. Actually, since the eleventh century it had become more and more customary to hold the offertory procession on certain specified feast days, and even to regard it as obligatory on such days. The number of these days fluctuated at first. In the later Middle Ages they were usually the greater feasts, Christmas, Easter and Pentecost, to which was added All Saints or the Assumption, or the feast of the dedication of the church, or the church's patronal feast. In the many source documents in which arrangements are made for the proper carrying out of the offering, frequent reference is therefore made to the offering of the quattuor or quinque festivitates, of the four-time offering or simply the quattuor offertoria. Even in the course of the Catholic Reform during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries an effort was made to retain these offertory processions or to revive them. But they seem to have disappeared more completely, even, than the old Sunday offerings. Why these efforts at restoration miscarried is not easy to understand; the main reason, perhaps, lay in the opposition to feast day offertory processions which had become entangled in the financial overgrowthes of the late Middle Ages, an opposition which, after the Council of Trent, outweighed the desire to restore the ancient symbolical rite.

Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters, 306-322, offers a commentary on this legislation. This rule found also in the Corpus Juris Canonici, Decretum Gratiani, III, 1, 69 (Friedberg, I, 1312 f.)—Durandus, IV, 30, 32 f., stresses the obligation with great emphasis, citing many Old Testament passages.—As many later synods pointed out in more detail, the obligation embraced all those who had reached the 14th year or who had received their First Communion; the Sunday oblations are still held in many churches.

The obligation is already restricted to the people in John Beleth (d. about 1165), Expositio, c. 17 (PL, CCII, 30).

Schreiber, Untersuchungen, 7; 12 f.; 38; Merk, Abriss, 18-21. A larger number of feast days is still mentioned in 1364 in an enactment of the bishop of Ermland, in Merk, 104 f.

Synod of Arras (1570), Statuta proar. 9 (Hartzheim, VIII, 255 f.). The synod makes a reference to the wording of those secret prayers which commend to God the oblationes populi. Cf. idem, alter alia, also the synod of Cologne, 1549 (Hartzheim, VI, 557), and even Constance, 1609 (ibid., VIII, 912 f.).

M. Martini, around 1700, still knows of offertory processions being held on certain days in French churches here and there, but they were, in part at least, restricted either to communicants or to the clergy; Martini, 1, 4, 6, 9 (1, 388 f.). Cf. Corbiet, I, 222-225.—A well-known instance of the offertory procession is that which still survives at the cathedral of Milan, in a manner stately if somewhat formal: two men and two women from the Scuola di San't Ambrogio, dressed in special attire, march to the entrance of the choir, holding in their right hand wafers or hosts, in their left a censer of wine; the celebrant accepts both. Righetti, Manuale, III, 253. Similarly in the 12th century, but then the men went up to the altar; M. Magistretti, Beroldus (Milan, 1894), 52.

Cf. Jedin, "Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform des römischen Mschzbuches" (Liturg. Zeitsschrift, 1939), 59.—In the Age of Enlightenment, too, the only things that seemed to be noticed in the offertory procession were the abuses; see Vierbach, 228-233; cf. supra, note 82.

At the beginning of the 16th century, for example, it was the custom in Ingolstadt for the members of the Hatmakers' Guild, along with their wives and servants, to form an offertory procession on the feast of St. Barbara, their patron. At academic services it was the duty of the rector of the university to see that all the prominent members of the university, the doctors, licentiates, masters and noble students, took part in the offertory procession if they were absent be had to impose a fine of two groats. Greving, Johann Ecks Pfarrbuch, 115 ff., 168.

Even in the dominion of Joseph II, who forbade processions precisely of this type (in the ordinance cited supra, note 82). Unfortunately there is no survey of present-day usages. Some instances are found in J. Kramp, "Meszegebriuche der Gläubigen in der Neuezit" (SIZ, 1926, 11), 214; "Meutebrüche der Gläubigen in den ausserdeutschen Ländern" (ibid., 1927, II), 357 g.; 261 f. The offertory procession at services for the dead seems to be customary wherever German is the native tongue; it also exists in Holland, Belgium and Spain.—At weddings it still survives in the eastern portion of Germany, especially in upper Silesia; R. Adamsky, in Seelsorger, 6 (Vienna, 1929-30), 381. Likewise in Vorarlberg, where the whole bridal party marches around the church of St. Barbara (see supra, note 82), 266. It is also found among the Carinthian Slovenes, where the groomsmen takes the lead (according to Srnc; see supra, note 72). In some places, as in my own native parish of Taufers in South Tyrol, it is a traditional custom to celebrate the feasts of the various trades unions with an offertory procession; the head of the union leads the procession; the offering represents the annual contribution to the church. Elsewhere, too, the designation of a particular person to head the procession appears to be part of the offertory procession rite; cf. L. A. Veit, Volksbräuche Brauchum and Kirche im deutschen Mittelalter (Freiburg, 1936), 96, where we read the following regarding a present-day custom: "In Swabia at the Herd-Mass which is celebrated before the cattle are driven out in the spring, the whole congregation parades around the altar with the herd's boy in the lead."
However, one gives the bishop who had just baptized in Epiphanius, note 22), cases that must have been duplicated since the 12th century; to these date for the first appearance of the Mass found in E. Bishop, Liturgica Historica (Oxford, 1918), 368.

This is the occulta offere, the denarius sum (Merk, 37 f. Further discussion in Bridgitt, 123-140). Early examples of the establishment of Mass-foundations in E. Bishop, Liturgica Historica (Oxford, 1918), 368.

These latter represent the recommendations missa which make an appearance since the 12th century; to these recommendations was frequently coupl ed an obligation for the priest to make mention of the name in the Memento or to insert a special oration. Merk, 45 f., 74, 88 f.

It would be difficult to set an exact date for the first appearance of the Mass stipend. If a money gift is the essential in the notion of a stipend, then that essential can be discovered already in such cases as that mentioned by St. Augustine (supra, note 22), cases that must have been duplicated long before. Further, there is the account found in Ephesians, Acts, 6, XXX, 8 (PG, XLI, 413), where some one gives the bishop who had just baptized him a sum of money with the request: προτερα παρο αυτου — However, the Mass stipend grew erroneously in importance near the end of the Middle Ages, when the number of priests increased, and with them the number of private Masses; cf. supra, I, 223 f. Thus it became possible more and more for an individual to secure the celebration of Mass for his own intention by handing the priest a present. — So far no one has written a satisfactory history of the development of the Mass stipends. The evidence see Merk, Abrias, especially his summary, p. 91 ff. This book, which is so valuable for the documentary materials it supplies, is not always trustworthy in its historical exposition or its conclusions. A wealth of material is also gathered in Fr. de Berlendis, De obligationibus ad altare (Venice, 1743).

Evidence since the 13th century in Merk; see the index under comparatio. But the word comparare in the Latin of the period had also the meaning “to buy.” — The technical word in German at the time was “Messeszvemen” (that is, frumen or frommen), which signifies nothing more than to engage or order; the word does not seem to have been given the meaning “to acquire an advantage or gain” (Merk, 96); cf. Grimm, Deutsches Wörterbuch, IV, 1 (1876), 246 f.; J. B. Schoepf, Tirolesische Idiostatik (Innsbruck, 1866), 157.

At Würzburg in 1342 a Magister Conrad Heger, who had impugned the “Messe frumen” as simoniacal, was forced to swear quod actus “messeszvemen” seu missae comparatio ex sui natura est oblatio... item quod non est “messenzen” seu missae empiro, and so was allowed. The text in Merk, 98-100. — Others opposed Mass stipends without calling their lawfulness into question; thus Heinrich von Pflummern of Biberach (d. 1531); L. A. Veit, Volkszrmones Brauchkun und Kirche (Freiburg, 1936), 211. The Society of Jesus originally accepted no Mass stipends; Constitutiones S.J., VI, 2, 7 (Institutum S.J., II [Florence, 1893], 96). — The Franciscans were even stricter; from the start they did not permit even obligations manuales; Salimbene, Chronik (MGH, SS, 32, p. 422; 425).

Other discussions of stipends can be found in the works of the canonists; e.g. Ch. F. Keller, Mass Stipends (Catholic University dissertation, 25 Washington, 1925).

The ancient offering of the faithful survives also in another metaphor, the offertory collection. There is no reason why this should work, in the Church. Of other liberalis eleemosynarum actiones politicam quan postulationes.

Roman decisions in this sense since 1848, in Hansens, Institutiones, II, 64 f. Hansens considers that from the 16th century on there came into being a new concept of the Mass stipend, by virtue of which the donor of the stipend is no longer necessarily a missus oblator. — Still it seems to me we are doing justice to the facts if, with M. de la Taille, The Mystery of the Faith, II (transl., Archpriest Jno. Carroll; London & New York, 1950), 292 f., we view these decisions as treating certain borderline cases in which the Mass stipend in its true concept as a contractual engagement is not under consideration at all, but simply an alms which is accepted and in view of which a promise is made to offer the sacrifice for the intentions expressed.

M. de la Taille, The Mystery of Faith and Human Opinion (London, 1934), 81-197; 221-223. Other discussions of stipends can be found in the works of the canonists; e.g. Ch. F. Keller, Mass Stipends (Catholic University dissertation, 25 Washington, 1925).

In Germany the so-called Klingbeutel
not be permitted to serve a more than merely utilitarian purpose, no reason why it should not be given a deeper spirit and a more vivid form than it ordinarily presents—a spirit, by backing back to the living roots of this contribution which is primarily intended as a gift to God and which is destined for the earthly recipient only through and over the altar; a form, by confining the collection to the time of the offertory and clothing the activity with dignified and appropriate ceremonial. Even though this is a collection and not an offertory procession, the basic idea of a genuine oblation is not excluded any more than it was at the rite in vogue in the stational services of the city of Rome.

2. The Offertory Chant

The entrance of the clergy at the start of Mass was made to the accompaniment of the introit sung by the schola cantorum. It was then but a natural application of the same principle that suggested that the "procession" of the people at the offertory and communion—both interruptions during the audible part of the Mass—should be enlivened and enriched by psalmic song. That this was the meaning and purpose of the offertory chant was well understood all during the Middle Ages. The chanting was called by the same name that was given to the presentation of the oblation gifts: offertorium, offerenda. Even in the Middle Ages the commentators stressed or offertory basket is passed around only on certain occasions to receive the voluntary money contributions of the faithful, or offertory basket is passed around only on certain occasions to receive the voluntary money contributions of the faithful, or offertory basket is passed around only on certain occasions to receive the voluntary money contributions of the faithful.

In the Ordo Romanus Primus (Washington, 1948), 48.

1 The name offertorium for the chant appears regularly even in the earliest MSS. of the Mass chant books, so that it goes back at least to the 17th century; see Gesbert, Antiphonale missarum secundae. The full title, antiphona ad offertorium, is less frequent; cf. Wagner, Einführung, I, 107, 121; III, 418. In the first place the word offertorium designated the rite of offere, that is, the presentation of the oblation gifts by people and clergy; thus in the description of the course of the Mass in the Sacramentarium Gregorianum (Lietzmann, n. 1) and in the Ordo Romanus, I, n. 16 (PL, LXVIII, 944); cf. the paraphrase in the Maundy Thursday rite in the older Gelasianum, I, 39 (Wilson, 67): Post haece offerte pleba. Transferred to the chant, the term appears first in Isidore of Seville, De eccle. off., I, 14 (PL, LXXXI, 751): De offertoris.

2 Thus in the MS redacted by G. M. Tommasi (Tommasi-Vezzosi, V, 3 ff.); see also Amalar, De eccl. off., III, 19 (PL, CV, 1126 D); Remigius of Auxerre, Epistola (PL, CI, 1251 D) Pontificale of Poitiers: Martene, 4, 22, 5 (III, 300 C).

—The expression appears principally in the French area and then as a designation of the offertory procession; cf. Schreiber, Untersuchungen, 21 ff. It survives in the French word "offrande," offering, offertory procession.


Augustine, Reclaraciones, II, 37 (CSEL, 26, 144): ut hymni ad altare dicentur de psalmorum libro sine ante oblationem, sine cum distribuenter populo, quod justet oblationem.

4 But J. Brinkhoffer, "De origine offertorii in missa Romana," Eph. Liturg., 40 (1926), 15-20; idem., Die hl. Messe, 125 f, thinks differently. However, the grounds alleged by Brinkhoffer for a late origin of the Roman offertorium (8th c.), especially the
ever, to all appearances Rome had but a modest store of offertory chants even in the sixth century, as we can gauge from the Milanese Mass, which has preserved its antique form to the present, and in which the offertory chants give every indication of having been borrowed from Rome. In the Roman Mass itself, however, this modest store was later richly augmented by Gregory the Great and his successors.\footnote{Wagner, I, 108.} At first the offertory chant probably had the same antiphonal design as the chant at the introit: the schola, divided into two choirs, sang a psalm alternately, with an antiphon as prelude.\footnote{Thus Wagner, I, 108. However, for the procedure in this offertory rite cf. supra, I, 71-72.} The psalm varied from celebration to celebration, taking into account, as far as possible, the church year with its festivals and seasons.

It is a striking fact that at a very early period the antiphonal performance of the offertory was abandoned and a responsorial style substituted for it. Even the ancient substructure of Roman offertories preserved at Milan, as mentioned above, had this responsorial design. Among these, for instance, is the offertory which the present Roman Missal assigns to the eleventh Sunday after Pentecost (also used on Ash Wednesday); in the oldest sources it has the following form:

Exaltabo te, Domine, quoniam suscipe mi, nec delectasti inimicos meos super me. [Refrain:] Domine clama mi ad te et sanasti me. V. Domine abscesti ab inferis animam meam, salvasti me a descendenti in lacum. [Refrain:] Domine clama mi ad te et sanasti me. V. Ego autem dixi in mea abundancia: non mover me in aeternum. Domine in voluntate tua praesistiti decore meo virtutem. [Refrain:] Domine, clama mi [ad te et sanasti me].\footnote{\textsuperscript{10} Antiphonary of Compiegne (Hesbert, n. 196 a). There is no procedure in this offertory rite cf. supra, I, 71-72. \textsuperscript{11} Wagner, I, 425 f.}

Here, just as in the chants interpolated before the Gospel, a refrain is repeated several times.\footnote{\textsuperscript{12} For particulars see Wagner, I, 111.} In line with this, the verse (as found in the oldest manuscripts with neums) is treated as a solo and consequently provided with the greatest melodic richness.\footnote{\textsuperscript{13} For this connection see, about 1080, \textit{Udabridg Consuet. Clun.}, I, 6 (PI, CII, 652) : the praecentor should intone one verse or all of them, as he sees fit, \textit{maxime propter offerentes}.} A few of the manuscripts devoted to the solo chants therefore contain the verse of the offertory while merely indicating the texts that pertain to the choir, namely, the initial section and the refrain.\footnote{\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.} Apparently the \textit{Gloria Patri} was not appended to these verses.

And now we may well ask how this remarkable development came about. It is almost certain that the main consideration was to give the offertory chant a certain lengthiness, in view (obviously) of the people's procession. True, this extra length could also have been achieved by having the psalm sung antiphonally right down to the end, and then repeating the antiphon which stands at the start. Perhaps the responsorial form was chosen to make it easier for the singers to take part in the offertory procession.\footnote{\textsuperscript{15} Wagner, I, 111.} Besides, the main point in singing at all was not so much to render the text of a complete psalm, but rather to achieve a festive mood, which could be done more readily by musical means. This resulted, therefore, in a shortening of the psalm, along with a corresponding compensation both by the enrichment of the melody of the verse sung as a solo, and by the repetition of the antiphon or a part thereof, after the manner of a refrain. This refrain could, of course, have been turned over to the people, but by this time there was obviously little interest in such participation of the people in responsorial chanting, at least in the greater stational services. We already noted in the history of the intervenient chants how early the art of the special singers preponderated even in responsorial song.\footnote{\textsuperscript{16} Wagner, I, 108.} So the refrain at the offertory was from the very start reserved to the singing choir.

It is in this responsorial form that the offertory chant regularly appears in the choral books of the early Middle Ages. The number of psalm verses fluctuates between one and four.\footnote{\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.} That is patently more than in the other Mass chants. The extension must be explained, as already indicated, by the length of the offertory procession.\footnote{\textsuperscript{18} Thus Wagner, I, 108. However, for the procedure in this offertory rite cf. supra, I, 71-72.} Whereas at the introit only a single group, the clergy, wended through the church, and whereas the reception of Communion, for which the communion chant was intended, had become since the close of the ancient era nearly everywhere a rare and slight affair, the whole congregation continued to take part in the offertory procession Sunday after Sunday till at least the year 1000. Not till the eleventh century was there any noticeable drop in the regularity of this procession; after that it was gradually limited to the greater festivals. And, as a matter of fact, it is in the eleventh century that the offertory verses begin to disappear from many manuscripts. By the following century this omission has become a general rule, although exceptions are to...
be found till the very end of the Middle Ages. The portion which had originally been the antiphon was considered sufficient. In the Missal of Plus V only the Mass for the Dead retained a verse, and with it a refrain: Hostias et preces and Quam olim Abraham; this fits in once again with the fact that it was precisely at the Requiem that the offertory procession continued in use. On the other hand, the Milanese Mass has retained the offertory verse even to the present, and similarly the Mozarabic Mass.

As already pointed out, the offertory was always performed by a choral group. And because their singing prevented the choristers from personally taking part in the offertory procession, their place was taken by one of the members; at Rome it was the archipparaphonista whose duty it was to offer the water. Since in the churches of the later Middle Ages the singing choir usually represented a part of the clerical choir, it was really only a nominal difference when sometimes the origin of the chant would naturally imply. In the Missal of the recent editions the verses of the Masses of the first Sunday of Advent and of the Dedication of a Church: Domine Deus, in simplicitate cordis mei were sung by the members; at Rome it was the apparatus in García, 22, 3.

As for the texts of the offertory, they are taken as a rule from Holy Scripture; for the most part, in fact, from the Psalms, as the psalmic origin of the chant would naturally imply. One would expect that the texts chosen would be expressive of the idea of oblation and so suggest the meaning of the offertory procession. But actually this is only the exceptional case: examples of this sort are found in the Mass and the Mass of the Dead also belongs to this class; notice the verse: Hostias et preces tibi Domine laudis offerimus. But most of the texts have a very general character or dwell on the theme of the feast being celebrated. This is true of the verses which once were appended here; they regularly belonged to the same psalm or the same scriptural text as the initial verse. As a matter of fact, a reference to what was happening at the offertory procession was superfluous so long as the practice itself was alive. The chief purpose then was not, as it is in our present-day Mass chants, to explain what was already plain enough in itself; the chief thing was to give it a religious dedication.

3. The Matter for the Sacrifice

The vicissitudes which befell the offertory procession were dependent, to a large extent, on the requirements regarding the condition of the elements for the sacrifice. There can be little doubt that the bread used by Christ our Lord at the Last Supper was the unleavened bread prescribed for the paschal meal, a bread made of fine wheat flour. But the very way the accounts read readily indicates that no importance was attached to the particular paschal practice of using unleavened bread;
what our Lord took into his hands is simply called ἡρακλής, a word which could designate not only the unleavened bread used at the paschal feast but also the leavened kind which was otherwise in use among Jews as well as pagans. The latter kind was therefore from earliest times considered at least licit for the Eucharist. Thus it was all the less difficult for the faithful to be able to make an offering of the bread for the altar; they just took bread from their domestic supply and brought it for divine service. Both literary accounts and pictorial illustrations show us that the shape of the eucharistic bread did not differ from the shape of bread used for domestic purposes. The only distinction, if distinction it was, consisted in this, that the finest and best formed loaves were selected, as was only natural. In two mosaics at Ravenna, in which the eucharistic altar is shown, the bread appears in the form of a chaplet or crown, that is, twisted like a braid and then wound into a circle about four inches across. This is the corona referred to by St. Gregory the Great; being an out-

marizing all the above, is found in B. M. Serrelli, L'offertorio della Messa dei de-

funti (Rome, 1946); see the review in Eph. liturg., 61 (1947), 245-252.

Gossens, Les origines, 117.—Present usage requires bread made of wheaten flour, and therefore flour ground from rye, oats, barley or maize—though these are all classified as grain (frumentum)—is invalid. R. Butin, "The Bread of the Bible," The Ecclesiastical Review, 59 (1918), 113-125, remarks that nothing definite can be deduced from the scriptural nar-

ratives of the Last Supper, for although ἡρακλής was generally used in classical Greek for wheaten bread, it is probably here only a translation of the Hebrew lehem (or rather the Aramaic lahma), which referred to any kind of bread. An uninterrupted tradition, however, has al-

ways favored wheaten bread.

Cf. the accounts supra, p. 2 ff. Ambrose, De sacramentis, IV, 4 (Quasten, Mon., 158), is quite unmistakable when he puts these words upon his hearer's lips: mens panis est usitatus, that is, the bread I have received in Communion is the bread I am accustomed to use every day.—It is recounted of the Egyptian monk and Monophysite bishop, Peter the Iberian (d. 487), that for the Eucharist he had a bakery produce loaves that were beautiful and white, and fit for the sacrifice, and very small in circumference; these let him harden—they were therefore leavened bread—and thus he used them from time to time as he celebrated the holy sacrifice. Dölger, Antike u. Christentum, 1 (1929), 33 f.; further references, ibid., 34 ff.—The story in John the Deacon, Vita s. Gregorii, II, 41 (PL, LXXV, 103), about the lady who recognized in the particles given at Communion the same bread she had herself baked and brought along, and who thereupon laughed and received a repri-

mand for so doing, is probably only a legend of the 9th century, as the formula for distribution shows (see infra).

In the West the XVI Synod of Toledo (693) demanded that the host-bread be prepared specially; can. 6 (Mansi, XII, 73 f.).


don, 1913).


Supra, p. 15, note 75.—The Liber pontificalis (under Zephyrinus: Duchesne, I, 139), mentions the corona consecrata that is distributed for Communion. In the Ordo of St. Amund (9th c.), too, the host is once referred to as corona; Duchesne, Christian Worship, 461.—The host-breads on the ivory tablet in Frankfort are also in the form of a crown; illustration, DACL, III, 2476-77; Braun, Das christliche Altargest, plate 6.

Dölger, 37, note 152.

Thus one of the two loaves in the repre-

sentation of the altar at Sant' Apollinare; a cross is depicted in the center. Cf. supra, note 4.

A. de Waal, "Hostie," in Kraus, Realencyclopdie, I (Freiburg, 1882), 672. The shape and size were about those of a hot-cross bun.

Cf. Gregory the Great, Dial., I, 11 (PL, LXXVII, 212).

Dölger, 39-43. In one ancient repre-

sentation of the Last Supper is seen a loaf divided into three sections by three ray-

like gashes starting at the center (panis tridus), the type which Paulinus of Nola describes as usual in his neighborhood, and which he interprets in terms of the Trin-

ity; Dölger, Antike u. Christentum, I (1929), 44 f.; 5 (1940), 67.

Dölger, Antike u. Christentum, I (1929), 17-20, with plate 9.—Similarly a bread stamp of the 6th century from Carthage, which bears, in addition, the inscription: Hic est flos campi et ilium; H. Lecercq, DACL, V, 1367.

Dölger, 21-29, along with the illustra-

tions on plate 3-8.—The host-breads of the Orientals, excepting perhaps the East Syrians, are somewhat larger than our own large hosts and, because of the yeast, thicker, about the thickness of a finger (except in the Byzantine rite); Hansas, II, 174-78. Thus they can always be broken.

Alcinus, Ep. 69 (alias 90); PL, C, 289: panis, qui corpus Christi consecratur, absum fermento utius alterius infectionis debet esse mundissimus. However, the point directly insisted on here is that there be no admixture (fermentum) of salt—Rabanus Maurus, De inst. cler., I, 31 (PL, CVII, 318 D): panem infermentatum.—The oft-cited quotation from Venerable Bede is not relevant; for this and other surmised references see J. R. Geissmann, Die Abendmahlslehre an der Wende der christlichen Spätantike, 21-36. Nevertheless Geissmann grants that the use of un-

leavened bread was recognized towards
the best and whitest bread, along with various scriptural considerations—a favor this development. Still, the new custom did not come into exclusive vogue until the middle of the eleventh century. Particularly in Rome it was not universally accepted till after the general infiltration of various usages from the North. In the Orient there were few objections to this usage during olden times. Not till the discussions that led to the schism of 1054 did it become one of the chief objections against the Latins. To this usage during olden times.

Who are united with Rome continue to use the type of bread traditional among them.

Reverence for the Blessed Sacrament, however, soon took a new turn both in the East and in the West, namely, in the effort to remove the bread destined for the altar farther and farther from the sphere of the merely profane. In the Orient the making of the breads was committed to the end of the 8th century. A. Michel, Byzant. Zeitschrift, 36 (1936), 119 f., assigns a substantially greater antiquity for unleavened bread in the West. 87

In the West, too, the making of bread was for a time given a liturgical form, particularly within the ambit of the Cluniac reform movement. According to the customs of the monastery of Hirsau in the Black Forest (eleventh century), the wheat had to be selected kernel for kernel; the mill on which it was to be ground had to be cleaned, then hung about with curtains; the monk who supervised the milling had to don alb and humeral. The same vesture was worn by the four monks to whom the baking of the hosts was confined; at least three of these monks were to be in deacon's orders or even higher rank. While working they were to keep strict silence, so that their breath might not touch the bread. According to the instructions in other monasteries, on the other hand, the monks were to combine their work with the singing of psalms according to a precise plan. It might be added that such a solemn act did not take place every day, but only a few times in the year. Recalling the instructions regarding the Old Testament bread of proposition, the desire was expressed that even outside the monasteries only the priest should prepare and bake the host; in France this order was in many instances faithfully

Hanssens, II, 206-217.

Ibid., II, 208 f.; Brightman, 247-249.

Hanssens, II, 210 f. For the Mass itself only one of the three breads is selected.


Consuetudines of Fruttuaria (11th c.); Alberas, Consuetudines, IV, 138; Lanfranc (d. 1089), Decreta pro O.S.B., c. 6 (PL, CL, 488 f.). Further references in Cornet, I, 176 f.

William of Hirsau, Const., II, 32 (PL, CL, 1087 A) : there was no regulation qui tibicibus in onus; cf. Bernardus, Ordo Clun., I, 53 (Herrgott, 249): especially before Christmas and Easter.

I Par. 9: 32.

Sacrid of Cremona, Mitrale, III, 6 (PL, CCLIII, 119 A). Even the accompanying melody psalmorum is mentioned as a general regulation; Humbert of Silva Candida, Acta Gratuum calumnias, n. 21 (PL, CCLIII, 946); C. Will, Acta et scripta de controversiis ecclesiae græco et latinæ s. XI (Leipzig, 1861), 104).—Already in the canons of Theodore of Canterbury, II, 7, 4 (Finsterwalder, 322), it is expressly stated that according to the Roman practice— it was different with the Greeks—the host-bread was not allowed to be prepared by women. In Theodulf of Orleans (d 821), Capitulare, i, c. 5 (PL, CV, 193), the preparation is reserved to priests or at least clerics: Pones, quos Deo in sacrificium offeritis, aut a votis aut a vestris fueris coram Deo niti te ac studioste fiant.
followed even as late as the eighteenth century. Elsewhere, at an earlier period, it was thought sufficient if there was some guarantee that the pertinent ecclesiastical prescriptions were fully carried out by the persons entrusted with the operation. As a result, the preparation of the hosts was done mostly in the houses of religious, more especially in convents of women.

The drift away from selecting the bread destined for the altar just from the gifts of the faithful, and towards providing for it carefully in some other way is to be noticed occasionally even at an early period. But with the substitution of unleavened bread the exclusion of the faithful became a matter of course. At first the thin disks of the unleavened wheat bread were made in a larger size and were brought thus to the altar where they were broken up for the Communion of the people. But since this Communion came under consideration almost only on the greatest feast days, it soon became the practice, even in the twelfth century, to shape the priest’s host in the more modest size it has today, in modum denarii.

This form was then retained even on Communion days, and in order to avoid breaking up the species the custom grew of preparing the “particles” for the Communion of the faithful ahead of time. And since the thin cakes from which the hosts were cut had to be baked in a metal form, the altar-bread irons, it was not hard to impress at least the large hosts with some sort of decorative stamp. At first this was simply the traditional "host", ancient as Christianity itself; see E. Peter­son, "Mepct", Hostienpartikel und Opfert­eken, (1947), 243 ff. Examples from the 11th century on, in Elmer, 296, 298, 300, etc. Further references in Eisenhofer, II, 130. Perhaps we ought to cite in this connection Amalar, De eccl. of., Prefatio altera (PL, CV, 990 B): sacerdos componit hostiam in altare—On the other hand, cf. the more ancient meaning of the word in our canon of the Mass, where it embraces also the body and blood of Christ: hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam.

Similar designations were, of course, as ancient as Christianity itself; see E. Peterson, "Mepct", Hostienpartikel und Opfert­eken, (1947), 3-12; Chr. Mohrmann, Vigiliae christianae, 1 (1947), 22 f.

The designation appears in the Egyptian liturgy, especially for the consecrated host. The Copts, too, call the host "Lamb," Arabic alhamal. The designation in use at the Lateran basilica (c. 985), was “bult” in the region of Antioch as early as the fourth century; J. E. Eschen­bach, Die Auffassung der Stelle Is. 6: 6, 7 bei den Kirchen­geistern und ihrer Verwen­dung in der Liturgie (Würzburger theolog. Preisaufgabe: Würzburg, 1927), esp. 34 ff. —The designation σαρκα­ριτα, marga­rita, “pearl” is also used in the same sense by Syrians and Greeks, and in the Byzantine liturgy, especially for the consecrated particles distributed to the faithful. —Bright­man, 585, s. v. “Pearl.” The designation is traceable to early Christian tradition; Dekkers, Tertullianum, 46, note 3.

A Paris synodal decree (ab. 1210) found
versally obligatory. When, later on, the use of the purificative became general, that is, since the sixteenth century, white wine has been commonly preferred because it leaves fewer traces in the linen. 46

In some few districts of the Orient where wine is hard to get—especially among the Copts and Abyssinians—a substitute was and is created by softening dried grapes (raisins, that is) in water and then pressing them out; this process is permitted even among Catholics, with the proviso that at least the start of fermentation is awaited. 47

Much more profound were the discussions regarding the mixture of the wine. According to ancient rule some water must be mingled with the wine. This was not, indeed, a native Palestinian custom, but a Greek practice which was observed in Palestine in Christ's time. 48 As early as the second century this admixture for the Eucharist is expressly mentioned. 49 Later, under pressure of Gnostic circles that rejected all wine-drinking, there was a trend here and there to replace the wine entirely by water. 50 In one of his detailed writings Cyprian repudiated such a procedure which was practiced by some ignorant people, declaring it contrary to the institution of Jesus. 51 On the other hand, it was he who emphasized the symbolic sense of the commingling. Just as the wine receives the water among the Præcepta synodalia of Bishop Odo, n. 28 (Mansi, XXII, 682 E); Synod of Clermont (1268), c. 6 (ibid., XXIII, 1190 E). Cf. also Corbel, I, 201—

46 William de Waddington is quoted as saying “E le vin vermail ou blanc”; see Robert de Brune’s Handlyn Synne, F. J. Furnivall, ed. (EETS, OS, 119 [1901], 7301. —There can be no doubt that tradition has always required a grape wine (vīnum de stīle). So the I Provincial Synod of Milan (1565), II, 5 (Hardoun, X, 650 f.); the synods of America (1595) and Majorca (1639), in Corbel, I, 200.

47 Hansens, II, 217 f.—The Council of Winchester, 1076, under Lanfranc, took the precaution to legislate lest through ignorance priests should attempt to celebrate either with water alone, or with beer as a substitute for wine: Quod sacrificium de cecervisia, vel sola aqua non fiat; sed sum modo aqua vīno mixtō (Mansi, XX, 459).

48 Strack-Billerbeck, IV, 613 f.; cf. 616, 72; G. Beer, Pesachim (Gieseler, 1912), 71 f., 105.—The dilution of wine with water is specially noted at the Passover supper, so there is no doubt that our Lord actually used a mixed chalice. Origen alone seems to deny this, for symbolic reasons; Hom. in Jerem., 12, 2 (PG, XIII, 380-381).—Although the Gospels do not expressly mention this mixing of water and wine, the oriental anaphoras in their account of the institution as a rule do; see infra.

49 Justin, Apol., I, 65; 67 (supra, I, 22 f); Ireneus, Adv. haer., V, 1; 2 (Harvey, II, 316; 319 f); Inscription of Abercius (Quasten, Mon., 24): κέρασμα διδόμου μετ’ αὕτης.

50 The material is gathered in A. Harnack, Brod und Wasser (TU, 7, 2, [Leipzig, 1891], p. 115-144).—Among the heretical sects using only water were the Ebonites mentioned by Ireneus (see note 49 below) and the Aqurii mentioned by Augustine (PL, XLII, 42). A eucharist with water appears in the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles (2nd cent.), and still survives in certain monkish circles in the 5th century (Theodoret, Hæresicarum fabularum comp., I, 20). For an answer to Harnack’s thesis that in the early Church water and wine were both considered as equally licit, see C. Ruch, “Messe,” II, 6: DThC, X, 947-955.

51 Cyprian, Ep., 63, ad Ceccilium (CSEL, 3, 701-717). In itself, so has Christ taken to Himself us and our sins. Therefore, the mixing of the water with the wine symbolizes the intimate union of the faithful with Him to whom they have bound themselves in faith; and this union is so firm that nothing can sever it, just as the water can no longer be separated from the wine. From this, Cyprian concludes: “When someone offers only wine, then the blood of Christ begins to exist without us; but when it is only water, then the people begin to exist without Christ.” These words were often repeated and extended all through the Middle ages. 52 Along with this symbolism, another made an early appearance—the reference to the blood and water which flowed from Christ’s side on Calvary. 53 But in the foreground was always the symbolism of Christ’s union with His Church. This was intensified by the statement in the Apocalypse (17:15), that in the water the peoples are represented. 54 The jubilant nations, who are represented by the singers, offer it up. As a picture of the people who still need expiation, it is blessed, while the wine as a rule is not. 55 In the course of the Middle Ages the little ceremony was made the basis for theological reflections: the commingling of the water shows pointedly that in the Mass not only is Christ offered up, but the Church too; still this can be done only by the priest who is not separated from the Church. 56 Precisely because of this symbolism, wherein he perceived the handiwork of God being belittled by human admixture, Luther declared the commingling of the water unfitting inasmuch as it was indicative of our oneness with Christ. 57 Therefore the Council of Trent explicitly defended the practice and threatened its rejection with an anathema.

In the Orient, too, there were some stubborn battles over the droplet of water. Behind the reference to the blood and water from Christ’s side,
which was also the usual conception here, the Orientals found a theological symbolism that took a somewhat different turn. Matching the acuteness of the christological strife in the Orient, the wine and water were made to represent the divine and human natures in Christ. The Armenians, whose ranks were penetrated by a radical Monophysitism (which taught that after the Incarnation there could be question of only one nature in Christ, namely, the divine), eliminated the admixture of water as early as the sixth century, at any rate surely before 632. In spite of some wavering, they held to their position, even though, in their repeated efforts to unite with Byzantium and with Rome, this point always formed a block.29

The exclusion of leaven, too, was given a similar theological signification by the Armenians. "The Chalcedonian error of the two natures" and the practice of "tainting [the Sacrament] by the fermenting of the bread and by [the admixture of] water" are occasionally mentioned in Armenian sources in one and the same breath.30 Because of this theological background the Catholic Armenians have taken up the use of water with the wine.

In the Roman liturgy of today the water that is added is only a small amount in comparison with the wine, but in the liturgies of the Orient it forms, and has formed, a goodly portion of the contents of the chalice.31 Amongst the Syrian Jacobites it has been the practice from olden times to add an equal quantity of water to the wine,32 and this practice corresponds to what was customary in the surroundings of the nascent Church.33 But in the Occident, too, there is the instance of the synod of Tribur (895), which required that the chalice contain two-thirds wine and one-third water,34 and even in the thirteenth century it was considered sufficient to insist that more wine be taken than water.35 But after that there is a definite shrinking of the minimum required by the symbolism, and at the same time the spoon appears, to make it easier to avoid exceeding the minimum.36

4. Laying the Offerings on the Altar.

The Accompanying Prayers

When the offerings of bread and wine are ready as required, there is still the problem of fitting them into a richly developed liturgy, there is still the question of how and by whom they are to be deposited on the altar, how they are to be disposed there, and particularly whether and how, in these moments before the ancient traditional Eucharistia, they are to be drawn by word and gesture into the sacrificial action.

The older Roman liturgy provided only for the well-regulated external activity,37 and for the single prayer, the oratio super oblata, which, however, was said in the name of the whole assembly in a loud voice. When transferred to Frankish territory the external action was soon modified in several ways (principally by being coupled with the offertory procession, which itself was altered through the years), and was enriched by other preparatory acts, like the incensation and the washing of the hands. In addition, each step of the activity was joined by a significant word, spoken by the liturgus not aloud, but only softly to himself. Even the prayer itself acquired further addition. This showed the same half-private character and tried especially to connect individual desires with the offering. Moreover, all this liturgical growth in the Frankish realm was not regulated from one appointed center, but emanated rather from different points and criss-crossed in the most diverse ways over all the lands of Christendom. As a result the Mass books of the later Middle Ages contain at the oblation a veritable jungle of new prayers and texts. The diversity and multiplicity of these formulas and their grouping is so great that a

29 Hanssens, II, 250-271. Even as late as the 14th century, this Monophysite argument is much in evidence among the Armenians; Hanssens, II, 261. The Armenian use of undiluted wine was formally condemned at the Trullanum (692), can. 32 (Mansi, XI, 956 f.). The dissident Armenians are the only group of ancient Christians who do not use the "mixed chalice"; Catholics, of course, follow the Roman usage.
30 So the Armenian historian Stephen Asoghik (ab. 1025), who thus describes the principal object of an Armenian synod of the year 726; Hanssens, II, 163.
31 Hanssens, II, 242-250.
32 Ibid., 244, 248.—This regulation, which already appears in a West-Syrian source in 538, is repeated in a Nestorian ruling about 900; the latter, however, declares that even up to three-fourths wine is still permissible; ibid., 248 f.
33 Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, IV, 58; 614. With Sharon wine it was the rule to take one-third wine and two-thirds water.
34 Can. 19 (Mansi, XVIII, 142). A similar rule was in force at Rouen even in 1700; de Moléon, 366.
35 Durandus, IV, 30, 21. Still even William of Melitona (d. 1200), Opusc. super misam, ed. van Dijk (Eph. liturg., 1939), 328, following his somewhat earlier Franciscan model, demands that the water be added only in modica quantitate, because (he says) we are as nothing in comparison with Christ.
36 Ibid. 446. The spoon is not mentioned in the Roman missal, but its use was approved by the SRC, Feb. 6, 1858 (n. 3064 ad 4). It is commonly used in Spain and Ireland; but elsewhere, e.g., Italy, is even at present entirely unknown.
37 Supra, I, 71-2.—For a better understanding of this chapter, it is necessary to distinguish two purposes in the offertory ceremonies: (1) the provision of the elements of bread and wine, and (2) a ritual presentation of these elements at the sacrifice, arranging them on the altar and commanding them to God. Cf. Alan Clark, "The Function of the Offertory Rite in the Mass," Eph. liturg., 64 (1950), 309-344.
classification appears well-nigh impossible. Nevertheless, if we want to get a closer understanding of the form of the oblation rite as it appears in the Roman Missal—comparatively scant though it be—we may not by-pass this jungle entirely.

The point of view which prevails today, in which the worth and importance of the Eucharistia is once more discovered and which is swayed but little by the novel medieval customs, makes it appear that the officium grew out of the fact that the officium process had vanished in the course of the Middle Ages and the vacancy which thus arose had to be filled out by these ceremonies and prayers. Besides, according to this conception, these prayers are ascribed in the first instance to the private Masses which were then coming to the fore, and which seemed to be especially adapted to such an enrichment. These are the two assertions that are repeated even by great authorities; but these opinions are in urgent need of investigation. We shall therefore try to follow, in rough outline at least, the development of the forms from their beginnings.

The first thing we notice—right within the framework of the old Roman oblation scheme—is the quiet praying of the celebrant, even before he says the secret. The eighth-century Frankish recensions of the ordines of John the Arch-chamberlain prescribe that at a solemn high Mass, after the offerings of the faithful and the clergy have been arranged on the altar, the celebrant take his own offering in hand and lift up hands and eyes to God in silent prayer. This is also indicated in the other Roman ordines. The fact that the celebrant turned to the surrounding clergy to ask for their prayers is also mentioned here.

The first brief wording of such an offering prayer is presented in the Sacramentary of Amiens. The heart of this prayer appears to be the humble offering of the gifts already prepared, which are designated as offerings of the faithful and therefore presuppose an officium process.

* Eisenhofer, II, 114.
* Eisenhofer, II, 139. The derivation from private Mass, in Bataille, Lexicon, 21: 144. The void left by the disappearance of the process, in Fortescue, 305.
* Capitulare eccl. ord. (Silva-Tarouca, 198): Ipsa vero pontificis nuncio sus propriae suae [oblationes] accipiens in manus sua [s], elevans [read: elevativa] ocula et manibus cum ipsa ad calum, orat ad Deum secreta, et completa oratione ponit eam super altare. Thereupon the archdeacon arranges the chalice, and the bishop, bowing low, pronounces the oratio super oblatam. Similarly the parallel monastic text of the Brevisarium (ibid.), where the same rite is repeated with the chalice: similiter offerat et vinum.

* Brevisarium (loc. cit.): Tunc vero acer­ dos dextera laevaque alius acerdotios postulat pro se orare.—As the bad Latin reveals, these sources bring us back before the Carolingian reform, in the middle of the 8th century (Silva-Tarouca, 180 f.; but see M. Andrieu’s new study, which dates the Brevisarium and the Capitulare towards the end of the 8th century).
* The two-part prayer reads: Hanc oblationem, quassamus, omnipotens Deus, placatum accepi, et omnia offerentium et eorum, pro quibus tibi offerent, pecunia indulge. Et in spiritu humiliatis... Domine Deus (Dan. 3: 39 f., nearly as at present). Leroquais, Les sacramentaires, I, 39 f. The whole Mass-ordo edited by the same author, Bpfl., 1927, 441.—The first formula (Hanc... indulge. Per) is also found later similarly employed: Lero­ quais, I, 126; 155, 211; II, 25; 34f.

* Cf. the texts below for the Memento of the Living.
* Amalar, De eccl. off., III, 19 (PL, CV, 1127).
* Walafrid Strabo, De exord. et incer., c. 22 (PL, CXIV, 948). Regino of Prüm, De synod. causis, I, inquis. 73 (PL, CXXIII, 190), also insists that only one oblation be offered for all intentions.

* See infra, p. 46 ff.
* The Ordo Rom. I, n. 14) PL, LXXVIII, 944, merely says of the archdeacon: composuit altare. Only the Ordo of St. Amand directs him to take the oblation and form three or five ordines on the altar (Duchesne, Christian Worship, 400).—In the mosaic of San Vitale in Ravenna two breads are placed symmetrically to the right and left of the chalice; Braun, Der christliche Alter, I, plate 6. Likewise in the mosaic of Sani’ Apollinare, where Melchisedech, represented as the celebrant, holds a third bread in his hands; Dölger, Antike u. Christentum, 1 (1929), table 10.
* Rabanus Maurus, De inst. cler., I, 33, additto (PL, CVII, 324 D). Illustrations in the Stuttgarter Bilder-Psalter (Stutt­ gart illuminated psalter) of the 9th cen­ tury; Fiala, 190.
* Ebner, 309; Fiala, 203. Clearly there is question here of hosts for the Communion of the monks.
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The next thing we specially note in these more ancient oblation prayers and the practices connected with them, is that about the year 1000 they have grown tremendously, and that they are especially extended at the start of the oblation, before the chalice is brought to the altar. They have an essentially intercessory character; the offering is done “for” (pro) certain specified purposes and persons. This is evidently the consequence of recollections of the Gallican liturgy. The trend can be traced even in Amalar. In his explanation of the offerenda he cites Old Testament re­ quirements and then names a series of requests pro quibus offerre de­ beamus sacrificia: for the fulfillment of vows which were made in affliction, for the expiation of our sins, for the royal house, for the ecclesiastical estates, for peace. His younger contemporary, Walafrid Strabo (d. 849), feels compelled to combat the opinion that a special offering and a special petition must be made for each intention, and that it was not possible to beg una petitione pro multis. Along with this another factor, reverence for certain mysteries of faith, found expression both in the prayers them­selves and in the manner in which the oblations were distributed on the altar. Indeed we encounter this trend about the same time in the East as well as in the West. While in the older Roman ordines little importance was attached to the manner of composing the oblations on the altar, in the Carolingian territory we hear of two crosses which the priest is to build de oblatas and place next to the chalice. Even as late as 1100 some missals from the orbit of Monte Cassino demand that the oblations be arranged in modum crucis. In Spain, around 845, a Bishop Ildefons gives even more detailed directions: whereas on ordinary days only one bread is laid out, on Sundays five breads are to be taken and arranged cross­wise; on Christmas and some other feast days seventeen breads, of which five are to form a cross, the other twelve a circle around the chalice; on Easter and Whitsunday forty-five breads, for which a combined cross-
form is sketched. Even in the eleventh century the Trier Liber officiorum takes a stand against those who insist that, for the sake of the number three, three oblates are always to be consecrated. Besides a regard for the Communion of the faithful, such efforts indicate also the tendency to give symbolic expression to certain offertory-motifs or at least to give prominence to symbolic numbers. If we turn our glance to the contemporaneous development of the Byzantine Mass, we find that it has gone even a step farther in the same direction. In its arrangement of the bread-oblation there are at work not only the effort to indicate symbolically certain mysteries of faith, but also the most important petitions. While the other oriental liturgies have no further prescriptions in this matter, and even on Communion days merely use and consecrate a correspondingly larger bread, in the Byzantine Mass it has gradually become a rule since about the year 1000 that in the proskomide five breads are to be laid out, of which, however, only certain particles are to be selected for the altar and there to be arranged in a fixed manner. From the first bread the “Lamb” is cut; from the second, a particle (the “All-holy”) in honor of the Blessed Virgin; from the third nine particles in honor of specified saints who are named; from the fourth, an arbitrary number for the living who are to be recommended to God; and from the fifth, similarly, a number for the dead. These all have their proper position and arrangement on the discos, the large paten on which they are carried to the altar and on which they remain lying to the left of the chalice. The portions cut from the first three breads form a row in the middle of which lies the “Lamb,” the portions for the living form a second row, those for the dead a third.

Amongst the Russians it is—or was—possible for the faithful also to contribute a particle to the second or third row, a portion of the bread directed the deacon to add one loaf for every ten communicants. Hanssens, II, 196-200.

38 Brightman, 356-359; Hanssens, II, 182-185; ibid., 185-196, the historical presentation of the practice. The typikon of the Empress Irene (about 1100) orders that seven breads are to be used; of these the fourth is offered for the emperor, the fifth for the deceased monks, the sixth for the dead of the imperial family, the seventh for the living of that family. Hanssens, II, 188 f.

39 This sketch patterned after Mercenier-Paris, La prière des églises de rite byzantin, I, 216. In the dissident churches these particles are not consecrated with the “Lamb,” but as a rule are put into the chalice before the Communion of the people and, thus moistened with the Precious Blood, are removed by means of the little spoon and given in Communion; Hanssens, II, 200-206. The particles of host-breads that remain are dispensed to the faithful after Mass as antidoron. Among the uniate Ruthenians the regulations regarding the
they had presented before Mass being used for this purpose; thus they would be drawn closer to the sacrifice.

In the Occident such a symbolic commemoration for stipulated intentions was never carried through. But for that very reason these latter have stretched to greater proportions in the prayers. Around the same year 1000 we see the bishop at a solemn high Mass stepping to the altar after the offertory procession of the people and clerics, and pronouncing a whole series, more or less long, of offertory prayers in which the most important requests are set forth. And all are formed according to one scheme that plainly displays Gallican features, though previously there were some tentative efforts to model them more or less strictly on the pattern of prayer in the Roman canon. They begin with the phrase Suscipe sancta Trinitas hanc oblationem quam tibi offero pro . . .; then the request is named and continued with an ut-clause; the conclusion can be either Gallican or Roman. The formula is met as early as the ninth century in Northern France, either as a single prayer or as a series of prayers in multiple variation. In the Mass ordinaries of the succeeding years it appears in use for the most diverse purposes; for the celebrant himself, for the congregation and its benefactors, for the King and the Christian people,

Particles have more recently been greatly modified; ibid., 183 ff.

See supra, note 6, the formula Hanc oblationem. It is obviously modeled on the Hanc igitur oblationem of the canon, which is meant for the naming of intentions. The same formula in the 11th century in the sacramentaries of Limoges (Leroquais, I, 155) and Moissac (Martène, I, 4, VIII [I, 539 A]); in Limoges still as principal oblation prayer in the Missal of 1438: Martène, I, 4, 6, 16 (I, 393 D). The formula is also in the Mozarabic Missale mis­ tum (PL, LXXXV, 536 C).— Other echoes of the canon formulae are to be seen in the terms of address, e.g., clementissime Pater: Sacramentary of Angers (10th c.): Leroquais, I, 71.—For the present-day Suscipe sancte Pater, see infra, p. 57.

Besides the Roman Per Christum the Gallican Quo vivo is often found, and occasionally also Per te Jesus Christus (thus in a Dominican missal of the 13th century: Sölch, 77, note 152) and Quod ipse præstatre dignetur (missal of Fécamp: Martène, I, 4, XXVII [I, 637; 640]). For the Gallican origin of these closing formulæ, see supra, note 59ff. Two sacramentaries of S. Thierry near Reims (second half of the 9th and end of the 10th century; see Leroquais, I, 21 f., 91 f.) agree in having the present-day formula (in memoriam) along with three others: for the king, for the priest himself, and for the dead; Martène, I, 4, IX; X (I, 545; 548 f.). So, too, the Sacramentary of S. Amand (end of the 9th c.): Lero­ quais, I, 56; similarly that of Corbie (without the formula for the priest): ibid., 27.— The Sacramentary of Amiens, which originated in the second half of the 9th century, contains the prayer cited in note 6 above, followed by Suscipe sancta Trinitas, with five divergent clauses (the four already mentioned, plus a formula for the Chris­ tian people); Leroquais (L'hir. Liturg., 1922. Ps. 479, note 3). Later versions are brought together in F. Cabrol, "Diptyques: XII," DACL, IV, 1081-1083.

Sometimes a phrase is added that implies a kind of apology for having included so many intentions: Suscipe sancta Trini­ tas, hanc oblationem quam offero impermis, ut justum est, in memoriam . . . Thus, e.g., in the Mass-ordo of Séez (PL, LXXVIII, 248 B).

Related in content to this formula is the last oblation formula which is found in the Salamanca (ed. Werner [HBS, 32], 9), inserted by Moealaich (9th c.) imme­ diately before the Sursum corda. It reads: Grata sit tibi hanc oblationem quam tibi offerimus in honorum Domini nostri Jesu Christi et in conmemorationem ostato­ rum apostolorum tuorum ac martyrum tuorum et confessorum, quorum hic religiosis specialiter recolimus n. et eorum quorum festivitas hodie celebratur et pro animabu­ bus et penitentium nostrorum, cunctis prope ad salutem. P. D.

Thirteen formulæ in the Missa Illrica: Martène, I, 4, IV (I, 509 f.); the missal of S. Lawrence in Liège (Martène, I, 4, XV [I, 590 f.]) has seven; the Mass-ordo of Gregoriemünster (ibid., XVI [I, 598 f.]) has six; an 11th century missal from S. Denis (ibid., V [I, 524 f.]) has four; likewise the missal of Troyes (ibid., VI [I, 533]) of the same period, and the Mass formulary originating in Séez (PL, LXXVII, 248 A).—For the most part, therefore, these are all Mass books from the so-called Séez group (supra, I, 93 f.).— Italian examples from the 11th century in Ebner, 171; 304 f., 337 f. Several formulæ have the same content but with a different form of address in a Milanese Mass-ordo of the 11th century: Codex sacramentorum Bergomensis (Solomines, 1903), p. 91, note 1.

A series of Mass-orde, all of this period but of different provenience, plainly indicate that there are differences in form of address in which at least the clergy participated; thus in the Missa Illrica (Martène, I, 4, IV [I, 508 B]) a rubric pre­ cedes: Tunc contiverat se suscipere obla­ tiones prebendarum aliorumque. After receiving the offering of bread properly so called, he recites this series of oblation prayers. Similarly (but without aliorumque) the Mass formulary of Séez: PL, LXXVIII, 248 A; missal of Monte Cassino (11-12th c.): Ebner, 309, ibid., 346; missal of S. Lambert of Bracte (1336): Köck, 120.—Berndolf von Constantine, Micro­ logus, c. 10 f. (PL, CLI, 983 f.) is equally clear; he mentions the procession after the offering of the gifts properly so called, and the recitation of these prayers. Similarly in the Mass-ordo at Séez (ibid., 27), the reciting of the oblation prayer. It is possible that the older arrangement was for the celebrant to say these prayers when the altar was being readied after the procession of the people and before he received the gifts of the ministers; cf. Ordo
bread-oblation had been arranged on the altar by the deacon, and very likely after his own oblation was added, but before the chalice was brought to the altar. But soon other influences began to be felt, influences that resulted from the transformation of the offertory procession. The offertory procession survived above all at the great feast day high Masses which the rubrics of the Mass books usually spoke of, but the offerings made at it were no longer brought to the altar. The bread-oblation consisted mostly of just the thin host which the priest himself offered as his own gift. Therefore, before starting these prayers the celebrant had to await this gift. And in view of its smallness, it is quite understandable that he would also wait till the chalice was prepared; this, as we shall see in a moment, was usually handed to the celebrant along with the paten. The series of offertory prayers therefore moves back to a later position. In fact there must even have been some question whether the prayers were not actually to be postponed till after all the other preparatory activities, which had meanwhile often gained a place in this spot—the hand-washing, the insensating—and so inserted immediately before the petition for prayer (Orate fratres) which had long since found a secure place; it would thus serve as the last personal concurrence in the official priestly act, the sacrificial work of the Mass which was then usually thought of as starting with the secreta. About the same time another trend was to be noticed, a trend towards limiting the number of these prayers. Bernold of Constance (d. 1100) appears as advocate for this limitation, praising, as he does, those who were content with a single formula in which they commended to God both living and dead. The formula which he means, and which he suggests the priest should say inclinatus ante altare, follows the traditional type:

Rom. II, n. 9 (PL, LXXVIII, 973 B) : orat . . . et suscipe oblatas de manu presbyterorum.

10 Mass formulary of Séez (PL, LXXVIII, 248 C) : Tunc puro corde offerat Domino oblatas altari superpulsas dicens.

11 In the Missa Illyrica the rubric before this series of prayers states that these are zuo oblationes offerentur; however, the whole series is introduced between the first and the second formulas with which the bishop offers up the oblation which he holds in his hands: Martene, I, 4, IV (I, 508 E-510 E). Both the Mass of Troyes and that of Gregorien-münster presuppose that at least at the start the celebrant holds in his hands and lifts up his own bread oblation: ibid., i, 4, VI, XVI (I, 532 C; 598 B). Cf. supra, note 26. Elsewhere a bow was prescribed, and this implies that the celebrant’s gift already lay on the altar.

12 See infra, p. 82 f. — Jungmann, Gewordene Liturgie, 105 ff.—An indication that a certain need was felt for preparatory prayers is the fact that here and there we come across the prayer Aperi Domine os ... which at present is found, slightly modified, at the beginning of the breviary. Sacramentary of S. Denis (11th c.) : Martene, I, 4, V (I, 526 B) ; Spanish missals of the 15th century: Ferreiras, 130.

13 Bernold of Constance, Micrologus, c. 11 (PL, CLI, 984) : Qua utique oratio a dilegentioribus ordinis et comprobata constatudinis observatoribus tam pro defunctis quam pro vivis sola frequentata quam qui hanc oblationem rogant quia in multo ait esse ilia lauda quam hanc. Amalar, too, had already taken a stand against the multiplication of prayers; see supra, I, 385.

Suscipe sancta Trinitas. It is the prayer we still recite with bowed head just before the Orate fratres, therefore at the later spot as indicated above; formerly this prayer was found at the very top of the list of formulas. In this place, just before the Orate fratres, and said by itself in this bowed attitude, the prayer is to be found even in an earlier period, and in Italy itself, as a component part of the Roman offertory plan there developing. Not till later does it appear at the same place in various countries outside Italy. In contrast to the present-day wording, the formula regularly showed two expansions, particularly in the older texts. The list of redemptive mysteries commemorated—a list transferred from the canon: Passion, Resurrection, Ascension—was usually enlarged to read: in memoriam in...
LAVING THE OFFERINGS ON THE ALTAR

and the efficacy of their intercession. The function of the formula as a substitute for all other versions and as an epitome of all other oratory intentions is thus only imperfectly expressed.42

Elsewhere an oration of the same type, Suscipe sancta Trinitas, continued to be connected with the presentations of the offerings, while before the Orate fratre another prayer appeared, spoken likewise in the bowed posture of these oblation prayers; the prayer is that of Azarias (Dan. 3:39 f.): In spiritu humilitatis. This formula appeared quite early as a rival to formulas of the Suscipe sancta Trinitas type.43 In the Norman-English liturgy it actually won out and appears there as the concluding oblation prayer just before Orate fratre." This is true likewise in the liturgies of many religious orders, whereas in the Roman-Italian plan it is found very early, to be sure, but usually it appears as in today's design, immediately after the offering of the chalice.44 Thus we have in our present-day arrangement two prayers which, even by the bodily posture

42 Here and there attempts were made to render the formula complete. Thus the Regensburg missal of 1485 inserts: ( . . . ad salutem) et omnibus fidelibus definitus ad requiem (Beck, 238); similarly the Freising missal of 1520 (Beck, 308) and the missal of Pisa of 1513 (Velverd, p. 15). In the present-day arrangement of the oratory prayers the mention of the dead already occurs in the first oblation prayer. And so Batiffol, Leçons, 23, had grounds for thinking the Missal of Pope Pius V could just as well have omitted our formula.

43 See supra, p. 42, note 6. Further sources, presumably from the 9th to the 11th centuries, in Lebrun, Explication, I, 284. That northern France is the point of origin and spread is confirmed by the Sacramentary of S. Denis (middle of the 11th c.); here, too, there is the rubric: inclinatus ante altare dictat; Martène, I, 4, V (I, 526 C).

44 For Normandy see examples in Martène, I, 4, XXXVII f. (I, 673 C, 678 A); Legg, Tracts, 42; 60. For England examples in Legg, Tracts, 5; 221; Marshell, 94 f. For Sweden see Velverd, 15. Likewise in Spain; see Ehner, 342; Ferreres, 130 (n. 520).

45 For the Cistercians, see Franz, 587. For the Carthusians, see Legg, Tracts, 101; Ordinarium Cart., (1923), c. 26, 20. For the Dominicans, Sölch, Hugo, 82; Bonniwell, op. cit., 186. Also in the widespread Benedictine Liber orarium of Liège: Volk, 92.

46 A third formula, of like import and purpose, originally destined (to judge from its wording) to be said right after the presentation of the chalice, disappeared in the course of time. It reads as follows: Domino Jeu Christi, qui in cruco passionis tuae de latere two sanguinem et aquam, unde tibi Ecclesiam consecrare, manare volua, suscipe hoc sacrificium altari venerandum et in conspectum divinae matris tuae, ut pro redemptione nostra et eis totius mundi in conspectum divinae matris tuae, ut pro redemptione nostra et eis totius mundi in conspectum divinae matris tuae cum odore saeculati ascendat. Qui vivis.

In the Missa Illyrica it follows immediately after the chalice is set on the altar: Martène, I, 4, IV (I, 511 B); so, too, in the Mass-ordo of Sézé (PL, LXXVIII, 249 A) and in central Italian Mass formularies of the 11th-12th centuries (Ebner, 298; 313; Fiala, 204; Muratori, 190 f.); also in a Missal of 1336 from St. Lambrecht (Kök, 121). In the Missal of St. Lawrence in Liège it accompanies the raising of the chalice: Martène, I, 4, XV (I, 591 D). But at the same time in some central Italian formularies of the 11th-12th centuries it appears immediately before the Orate fratre, in one instance marked as exchangeable with the formula Suscipe sancta Trinitas (Ebner, 301) and with the rubric: Tunc inclinet se sacerdos ante altare et dictat (ibid., cf. Ebner, 296; 341).
with which they are said, give an indication that they are meant to anticipate the oblation prayers of the canon.\footnote{Both formulas as at present in the Mass formulary of the 11th century from Monte Cassino: Ebner, 340 (Cod. C 32); cf. 309 f. But generally the use of both formulas is infrequent in Italy till the Missale Romanum Curiae became common and the Franciscans put in their appearance (cf. Ebner, 314). However, cf. for Lyons, starting only in the 13th century: Ebner, 316; Martène, 1, 4, XXXIII (1, 659); for the south German area, Beck, 237 f.; Kock, 122.}

Another point to remark in this connection is that even in the more recent texts where these prayers are employed as accompaniment to the external act of offering, yet the endeavor is made to join the bowed posture with the gesture of offering. With a demeanor that is quite courteous—forms of social intercourse do recur often enough in divine worship—the gifts are presented to the Almighty while In spiritu humilitatis \footnote{The commentary of William de Gouda which first appeared in 1486, Expositio mysteriorum missae, has this to say: Electoavit iitare calice, parum susceptum, debeere affectum, humili corde praecus, genibus parum flexis, ut ille dignissimus dignetur aspiciere: In spiritu humilitatis. Quoted in M. Smits van Waesbergh, "Die Missverklaring van Meester Simon van Wenlo" (Ons geestelijck Erf, 1941), 303. This refers to the double offering of chalice and paten, as it occurred according to Netherland formularies; cf. ibid., 325-327.} or Suscipe sancta Trinitas is said.\footnote{The principle that every action should be embellished by an accompanying statement is noticeable, for instance, in the personal discipline as early as the 9th century and becomes more and more operative with time; Jungmann, Die lateinischen Bussenriten, 91 ff., 212 f. The formulas of absorption have their origin here.}

Not much later in origin is a second rank of text elements, but these are much more intimately connected with the external rite and essentially directed to the purpose of explaining the visible activity.\footnote{Brinktrin, Die feierliche Paspnmesse, 18.—In the Roman stationary Masses of the 7th century (see supra, I, 71) two deacons stretched the long corporal over the altar from end to end. The deacon's ritual spreading of the corporal at the Credo must be viewed as a trace of that more ample ceremony of the early Middle Ages; see Lebbe, The Mass: A Historical Commentary (Westminster, 1949), 54-55.} We can therefore understand them best if we combine our study of them with an exposition of the outer activity itself.

First of all, the altar has to be readied. At a high Mass even today, immediately before the offertory—or during the Credo if there is one—the corporal enclosed in the burse is carried by the deacon to the altar and spread out, while otherwise the priest carries it to the altar when he comes in, and spreads it out before Mass. This corporal is nowadays reduced to a very modest size; only at a solemn papal Mass does it cover the entire width of the altar, and in this case it is laid out over the altar by a (Cardinal) deacon and the subdeacon at the start of the offering of gifts.\footnote{Cf. supra, I, 79: 94.} This was the practice already in the Roman services of the 8th century.\footnote{Central Italian Mass books of the 12th century ordered the priest to say Ps. 67: 29 f. (Confirma hoc . . . munera) and to add: In two consecuta Domine hoc muneca nostra sit placa, ut nos tibi placere valeamus. Per. Ebner, 333; cf. 337, 340; Fiala, 203. Another formula (Per hoc sacrificium salutare) in a Florentine missal of the 11th century; Ebner, 300.—The formula In tranquillo also in the Mass of the papal chapel about 1290; ed. Brinktrin (Eph. liturg., 1937), 201; and with the rubric: Ad corporalia dispensatio, in Spanish Mass-books even of the 15th-16th centuries, Ferreres, 126.}

When the altar is ready, the gifts can be brought to the altar and properly arranged. For this, too, there was a well-balanced plan in the Roman stationary services: the archdeacon, assisted by the subdeacons, selects the oblation from amongst the gifts offered by the people and disposes it on the altar; the pope puts the bread-offering of the clerics and his own next to it; the archdeacon then places the chalice beside the bread offering of the pope.\footnote{Martène, 1, 4, IV (I, 508-512); the apologia, pp. 506 ff., 509 CD.—Apologia were also inserted at the hand-washing: ibid., I, 4, V (I, 525 f.).—A prayer in the apologia style is already mentioned for this location by Amalar, De ecle. off., III (PL, CV, 1130 C), when he says that the priest, before receiving the gifts of the clergy,} All this without a word being spoken. But such silence was intolerable to the Frankish liturgical concept. In the rite as we find it in the North about the year 1000, a rite developed upon the groundwork of the Roman arrangement as adapted in the Frankish realm, we see how fully this supposed deficiency was provided for. The greatest wealth is supplied in the so-called Missa Ilyrica, \footnote{Supra, I, 71-72.—The practice of placing the chalice to the right, the host to the left continued into the later Middle Ages. However, according to the Mass rubrics of the Dominicans proposed by Humbert in 1256 the host was placed in front of the chalice, as is done now in the Roman Mass. See Wm. Bonniwell, A History of the Dominican Liturgy (N.Y., 1944), 125 and note 5.} even if we take no account of the overgrowth of apologie which we here encounter both at the start of the offering and again in the course of it.\footnote{Another point to remark in this connection is that even in the more recent texts where these prayers are employed as accompaniment to the external act of offering, yet the endeavor is made to join the bowed posture with the gesture of offering. With a demeanor that is quite courteous—forms of social intercourse do recur often enough in divine worship—the gifts are presented to the Almighty while In spiritu humilitatis or Suscipe sancta Trinitas is said. Not much later in origin is a second rank of text elements, but these are much more intimately connected with the external rite and essentially directed to the purpose of explaining the visible activity. We can therefore understand them best if we combine our study of them with an exposition of the outer activity itself.}

Laying the offerings on the altar

The comment of William de Gouda which first appeared in 1486, Expositio mysteriorum missae, has this to say: Electoavit iitare calice, parum susceptum, debeere affectum, humili corde praecus, genibus parum flexis, ut ille dignissimus dignetur aspiciere: In spiritu humilitatis. Quoted in M. Smits van Waesbergh, "Die Missverklaring van Meester Simon van Wenlo" (Ons geestelijck Erf, 1941), 303. This refers to the double offering of chalice and paten, as it occurred according to Netherland formularies; cf. ibid., 325-327. Camaldolese Sacramentary of the 13th century: patenam cum oblatis accepti et inclinantis se a altare supplerici dicti hunc orationem: Suscipe sancta Trinitas; Ebner, 355.—Similar was the custom in England about the same period: The priest picks up the chalice, and the paten, et inclinantis parum elevat calicem, ut hanc manu offerens Domino sacrificium . . . : Suscipe sancta Trinitas; Frere, The Use of Sarum, 75. As late as 1617 the Cistercian missal orders: elevatit patena cum pane et calice et genuflectens dicit; Schneider (Cist Chr., 1926), 349.

The principle that every action should be embellished by an accompanying statement is noticeable, for instance, in the personal discipline as early as the 9th century and becomes more and more operative with time; Jungmann, Die lateinischen Bussenriten, 91 ff., 212 f. The formulas of absorption have their origin here. Brinktrin, Die feierliche Paspnmesse, 18.—In the Roman stationary Masses of the 7th century (see supra, I, 71) two deacons stretched the long corporal over the altar from end to end. The deacon's ritual spreading of the corporal at the Credo must be viewed as a trace of that more ample ceremony of the early Middle Ages; see Lebbe, The Mass: A Historical Commentary (Westminster, 1949), 54-55.

Ordor Rom. I, n. 12 (PL, LXXVIII, 943); Ordo Rom. II, n. 9 PL, LXXVIII, 972 ff.). Whereas in the early centuries only the altar coverings made of precious stuffs—from which our antependium derives—remained on the altar outside divine service, by the 7th century it was customary to leave cloths made of linen on the altar continually. A trace of the more ancient practice is to be seen even today on Good Friday when the altar cloths are put on the altar only at the start of service. Among these was the palla corporalis (so called because it came into contact with the body of Christ), our present-day corporal; it was so folded that after the host-bread the chalice were set on the altar it could be used as a covering over them. But since the later Middle Ages a special pall for the chalice was prepared. Braun, Die liturgischen Paramente, 184-192; 205-212; Eisenhofer, 1, 353-360. In some countries two corporals were—and are—employed, Ferreres, 126, n. 499 f. Even today the Carthusians still use only a corporal folded over the chalice; Ordinarium Cart. (1932), c. 26, 20.
EVEN AT THE PRESENTATION OF THE GIFTS DURING THE OFFERTORY PROCESSION, EACH OF THE DONORS IS TO PRONOUNCE A LITTLE PHRASE, THE RECIPIENT RESPONDING EACH TIME WITH A COUNTER-PHRASE. "THEN WHEN THE DEACON ACCEPTS FROM THE SUBDEACON THE BREAD-OBLATION INTENDED FOR THE CELEBRATING BISHOP, THIS ACT IS TO BE ACCOMPANYED BY A BLESSING: ACCETUM SIT OMNIPOTENTI DEO ET OMNINUS SANTIS EIS SACRIFICIUM TUUM." WHEN HE HANDS IT TO THE BISHOP, THE LATTER RECEIVES IT WITH A SIMILAR BLESSING, AND THE DEACON MEANWHILE IN HIS TURN PRONOUNCES A BLESSING, AND WITH IT OFFERS UP THE GIFT TO GOD. THEN THE BISHOP HIMSELF OFFERS UP THE GIFT TO GOD, EITHER WITH A SIMILAR BLESSING, WHICH COMPRISES APPROXIMATELY THE FIRST HALF OF OUR PRESENT-DAY SUSCIPTE SANCTE PATER, OR WITH SOME OTHER SUITABLE FORMULA; AND THEN follows the long series of oblation prayers which were spoken of in a previous paragraph.

other formulas were also in use. Then the priest lifts chalice and paten just as they were handed to him and pronounces a brief oblation for both together. In the Dominican liturgy it is a version of the *Suscipe sancta Trinitas* short but enriched as to contents; similarly for the most part in England, often also in France, where the same oblation rite had a wide influence.

now the priest’s response begins with *Quid retribuam?* *Miscula O.P.* (1899), 18, 27; the deacon’s phrase is dropped at a simple Mass; *ibid.*, 18. Similarly in Tongern about 1413; *de Coswarem*, 126.—According to the Benedictine *Libcr ordinarivs* of Liège this phrase is transferred to the priest, who continues with *Quid retribuam* (Volk, 92). Likewise in a Sacramentary of the 12th century from Camaldoli (Ebner, 296). Consistently, then, the priest says: *In nomine et redem*; thus in the Rhenish missal (13th c.) described by F. Rödel (*JL*, 1924, 84; cf. missal of Riga: *v. Bruiningk*, 81.—Without the deacon’s phrase frequently in many later Masses of the 12th century: Martène, 1, 4, 16 (1, 393, B.D.); *ibid.*, 1, 4, XVII; XXXIII (1, 600 E; 659 B); *Legg, Tracts*, 41, 59.—A Premonstratensian missal of 1539 has expanded the formula with reference to the *Panem celestem et calicem salutaris accipiam; Waevelghem*, 60, note 1.—According to the Cologne Sacramentary of the 14th century (Franz, 587) and in the rite of St. Pol-de-Léon (Martène, 1, 4, XXXIV (1, 662 E)).

**Laying the Offerings on the Altar**

But in other places the oblation rite was soon broken up further. At first, indeed, the paten and host were regularly laid on the chalice. Sometimes a blessing was pronounced over them. Then, however, the priest took first the paten and, with an accompanying prayer, offered up the host; only then did he offer up the chalice, unless this was still committed to the deacon to do.

For such a double oblation there were already a number of precedents in the earlier stage of the oblation rite, when the chalice was still handed to the celebrant separately. In the *Misra Illrica* there is even the beginning of the late Roman formula for the offering of the paten: *Suscipe sancta Pater,* and the complete formula for the chalice: *Oferimus* both encharged by other texts. Still, even this double accompaniment did not seem to have had the import of a real prayer, at least not that of a priestly oration. Especially with the chalice a simple and brief blessing was frequently thought sufficient. But little by little the details of the later
Roman oratory plan, already present in essentials in the Missa Ilyrica, became more evident, particularly in Italian Mass ordines from the eleventh and twelfth centuries on. The psalm verses that accompanied the handling of the chalice disappear. Alongside a short contemplation passage which was often used alone,28 the otherwise infrequent Suscipe sancte Pater (in its full form) now appears for the offering of the host.29 After the admixture of the water there follows the offering of the chalice with the formula Oferimus.30 But for a long time it was not a general rule that the celebrant raise paten and chalice above the altar,31 although in some scattered instances this had been done even in very early times.32 Add to these, besides, the invocation of the sanctificator, the two prayers, In spiritu humilitatis and Suscipe sancta Trinitas, which were to be said bowed, and were thus somewhat independent.33

It is not entirely an accident that the formula for the paten retains the singular number which predominates in these medieval oblation texts, while the formula for the chalice, Oferimus, is couched in the plural. For the latter is found not only put in the mouth of the priest,34 but instead in that of the deacon, who places the chalice on the altar and accompanies this with these words, which he would then be saying in the celebrant's name.35 Soon, however, there is an insistence on the fact that the deacon keeps the chalice with wine, which he has carried to the altar, and offers it up, and then arranges it on the altar, but the conclusion is drawn precisely from the Oferimus, that in reality the priest is acting through the deacon and that the priest must therefore pronounce the Oferimus36 or at least say it with the deacon.37 This latter arrangement has in a sense persisted, with the deacon touching the chalice and supporting the priest's arm, and pronouncing the words with the priest,38 but it is the priest, and not the deacon, who is now considered the chief offerer of the chalice. Thus, in the present-day solemn Mass, there is still a vestige of that older order in which the deacon was entrusted with the chalice,39 that older relationship which is mentioned in the legend where St. Lawrence says to Pope Xystus: Nunc quam sacrificium sine ministro offerre consueveras . . . cui commissisti Dominici sanguinis dispensationem.40

A change which was to be found quite early in the rite of the Roman curia, and was then confirmed by the reform of Pius V, consisted in that the preparation of the chalice, or in the first instance at least, the way of exception the prayer is found in the singular, to be said by the priest alone: Central Italian sacramentary of the 12th century (Ebner, 340); Zips missal of the 14th century (Rad6, 71).

28 Ordo Rom. XIV, n. 53 (PL, LXXXIII, 1164 A).—Likewise a Pressburg Missal of the 15th c.: Javór, 115.

29 Durandus, IV, 30, 17. That Durandus also had in mind the ceremony of priest and deacon together elevating the chalice is excluded by the context.

30 Rit. serv. VIII, 9.—For the first time in 1485 in the Roman pontifical of Patrizio Piccolomini; see de Puniet, Das römische Pontifikale, I, 185.—The rite is modeled on that at the closing doxology of the canon; see infra, p. 267 ff.

31 Supra, I, 71, 73.

32 Ambrose, De off., I, 41 (PL, XVI, 84 f.).
admixture of the water, was transferred to the altar and was thus incorporated into the oblation rite. According to the customs prevalent outside Italy this was all taken care of, as a rule, at some earlier moment, after the Epistle, or already at the beginning of Mass, even in Masses celebrated without levites.  

But according to the rule that was henceforth followed, the subdeacon at a high Mass, after the Oremus, brings up the paten with the host, but along with it only an empty chalice or a chalice containing wine alone, hands these to the deacon, and then, without special formality, pours (wine and) water into the chalice. The act of conveying the gifts to the altar—an act of some liturgical significance—thus suffers a certain impoverishment, even at a high Mass where, after the disappearance of the offertory procession, it might still have been continued.

The attempt had been made, time and again, to keep, at least at high Mass, the symbolism inherent in the impressive transfer of the gifts. Durandus still mentions the practice of having a subdeacon bring to the altar the paten and chalice along with the corporal, to be followed by two singers, one carrying the host in a little cloth, and a cruet of wine; the other, a cruet of water which the subdeacon uses for mingling with the wine.  

The usage did not take root. Still, there is an expression of great reverence in the very way chalice and paten have been handled these many centuries. When the gifts were to be carried over to the altar, the cleric whose duty it was to see to this, following an ancient ordinance, threw a veil around his shoulders, and touched the sacred vessels only through this medium.  

Another practice on the increase was one prescribing that the deacon, too, when handing the chalice and paten to the priest, do this mediate mappula.  

Even in the most ancient Roman ordines when the deacon put the chalice in its place, and likewise when he lifted it aloft at the end of the canon, he used a special cloth for this, the offertorium; and the paten, too, was held by the cleric entrusted with it, by means of a veil—called by such names as sindo, linctum—until he handed it back before the tractio.  

This concealing of the paten was then transferred to the non-solemn Mass.
There is also an early mention of the kissing of the hand when paten and chalice are handed to the celebrant.\textsuperscript{126} The sign of the Cross over the altar, which the celebrant makes with both the paten and the chalice after the oblation is somewhat more recent,\textsuperscript{127} but it had its forerunners even in early times.\textsuperscript{128}

After the preparation of the chalice was thus transferred once more to the altar, texts to accompany this action also begin to come to our notice. It stood to reason, for instance, that in the Roman liturgy as accommodated to Frankish tradition, the admixture of water, whose symbolism had so early and so generally become the object of profound consideration, would not long remain without accompanying words. That type of oblation rite which we first encounter in various scattered points along the northern border of the Carolingian realm, and then in the eleventh century in the Italian sphere affected by the Cluniac movement,\textsuperscript{130} presents a definite form for this, one which has been retained more or less in the Roman Mass of the present day. This form is as follows: the water is put into the chalice at the altar itself, before the offering of the chalice;\textsuperscript{131} and meanwhile is said the oration, \textit{Deus qui}

\textsuperscript{126} According to Innocent III, \textit{De s. alt. mysterio}, I, 58 (PL, CCXVII, 833 f.), the priest makes a sign of the cross over the gifts previous to receiving the paten and the host, the water and the chalice (and likewise the thurible).—There are isolated instances of a sign of the cross over the host-bread since the 4th century. Augustine, \textit{En. Joh. tract.}, 118, 5 (PL, XXXV, 1950); \textit{Canones Basilii}, c. 99 (Riedel, 276).—In St. Ephraem's locality the Marcionites marked a cross with red wine over the eucharistic bread: \textit{Dolger, Anthat}. u. \textit{Christentum}, 1 (1929), 30 ff.—This sign with the cross was not customary in the older Roman liturgy; nevertheless \textit{Ordo Rom.}, I, n. 14 (PL, LXXVIII, 944 B), says of the deacon who is to pour the wine into the chalice: \textit{infundit faciens crucem in calicis}.—He forms a cross as he pours. Cf. \textit{Ordo Rom. II}, n. 9 (PL, LXXVII, 973 B).

\textsuperscript{127} Missal at Monte Cassino (11th c.: Ebnor, 309.—\textit{Ordo Eccl. Lateran.} (about 1140; Fischer, 82, I, 33, 58), and here also when handling the water—\textit{Ordo Rom. XIV}, n. 53 (PL, LXXVIII, 1163 D).—According to \textit{Ordo Rom. I, n. 18 (PL, LXXVIII, 945 B) the deacon kisses the paten when he receives it after the \textit{Pater noster}.}

\textsuperscript{128} Missal of Montecassino (11-12th c.: Ebnor, 309.—\textit{Ordo Eccl. Lateran.} (about 1140; Fischer, 82, I, 33, 58), and here also when handling the water—\textit{Ordo Rom. XIV}, n. 53 (PL, LXXVIII, 1163 D).—According to \textit{Ordo Rom. I, n. 18 (PL, LXXVIII, 945 B) the deacon kisses the paten when he receives it after the \textit{Pater noster}.}

\textsuperscript{129} Missal of Monte Cassino (11th-12th c.: Ebnor, 309; Biala, 203.—Where paten and chalice were offered together under one ceremony, the cross was made with both together; Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{130} Mentioned for the paten by Durandus, IV, 30, 17; for the chalice in \textit{Ordo eccl. Lateran.}: Fischer, 83, I, 2. As a rite performed by the deacon with the chalice, in Benedictine missals of the 11th-12th century: Ebnor, 309; Biala, 203.—Where paten and chalice were offered together under one ceremony, the cross was made with both together; Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{131} For a practice mentioned since the 13th century: Durandus, IV, 30, 29; Frere, \textit{The Use of Sarum}, I, 75. But even at the end of the Middle Ages the practice was not universal; according to the \textit{Ordinarium of Coutance} (1557) the priest places the paten under the Mass-book, and the archdeacon kisses the paten when he receives it after the \textit{Pater noster}. 

\textsuperscript{132} Hence, a Mass-book of the 13th century: \textit{Ordinarium Sancti Martini}, in \textit{Liber Ro- mae} (1180; Legg, Tracts, 58).

\textsuperscript{133} Missal of Monte Cassino (11th-12th c.: Ebnor, 309.—\textit{Ordo Eccl. Lateran.} (about 1140; Fischer, 82, I, 33, 58), and here also when handling the water—\textit{Ordo Rom. XIV}, n. 53 (PL, LXXVIII, 1163 D).—According to \textit{Ordo Rom. I, n. 18 (PL, LXXVIII, 945 B) the deacon kisses the paten when he receives it after the \textit{Pater noster}.}

\textsuperscript{134} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{135} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{136} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{137} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{138} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{139} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{140} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{141} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{142} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{143} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{144} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}

\textsuperscript{145} Missal of Evreux (about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 B); cf. a Cologne \textit{Ordo celebrandi} of the 14th century: \textit{Binterim, 4, 3, p. 222.}
the side of Christ must have been very much a favorite; it did, of course, come within the compass of the ordinary allegorism which explained the Mass in terms of Christ's Passion. The notion was kept alive also by a widely-used oblivation formula which was spoken over the chalice instead of one of the other formulas mentioned earlier; but more especially by the regulation that the chalice was to stand on the altar to the right of the host quasi sanguinem Domini susceptrus, an interpretation which is indeed more recent than the custom upon which it is founded, but which recurs, along with the regulation itself, in nearly all the commentaries on the Mass of the later Middle Ages, and was not generally discarded, until the basis for it was removed by the Missal of Pius V.

If the symbolism of the water was thus to be emphasized, at the same time the water was also to be blessed. This is done at the present time by a sign of the Cross which is coupled with the words per huius aquae et vini mysterium, and which is omitted at a Requiem Mass because all formal blessings therein are bestowed only on the dead. In the oldest Roman ordines, as we have already seen, the act of pouring the water into the chalice was done in the form of a cross. In medieval missals this blessing was not infrequently accented even more forcefully. Perhaps it was as much for the sake of this blessing as for a greater emphasis on the symbolism that the addition of the water was reserved to the priest; at any rate the mixing of the water had to take place at the altar, with the result that the pouring of the wine was likewise transferred to the altar.

For the blessing itself various formulas were handed down. According to the Pontifical of Durandus, the bishop spoke as follows when he blessed the water at the Mass of his chaplain: Ab illo benedictar, cuius spiritus super eam ante mundi exordium ferobaratur. According to English Missal books, the celebrant said the following over the water: Ab eo sit benedicta de cuius latere exivit sanguis et aqua. In nomine Patris. Elsewhere the priest used words analogous to those used at the commingling of the species before Communion: Fiat commixtio et consecratio vini et aquae in nomine D. n. J. C., de cuius latere exivit sanguis et aqua, or: Fiat commixtio vini et aquae pariter in nomine Patris et Filiæ et Spiritus Sancti; or simply—apparently the original way—In nomine Patris et Filiæ et Spiritus Sancti. Most often such a blessing, coupled with the sign of the Cross, was appended to the formula which was designed to explain the commixture, or it was even combined with it into a single formula.

The later Middle Ages were a thriving era for blessings. All the products of nature and all the objects of human use were recipients of the Church's benedictions. No wonder, then, that a blessing was bestowed here at the oblation not only on the water, but also on all the other gifts which were destined for so exalted a purpose. Thus we come to a final layer of texts that were built up in the medieval oblation rite, a series of benediction formulas of which one, the Veni sanctificator, has secured a permanent place in the Roman Missal. Since for the most part these blessings take the form of an invocation, calling down God's blessing, the power
of the divine Spirit, or simply the Holy Ghost, we can also talk of epikletic formulas.\textsuperscript{188}

The simplest form\textsuperscript{189} is the one mentioned in a previous paragraph: the name of the triune God is mentioned at the preparatory action. In the Carthaginian rite the priest sets the chalice (with the paten resting upon it) on the altar with the words: \textit{In nomine Patris . . . Amen.}\textsuperscript{190} Or the same trinitarian formula stands at the start of the whole oblation rite,\textsuperscript{191} or is correlated to the various parts of the action;\textsuperscript{192} or, above all, it is tied in with other epikletic formulas\textsuperscript{193} where, however, as an introductory it is

\textit{supra}; cf. also the petition for a blessing at the end of the formula \textit{Ex lateri: supra}, note 116. Multiple blessings by way of simple unaccompanied crosses were customary among the ancient Irish monks; cf. Andrieu, \textit{supra}.

However, it would be misleading to talk here precisely of the epiklesis, as Gihr, \textit{Ordo celebrandi}, I, 3, p. 223.—Likewise in the Mass-ordo of St. Po\-dles Léon: Martène, 1, 4, XXXIV (1, 662 ff.), where the trinitarian formula also follows the \textit{Veni sanctificator}—therefore it appears four times in all. It also appears four times in the \textit{Ordinarium} of Coutance of 1559: Legg., \textit{Tracts}, 59 ff.—It is also found in four places in the offertory according to the Mass-arrangement at Augsburg in the 15th century, if the blessing of the wine is included: \textit{Benedictio Dei super hunc cunctem creaturum} (Franz, 752); in the Augsburg missal of 1386 (Hoeyncx, 373) this formula is still absolutely wanting. In a Salzburg Missal of the 15th century the traditional expression is found three times during the preliminary arrangement and preparation of chalice and host, and four times during the offertory; Rad6, 141.— Cf. also the \textit{In nomine Patris} at the start of the incensation in the Roman oblation-plan of the 13-14th century, in Salmon (\textit{Eph. liturg.}, 1929), 512 f.

In particular the formula \textit{Sit signatum} (or \textit{Sit benedictum}; see below, note 144) often begins with \textit{In nomine Patris}. Thus already in the Missa Illryica: Martène, 1, 4, 1V (1, 511 C), and in a Central Italian sacramentary of the 11th century: Ebner, 298; cf. 327—Similarly the \textit{Liber ordinarius} of the Liege missal of the 16th century: Smits van Waebershe, 325; cf. \textit{Liber ordinarius} of Liege: Volk, 92.—The \textit{Veni sanctificator} sometimes concludes with \textit{In nomine Patris}, and also the formula with which the host is laid on the altar. Legg., \textit{Tracts}, 41.—In the Cologne missal of 1498 the trinitarian formula is also at the start, before the \textit{Quid retribuam}; Smits van Waeberhje, 327; the development was not so far advanced yet in the 14th century. \textit{Ordo celebrandi}, Binterim, IV, 3, p. 223. 

As a sort of condensation of this double formula there follows in many cases a further formula which often occurs by itself; it begins that the double earthly offering might be exalted into the single holy one: \textit{In nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi sit sacrificium istud immaculatum et a Deo vivo et vero adunatum et benedictum}.

When the formula already mentioned, this, too, appears first along the northern rim of the former Carolingian domain,\textsuperscript{194} then later chiefly in Italy,\textsuperscript{195} where still another
parallel formula is found as an alternative.\textsuperscript{144} Even here, however, neither of the formulas held their ground, but on the contrary were supplanted by a third, which had put in an appearance early in the ninth century in the Irish Stowe Missal\textsuperscript{145} and which is still found in the present day Missale Romanum, namely, the prayer Veni sanctificator, which was but sparsely spread in Italy before the appearance of the Missale Romanum Curiae.\textsuperscript{146} Whereas in Italian Mass ordines it usually stands in the same spot it occupies at present and amid similar surroundings,\textsuperscript{147} in German ordines it regularly followed the two Sanctifica formulas as a sort of recapitulation,\textsuperscript{148} thus accentuating its significance as a blessing.\textsuperscript{149} But it was also used in these ways. In some few Mass ordines the Veni Sanctificator introduces the offertory.\textsuperscript{150} According to an ordo which circulated widely on both sides of the English Channel, it concluded the entire rite, coming in just before the Orate fratres.\textsuperscript{151} On the other hand, other formulations of the invocation of heaven’s power and grace seldom proved even relatively permanent.\textsuperscript{152}

In the territory just indicated, another phenomenon should be recorded because it throws some light on the frame of mind in which this epikletic formula was spoken. Towards the end of the Middle Ages both in Normandy and England—and elsewhere, too—we encounter not only one of the invocation formulas mentioned above, but also the hymn Veni Creator.\textsuperscript{153} The wording of the formula Veni sanctificator does not neces-

\textsuperscript{144} Again it is the formula which makes its initial appearance in the Missa Illyrica [in nomine F. et E. et Sp. 3.] sit sanctum, sanctificatum et benedictum hoc sacrifcium praeptum tibi is said after the first of the oblation prayers. In the Missa Illyrica, about 1030: ibid., IV (I, 511), after the incensing: hoc sacrifcium tibi praeptum. Quis vivis.

\textsuperscript{145} Ebner, 306, 327, 333, 340, 348. Sometimes a much expanded version is found, Veni sanctificator omnium, Sancte Spiritus, et sanctificatum hanc corporis et sanguinis nostrorum sanctificationem, et animum nostrum praeptum, et benedictum in hanc hostiam invisiibilem, sicut in patre hostias visibilibus descendent. Missal at Monte Cassino of the 11th century: cf. ibid., 328; Missal of St. Vincent-on-Voltaio: Fila, 205. Likewise in a Minorite missal: Ebner, 314; also in the missal of the chapter church of St. Lambrecht, 1336: Köck, 121.—The second highest of the prayer goes back to a prayer for the incensation of the gifts in the Missa Illyrica (Martène, 511 D), where the connection with the epiklesis of the canon is patent: Memores...petimus..ut ascendent.. et descendat... Obviously some Gallican schema is here belated at work; cf. Missale Gothicum: Muratori, II, 654; cf. ibid., 548, 699 f., 705; Lietzmann, Messe et Herrnhufl, 93 ff.

Akin, too, is the position it occupies in most of the Netherlands Mass-plans: Smits van Waesberghe, 326 f.; cf. ibid.

\textsuperscript{146} The sources as above, note 141. Likewise in the German Mass-plans enumerated in note 140.

\textsuperscript{147} The 13th century missal of Schlügle (Waigelham, 61, note 0) entitles the formula: Benedicte ponis et colicis.

\textsuperscript{148} Liber ordinarius of Liége (Volck, 92);
sarily force us to refer the invocation to the Holy Spirit, and thus to include in the series of oratory prayers and of the Mass prayers in general a form of address alien to them. Still, in view of the fact just noticed, there can hardly be any doubt that the invocation was often so understood in the Middle Ages. In fact, in some instances the address to the Holy Ghost is explicitly included in the *Veni sanctificator.* Notice, finally, that the various texts that accompany the oblation ritual—exclusive of the oblation prayers themselves—do not pretend to have the character or the import of orations and are therefore couched in the freer forms of simple invocations and blessings.

5. The Incensation

After the gifts have been deposited on the altar, there follows at high Mass yet another ceremony, the incensation. Today, and already in the *Missale Romana Curiae,* it has been so thoroughly incorporated into the course of the oratory, that, besides the washing of hands, there is still another oblation act to follow, whereas in other places, and according to the original plan, it formed the conclusion, coming immediately before the address to the Holy Spirit is even excluded by the wording of the text; thus, in two Norman texts we find: *Omnipotens Pater,* *benefic . . . hoc sacrificium*; Martène, 1, 4, XXXVI (I, 673 C); *Domine Deus omnipotens, benedic et sanctifica; Martène,* XXXVI (I, 637 E).

Two Italian missals of the 11-12th century (Ebner, 310; 328; cf. supra, note 146): *Veni sanctificator omnium, Sancte Spiritus.* Another from St. Peter (ibid., 333) has: *Veni Spiritus sanctificator omnium.*—A Sarum ordinarium of the 13th century (Legg, Tracts, 221) has: *Veni Sancte Spiritus, benedic* . . . *—The Mozarabic *Missale mixtum* (PL, LXXXV, 113 A) also has: *Veni, Sancte Spiritus sanctificator.* The Angulian missal of 1386 contains an obvious borrowing from the beginning of the hymn: *Veni creator et sanctificator,* Hoeynek, 373; cf. the somewhat varied formula in the Augsburg arrangement of the end of the 15th century. Franz, 752 e—According to the commentary of Balthasar of Pforta, which appeared in 1494, it was customary at that time to recite either *Veni invisibilis sanctificator* or the antiphon *O rex gloria . . . mitte promissum Patris in nos Spiritum veritatis,* Franz, 587.

*But cf. supra, I, 317, note 1.*

*The incensation at the conclusion of the oratory is first mentioned by Amalar;* but in a special preface to his work, written about 832 after his trip to Rome, he indicates that this custom of incensation was unknown in Rome. For that reason it was long contested even in the North, until the date when it at last found entry into Rome itself.

In Roman usage incense was burned in fixed braziers; in addition, incense was carried about at the entrance procession, at the procession with the Gospel book, and at the recess; but there was no real incensation. Incensation is therefore a fruit of Carolingian liturgical development. In particular, the incensing at the oratory which we are talking about became far more prominent than the incensions at the beginning of Mass and at the Gospel. And this prominence has been retained in our current liturgy, as is seen in the fact that it is richest in prayers and that the incensing of persons is most developed.

The outline of the present-day form is already encountered in the tenth century. The Mass *ordo* of Sèzé has the incensation of the gifts, of the altar, and of those standing around, along with all the prayers that are customary today, while several more recent Mass *ordines* are content with one or the other of these formulas. We thus meet here first of all a prayer for the moment the incense is being put into the censer: *Per inter-

---

**The Incensation**

Orate fratres.* The incensation at the conclusion of the oratory is first mentioned by Amalar; but in a special preface to his work, written about 832 after his trip to Rome, he indicates that this custom of incensation was unknown in Rome. For that reason it was long contested even in the North, until the date when it at last found entry into Rome itself. In Roman usage incense was burned in fixed braziers; in addition, incense was carried about at the entrance procession, at the procession with the Gospel book, and at the recess; but there was no real incensation. Incensation is therefore a fruit of Carolingian liturgical development. In particular, the incensing at the oratory which we are talking about became far more prominent than the incensions at the beginning of Mass and at the Gospel. And this prominence has been retained in our current liturgy, as is seen in the fact that it is richest in prayers and that the incensing of persons is most developed.

The outline of the present-day form is already encountered in the tenth century. The Mass *ordo* of Sèzé has the incensation of the gifts, of the altar, and of those standing around, along with all the prayers that are customary today, while several more recent Mass *ordines* are content with one or the other of these formulas. We thus meet here first of all a prayer for the moment the incense is being put into the censer: *Per inter-

---

*In this thrilling detail of medieval liturgical evolution two separate groups are sharply differentiated. The first arrangement is found in the Sacramentary of the Abbey of S. Denis (11th c.): Martène, I, 4, V (I, 525 f.), and then in Central Italian abbatial churches: Ebner, 290, 301, 310, etc. Cf. also the Benedictine Mass-plans in Köck, 120, 121.—The other arrangement, with the incensation immediately before the *Orate fratres,* is found in the 10th century Sacramentary of S. Thierry: Martène, I, 4, X (I, 549 C); Missa Ilyrica: ibid., IV (I, 511); Mass-ordo of Sèzé (PL, LXXVIII, 249). Also later outside of Italy, e.g., in Salzburg: Köck, 124 f.*

*Amaral, De eccl. off., III, 19, 26 (Hansens, II, 319) —Cf. Hincmar of Reims: Capitula (852), c. 6 (PL, CXVII, 774); Ordo sec. Rom., n. 9 (Andræiu, II, 220; PL, LXXVIII, 973 C).*

*Amaral, op. cit., praefatio altera (PL, CV, 992 B): *Post evangelium non offerent incensum super altare.*

*As late as the 11th century, by Bernold of Constance, *Microlagus,* c. 9 (PL, CLI, 983 B).*

*The incensation puts in an appearance since the 11th century in Central Italian abbey churches (note 2, supra); at the beginning of the 12th century also in Rome, in St. Peter’s (Ebner, 333); is then mentioned by *Innocent III, De s. alt. mysteria,* II, 57 E (PL, CCXVII, 832-834).*

*Cf. supra, I, 68, 71.*

*The Ordo *Postquam* for an episcopal Mass, which originated in Germany in the 10th century, puts the incensation of the altar after the oratory: *offerat illud [incennum] altari,* while it mentions a similar action after the Introit as the practice only of some few churches (Andrieu, II, 354; 360; PL, LXXVIII, 990; 993). Regarding the transference of the incensation after the Gospel, see supra, I, 451 f.—For the development of these rites see Batifol, *Legons,* 153-158. Numerous details regarding the incensation at the oratory in Atchley, *A History of the Use of Incense,* 247-364.*

*PL, LXXVIII, 249. Also in the Missa Ilyrica: Martène, I, 4, IV (I, 511), where the anamnesis-type prayer *Memores* cited above, p. 68, note 146, is added.*

*Cf. e.g., two sacramentaries of the 13th century in Ebner, 326, 342, both of which have only the *Dirigatur.***
cessionem beati Gabrielis archangeli," with a petition to bless the incense and to receive it "for a sweet savour"; a further prayer accompanying the incensation: Incensum istud, which continues with the psalm verse, Dirigatur oratio mea sicut incensum in conspectu tuo, Domine;" and finally the formula which is now spoken by the celebrant when he puts the censer back into the hands of the deacon: "Accedant in nobis Dominus ignem sui amoris et flamman aeternae caritatis, a prayer which the Mass ordines of the eleventh and twelfth centuries appointed to be said by each individual who received the incensation.  

These words give us a clue to the meaning then attributed to this incensation, a significance similar to what we saw on earlier occasions: the incense is something dedicated to God, something holy, in which, by a sort of communion, we want to be associated. The glowing coal and the smoke arising from it draw the mind to the very highest thing that we can beg of God as answer to our gift-offerings—the fire of divine love. This is still the case in the Carthusian rite: Ordinarium Cart. (1932), c. 26, 21; and was true till the 13th century of some of the immediate predecessors of the Missale Romanum in central Italy: Ebner, 310, 333, 342. The full text, Ps. 140: 2-4, in Ebner, 327 (13th c.) likewise in the Ordo of Stefaneschi (about 1311), n. 53 (PL, LXXXVIII, 1164 C), where, however, the initial verse, Dirigatur, is said three times during the triple-crossing of the gifts. The addition of verses 3 and 4 was made not for the sake of the contents but merely as a continuation of the psalm. Nevertheless the celebrating priest had good reason to ask that his lips be hallowed: Gihb, 578 f.  

Thus, already in a Central Italian sacramentary of the 13th century in which the texts at the incensation coincide exactly with the present-day ones: Ebner, 327; cf. also 531 E) of the Western liturgical tradition. This is true of the Missale Romanum at least up to the 13th century; hence, it is the case in the Sacramentary of St. Denis about the middle of the eleventh century; these prayers, which differ sharply from the usual texts, represent a further prayer accompanying the incensation in the Sacramentary of St. Denis, 1. 

As a matter of fact there is little to reproach in the use of such language so soon as we establish the plain dogma that in the New Testament the one essential sacrifice for the worship of the Church—uniquely essential because God has so ordained it—is the Eucharist. We can symbolize our
abasement before God both by word and by signs, even by gifts of our own selection, and few gifts are so expressive as the incense which is consumed in the charcoal, and then rises skyward in fragrant clouds. In the West, however, incense prayers of this kind were soon disdosed. Obviously the sinnerliness of the Christian sacrifice—which was not diminished by extending the concept of offering to the bread and wine—ought not to be unnecessarily obscured in the prayer-language of the liturgy. Even the symbolic action of lifting the incense up towards God52 before the incensation of the gifts was dropped. The use of incense even within the oratory was thus only a complement, not an independent gift to almighty God. Wherefore the first swings of the censer are for the gifts of bread and wine which are incensed three times cross-wise, three times in a circle. It is the fullest expression of blessing and consecration and in this way really a re-enforcement of the *Veni sanctificator.* The incense here, 

---

52 The first of the incense prayers in the sacramentary of S. Denis—a prayer originating in the East—has the start: Domine, Deus noster, qui suscepisti munera pueri tui Abel, Nee, Aaron et omnium sanctorum tuorum, appears also in the sacramentary of Amiens (*supra,* I, 78); further in the *Liber ordinum* of Abbot Rabula (fide corb. [PL, LXXXVIII, 243 A]), in the sacramentary of Moissac (11th c.): Martene, 1, IV, VIII (I, 538 E); in the missal of Troyes (about 1050): *ibid.,* VI, 1 (56 P); in two Benedectine missals of the 11th, resp. 11-12th century from Fonte Avellana: PL, CLI, 934 C, as well as in a ritual of Soissons (not dated): Martene, 1, 4, XXII (I, 611 F). Two sources of the 11th century also in Lero­quino, I, 139, 161. I have not been able to locate any later examples. (An exception is the missal of Chalons-sur-Marne, printed ed 1543, in Martene, 1, 4, 7, 1 [I, 394 E]).

—The other borrowings from the liturgy of St. James which Brightman, p. LIV, notes, belong to the same monastic range, from the 10th (not 9th) and 11th century on.

In the *Ecurial* of Holy Saturday the Roman liturgy also displays an exception to the stylistic law of liturgical language: *Susice, sancte Pater, incensi hunc sacrificius vestreptun quod tibi in hac cerei oblata . . . reddit Ecclesia.* By incen­sum is here meant the ("lighted") candle. 53 Such a rite is mentioned in the *Ordo* of Card. Stefanescu (about 1311), n. 53 (PL, LXXVIII, 1164 C): elevet paulli­sor in altum.

54 Akin to this ceremony, although differing in kind, the use to which the incense is today most frequently put, the incensation of the Eucharist, whereby the censer is swung towards the Blessed Sacrament. But the idea behind the action is not so much to pay homage to the Carthusians and symbolize veneration, as is done otherwise in incensing objects and persons. The same is true of the incensation of the cross which follows right after that of the gifts. Even in the oldest rubrics the incensation is arranged in this fashion; e.g., in the Missa Illyrica: . . . *Thuribulum super ponem et calicem circumducitur,* then: *Circumambulatione autem altare cum incenso;* and lastly: *odor incenii portabatur . . . ;* Martene, 1, 4, IV (I, 511). The crosses made with the incense over the gifts are also expressly mentioned since the 11th century, either a single cross (Ebner, 298) or a triple cross (ibid., 130, 327, 333). At Cluny about 1080 the ceremony included three crosses and a circle; Udalricus, Consuet. Clun., II, 30 (PL, CLI, 717 D). Innocent III, *De d. alt. mysterio,* II, 57 (PL, CCXVII, 832), like other older sources, mentions only the (threefold) encircling of the gifts. Durandus, IV, 31, 1, who here for the most part copies Innocent III, makes note of a threefold crossing and a threefold encircling of the chalice, but also acknowledges that some are content with a single circle and a single cross: *ibid.,* 31, 3. For further details see Atchley, 249-254. During this censing of the gifts sometimes only *In nomine Patris . . .* is recited; not so much the Carthusians (which also contains a peculiar arrangement for the censing of the altar): Martene, 1, 4, XXV (I, 632 E); *Ordinarium Cart.* (1932), c. 26, 21. Cf. missal of *Fécamp* (early 1400): Martene, XXVII (I, 640 C), and supra p. 66, note 157 (near the end).

55 John of Avranches, *De offic. eccl.* (PL, CXLVII, 35 C); Missal of St. Vincent (Fila, 205; cf. 199); *Ordo eccl. Lateran.* (Fischer, 83); *Mass-ordo* of the Carthusians: Martene, 1, 4, XXV (I, 632 F); *Ordinarium Cart.* (1932), c. 26, 21. Cf. a missal of the 11-12th century in Ebner, 310. According to the *Rituale of Soissons* Martene, 1, 4, XXII (I, 612 A), the deacon incenses the priest, the *corpus altaris,* the Eucharist hanging (in a Dove) over the altar, then the other altars, the crucifix and the rood altar, finally the successor. While doing so he recites Psalm 140 from the beginning: *Domine clamat.* The choir is incensed by the *clericulus.* A detailed norm for the incensation of the choir (by the thurifer) is given in the Sarum Missal: Martene, 1, 4, XXXV (I, 667); cf. the Sarum Customary (13th c.): *Fere, The Use of Sarum,* 1, 761.

56 *Cf.* supra, note 27; Missa Illyrica: Martene, 1, 4, IV (I, 511 E); *Mass-ordo* of *Sézé*: *ibid.,* XIII (I, 578 B); PL, LXVIII, 249 C.  

57 *Pontificale Romanum,* II, *De altaris consecratione.*  

58 However, a contrary custom was admitted by the Congregation of Rites on Feb. 3, 1877: *Decreta auth. S.R.C.,* n. 3413.  

59 A peculiar usage is offered by the *Liber ordinarius* of the *Premonstratensians* (12th c.; LeBèvre, 10; Waefelghem, 665): the deacon, after meanwhile incensing the altar, incenses the celebrant when the latter turns for the *Orate.* Likewise later, besides other Benedictine sources (Waefelghem, 57, note 1) the *Liber ordinarius* of Leffe (1923) and even at present the Carthusian rite: Martene, 1, 4, XXV (I, 633 A); *Ordinarium Cart.* (1932), c. 29, 13.

60 According to the English usage of the late Middle Ages the incensation of the choir was provided only on days with a *Credo,* that is, on days of greater rank; *Fere, The Use of Sarum,* 1, 77; Sarum Missal: Martene, 1, 4, XXXV (I, 667 E).
6. The Washing of the Hands

After the sacrificial gifts are laid ready on the altar, and after the incensation, if there is any, there follows the washing of the hands. Its meaning today in the spot it occupies is no longer plainly to be seen. Evidently the action, which now consists of nothing more than wetting the fingertips, has some symbolic significance. But even so we would like to know why it takes place just here and now.

It is natural that we handle precious things only with hands that are clean. Or to put it more generally, a person approaches a festive or sacred activity only after he has cleansed himself from the grime of the workday and besides has done festively attire. Thus we find in the liturgy, besides the vesting in liturgical garments, also a washing of hands. In Christian antiquity there is repeated evidence of the established custom of washing the hands before giving oneself to prayer. 1 Domestic devotion was also ruled by this law. We are, therefore, not surprised to find a washing of hands expressly mentioned in the liturgy at a very early date. At Jerusalem in the fourth century, the Mass of the Faithful began with the deacon's administering the water to the celebrant and the surrounding presbyters;2 and from the very start the symbolic meaning of the act was stressed. Similar was the custom in the Antiochene church.3 We gen-

---

1 Hippolytus, Trad. Ap. (Dix, 65; Hauler, 119); Canon. Basilii, c. 28 (Riedel, 246).—Tertullian, De or., c. 13 (CSEL, 20, 188 f.), combats the notion that this washing of the hands was necessary. Cf. for this Elfers, Die Kirchenordnung Hippolytis, 38-42.
2 Cyril of Jerusalem, Catech. myst., V, 2 (Quasten, Mon., 97 f.).
3 Const. Ap., VIII, 11, 12 (Quasten, Mon., 211): a subdeacon hands all the priests the άκρωτα χερων after the kiss of peace. The same arrangement in Theodore of Mopsuestia, Sermones catech., V (Rücker, 25).—In Ps.-Dionysius, De ecl. hierarchia, III, 2; 3, 10 (Quasten, Mon., 295; 308 f.), the washing of the hands is undertaken as a prelude to the incensation also of the choir: Mansionarius itaque accipientis thuribulum de manu diaconi ei incensum odorumandum praebet. Quod postquam fecerit, dat incensum fratrum per chorum, postea et populo. For this odorare cf. supra, I, 452, note 68.

---

THE WASHING OF THE HANDS

Generally come upon this same washing of the hands likewise in the oriental liturgies of the following era. As a rule it comes right after the gifts have been carried over to the altar. The rite received a notable extension in the Ethiopian Mass: after the priest has unveiled the gifts on the altar, he washes his hands but does not dry them at once; instead he turns and sprinkles the water clinging to his fingers towards the people with a threatening word of warning to those unworthy ones who might want to draw nigh to the Lord's table.

There were attempts, too, to extend to the people either the washing itself or at least some token of it that referred admonishingly to the purity of the interior man. In the atrium of the ancient Christian basilica stood the fount or well 4 which was understood precisely in this sense, and even at the entrance of our own churches there is the holy-water stoup for the people to sprinkle themselves. But since Carolingian times the parish high Mass on Sundays begins with the sprinkling of holy water over the assembled congregation, a custom explained by the very words which are linked with it: Asperges me Domine hyssopo et mundabor. The symbolism of purity and purification has obviously been from the very start the guiding factor for the ablutions in the liturgy. This is made clear in the oriental liturgies where the washing of the hands at the prescribed time was never, or hardly anywhere, based on the fact that the offerings were received just previously, for this was done before the beginning of Mass. It is simply an act of reverence after the Great Entrance, connected with the actual entrance into the sanctuary.

It is significant that even in the Western Mass we find the washing of the hands precisely in that place where the holy circle is entered; and because it is a multiple circle, we encounter this hand-washing at divers points: first when we penetrate the outermost circle, and last when we stand at the very threshold of the innermost sanctuary. Even in the earlier medieval sources a hand-washing before vesting is found as a constituent over the function of the hand-washing before the fraction.

4 If there be any who is pure let him receive of the host, and whoso is not pure let him not receive, that he be not consumed in the fire of the Godhead, whoso hath revenge in his heart and hath an alien mind by reason of unchastity. I am pure from the blood of you and from your sacrilege against the body and blood of Christ: I have nought to do with your reception thereof: I am pure of your error, and your sin will return upon your own head if ye receive not in purity," Liturgy of the Abyssinian Jacobites (Brightman, 226).
5 Beissel, Bilder, 254 f.
6 Supra, p. 4.
of the Mass pattern, and even today it is still presupposed, though with mitigated importance, in the hand-washing in the saecular.

However, we come upon some isolated instances of hand-washing immediately before the consecration. The ring encircling the consecration is the canon. Since the canon has been considered as beginning with the Teigitur, there are to be found some cases of a hand-washing just before the Teigitur. Originally it was the deacon who washed his hands here, since he would assist in the elevation of the chalice at the end of the canon, or else it was the deacons who had to help with the fraction; but towards the end of the Middle Ages this hand-washing had to a great extent become the priest's, especially in German territory.

But the hand-washing that came into special prominence was the more ancient one at the beginning of the sacrifice-Mass in connection with the offertory. This, too, bears first of all a symbolic character. According to the oldest sources, the pope at the Roman stational service first washed his hands right after the Oremus. Then he received the gifts of the nobility. Returning to his throne, he again washed his hands, and only then did he go to the altar and receive the gifts of the clerics. In other cases, the washing of the deacon in this spot as a custom began in the 11th century at Cluny: Udalricus, LXXVIII, 993 B: After the Suppiices; De eccl. offic., I, 79; 82. This last is true also of Tarouca, 197; cf. Brightman, 271-274.-Cf. the kissing of the altar in Schabes, 243 A), which adapted to Frankish conditions, and which likewise has a hand-washing at the vesting before Mass, with a prayer accompaniment (ibid., 241 A).- Cf. Ordo eccl. Lateran. (Fischer, 82, 1. 25).

Gallican in origin, the second Roman.

accounts this second washing alone is mentioned, but it takes place before the reception of the clerical oblation and is therefore governed not by practical motives, but rather by symbolic ones. It is an expression of reverence at the threshold of the Holy of Holies. The same arrangement is to be found in various localities throughout the entire Middle Ages, insofar as a hand-washing is provided for in the course of the Mass. It is found at the start of the offertory, fixed in such a way that any preoccupation with the gift-offerings can hardly come into consideration as a basis of explanation. This is particularly plain in the rite of the Franciscans, who generally did not permit the oblations of the faithful to Mass; they, too, began the offertory with the washing of the hands.

At the same time, however, there also appear various arrangements of the Mass in which the hand-washing is set to follow the offertory procession of the faithful; without detaching from any other symbolic interpretation, they establish the principle that by this hand-washing the priest must cleanse his hands a tactu communum manuum atque terrono
Sometimes it still precedes the arranging of the gifts on the altar, and in some instances even the incensing is designed to follow.

It is easy to understand how the next step would be taken; the incensation would be made to precede, and this would be done ad maiorem munditiam. According to one monastic instruction, the priest should now take care not to grasp anything with the fingers that would touch the Body of the Lord. This hand-washing often stands side by side with the first more ancient one which is done before the offertory, as is still the case in the present-day pontifical rite. But in the following years the older one was dropped, and only the more recent one remained. In the rite of the Carthusians, however, the hand-washing has retained its position in the more ancient spot.

Since the Frankish era the fundamental symbolic thought of the hand-washing is regularly expressed in the words which accompany it. The Lavabo, which is literally a protestation of the Psalmist's innocence, and which becomes in our mouth an expression of a longing for purity and a worthy service at the altar, was associated with this hand-washing at quite an early period, but its earliest association was with the washing done at the vesting. Usually the only portion used was the one verse, Psalm 25:6, or the two verses 6 and 7. Later, the rest of the psalm was appended, but this was done without any special consideration of the contents, which have no intimate relation to the washing. Medieval arrangements of the Mass often added more appropriate texts to the verses mentioned, both for the hand-washing at the start of Mass and for this one here. In the ambit of Monte Cassino, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, there was added to the Lavabo an oration, Concede mihi, omnipotens Deus, in manum lavare ut puro corde et corpore possum dominicum corpus et sanguinem tractare. Late Mass ordines in northern France supplement the Lavabo with a three-fold Kyrie eleison and Pater noster. Often, too, some such complementary oration appears as the only accompanying text. All the elements that go to make up a well-arranged ceremonial are thus brought together.

How strongly the symbolic sense of the hand-washing is emphasized can be seen in a monastic Mass-ordo of Rouen; according to this, the elements of the Dominicans (except in the earliest period: Sölch, 81) and formerly of the Cistercians; see the references in Sölch, 80. Only the later ablution, following the model of the Ordinarium O.P. of 1256 (Guerrini, 240), in the Benedictine Liber ordinariorum of Liege: Volks, 93.—Late medieval Mass-arrangements in Martène, XXVIII (I, 4, XX, XXII, XXIV (I, 608 D, 612 B, 629 A). In the later Mass-ordo of Gregorienrnann: ibid., XXXII (I, 656 E), the ablution does not occur till after the Orate.

Sometimes it still precedes the arranging of the gifts on the altar, but in the Middle Ages hand-washings following the model of Saint-Brieuc are very rare in the Middle Ages; see Bolesław, De eccl. off., 51, 84, 111 (PL, CLXXXVIII, 629 A). In the later Mass-ordo of Saint-Brieuc: ibid., XXXII (I, 656 E), the ablution does not occur till after the Orate.

The Mass-ordo of Saint-Brieuc about 1425 uses only one verse (Simmons, 100). The Dominican missal of 1256 indicated only the first verse; see Boniwell, A History of the Dominican Liturgy (New York, 1944), 125; the present Dominican rite still has only one verse (Missale O.P., 1889, 181).—The complete service at present was very rare in the Middle Ages; see the text above. Supra, 1, 277.

The hand-washing is an act of penance; and it has its place in the processus lavericorum. In the processus of Saint-Brieuc (14-15th c.) this oration is the sole accompaniment of the ablution at this place; Martène, I, 4, XXXI (I, 651 A).

Missal of Exemve: Martène, I, 4, XXVIII (I, 644 C) Alphabeticum sacerdotum; Legg, Tract. 10, 41; Ordinarium of Coutance: ibid., 60.

Missa Illirica (cf. supra, note 17): Lavare sensisse nostris, omnipotens Pater, ut sicci sit exterius abluntur iniqua-

menta manuum, sae te munentur interius politiones mentum et crescat in nobis sanctarum augmentum vitriatum. Per.; Martène, I, 4, IV (I, 505 E). Likewise in the sacramentary of S. Denis: ibid., V (I, 523 C), and in Central Italian Mass-plans: Ebner, 337, 347, 350; cf. Ferreres, 129.—Gerboh of Reichenberg (ed. 1169) introduces the oration in his explanation of Psalm 25: 6 (PL, 131, 1165 B). The Pontifical of Durandus (Andrieu, 640) uses the oration Largire at the ablution before the oration of the offertory and after the incensation when the bishop washes summatas digitorum et labar.—An Italian pontifical of the 11-12th century (Ebner, 312) offers the prayer: Omnipotens sempiterna Deus, abundes cor nostrum et manus a cuncta sordibus peccatorum, ut templum Spiritus Sancti effici mercarum. Per.—According to the late medieval order of Sarum, in Martène, I, 4, XXXV (I, 667 E), the celebrant says: Munda me Domine ab omni iniquinamento cordis et corporis nostri, ut possim mundum impleare opus sanctum Domini. Cfr. Ferreres, 133 (n. 531); Frere, The Use of Sarum, I, 77; Maskell, 92.—According to the commentary of William of Gouda (15th c.) the priest prays: Amplius lavo me sancte superius sicci sit puer in baptismo... P. Schlagler, Franciscan Studien, 6 (1919), 332.

In the Regensburg missal of 1500 (Beck, 261), the priest at the ablution before vesting recites the verse Lavabo first as an antiphon, then Psalm 25 in its entirety, again the antiphon, Kyrie eleison, etc.
brants's *Lavabo* is answered by the abbot with the *Misereatur.* 6 Thus the hand-washing is turned into a formal act of absolution.

However, the hand-washing is occasionally found even at a later time without any formula, 7 and often still there is no mention of it whatever in the course of the Mass. 8 In the case of late medieval arrangements of non-solemn Mass, the explanation for this lack is to be found in the practical motivation of the hand-washing, since there would be no question of it when there was neither offertory procession nor incensation. In the Missal of Pius V, however, the hand-washing was retained for every Mass, high or low. This shows that the symbolic meaning of the rite still remained in the foreground; only the position it occupies in the Mass is reminiscent of the other and later concept of its purpose as a precaution before handling the sacred Host and chalice during the canon.

### 7. *Orate Fratres*

One of the few fixed points which recur unchanged in all the medieval oblation rites is a petition found near the end of the rite, a petition by the priest for the prayer of the bystanders. According to the eighth century Roman pontifical rite as adapted to Frankish circumstances, such a ceremony occurred right after the celebrant had added his own gift to the common offering:

> *Hoc fieri desiderat meus amor, ut dominus et salutis tuae et vestri aequus est.*

The same idea may be gleaned from the fact that even in the earliest examples where the wording is included—and hence throughout the Middle Ages—the petition for prayer almost always retains a personal character *Orate pro me.* Instances where this *pro me* is wanting do appear in some of the oldest sources, 9 but on the other hand the personal note recurs in the most diverse forms: *pro me or pro me peccato,* 10 also *pro me misero peccatore,* and *pro me miserrimo peccatore,* 11 or the personal note is even stressed by the phrase: *Obsecro vos, fratres, orate pro me,* or by the promise: *Orate pro me, fratres et sorores, et ego orabo pro vos.* 12 13

---

8 In the Western rite we have the early opinion of Amalar to the same effect. It anticipates the *Sursum corda* and endeavors to summon, so to say, all the forces of prayer; for this reason let the priest turn to the people and *precatur ut orent pro illo,* *quatenus dignus sit universae plebis obligationem offerre Domino.* The priest feels very strongly that he is exalted above the people—a matter the early medieval Church was fully conscious of—and even in his sacrificial prayer he realizes he stands alone before God as the people's mediator. 9

The same idea may be gleaned from the fact that even in the earlier examples where the wording is included—and hence throughout the Middle Ages—the petition for prayer almost always retains a personal character *Orate pro me.* Instances where this *pro me* is wanting do appear in some of the oldest sources, 9 but on the other hand the personal note recurs in the most diverse forms: *pro me or pro me peccato,* 10 also *pro me misero peccatore,* and *pro me miserrimo peccatore,* 11 or the personal note is even stressed by the phrase: *Obsecro vos, fratres, orate pro me,* or by the promise: *Orate pro me, fratres et sorores, et ego orabo pro vos.*

---

9 In the West Syrian (Brightman, 83.1,2) and in the East Syrian Mass (ibid., 272 f.) there is a traditional custom, common to both and consequently quite ancient, which is closely allied to the western practice. In the first (the Syrian Jacobite) liturgy the priest says: *"My brethren and my masters, pray for me that my sacrifice be accepted." In the second (the Nestorian) rite his prayer is longer: *"Pray for me, my brethren and my beloved, that I be accounted worthy to offer before our Lord Jesus Christ this sacrifice living and holy for myself and for all the body of the holy Church by the grace of His compassion forever, Amen." And in this latter liturgy there is also a response somewhat similar to our *Suscipiat* (273).


11 *Orate fratres,* e.g., *Lercuquis* (Eph. liturg., 1937, 442. Likewise the two sacramentaries of S. Thierry (9th and 10th c.): Martene, I, 4, IX; X (1, 446 E, 549 D); cf. ibid., XV (I, 592 C). In *Ordo Rom. II,* n. 9 (PL, LXXVIII, 973 C) the priest says only: *Orate.*

12 For the latter see Sacramentary of Lorsch (10th c.): Ebner, 247; Missa Ilyrica: Martene, I, 4, IV (I, 512 A). Also in the most ancient Italian Mass orders since the 11th century: Ebner, 301, 306, 327. Likewise still in the *Ordinarium Cartusianum* (1323), c. 26, 21.

13 Martene, I, 4, XIII; LXXVII (I, 578 C, 640 E); cf. ibid., XXXII (I, 656 D).

14 Missal of Fécamp: Martene, I, 4, XXVI (I, 638 A); a Dominican missal of the 13th century: Solch, 83, note 193.

15 Sacramentary of Moissac: Martene, I, 4, VIII (I, 539 D); further examples: Ebner, 333—In the Mozarabic liturgy there is a further reinforcement: *Adin cate me, fratres, in orationibus vestris et orate pro me ad Deum; Misaltum mixtum* (PL, LXXXV, 537 A).

16 Missal from S. Pol de Léon: Martene,
or even, in one case, by a formal self-accusation; or the humility of the petition is underlined by the bodily bearing, the priest crossing his hands over his breast. At any rate the next clause, which is seldom missing, stresses the idea that the aid of prayer is being asked for the priest's own sacrifice, which is likewise the sacrifice of the congregation, so that it might be acceptable. The usual version reads: ut meum pariter et vestrum sacrificium acceptum sit Deo. 

The original conception is finally abandoned when in England and in Normandy, in special formulas for Masses for the Dead, prayer is asked only for the dead.

To whom is the petition directed? In the most ancient example cited above it is addressed to the priests standing around. The statements of the succeeding era, beginning with Amalar, mention the people without exception. In the second Roman ordo (a product of Frankish territory), the bishop first gives the schola a signal ut silient; then it continues: et convertet se ad populum dicens: Orate. He therefore addresses himself to the whole assembly in a distinctly audible voice. In some isolated instances provision is even made for the priest to prefix a Dominus vobiscum. Little, therefore, is lacking to make this address match those addresses which the priest sings at the service. In fact, in the Mozarabic liturgy the corresponding Adjutate me frater is actually sung. In the Roman liturgy, however, it never came to this. The Dominus vobiscum was merely spoken softly—the directions for this are remarkably discordant—but then disappeared again.

The further development adhered to the direction that the priest turn ad populum; in at least half the cases this is expressly stated. Before this, he kisses the altar, as became the rule later on for all such occasions when the priest turns to the people. But he speaks the words in a subdued voice, as is indicated at various times.

The fact that the priest, in turning towards the people here, completes the turn—a procedure differing from that at the Dominus vobiscum—might incline one to look upon this as a similar stressing of the address to the people, but in reality there is a different explanation. That the people, and not merely the clerics, are addressed seems evident from the very form of the address as found in those non-monastic documents of the Middle Ages, outside Italy and Spain, which connect an apud Deum omni potentem pro salute et requie tam vivorum quam mortuorum.

Ordo Rom. II, n. 9 (PL, LXXVIII, 973 C).

Durandus, IV, 32, 3 (cf. IV, 14, 10): sub silencio the priest should say Dominus vobiscum, then, voce aliquantulum elata, the petition for prayers. Cf. John Beleth, Explication, c. 44 (PL, CCII, 52 B). Two 1417 missals from Valencia exactly as Durandus: Ferreres, 131. In Germany, too, even as late as 1462, Bernard of Waging makes mention of the practice many have of inserting the Domine exaudi orationem meam or the Dominus vobiscum before the Ora pro me frater: Franz, 575.

In Italian Mass orders this rubric often reads: ad circumstantes—which in this era would not necessarily mean the same things as before. 301, 306, 314, 334, 341, 346. Cf. supra, I, 316, 36.


Nevertheless this was not the practice in the ancient Cistercian rite; Schneider (Cist-Chr., 1927), 6.

The real reason is probably that given by Gavanti, namely, that the priest turns to where the book is from which he is to read; cf. Lebrun, Explication, 326, with reference also to the fact that formerly the book frequently stood farther from the center of the altar than it does now. In fact, this is made clear, for instance by the Ordinarium O.P. of 1256 (Guerrini, 240); according to this order the priest during the secreta stands between the book and the chalice and not simply in the middle, and therefore here too the priest is expected to make a complete turn (cf. to the
explicit address to the formula; the words frates et sorores appear quite consistently. In earlier sources, it is true, the address is usually made to the frates alone, and it is quite possible that the word specifies not the entire community of the faithful, as it did in ancient times, but only the clergy.

But the unrestricted addition of sorores corroborates the belief that the medieval liturgists were in agreement with us in extending the word to include everyone, men and women, in the same way that St. Paul did when he addressed the whole community with the title "brethren."

The present-day wording of the formula first appears in Italian Mass ordines of the twelfth century and after.

In the oldest witnesses to our petition for prayer, no provision is made contrary Liber ordinarius of Liége, ed. Volk, 93, 1. 19). It is the same already in the 12th century in the Liber ordinarius of the Premonstratensians (Lefevre, 11; cf. Waelhelm, 67 with note 2). Cf. also the Liber auzum O. Cist. c. 53 (PL, CXXVI, 1338). Thus, we have the same situation as today before the last Gospel.—At the present time the rule just back on the deacon standing next to him addressed the whole community with the title "brethren."

The present-day wording of the formula used by the priest first appears in Italian Mass ordines of the twelfth century and after.

In the oldest witnesses to our petition for prayer, no provision is made for any answer. Even much later, right down to the present, there are isolated ordines where no response follows, just as in the present-day Roman service for Good Friday. The petition is interpreted simply as a request for the prayer of each individual. But already in the Carolingian period, answers of a kind were advised. Amalar heard it said that the people ought to pronounce three verses for the priest, namely verses 3-5 from Psalm 19: Mittat tibi Dominus auxilium de sancto et de Sion tecum te. Memor sit omnis sacrificii tui et holocaustum tuum pingue fiat. Tribuat tibi secundum cor tuum et omne consilium tuum confirmet. These verses, or at least the first three verses of the psalm, or at least the one or other verse of the same psalm, recur nearly everywhere during the following centuries in the answer to the Orate fratres, seldom alone, but usually in combination with other formulas of intercession, which in their turn often occur all by themselves.

Thus, according to Remigius of Auxerre (d. c. 908), the people can respond with Psalm 19:2-4, or else with the words: Sit Dominus in corde tuo et in ore tuo et—in this continuation we have the first evidence of a Suscipiat—suscipiat sacrificium sibi acceptum de ore tuo et de manibus tuis pro nostra omniumque salute. Amen. The Prayerbook of Charles the Bald, written about 870, contains under the inscription Quid orandum sit ad missam pro sacerdote, quando petit pro se orare, the words of the angel in Luke 1:35 transformed into a blessing: Spiritus Sanctus supernat volit in te et virtus Altissimi obumbret te. Then Psalm 19:4-5, and after that the further prayer: Da Domine pro nostris peccatis acceptabile et susceptibile fere sacrificium in conspectu tuo. For the prayer which each is to say, to the further prayer:

ORATE FRATRES
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The Sacramentary of Sézé has the initial words: *Orent pro te omnes sancti* and adds, after Psalm 19:4, the phrases: *Exaudiat te Dominus pro nobis orantem* and *Misereatur tuo omnipotens Deus, dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua.* Elsewhere appears the psalm verse (49-14): *Immola Deo sacrificium laudis et reddite Alitissimo vota tua,* or the benediction: *Sanc(i) Spiritus gratia illuminet cor tuum et labia tua.* Several Mass ordines present a number of these answers, to be chosen at will, and often the prayer is taken up again after the *Sanctus.*

Aside from the psalm verses, the most widespread were the *Susceptam* formulas, but these appeared in various versions and usually as the continuation of some other text which was conjoined. The version familiar to us, which appeared but seldom outside Italy, had become the only formula current in Italy since the eleventh century, and thus reached the *Missale Romanum.*

---

This formula alone forms the response in Italian Mass-books: Ebner, 329, 341. In other cases with various additions: see, e.g., the Rhenish missal described by F. Rödel: J.L, 4 (1924), 84.

Thus the response in some Mass-books of Italian monasteries of the 11-12th century: Ebner, 306, 310; cf. 14, 20, 523; Fiala, 206. In the Hungarian sacramentary of Boldau (but with Psalm 19: 3-5; Rad6, 43) and in two Sackwell missals: Kock, 120, 122. The same with the addition of Ps. 49: 14 (Isa. 55) in the Augsburg missal of 1386: Hoeynck.

PL, LXXVIII, 249 D.—Likewise with the addition of Luke 1:35; Psalm 49: 14 and Susc iptam in the Mass-order of Geron iemus: Martene, 1, 4, XVI (I, 599 D).— Cf. the Missal of St. Lawrence in Liége: ibid., XV (I, 592 C); sacramentary of Modena: Muratori, I, 92; sacra mentary of Boldau: Rad6, 43.

These words are the beginning of the response as provided in the Pontifical of Du randus in the case when a bishop assists at the Mass of his chaplain: Martene, 1, 4, XVIII (I, 619 F); the bishop continues: *ipseque, tuus plus et misericors adiutor, exaudito existat; Psalm 19: 3-4 and to day’s *Susc iptam* follows.—Psalm 49: 14 is also found within a long series of formulas in the Missa Illyrica: Martene, 1, 4, IV (I, 512 B), and in the Sacramentary of S. Denis: ibid., V (I, 526 f.).

With an added Suscipit formula (et ac ci pit . . .) in the use of Sarum: Legg, *The Sarum Missal,* 219; Martene, 1, 4, XXXV (I, 608 A); cf. Ferreres, 133; Maskell, 160.

—Sacramentary of S. Denis (11th c.): Martene, 1, 4, V (I, 526 F.); William of Melitona, Opusc. super missam, ed. van Dijck (*Eph. littera,* 1939), 329; Durandus, IV, 32, 3.

—See infra.—The Sacramentary of Fonte Avellana (before 1325) has the priest himself recite the respective psalms, 24, 50, 89 and 90, after he receives the response to his *Orate fratres* (PL, CLI, 887 B).

E.g., in the Sacramentary of S. Denis: Martene, 1, 4, V (I, 526 B): *Susc ipit Dominus sacrificium de manibus tuis ad tuam et nostrorum salutem omnium circumstantium et animarum omnium fideli um defunctorum.*—In Spain: *Suscipit Dominus Jesus Christus sacrificium de manibus tuis et dimittat tibi omnia pec cata:* Ferreres, p. CV; 131, 132; Ebner, 342. A Bobbio missal of the 10-11th century: *Accipiat Dominus Deus omnipotens sacrificium,* ad utilitatem totius san ctus Dei Ecclesiae; Ebner, 81.—MSS of the 14th century from Gerona offer as the sole response a formula that is otherwise hardly ever found: *Oratio tua accepta sit in con spectu Altissimi et nos tecum pariter salvari merearum in perpetuum:* Ferreres, 131 (n. 524); cf. ibid., XXVIII; also in the Missal of Narbonne (1528): Martene, 1, 4, 7, 4 (I, 396 A).

—Cf. supra, p. 87.

—An example; supra, note 42.


As is evident from the statements above, the answer is committed, time and again, to the people. This assignment to the people occurs in some individual instances right on to the end of the Middle Ages. At least in those cases where *fratres* and *sorores* are addressed, it can hardly cause astonishment. At other times, both in early and late texts, the *circumstantes* or the *clerici* or the *chorus* are named. It is noteworthy that in a group of Mass-orders of the 11-12th century the answer should be given by each one (*singulis*). It is curious that the text is not to be said aloud, but is to be regarded as an aid to private prayer. Silent prayer by the individual was evidently presupposed from the very start wherever the books did not contain an answer; and even where texts were then presented, they were at first probably intended for a similar purpose. The later rule was probably that the answer be given by the choir of clerics in common, since its Latin form and considerable length was too much for the people to master. There is one extreme case of an *ordo* of Sarum in England, where at a Mass for the Dead the special answer is united with the chant of the offertory. When the priest has softly spoken the *Orate fratres et sorores pro fidelibus defunctis,* the clergy

—Sacramentary of Barcelona (13th c.): Ebner, 331; Spanish Missals of the 14th and 15th centuries: Ferreres, 131.—Missal of Fécamp about 1400: Martene, 1, 4, XXVII (I, 641 A): *Oratio populi pro sacerdote dicentis hos versas.*—Cf. Miss. of 1427: S. XXI (I, 561 C): *respondeetur et ab omnibus.*


—Ebner, 314, 322, 323; Martene, 1, 4, VI; XV (I, 533 C; 592 C). Thus also in the present-day Roman Missal: *Et respon sob a Min istro, vel a circumstantibus: Suscipiat ... Rit. serv., VII, 7.*

—Martene, 1, 4, XVI; XXVI (I, 599; 638 A); Ferreres, 133.

—Martene, 1, 4, XXII (I, 612 C): York Mass order: Simmons, 100.

—Martene, 1, 4, IV; XIII (I, 512 A; 578 C); Ebner, 301, 334.

This is the natural interpretation for the text in the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald, supra, p. 87.—Therefore also the stressing of silent prayer. Cf. John Beleth, *Explicatio c. 44* (PL, CCII, 52 B): When we hear the priest saying the *Orate fratres,* we must pray quietly (*secres*); and the author suggests Psalms 19 and 20. Simi larly Durandus, IV, 32, 3: *populus debeat simuliter secere orae respondere.*

But authentic examples are to be found already since the 11-12th century: Ebner, 338.—In the Custumarium of Sarum (13th c.) we find the following in the order for high Mass: *When the priest has said the Orate fratres et sorores softly (facita voce): Responsorio clericum privatim: Sancti Spiritus ... Fiere, The Use of Sarum, 1, 78.*

According to the English *Lay Folks Mass Book* (Simmons, 24; cf. supra, I, 243), a participation of the laity is urged on all: “Then he asks with quiet voice—For each man’s prayers to God of heaven. Take good heed unto the priest.—When he turns knock on thy breast—And think then for thy sin—Thou art not worthy to pray for him ... Answer the priest with this aloud (‘on high’)”—The Holy Ghost in thee light—and send His grace unto the right—to rule thy heart and thy speaking—to God’s worship and His love, (Modernized wording and spelling.) The rimed prayer over, the author concludes: *In hoc sacrifice patri nostro salutare servatum est.* He also suggests some additions: *Alleluia.* In the same sense the Melk Commentary, written in 1366, introduces the three formulas for the response with the remark: *tunc asantes a loquitur dicent: Memor sit;* Franz, 510, note 3.
answer by singing the last verse of the offertory chant: Requiem aeternam dona eis Domine et lux perpetua luceat eis, Quam olim Abraham promisisti et semini eius.9

8. The Secret

In the liturgy of the city of Rome in the early Middle Ages, the collecting and depositing of the offertory gifts was not accompanied by any prayer at all, but simply by the singing of the offertory. Not till the external activity had come to an end did the celebrant once more take up the phrases of the entrance procession was concluded with the collect, and the communion with the post-communion, so the oblation was concluded with this oration which appears, like the others, in all the Roman sacramentaries and, like them, varies according to the Church year, and agrees with them in structure and design. Like them, it is spoken in the prayer posture of the orantes, and was likewise at one time (as is self-evident) pronounced in a loud voice. Even today the final words Per omnia sacrae sanctorum, like the Oremus at the start, which belongs to it, are sung aloud. In the Milanese Mass the practice has been retained even at present of saying the whole oratio super oblation aloud.9

The first point to clear up is the puzzling problem of how the oratio super oblatione came to be said silently. The earliest evidence of the quiet recitation of this prayer appears in the middle of the eighth century in Frankish territory, in the tradition of John the Arch-chantor. We are thus led to the opinion that the name secreta appeared in the North and that it was here created to indicate that the pertinent oration was to be spoken softly. From then on, the quiet recitation of this prayer was taken

9 Martène, 1, 4, XXXV (I, 668 B); Frere, The Use of Sarum, I, 78; cf. supra, p. 84. The same answer already in the Ordinarium of the 13th century, but here with the superscription: responsio populi. Legg. Tracts, 221.
8 The Ordinarium of Coutances (1557) has a late deviation from this rule; according to this order the secreta is said manusius super sacrificio extensis: Legg. Tracts, 61.
9 Supra, I, 483 f.
1 Missale Ambrosianum (1902), p. V.
2 This title is found in the Sacramentarium Gregorianum (Lietzmann, n. 1). Here even the individual formulas are headed: Super oblation (Cod. Pad. 147, ed. Mohlberg-Baumstark: Super oblation); likewise in the later Gelasianum, ed. Mohlberg. The same designation is to be found in the oldest ordines, insofar as they note the subject; in the Ordo Rom. II, n. 10 (PL, LXXVIII 973 D): dicta oratione super oblationes secretae; and in the Ord of Johannes Archicantor, Capitulare (see following note).
3 Capitulare eccl. ordinis (Silva-Tarouca, 198: Tune pontifex inclinato vultus in terram dictam orationem super oblationes et nullus praeter Deum et ipsum audiat nuntium Per omnia sacrae sanctorum. Similarly the adaptation in the Breviarium (ibid.).
4 This is the explanation given by Fortescue, The Mass, 312. Other explanations of the name are pure hypotheses. Ever since Bossuet it has come to be generally accepted — without historical evidence — that secreta = oratio ad secretionem, that is, either at the "sorting out" of the sacrificial gifts (an action which as such had no religious signification beyond this, but only a purely practical one; thus the secret is equivalently oratio super secreta [a merely conjectural form]; or else at the "sorting out," that is, the dismissal of the catechumens (there is nothing in the con-
5 tacts to show any connection with this act.). —Batifol, Lepons, 161 (cf. ibid., 7th ed., p. XXI), proposed a derivation of secreta from sacer nes in the sense of benedictes, a conjecture, to which no evidence is to be traced.— Brinktrine, Die hl. Messe, 171 f., regards secreta as equivalent to mysteria, which appears in Innocent I, Ep. 25 (PL, XX, 553 f.) as a designation of the prayers of the canons; the word, he thinks, then survived as the name of the introductory prayer. However, we are concerned not with mysteria but with secreta, and this is not found as the name of the canon from Teigitur on till the 9th century, and for the full canon including our oblation prayer not till the 12th century, so that its cling- ing to our prayer already in the 8th century remains unexplained. Cf. Jungmann, Gewordene Liturgie, 93 ff., 165 ff. Even what Th. Michelis, Liturg. Leben, 3 (1936), 307 f., adduces in support of Brinktrine only proves that secreta = canon in the 11th century.
6 Amalir, Liber off., III, 20, 1 (Hansens, I, 323): Secrétia ideo nominatur,quia secreto dictur. The same thing is implied by the designation arcana in Frankish sacra-
7 mentaries, to which Martène, 1, 4, 7, 5, (I, 396 D), refers.

The older designation survived the longest in MSS of the Gregorianum. But even here it was soon replaced by secreta, as e.g. partially in the MS. of Pamelfius (Col- ledge, 1571).—A group of South French and Spanish MSS, since the 11th century, uses the name secreta, which arose from a misunderstanding of the abbreviation scr. Cf. A. Wilmart, "Une curieuse expression pour designer l'orsac lère," Bulletin de litt. eccles., 1925, 94-103; cf. Il., (1925), 291 f. Examples of this also in Ferreres, 132, and passim in his introductory de-
8 The same thing is implied by the denomination arcana in Frankish sacra-
9 Martène, Gewordene Liturgie, 93 ff.
10 Here, too, the name secreta appears as a heading over the last formula that pre-
cedes the preface. Although the Bobbio missal displays a large degree of Roman liturgy, still among perhaps a dozen cases where the heading occurs there is one, if I mistake not, where the name indicates a Roman oratio super oblation; this is the oration Munda nos Domine (Sacramentary of Padua: Mohlberg-Baumstark, n. 79b); see Lowe, The Bobbio Missal (HHS, 58), n. 514. As for the other instances, there are some few Roman collects, rather general in content, that are used as secreta, and mostly they are purely Gallic formulas. On the other hand, time and again Roman super oblation formulae appear under the Gallic captions Post nomina and Ad pa- rem; see Lowe, 6, 154, 260, et al. This shows conclusively that their designation
that all the silent prayers come to light which have since filled out the offertory.\textsuperscript{11}

In the formation of the practice, reminiscences of the Gallic liturgy and, in the last analysis, some suggestions from the Orient must have been at work. The place of the Roman offertory was taken in the Gallican Mass by the offertory procession at which a holy silence was advised.\textsuperscript{12} At any rate, silent prayer at this point is an ancient tradition in the sister-liturgy, the Mozarabic.\textsuperscript{13} And silent prayer, especially in the form of apologiae, as well as of incense prayers, and (by no means lastly) oblation prayers, must have become customary in the Gallican Mass, in connection with the offertory procession. Otherwise, the elements of this sort which had forced their way here into the Roman Mass as early as the ninth century, are not understandable.\textsuperscript{14} We have already had occasion to ascertain that precisely at this point oriental models had an influence in the Frankish realm, where we have even encountered word-for-word borrowings from the Greek Liturgy of St. James, \textit{i.e.}, from the liturgy of the center of pilgrimage, Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{15} For here we also came upon the pictorial model: the solemn entrance of the Great King (proleptically honoring in the gifts-offerings) amid the resounding lines of the Cherubic hymn, which offered the offertory procession. Otherwise, the elements of this sort which we see here as well are not more primitive than the Gregorian Super oblatione; the offertory procession which is used in the Missale Gothicum and also in the Missale Gothicum vetus for the first prayer after the consecration; Muratori, II, 522, 534, 559, etc.; 699, 705.

The main argument against this explanation is the fact already noted that the other Gelasianum, which in general presents us with the Roman liturgy of the 6th century, has the heading secreta (
which for which also Post mysterium) which is used in the Missale Gothicum and also in the Missale Gothicum vetus for the first prayer after the consecration; Muratori, II, 522, 534, 559, etc.; 699, 705.

The main argument against this explanation is the fact already noted that the other Gelasianum, which in general presents us with the Roman liturgy of the 6th century, has the heading secreta (for which also Post mysterium) which is used in the Missale Gothicum and also in the Missale Gothicum vetus for the first prayer after the consecration; Muratori, II, 522, 534, 559, etc.; 699, 705.

The main argument against this explanation is the fact already noted that the other Gelasianum, which in general presents us with the Roman liturgy of the 6th century, has the heading secreta (for which also Post mysterium) which is used in the Missale Gothicum and also in the Missale Gothicum vetus for the first prayer after the consecration; Muratori, II, 522, 534, 559, etc.; 699, 705.
But if we want to find the real meaning of our oration, that is, the meaning consonant with its origin, we must look, as we have said, not forwards but backwards. The secret is the prayer which concludes the offering and depositing of the material gifts and which explains the significance by transmuting them into the language of prayer. The creation of such a prayer must be considered a natural result, if not a matter of course, once the material gift itself was regarded as an oblation to God and, by the inclusion of the people in it, its symbolic meaning was emphasized. Thus we find already in the oldest Roman sacramentary, the Leonianum, precisely those traits clearly marked which still, even at the present time, distinguish the secret. No matter how the formula varies, the same thought consistently recurs in different words: We offer God gifts, dona, munera, oblationem; less frequently—and then obviously only to diversify the expression—hostias, sacrificium. They are in the first instance earthly gifts, as is occasionally pointed out in due form: Altaribus tuis, Domine, munera terrena gratanter offereimus, ut cælestia consequamur, damus temporialia ut sumamus aeterna. Per ... Or: Exercerent Domine gloria tua commercia offerimus qua redistis. Or, in one formula, which we still use today: Domine Deus noster, qui in hostias tuae presentis condictis, tuo quoque nominis munera iussisti dicanda constituit ... Or the attention is called with unconstrained assurance to the heap of gifts offered up: Tua Domine muneribus altaria cumulumamus ... But the gifts represent no independent sacrifice; they are offered up only to be merged into the sacrifice of Christ. At times, even in the secret, the prayer touches upon this disposition of the gifts: Sacramand tibi, Domine, munus offerimus ... Or: Propitius, Domine quossumus, haec dona sanctifica. Or: Reo mis oblationibus carnalium victimariam spiritalem tibi, summe Pater, hostiam suppliant servitute dejerimus. Still, such an extension of the thought, although corresponding to a general law of development, is less frequent in the older texts, particularly in the Leonianum, than in later ones and those of the present time, just as on the other hand the complete absence of the thought of sacrifice has always, from the beginning until now, continued to be an exception.

Brinktrine (cf. above, note 21) seeks to revive this concept of the canon; according to him the second main portion of the Mass, the “Eucharistic consecration,” begins with the secreta (168 ff.).

However, the sacrificial oblation does indeed appear in divers modifications. Besides the offerimus and immolamus there stands the suscipe, respice, ne despicias, intende placatus or—often on feast days—the reference to the merits of the saints or to the redemptive mystery being celebrated, which may recommend our gifts to God: Eculessiae tuae, quassumus, Domine, præces et hostias beati Petri Apostoli commendet oratio. Or prayer is said for the right disposition to offer the sacrifice worthwhile or, inversely, even for the fruit of the sacrifice already offered up, with the sacrifice itself being named only in obiquo. Sometimes we even get a momentary glimpse of the whole composite of sacrifice and symbolic symbol, as in the wonderful secret on Pentecost Monday: Propitius, Domine quassumus, haec dona sanctificæ et hostie spirituali oblatione susceptrae nostris tibi perfecce munus aeternum. Per ... Mostly, however, the petition that is linked with the oblation—the secret is indeed formulated as an oratio, that is, a prayer of petition—is kept very general: as our gift mounts up, so may God’s blessing come down upon us. Thus there is frequent mention of the mystical exchange, of the sacrosancta commercia, of the huius sacrificii veneranda commercia which are consummated in the sacred celebration.

In the whole tradition of the Roman sacramentaries two points are strictly maintained; the secret is always formulated in the plural as a prayer of the congregation: offerimus, immolamus, munera nostra, oblationes populi tui; and it is directed to God and concluded with Per Dominum. Even the Missal of Pius V contains not one exception to this rule. As a matter of fact, if that ancient law: Cum altari assisti, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio, should have been maintained anywhere in liturgical prayer it was here where there was question not of receiving the sacrifice instituted by Christ, but of offering it up to the heavenly Father. Of course, it is still conformable to Catholic dogma to direct the oblation to Christ Himself. The first exception of this sort in the Missale Romanum is found in the secret for the feast of St. Anthony of Padua, which was prescribed for the Church universal by Pope Sixtus V. Later on, a few other cases were added right down to most recent times.

For a long time it has been the rule that at each Mass there should be...
as many secrets—and then also post-communions—as there are collects.\textsuperscript{96} This rule is not entirely self-evident since in the formulas for the secret—which revolves more strictly around its own theme and seldom adds a relative predication to the word of address\textsuperscript{97}—the content varies but little and the influence of the Church year is slight, aside from the fact that on saints’ feasts the intercession of the saints is usually bracketed with the oblation. Thus, the superaddition of several formulas at times simply amounts to a repetition of the same thought. Still, the rule was inculcated with increasing positiveness,\textsuperscript{98} evidently because it conformed to a sense of symmetry.

The concluding words of the last secret,\textit{Per omnia saccula secundarum}, are spoken in a loud voice.\textsuperscript{99} That at least the words of a prayer destined for public performance should be said aloud is a law which we see followed in other places too: at the conclusion of the canon and the final words of the embolism. In both cases the same phrase is in question, the same way outside of Mass. In the oriental liturgies, the silent praying of the priestly orations occupies a much larger space, especially owing to the convergence of the priestly prayer with the alternate prayer of deacon and people which used to precede it; as a result, the so-called \textit{έκφωνης τις} plays a grand role.\textsuperscript{100} It is generally more extensive than its occidental counterpart, comprising as a rule a complete doxology, so that the people’s \textit{Amen} retains a meaning as an affirmation of the latter. Our \textit{Per omnia saccula secundarum} demands a complement in the foregoing prayer of the priest. This is not difficult, inasmuch as the course of the priestly prayers still had a vital sense of just this reality, that the words have been reinforced by the external symbol. Remigius of Auxerre (d. 933) already in this loud-spoken \textit{Per omnia saccula secundarum} refers back once more to the \textit{Oremus} that stands at the beginning and draws all that comes in between into a unit. For what comes in between is actually an \textit{orare}, with this difference, that the words have been reinforced by the external symbol. Remigius of Auxerre (d. 908) still had a vital sense of just this reality, for he explains the seemingly isolated \textit{Oremus} by claiming it to be an invitation to the faithful to be mindful of the oblation by joining to it their inmost offering so that their gift might be agreeable to the Lord.\textsuperscript{101} In the same sense a large number of ancient formulas of the secret speak expressly not only of the sacrificial gifts, but at the same time of the prayers of the people: \textit{Susce quassumus Domine preces populi cum oblationibus sua omnis populus obligation iste interessantibus ut oblatiur intentionem suam offertur, quatenus illorum oblatio accepta sit Domino. Cf. also Amalar, Liber off., pros- cunctum n. 13 (Hanssens, II, 16).}

"The formulas from Holy Saturday to Easter Tuesday begin in this way, already in the Gregorianum (Lietzmann, n. 87 90)."


"Cf. supra, I, 483 f.

With the present-day wording and in the present-day order (with two additions, and leaving aside the hand-washing which is still at the start of the series) already in the Mass order of the papal chapel about 1171, dum oblationi intentionem suam offertur, quatenus illorum oblatio accepta sit Domino. Cf. also Amalar, Liber off., pros- cunctum n. 13 (Hanssens, II, 16)."

9. The Oblation Rites as a Unit

In view of the perplexing multitude of forms and formulas which we have seen building up in the offertory during the course of centuries, there is ample ground for inquiring just how, in the light of what we have learned, are we to evaluate the completed structure. More particularly, how should we regard as a whole the series of texts which, as a result of the medieval development, now stand in our Missale Romanum? And how can we give this whole its fullest significance in the course of our celebration of Mass?

There is, first of all, no denying that here we have an anticipation of the thought of the canon, and therefore a certain duplication. True, it was not till the late Middle Ages that the term “little (or lesser) canon” was applied to the offertory rites,\textsuperscript{3} but the idea long stood unexpressed behind the new formation. In the liturgical thinking of the Middle Ages the wording of the Great Prayer of the Mass had only a small role to play. It was couched in a language whose Roman stamp continued to be strange and foreign to the newer nations, no matter how hard they tried to speak Latin and think Catholic. The canon, and this understood more and more...
hand, a closer resemblance to the form of the prayer of the canon (such as might have existed had the prayers each ended with Per Christum) did not gain general acceptance.

All in all, the offertory prayers of our present-day Ordo Missæ can be considered a needless anticipation of the canon only if we pivot our attention on the missa lecta where the dominant and recessive elements of the service are all evened out, and if consequently we bestow on these prayers as much weight as on the pithy phrases of the canon. These prayers do not pretend to be an anticipation of the canon, but rather a suggestion of its various motives. Indeed they are generally not even "prayers" in the full sense, but predominantly accompanying phrases to match the external action. They were never intended—excepting in part the Orate fratres—to be recited publicly before the congregation, and thus make no pretense at furthering the dramatic performance of the Mass.

To some extent it is different with regard to the ancient oratio super oblata, which is, too, in its own way, actually an anticipation of the concept of sacrifice. From it, too, the proper arrangement of the medieval texts must derive. The oratio super oblata endeavors to underline the one step taken during the entire oblation rite: the provisional offering of the material gifts. Even these material gifts of bread and wine can be symbols of our interior surrender. So, just as they were brought to the altar by the faithful, in an external rite, they are now offered up to God by the Church in prayer, but at the same time the attention focuses on the veritable gift which will issue from the material ones. These latter, then, receive thereby a preliminary dedication, a "pre-consecration," similar to the preparatory consecration received by other requisites of divine worship, church and altar, chalice and paten, candles and altar-linens.

There is no reason why we cannot include the more recent oblation prayers in this function of the secret; thus they will best fit into the course of the Mass.\(^4\)

\(^3\) See supra, p. 46 ff., with note 41, p. 50.  
\(^4\) See the fine biblico-liturgical exposition of the text in G. E. Closen, Wege in die Hist. Schrift (Regensburg, 1939), 148-156.
II. The Canon actionis

1. The Canon actionis or the Eucharistic Prayer as a Whole

In our study of the history of the Mass we have come to recognize that the core of the Mass and the inner area within which Christ's institution is fulfilled is plainly and simply the Eucharistia. A thanksgiving prayer rises from the congregation and is borne up to God by the priest; it shifts into the words of consecration, and then into the oblation of the sacred gifts, and this oblation, in turn, concludes with a solemn word of praise. Although the fabric thus formed continues to survive unbroken in our present Mass, it is difficult for anyone not initiated into the history of the Mass to recognize the outlines of such a plan in the text of today. In the "preface," the prayer of thanksgiving is presented as an isolated unit, a preparatory item to be followed by the canon. The canon itself, however, with the exception of the words of consecration, appears to be nothing more than a loosely arranged succession of oblations, prayers of intercession and a reverential citation of apostles and martyrs of early Christianity. Still greater is the divergence from this plan when we turn our attention to the external presentation. At the Sanctus the audible performance breaks off, and all the rest is done in utter stillness, with only the altar boy's bell to give warning of the elevation of the sacred species, and again the silence resumes. At a high Mass this quiet is overlaid with the singing of the Sanctus and the Benedictus. Then the torchbearers appear in procession and range in front of the altar as for a grand reception; those assisting in choir fall on their knees; the Hosanna resounds in jubilant worship of Him who cometh in the name of the Lord. The God-ward movement of the great prayer of thanksgiving has been replaced by a reverse movement, turning upon the descent of the sacred mystery, and it is the impetus of this movement which has determined to a large extent the present pattern of the ancient Eucharistia.

It will therefore be our task to trace the various elements of this central portion of our Mass to their sources and to show more clearly the underlying ancient plan. We have already mentioned the decisive theological factor: the movement in the eucharistic teaching which led to a lessening regard for the oblation which we ourselves offer up and in which we offer ourselves as members of the Body of Christ, and a greater atten-
tion to the act of transubstantiation in which the divine omnipotence becomes operative in the midst of us, bringing Christ to us under the appearances of bread and wine. This theological movement left its mark in various additions and appendages to the eucharistic prayer in the Roman Mass, and thus the work of recasting it was started. The most notable modification was the break at the Te igitur which led to splitting off the preface and to a new make-up of the canon that now followed.

In all the ancient liturgies the eucharistic prayer is composed as a unit and also titled as a unit. The original name (εὐχαριστία) was soon replaced by other designations, but these, too, kept the entire canon in view as a single whole. Nearly everywhere in the Orient the substitute for eucharistia was found in the word “anaphora,” which brings to the fore the notion of sacrifice. In the older Western liturgies, too, there were similar designations which emphasize the sacrifice: oratio oblationis, actio sacrificii. But here in the West the names more widely distributed were others that referred immediately only to the accompanying prayer, or else, like the word εὐχαριστία designated its contents as divine praise, above all prædicatio—terms which we can represent to a certain extent by “Great Prayer” and Eucharistic Prayer. Another designation, the word actio, defined the section beginning here as a sacred activity; intra

1 Above I, 82 f., 118 ff.
2 In every instance the anaphora embraces the whole prayer, but is extended in various ways in different rites, to include the prayers that precede and also the Canon that now followed. Later the word canon was used all by itself in the same sense.
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Even as late as the turn of the eighth century the preface was still included in the conception of the canon. Thus it is directed that the Easter candle should be consecrated decantando quasi canone. Even more plainly in a later writing we read that the subdeacon takes the paten medio canone, id est cum dictur Te igitur. Thus the unity of the Great Prayer was also preserved in the concept of “canon.” The Canon began with what we call the preface, and even the external ritual at the solemn pontifical functions signalized this spot as a beginning.

Later on, however, a splitting of this original unity occurred, and preface and canon appear as separate parts thereof. This split proceeded from the Gallic liturgies. For here the eucharistic prayer, or rather all the praying in the course of the sacrifice-Mass, was from the start a series of individual prayers. The oratio sexta, to which Isidore assigns the consecration without further distinction, reached from the end of the Sanctus-chant to the Pater noster.

This scheme derived from Isidore was the one which Frankish commentators of the eighth and ninth centuries applied to the Roman liturgy. Here, too, the oratio quinta would have to conclude with the Sanctus, and the consecutor oratio sexta would begin at that point. What went ahead was the præfatio, that is, in the new language that evolved from the Gallic liturgy, the preem and introduction to the Great Pray er. In the Gregorian Sacramentary the word præfatio was to be seen as a heading for the Vere dignum formulas. Without hesitation its meaning was confined to the unit that preceded the Sanctus.
And in consequence, the canon was understood as comprising what followed, namely, the prayer beginning with *Te igitur*.

Despite the prevailing opposition of the Roman books, this notion appeared to be corroborated by a remark in the first Roman *ordo* where, after the mention of the *Sanctus*-chant, the rubric continues: *Quem dum expleverint, surgit pontifex solus et intrat in canonem*; the canon (it seems to imply) is a sanctuary into which the priest enters alone.

The sanctity of this inner chamber, which must be kept closed to the people, is matched by the silence reigning in it. The canon becomes a prayer spoken by the priest in such a tone that even the bystanders cannot hear it. The transition to this is to be noticed very evidently about the middle of the eighth century in the Frankish revision of the Roman *ordo* of John the Arch-chanter; here, after the *Sanctus*, we read: *Et incipit canere dissimili voce et melodia, ita ut a circumstantibus altae tantum audiatur*—he starts to sing in a different tone and melody, so as to be heard only by those standing around the altar. At first the canon was said merely in a subdued tone, whereas the secret had become a completely silent prayer. But about the turn of the eighth century various authentic reports begin to make mention of an absolute silence also for the canon. In the second Roman *ordo*, which represents a late Carolingian revision of the first, the rubric cited above is reworded as follows: *surgit solus pontifex et tacite intrat in canonem*.

In the period that followed, the quiet recitation of the canon became the established rule, but this is not to say that before Pius V the rule was everywhere taken in the sense of a fully inaudible recitation. That the canon, however, was a holy of holies which the priest alone could tread, was a concept that was continually developed and consolidated. Other reasons for silently reciting the canon pointed in the same direction; the sacred words must not be profaned, lest we call down God’s punishment upon our heads. The same thought is put in a positive way when it is emphasized that the canon must be reserved to the priest alone: *specialiter ad sacerdotem pertinet*.

The splitting-off of the preface was also marked out very plainly in the set-up of the Mass book. At the beginning of the eighth century, in *Cod. Reg. 316*, which gives us the older *Gelasianum*, the *Te igitur* follows right after the last *Hosanna* without a break, indeed without even starting a new line, even though the manuscript is definitely an artistic one; other manuscripts, however, of the same century already show the break.

The cleavage was displayed in several ways. The “†” of *Te igitur* was expanded into an initial. Then the initial was revamped into a picture of the Crucified. At first this was done only in isolated instances, but since the tenth century it became more and more the normal thing. Since the twelfth century the picture was frequently separated from the text and became a special canon-plate; a new initial “†” was then introduced at the start of the text and this, in turn, was not seldom treated as a decorative figure. Along with this there was another tradition of long standing, the artistic transfiguration of the start of the preface, the first words of which (*Vere dignum*) were displayed, as a rule, with two artistically

---

20 *Ordo Rom.*, I, n. 16 (PL, 78, 945); cf. Jungmann, *Gewordene Liturgie*, 100 ff., for textual criticism of the passage. The meaning of the words is only that the celebrant “enters into” that is, continues alone with the Canon after the singing in common of the *Sanctus*; cf. ibid., 101 f.

21 *Capitulare eccl. ord.* (Andrieu, III, 103). Andrieu is hardly right in doubting the originality of this reading (ibid., note), found in the older recension (St. Gall 349) in favor of the later version (*without et melodia; canone instead of canere = canere*); in the latter the mention of the melody could have been quietly dropped if, about 800, the transition to complete silence had been accomplished.—Cf. also for the following, Jungmann, *Gewordene Liturgie*, 53-119: the study “Praefatio et stiller Kanon” (= ZTh, 1929, 66-94; 247-271), especially p. 87 ff.—That the cannon then was said in a perceptible tone is presupposed also in the *Ordo Rom.*, I, n. 16 (Andrieu, II, 96; PL, 78, 945), for the statement is made, without further remark, that the subdeacons resume an erect position at the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus, Ordo sec. Rom.*, n. 10 (Andrieu, II, 222; PL, 78, 974), which already supposes the canon’s being said in silence, quite logically directs that the bishop say these words *aperta clamans voce*. This is also attested by Amalar, *Liber offic. III*, 26, 5; 14 ff. (Hanssen, II, 345; 347 f.): *exaltat vocem, elevat voceum*. The commentary “Quotiens contra se”: Martène, I, 4, 11 (I, 455 D); *Flor. Diaconus, De actione missae, n.* 421 (PL, 119, 43); Remigius of Auxerre, *Expositio* (PL, 101, 1256 C): *Expositio, Intrat en missae quare*, ed. Hanssen (Eph. liturg., 1930) 45.

22 *Ordo Romanus* II, n. 10 (PL, 78, 974 A). Such the warning issued by the Synod of Sarum in England 1217, can. 36 (Mansi XXII, 1119): *ut verba canonis in missa rotonde et distincte dicantur; see Har­douin, XI, 1335. According to the *Ordo Rom.*, XIV, n. 53 (PL, 78, 1165) the canon was to be said *submissa voce* by the priest, in the same manner as the deacon and subdeacon together said the *Sanctus*, therefore in a loud tone of voice. The consecration of the Oil of the Sick before the *Vor quem hae omnis* on Maundy Thursday, spoken in a subdued tone (*voce demissa*), is a carry-over from this older practice.

23 Cf. above, I, 82 f.

24 Remigius of Auxerre, *Expositio* (PL, 101, 1256 D). Remigius introduces a story told originally by John Moschus (PL, 619), *Pratum spirituale*, c. 196 (PL, 74, 225 f.; PG, 87, 3081 f.), a story repeated by many later commentators on the Mass, how shepherd boys were struck by lightning because they dared to sing the canon in the open field. The movement for the silent recitation of the canon in the Orient is even older, although it did assume different forms; cf. E. Bishop, *Silent Recitals in the Mass of the Faithful*: the Appendix to R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, 121-126.

25 *Ecloga* (10th cent.; PL, 105, 1326 C). Only since the 12th century do some interpreters call attention to the fatigue of the priest that is to be avoided by the silent prayer; see Eisenhofer, II, 154, who sees in it a possible supporting factor. We might agree with his opinion.

26 See the facsimile, DACL, VI, 756-57.

27 In the Sacramentary of Gellone (about 770); see pictures in Leroquais IV, Table II.

28 Ebner, 445 f. Illustrations of the two methods, ibid., 9; 16; 50; 130; 184; 444, and in the frontispiece; Leroquais, *Les Sacramentaires*, IV. Sometimes this cross-formed T stands as an abbreviation for the words *Te igitur* and the text then continues with *clementis... Pater*.

29 For this purpose a favorite in the Middle Ages was the representation of the celebrant at the altar, or of the Pietà, or of the Brazen Serpent. Ebner, 447 f.
ornamented letters V D, usually converted into the form ΕΠ. Since the ninth century the rounding of this figure was utilized more and more by miniaturists as a space for the Maiestas Domini. But towards end of the Middle Ages the preface-symbol disappeared, and with it the special beginning of the Great Prayer. The only picture our missal has, is one before the Teigitur, so that even the book-making art marks the beginning of the canon as something entirely new. In the manuscripts the greatest care is often expended on the text of the canon. Not infrequently it is written in gold or silver lettering on purple parchment. Even today the Mass books usually print this part in a large (48-point) type which typographers call "canon." In the course of the centuries, the close of the canon was set at various places. The conclusion at the doxology is still presupposed in the third Roman ordo, and basically even in the present-day rubrics. On the other hand, our missals extend the page heading canon actionis and the large print to the last Gospel. Since the ninth century the conclusion of the canon has varied, shifting between these two points, particularly in accord with the various theories regarding the consecration prayer and those rites by which the sacrifice is completed, or the representation of Christ's Passion is concluded. The end of the canon was set after the Pater noster, after the embolism, at the Agnus Dei, or after the Communion. Other particulars of the external rite were also determined in accordance with these same theories, like the extent of the silence during the canon, the duration of the time assistants stayed on their knees, etc. We will have occasion later to speak about these different regulations. But there can be no doubt that in the original construction of the Mass-liturgy the principal portion of the Mass ended at the Amen before the Pater noster.

The pre-Carolingian Roman liturgy had, as we have said, no thought at all of the division into preface and canon which we are considering. Not only was the entire eucharistic prayer comprised under the word canon, but even the word praefatio to all appearances had the same meaning. It was the solemn prayer which ascended to God before the whole assembly. In this sense the word was already current in ancient sacral language, and we find it being employed in a similar sense as a liturgical term in Christian usage. Thus it became, by preference, the name for the Great Prayer of the Mass.

If, in arguing as we do, we are on the right track, then the name only confirms what we have been forced to conclude from other considerations, namely, that the whole prayer was said in a loud voice. If anywhere, then surely here, the solemn recitation must have become even at an early period a kind of speech-song. Since the sixth century there are witnesses to the song-like performance of the Mass-prayers, and obviously these must be referred above all to the eucharistic prayer. This does not mean, of course, that originally the whole eucharistic prayer was sung to the tune of the preface. A great deal of it, indeed, must have been chanted. But we must conclude that after the Sanctus a mere recitative—the simple reading tone—predominated from time immemorial. This, indeed, corresponded to the character of the prayer-text which no longer displayed the

The Herder Missal of 1931, prepared by the Abbey of Maria Laach, is perhaps the first printed missal with a preface picture placed before the praefatio communis, which moreover is set in the large type usual for the canon.

Influence. A Sacramentary of Tours at the end of the 9th century has the Praefatio communis along with the canon in gold lettering upon a purple background; another of the 10th century from Trier has only this preface with the Sanctus, Lercogius, I, 53, 83.

The oldest testimony is probably to be found in the Leoniannum (Muratori, I, 375): Incipient preces diurna cum sensu bus necessariis. By the word sensus is meant the recitative melody; cf. above, I, 409, n. 36. The word is used for the melody of the Psalms in the Liber Pont. In a reference to Gregory III (d. 741) Du Chesne, I, 415, 1. 3). Cf. also for the priest's chant in the Mass, the Synod of Cloveshoe, can. 12, cited supra, I, 377, note 17. That seems to be the sense of the expression mentioned above: decantando quasi canonem.

This is indicated by the expression disimili voce et melodia in the text cited above, p. 103 f., from the Capitulare ecclesiasticorum ordinum. At all events, in the Roman prayer for the blessing of the baptismal water on Holy Saturday, a prayer that parallels the Eucharistic prayer, we have

---

37 Ebner, 432 f.; for illustrations see the list, p. XI. Individual MSS., like the Cod. Ottobon. 313 (beginning of the 9th cent.) which scarcely emphasizes the beginning of the canon, still have the elaborate symbol for the preface; Ebner, 223 f.

38 Ebner, 438-441.

39 Ebner, 434 f., 437.

40 The Herder Missal of 1931, prepared by the Abbey of Maria Laach, is perhaps the first printed missal with a preface picture placed before the praefatio communis, which moreover is set in the large type usual for the canon.

41 Ebner, 449; Martene, 1, 4, 8, 2 (1, 399). Older memories still exerted their influence. A Sacramentary of Tours at the end of the 9th century has the Praefatio communis along with the canon in gold lettering upon a purple background; another of the 10th century from Trier has only this preface with the Sanctus, Lercogius, I, 53, 83.

42 Ordo Rom. III (11th cent.), n. 16 (PL, 78, 981 C).

43 Missale Rom., Ritus serv. VIII; IX.

44 Ebner, 425.—In the last-mentioned instance the end of the canon was distinguished by a picture, the Lamb of God in a round medallion. Ebner, 448 f.


46 For the following see Jungmann, Gewordene Liturgie, 53-80, which also contains the monochord. The word praefatio was used for the separate parts of the Eucharistic prayer, not only for the Vere dignum, but likewise for the Hanc igitur and for the blessing formulas that were to be interpolated before the concluding doxology; thus in the Gregorianum (Lietzmann, n. 2, 9, 138, 3; cf. n. 77, 3 in the Apparatus). This presupposes an earlier application of the word for the entire Eucharistic prayer.

47 There are phrases like praefari divos (Virgil), praefari Vestam (Ovid), fausta vota praefari (Apuleius); praefatio was precisely the prayer which was joined with the sacrum (Suetonius). Even in common parlance the word was used in the sense of a public announcement, a proclamation. Further proofs in Jungmann, Gewordene Liturgie, 76-78. The same spatial significance is here attached to the praefatio communis, praesidium; it designates an action that is performed in the presence of someone, and not one that precedes another in point of time.

48 Council of Meline (416), c. 12 (Mansi, IV, 330.—Liber pont. (Du Chesne, I, 255): (Gelasius): fecit etiam et sacramentorum praefationes. When Cyprian, De Dom. or., c. 31, calls the sursum corda a praefatio, he has a different meaning in mind. Here praefatio does not mean the speech said in common before the people, but the speech said as a preliminary or preparation before the holy of holies. The word corresponds to the Greek προθωραίος; cf. Döllger, Sol salutis, 268 ff. In the Gallican liturgy praefatio was used in the sense of a preparatory announcement for the invitation to prayer.

49 Cf. above I, 377 f.

50 The oldest testimony is probably to be found in the Leonianum (Muratori, I, 375): Incipient preces diurna cum sensibus necessariis. By the word sensus is meant the recitative melody; cf. above, I, 409, n. 36. The word is used for the melody of the Psalms in the Liber Pont. In a reference to Gregory III (d. 741) Du Chesne, I, 415, 1. 3). Cf. also for the priest's chant in the Mass, the Synod of Cloveshoe, can. 12, cited supra, I, 377, note 17. That seems to be the sense of the expression mentioned above: decantando quasi canone.
already in the 7th century the rubric that to this day requires the transition to the tonus lectionis for the last part; in the older Gelasianum I, 44 (Wilson, 86): hic sensum mutabis; in the Sacramentary of Gellone (about 770): hic mutas sensum quasi lectionem legas; Martène, I, 1, 18, VI (1, 184 E). Regarding the word sensus, see above, note 40. That a rubric so frequently used at Mass should not be transmitted can be explained by the fact that, unlike the blessing of the Easter water, it was sufficiently current by constant practice.

"That is shown in the fact that the melody of the preface was not written in notes, but was maintained merely with the help of certain reading signs; cf. above, I, 378. Concerning certain trends beyond these bounds even in the 8th century, see above, I, 377, note 17.

"Von Ursprung, Die kath. Kirchennusik, 58 f.; cf. 27 f. According to this study the first step in the development was the replacement of the subtonal "tuba" or recitation note, which made a full step down from b to a. About the 10th century we find in its stead a sub-semitonal tuba—a recitation note which made only a half step down (from c to b flat; our ferial preface tone). A further development, along with the elaboration of the initial and final phrases, was the introduction of a special accent tone above the tuba for certain syllables (cf. our festive Pater noster). And since the 12th century we have the development of a secondary tuba, the recitation moving along for a time on a note below the ordinary recitation (our solemn preface tone). Lastly, about the same time, the introductory and final phrases on festive occasions were set with melismas of three or four notes, so that we have a really melodic form (our tonus sollemnior for the preface).

"Above I, 53 f.

"Euchologion of Serapion 13, 18 (above I, 34); Const. sp., VIII, 12, 40-49 (Quasten, Mon., 224-227); Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat. myst., V, 8-10 (Quasten, Mon., 102 f).

"Above I, 171.

the mysteria, and not before, of the names of those who had offered the gifts, is found even in Innocent I. In the Orient, the intercessory prayers, in a very elaborate form, obtained an entrance into the inner circle of the Great Prayer as early as the fourth century. The evolution seems to have followed this pattern: By degrees the viewpoint changed, and the celebration was no longer looked upon as an altogether spiritual eucharistia; over and above this there was the offering of the gifts, the oblation (according to the current designation), and this, too, had to be clearly kept in view; naturally, then, there developed a provision for putting this oblation of gifts forward in an intercessory sense, a thing not easily done in a "thanksgiving prayer." Or, putting it a different way, there was a growing trend to relocate the intercessory prayers which had been said from time past right after the readings, linking them more closely with the gifts. This connection was certainly closest when the intercessory prayers were included in the very inner circle of the oblation prayers.

The driving force could well have been the closely related notion that our prayers would be all the more efficacious the nearer they were drawn to the Holy of Holies, thereby attracting to themselves the power of the Sacrament Itself. Even today, a person asking help is advised to place his needs before God at the consecration. Thus the importunate friend could seek to gain access even into the sanctuary of the Great Prayer. In the Orient the damage done to the prayer by this insertion took place in only one step, either after the consecration as in the liturgies of the Syrian and Byzantine domains, or before the consecration, in fact before the Sanctus (as in the Egyptian liturgies). But in the West the effect was greater because the prayer of thanks had always been so much more terse (and when the praefatio communis became the normal text, it was actually reduced to a mere minimum), and because, on the other hand, the intercessory prayers were inserted finally in two different places, before the consecration and after.
2. The Introductory Dialogue

Whereas generally the priestly prayer is preceded only by the customary greeting and the invitation Oremus, the Great Prayer displays its higher importance in the increased formality of its introduction. After the greeting there is an invitation not simply to a prayer, to an oratio, but to a prayer of thanks, an εὐχερετία: Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro: Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ Χριστῷ. And this formal invitation is preceded by still another: Sursum corda. In both instances the people are not ignored, as they are with a mere Oremus, but are given a special concurrent response: Habemus ad Dominum, Dignum et iustum est.

In this introductory dialogue we have a most ancient Christian tradition. 1 Cyprian already comments on the Sursum corda and sees in these words the expression of the mood in which the Christian should properly begin every prayer: every fleshly and worldly thought should be suppressed, and the mind bent solely upon the Lord. 2 Augustine takes occasion, time after time, to speak of the Sursum corda. For him the words are the expression of a Christian attitude, much the same as St. Paul’s admonition to those who have risen with Christ: quaesursum sunt quaritie; 3 our Head is in heaven, and therefore our hearts must also be with Him. It is through God’s grace that they are with Him, and the gladsome consciousness of this, as expressed in the common response of the faithful, Habemus ad Dominum, is basically the factor which, according to St. Augustine, urges the priest on to the Gratias agamus. 4 Of course our thoughts cannot always be on God, but certainly they should be so—as another commentator insists—at least in this sublime hour. 5

1 Above I, 16; 29.
2 Cyprian, De dom. or., c. 31 (CSEL 3, 289): Cognitio omnia carnalis et seculare abscedat nec quiaquum animus quam id solum cogit et quod precatur. Ideo et sacrificia ante orationem prestitio praemissa parat fratum mentes dicendo: Sursum corda, dum respondet plebs: Habemus ad Dominum, admonitoriun nihil aliud se quam Dominum cogitare debere.
3 Col., 3: 1.
4 Augustine, Serm. 227 (PL, 38, 1100 f.). —Nine more pertinent passages are recorded by Rötzer, 118 f., to which he adds an et cet. The word Dominus here, just as in the Dominus vocibus, is not always understood by Augustine to mean Christ, e.g., Serm. 6, 3 Denis (Müller, Aug. I, 30); Quid est Sursum cor? Sopr. Deo, non in te. Tu enim deorsum es, Deus sursum est. With the same emphasis as St. Augustine, Cresarius of Arles explained Sursum corda in his homilies; see Sermones, ed. Morin, in the Register, p. 999. He connects the Sursum corda, among others, with Phil. 3: 20; Serm. 22, 4 (Morin, 97).
5 Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat. myst. V, 4 (Quasten, Mon., 99 f.). The summons to be rid of χωριαλς φροντιδας that Cyril inserts in the Ανω τις και πανετος later comes to light in the oriental liturgy, in the hymn of the cherubim that accompanies the Great Entry (Brightman, 377). From a later age we might be permitted a reference to Henry Suso, who always sang these words in the Mass with special fervor. Asked what was his object, he answered that he was calling upon all creatures of heaven and earth and that he felt himself as their precentor in the praise of God; and, finally, that this song was for him a plea to all the tepid, who belong neither entirely to God, nor are yet entirely absorbed in

creatures. Vita I, 9 (Des Mystikers H. Suses deutsche Schriften, ed. N. Heller [Regensburg, 1926], p. 29 f.).
6 Nno. 11: 41; Col. 3: 11; especially Lament. 3: 41 are considered as possible biblical references. Cf. Gassner, 106. A Baumsstück “Wege zum Judentum des neuteinstellenten Zeitalters”: Bonner Zeitschrift f. Theologie u. Seelsorge, 4 (1927), 33, calls attention to a formula in the Samaritan liturgy that requires the uplifting of hands before designated high points in prayer. Recently, however, he is more inclined to consider a Hellenistic origin and supposes that the greeting at the beginning of the prayer was somehow united sometimes with the Gratias agamus, sometimes with the Sursum corda, until at last both invocations were set side by side. Baumsstück, Liturgie compareè, 97. A Robinson, on the other hand, considers the expression Sursum corda haber a a natural Latin one; see the note of R. H. Connolly, The Journal of Theol. Studies, 39 (1938), 355.—In Hippolytus, Trad. Ap. (Dix 50 f.) the thanksgiving prayer that introduces the Agape, is preceded only by the Dominus vocibus and the Gratias agamus, and the point is stressed that the Sursum corda should be said only at the Sacrifice. Hence it appears as a confirmation and enrichment of the invocation implied in the Gratias agamus.
7 Above I, 15, note 46.
8 As a confirmation equivalent to the Amen in the Schema of the morning prayer: ‘‘emet waajabj; I. Elbogen, Der judische Gottesdienst, 21, 25.
10 Thus at the election of the Emperor Gordian; Scripturies hist. Aug., Gordian, c. 8 (ed. Didot 501); Peterson, 177.—cf. the remark of an acclamation by E. Peterson, 2-231.
11 Both at the election of the Bishop in Hippo; Augustine, Ep. 213 (CSEL, 57, 375 f.).
12 Cf. Chrisostom, In II Cor. hom., 18 (PG, 61, 527): “It is not the priest alone who completes the thanksgiving, but the people with him.”
13 Peterson, op. cit., 179, surmises that in
responses mentioned were actually spoken by the people. In fact, in the
evidence already presented, this matter is made clear enough. 41 One peculiarity in the ritual of this introductory dialogue is the fact
that the priest does not turn to the people when greeting them, as he does
otherwise. In the Roman Mass he continues to face the altar. 42 Here, too,
we have an example of the more delicate sense of form which ancient
culture possessed, for once the sacred action is inaugurated, once this
God-ward activity has begun, it would be improper to turn away. 43 At any
rate, on this depended the decision as to what precisely was considered
the opening of the sacred action, whether at the beginning of the
Eucharistia itself, as was evidently the case in the Byzantine liturgy, 44 or rather
at the presentation of the gifts, as is apparently presupposed in our Mass.
This ancient sense of form is also manifested in the accompanying gestures:
the summons to lift up the heart is accompanied by the priest's lifting of
his hands, 45 and they then remain outstretched in the attitude of the
orantes, the prayer-attitude of the ancient Church.

It is otherwise in the Byzantine liturgy, where the salutation has the solemn form
of II Cor. 13:13 (see above in the text) and is also accompanied by a gesture of
blessing; Brightman, 384. While saying this as well as the following "Ας σε θυσία
τας καρδίας he stands facing the people whom he is addressing; it is not till he
invoes the Εὐχαριστητήμεν τῷ κυρίῳ that he turns "towards the East." Hornykewitsch, 76.

41 Above I, 29.
42 H. Engberding, "Der Gruss des Priesters zu Beginn der Eucharistia in östlichen Liturgien," JL, 9 (1929) 138-143. — The most important development is that the part which pertains to God the Father is placed at the very front: 'H ἁγίον τῷ
κυρίῳ καὶ τοῖς θυσίαις, ἡ χάρις ... This form spread from Jerusalem. The Mozarabic Missele mixtum has a similar version (PL, 85, 546 f.). — Baumstark, Liturgie comparée, 89 f.
43 In the Syrian-Antiochian sphere: 'Ας σε θυσίας τας καρδίας ἡμῶν; Baumstark, 90 f. Alongside the Sursum corda there is the formula of the Apostolic Constitutions VIII, 12, 5 (Quasten, Mon., 213): 'Ας σε θυσίας τόν νομόν, τόν Κυρίον τόν Θεόν. The Greek liturgy of St. James combines both: 'Ας σε θυσίας τόν νομόν καὶ τας καρδίας. Brightman, 85; cf. 473.
44 The Mozarabic Mass inserts after the trinitarian plea for blessing, the invi­
tation to the kiss of peace, to which the choir responds with a chant of several verses; next the words of the Psalm Introibo ad altare Dei mei which the choir again takes up with Ad Deum qui laetificat

general spread of this response in his De vera religio, c. 3, 5 (PL, 34, 125): mankind throughout the world answers
daily in this phrase.

The East Syrian Mass brings to the fore the notion of sacrifice which is
concealed in the thanksgiving: 'The sacrifice is offered up to God, the Lord
of all,' whereupon the usual answer follows: "It is meet and just." 46 The
Mozarabic liturgy connects with this exclamation a trinitarian confession,
just as the Byzantine does with the response of the people.

45 Above I, 29.
46 Brightman, 85; cf. above I, 39.
47 Brightman, 283. The same stress on the sacrificial character in this passage, though
in more elaborate phraseology, in both the East Syrian anaphora of Theodore of
Mopsuestia and that of Nestorius; Re­
mudor, Liturgien orientalis, II (1847), 611; 620.
48 Liber ordinum (Ferotin, 256): Deo ac Domino nostro, Patri et Filio et Spi­
ritui Sancto, dignas laudes et gratias referamus, in Missale mixtum (PL, 85, 547)
Christ is substituted in place of the Three

persons.
49 Brightman, 384: "Ας σε θυσίας έτιν προσκύνησιν παρεί οἱν καὶ λαβεῖν πνεύμα
τριάδος θυσίαν καὶ χαρίαν. In many other texts the addition is missing.
from what precedes, and is given greater emphasis by an elucidation of the deacon, admonishing the people to assume a proper demeanor of reverence and attention in view of the Holy Sacrifice now to be offered up: Σωματικός, σωματικός μετα φόρου, πράγματι την άγιαν άνεροφάννην ειρήνη προσφέρεται. Let us stand upright, let us stand in fear, let us give our attention to offering the Holy Sacrifice in peace. The choir confirms this admonition by glorifying the oblation as a grace-laden pledge of peace and a sacrifice of praise: "Ελέων εἰρήνης, φῶς άλήτως." In some churches of the West Syrian ambit, a monition of this sort was augmented as early as the fourth-fifth century by a whole series of warnings from the deacon to guard against the possibility of anyone unworthy remaining amongst the participants. We have here the ancient πρόερησις, the πραφατίο in the sense indicated by St. Cyprian. The kiss of peace, too, which, in the oriental liturgies precedes the dialogue, resp., the deacon’s warnings, either immediately or mediatly, evidently had the same function of an assurance that all were ready for the sacred action.

The Roman liturgy has no such monitory pause at this juncture. The deacon’s function is scarcely developed at all, and the kiss of peace is deferred to a different place. Conversely, the dialogue that introduces the prayer of thanks is today so closely interwoven with what precedes that there is no evident break-off. After his silent preparation of the gifts, the deacon goes on with: 'Ελέων εἰρήνης, φῶς άλήτως and its equivalent, as the translations show, seems not to have been understood any more. Φως άλήτως (from Ps. 115:7, according to the Septuagint) can just about be rendered with ἄλκηγενθαι; a sacrifice consisting of praise. The revision cited above for Φως εἰρήνης follows Mercenier-Paris, La prière des εὐλαβείας Byzantins, i, 238. The invitation to offering the Holy Sacrifice in peace. The choir confirms this admonition by glorifying the oblation as a grace-laden pledge of peace and a sacrifice of praise: "Ελέων εἰρήνης, φῶς άλήτως." In some churches of the West Syrian ambit, a monition of this sort was augmented as early as the fourth-fifth century by a whole series of warnings from the deacon to guard against the possibility of anyone unworthy remaining amongst the participants. We have here the ancient πρόερησις, the πραφατίο in the sense indicated by St. Cyprian. The kiss of peace, too, which, in the oriental liturgies precedes the dialogue, resp., the deacon’s warnings, either immediately or mediatly, evidently had the same function of an assurance that all were ready for the sacred action.

The Roman liturgy has no such monitory pause at this juncture. The deacon’s function is scarcely developed at all, and the kiss of peace is deferred to a different place. Conversely, the dialogue that introduces the prayer of thanks is today so closely interwoven with what precedes that there is no evident break-off. After his silent preparation of the gifts, the deacon begins by saying aloud: Per omnia saecula saeculorum, the concluding words of the secreta and therefore a part of the offertory. Thus the Dominus vobiscum does not sound at all like a start, but rather like a continuation. Such was the case already in the eighth century. Still, at that time there was a conscious knowledge that the real beginning started with the Dominus vobiscum, several of the Carolingian commentaries commencing with these words. Some of the oldest manuscripts which contain the canon leave out the Dominus vobiscum—taking it for granted—and introduce the canon with the words Sursum corda. It is possible to admit that at least the solemn melody did not start till the Dominus vobiscum.

3. The Preface

The prayer ushered in with the preface is the prayer of the Church, her Great Prayer. It is an attempt to create with human words a worthy framework and more especially a fitting adit for the holy mystery which will be accomplished in our midst and which we are privileged to present to God. There are two ranges of ideas which here press for expression: first, the primitive consciousness that we owe God, our Creator and Lord, adoration and praise, the basic acts of all religion and worship; and second, the Christian acknowledgment that we who have been elected and honored by the wonderful vocation which is ours through Christ, can do nothing less than thank Him again and again. The only proper response to the εὐχαριστία is the εὐχαριστία. For what we have here received is something far beyond anything that our human nature might expect from its Creator as a fitting endowment. Gratitude is also called for by the vision of earthly creation, the vision of all that nature provides for men. This gratitude for the benefits of the natural order is to be found remarkably amplified in a number of examples from the early Christian period, both within the

---

90 Thus in the Byzantine Mass; Brightman, 383. In other liturgies within the Syrian sphere the same invocation underwent various revisions. It is considerably amplified in the East Syrian and Armenian Mass; Brightman, 282; 434 f. In the Egyptian it must have found partial acceptance only later, as is shown by the still prevailing Greek text of the Copts; ibid., 164. The answer of the choir Ειρήνη εἰρήνης, φῶς άλήτως and its equivalent, as the translations show, seems not to have been understood any more. Φως άλήτως (from Ps. 115:7, according to the Septuagint) can just about be rendered with ἄλκηγενθαι; a sacrifice consisting of praise. The revision cited above for Φως εἰρήνης follows Mercenier-Paris, La prière des εὐλαβείας Byzantins, i, 238. The invitation to offering the Holy Sacrifice in peace. The choir confirms this admonition by glorifying the oblation as a grace-laden pledge of peace and a sacrifice of praise: "Ελέων εἰρήνης, φῶς άλήτως." In some churches of the West Syrian ambit, a monition of this sort was augmented as early as the fourth-fifth century by a whole series of warnings from the deacon to guard against the possibility of anyone unworthy remaining amongst the participants. We have here the ancient πρόερησις, the πραφατίο in the sense indicated by St. Cyprian. The kiss of peace, too, which, in the oriental liturgies precedes the dialogue, resp., the deacon’s warnings, either immediately or mediatly, evidently had the same function of an assurance that all were ready for the sacred action.

---

Note 2, above. Dolger, Sol Salutis, 290, refers to Livy, 45, 5: . . . cum omnia praefatio sacrorum eos, quibus non sunt pars manus, sacrat arceat. Thus in the Coptic, Ethiopian, and in the East Syrian liturgy; Brightman, 162 f.; 227; 281 f.

Griesgräff (Lietzmann, n. 1). The Cod. Otobon, 313, which goes back to the 9th century, inserts expressly: qua (sc. oratione super oblatione) completa diecit saeculorum speculavit voce: Per omnia (ibid.);
eucharistic prayer and outside it. Later, the theme is less common. It is particularly infrequent in the Roman liturgy, though even here it is not entirely absent. But there is a new note and a new urgency in the gratitude with regard to the Christian economy of salvation. The Epistles of St. Paul, which almost invariably begin with a word of thanksgiving,* are the first manifestations of this.

In this connection it is hard to decide whether the liturgical eucharistia in its pre-Greek beginnings (as they are to be found in the Berachah) possessed this evident preponderance of thanksgiving over the general expression of praise or of adoration. This last objective has indeed always been an important factor in the eucharistic prayer, especially after the Sanctus was included; it is its expansion into the realm of the universal and metaphysical. Petition, too, is included along with the thanksgiving, at first tentatively,* later even in a relatively developed form. But it is equally evident from the earliest sources that in principle, and aside from certain more recent marginal developments, the keynote of the eucharistia that now begins has always been thanksgiving.

Besides the character of the Christian dispensation, there was another element that helped bring this about. The Lord had given the Sacrament to his disciples with the command: "Do this for a memory of me." Accordingly, all the liturgies include this commemoration in some form or other in the anamnesis after the words of consecration. But in this place they all turn more or less hurriedly to the offering of the gifts just hallowed, as the very nature of the case demands. So the proper place for this concept, a place where it can expand, is not here after the transubstantiation, but rather enveloped in prayer before God. It is after all etymologically nothing less than "to think" about benefits received, and not thoughtlessly to ignore them.

As the central theme of his remembrance, St. Paul already mentions the death of our Lord, the work of redemption. And this continued to be, far and wide, the cardinal object of the eucharistia, and as such was conscientiously retained. We should remember what the action really is a remembrance of; we should remember what is represented in the action as a memorial. The Mass is not a sacrifice reposing on its own self; it is a sacrifice only insofar as it is at the same time a memorial of the sacrifice already consummated, which brought us redemption. Therefore, it is at the same time a thanksgiving, and demands of us such a thanksgiving. When the fundamental mysteries of the Christian economy are focused in this way in a prayer of thanks that rises to God in the sight of the congregation, the prayer itself becomes a more effective expression of a consciousness of their faith and their acknowledgment of it. Thus, in the most ancient tradition the eucharistia appears at the same time as another more exalted form of the profession of faith.

Gratitude for the advent of the Lord, for His Passion and death, for His Resurrection and Ascension, for all that He has done to procure our salvation—these are the themes that form the object of thanksgiving in the prefaces of the Roman liturgy as they range through the course of the year. It is a peculiarity of the occidental liturgies that their prayer, including the Great Prayer, varies with the progress of the year, and, in consequence, the mysteries of faith are kept in view only one portion at a time. Other

---

* Above I, 31-2, 35 f.

* Cf. in the Leonianum (Muratori I, 303) : V.D. Quoniam licet immensa sint omnia quae initii humanae sunt collata substantia, quod eam scilicet creatur ex nihil, quod tui dei vis cogitante felleare, quod unicum animantium summa rationis participatione praelatcrs, quod tota mundi sessione ditaris; longe tamen mirabiliora sunt . . .

* According to the Hellenistic epistolary style a thanksgiving was certainly part of the beginning of a letter; see A. Deissmann, Licht vom Ostern, 4, Aufl., Tubingen, 1923, 147, n. 3.


* Cf. J. M. Nielen, The Earliest Christian Liturgy, 295-296. Nielen refers to M. J. Lagrange, Evangelie selon S. Luc. (3d ed.; Paris, 1927), 544, who regards the biblical word εὐχαριστία not simply as a translation of a Hebrew word of general meaning, and who, therefore, infers a tradition of the primitive Church, "qua la priere de Jésus bénissant avant de distribuer le pain et le vin était une action de grâce."

* In the oriental liturgies, as a rule, the preface up the Sanctus is dedicated to the praise of God in general; in those outside of Egypt a christological prayer of thanksgiving follows upon the Sanctus, a prayer that, because of its closer connection with the account of the Institution, shows itself more original. Cf. Hanssens, III, 356.

* Cf. Eucharologion Sepsiones, above I, 34.—With regard to Justin, Apol. I, 67 below p. 152, n. 3.  

* Above I, 31-2, 35 f.

* The latter is very clearly the case, e.g., in the letter of James of Edessa (4, 708) to Thomas the Presbyter (Brightman, 492) : "and whereas the priest and the people have meetly accounted it right to give thanks unto the Lord, he says, It is meet and right to praise thee and in a few words commemorates the whole scope of the grace of God as touching man and his first creation and his redemption there­after and as touching the dispensation which Christ wrought in our behalf when He suffered for us in the flesh: for this is the whole kurobho that we should commem­orate and declare the things which Christ wrought in our behalf." How close the formulation of the changing Roman pref­ace could adhere to the anamnesis is shown in the Sunday preface after the feast of Ascension, which the Alcuin appendix (Muratori, II, 319) presents: V.D. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Qui generi humano nascendo sustituit, quam per mortem passionis mundum devictis, per glori­osa resurrectionis sula aeterna aditus patet fecit et per suam ascesensionem ad calos nobis spem ascendendi donavit. Per . . .

* Both ideas are remarkably well expressed by Fulgentius, De Fide, n. 60 (PL, 65, 699) : In illis enim carnibus illicitus significatio fuit carnis Christi, quam . . . fuerat oblatum . . . in isto autem sacrificio gratiarum actio atque commemoratio est carnis Christi, quam pro nobis obtulit, Ep. 14, 44 (PL, 65, 432 C) : Ideo . . . gratiarum actione incipit, ut Christum non pandam, sed datum nobis in veritate monstrarentur . . .

* Regarding the original connection between the Eucharistic prayer and the Symbolum cf. the reference supra, I, 473.
liturgies, especially the liturgies of the East (taken as a whole), do not have this variety. They do have variations in the formularies, often in great profusion; take the West Syrian liturgy, for example, or the Ethiopian. But each formula of the anaphora surveys the whole field of the economy in a new way. This was likewise the principle which governed the eucharistia of the early Church. There was only one further rule, that the preface at a Sunday or a feast-day assembly should be longer and more solemn than at the celebration at the graves of the martyrs, since these latter celebrations naturally drew a smaller congregation and were not fully public in character. In the course of centuries, however, the custom of constantly reshaping the prayer of thanks, along with the effort to say something new for each occasion, must have resulted in the formation of many a version that touched only the periphery of the theme peculiar to the prayer. Traces of such a tendency can be found even in the oldest examples. And those centrifugal forces must have been all the more powerful when every festal ceremony not only gave occasion for a new version but seemed to demand a new theme, one more consonant with the feast itself. This was the case from the very start in the liturgies of the West, and especially in the Latin liturgy of Rome. The most ancient collection of Roman Mass formularies, the Sacramentarium Leonianum, has a proper preface for each Mass; thus, although it is quite incomplete, the sacramentary has 267 prefaces! Even the older Gelasianum still furnishes 54 prefaces, the later Gelasianum in the St. Gall manuscript, 186.

The lion's share of such prefaces fell to the feasts of martyrs. As a special theme on such days, the obvious one, was derived from the martyr's victory-in-death. When in the preface of martyrs only the fundamental concept of their bloody witness to Christ was emphasized, the result was a prayer of thanks that stayed pretty close to the basic theme of our salvation, as when, after the mention of Christ's name, the special text continued:

 Qui ae maiorem triumphum de hominis generis hoste capiendam praeter illum gloriam singularem, qua inefabilis modis Domini curat se prostratus est, ut etiam sanctis martyribus superetur effect, atque in membris quoque suis victoria sequetur, quae praeceit in capite. Per."

At other times the victorious struggle of the martyr or even his intercessory power after his victory stands as an independent theme of thanksgiving. Sometimes, however, a panegyric on the hero is developed in formal outline, and becomes at last a more or less expanded recounting of the history of the saint's suffering. It is not to be wondered at that among the five prefaces which the Leonianum contains for the feast of St. Cecilia, one or another should have succumbed to this last danger. Rather is it astonishing to find that, of the twenty prefaces provided in the several Mass formularies for the feast of the apostles Peter and Paul, almost all are still concerned with the theological and Christological contents of the apostolic office.

In this oldest of sacramentaries, even Mass-formularies lacking a distinctively festal character are sometimes found with a preface whose contents are far different from the original conception of a eucharistic prayer, for example when it is used as a tirade against objectionable adversaries or as an exhortation to lead a moral life. Such curiosities as these must lead sooner or later to a reaction. Perhaps an advance along these very lines is to be discerned behind the narrative of the Liber pontificalis regarding Pope Alexander: Fratres [Alexander] passionem Domini miscuit in praedicatione sacerdotum, quando missa celebratur. Phenomena of the sort described must finally have induced that drastic reform which is revealed in the Gregorian Sacramentary. In the genuine portions of this sacramentary as reformed by Adrian I to Charlemagne, there are only

---

18 Above I, 41-42.
19 Above I, 29; 34-37.
20 Canones Basilii, c. 97 (Riedel, 274).
21 To some extent the formulary in the Esychological Sacramentary probably belongs here, above I, 34.
22 These figures according to Eisenhofer II, 157. His other enumerations for the Gregorianum are, however, incorrect.
23 Mohlberg, Das fränkische Sacramentarium Gelasianum, after the index, p. 280-282.—Baumstark refers these prefaces of the later Gelasianum back to a primitive Gelasianum, in which almost every Mass formulary would have its own preface. Mohlberg-Baumstark, Die älteste erreichbare Gestalt, 128.
24 Leonianum (Muratori, I, 311 f.).
fourteen prefaces counting the *præfatio communis*. Of these, a number—those for extraordinary occasions and for the two saints' feasts which were still favored—were later discontinued in Frankish territory, so that the grand wealth of ancient Roman tradition was reduced to seven formulas. But this poverty was somewhat augmented in the centuries to follow, that same Frankish territory contributing the preface of the Holy Cross, of the Holy Trinity, and of Lent. These ten prefaces—or rather, since the *præfatio communis* was not counted in, the total was usually reckoned as nine—were the only ones considered admissible in the Decretals first mentioned by Burchard of Worms, and by him ascribed to Pelagius II (d. 590); from here they were incorporated in the *Corpus Iuris Canonici*. Finally, to this sparse group was added the Marian preface, prescribed by Urban II at the Synod of Piacenza in 1095, although it is itself of an earlier date.

Many medieval churches, however, were not content with this poverty. Even in the appendix which Alcuin attached to the Gregorian Sacramentary coming from Rome, there was included, among other things, a special section containing a large number of prefaces, stemming for the most part from old Roman tradition. Mönchberg-Baumstark, *Die älteste erreichbare Gestalt*, see in the index, p. 96 ff. Does this mean that the final curtailment did not take place till after Gregory? Lietzmann, see Register, p. 185. Besides the *præfatio communis*, they are the prefaces for Christmas, Easter, Epiphany, Ascension, Pentecost, and for the feasts of the Apostles. Besides these there is a preface in *santali Popu*, for ordination, consecration of an altar, for the bridal Mass, for Andrew, two for Anastasia (one an extra preface for Christmas). The preference for these two Saints shows a Byzantine influence at work, as was the case with the introduction of St. Andrew into the embolism, see below.

Of unknown origin. I could nowhere discover it in the sources of the 8th and 9th centuries. A preface of the Holy Cross with the antithesis of the two woods is found in the Alcuin appendix; Muratori, I, 318. This antithesis itself is surely an ancient one, since, among others, it is found in Irenæus, *Adv. haer.*, V, 17, 3; see H. Rahner, *Domnus crucis*, III, (22th, 1943) I, n. 1. It appeared first in the older Gelasianum I, 84 (Wilson, 129) on the Sunday after Pentecost, which later became Trinity Sunday. It could have originated in Spain and thus be dated back to the 7th century; e.g. A. Klaus, *Ursprung und Verbreitung der Dreifaltigkeitsmesse* (Werb, 1938), 171 ff.; 81-83.

This appears in the later Gelasianum (Mönchberg, n. 254), but also in the oldest available form of the Gregorianum (Mönchberg-Baumstark, n. 161); hence it belongs to an older Roman tradition. Burchard of Worms (d. 1025), *Decre tum III*, 69 (PL, 140, 687 f.). Capelle (see below, p. 32) expresses a well-founded suspicion that Burchard himself was the author of this Canon (47).

*Decre tum Gratiani*, III, 1, 71 (Friedberg, I, 1313). Cf. Durandus, IV, 33, 35.

Some suggestions of it are found in the later Gelasianum. With a minor variation (*luco mundi lumen eternum effudit*) and an introductory clause referring to Virgins in general, today's wording is the same as that found in about 850 in the Cod. Ottobon. 313 of the Gregorianum, ed. Wilson (*HBS*, 49), 283 f.; also in the Sacramentary of Eligius (PL, 78, 133); see B. Capelle, *Les origines de la préface romaine de la Vierge*, *Revue d'histoire eccl.*, 38 (1942), 46-58. Cf. C. Mesini, *De auctore et loco compositionis praefationis B. M. V.*, *Antonianum*, 10 (1955), 59-72.

Up to the eleventh century and even beyond, the Mass books frequently preserved some heritage, large or small, of this tradition. The Leofric Missal (11th century), which originated in the Rhineland, still has a special preface for every Mass-formulary. Similarly, several sacramentaries from France. But in the end the victory was won by the canon which was promoted by Burchard, and which after that was repeated by all commentators on the liturgy. Even in the Middle Ages, however, the victory was not an absolute one. For saints who were singularly venerated—John the Baptist, Augustine, Jerome, Francis, Roch, Christopher—special prefaces again came into use, but because of the unhistorical contents they provoked the antagonism of various reforming circles at the time of the Council of Trent, and so most of them had again to be dropped. Only in certain orders and in the *proprium* of this or that diocese were special prefaces retained or even brought into use anew. But not till most recent times did the Roman Missal itself experience an enrichment of this sort, after the canon of eleven prefaces had held firm for almost eight hundred years. And this enrichment actually involved, on the whole, a development of the central concept of the prayer of thanks. In 1919 the prefaces for the Requiem Mass and for St. Joseph were introduced; in 1928 there followed the preface for the feast of Christ the King, in 1928 the preface for the Mass of the Sacred Heart.

A remarkable thing in the medieval canon of prefaces is the absence of any special preface for Sundays. In the older Roman sacramentary tradition such was not the case. Prefaces for Sunday appear in the newer *Gelasianum* and in the Alcuin appendix. Within the festal cycles, in Advent, after Epiphany, during Lent, and after Easter, they adhere to the
theme suggested by the festal cycle. Thus, for the last Sunday of Advent we have:

V D. Sanctificator et conditor generis humani, qui Filio tuo tecum aeterno claritate regnante, cum de nullis extantibus cuncta protulisses

A preface for the second Sunday after Epiphany reads as follows:

V D. Semperque virtutes et laudes tuas labiis exsultationis effarti, qui nobis ad revocandos pulvinos et laores super diversa donorum tuorum solatia etiam nuncurum salutarium gaudia consuliisti mittendo nobis Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum.

In the neutral period after Pentecost several formulas appear that depart from the character of the prayer of thanks and either take in the least content with a very general theme of praise of God's goodness. Thus, on the Sunday of the autumn Embertide we have:

V D. Quia cum laude nostra non egeas, grata tibi tamen est tuorum devotio famularum nec te Augustus nostra praecossa, sed nobis perficiunt ad salutem, quoniam sicut fontem vitæ praeriter causa moriendi est, sic eodem inviter redire definitus est sine fine viscendi. Per Christianum.

At other times a beauteous universality of Christian gratitude is achieved, as on the fifteenth Sunday after Pentecost:

V D. Qui nos de donis donorum temporaliud ad perceptionem praevia
donorum et hac tribus et ilia promittis, ut et munera ianum inscriber et praevereuntibus non teneris; tuum est enim quod vicemus, quia licet peccati valore nostra eti dilieta, tua tamen est opiferis, ut terreni ac caelesti atque renascamur. Per Christum.

Several formulas, however, present very prominently the cardinal theme of the eucharistia, which we must expect above all on Sundays just as we expected it on Easter; a sample of this is found in the third Sunday after Pentecost:

V D. Per Christum. Cuius hoc mirificum opus ac salutare mysterium fuit, ut perditae dudum atque prostrati a diablo et mortis aucoelo ad hanc gloriae vocaremur, quia nunc genci electum, sacerdotium sanctumque munificentiam tuae Pra!dica!tes

Or on the seventh Sunday:

V D. Per Christum. Verum aeternumque pontificem et solnm sine pecati maculo sacerdotem, cuius sanguine omnium fideliude corda mundantur, placati nos tibi hostias non solum pro delicis populi, sed etiam pro nostris offenderibus immolamus, ut omne peccatum quod carnis fragilitate commissum summo pro nostri autiste interpellante salvetur. Per quem.

It may well be that the tenacious retention of the special Sunday concepts precisely in Frankish territory is a result of the fact that, even in the sixth century, the Sunday was here called Dominica Resurrectionis dies, and was consciously celebrated as such. But in the eleventh century the prescription supposedly written by Pelagius II finally prevailed everywhere, and thus evidently the praefatio communis was at first used on Sundays, since it had already acquired this role at Rome perhaps as early as the sixteenth century, and generally took the lead among all the prefaces. Since the thirteenth century, however, the Trinity preface began to be used for Sundays. But it was not prescribed by Rome till 1759.

Among the prefaces in use today, two appear to escape the ordinary scheme for prefaces: the Trinity preface (which presents a profession of belief in the mystery of the Trinity rather than a prayer of thanks) and the canonical prayer of the Sunday of the autumn Embertide:

V D. Per Christum. Verum aeternumque pontificem et solnm sine pecati maculo sacerdotem, cuius sanguine omnium fideliude corda mundantur, placati nos tibi hostias non solum pro delicis populi, sed etiam pro nostris offenderibus immolamus, ut omne peccatum quod carnis fragilitate commissum summo pro nostri autiste interpellante salvetur. Per quem.
the preface of the Apostles. There is, to be sure, no reason for supposing that this latter is addressed to Christ, since there is no precedent for such a supposition in the whole Roman sacramentary tradition. But starting with the very introductory phrases, the thanksgiving in this preface is transformed into a prayer of petition, though it is possible to discover in the continuation echoes of the thanksgiving that was heralded by the Gratias agamus. We have here a distortion of the original text. The original is found in the Leonianum where the preface presupposes the entire normal introduction, starting with a word of thanks and concluding with Per Christum (thus obviously assuming the usual mode of address to God the Father): Verni dignum... gratias agere... aeternae Deus supplerit exorantes ut gregem tuum, pastor aterne, non deserat... pastores, per (Christum Dominum nostrum, per quem). It might be added that even in the Leonianum the preface (aside from the introductory phrases) not infrequently takes on the features of a petition. The basic schema of the Roman preface is to be seen in the profatio communis. Without descending to prosaic banality, it embraces only the barest outline of the prayer of thanks. The reason for giving thanks is no longer expounded, but is included in the fact that the thanksgiving is offered per Christum Dominum nostrum. The reason is thus presented in the fact that the vast distance separating man from God has been bridged, that we have the access and the trusty password "through Christ our Lord." In the other prefaces this schema is either repeated word for word, as in the prefaces for Lent and Passiontide where, after the word Deus, the corresponding expansion is inserted and then the preface continues with per Christum Dominum nostrum, per quem, and similarly

The reason is thus presented in the fact that the vast distance separating man from God has been bridged, that we have the access and the trusty password "through Christ our Lord." In the other prefaces this schema is either repeated word for word, as in the prefaces for Lent and Passiontide where, after the word Deus, the corresponding expansion is inserted and then the preface continues with per Christum Dominum nostrum, per quem, and similarly

ferent meaning: it is no longer our thanks through Christ, but God's acting through Christ. Cf. Jungmann, Die Stellung Christi, 156 f.

Thus also in the Eucharistia of Hippolytus, above I, 29. An Arian of the 4-5th century in arguing against the Catholic Christology, bases his reasoning on the Catholic custom of directing the thanksgiving prayer in oblationibus through Christ to God; there it says Dignum et iustum... neque est alius per quem ad te admittam habeas, precem facere, sacrificacionem tibi offere possimus nisi per quem tu nobis misisti. G. Mercail, Antike religioe literariche (Studie e Testi, 7; Rom., 1902), 52.

A more exact classification of the entire Latin tradition with regard to the preface is supplied by C. Cavin, Te Deum ou illiatio (Solessmes, 1906), 356-371.

In the Gallic liturgy the beginning reads Dignum et iustum est, in the oriental either as at Rome: ΄Αλλακος γαρ ἐδω ἐν τοῖς ἔλεοις (Egyptian anaphora of St. Mark: Brightman, 125; cf. 164; Byzantine liturgy of St. Chrysostom: ibid., 321 f.) or the expression is enriched with a certain emotional tone: ΄Αλλακος γαρ ἐδω ἐν τοῖς ἔλεοις (West Syrian anaphora of St. James: Brightman, 50; cf. Const. Ap. VIII, 12; ibid., 14).—The Byzantine liturgy of St. Basil has a solemn address to God preceding this introductory phrase: ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν νῦν τιθέναι πάντως ἄλφας τὰ ἐλέοις.. Brightman, 321 f.

Cfr., above, p. 111.
must in essence be paid always and everywhere. Other liturgies intensify the word “thanksgiving” by adding a long series of expressions all designating the praise and worship of God.\footnote{Cf. I Thess. 5: 18; Col. 1: 12; 2: 7; 3: 15-17.}

The address to God which at present is divided as follows: Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aterne Deus\footnote{This is true especially in regard to the liturgy of St. Basil. It is noteworthy in this connection that in all its versions, outside the Egyptian, the sacrificial character of the Eucharist is revealed along with the Εὐαγγελιστὴς of heaven and that by its means we are able to take the place of the fallen angels. “The scene of your approach now is mount Sion, is the heavenly place of the Firstborn.” \textit{This ancient Christendom a favorite way of representing the salvation which is ours in Christ was to show that it associates us with the blessed spirits of heaven and that by its means we are able to take the place of the fallen angels. “The scene of your approach now is mount Sion, is the heavenly place of the Firstborn.”} must originally have been arranged in this way: Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens aterne Deus.\footnote{Thus already about 800 the \textit{Expositio Quotiens contra se} (PL 96, 1489 B). Remigius of Auxerre, \textit{Expositio} (PL 101, 1253) also unites: Domine sancte.}\footnote{Brinktine, \textit{Die hl. Messe}, 168. He refers to the Qui pridie of Ambrose (above I, 52): \textit{ad te, sancte Pater omnipotens aterne Deus}, and to our first offering of prayer at the Offertory: \textit{Suscipe, sancte Pater} that could have its beginning in the 10-11th century. The General Chapter of the Cistercians in 1188 decided that a \textit{cassura} could be made only after the word Pater; Schneider (Cist.-Chr., 1927), 8 f.— Cf. Baumstark, \textit{Liturgie comparée}, 72, who sees in the arrangement of the single, double, and triple expression a mannerism of ancient rhetoric. See for further references A. Dold, \textit{Bened. Monatschrift}, 22 (1946), 143; 146. A summary of all the arguments for the suggested re-arrangement in Jean Juglar, “Sancte Pater” Note sur la ponctuation de la formule \textit{Sancte Pater} d’invocation de la Preface.” \textit{Eph. liturg.}, 65 (1951), 101-104.— E. C. V. “De Genuina Interpretatione Formule ‘Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens aterne Deus’,” \textit{Eph. liturg.}, 66 (1952), 77-80, upholds the customary pointing. This occurs with true oriental proximity at the same place in some liturgies of the East; thus, e.g., note 59 above, and also 1, 35 f.}

Both the Domine and the omnipotens aterne Deus are usual forms of address in the Roman liturgy. Sancte Pater evidently corresponds to the \textit{clementissime Pater} which follows later. The solemnity of this address, grouping as it does various popular titles for God,\footnote{Hebr. 12: 22 f.; cf. also the conception of the parable of the Good Shepherd, (Luke 15: 4-7), which is almost universal among the Fathers. According to this, the Son of God left the ninety-nine sheep, the angels of heaven, to seek the one lost sheep, to bring him back happily to the fold: see evidences from Irenaeus, Origen, Methodius, Hilary, Cyril of Alexandria, Peter Chrysologus in Th. K. Kempf, \textit{Christus der Hirt}, Uebersetz. und Deutung einer altchristlichen Symbolik} is ours in Christ was to show that it associates us with the blessed spirits of heaven. The Armenian version is rendered: \textit{kai ou proo- ferein ton xairetai xaireias} : Enderding, \textit{Das byzantinische Hochgebet der Basilikali-turgie} (Münster, 1931), 2 f.

Our thanks and worship we do not bring to God directly as just any group of human petitioners; we offer it rather as a congregation of the redeemed, through Him who is our Redeemer and our Head, through Christ, our Lord. In the festal prefaces this step disappears in favor of a jubilant celebration of the festal theme; since this theme always has reference to a mystery of Christ, it is unnecessary to add that we praise God through Him.

Finally, our praise is joined to the praise of the heavenly choirs. In ancient Christendom a favorite way of representing the salvation which is ours in Christ was to show that it associates us with the blessed spirits of heaven and that by its means we are able to take the place of the fallen angels. “The scene of your approach now is mount Sion, is the heavenly place of the Firstborn.”

Jerusalem, the city of the living God; here are gathered thousands upon thousands of angels, here is the assembly of those first-born sons whose names are written in heaven.” “Thus even in this life, as children of the Jerusalem which is above, and especially when we are assembled for the celebration of the New Covenant, we may join our voices to the songs of praise raised by the hosts of heaven.” At first the preface lets us listen, so to speak, to these songs of praise. One thing that surprises us here is that these songs, too—as the \textit{praeferatio communis} puts it—are offered up through Christ: \textit{per quem maiestatem tuam laudant angeli} . . . Why should we be surprised? He is set “high above all princes of power and powers and virtues and dominations, and every name that is known, not in this world only, but in the world to come.” “All the angels and powers and princes [are] made subject under His feet.” InChrist “all that is in heaven, all that is on earth [are] summed up.” The concept is therefore thoroughly biblical, although the Scholastics were wont to add that the angels cannot bear the same relationship to Christ as do men who were redeemed by Him. Thus even in the concise \textit{praeferatio communis} the second part is dominated by the Christ-theme: Christ appears before our gaze as the King of the triumphant Church.

The Bible also furnished the materials for the detailed description of the choirs of angels and their activity. The \textit{praeferatio communis} presents the lengthiest enumeration of their names: \textit{angeli, dominationes, potestates, caeli, caelestum virtutes, seraphim.} A shorter series is associated with the concluding formula \textit{Et ideo}, but here two other groups are recorded, \textit{archangeli and throni.} The Trinity preface, in spite of its terse arrangement, adds the \textit{cherubim} to the list. The Pentecost preface summarizes
the whole series in the phrase *superna virtutes atque angelicæ potestates*, much as the *Et ideo* formula mentions last of all *omnia militia caelestis exercitus*. All bow in reverence before God's majesty, they sing out their song *una voce*, they cry out *sine fine*—two phrases adapted from the earthly custom of the acclamation and applied to the description of the heavenly liturgy.  

It is in this heavenly liturgy, which is described with even greater emphasis in the texts of the oriental *anaphora*, that we are bidden to enter the circle of the heavenly spirits: *cum quibus et nostras voces ut adimiti iubes deprecamur*, and intone with them the *Sanctus*.

## 4. Sanctus and Benedictus

The *Sanctus* is the continuation of the preface. So true is this that the oldest melody of the *Sanctus* 3 is simply a continuation of the ferial melody of the *Sanctus*. But because the *Sanctus* is here more than a mere citation from the account of the Prophet Isaiah, because it is intended to go more than recall to our minds that the seraphim sang this hymn, 4 but is rather a reminder that the earthly church should take part in the heavenly singing, the *Sanctus* takes on its own independent importance. All the people join in singing the *Sanctus*—that was taken for granted in ancient Christian times, 5 and to some extent still is in the Orient.

59) are mostly treated by the commentators of the Middle Ages as equivalent to the *throni*, which are not mentioned in the respective series. The consideration of the *caril* as an angelic choir became the occasion for using Ps. 18 (Celi evanarrant) in the Office of the Angels. Originally the *caril* were thought of as spirits that stood aloft. 6

59) in Mass XVIII of the Vatican edition of the *Graduale Romanum*, the Mass appointed for feast-days in Advent and Lent, coincides with the melody for Requiem *Sanctus*. The Benedictus is included in the text of the *Sanctus*. 7

### Even in the West as late as 530 the Liber pontificalis indicates that Pope Sixtus I ordered: *ut intra actionem, sacerdos incipiens, populo [1.±us] hymnorum decantare [4]: Sanctus.* Perhaps it was already necessary at that time to recall to memory the tradition which was to be found implicit in the text itself, for then as now it read: *cum quibus et nostras voces ut adimiti iubes deprecamur*. As a matter of fact the singing at Rome, as described in the Roman *ordinis* for feast-day service, was transferred to a group of clerics. 8

In the land of the Franks, however, provision continued to be made for the people to sing the *Sanctus* as of yore. 9 Thus the *ordo* of John the Arch-chantor still mentions the people. 10 In fact, the reform decrees of the Carolingian period did not have to insist that the people sing the *Sanctus*, but instead had to demand that the celebrating priest go along with the singing to its finish and only then continue with *Te igitum*. 11

86; 132; 176; 231); also in the older Byzantine liturgy (*ibid.*, 385; 403; 436). Cf. Hansses III, p, 392 f.; 400.  


13) Ordo Rom. I, n. 16 (PL, 78, 944 f.): *subdiaconi regionarii*. Cf. Ordo Rom. II, n. 10 (PL, 78, 973): *subdiaconi*. Ordo Rom. V, n. 9 (PL, 988): *Subdiaconi intone dum canitur Sanctus, post altare pergant stare*, and others also sing along. Ordo Rom. XI, n. 20 (PL, 78, 1033) has the basilican, that is, the clergy attached to the respective basilica, sing the *Sanctus*, as they do the *Credo*; cf. above, I, 473, n. 69. Therefore, even here the *Sanctus* is never left to the Schola cantorum. Quite probably the congregational singing of the *Sanctus* is considered as the ideal also in the *Ordo eccl. Later.* (ed. Fischer, 44). Still in the Pontifical Mass it is sung by the choir, in *choro*. (ibid., 83, L 38). Perhaps the exclusion of the people, as noted in the *Roman Ordines*, is also to be understood as holding only for the Pontifical Mass.

14) Ammonius generalis (789) n. 70 (MGH, *Capitulare eccl. regionarii*): *et ipsa sanctus angelicæ populi Dei communi voce Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus decantet*. Herard of Tours (885) *Capitula*, n. 16 (PL, 121, 765): *ut secreta presbyteri non inchoent, antependium Sanctus finitum, sed cum populo Sanctum cantet*. Amalar, *De eccl. off.*, III, 21 (PL, 105, 1134 C) refers to the decree of Sixtus I mentioned above. With the rise of the *Apologies* these prescriptions were again transgressed; cf. further the *Sacramentum* of Amiens in the 9th cent. ed. Lequercais (*Eph. liturg.*, 1927), 442: *Quando tractim canitur Sanctus, idem sacerdos cursum decantet*, followed by an *Apology*. But towards the end of the 11th century the Missal of St. Vincent, for example, again has neums marked over the *Sanctus*, obviously for the priest to sing; *Fiala*, 192.
Being music for the people, the Sanctus retained its traditional simple melody, which hardly goes beyond a mere recitative. This explains why one Carolingian music writer about 830, in enumerating the songs of the Mass, makes no mention whatever of the Sanctus. There is evidence that the Sanctus continued to be sung by priest and people together even in the twelfth century; it is so described in Hildebert 11 and Honorius. 12 An intermediate step before its complete disappearance as a people's chant was to be found in northern countries where it was assigned to the clergy assisting in choir. 13 There is a relic of this in the present-day prescription that at high Mass the deacon and the subdeacon 14 recite the Sanctus together with the celebrant. The transfer of the Sanctus from the people to the special singing choir goes hand in hand with the composition of the more recent Sanctus melodies and is finally complete when polyphonic music came into its own in the Gothic period. It is significant that the text of the Sanctus—basically little more than a simple outcry of praise, an acclamation 15—was altered for a time to suit the newer settings, and like the other chants it was expanded by the addition of tropes. 16

11 Aurelian of Reaume, Musica disciplina, c. 20 (Gerbert, Scriptores de mus. sacra, I, 601.) He discusses the Introit, Kyrie, Gloria, Gradual, Alleluja, Offertory, and Communion. 155 D. Wagner, Einführung, I, 58 f. Evidently the melody under discussion is the melody mentioned above, n. 7, the only one that was in use among the Carthusians, even as late as the 18th century; Wagner, 114. It seems that more elaborate melodies for the Sanctus in general were not created till the 11th-12th century, hence a century later than was the case with the Kyrie (cf. below, n. 16).—This also fits in with the fact that the Sanctus was set to polyphonic melodies only at a later date. The oldest collection of two-voiced compositions, the Winchester Troper (HBS, 8) has twelve settings for the Kyrie, 8 for the Gloria, but none for the Sanctus (and likewise none for the Agnus Dei). Cf. Ursprun, 57; 119.

12 Hildebert of Le Mans, Verba de mysterio missae (PL, 171, 1182); Hinc bene cum populo ter Sanctus . . . cantit. 13 Honorius Augustod, Gemma un., I, 42 (PL, 172, 556 D). 14 A Sacramentary of the 9th century of Le Mans and likewise one of the 11th century from Echternach (Leroquais, I, 30 f, 122) Quando cleru . . . Sanctus cantat; cf. Leroquais, I, 59.—Robert Paululus (d. about 1184), De ceremoniis, II, 24 (PL, 177, 425 D): Hinc hymnum sanctum dicet . . . simul cantit dicet evangeliwm hymnum. According to A. Gastoüé, L'église et la musique, (Paris, 1936), 80, the Sanctus in many cathedrals was for a long time reserved to seven subdeacons, who formed a semi-circle before the altar; cf. above I, 197, note 9. Even at the beginning of the 14th century rubricists were vividly aware that the Sanctus was to be said by the clergy present in choir, as is clear from the Ordines of Stefaneschi, n. 61 (PL, 78, 1176); of Pius II, 164, note 10. Moreover, even these signals were not universally in use in the Roman basilicas. There is no mention of them in the Ceremoniale Episc., I, 8, 67, 69. Cf. Les Questions liturgiques, 4 (1913-14), 164 f.

15 The reports about the bell signal that began to appear in the 13th century pertain almost exclusively to the elevation of the Sacred Species at the consecration, that was, of course, introduced at the time; cf. Braun, Das christliche Alltagsgew., 573-577. Nevertheless, even before the Missale of Pius V, testimony for a signal with the bell at the Sanctus is not entirely lacking. According to an endowment foundation made at Chartres, 1399, one of the bells suspended above the choir was to be rung dum incipietur cantari Sanctus, and the reason given is that the attention of the people might be called to the levatio sacrificii. Du Cange-Favre, VII, 259. The inventories of the English churches made under Edward VI (d. 1553) frequently record the Sanctus bells (santone or sanctuary bell). F. C. Eeles, The Edwardian Inventories for Buckinghamshire (Alcuin Club Coll., 9) 3; S. P. Browe, "Die Elevation" (IJ, 1929), 39, who cites these passages, assumes (as the foundation mentioned above clearly indicates), that the signal of the bell at the Sanctus was only a preliminary warning of the approach of the consecration. That, however, need not have been its full purpose. While the little hand-bell may have been introduced to signal the consecration and was then extended also to the Sanctus, its primary purpose was not to give a signal, since the singing of the chant had already been sufficient for the purpose, but rather for much the same object we have in mind today, when at a solemn Te Deum, or, as was done for ages, at the Gloria, when it is resumed on Holy Saturday, every available instrument is sounded. The latter custom is attested in the Ordo ecclesia Lateranensis (middle of the 12th century; Fischer, 73): . . . Gloria in excelsis, et statim omnia signa pro gaudio tanta solennitate in classicum pulsantur. According to Gavanti-Merati, II, 7, 11, (I, 282), one should ring the campanas mayores at High Mass, and at private Mass the campana parva (which could be dispensed with at High Mass, unless it is to be used as a signal for the ringing of the large bell). The custom of ringing the large bell at High Mass during the preface un-
The origins of the Sanctus in Christian liturgy are not fully clear. There is no Sanctus in the eucharistic prayer of Hippolytus of Rome. On the other hand, even as early as the turn of the first century, it appears to have been part of the prayers of the Christian community right in Rome itself. For it is very surprising that Clement of Rome should not only cite the song itself from the vision of Isaias (Isaias 6:3) but also introduce it with the passage from Daniel 7:10, just as it is done later in most of the liturgies of the Orient:

"Let us consider the vast multitude of His angels, and see how they stand in readiness to minister to His will. For the Scripture says: "Ten thousand thousand stood ready before Him, and a thousand thousand ministered to Him, and cried out: Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts; the whole creation is replete with His splendor." And so too, we, too, being dutifully assembled with one accord, should as with one voice, cry out to Him earnestly, so that we may participate in His great and glorious promises."

The triple Sanctus is to be found likewise in all the other liturgies known to us, starting with the Euchologion of Serapion and the Clementine liturgy. It is then but a step to assume that the Sanctus had been sung already in the primitive Church. Perhaps the synagogue served as a model and so concurred in some way in establishing its use.

The Sanctus is reported from the monastery of Hohenfurt in Czechoslovakia (about 1337); the ringing of the large bell at the Sanctus itself is still customary in the Weterwald (1847; Prof. B. Fischer).

Clement of Rome, Ad Corinth., c. 34; see J. A. Kleist, The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch (Ancient Christian Writers, 1; West­minster, 1946), 30. That this, however, is not clearly a reference to the Eucharistic prayer is shown by W. C. van Ummick, "I Clement 34 and the 'Sanctus,'" Vigiliae Christianae, 5 (1951), 204-248.—A similarly indefinite reference also in Tertullian, De or., (CSEL, 20, 182); cf. Dekker, Tertullianus, 43 f. Somewhat plainer is Origen, De princ., I, 3; IV, 3, 14 (GGS, Orig., V, 52 f., 346); cf. G. Dix, "Primitive Consecration Prayer," Theology, 37 (1938), 261-283.

Regarding the supposition that the Sanctus is a legacy from the synagogue, see A. Baumstark, "Trishagion und Qedu­schah," JL, 3 (1933), 18-32; Lietemann, Messie et Herrenmahl, 128 ff., 258 f.; W. O. E. Oesterley, The Jewish Back­ground of the Christian Liturgy (Oxford, 1925), 144-147. The Sanctus, says the Jewish Encyclopedia, VII, 463, "must have been borrowed by the Church from the Synagogue at an early date." This statement is at best highly doubtful. W. H. Frere, The Anaphora or Great Eucharistic Prayer (SPCK, 1938), is inclined to put the Sanctus after the time of Hippolytus. —The triple "holy" or Kedushah used in various parts of the present synagogue service was surely introduced into that service by the second century A.D.; see C. W. Dougmore, The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office (Lon­don, 1945), 102-103, 108. This is a benediction and song of praise sung not only by the Seraphim among themselves, as in Is. 6:2, but by all the angels (all His servants) just as is presupposed as a rule in the Christian liturgies, although individual choirs are not marked out. See the Hebrew text in W. Stark, Liturgische liter­äre Gebete (2nd ed.; Kleine Texte, 58; Berlin, 1930), 5.—Worthy of note is the fact that the triple "holy," treated as a song of praise sung by the entire host of angels, is found in Bk. VII of the Apostolic Constitutions within that very section (c. 33-38) which is evidently only a superficially christianized collection of Jewish prayers (VII, 35, 3; Funk, I, 430). And here is something to which Baum­stark, op. cit., 132, attaches a great deal of importance: Ez. 3:12: Εὐλογηθεὶς ὁ θεὸς ἁγιοί τοῦ τῶν αὐτῶν, ἐστιν added as the response of the other choirs of angels; this is a benediction which is also found in later Jewish services as an additional prayer, and which corresponds to the Benedictus which follows immediately after the triple "holy" in the Christian liturgies except that of Egypt. In the Clementine liturgy this Benedictus has the form: Ἐλεοντορεῖς ἐν τοῖς αἰῶναῖς. "Αμήν. (Const. Ap. VIII, 12, 27; Funk, I, 506; Quasten, Mon., 220). In the other liturgies it reads more or less like that of the Roman Mass; in other words, the words of the crowd recorded in Matt. 21:9, with doubled Hosanna. This combination Hosanna-Benedictus must have been joined to the triple "holy" at a very early date, in Palestine itself, in conscious opposition to the narrowly national Jewish formula (Baumstark, 23 ff.). —Against this assumption, which Baum­stark in particular upholds, we have the fact that outside the short and rather irrelevant phrase in Const. Ap. VIII, 12, 27, there is no early evidence of this Hosanna-Benedictus. Even in the East it does not appear till the 8th century; on the contrary, the oldest Palestinian and Antiochene sources (Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia) do not mention it in this connection at all. (It does appear in Peregrinatio Aethorisa, c. 31, but in an entirely different connection, as a response of the procession chant sung by the people, and without Hosanna). Add to this the sharp dissimilarity of the Teranscantus itself, and especially of the sentences leading up to the phrase, which indicates the troops of angels only in a general way, while the Christian texts always mention various choirs. These differences are not accountable for merely by polemic antagonism. Hanssen, Institutiones, III (1932), 402 f., 404; E. Peters­son, Das Buch von den Engeln (Leipzig, 1935), 115-117.—Baumstark, Liturgie comparée (1939), 55 f., 92 f., continues to hold to his thesis, without, however, ad­verting to the objections raised against it. Perhaps, as Hanssens, III, 404, remarks, the example of the Jews somehow did act as a stimulus for the Christians when they interpolated the Sanctus from Is. 6:2, into their Eucharistic prayer. Perhaps, just as the example of the Jews somehow did act as a stimulus for the Christians when they interpolated the Sanctus from Is. 6:2, into their Eucharistic prayer, so the parallel to the threefold "holy" here discussed was already noticed by Tertul­lian, De or., 3 (CSEL, 20, 182). For this reason, so he argues, we say the Sancti­fectum as angelorum candidatus.
was not expressly attached to the triple “holy,” still there was inherent in it an echo of this most profound of Christian mysteries. It is surprising, indeed, that the text of the Tectansus, despite its brevity, shows some variations from the basic biblical text and also from that used in the synagogue. The basic text as found in Vulgate reads as follows: Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Deus exercituum, plena est omnis terra gloria eius. Even here the word Deus is an addition, already to be found in the Old Latin version. The liturgical text leaves the word sabbath untranslated. God is the Lord of “armies,” of “hosts.” This refers not only to the hosts of angels but to the “whole multitude” of beings which God had made in the six days of creation. With this the appended clause agrees, for it makes the angels assert that the glory of God fills the whole earth. The liturgical text changes the cry into a form of address, gloria tua, thus reinforcing its character as a prayer.

More important is the addition in the song of the word “heaven”: caeli et terra; this is true of all the Christian liturgies, and only of them. This peculiarity is in line with the introduction to the Sanctus where all the Christian liturgies have likewise acquired a rather imposing augment. No longer is it the Temple of Jerusalem that resounds with the triple Sanctus,

The addition of a trinitarian meaning is already found in John 12: 41, when it is said of Isaias in reference to Christ that he had seen His glory. It plays a part in the struggle against Arianism; see, e.g., the conference of the Catholic Bishops in opposition to the Arians in Victor of Vita, quoque Filius, mones the liturgy and they add that the oneness of the liturgy and they add that the oneness of melodies became richer, texts of trinitarian content were selected, for the most part, although not exclusively, for the tropes that were fitted to the notes; see Blume-Bannister, Tropen, n. 250 f., 253, 256 f., etc. The trinitarian meaning of the three-fold mention of Sanctus at the time is found regularly in the medieval interpreters of the liturgy and they add that the oneness of the divine essence is indicated in the Dominus or Deus; thus already Remigius of Auxerre, Expositio (PL, 101, 1255); S. Petroni, Das Buch von den Engel, 115 f.

In the Christian conception of the phrase the Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua is enveloped in great part with the Pentecostal Spiritus Domini refletis orbem terrarum. The grace bestowed in the Holy Ghost is at the same time the beginning of heavenly glory for men and consequently the beginning of the conclusive revelation of divine glory. The interpretation of the Holy Ghost is manifested also in the Egyptian liturgies, where after the τετράλογον ἀπόσπασμα they continue with the πληρωμὴν = Epiklesis. Thus the Euchologia of Serapion (Quasten, Mon., 61; above I, 34); cf. moreover Brightman, 132 and parallels (below, l. c.). Cf. M. Steinheimer, Die Θεία τοῦ θνήσκου in der römischen Liturgie (Munich, 1951), 53 f. Cf. Chrysostom, In illud “Vidi Dominum” hom., 6, 3 (PG, 56, 138) “After Christ removed the wall between heaven and earth... He brought us this song of praise from heaven.”

**SANCTUS AND BENEDICTUS**

nor is it only the seraphim who cry out one to another; heaven has become the scene, and all the choirs of heavenly spirits, the militia celestis exercitus, are united in the singing. Socia exultatione they sing their song of praise, and their cry is sine fine.

Even more impressive is the picture presented in this same spot by the oriental liturgies, like the Egyptian anaphora of St. Mark where the curtain is drawn aside to reveal a thousand times a thousand and ten thousand times ten thousand angels and choirs of archangels standing in God’s presence, and the six-winged cherubim calling to each other in this hymn of victory “with untiring mouth and never-ceasing praises of God” and “singing, calling, praising, sounding and speaking” the song “before Thy great glory.”

These changes cannot have been fortuitous, even though they could hardly have resulted from any conscious plan. The enlargement of the picture corresponds to the breakdown of the national narrowness of Judaism and of its cult which was conjoined to the Temple. “The glory of the Lord” which had once dwelt in the Temple, had, in a manner new and unparalleled, pitched its tent on earth in the Incarnation of the Son of God (John 1:14). Now, however, no longer to be confined by the boundaries of one country, but to be a light to enlighten all people and—more completely after the Ascension—to be the Head beneath which earth and heaven should be conjoined. From this Head the Spirit should be poured out over the entire world as a new revelation of divine grace and of divine glory.

Since the exaltation of the God-man therefore, the proper locale for the praise of God has been the heavenly Jerusalem where the earthly Church has its true home and towards which it makes its pilgrimage. Part of the value of the Church’s liturgy is that it is already a participation in the never-ending song of praise of the City of God.
The New Testament motif that bursts forth in the angelic hymn has found even fuller expression in the appended Benedictus, with its two enclosing Hosanna's. Here, too, the praise resounds “to Him who sits on the throne, and to the Lamb” (Apoc. 5:13). It seems that it was in Gallic territory that the Benedictus was first annexed to the Sanctus. At any rate the thought that must have been determining was this, that the glory of the Lord, which fills heaven and earth, did not begin to shine in its fullest splendor until the Son of God came to us in the form of flesh. Therefore, even in Bethlehem His coming was heralded by the Gloria of the angels’ song, and therefore the crowds welcomed Him to Jerusalem in the phrase of the Psalm as He “who comes in the name of the Lord.”

In the basic text from the Gospel the words qui venit (ὃ εὐρίσκεται) must certainly be taken in the present tense: the people greeted one who was just coming. But one could well inquire whether the liturgical text is to be understood in the preterite (perfect) tense: qui venit. Naturally the question is independent of the position occupied by the Benedictus, whether before or after the consecration, for in either instance the praise must be referred to one who once came down to our midst in His Incarnation. Still, the change of meaning could be unnecessary. Christ is still always “coming.” We still continue to pray for the coming of His kingdom, and even at Christmastide when we recall His adventus our mind turns as much to the Benedictus and benedictus

While the Benedictus can be verified in the Orient only since the 8th century (cf. above, note 26), it must already have been customary in the Roman Mass in at least in the 7th century. For it appears in most MSS. of the Roman Canon, though not in all; see Botte, Le canon, 30 Apparat. The earliest testimony for Gaul is presented by Cæsarius of Arles (d. 540), see note 8, above. The Benedictus is also a permanent part of the Gallican Mass. For it is presupposed in the Post-Sanctus, which frequently begins with Vere sanctus, vere benedictus Dominus noster Iesu Christus; Muratori, II, 518, 526; 534; etc. Also with preceding Osanna in excelsis; ibid., II, 29, or with a repetition of the Benedictus; ibid., 699. The same occurrence already in the Mone Masses, that probably originated in the 6th century. (PL, 138, 866 C, 875 B). In another place, namely, within the Communion portion of the Mass, the Benedictus (Mt. 21: 9 and Ps. 117: 26) was certainly used in answer to the Τα τε ὑγιατικαευανετι Const. Δπ., VIII, 13, 13 (Quasten, Mon., 230).

Matt. 21: 8, is probably the immediate prototype of the liturgical text, but with one divergence, that the first Hosanna of Matthew reads Hosanna filio David. In the liturgical text, however, the reading of the second Hosanna was inserted in its place, a reading, that, as a matter of fact, because it is a praise of God, results in a better transition. The form of the original text, Ps. 117, 25 f., may have had its part in bringing this about: O Domine, salveum me fac; . . . benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. These verses from the Psalm refer to the arrival of the festive procession to the Temple. In the meantime, however, the words “He who comes” without the addition “in the name of the Lord” had for a long time been turned into a term for the Messias, see Matt. 11, 3. Cf. J. Schneider, ἐγγύων; Theol. Worterbuch a. N. Test., II, 664-672, especially 666 f. The homo-mah, which the Psalm still retains in its original meaning “help, we pray” assumed in the language of the people the meaning of a respectful invocation, “Hail,” as is easily recognized in Hosanna filio David and as the addition in the cantus shows; cf. Gloria in excelsis. It is a hymn of praise to Him who dwells on High, praise in view of the manifestation of His benevolence, just as is said of those who were witnesses of the miracles of Jesus,” they exulted and praised God.” Cf. in the Byzantine Mass the version in the second passage ὁσαννα καὶ τίς ἡ ὁσαννα; Brightman, 385. When Brinktrine, Die hl. Messe, 173, states that Hosanna is tantamount to ὁσαννα, gloria, we may let it pass. (The Armenian Mass actually substitutes a word with this meaning for the Hosanna; Hanssens, III, 394). But it is incorrect to place this (subjective and moreover unspontaneous) gloria on the same plane with the (objectively meant) gloria of the Pleni sunt caeli and so to see a connection between the two.

It was clearly used in this predominantly future sense when the Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini was employed as a memorial inscription, as in the Greek inscription on the portal of a Syrian mountain hypogaeum; see C. M. Kaufmann, Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie, (3rd ed.; Paderborn, 1922), 148. For the rest, the oriental liturgies insert instead of the simple qui venit a double phrase that places past and future together: “he who has come and is to come.”
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5. Various Practices during the Canon

The *Tersanctus* finished, it was originally the custom in Rome for the celebrating priest to continue the performance of the Great Prayer in a loud voice but—we must presume—as a simple recitation, without any melody. Once the Roman Mass was transplanted to Frankish territory, however, the picture was altered, and our present *ritus* is broadly stamped with the new customs that sprung up here. *Surgit solus pontifex et tacite intrat in canonem*. This phrase, which crystallizes the Carolingian revision of the older norm found in the first Roman ordo,26 can be considered the basic pattern followed in transforming and reshaping the rite in the most part of the celebration of Mass.

The priest enters the sanctuary of the canon alone. Up till now the people have thronged around him, their songs at times accompanying him in the fore-Mass. But the songs have become less frequent, and after the steep ascent of the Great Prayer they have come to an end in the *Tersanctus*. A sacred stillness reigns; a worthy preparation for God's approach. Like the High-priest of the Old Testament, who once a year was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies with the blood of a sacrificial animal (Hebr. 9:7), the priest now separates from the people and makes his way before the all-holy God in order to offer up the sacrifice to Him.27 In the early medieval Mass he did not do so without first acknowledging his unworthiness in a humble apology,28 or begging prayerfully for God's help. Sometimes a hand-washing was prescribed.29 The whole assembly knelt down or, when this was forbidden because of the Sunday or feast day, remained bowed.30 In many churches of the eleventh and twelfth centuries the choir of clerics surrounding the altar, taking up the *Orate-plea* of the

---

26 This allegorism was developed by the Carolingian and post-Carolingian interpreters to greater and greater lengths; Florus Diaconus, *De actione miss.,* n. 42 f. (PL, 119, 48); Remigius of Auxerre, *Epithesi* (PL, 101, 1256); especially Ivo of Chartres, *De convent. v. et n. sacrif.* (PL, 162, 554); according to the parallel with Hebr. 9:7 (the priest enters the Holy of Holies with the Blood of Christ, i.e., with the memorial of His passion); Hildegard of Siena, *Verus de mysterio missae* (PL, 171, 1183); Isaac of Stella, *Ep. de off. missae* (PL, 194, 1889-1896); Robert Paulhus, *De carmenis,* II, 23-30 (PL, 177, 425-430); Sicard of Cremona, *Mitrale,* III, 6 (PL, 213, 125 B); Durandus, IV, 36, 5.

27 The Missa lirica, which is especially rich in applause, inserts here three formulas with which the priest begins, even while the *Sanctus* is still being sung. The third one reads as follows: *Facturus meum patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum*; "we worship the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost," or, "we adore the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost with an old tradition, see above, p. 78.

28 This kneeling posture may have been the incentive for interpolating here (*post offer­­torium et ante canone*) a prayer for help against the Tartar danger; this a Synod of Mainz, 1261 (Hartzm, III, 361) does, commending Psalm 78, with a *Pater noster* and the oration for peace; Franz, 205 f. The case seems to be an isolated one. Similar prayers in time of distress will be found inserted most frequently either before or after the emblems.

29 Evidences since the 9th century; Jungmann, *Gewordene Liturgie,* 126 ff. (cf. above, I, 240).—Regarding the gradual change in the meaning of this practice from adoring reverence to God to veneration of the Blessed Sacrament, see Jungmann, *Gewordene Liturgie,* 127-131. A bowed at­itude during the Canon is in accordance with an old tradition, see above, I, 72. —Humble submission before God's majesty is most likely the original meaning of the custom that is reported today from many countries (among others, Poland, Portugal, Central America) where the faithful
priest, began to recite psalms for him in a loud voice. A formal office of accompanying prayers of petition, akin to the oriental εκτενσις, was for a time employed as an outward veil to cover the silent prayer of the celebrant. No surprise, then, that there were even attempts to hide completely the visible activities of the priest from the congregation.

On the other hand, more recent rules, still in force at the present, prescribe that at a pontifical function a procession of clerics should appear in its full extent form in the Missa Illirica: a procession that at a pontifical function a procession of clerics should appear in its full extent form in the Missa Illirica:

The cessation of the practice seems to coincide with the elaboration of the Sanctus melodies (cf. above, p. 130); then, too, with the elevating of the host that was coming more and more into vogue. In this sense Durandus, IV, 39, 1: in quibusdam ecclesiis . . . quasi eititur et velatur. Still, even in these instances, clearly not many, it was a symbolical concealment (quasi), since a real concealment of the priest is excluded, at least since the 13th century, by the very fact that he held up the host to view. Even earlier there is evidence of various altar curtains, but they were hung rather on the sides and were for the sake of ornamentation, especially those in Latin churches.

The custom of lighting the so-called Sanctus candle at every Mass, this custom was elevated to a rubric in the Missale Romanum, but by contrary custom the rule has lost its force. Through such rites, without doubt, there was awakened during the Mass in the later Middle Ages a lively reverence for the mystery that took place at the consecration like a new epiphany of the God-man. On the other hand, no one any longer thought of following the priest's prayers, which indeed were now only whispered quietly, and whose ideas turned in a very different direction. In fact, they were in essence for the priest exclusively, and were not supposed to be accessible to lay folk. The only part of the liturgy of the canon that was open to the faithful was the external action of the priest, and, until the elevation of the species became customary in the thirteenth century, this consisted in little more than the extension of the arms, bowing, kissing the altar, and making signs of the Cross over the gifts. We must therefore cast a glance at these external rites, inasmuch as they reappear several times in the course of the canon.

It is taken for granted that the basic attitude of the priest during this most ancient traditional prayer should continue to be the same as that of the preface, the traditional stance of the orantes. This same posture was originally taken also by the surrounding clergy, and perhaps also by the faithful, until for them bowing or kneeling became the predominant rule. Only the priest continues to remain standing with arms extended. In the

The custom of lighting the so-called Sanctus candle at every Mass, this custom was elevated to a rubric in the Missale Romanum, but by contrary custom the rule has lost its force. Through such rites, without doubt, there was awakened during the Mass in the later Middle Ages a lively reverence for the mystery that took place at the consecration like a new epiphany of the God-man. On the other hand, no one any longer thought of following the priest's prayers, which indeed were now only whispered quietly, and whose ideas turned in a very different direction. In fact, they were in essence for the priest exclusively, and were not supposed to be accessible to lay folk. The only part of the liturgy of the canon that was open to the faithful was the external action of the priest, and, until the elevation of the species became customary in the thirteenth century, this consisted in little more than the extension of the arms, bowing, kissing the altar, and making signs of the Cross over the gifts. We must therefore cast a glance at these external rites, inasmuch as they reappear several times in the course of the canon.

It is taken for granted that the basic attitude of the priest during this most ancient traditional prayer should continue to be the same as that of the preface, the traditional stance of the orantes. This same posture was originally taken also by the surrounding clergy, and perhaps also by the faithful, until for them bowing or kneeling became the predominant rule. Only the priest continues to remain standing with arms extended. In the

for the Sunday Masses. See Eisenhofer, II, 163 in regard to the present practice.

Plentiful material on this in Browe, "Die Elevation in der Messe" (1929), 40-43. Pictures from the 13th century in Ch. Rohault de Fleury, La Messe, I (Paris, 1883), Table XX; pictures from later times in F. Falk, Die deutschen Messauslegungen von der Mitte des 15 Jh. bis zum Jahre 1525 (Cologne, 1889), 28, 30, 33, 37, 46.

Rubr. gen. XX; cf. Ritus serv., VIII, 6. This contrary custom was recognized and approved by the Congregation of Rites, July 9, 1899: Decreta auth. SRC, n. 4029, 2.—But the sanctus candle still survives in many places. In Spain at the Sanctus the server lights a smaller candle (much like the bugie used by prelates) and places it close to the priest's right arm; it remains lighted till the Communion, when the server holds it over the pater while the priest collects any detached particles; then it is extinguished; Raphael M. Huber, "Unusual Spanish and Portuguese Liturgical Customs," Homiletic & Pastoral Rev, 52 (1951), 323. The Sanctus candle is still in use also in Central America, in many parts of Switzerland, in a few parishes of the diocese of Rottenburg and Würzburg, and in the Freiburg cathedral; Kramp, "Messegebräuche der Gläubigen in der Neuzeit," (SIZ, 1926, II), 218; Idem, "Messegebräuche der Gläubigen in den ausserdeutschen Ländern," (SIZ, 1927, II), 352, note 2; 364; Krömer, 58. In Vorarlberg the custom continued till World War I; L. Jochem, "Religiöses und kirchliches Brauchtum in Vorarlberg," Montforti, I (Bregenz, 1940), 290 f. The Carthusians have kept it: Ordinarium Cart. (1932), c. 29, 14; 32; 13. Likewise the Dominicans: G. Sülch, "Die Liturgie des Dominikaner­ordens" (Angelicum, 1950), 32.

— Cf. supra, I, 82 f.; 143 f.

Supra, I, 239, Cf. the illustrations (9th-11th cent.) in Righetti, Manuale II, 357; 361; also the late remnant of the practice at the consecration, infra.
Middle Ages it was often customary for him to stretch his arms out wide in the form of a cross, at least after the consecration, as is still the practice with the Dominicans, amongst others. Then at the Supplices te rogamus it was usual to cross them in front of the breast. Both these postures are evident references to the Crucified, whom an older Christendom was accustomed to see in the very attitude of the orantes, although no special emphasis was laid on this.

The reverential bowing—the posture stipulated by the Roman ordines for the surrounding clergy all through the canon—was originally shared by the celebrant, as we have seen, only at the Sanctus. Then he also bowed after the consecration when he began the humble petition for acceptance, at the Supra quae or, as at present, at least at the Supplices, and he held this pose to the end of the petition. The textual analogy of the introductory petition for acceptance in the Teigitur must have led to a similar bowing right after the Sanctus, while pronouncing the words: rogamus ac petimus, uti accepta habeas . . . hae dona. While this practice of bowing was stabilized already in the thirteenth century, the preparatory gestures of extending, lifting and joining the hands, and in general also the concluding kiss of the altar were at this same period still unknown.

When the priest Straightens up from this first bow after the Sanctus, he makes three signs of the Cross over the sacrificial gifts. These are the first signs of the Cross within the canon, and likewise the oldest. First evidence

Infra for the proofs. The Carthusian rite prescribes outstretched arms also before the consecration; Ordinarium Cart. (1932), c. 27, 2.

Cf. Dölger, Sol salutis, 318 with n. 4.

Ordo of John Archicantor, Silva-Tarronca, 199).


Missal of the Minorites of the 13th century: Ehener, 314; cf. Ordinarium O. P. of 1256 (Guerrini, 241); Liber ordinarius of Liége (Volk, 94).—Unless he maintained the position assumed at the Sanctus: Liber ussum O. Cist., c. 53 (PL, 166, 1425) cf. Söch, 88, note 20. —Because such a plea for acceptance is also present in the Hanc igitur, though in a special connection, we find the profound bow very much in use here too, in the later Middle Ages; see below.

Here we clearly have the same idea as at the beginning of the Gloria and Credo and at the invitation to pray Oremus and Gratias agamus: namely, a gesture introductory to a proper prayer attitude at an important moment of the service, comparable to the melodious initium of the verses of a solemn psalmody. Before the Teigitur the gesture is in a certain sense an independent one and of itself forms, as it were, a silent invocation. Such is the case at least if we follow the usual understanding of the rubric; namely, that the gesture comes first, and only then the Teigitur is actually to begin in a bowed attitude. Cf. Merati in Gavanti-Merati, Theosaurus, II, 8, 1 (1. 284 f.). The rubric (Ritus serv., VIII, I) which was slightly altered in 1897, admits of more than one meaning; see J. B. Müller, Zeremonienbuchlein, (13th ed.; Freiburg, 1934), 63.

Söch, Hugo, 88 f. This first kissing of the altar is mentioned only by Sicard of Cremona, Mitrale, III, 6 (PL, 213, 125), whose note is repeated by Durandus, IV, 36, 6: hic osculatur alter at serenitatem faciones. It may be doubted if the last word indicates the original meaning of this kiss. Possibly it is a copy of the older kissing of the altar at the Supplices te rogamus occasioned by the Supplices te rogamus, consequently a gesture of reverential pleading. In the Mass-ordo of Cologne, 14th century (Binterim, IV, 3, p. 224), shows a further development of this kiss, inasmuch as it adds a kissing of the picture of the crucifixion and a prayer (paraphrasing Isaiah 138, 16 a). The rubric of the Mass-ordo of Amiens in the 9th century, ed. Leroquais (Eph. liturg., 1927), 442, is an entirely isolated one: Postea osculatur altare et dicit: Te igitur. This can only mean a greeting, a salute upon "going into" the canon; cf. the salutation of the altar at the offertory in the Ordo Rom. I, n. 15 (above, I, 314, note 20) and the parallel in the East Syrian Rite (above, II, 79, n. 16); here in the Syro-Malabar Rite the further parallel of the repeated kissing of the altar (twice in the center, then to the right and to the left) also during the Sanctus; Hassens, III, 395 f.

In the Cod. Reg., 316 of the older Gesallianum; here and in other individual MSS, a fourth sign of the cross at the Masses appears along with the customary three. Cf. also in addition to the following references the excursion on the cross in the canon, in Brinktrine, Die kl. Messe, 295-303. Several other individual instances in Eisenhofer, II, 171 f.


Ordo Rom. II, n. 10 (PL, 78, 974).

That there was no complete uniformity in the 11th century is shown by the fact that Bertrand of Constance, Micrologus, 14 (PL, 151, 986 f.) expressly appeals to the authority of Gregory VII in support of the method he advocates (among others, the uneven numbers).

In individual cases today's customary signs of the cross appear here already at an early date, as in the Sacramentary of Angoulême written around the year 800. However, they are still missing often enough in the 11th and 12th centuries; Brinktrine, 299.

The Expositio "Missio pro multa," ed. Hansens (Eph. liturg., 1930), 39, explains the sex ordines crucium in the appendix of the Ordo Rom. II by means of the relationship of the six eras of the world to the cross of Christ. Since the 11th century many an interpreter loved to ascribe some sort of symbolic meaning to every number of the signs of the cross; Franz, 415 f., 419. Others again, like Rupert of Deutz and Innocent III, connect them with some phase of Christ's passion (Franz, 418, 455, 662); or all these interpretations are jumbled together, as Honorius Augustod. (Franz, 424) does. Or, again, with Bertold of Regensburg, a special specification from the representation of Christ's passion...
sacrifice of the Cross which is being made present sacramentally. Nowadays it is taken for granted that the signum crucis also signifies a blessing; one meaning of “to bless” is to make the sign of the Cross. Although in the Church of the first thousand years the laying-on of hands was generally the form used for blessing, still this form seems to have been superseded more and more by the sign of the Cross, especially in Gallic territory. In some passages, indeed, it is quite apparent that the cross is meant as a blessing, being linked with words that signify just that: the double benedixit at the consecration, the words benedictam, adscriptum, ratam, and sanctificas, vivificas, benedicis.

But it also appears in other passages. Brinktrine maintains that the sign of the Cross in the canon was intended from most ancient times not only to emphasize the notion of blessing and sanctifying, but also to underline certain significant words. This latter intention (he holds) must be granted in the case of the two crosses that accompany the words ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat just before the consecration, and likewise the five crosses right after the consecration, at hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatum, panem sanctum vitae aeterna, calicem salutis perpetua. To these would naturally be added at least the crosses over the consecrated gifts in the Supplices, at the words corpus et sanguinem. The use of the signum crucis is attributed to each one of the twenty-five signs of the cross, with the basic idea “short sign of the cross, quick torment; prolonged torment, big sign of the cross.” (Franz, 656; cf. 695 f.), or with an imitator of his, with some restrictions, as signs of the cross gained greater importance in proportion as the instruction to each one of the twenty-five rebus sacratis vel sacrandis is attributed to each one of the twenty-five signs of the cross.

According to this study the Middle Ages attributed only commemorative significance to the sign of the cross, as we have just stated, whereas modern times, with few exceptions (Maldonatus especially among them, see below) viewed them, with restrictions, as signs of blessing. The Syrian Narasi (d. about 502) already made the same assumption and had the same problem, but suggested, “He [the priest] signs now [after the epiclesis] not because the Mysteries have need of the signing, but to teach by the last sign (of the cross) that they are accomplished.” Connolly, The Liturgical Homilies of Narasi, 22.

Thus, the commission on the removal of abnua missae in the Council of Trent proposed abolishing the signs of the cross after the consecration; Concilium Tridentinum, ed. G. Veltasus, 1917, R. Haungs, “Die Kreuzzeichen nach der Wandlung im römischen Messkanon” Benediktin. Monatschrift, 21 (1939), 249-261, reviews the history of the interpretation of the signs. According to this study the Middle Ages attributed only commemorative signification to the sign of the cross, as we have just stated, whereas modern times, with few exceptions (Maldonatus especially among them, see below) viewed them, with restrictions, as signs of blessing.

In the Ethiopian anaphora of the Apostles the words of the institution are given as follows, “Take, eat: (pointing) this bread (bowing) is my body (pointing) . . . “ and likewise with the chalice. In the anamnesis and offertory prayer that follows (which has just been sung) that they are accomplished.” Connolly, The Liturgical Homilies of Narasi, 22.

The signs of the Cross over the consecrated gifts has often been commented on with some astonishment, because the first thought that strikes one is that these are blessings. A blessing is obviously out of place here. Yet it may be questioned whether it is enough to explain them as underlining certain words. Why precisely are these words emphasized? They are certainly not the most sacred words that appear in the canon.

We must remind ourselves that the solemn prose style that dominates the Roman canon is the type of speech that was cultivated in the schools of rhetoric in the decadent Roman empire. The oratorical phrase implies also the oratorical gesture. The oratorical phrase that touches on some object in the view of the listener implies a gesture directing the attention to that object, a principle that governs every vital speech and therefore likewise the prayer which was naturally and originally eloquent. Although such things, because taken for granted, are seldom mentioned in liturgical works, still there are some examples, and not only in oriental liturgy, but....
in the Roman as well. We must conclude that these gestures were subsequently—that is, since the eighth century—stylized into a sign of the Cross. For such a process of transformation there is no lack of examples and parallels.

If, with this in mind, we con the text of the canon, we actually find that every time the gifts are mentioned the sign of the Cross is also indicated, with the exception of the Hanc igitur oblataem, where the hands are spread out over the gifts, and possibly the phrase qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis, in which the sacrifice is mentioned in passing. In fact, we have a document, the Admonitio synodalis of the ninth century, that may perhaps permit us to see the transition very plainly. The conclusion is thus forced upon us that the original gesture within the canon was a demonstrative one, and as such was not mentioned in the liturgical text. And this would hold not only for the three passages cited above, but also for the Te igitur where the petition for acceptance is mentioned for the first time in the canon: uti accepta habeas et benedicas haec dona,

as well as over the chalice; Brightman, 386 f.

In the orations of reconciliation for Maundy Thursday, presented in the Pontifical of Poitiers, written in the 9th century, and emanating from the Roman usage, the priests were obliged to touch with the right hand vice postuliffis the protestant penitents each time the bishop spoke the words hoc tamulos tuos in the orations; J. Morinus, Commentarius historicus de disciplina in administratw sacramenti penitentiae (Antwerp, 1682), Appendix, p. 67. The touching here is in all likelihood also equivalent to the laying on of hands...

The opinion that the sign of the cross here was not meant as a blessing, but simply as a sign, was upheld by J. Maldonat, S.J. (d. 1583), De ceremoniis, II, 21 (in F. A. Zaccaria, Bibliotheca ritualis, II, 2 [Rome, 1781], 142 f.; cf. 131 f.).

Attention is especially to be called to the transformation of the laying on of hands as a form of blessing into the sign of the cross over the object to be blessed. Thus, in the Indulgenzien before the sacramental absolution we still have a trace of the ancient oratorical gestures which are conjoined to the formula; cf. Jungmann, Die lateinischen Bussriten, 263 f. But even otherwise the sign of the cross occasionally replaced a gesture of pointing; thus in the Ordo Rom., I, n. 21 (PL, 78, 947) when the regional subdeacon gives the sign to the leader of the schola, at the end of the Communion of the people, to conclude the Communion Psalm with Gloria Patri: iterumque clauso ad primum scholae, faciens crucem in fronte sua, annuit et dicere Gloriam. The signal has been stylized into the sign of the cross, just as the simple greeting addressed to the people developed into a conventional religious greeting Dominus vobiscum. There are, moreover, evidences at present of a parallel manifestation, where the sign of the cross is often substituted for punctuation marks in the artistic script in which religious texts are written.

In the version of Rheiuser of Verona (d. 974; PL, 136, 560 A) Calicem et oblation recta cruces signate, id est non in circulo et variatione (al. variatione, PL, 135, 1071 D; vacillationem, PL, 132, 459 A, 461 A) digitorum, ut plurimi faciant, sed stricte duobus digitis et pollice intus recus. The passage is missing in one portion of the traditional texts (see Leclercq, DACL, VI, 576-579), but was present at least in the 10th century. In the movement of free hand and finger which is here centured, we might possibly have a vestige of the ancient oratorical gestures which are now supplanted by the sign of the cross; see Eisenhofer, I, 280 f. regarding the position of the fingers in the signs of blessing.

The first prayer that we meet in the text of the canon after the Sanctus is an offering of the gifts in the solemn yet suppliant form of a plea for gracious acceptance. Such an offering, at least in this position, is not self-explanatory. It is on the same footing as the offertory, or more precisely

Te igitur. The Plea for Acceptance

hac munera, hac sancta sacrificia illitata. The benedicas would then be the occasion for a change, a transformation into the sign of the Cross, while in the other passages the pointing gesture would still be retained, and as such would not be mentioned.

Looking yet more closely at the significance of this pointing gesture, we are forced to remark the following: Since we are concerned with the offering up of gifts which we cannot transfer to an invisible God except by means of interpretative words and gestures, the gesture of pointing would become a gesture of oblation whenever it accompanied the plea for acceptance (petimus uti accepta habeas; offerimus praecordia maiestati tuae). This is not the only gesture used to give visible expression to the oblation. Mention has already been made of bowing which is tied in with the plea for acceptance. Extending the hands over the gifts embodies the same symbolism. Recall that we came upon a prescription in Hippolytus of Rome, ordering the bishop to say the eucharistic prayer extending his hands over the gifts. This extension of hands, which represents the same thought, but with greater emphasis, never became a permanent gesture or one that accompanied the entire eucharistic prayer. Only at the Hanc igitur did it remain until the present day, or rather once more come into use. It was also used for a time at Supra quae propitio. For the rest, the hands were left free for the ordinary posture of the orantes, signifying our striving God-ward. Only when the phrase calls for it are the hands used to indicate the gifts that should belong to God. Seen from this vantage point, it is not at all unreasonable that the gesture of pointing—still always valid—should be combined with a sign of the Cross, and thus our offering of Christ on the Cross. These demonstrative signs of the Cross are therefore merely another expression of our will humbly to offer up to God the gifts that lie on the altar, and in this sense they rank with the laying of hands over the gifts, the bowing that accompanies the petition for acceptance, and the elevation of chalice and host connected with the closing doxology.

6. Te igitur. The Plea for Acceptance

The first prayer that we meet in the text of the canon after the Sanctus is an offering of the gifts in the solemn yet suppliant form of a plea for gracious acceptance. Such an offering, at least in this position, is not self-explanatory. It is on the same footing as the offertory, or more precisely

The fact that in the oldest occurrence of these signs the benedicas also has a sign of the cross, would be in accord with this; see note 27 above.

Above, p. 142. Cf. the exactly corresponding practices at the offertory, above, p. 51.

Above, I, 29. The same prescription also in the Testamentum Domini, I, 23 (Quas- ten, Mon., 249).

Balthasar de Pforta, O. Cist., verifies it as the practice of the secular clergy in Germany towards the end of the 15th century, Franz, 587.
the oratio super oblatas, the offering up even of the earthly gifts, which is distinctive of the Roman Mass. In other liturgies such an offering, as well as the insertion of the intercessions after the Sanctus, is unknown. Instead, they build a short span from the Sanctus to the words of institution, either by developing the Christological theme of the prayer of thanks, as in the West Syrian and the Byzantine formularies; or by continuing in a free fashion the words of praise, as often happens in the Post-Sanctus of the Gallic liturgies; or, finally, by attaching an epiklesis to the Pleni sunt caeli, as the Egyptian liturgies do.

The transition from the Sanctus to this offering in the Te igitur has been considered rather abrupt, and the word igitur, which seems to mark the connection externally, has been found unintelligible. Even up to the very present the word has been given various and varied interpretations. But obviously its only purpose is to link the action which is beginning to unfold in the plea for acceptance with the foregoing thanksgiving of the preface, by which it was, in substance, already set in motion. It is the same igitur which forms the transition between the first section of the

---

1 Cf. above, I, 43. In the liturgy of St. Basil it is done very elaborately.
2 In a short and typical manner, e.g., in the first Massale Gothicum: Vere sanctus, vere benedictus Dominus noster Jesus Christus Filius tuus, manens in caelis, manifestatus in terris. Ipsi enim prius quam pateretur; Muratori, I, 516.
3 It seems that in the Gallic Mass, too, the basic form of the Post Sanctus was a Christological continuation of the thanksgiving prayer; Cagin, De Deum teum ollilato, 381-385.
4 Thus in the anaphora of St. Mark (Brightman, 132): "Heaven and earth are truly full of Thy glory through the appearance of our Lord God and Jesus Christ. Make this sacrifice also, O God, replete with Thy blessing through the desert of the Holy Ghost; for He, our Lord and God and all-king Jesus Christ in the night took . ." cf. above, p. 135, n.39.
5 Upon this foundation one portion of the canon theories cited above I, 50, n. 1, is built; cf. e.g., P. Drews, Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Kanons in the römischen Messe (Tübingen, 1902; especially p. 23), who placed the three following prayers after the consecration, before the Memento eis in te, Fortescue, 328 f., also complains of the incomprehensibility of the igitur.
6 The question is, for what idea in the prayer now to begin is the igitur supposed to supply a link with the motivation or explanation in the prayer which precedes? Among others, the address elemcntisam Pater is mentioned, since the address to the Father is also contained in the preface (J. de Pontic, De liturgie der mist. [Roermond, 1939], 196 f., and already F. X. Funk, Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen, III, [Paderborn, 1907], 87 f.); the formula per Jesum Christum that is also in the preface (Brinktrine, Die hl. Messe, 175); the supplices of the invocation for acceptance, because it once again takes up the supplici confessionis dicens (Baumstark, "Das 'Problem' des römischen Messkanons" [Eph. liturg., 1939], 241 f.) the trustful rogare, because the way of God is opened through the mediation of the angels (J. Bona, De sacrificio missae, V, 8 [Bibliotheca ascetica, 7; Regensburg, 1913, 119]); the rogamus ac peitimus ut accepta habeas in which the oblation prayer of the Secreta is again taken up (V. Thallhofer, Handbuch der katholischen Liturgie, II, [Freiburg, 1890], 190); finally the benedictus, because only holy gifts are due to the Holy God, whom we have thrice praised as holy (Eisenhofer, II, 173).
7 In this sense Batifol, Leçons, 237. Likewise already Odo of Cambrai (d. 1113), Expositio in canonem missae, c. 1 (PL, 160, 1655 A).

---
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Holy Saturday Exultet, the laus cerei, with the oblation that follows, only in our case the juncture is even closer and more natural. We must try to remember how closely conjoined in ancient Christian thought were the concepts of thanksgiving and offering. What up to the third century was prevailing styled a thanksgiving: εὐχαριστία, was thereafter usually called an offering, oblatio. The Mass is a thanksgiving which culminates in the offering of a holy gift; it is an offering which is so spiritual that it appears to be only a thanksgiving. The expressions, sacrificium laudis and oblatio rationabilis, stress within the Roman canon itself the spirituality of the sacrifice. On the other hand, we must not see in the Gratias agamus simply an invitation to give thanks by word only. A Christian gratias agere is meant, a eucharistia, a thanksgiving which terminates sacrificially in the self-oblation of Christ. Therefore it was possible occasionally to enlarge the Gratias agamus in the sense of an oblation, just as the expression of thanks within the preface was associated with paraphrases of the notion of sacrifice. This latter proceeding is to be found in extra-Roman liturgies as well as in the Roman. The intermixture of expressions of thanks and sacrifice is particularly noticeable in the second portion of a eucharistia cited among the Arian fragments, a piece bearing evident resemblances to the Te igitur:

Dignum et iustum est . . . [a description of the work of redemption follows].

Culit benignitatis agere gratias tuae tantae magnanimitatis qui quisque laudibus nee sufficere possumus, petentis de tua magna et flexibile pietate accepto ferre sacrificium iustum, quod tibi offerentur stantes ante conspectum

---

8 In huius igitur noctis gratia suscipte, sancte Pater, incensu huius sacrificii veniam vestigium. The praecox, which is then resumed, is once more switched, by means of the equivalent ergo into the prayer of petition Omnes ergo te Domine.
9 Supra, I, 23 ff.; 169 ff. In embryo the idea of an oblation was already presented in the Jewish berachah; Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, 272; cf. supra, I, 21, note 63.
10 Supra, p. 114.
11 Cf. the liturgy of St. Basil in the fundamental form which must be considered pre-Basil, supra, p. 126, n. 62. In the anaphora of St. Mark the thanksgiving prayer in the fragments of the 4th century also switches over at once into an offering . .
12 Ἰνα δέ Χριστόν, ὅταν ἐν οἷς . . . εὐχαριστοῦντες προσφέροντες τὴν θυσίαν τὴν λατρείαν, τὴν ἄνθρωπος λατρείαν ἐκείνην; Quasten, Mon., 44 f.; cf. Brightman, 126; 165 f.; Within the Gallic liturgical sphere the idea of oblation is presented in two Sunday prefaces of the Missale Gothicum (Muratori, II, 648 f., 652), a document in which the preface is generally designated as immolatio, just as in the Mozarabic it is captioned ilatio.
13 A Christmas preface found both in the Leonianum and in the Gelasian Sacramentary (Mohlberg, n. 27; cf. sources, p. 293) begins: VD. Tuæ laudis hostiam immolantes, wherupon Old Testament prototypes of the Christian sacrifice and their realization at Christmas are described. For more examples in the Leonianum see Muratori I, 303 (12, n. XXIV), 403; cf. also above, 122 f. Besides this the Leonianum presents a transitional formula to the Sanctas that is relevant here, it reads (on the feast of Martyrs: . . . quorum gloria eorum die recolest): hostias tibi laudis offerimus, cum angelis, etc. (Muratori, I, 296; also I, 332: 392): or: . . . hostias tibi laudis offerimus, Per. (Dix, 396, 391, 396, 387); or: . . . hostias tibi laudis offerimus, etc., (ibid., 318).
In a word, the Teigitur and its plea for acceptance merely take up the thread of thought begun in the preface, putting it in a definite form, with an eye on the gifts.

In accord with this resumption of the thought after the slight pause in the Sanctus, both the term of address and the formula of mediation are repeated. The address, however, is no longer in the solemn, three-section form as found in the beginning of the preface, but merely a simple phrase, clementissime Pater, corresponding to the second section, sancte Pater. This confident term, otherwise scarcely to be met, is probably inspired by the nearness of the grace-laden mystery. Regarding the formula of mediation, the remarkable thing here is that it appears not at the end of a prayer or of a segment of prayer, as it otherwise always does, but at the beginning. Here it is plainly a supplement to the rogamus ac petimus; we carry our petitions before God's throne through our advocate and mediator Jesus Christ. The union of the faithful with the exalted Christ is here so vividly clear that it enters into the prayer even without the impetus of a closing formula.

The plea for acceptance is a reverently reserved form of offering, as the word supplices and the deep bow that accompanies it likewise indicate. The gifts are not yet dedicated, but we realize that they must be accepted just as they must be dedicated or consecrated; hence the words: uti accepta habeas et benedicas. In this petition for a blessing, taken strictly, as here outlined, it was followed at once by the Quam
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ilibata. We cannot put too much store in this tri-membered expression. In the formulas of the secret prayer all three terms are used to designate the same thing, namely the material gifts. In our passage they are merely juxtaposed in order to emphasize the expression, in accordance with a stylistic law that also operates elsewhere in the canon. A certain gradation, however, is plainly discernible; first the gifts are just called dona, gifts such as we are accustomed in some way or other to exchange from man to man; as munera they appear as a result of a more fixed arrangement, as a public service; and finally as sacrificia they are labeled as the sacred tribute dedicated to God.

It is not improbable that in the first version of the Roman canon, in the form it had till about the end of the fourth century, the plea for an acceptance of the gifts, as here outlined, was followed at once by the Quam...
oblationem and the consecration. This design was then disrupted by the interjection of the intercessory prayers.  

7. General Intercessory Prayers

About the end of the fourth century intercessory prayers began to be inserted into the Great Prayer even in Rome, just as had become customary in the Orient perhaps since the beginning of the same century.  

As we have already seen in Justin's account, intercessory prayers were conjoined to the eucharistic celebration,  but they preceded the eucharistia and formed the conclusion of the service of prayer and reading.  It is in this very same place that we have located the "General Prayer of the Church," even down to the present time, although here a process of contraction set in quite early. As a result the core of the intercessory prayer, in the Roman liturgy as well as in others, was transferred to the inner sanctuary of the eucharistic prayer. Only the Gallic liturgies withstood this development, so that to the last—and in the Mozarabic Mass right down to the present—the intercessions remained standing outside the gates of the eucharistic prayer, in the portion of the Mass given over to preparing the gifts. In the Roman Mass the intercessions, as we know them at the present, were remodelled in the course of the fifth century and built into the canon between the Sanctus and the prayer for the consecration in the Quam oblationem, and the corresponding remembrance of the dead was then added after the consecration.

If we may perceive in the orationes sollemnes of Good Friday the General Prayer of the Church as it appeared in the primitive Roman liturgy, we are struck by the strong contrast between these ancient intercessions and the newer type constructed within the canon. In the latter, the formulation would, as a matter of course, have to be more brief. But only echoes of the former type that really recur are the prayer pro ecclesia sancta Dei, phrases the Eucharistic prayer as εὐχές θείας καὶ εὐχερήσεως. Herewith, however, in agreement with I, 65, 3, the εὐχές are rather to be understood as coupling the Δεός and Δέον that are mentioned in the latter passage before the εὐχερήσεως. Outside of that, Justin's Eucharistia must have included a prayer for an efficacious Communion; cf. above I, 35, 37. The view advocated by Baumstark among others, that a prayer of petition is already to be assumed within the Eucha­ristia of Justin, is, in the face of further facts, not acceptable.

At any rate Justin, Apol., I, 67, 5, para-

8. At any rate Justin, Apol., I, 67, 5, para-

The prayer pro beatissimo papa nostro, and the prayer pro omnibus episcopis, etc.—and this last only in more recent texts—while the prayer for the Church in the canon accords with its model all the more plainly since in both petition is made for peace, protection, and unity for the Church toto orbe terrarum. The explanation lies in the fact that, as Innocent I tells us, the chief concern was the mention of the names within the canon, that therefore the main stress was on the Memento; and, on the other hand, the General Prayer for the Church still continued in use. Besides this, the prayer for the emperor appears to have actually had its place here in the fifth century. The prayer for the catechumens, of whom there were but few, would naturally have been considered no longer so opportune as to require a place in the canon. The prayer for heretics, Jews, and pagans, however, as it appeared in the orationes sollemnes, was somewhat of a specialty of Rome's, in comparison with the other liturgies; it therefore continued to be restricted to the orationes sollemnes. These orationes sollemnes seem not to have been excluded entirely from the ordinary service until a suitable substitute appeared in the Kyrie litany. The deprecatio Gelasii, which we took as evidence for this inference, includes in its seventeen petitions all nine titles of the orationes sollemnes.

In the canon the pertinent names ought to have been spoken simply with a brief accompanying phrase. The framework provided for this is the Memento, with the short preliminary piece beginning with the words in primis. Somewhat later the Communicantes sprouted from the same root, and lastly the Hanc igitur took its place alongside as an independent structure. If the rights of the individual should thus be acknowledged in the very sanctuary of the liturgy, then it is only right and proper that at the heart of the list of names should appear the first name of the Christian community and the community itself. The sacrifice which we offer up humbly to God, and which should, in the first instance, be our thanks and our tribute to our Creator and Father, will also draw down upon us God's protection and grace precisely because it is a sacrifice and because it is this sacrifice. May it be of avail above all for the whole Catholic Church!
The prayer for the whole Church was a matter very close to the heart of the primitive Christians. Well known are the prayers of the Didache (9.4; 10.5). When Bishop Polycarp of Smyrna (d. 155-156), upon being arrested, begged for a little time to pray, he prayed aloud for all whom he had known and for the whole Catholic Church, spread over the world.14 Another martyr-bishop, Fructuosus of Tarragona (d. 259), about to be burnt to death, answered a Christian who sought his prayer, saying in a firm voice: “I am bound to remember the whole Catholic Church from sunrise to sunset.”15

Only two attributes are joined to the mention of the Church, but in them its entire greatness is made manifest. The Church is holy; it is the assembly of those who are sanctified in water and in the Holy Spirit. Sanctae is the earliest of the adjectives customarily attached to the mention of the Church. And it is Catholic; according to God’s plan of grace, the Church is appointed for all peoples, and at the time this word was inserted into the canon it could be said triumphantly that it was actually spread to all peoples, toto orbe terrarum—an expression that merely serves to underscore the Catholica.16 What we petition for the Church is peace (pacificare), or putting it negatively, defense from every threat of danger (custodire), so that she might bring forth rich fruit, so that the leaven of the divine power within her might penetrate every level of human society. For the Church internally we follow the example of the Master Himself (John 17:21) by asking above all for unity: that she might continue to be guarded against division and error, that she might be held together through love, the bond of the one family of God (adunare), and that the Spirit of God Himself might lead and govern her (regere).17

This leads on to the mention of those through whom the Spirit of God wills to direct the Church and hold it together as a visible society. In other rites, too, since earliest times, we find that at the start of the intercessory prayer the mention of the Church is followed at once by that name which visibly represents the leadership of the Church.18 Often the name does not extend beyond the bishop. In the Roman canon the words in this passage that represent the traditional basic text are the words una cum fumulo tuo papa nostro illo,19 whereupon the Memento follows at once. But outside of Rome these words were soon expanded in various ways. In the Frankish realm during the sixth century the title papa could, for example, mean any bishop;20 therefore we find various clarifying additions that univocally designate the Roman pontiff.21 More and more since the sixth century the naming of the pope in the intercessory prayer became a fixed rule in the churches of the West. In Milan and Ravenna the custom existed already about 500.22 In the year 519 two bishops from an episcopal city of Epirus tell about it.23 In the year 529, at the urgent insistence of St. Cæsarius of Arles, the practice was prescribed by the Council of Vaison for that section.24 Pope Pelagius (d. 561) desired the Bishops of Tuscany to mention his name at Mass: quomodo vos ab universi orbis communione separatos esse non creditis, si mei inter sacra mysteria secundum consuetudinem nominis memoriam retinetis.25 At Constantino, too, during the sixth century the name of the pope was mentioned in the diptychs, and since the time of Justinian it was put in the first place.26

In Italian manuscripts especially, up to the eleventh century, the pope is often named alone.27 But outside of Rome the name of the bishop could not long be omitted. That name appears with increasing regularity, usually

14 Martyrium Polycarpi, c. 8, 1; cf. 5, 1.
15 Ruinart, Acta Martyrum (Regensburg, 1859; 266).
16 The formula is already verified in liturgical practice in the 11th century by Optatus of Mileve, Contra Parmen., II, 12; CSEL, 26, 47): offere vos dicitis Deo pro una Ecclesia, que sit in toto terrarum orbe diffusa. In this reference Optatus presumes that the Donatists had retained this prayer since their break with the Church in 312. It is possible that the phrase in the canon is linked with the fact that since the 4th century the original meaning of catholica was weakened more and more to a mere anathesis to heresy.
17 Botte, Le canon, 33. Several of the oldest manuscripts have beatizimunos famulo tuo. This is possibly the primitive reading. Cf. Brinktrin.e, 178.—Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, 501, seeks to associate the expression under consideration with the Memento of the living: Una cum fumulo tuo ... memento, Domine. Aside from the fact that it is difficult to approve this assumption on stylistic grounds and that it has no support in tradition, the point against it is that in this way the naming of the Pope would have to be considered as a mere side issue.
19 Thus, in the Irish Stowe Missal (about 800): sedes apostolica episcopo. Ebner, 398.
20 Enotius, Libellus de synodo, c. 77 (CSEL, 6, 311); E. Bishop, “The diptychs” (Appendix to Connolly, The Liturgical Homilies of Naos), 113, n. 2.
21 Cormand, Ep., 59, 2 (CSEL, 35, 672): nullius nonem oboeziuin religionis est recitatum nisi tautum beatitudinis vestra.
22 Can. 4 (Mansi, VIII, 727): Et hoc nobis justum vixion est, ut nomen domini papa, quicumque sedis apostolica praeferit in nostris ecclesias recitetur.
24 Bishop, op. cit., 111; 104, n. 1.
25 Ebner, 398.
with the wording: et antiste nostro illo. The further supplement: et
omnibus orthodoxis atque apostolice fidei culturibus, is also
found first outside Rome, in Gallic territory, and this at a surprisingly
early date.

Who are meant by the orthodoxi? The word could designate simply
those who were sound and solid in doctrine, the Catholic Christians.
The same meaning is conveyed by the complementary phrase, catholica
et apostolica fidei cultus, a phrase appended in conformity with a
stylistic law of the canon which prefers twin-type expressions. The only
difference is that the latter phrase designates in the first place those who
estee the Catholic and apostolic faith and who consciously profess it.
The first-named culturos fidei are obviously, then, the shepherds of the
Church, the bishops. A confirmatory argument to show that they, and
not simply the faithful, are meant by the double expression, is found in
the construction una cum, which would otherwise be meaningless; may
God, we say, protect the Church which is composed of the faithful as a
unit, along with the pope and all those who, as faithful pastors, have a
part in her governance. But in more recent times, when the tautology
that arose in connection with Ecclesia tua was no longer sensed, the ex-
pression was taken to refer to all the faithful; it was opposed as superflu-
ous, for example, by Micrologus, adding the rather poor argument,
among others, that the Memento followed.

The civil authorities, for whom St. Paul, even in the time of Nero,
earnestly desired the prayer of the faithful community (1 Tim. 2:2), get
no mention in the Mass of the city of Rome. This is understandable,
considering the time from which the oldest extant manuscripts derive, for
then the pope was, in point of fact at least, the civil lord of the “Papal”
State. Hardly a shadow of the eastern Roman empire was any longer
noticeable. In the preceding centuries, on the contrary, prayer for the
emperor was decidedly a part of the canon. In the Milanese form of the
Roman canon, representing a text taken over from Rome perhaps already
before Gregory the Great, the prayer for the ruler is still to be found,
and this is true also in other isolated instances. When the Roman Empire
was revived in the year 800, the mention of the emperor occurs at first

Great to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Ep., 80, 3 (PL, 54, 914 f.). Cf. Kennedy,
The Saints, 24; in De Christian Worp-
ship, 179 f. In the 11th century there are
again reports regarding attempts to
introduce the practice; see Martène, 1, 4, 8, 7
(I, 403 D).—The celebrating bishop, resp.
the pope, substitutes in the place of the usual
formula me indigne falamulo tuo. Eisen-
hofer, II, 175.

Bishop, Liturgica historica, 82.

In the Bobbio Missal (about 700) the
entire addition has the following form: una cum devotissimo famulo tuo illi. papa
nostro sedis apostolice et antiste nostro
et omnis orthodoxis atque apostolice fidei
et omnis orthodoxis atque apostolice fidei
culturibus. Lowe, The Bobbio Missal
(HBS, 58), n. 11; Muratori, II, 777. Cf.
also the study of H. Capelle, “Et omnis
orthodoxis atque apostolice fidei culturi-
bus,” Miscellanea histo. Alb. de Mayer, I
(Louvain, 1946), 137-150. Capelle ad-
vocates the assumption that the supple-
ment belonged to the original text of the

Thus already some of the oldest MSS.
The MS. of the older Galasianum (1st
half of the 8th cent.) has et antiste nostri
illo episcopo; Botte, 32. The naming of
the abbot also occurs; see examples in
Ebner, 100, 163, 302; Martène, I, 4, 8, 7
(I, 403 D).—The celebrating bishop, resp.
the pope, substitutes in the place of the usual
formula me indigne famulo tuo. Eisen-
hofer, II, 175.

Bishop, Liturgica historica, 82.

In the Bobbio Missal (about 700) the
ten entire addition has the following form: una cum devotissimo famulo tuo illi. papa
nostro sedis apostolice et antiste nostro
et omnis orthodoxis atque apostolice fidei
culturibus. Lowe, The Bobbio Missal
(HBS, 58), n. 11; Muratori, II, 777. Cf.
also the study of H. Capelle, “Et omnis
orthodoxis atque apostolice fidei culturi-
bus,” Miscellanea histo. Alb. de Mayer, I
(Louvain, 1946), 137-150. Capelle ad-
vocates the assumption that the supple-
ment belonged to the original text of the
canon, but that it was deleted by Gregory
the Great. See Eph. liturg., 61 (1947),
281 f.

Orthodoxus in opposition to hereticus,
e.g., in Jerome, Ep., 17, 2.

The expression was current in the 5th
century. Gelasius, Ep., 43 (Thiel, 472); the
pope designates himself minister cat-
tholic et apostolice fidei.

Cyprian, Ep., 67, 6 (CSEL, 3, 740, l.
11): fidei cultor ac defensor veritatis (re-
garding a bishop). There is an undertone
of conscious pride in the inscription Quis
tantas Christo venerandas condidit aces,
stit caesar: culor Pacom machius fidei, at
the entrance to the Basilica of John and
Paul. Here the expression certainly does
not designate a bishop.—Brinktrine, Die
kl. Messe, 176, refers to the parallel cul-
tor Dei, II Mace. 1: 19; John 9: 31. He there-
fore clings to the interpretation of this
phrase as referring to all the faithful.—A.
Mauretagnian inscription of the 3rd cen-
tury designates the Christian as cultor
verbi; C. M. Kaufmann, Handbuch der
antikerchristlichen Epigraphik (Freiburg,
1917), 127.

Cf. Capelle, loc. cit., who stresses the
tautology that would otherwise ensue.
Moreover, mentioning the names of bish-
ops of leading metropolitan sees must have
been customary in the 5th century in Rome
as well as elsewhere; this is obviously to
be deduced from a writing of Leo the

GENERAL INTERCESSORY PRAYERS 157

for whom St. Paul, even in the time of Nero,
earnestly desired the prayer of the faithful community (1 Tim. 2:2), get
no mention in the Mass of the city of Rome. This is understandable,
considering the time from which the oldest extant manuscripts derive, for
then the pope was, in point of fact at least, the civil lord of the “Papal”
State. Hardly a shadow of the eastern Roman empire was any longer
noticeable. In the preceding centuries, on the contrary, prayer for the
emperor was decidedly a part of the canon. In the Milanese form of the
Roman canon, representing a text taken over from Rome perhaps already
before Gregory the Great, the prayer for the ruler is still to be found,
and this is true also in other isolated instances. When the Roman Empire
was revived in the year 800, the mention of the emperor occurs at first

Great to the Patriarch of Constantinople,
Ep., 80, 3 (PL, 54, 914 f.). Cf. Kennedy,
The Saints, 24; in De Christian Wor-
pship, 179 f. In the 11th century there are
again reports regarding attempts to
introduce the practice; see Martène, 1, 4, 8, 7
(I, 403 E). The Missa Illlirica, which be-
longs to this period, seems to have so
contrived our formula, when it gives its
version: et pro omnibus orthodoxis atque
fidei culturibus, pontificibus et abbatibus,
gubernatoribus et rectorum Ecclesiae Dei,
ill. papa nostro Dei, et pro omni papae
sancto Dei: Martène, 1, 4, 4 (I, 513 C).

Bernold of Constance, Micrologus, c. 13
(PL, 151, 985). Bernold’s reasoning is not
peremptory, because in Memento the
prayer is said only for the offerants and
those present, whereas we are consider-
ing prayers for the faithful of the whole
Church in general; thus also H. Ménard,
PL, 78, 275 B—The Sacramentarium Ros-
minianum (10th cent.; ed. Brinktrine [Frei-
burg, 1930]), p. 74) has the specific addi-
tion omnium sacerdote tuo pontifice nostro
et regibus. The plural specifically recalls the prayer in the
Mass pro regina, as verified in Milan by
the Ambrosianum (above I, 53). There-
fore, it is not necessary to suggest a refer-
ence to the rulers of the Carolingian
provinces since the division of the empire
in 843, as Beihl, 57 does. An Ambrosian
MS. adduced by Muratori, I, 131, merely
presents et famulo tuo (illo) imperare. The
simple naming of the emperor is still
found in the Milan Missal of 751, but
quite naturally no longer in that of 902;
Ratti-Magistretti, 240.—The view that in
the naming of the emperor at Milan we
have a residue of an even older Roman
custom, is held by Kennedy, The Saints,
21, 48, 189.—Batiffol, Leçons, 243, n. 2,
shows, with a reference to the Leoninian,
how strongly the prayer for the Roman
empire corresponded to the attitude of the
Roman Church at the end of the ancient
era. Beihl, 37 f.
only in some few examples. A more frequent occurrence is not noticed till the eleventh century and by this time, because of the trouble arising over investiture, it was again challenged, as erasures and deletions in the text of the canon frequently show. In general, however, it was retained. Commentators on the Mass since the twelfth century refer to it without question. The formula is either: et imperatore nostro, or (at first with the same meaning): et rege nostro. Later, both emperor and king are mentioned together—or—an indication of the growing sense of territorialism—the rege nostro is understood of the king alone as the ruler of the land.

The Missale secundum usum Romanae Curiae of the thirteenth century, which originated in an atmosphere of ecclesiastico-political strife, mentions only pope and bishop. Because of its general acceptance, and because of the Missal of Pius V which was founded on it, mention of the civil ruler was generally discontinued. It was only by way of privilege that the rege was mentioned in the canon; this custom prevailed in Spain in former times, and since 1761 in Austria, with the latter custom continuing till 1918. In the framework of the formula una cum, which can comprise only the heads of Catholic Christendom, the naming of the

8. The Memento of the Living

The decisive factor which brought about in the Roman Mass the division of the Great Prayer and the insertion of the intercessions was, as we learn from the letter of Pope Innocent I, the desire to mention inter sacra mysteria the names of those offering. The precise setting for this mention of names is the prayer that follows, Memento Domine, along with the Communicantes. In the intercessory prayer of oriental liturgies the same words Miserere nobis are used to introduce a whole series of petitions commending to God various groups of the faithful; these were at one time closely linked with the names from the diptychs. In ecclesiastical life, especially in oriental Christendom, the diptychs have played a major role since the fourth century.

Most prominent there were the diptychs of the dead, but besides these there were also special diptychs of the living, at least in Constantinople. Seemingly as early as the start of the sixth century, both were read out in a loud voice within the intercessory prayer that followed the con
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ruler is possible only in a Christian state. For the rest, the great needs of the political order are expressed in the preceding pacificare, which necessarily implies a condition of ecclesiastical life tranquil and undisturbed.
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The insertion or omission of a name could thus at times cause a popular uproar, as happened at the beginning of the fifth century in the case of the name of St. John Chrysostom, for the inclusion of a name in the diptychs indicated the attitude of the ecclesiastical community towards the person involved and its acknowledgment of his orthodoxy. Therefore, in oriental diptychs since the sixth century, we sometimes find at the top of the list, along with the “patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs,” mention of the fathers of the first councils, above all the “318 orthodox fathers” of Nicea.

In the West, and particularly in the Roman liturgy, the listing of the names of the living takes the lead. Regarding the dead there is, as we shall see, no mention at this moment in public worship. This fits in with what we have already pointed to as the starting-point of the list, namely the offering of the sacrificial gifts of the faithful. Their offerings were to be commended to God by a special prayer, which is precisely what happened in the oratio super obleta. Besides this, there was within the canon an additional plea that God might be mindful of those qui tibi

DACL, IV, 1045-1094. 

Therefore, the term “sacrificial gift” was used in this context. Interestingly, the term “sacrificial gift” was also used for the offerings made to God by individuals, such as the orations for the living and the dead, as mentioned in the canon of the Byzantine diptychs.

While the priest is silent, another cleric reads aloud the names of the godparents or sponsors. At the ordinary service the only names mentioned present in the diptychs are the names of prominent personages, above all in ecclesiastical life, arranged in specified series starting with those of former bishops of the imperial city. The insertion or omission of a name could thus at times cause a popular uproar, as happened at the beginning of the fifth century in the case of the name of St. John Chrysostom, for the inclusion of a name in the diptychs indicated the attitude of the ecclesiastical community towards the person involved and its acknowledgment of his orthodoxy. Therefore, in oriental diptychs since the sixth century, we sometimes find at the top of the list, along with the “patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs,” mention of the fathers of the first councils, above all the “318 orthodox fathers” of Nicea.

In the West, and particularly in the Roman liturgy, the listing of the names of the living takes the lead. Regarding the dead there is, as we shall see, no mention at this moment in public worship. This fits in with what we have already pointed to as the starting-point of the list, namely the offering of the sacrificial gifts of the faithful. Their offerings were to be commended to God by a special prayer, which is precisely what happened in the oratio super obleta. Besides this, there was within the canon an additional plea that God might be mindful of those qui tibi...
would probably have been those which merited marked prominence for having given a special oblation over and above the liturgical offering of bread and wine. This can be gathered from a somewhat tautological remark of the hermit of Bethlehem, who had probably heard about the new practice at Rome: ut ... gloriuntur publiceque diaconus in ecclesiis recitent offertorium nomina: tantum offert ilia, tantum ille pollicitus est, placenterque sibi ad plausum populi.

A reading similar to that at Rome is evidenced beyond doubt in the domain of the Gallic liturgy, and here it is the offerers who are expressly named. The Gallican Mass of the seventh century—and likewise the Mozarabic—includes a special priestly oration Post nomina after the offertory procession and the introductory prayer. The wording of this oration is often linked to the reading of the names that just took place, then launches into a prayer of intercession for living and dead. An example is the prayer on the feast of the Circumcision: *Auditis nominibus offerentium, fratres dilectissimi, Christum Dominum deprecemur [a reference to the feast follows] ... prstante pietate sua, ut hac sacrificia sic viventibus proficiant ad emendationem, ut defunctis optulentur ad requiem, Per Dominum.* The reading itself, however, includes under the notion of offerentes not only those present, above all the clergy assembled here, but also all whose society is valued while the sacrifice is being offered up. Even the dead are embodied in this circle of offerers, either because those offering the sacrifice do so “for” them, that is, as their representatives, or that they “remember” them in the oblation. In the Mozarabic Mass this reading, which precedes the oration Post nomina, has been retained to the present.

The priest [formerly it was perhaps the deacon] begins: *Offerunt Deo Dominum oblationem sacerdotis nostri, papam Romanam et reliqui pro se et pro omni clero et plebis ecclesiae sibimet consignatis vel pro universa fratertitate. Item offerunt universi presbyteri, diaconi, clericis ac populis circumstantibus in honorem sanctorum pro se et suis.*

* R. [the choir corroborating]: *Offerunt pro se et pro universa fratertitate.*

The priest: *Facientes commemorationem beatissimorum apostolorum et martyrum.* [Names follow.]

It is noteworthy that not till the second sentence is the word *offerunt* applied to those present, while in the first sentence it is ascribed in honorary fashion to the representatives of the grand ecclesiastical communion. It is probably to be presumed that originally the names of the persons in office—the leading bishops in Spain and the *papa Romensis*—were pronounced. In the course of time this mention of names was omitted in favor of the bare formula, either because it was deemed unimportant or because it was found too bothersome.

Something like this must also have occurred in the Roman canon where the oldest extant manuscripts in general no longer have any indication whatever of an explicit listing of names after the words: *Memento Domine familiorum famularumque tuarum.* But since the formula obviously implies it, the indication for such an insert was later restored, some way or other, even soon after the Roman Mass was transplanted to Frankish soil. In his *Admonitio Generalis* of 789 Charlemagne decreed: The names should not be publicly read at some earlier part of the Mass (as in the Gallican rite), but during the canon. The express direction is then found variously in the Mass books.

The Mozarabic formula of names that followed is preserved on a diptych that dates back to the Roman Consul Anastasius of the year 517 and that was in ecclesiastical use in Northern France. Cf. Leclerq, “Diptyques”: DACL, 1119 f.; *Kennedy, The Saints*, 65-67. Another diptych (PL 85, 542 ff.). Prayers are those who “rest” (from worldly cares). It is to be noted here, however, that a summons on the part of the priest precedes this diptych formula, though it is separated from it (probably as a later and secondary intrusion) by an oration: *Eccleniast sacrament in orationibus in mente habeam us, ut pro Dominius . . . Omnes lapas, captivos, infirmos atque peregrinos in mente habeamus, ut eos Dominius . . . (loc. cit., 540).* Another diptych formula is given in the Stowe Missal, where it is inserted in the *Memento* of the Dead of the Roman Mass; it begins: *Cun omniis in toto mundo offerentibus sacrificium spirituale . . . sacerdotibus offeret senior nostor N. presbyter pro se et pro suis et pro totius Ecclesie coetu catholice et pro commemorando anatheticus gradu . . . Then comes a lengthy list of saints of the Old and then of the New Testament, martyrs, hermits, bishops, priests, and the conclusion: *et omnium pausantium.*

Thus A. Lesley, PL 85, 542 C Df. Cf. also preceding note.

The Stowe Missal, which notes before the words, *Hic recitantur nomina vivo­rum,* forms an exception. Botte, 32; Warner (HBS), 32).

Cf. supra, p. 11.

Jerome, *Comm. in Ezech.* (of the year 411), c. 18 (PL 25, 175).—Cf. Jerome, *Comm. in Jerem.* (of the year 420): At nunc publice recitantur offertorium nomina et redemptio peccatorum mutatur in laudem. The practice was therefore considered an innovation. That Jerome is referring to a Western practice is clear also from this, that in oriental liturgy the names of the *offerentes*, as far as present information goes, never played such a part.

Missale Gothicum, Muratori, II, 553; cf. 542 f., 554, etc. Such a Gallican *Post­nomina* formula is still found in today’s Roman Mass, in the Secreta that is supposed to be said in Lent: *Deus cui soli cognitos est numerorum in superna felicitate locanda.* Cf. Cabrol, *La messe en occident*, 120. A 6th century testimony for the reading of the names from an ivory diptych in Venantius Fortunatus, *Comm., X, 7* (MGH, Auct. ant., IV, 1, 240); *cui hodie in templo diptychus edit ebur.* He is referring to the names of King Child­debert and his mother Brunehild. Cf. Bish­op, 100, n. 1.

In this formula *Facientes* with a long list of names that followed is preserved on a diptych that dates back to the Roman Consul Anastasius of the year 517 and that was in ecclesiastical use in Northern France. Cf. Leclerq, “Diptyques”: DACL, 1119 f.; *Kennedy, The Saints*, 65-67. Another diptych (PL 85, 542 ff.). Prayers are those who “rest” (from worldly cares). It is to be noted here, however, that a summons on the part of the priest precedes this diptych formula, though it is separated from it (probably as a later and secondary intrusion) by an oration: *Eccleniast sacrament in orationibus in mente habeam us, ut pro Dominius . . . Omnes lapas, captivos, infirmos atque peregrinos in mente habeamus, ut eos Dominius . . . (loc. cit., 540).* Another diptych formula is given in the Stowe Missal, where it is inserted in the *Memento* of the Dead of the Roman Mass; it begins: *Cun omniis in toto mundo offerentibus sacrificium spirituale . . . sacerdotibus offeret senior nostor N. presbyter pro se et pro suis et pro totius Ecclesie coetu catholice et pro commemorando anatheticus gradu . . . Then comes a lengthy list of saints of the Old and then of the New Testament, martyrs, hermits, bishops, priests, and the conclusion: *et omnium pausantium.*

It is noteworthy that not till the second sentence is the word *offerunt* applied to those present, while in the first sentence it is ascribed in honorary fashion to the representatives of the grand ecclesiastical communion. It is probably to be presumed that originally the names of the persons in office—the leading bishops in Spain and the *papa Romensis*—were pronounced. In the course of time this mention of names was omitted in favor of the bare formula, either because it was deemed unimportant or because it was found too bothersome.

Something like this must also have occurred in the Roman canon where the oldest extant manuscripts in general no longer have any indication whatever of an explicit listing of names after the words: *Memento Domine familiorum famularumque tuarum.* But since the formula obviously implies it, the indication for such an insert was later restored, some way or other, even soon after the Roman Mass was transplanted to Frankish soil. In his *Admonitio Generalis* of 789 Charlemagne decreed: The names should not be publicly read at some earlier part of the Mass (as in the Gallican rite), but during the canon. The express direction is then found variously in the Mass books.

A special announcement will be made in 2015 for the Ordinary Form — Visit: ecwatershed.org/vatican
Since the canon began to be said in a low tone, this reading of names could no longer be loud and public. According to one eleventh century account, the names were whispered into the priest's ear on those occasions when he had assistants around him. In another instance the names were pronounced by the priest himself. Many Mass books, therefore, even indicate certain names right in the text of the canon, at least as a marginal notation, perhaps by reason of foundations. Or a corresponding general formula was inserted, embracing those names that had a right to be mentioned. Sometimes the register of names was laid on the altar and merely a reference introduced into the *Memento*, a practice similar to one still in use at present in the West Syrian rite.

in this or similar form until well into the 5th century (Ebner, 146, 157, 194, 204, 280, 334 f.) also as a later addition (ibid., 27); see also Martène, I, 4, XVII (I, 601). Nevertheless the corresponding remark regarding the deceased is more frequent.

In this way the Bishop at Rheims recalled the names of his predecessors in the Mass for the Dead; Fulwin, *De lobiis, c. 7* (d'Achery, Spicilegium, 2 ed., II, 733). Cf. Martène, I, 4, 8, 13 (I, 405 f.). A Sacramentary of the 11th century from Fulda (Ebner, 208) mentions names from the Byzantine Imperial Court. Head­
ing the list is *Constantinus Monomachus imperatoris* (d. 1054). More examples, Le­
roquais, I, 14, 33 (9th cent.; see moreover in the Register, III, 389); Ebner, 7; 94 (*margins covered over with names, 10th c.); 149; 196; 249; Martène, I, 4, 8, 10 (I, 404 f.). In a deed of gift from Vendôme in the year 1073 the benefactors of the church stipulated that their names will be mentioned in the Canon of the Mass both during life and after death. Merk, *Abris*, 87, n. 11; here also further data.

Thus, a 10th century marginal gloss in the famous Cod. Padianus reads: omnis Christianorum, omnis qui misi pecatori propiter tuare timore confessi sunt et suas eleemosynas . . . donaverunt et omnium patentorum meorum vel qui se in meis orationibus commendaverunt, tam extrems quam et defunctis. Ebner, 128; Möhler-Baum­
 stark, n. 877. Formulas according to this scheme then appear in ever widening cir­cles; see Martène, I, 4, IV; VI; XXXVI (I, 513C., 533 E., 673 f.); Bonn, II, 11, 5 (756 f.); Leroquais, I, 103, etc.; Ebner, 402 f.; cf. the notices in the description of the MSS., ibid., 17, 53, etc. A formula that appears at Seckau in the 15th century (Köck, 62), and in 1539 at Rome in Cic­
nioro (Legg, *Tracts*, 280), begins: *mei pecatoris cui tantum gratiam concedere digneris, ut assidue tuae misericordiae placet, illa pro qua . . .

So, too, a marginal gloss already in the Sacramentary in J. Pamelius, *Liturgica Latina*, II (Cologne, 1571), 180: (*Memento Domine jamulatorum jamulatorumque tuorum et corum quorum nomen ad memorandum conscriptum ac super sanctum altare tuum scripta adesse videntur. More examples in Martène, I, 4, 8, 15 (I, 406); Ebner, 403; cf. PL, 78, 26, note g (from a 9th cent. MS. of Rheims). Such references were occasioned, among others, by the *libri vitae* that were intro­duced in monasteries on the basis of prayer affiliations; cf. A. Ebner, *Die öster­
lichen Gebetserklärungen bis zum Ausgang des karolingischen Zeitalters* (Regensburg, 1890), 97 ff., 121 ff. But reference is made to such registers with­
out their having been placed on the altar; see the entry of the 11th century in a Sac­
ramentary of Dobbio; et quorum vel quorum nominum scripta reteniuntur; Ebner, 81; Ferreres, 147.

In the West Syrian Mass the names of such families as requested prayers for their deceased members during a specific period of the ecclesiastical year were inscribed upon a tablet that was laid upon the altar. At the Memento of the Dead the priest lays his hand upon the host and then makes a threelfold sign of the cross over the tablet. S. Salaville in R. Aigrin, *Liturgoia* (Paris, 1935), 915 f., note; cf. Hanssens, III, 473 f.

*See*. e.g., *Adiuncta Pauli Diaconi intra canonem quando volueris in Ebner, 302.*

Ebner, 401; see also the description of the Missal of the Dead. Cf. also Martène, I, 4, 8, 15 (I, 406 f.).

Ebner, 247; Leroquais, I, 40; 84; Fer­

eres, p. C.; cf. Martène, I, 4, 8, 15 (I, 406 b). A formula of this kind frequently precedes the *Memento of the Dead*; see infra. The case of the Valenci­e Missal (1402) may be exceptional, inasmuch as a whole list of invocations from the litany precedes the *Memento: Per mysterium sancta incarnationis tuae nostrae corporis et santis, te rogamus audi mei, etc.* Ferreres, P. XCI. Cf. ibid., p. LXXXVIII, the de­

brecato before the *Memento*. Often a Me­

mento of the Dead is here appended at the same time.

Nevertheless even Merati (d. 1744) still proposed a lengthy interpolated prayer that the priest could here pray secretly; Gav­

ant-Merati, II, 8, 3 (I, 289).

Bernald of Constance (d. 1100), *Microl­

ogogia*, c. 13 (PL, 151, 985) opposes those who interpolate suas orationes here. The chapter is captioned: *Quid superfluum sit in canone.* John Beleth (d. about 1165), *Explicatio*, c. 46 (PL, 202, 54 B): adde­

muni nulli hic [in the canon] concessum esse aliquid vel detrahere vel addere, nisi quandoque nomen illorum, pro quibus specialist aut nominationem offerri sacrif­

icum.

Hints regarding the matter are often given in the Missal commentaries of the Middle Ages. Thus, Hugo of S. Cher, *Tract. super missam* (ed. Söch, 27) ad­

vises to proceed justa ordinem caritatis and to pray first for parents and relatives, then pro spiritualibus parentibus, next for those who have recommended themselves to our prayers (commendaverunt; this phrase is the first mention of the *offerentes* in the traditional sense of those who offered a stipend and the like; see above, p. 130), then for those present, and finally for all the people. The Missal of Regensburg about 1500 lists eight groups in another way: Beck, 273.

The *Liber ordinarius* of Liège (Volk, 69, I, 4) requires, that if any one is ill, a sign be given after the Sanctus, ut fratres in suis orationibus infirmi recordantur et dicant psalmum Missere.

Along with the ill, as a sign for the name to be inserted, the *N. of today was already used at an early date; thus, in fact, the Stowe Missal about the year 800; Warner (IHS, 25), n.; cf. 6, 10, 14, 19 ff.
said for a stipend the one who in this way became an offerens should be especially remembered here.\footnote{\textsuperscript{26}}

But in the text of the Memento itself the circle is broadened. Into it are drawn all those present, since they did come to church in order to honor God by this communal oblation.\footnote{\textsuperscript{27}} They are called circumstantes or, in the more ancient texts, circum adstantes.\footnote{\textsuperscript{28}} During the first thousand years, standing was the principal posture even during the canon.\footnote{\textsuperscript{29}} Note, however, that the circum is not to be construed as though the faithful had ever completely surrounded the altar. Rather the picture intended is what is suggested by the structure of the old Roman basilicas, where the altar stood between the presbytery and the nave, so that the faithful—especially if there was a transept—could form a semi-circle or "open ring"\footnote{\textsuperscript{30}} around the altar.

About those mentioned by name and about the group of circum adstantes, a two-membered clause originally had two things to say. One phrase regarded their general state of soul, namely: their faith and their devotion\footnote{\textsuperscript{31}} is well known to Thee.\footnote{\textsuperscript{32}} The other phrase took notice of their activity: they offer up to Thee a sacrifice of praise; this is further described and defined. The original text, like the text of the first prayer, is the text of the first prayer after the consecration, ascribes to the faithful the offering of the sacrifice, without any special restriction: qui tibi offerunt hon sacrficiun laudis.\footnote{\textsuperscript{33}}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{26}} Cf. above, p. 24. Thus also Benedict XIV, De s. sacrificio misae, p. 87 (Schneider, 167); Florus Diaconus (d. about 860), De actione missae, c. 51 (PL, 119, 47 B) and Remigius of Auxerre (d. about 908), Expositio (PL, 101, 1258 B), were emphatic about the liberty to insert other names in the place where from time immemorial the names of the offerentium were used (\textit{quos desideravi particularer nominare}).

\footnote{\textsuperscript{27}} Spanish Mass books of the 12th century also add: (circumstantium) & quum omnium offerentium quorum tibi; Ferreres, P. XXXI, LXX ff., CVII; cf. XXIV, XXVI, XLVI, XLIX, LI, CXII. This last extension in reference to the qui tibi offerent to include those who are absent in the line with the Spanish tradition; see above, p. 162.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{28}} Ebner, 405; Ménard, PL, 78, 275 BC.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{29}} Above I, 239 ff.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{30}} Cf. Schwarz, \textit{Von Bau der Kirche} (Würzburg, 1938, where the inherent correctness of this plan is made clear. The opening of the ring, where the altar stands, indicates the movement by which the congregation, led by the priest, strive towards God; cf. also above I, 256.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{31}} Cf. A. Daniels, "Devotio," JL, I (1921) 40-60. The words "devotio," which otherwise frequently signifies in some form or other the very actions of divine service, here refers to the disposition of heart. Fides is the basic attitude by which one's whole life is erected upon God's word and promises; devotion the readiness faithfully to regulate one's conduct accordingly without reservation. The two expressions are similarly united by Nicetas of Remesiana (d. after 414), De psalmiebre bono, c. 3 (PL, 68, 373; Daniels, 47): nullus debet ambigere hoc vigilarum sanctarum ministerium, si dixit fide et devotione vero celebretur, angelis esse conjunctum.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{32}} F. Rüttjen, "Philologisches zum Canon missae" (SIZ, 1938, 1) 43 ff., has claimed a deeper meaning for the word \textit{fides cognitio}: tried, proven. But it seems rather that we have here only a doubling of the expression \textit{nota} in conformity with a rule of style applied in the canon; cf. above, I, p. 56. The tibi ahead makes it necessary to abide by this interpretation.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{33}} Regarding the biblical expression \textit{sacrificium laudis}, cf. above I, 241; II, p. 114, n. 26.—The word brings out the spiritual character of the Christian sacrifice and its primary purpose, the glorification of God.\footnote{\textsuperscript{34}} Cod. Ottobon, 313 (first half of the 9th cent.), also in the Cod. of Pamelium; cf. Lietzmann, n. 1, 20.

They are called "honors."\footnote{\textsuperscript{35}} Bernold of Constance, Micrologus, c. 13 (PL, 151, 985 C).—Lebrun, I, 369, note 4, mentions among others, a Cistercian Missal of 1512, in which the insertion is still reserved. The point made by this phrase was that the priest (surrounded by his assistants) was primarily the one who offered the sacrifice. It is possible that a contributing factor was to be found in the consideration that in this period, when foundations and stipends were growing headway, those whose names were to be recalled at the Memento were often not present at the Mass, so that the priest was also their representative in a narrower sense.\footnote{\textsuperscript{36}} Still, as a rule the original concept continued to stand unimpaired.

The sacrificial activity of the faithful is next more clearly defined according to its purpose. They offer up the sacrifice for themselves and for their dear ones; the bonds of family have a rightful place in prayer. They offer their sacrifice that thus they might "redeem (purchase) their souls."\footnote{\textsuperscript{37}} According to Christ's own words, no price can be high enough...
to make such a purchase, and yet this will surely do. They want to redeem their souls, that is they want to gain the welfare and health that they as Christians may dare to hope for—as the clarifying clause puts it—pro spe salutis et incolumitatis sua. In this phrase the word salus can be taken for the salvation of the soul, as Christian usage employs the word, while incolumitas at least includes the notion of bodily health and security."

The Memento closes with the words tibiique reddunt vota sua aeterno Deo vivo et vero, thus tackling a second phrase to the words qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis. One might possibly expect to find in this a continuation of the thought, but this is rather hard to establish. Although vota can have other meanings, reddere vota is without doubt either the dutiful gift of something commended to God (as is the case in many passages in the Latin rendering of the Old Testament), or it is, as here, simply the giving of a gift to God, taking into account a previous obligation; it is the offering up of a sacrifice, but with a sharp underscoring of the thought inherent in every sacrifice, that the work is one that is due."

In the clause doubled in this way we have a clear imitation of Psalm 49:14: Immola Deo sacrificium laudis et reddet Altissimo vota tua. The only addition is the solemn invocation of God's name, likewise formed on a scriptural quotation, and emphasized by prefacing the word aeterno. It dwawns on one's consciousness that in the sacrifice one is face to face with the eternal, living, true God.

All in all, however there seems to be something very curious in the twin phrase in this passage, for the poetic parallelism of the two members, as it is found in the quotation from the Psalm, is not to be found here. We are tempted to conclude that the detailed description of the sacrifice of the faithful as outlined here was inserted only belatedly, and that the original text ran as follows: Memento Domine Jamulorum Jamularumque tuarum, qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis et tibi reddunt vota sua aeterno Deo vivo et vero. This conclusion is corroborated by the Mozarabic citation from the Roman canon already referred to. But how is it possible that the first member should have been supplemented as we find it today, bold twisting of our Lord's words, like those used for the Canaanite woman, (Matt. 15: 27), the great sacrificium laudis is set in opposition to that danger; cf. Ambrose, De Elia et jej., c. 22 (PL, 32, 2, 463 f.) : in baptism the redemptio animae is granted us. It is therefore hard to justify interpreting the word as an indication of the material performance, as we often find in medieval charters, and as Gibr, 645-646, tries to render it.

Proofs from ecclesiastical language for both meanings of incolumitas in Batiffol, Leçons, 246 f. Nor will it do to try to narrow down the meaning of salus; the same double expression sometimes has a simple temporal meaning, as in the Hanc igitum of the Gelasianum, I, 40 (Wilson, 70): ut per multa curricula annorum salvi et incolumes munera . . . merecantur offere.


I Thess. 1: 9. The expression here is explained by its antithesis to the dead gods, from whom the faithful turned away.

Supra I, 55, n. 20.

THE MEMENTO OF THE LIVING

while the second member, widely separated from it, should have remained unaltered?

This first surprise is joined by a second. In all the oldest texts of the Roman canon, without exception, the suffix—que is missing at the beginning of the second member; invariably it reads: . . . incolumitas sua tibi reddunt vota sua . . . " Grammatical carelessness of this type, copied century after century, must indeed be serious cause for wonder, particularly in a text of the Roman canon which, taken all in all, is otherwise smooth.

Both problems are solved at one blow if we put a period after the words incolumitas sua, and then begin with a new sentence: Tibi reddunt vota sua aeterno Deo vivo et vero communicantes . . . " That is to say, these words take up the tibi offerunt sacrificium laudis with a different wording in order to append to it the idea of the grand Communion. Thus, communion with the saints was originally claimed principally for the faithful, just as the offering of the sacrifice was, but then, influenced by the different atmosphere of the Frankish church, both claims were at the same time not indeed voided but at least obscured, not, however, to such an extent that even at the present the ancient thought should not be offered as the most natural interpretation of the text. In other words, we feel justified in considering and explaining the phrase tibi reddunt, etc., as a part of the Communicantes text.

84 Botte, Le canon, 34. Of the 19 pertinent texts that begin about 700 there is but a single one, according to Botte, that presents tibiique at first hand; it is the one in the Cod. Pad. D 47, written during the time of King Lothar I (d. 855) in the neighborhood of Liege. But, as the printed edition of this MS. shows (Mohlberg-Baumstark, Die alteste erreichbare Gestalt, n. 877), the -que here too is in reality an addition by a second hand. The -que is still missing in the Cod. Eligii (10th cent., PL, 78, 26 B) and also in the Sacramentary of the Papal court chapel about 1200; Brinktrine (Eph. liturg., 1937), 204. Ehmer, 405, refers to this peculiarity, but without attempting an explanation.

85 The old MSS., as is known, have either no punctuation at all, or very little, and seemingly, as a rule, no paragraphs (sections) within the canon. The latter is also the case in the Cod. S. Gall, 348 (ed. Mohlberg, n. 1551), but it does make use of red initial letters in three places within the Communicantes; the word communicantes itself, however, is connected with the preceding without any such distinguishing mark (n. 1552). Unambiguous, too, as Botte, 55, also notes, is the unruptured union of Deo vivo et vero communicantes in two of the most important texts of the Roman Canon; in the Bobbio missal, ed. Lowe, I (HBS, 58), n. 11, see Facsimile (HBS, 31), fol. 25. Cf. moreover, a like construction in a Hanc igitur formula of the Gelasianum, III, 37 (Wilson, 254); pro hoc reddo tibi vota mea Deo vero et vero masses suscriter sumus suppli­citer implorans.

86 Grammatically independent sentences begin within the canon also in other places: in the two Mementos, in the Supplices, and in the Nobis quoque.
9. Communicantes

The Communicantes that follows is not, as it now stands, a grammatically complete sentence. The first question therefore regarding it naturally is: what is it connected with? Other links have been pronounced, but the one that appears most natural is that suggested to us by the text just studied, a proposal that was already made years ago. Just as by origin the respectively complete sentence. The first question therefore regarding it is: by the text just studied, a proposal that was already made years ago. The juncture with a verb of the kingdom and the saints whose names are about to be mentioned all of them, for the congregation which now stands before Thee and the saints whose names are about to be en numen sanctorum celebrantes et memori arum venerantes; cf. Botte, 55 f.; cf. below.

"The fuller meaning of memoria: memorial monument, (martyr's) grave, that has been suggested, is out of the question in this connection. Cf. Botte, 55 f.; also Th. Kraemer, JL, 15 (1914), 464.

*Page 159.*

*However, as a rule, in such manner that the Saints are clearly distinct from other deceased persons. It is only in the East Syrian anaphoras that we find an exception. Hanssens, III, 471 f.*

* Const. Ap., VIII, 12, 43 (Quasten, Mon., 225 f.): "Et per se præfrenter nos et malam soccitant eum, et munera sanctiora oblatae. In regard to the indefinite meaning of "et, pro," for" as here used, see Jungmann, Die Stellung Christi, 234-238.

*East Syrian anaphora of Theodoros: Renaudot, II, (1847), 614.*

*Anaphora of St. James: Brightman, 56, 1, 20: "Et xerobphas kathethrophos ev allalino kai ev kai ev alalino kai ev allalino; cf. ibid., 57, 1, 13; 92 f. Similar formulas also in the Armenian liturgy (Brightman, 440, 1, 13), in Egypt (Brightman, 128, 1, 23; 169, 1, 7), and also among the East Syrians; Brightman, 440, 1, 1.*

*Armenian liturgy; Brightman, 440, 1, 1.*

*cf. also the Mozarabic facientes commemorationem, supra, p. 162.*

*Leo the Great, Ep., 80, 3; 85, 2 (PL, 54, 914 f., 923 f.); John II of Constantinople to Hormisdas (d. 523) (CSEL, 35, 992).*

*Brightman, 56. In addition the word eis eis eis inserted in the Byzantine formulas of the present; Brightman, 388. Further parallels in Kennedy, The Saints, 36.*

The Communicantes that follows is not, as it now stands, a grammatically complete sentence. The first question therefore regarding it naturally is: what is it connected with? Other links have been pronounced, but the one that appears most natural is that suggested to us by the text just studied, a proposal that was already made years ago. Just as by origin the respectively complete sentence. The first question therefore regarding it is: by the text just studied, a proposal that was already made years ago. The juncture with a verb of the kingdom and the saints whose names are about to be mentioned all of them, for the congregation which now stands before Thee and the saints whose names are about to be en numen sanctorum celebrantes et memori arum venerantes; cf. Botte, 55 f.; cf. below.
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* Const. Ap., VIII, 12, 43 (Quasten, Mon., 225 f.): "Et per se præfrenter nos et malam soccitant eum, et munera sanctiora oblatae. In regard to the indefinite meaning of "et, pro," for" as here used, see Jungmann, Die Stellung Christi, 234-238.
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*Anaphora of St. James: Brightman, 56, 1, 20: "Et xerobphas kathethrophos ev allalino kai ev kai ev alalino kai ev allalino; cf. ibid., 57, 1, 13; 92 f. Similar formulas also in the Armenian liturgy (Brightman, 440, 1, 13), in Egypt (Brightman, 128, 1, 23; 169, 1, 7), and also among the East Syrians; Brightman, 440, 1, 1.*
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*Leo the Great, Ep., 80, 3; 85, 2 (PL, 54, 914 f., 923 f.); John II of Constantinople to Hormisdas (d. 523) (CSEL, 35, 992).*

*Brightman, 56. In addition the word eis eis eis inserted in the Byzantine formulas of the present; Brightman, 388. Further parallels in Kennedy, The Saints, 36.*
closing formula: et omnium sanctorum, quorum meritis precibusque concedas, ut in omnibus protectionis tuae muniamur auxilio, there is likewise a corresponding phrase in the same anaphora of St. James 8 and an even more faithful trace in the Byzantine liturgy: καὶ πάντων τῶν ἄγιων σου, ὑμῶν τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἁμαρτίας διέκομεν χῆμας δ ὥσις. 18

Thus, for all the insistence on the concept of communion, the beginning and the end in both instances present a slight anomaly. For the one singled out to head the list of saints is one who had the incomparable exactness by the humble prayer that their intercession might avail us. By and the end in both instances present a slight anomaly. For the one
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contemporary of St. Cornelius (who is therefore the only one taken out of chronological order so as to be set side by side with Cyprian). Among the other six martyrs, the first two are clerics, Lawrence and Chrysogonus; 19 then follow the laymen, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian. Clearly we have here the work of a systematic hand. In the sacred precepts of the Great Prayer, so to say, a properly chosen representation from the choirs of martyrs ought to appear. This is the one conception that we can make our own even at the present; the one thought that can reconcile us with the catalogue of saints in the canon, in spite of its weaknesses, even though two thousand years of Church history and the extension of the horizon beyond that of a city-liturgy into a world-liturgy has presented us with numberless other names to choose from. To this double series of twelve names from the early ages of Christianity and from the life of the Roman Mother-Church we are pleased to grant the privilege to be named at the altar as representatives of the Church Triumphant.

It is obvious, no doubt, that the list of saints in the Communicantes—and something similar must be said later about the second list—is not a first draft. In some oriental anaphoras the list of saints named in the prayer of intercession has been kept at a minimum. 38 In the Roman canon as it was when transferred to Milan, perhaps in the sixth century, some names found in our present-day list are missing, namely, those of Popes Linus and Cletus, and the names included are not yet presented in the nice order they now possess. 39

The original list must have comprised those saints who enjoyed a special cult at Rome at the time of the introduction of the Communicantes. Around the turn of the fifth century these were: Mary, Peter and Paul, Xystus and Lawrence, Cornelius and Cyprian. Soon after the Council of Ephesus devotion to the Blessed Virgin in the Eternal City had acquired

this and also in the Byzantine liturgy, as compared with the sober and retiring Roman, the memory of the Mother of God is given striking emphasis not only by highly ornate, not to say showy formulas, but by other devices also. In the anaphora of St. James an Ave Maria, combining Luke 1: 28: 42 as we know it, is inserted by the priest immediately before this phrase. In the Byzantine liturgy, after the priest has in a loud tone of voice commemorated the Mother of God, while incensing the altar, the choir intones a special hymn of Mary, one in conformity with the season of the year: the μεγαλειών, so called because of the word μεγαλεία (Magnificat) that occurs in it; Brightman, 388; 600. 18

18 Brightman, 48; cf. 94.
19 Brightman, 331 ff., 388, 406 ff.; Kennedy, 37f.
20 Augustine, Sermo 159, 1 (PL, 38, 868); cf. In Joh. tract., 84, 1 (PL, 35, 1847).
21 Cf. Raffaele’s “Disputa.”
22 At any rate, Chrysogonus is always described as a cleric in the legend: J. P. Kirch, “Chrysogonus”; LTHK, II, 949 ff.
23 Baumstark, Das Communicantes, 11 ff. The formula of the Apostolic Constitutions, VIII, 12, 43 (see note 7 above) did not present any names at all.
24 The Ambrosian Mass has the following arrangement. The twelve martyrs are aligned in hierarchical order. First come six bishops, five of them popes, and then a non-Roman, Cyprian, as martyrs; the cult of confessors, whose beginnings are surely to be compared with the sober and retiring Roman, the memory of the Mother of God, while incensing the altar, the choir intones a special hymn of Mary, one in conformity with the season of the year: the μεγαλειών, so called because of the word μεγαλεία (Magnificat) that occurs in it; Brightman, 388; 600.

25 Baumstark, Das Communicantes, 11 ff. The formula of the Apostolic Constitutions, VIII, 12, 43 (see note 7 above) did not present any names at all.
26 The Ambrosian Mass has the following arrangement. The twelve martyrs are aligned in hierarchical order. First come six bishops, five of them popes, and then a non-Roman, Cyprian, as martyrs; the cult of confessors, whose beginnings are surely to be compared with the sober and retiring Roman, the memory of the Mother of God, while incensing the altar, the choir intones a special hymn of Mary, one in conformity with the season of the year: the μεγαλειών, so called because of the word μεγαλεία (Magnificat) that occurs in it; Brightman, 388; 600.

27 Augustine, Sermo 159, 1 (PL, 38, 868); cf. In Joh. tract., 84, 1 (PL, 35, 1847).
28 Cf. Raffaele’s “Disputa.”

29 At any rate, Chrysogonus is always described as a cleric in the legend: J. P. Kirch, “Chrysogonus”; LTHK, II, 949 ff.
30 Baumstark, Das Communicantes, 11 ff. The formula of the Apostolic Constitutions, VIII, 12, 43 (see note 7 above) did not present any names at all.
31 The Ambrosian Mass has the following arrangement. The twelve martyrs are aligned in hierarchical order. First come six bishops, five of them popes, and then a non-Roman, Cyprian, as martyrs; the cult of confessors, whose beginnings are surely to be compared with the sober and retiring Roman, the memory of the Mother of God, while incensing the altar, the choir intones a special hymn of Mary, one in conformity with the season of the year: the μεγαλειών, so called because of the word μεγαλεία (Magnificat) that occurs in it; Brightman, 388; 600.

32 Augustine, Sermo 159, 1 (PL, 38, 868); cf. In Joh. tract., 84, 1 (PL, 35, 1847).
33 Cf. Raffaele’s “Disputa.”
a magnificent center through the consecration of the renovated Liberian basilica in her honor, S. Maria Maggiore, under Sixtus III (432-440). The development of the cultus of the Princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, is attested not only by the most ancient sacramentaries with their Mass formularies for their feasts, but above all by the graves of the apostles, which had acquired beautiful buildings already in Constantine's time. Pope Xyustus (or, as his name was later spelled, Sixtus), the second of that name, was seized in the cemetery of Callistus in 258, during the persecution of Valerian, and summarily executed. He was followed in martyrdom a few days later by his deacon, Lawrence. The memorial days for both of them, which were celebrated yearly on the sixth and tenth of August, belong to the oldest Martyr feasts of Rome. Pope Cornelius, of an old Roman family, died in exile after a short reign (251-253); his remains were shortly after returned to Rome. His grave is the first of the papal tombs to bear a Latin inscription: Cornelius Martyr ep. Bishop Cyprian of Carthage, who had corresponded with Cornelius, was one of the great figures of the third Christian century; he suffered martyrdom a few years later (258). His memorial day was celebrated at Rome already in the fourth century, and the oldest sacramentaries present Cornelius and Cyprian together on the fourteenth of September.

The twelve apostles as a group were venerated at Rome as early as the fifth century. Full the still listing of their names have not been included in the canon till later. For this list displays a very curious dissimilarity to both the biblical list and to all other known catalogues. It is closest to that in Matthew 10:2-4, but is distinguished from it (aside from the insertion of St. Paul and the reversal of the last two names, as found likewise in Luke and the Acts of the Apostles) by the fact that the sons of Zebedee are followed at once by Thomas, James and Philip, of whom the last two take the ninth and the fifth place in all the biblical catalogues. A special cult of the Apostle Thomas is attested since the days of Pope Symmachus (498-514), who had erected a oratorium Sancti Thome. A similar cultus for Philip and James is found since the time of Pelagius I and John III (556-574), when the basilica of the Apostles was built in their honor. Of the preceding names in the list, the apostles John and Andrew had their sanctuaries in Rome already in the fifth century. James the Greater appears originally to have been celebrated at Rome along with his brother John on the feast of December 27, for which there is evidence a bit later. But evidence for a cultus of the other apostles that follow is wanting. So it is probable that the list of apostles in the canon consisted at first of the names of Peter, Paul, Andrew, (James?) and John, and that in the course of the sixth century Thomas, James and Philip were added, and finally the remainder, until the number twelve was filled out. Something like that must also have occurred in the list of martyrs.

In the course of the same century there was an increase of devotion to Pope Clement, who was being glorified by an extensive literature; to Chrysogonus, the martyr whose history is interwoven with legend and who was identified with a like-named founder of one of the Roman titular churches; for John and Paul, whom one legend assumed to have been Roman martyrs of the time of Julian the Apostate; for the two physicians and martyrs so highly venerated in the Orient, Cosmas and Damian, who were invoked as liberal helpers in cases of sickness. Thus the list must have grown during the sixth century more or less of itself. The redactor who put the list in the order we have today, to fill out the number twelve for the martyrs as for the apostles must have inserted the two first successors of St. Peter, Linus and Cletus, who are otherwise seldom mentioned. This redactor, whose work must have been done about the turn of the sixth century, can have been no other than Pope Gregory the Great. Due to the circumstance that the Roman Church in the period of the persecutions, unlike the Church in North Africa, kept no acts of the Martyrs, and so gave ample play for the development of legend, there is considerable doubt about the last five names in the series of martyrs, so that from the viewpoint of historical truth little more can be established than the names.

In the centuries following there was no feeling that the list as found in the Roman canon was closed once and for all. While keeping the twelve saints, there was nothing to hinder the addition of names of other prominent figures, in keeping with the altering features of ecclesiastical life. Thus the oldest Frankish manuscripts tack on not only the two great saints of Gaul, Hilary and Martin, but also the Doctors of the Church then already in high honor: (Ambrose), Augustine, Gregory, Jerome, along with the father of Western monasticism, Benedict.\footnote{Lietzmann, Petrus und Paulus in Rom., 140, with n. 2; Baumstark, Das Communicantes, 23.}

\footnote{Cf. Kennedy, 105, 110 f. (without St. James).}

\footnote{Behind the legend the martyr-bishop Chrysogonus of Aquileia (beginning of the 3d cent.) appears to loom as the historic figure. J. P. Kirsch, Die römischen Titelkirchen im Altertum, (Paderborn, 1918), 108-113; Kennedy, 128-130; H. Delehaye, Etudes sur le légendier Romain (Brussels, 1938), 151-162.}

\footnote{Kennedy, 111-117; 128-140.}

\footnote{Cf. the presentation in Hosp, 110 ff., 222 ff., 38 ff., and Kennedy, 128-140. The judgment regarding these names was substantially less skeptical a few decades ago than it is today after the important work by H. Delehaye, P. Franchi de' Cavalieri and others.}

\footnote{Botte, 34. Ambrose appears in only two
Sometimes additions were made of regional saints or of patrons of the particular diocese or church. Thus, in the environs of Fulda, Boniface was attached to the list of martyrs. The names thus added in many manuscripts have become important indexes in establishing their provenience. Often enough the number of additional names became unbearably long; thus in one eleventh-century manuscript of Rouen twenty-three names are annexed.

One expedient for satisfying local requirements without lengthening the list unduly was intimated by Pope Gregory III (731-741) when he prescribed for the monks of an oratory of St. Peter's endowed with a wealth of relics an addition to the Communicantes as follows: sed et diem natalitii celebrantes sanctorum tuorum martyrum ac confessorum, perfectorum iustorum, quorum sollemnitas hodie in conspectu gloria tua celebratur, quorum meritis precibusque... As a matter of fact, this or a similar additament is found in numerous medieval Mass books, mostly (it is true) as a further enrichment of the already longish formula, especially as a means of including the special saints of the diocease or church. Thus, in the environs of Fulda, Boniface was attached to the list of martyrs.

But in the meantime there arose a determined opposition to the unnatural distension of the Communicantes formula until at last all such accretions disappeared altogether.

A different type of addition, however, has continued down to our own day, the most ancient addition to the Communicantes that we know of, namely the announcement of the day's mystery on Christmas, Epiphany, Maundy Thursday, Easter, Ascension and Pentecost. The addition on of the MSS., recorded by Botte.—These names recur in numerous MSS. until late in the Middle Ages; Ebner, 407 f.

Often list undesirably was intimated by Pope Gregory III (731-741) when he prescribed: sed et diem natalitii celebrantes sanctorum tuorum martyrum ac confessionis unius. Thus in one eleventh-century manuscript of Rouen twenty-three names are annexed.

One expedient for satisfying local requirements without lengthening the list unduly was intimated by Pope Gregory III (731-741) when he prescribed for the monks of an oratory of St. Peter's endowed with a wealth of relics an addition to the Communicantes as follows: sed et diem natalitii celebrantes sanctorum tuorum martyrum ac confessorum, perfectorum iustorum, quorum sollemnitas hodie in conspectu gloria tua celebratur, quorum meritis precibusque... As a matter of fact, this or a similar additament is found in numerous medieval Mass books, mostly (it is true) as a further enrichment of the already longish formula, especially as a means of including the special saints of the day. But in the meantime there arose a determined opposition to the unnatural distension of the Communicantes formula until at last all such accretions disappeared altogether.

A different type of addition, however, has continued down to our own day, the most ancient addition to the Communicantes that we know of, namely the announcement of the day's mystery on Christmas, Epiphany, Maundy Thursday, Easter, Ascension and Pentecost. The addition on of the MSS., recorded by Botte.—These names recur in numerous MSS. until late in the Middle Ages; Ebner, 407 f.

Often list undesirably was intimated by Pope Gregory III (731-741) when he prescribed: sed et diem natalitii celebrantes sanctorum tuorum martyrum ac confessionis unius. Thus in one eleventh-century manuscript of Rouen twenty-three names are annexed.

One expedient for satisfying local requirements without lengthening the list unduly was intimated by Pope Gregory III (731-741) when he prescribed for the monks of an oratory of St. Peter's endowed with a wealth of relics an addition to the Communicantes as follows: sed et diem natalitii celebrantes sanctorum tuorum martyrum ac confessorum, perfectorum iustorum, quorum sollemnitas hodie in conspectu gloria tua celebratur, quorum meritis precibusque... As a matter of fact, this or a similar additament is found in numerous medieval Mass books, mostly (it is true) as a further enrichment of the already longish formula, especially as a means of including the special saints of the day. But in the meantime there arose a determined opposition to the unnatural distension of the Communicantes formula until at last all such accretions disappeared altogether.

A different type of addition, however, has continued down to our own day, the most ancient addition to the Communicantes that we know of, namely the announcement of the day's mystery on Christmas, Epiphany, Maundy Thursday, Easter, Ascension and Pentecost. The addition on of the MSS., recorded by Botte.—These names recur in numerous MSS. until late in the Middle Ages; Ebner, 407 f.

Often list undesirably was intimated by Pope Gregory III (731-741) when he prescribed: sed et diem natalitii celebrantes sanctorum tuorum martyrum ac confessionis unius. Thus in one eleventh-century manuscript of Rouen twenty-three names are annexed.
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reform, it is probably because they go back in substance to the very basic concept of all eucharistic solemnity and also, perhaps, because we have grown accustomed to giving the word communicantes a broader meaning, so that the line of thought on these days might be paraphrased somewhat in this fashion.

They render Thee their gifts as members of the sacred congregation, in remembrance of the mystery of redemption which we recall this day, and in respectful regard for these saints. The insert would thus have become a sort of anamnesis.

In reference to these inserts, the words Infra actionem have been left in the Roman Missal within the canon, just before the Communicantes, the same words which, in accord with their strict meaning, are to be found as a heading above the text of the insert formula where this is usually located, namely, after the prefaces. These words signify that the text is to be inserted "within the action." This title, Infra actionem, derives from the Gelasian Sacramentaries, where it generally stands just before the Communicantes formulas to be inserted, and also before the Hanc igitur formulas. Many of the manuscripts of this group of sacramentaries likewise disclose a special caption just before the Sursum corda, namely: Incipti canon actionis.4

The Communicantes brings to a close the first section of the intercessory prayer. External this is manifested by the concluding formula, Per Christum Dominum nostrum, which thus appears for the first time in the canon. Our intercessory prayers and commendations, like all our prayers, should be offered up only "through Christ our Lord." This it is we are conscious of in this preliminary conclusion of our pleading. The same Per Christum Dominum nostrum then reappears after the Hanc igitur, after the Supplices, after the Memento etiam and after the Nobis quoque.5 Like a sign-post marking the line of our prayer, the formula is found today after successive stages all through the canon. While in all these places the formula is part and parcel of the oldest canon text to come down to us (although, it is true, only in the train of a secondary augmentation of this text), its first appearance is in the preface: . . . gratias agere per Christum Dominum nostrum. Here it strikes no definitely conclusive note, but rather, like the close of the Nobis quoque, it is at once expanded by means of a relate.

101, attempts to prove that the set formula and the feast-day insertions must have originated with Leo the Great. Similarly C. Callewaert, "S. Leon le Communicantes et le Nobis quoque peccatoribus," Sacris erudiri, I (1948), 123-164. The Leonine derivation of at least three of the insert formulas is acknowledged by H. Frank, "Beobachtungen zur Geschichte des Messkanons," Archiv f. Liturgiewiss., I (1950), 114-119. Therefore the normal text, Communicantes et memoriam venerantes, must have been regarded even then as strictly formal.

4 See above, p. 103.

5 Remigius of Auxerre, Expositio (PL, 101, 1258), wanted even the first prayer of the canon after Iesu cultubus concluded with the Per Christum Dominum nostrum. But he seems to have had little success in his attempt, and rightly so; cf. above, p. 159.

In the remaining four passages, where this expansion is omitted, the post-Carolingian Middle Ages seemed more and more to expect that the Per Christum Dominum nostrum must be followed by an Amen. In the manuscripts this Amen appears for the first time in the ninth century,6 and after that with ever-increasing frequency, till by the twelfth century its insertion in all these passages became the prevailing rule, although even at the close of the Middle Ages there were some outstanding exceptions.7 Since the Amen at the close of the canon—the only place where of old it was spoken by all the people—had lost its uniqueness, it became merely an indispensable sign of the end of the prayer and thus had to be added to the Christological formula.

Later on, in the neo-Gallican movement, this Amen which had passed into the Missal of Pius V played a new role. In some dioceses the faithful had to recite it in a loud voice.8 It was thought that doing so revived a custom of the ancient Church.

10. Hanc igitur

By the closing formula Per Christum Dominum nostrum, the Hanc igitur also labels itself as an independent prayer that did not belong to the original draft of the canon but was inserted only later on. The meaning of the words appears, at first sight, obvious and unequivocal, leaving little to be explained. The only problem that seems to require further elucidation is why this prayer, in its present form, should have been inserted just here. Is the prayer nothing more than a plea for the acceptance of the sacrificial gifts, as it is captioned in some translations? But such a plea has already been made and is here simply repeated in different words. One would scarcely have inserted an independent prayer just for this purpose. Or maybe the stress is on the contents of the petitions appended? But then why are these petitions included precisely in this place? It is around this prayer that the various theories regarding the canon have been de-

4 Sacramentary of S. Thierry; Leroquais, I, 22.

5 P. Salmon, "Les 'Amen' du canon de la messe," Eph. liturg., 43 (1928), 496-506. Ibid., 501, n. 4, the author mentions the printed missals of the 1518 and 1523 in which no Amen was interpolated.—G. Eillard, "Interpolated Amen's in the Canon of the Mass," Theological Studies, 6 (1945), 380-391. According to this there are traces of the Amen in the 13th century even in Rome (386 ff.). The medieval commentaries who expressed themselves as opposed to the interpolation, alleged as a reason that the angels here spoke the Amen. Thus, also, though along with other attempts for a reasonable explanation, Durandus, IV, 38, 7; 46, 8. In individual instances the Amen was added also at the end of the Nobis quoque. Salmon, 499; 501. —cf. also Söch, Hugo, 91-93.

6 Salmon, 503-505. Cf. above.

developed, and a summary consideration has forced the conclusion that in this prayer we have "perhaps the most difficult prayer in the Mass."

As regards its history, it is known, first of all, that the *Hanc igitur* (which all textual evidence shows to belong to the traditional wording of the Roman canon) did not acquire its present-day form before Gregory the Great, who (as the Liber pontificalis recounts) added the last words. Even the earlier form of the prayer is not merely a matter of hypothesis. True, it is nowhere found, as we might be led to expect from this account, in a form which merely omits the Gregorian addition: *igitur oblationem... qui sussumus Domine ut placatus accipias.* But in the pre-Gregorian sacramentaries there are certainly a considerable number of formulas in which these or similar initial words are connected to a lengthy complementary clause and fitted to the respective Mass-formulas in much the same way as the present-day basic formula is provided with special supplements for certain occasions like Holy Saturday, Easter, Pentecost, and the consecration of a bishop. Incidentally we thus discover that the account in the Liber pontificalis is not quite exact, since the additional phrase of Gregory proves to be not entirely new, and, on the other hand, in the most ancient texts the preceding words do not recur at all with the same wording, so that here, too, a crystallizing process must have occurred. Thus the *Hanc igitur* in the Leonianum for (Easter and) Pentecost reads as follows:

*Hanc igitur oblationem, quam tibi offerimus pro his quos ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto regenerate dignatus es, tribuens eis remissionem omnium peccatorum, quassumus, placatus accipias eorumque nomina adscribi tueas in libro viventium.* Per.*

In general, the formula shows great variability, both in the subordinate clause and in the main clause. Only the first few words, *Hanc igitur oblationem,* commonly remain unaltered. But in most cases the oblation was in some way or another exactly defined in the subordinate clause, the determination having in view those who offer it up. As a rule, it was defined as an oblation which "we" offer up for someone; but it was also described as the oblation of one person which we, in turn, offer up for a second person, or as the oblation of one person which he offers up for a second, or even as an oblation which the priest offers up.*

Even more pronounced was the variation in the main clause, which was regularly annexed. It appears that generally there was no basic scheme, but that one of the alternate texts was chosen at random and inserted, these texts being augmented at pleasure. In this main clause mention was made of the special intention which was connected with the particular celebration. Such an intention did not come into consideration for every Mass. The Mass on Sundays and feast days, for example, is not, and never was, for a special intention, but was simply the Mass of the congregation. This tallies with the fact that in pre-Gregorian sacramentaries the *Hanc igitur* does not appertain to the Sunday Mass or feast-day Mass as such, but to the Mass for special occasions and to the Votive Mass, as is especially plain from the evidence of the older Gelasianum, and is also confirmed by the Leonianum.*

This also tallies with the form the *Hanc igitur* takes, and more particularly with the manner in which certain persons or groups of persons are introduced in it. These, whether named or not, appear either as offerers themselves or—and this especially often—as those for whom the Mass is offered; or else mention is made of persons for both functions. An offering for someone turns out to be plainly a characteristic of the *Hanc igitur* formula. It finds expression in the formulas for the Masses for the Dead and...
and in the Mass of the scrutinies of candidates for Baptism, both cases where those involved cannot themselves make the offering. Certain Votive Masses, too, from the very nature of the case, fit in here. But neophytes also, although possessing all the rights of full Christians, do not appear as offerers themselves, and the same is true of newly-ordained deacons and priests, and of the bride at a Nuptial Mass. We discover here a fine piece of ancient Christian etiquette. It must have been accounted an honor to relieve those concerned of their duty of offering on this their great day, and to make the offering "for" them, in their stead and for their benefit.

Further investigation finally brings to light the fact that the mention of those for whom the offering is made is missing in the Hanc igitur only where these persons are the same as the offerers, the sacrifice being offered for oneself and one's own intentions. It is only in such cases that the

*Of the two Hanc igitur formulas in the Mass Ad profilactendum in teneore in the older Gelasianum (III, 24), the former has the traveler himself as the offerant and the second already supposes a substitute, who offers in his stead: Hanc igitur oblationem. Domine, famuli tui illius, quam tibi offerit suo servus tuus. The Mass pro sterilitate mulierum (III, 54) does not permit the one to whom it pertains to be the offerant, probably to save her from embarrassment (pro famula tua illa).

10 'Hanc igitur oblationem, quam tibi offerimus pro famulis tuis, quos ad presbyteri vel diaconatus gradus promovere dignatus es... Therefore, at that time the newly ordained did not concelebrate in their ordination Mass, or at any rate they did not consecrate. On the other hand, a Mass is provided for a newly consecrated bishop (I, 100): quam pro se episcopus die ordinantis sua conat. Hence the corresponding formula begins with: Hanc quoque oblationem quam offero ego tuis famulis et sacerdotes ob diem in quo me...

11 Thus, e.g., in the first Hanc igitur in the Mass for a successful journey: Hanc igitur oblationem, Domine, famuli tui illius, quam tibi offerit... commendamus tibi Deus tueretur... Gelasianum, III, 24 (Wilson, 144). The reading of the names is omitted, because such prominence was accorded to the deacon. In all Sacramentary MSS. of the living belongs to the prayer for the living, insofar as in either instance definite persons are mentioned and names are read out. But there is more here than simply a doubling of the framework for such a listing of names. The real matter is a determination of the aim of our action, the intention of the particular offerer alone is mentioned, and even then he is mentioned not as such, but rather as one expecting the fruits of the sacrifice. Especially instructive is the case of the Mass of the scrutinies already cited, where the candidates for Baptism are, in the main, the only ones mentioned in the Hanc igitur. As already pointed out regarding this Mass, the Memento for the living the names of the sponsors were read out, and these could, of course, be offerers. Now at the Hanc igitur there follow the names of the children who are ready for Baptism, for whom the sacrifice is offered up. Even if in other cases there is no evidence of such a distribution of names, and even if time and again in the Hanc igitur itself those who offer and those for whom the offering is made are both mentioned one after the other, still this case makes it plain enough that the accent of the Hanc igitur is placed on naming the ones for whom Mass is offered and on the special intentions. Thus there exists a certain external parallel to the Memento for the living, insofar as in each instance definite persons are mentioned and names are read out. But there is more here than simply a doubling of the framework for such a listing of names.
The peace that God gives comprises also, though not exclusively, the peace of nations. The constant troubles caused by the Lombards may have been the motive for introducing a request that has been fervently re-echoed in every war-ravaged age; cf. Duschek, Liber pont., I, 312.

Perhaps the “law of retaining the ancient in seasons of high liturgical worth” (Baumstark) was especially effective here as in so many instances during the Holy Week liturgy. Still, the formula may originally have been intended for the penitents, who were permitted to offer their gifts again for the first time. In the Gelasianum the formula reads, ... ut (familia tua) per missas et curricula eandem salutis et incoluminis mannera tua tibi Domine mercatur offere; Gelasianum, I, 39 (Wilson, 67, 70).

The amplification servitis nostrae sed et cunctae familiae tuae is missing in the ordination and bridal Mass, and at least the second part in the formula for a deceased bishop, Lietzmann, loc. cit.

Muratori, II, 188; 193; 195; 200; 219-223.

Here the subordinate clause was amplified in a manner entirely contrary to the sense of the original formula. No formulations that express the offering in honor of the saints (mentioning their names) and also in honor of Christ and of God. Examples in Kennedy, 354-357; Botte, 36, Apparatus.

The intension for the newly baptized and for the newly consecrated bishop, which in the preGregorian texts as a rule was the only intention mentioned—Leonianum (Muratori, I, 318; 421); Gelasianum, I, 100 (Wilson, 154); cf. supra, note 13—now occupies only a secondary position: pro hoc quoque; etiam pro hoc famulo tuo.

The Hanc igitur form is retained even on these special days, a supplementary phrase derived from the ancient wording being incorporated into it. On the other hand, Gregory the Great himself appears to have retained for these special formulas only the conclusion of his common text, not utilizing the continuation of the introductory words in all cases.

The Hanc igitur formulas still in use are so constructed that the basic Gregorian form is retained even on these special days, a supplementary phrase derived from the ancient wording being incorporated into it. On the other hand, Gregory the Great himself appears to have retained for these special formulas only the conclusion of his common text, not utilizing the continuation of the introductory words in all cases.

Furthermore, outside of Rome not only did a certain amount of the older Hanc igitur formulas survive for a time, due to Alcuin’s supplement to Gregory’s Sacramentary, but actually in the milieu of the Gallic liturgies there was a whole new growth of formulas, as we can see from examples in Gallican and Irish Sacramentaries, and from the formation...
of new formulas even in the Carolingian period. But the Roman Church adhered to Gregory's reform. The formulation of the particular intention for each celebration was excluded, thus to an extent shunting the formula away from its original and proper intent. But the loss was more than compensated for by the fact that the perpetual intentions of all Christians—which are likewise those of every individual Christian—were firmly fixed therein, above all the decisive request for endless glory, a grace of which it is said that we can gain only by persevering prayer, and for which we therefore humbly beg, day after day, right before the sacred moment of consecration.

There was but one further change in the Hanc igitur, namely in the contours of the external rite. Because the sacrificial note was emphasized in the prayer, it was quite natural to employ the same bowed posture that was attached in other places to prayers of offering. For this bow there are various evidences throughout the course of the Middle Ages. But since the close of the Middle Ages the present-day rubric of holding the hands outstretched over the offerings gradually prevailed, unless (as happened) objection was taken to every sort of formula. The present rite was originally a pointing gesture, occasioned by the word hanc. Thus the gesture indicates the gifts we wish to offer God, and insofar is an oblation rite, a very natural one at that, one we have come upon naturally. What is more, a proper prayer of intercession accompanies the oblation, a proper prayer for the case of a lawsuit; it is also found in a Missal of Tortosa (about 1300), n. 53 (PL, 78, 1166 A), also in the Dominican Rite of today: Missale O.P. (1889), 19.


Above I, 29; II, p. 147, nn. 44, 45.

*Lev. I, 4; 3: 2, 8, 13; 8: 18, 22.

**A comprehensive formula dating back to the Patriarch Paulinus of Aquileja (d. 802) which mentions in the form of a prayer of intercession a long list of requests, is discussed more in detail by Eber, 115-117; cf. ibid., 23. In its original version it is also found in a Missal of Tortosa (11th cent.).: Ferreres, 360. In the Sacramentary of S. Thierry, 9-10th cent., Martene, I, 4, X (I, 552-562), there are five formulas of a like nature within the compass of as many votive formulæ, which in each instance include, along with the oration, a proper Preface and Hanc igitur. The Missa Ilyrica has a Hanc igitur formula for the case of a lawsuit; ibid., IV (I, 513 E). Further examples ibid., I, 4, 8, 17 (I, 408).

**Ordo "Quoliter quadam" (Andrieu, II, 298; PL, 78, 1380 C): Hic inclinat se usque ad altare. Bernold of Constance, Micrologus, c. 88 (PL, 986 D); Honorius Augustod, Sacramentarium, c. 88 (PL, 172, 793 B); Liber ordinarius O. Praem. (Weaëlghem, 71 L); Liber ordinarius of Liege (Volk, 94). Durandus, IV, 19, 1, testifies to the profound bow in quibusdam ecclesiis. According to Eisenhofer, II, 180, also in "countless" Mass books until the 15th century. Cf. also Lebrun, I, 384.

This is the case, e.g., in the Ordo of Cardinal Stefanescchi (about 1311), n. 53 (PL, 78, 1166 A), also in the Dominican Rite of today: Missale O.P. (1889), 19.


Above I, 29; II, p. 147, nn. 44, 45.

**Lev. I, 4; 3: 2, 8, 13; 8: 18, 22.

With the exception that in the present-day text the word (Dominus) Dei (noster Jesus Christi) is lacking: Botte, 38. But it is also wanting in one Vatican MS. of the Greg. Sacramentary, Codex Ottonianus, 313; cf. E. Bishop, "Table of Early Texts of the Roman Canon," Journal of Theological Studies, 1903, 555-578.

* Cf. the complaints in G. Rietschel, Lehr­buch der Liturgie (Berlin, 1900), 382, who declares the prayer "unintelligible." Suarez, too, thinks: obscurior est religiis; De sacramentis, 1, 83, 2, 9 (Opp., ed. Ber­ton, 21, 875).

11. Quam obligationem

The last prayer before the account of the institution forms with it a grammatical unit. It is like an up-beat before the full measure, a final swell in human words before the introduction of the imposing phrases of the sacred account, which are attached by means of a simple relative pronoun. For this introductory prayer of our canon we have the early testimony of St. Ambrose, both for the prayer itself and for its introductory character, since when he cites it his chief concern is with the words of Christ thus introduced by it. In the eucharistia of Hippolytus a preliminary of this kind is still lacking. There the account of the institution simply follows the words of praise regarding the redemption in the course of the prayer of thanksgiving. But meditation on the work of the divine omnipotence and favor which is about to be performed must have induced the notion of prefacing it with a formal prayer, much in the same way as we pray for our daily bread before we sit down to eat it.

The prayer Quam obligationem is the plea for the final hallowing of the earthly gift and, in the last analysis, a plea "that it may become for us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ." The main thought is clear, but the expression is not very sharply stamped. The present-day wording of the prayer is already to be found in the Sacramentary of Gregory the Great, but it differs considerably from the earlier form presented by Ambrose. The old traditional formulæ are not fitted together into the newer framework very smoothly. In Ambrose we read: jac nobis hanc obligationem adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem, quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu...
Christi. Here the meaning is quite plain; an appeal is made that God may turn the gift into a perfect offering, which is the representation of Christ's Body and Blood. The expressions adscripta, etc., here describe the sacrificial gift in its already altered state.

It is not impossible to explain the present-day text in a similar sense. In the introductory phrase only the fac has been changed to facere digneris and the word benefictum added, in no way altering the meaning. The four-member expression has been changed into five, thus giving still greater force to the guarded legal terminology of the Romans which is here in evidence. In the second clause a noteworthy addition, evoked doubtfully by the nearness of the great, grace-filled event, is the emotional word joined to the mention of our Saviour, the word dilectissimi, all the more remarkable because of the contrast to the legal language of the preceding phrase. Of greater importance, however, is the fact that, after the ambiguous figura was dropped, the quod est should be turned into ut fiat. Thus, according to the grammatical formulation now presented, the change into the Body and Blood of Christ is no longer contained amongst the properties of the sacrificial gift expected from God, but appears instead as the result of it (or as a goal to which that divine operation is ordered.) Still it is possible to consider this result as provided in that exaltation itself, so that only in concept would it be detached therefrom as the sought-for consequence. Make this gift (we seem to say) into a perfect oblation in such a way that it becomes the Body and Blood of our Lord.

The attempt to wrest the ancient meaning out of the later wording is given special impetus by one expression which has survived in the first clause. Along with the other qualifications, our oblation gift should be rationabilis. Even in the Vulgate the word rationabilis corresponds to the Greek λογικός: spiritual, spiritualized, inmaterial. Oblatio rationabilis = λογική θυσία is an exact description of the spiritual sacrifice proper to Christianity, a sacrifice lifted high above the realm of matter. In the Roman canon as quoted by Ambrose the same word reappears after the consecration begged for a divinely effected exaltation and spiritualizing of our sacrifice, beyond blood and earthly taint, and the other terms from the Roman legal language merely attempted to define this plea more exactly within the given context. Adscriptum, for instance, applied to citizens and soldiers, indicated that they were entered in the lists, and so here, too, it means recognized and accepted. Still, it is precisely the meaning of the word rationabilis in our prayer which underwent a profound change between Ambrose's time and Gregory the Great. Already in the usage of Leo the Great, and definitely in Gregory's rationabilis lost the shade of meaning it had in Christian cult and signified merely what was suited to reason or the nature of things. So too in our Quam oblationem, where it is encircled by Roman legal terms, it reverts to the simple Roman significature, at least as far as it was understood in that era. Thus an opportunity was presented to see in what was petitioned by the fac or facere digneris not the completed transubstantiation but rather a preparation for that change, the condition by which the gift was made "serviceable" or "right." Furthermore, by means of the ut-clause, this latter was

---

"Ambrose, De sacra, IV, 5, 21 (supra, I, 52). The amended text as edited by B. Botte (Sources chrétiennes, 25; 1950), 84, reads: oblationem scriptam, rationabilem (without ratam).

"The quod may be the Latin for qua; O. Casel, "Quam oblationem" (JL, 2, (1922) 98-101) 100.

"Figura does not exclude the reality as does our word for "picture," but leaves room for it; in translation this is perhaps best expressed as "representation." A like mode of expression is known to occur frequently until into the 5th century. Cf. the parallels in Quasten, IV, 160, n. 1. Cf. also the equivalent expression in the Liber ordinum (Férotin, 322; supra I, 55, n. 20). Cf. W. Dürig, "Imago" (Münchener Theol. Studien, 11, 5; Munich, 1913), 91 ff.

"This explanation, which Casel adopted, loc. cit., was later quietly toned down by hin quite noticeably (JL, [for 1931] 1-19) 121; now he stresses the point that the primitive meaning of the prayer was not "a petition for the consecration, but a prayer of sacrifice in the form of a petition for acceptance." The Church pleads for the acceptance of its sacrifice as something fully valid and agreeable, "because it is really identical with the sacrifice of Christ." At the same time he strikes out from the Ambrosian text above the word rationabilis (10 f.), which is not easy to connect with fac. Still he treats the fac as well as the facere digneris of today, as though habe, habeare digneris were in its place; cf. the proposed translation, ibid., 17, note 30: "Look upon (or regard) this offering... as blessed..." In reality it is still a matter of God's action. We are compelled to say that even with Ambrose the prayer had a twofold character, insofar as expressions of an attitude of agreement are united with a petition for action; in other words, the prayer is conceived as though the consecration had already taken place, but we are once again praying for it.

"Cf. Baumstark, Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie, 84. The dying dedication of the Decians in Livy, VIII, 9, 6-8, presents a pre-Christian example of such a legal-sacral combination of terms.

"According to Matth. 3: 17; 17: 5 and parallels.

---

10 Rom. 12: 1; I Peter 2: 2.
12 Ambrose, De sacra, IV, 6, 27.
13 Cf. Casel, Quam oblationem, 100. Contrariwise Batiffol, Leçons, 251, n. 1, would rather take it in the sense of "accredited," with reference to the Leonianum (Murator., I, 361): Omnium pontificum semiternae Dei, qui oferenda sunt nomina tribus et oblatione devotionis nostra servitutis adscribant. Perhaps it is best, however, to take the word to mean "consecrated, dedicated, considering ascribere as equivalent to attribuere; cf. Theaurus Linguae Latinae, II, 727-726.
14 But perhaps we ought rather to follow the argument of Botte, "Traduction du Canon de la Messe," La Maison-Dieu, 23 (1950), 41, 47-49, and take the word rationabilis in its older meaning even here in our present Roman Canon; after all, in the language of religion certain expressions do keep a more ancient significance even when in every-day use the meaning changes. Cf. Chr. Mohrmann, "Rationabilis-Logik, Revue Internat. des Droits de l'Antiquité, 5 (1950), 225-234.
defined as the proper goal, but it is now spoken of not as the immediate object of the petition, but only as a consequence or intention. Once again the matter kept in view is a preparatory step to the consecration itself, with the latter mentioned only in the background. The train of thought is then the same as that which is manifested more than once in the *secreta*, the thought which is given full expression, for instance, in one of the secret prayers of the Gregorianum: *Munera, Domine, oblata sanctifica, ut tui nobis Unigeniti corpus et sanguis fiant. Per.* But if one is unwilling to take the new version of the *Quam oblationem* in the original sense, even in the sense as thus half-buried, it will then be necessary to accept a very weakened interpretation of the text, formulated somewhat as follows: Let this gift, O God, be in all blessed, approved, valid, right and acceptable, so that it (may) become for us the Body and Blood of Thy well-beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ.

The goal of our petition is still the consecration, or more exactly the transformation of our sacrificial gift, even though it is modestly pushed to the background in favor of the preparatory step. The formula thus represents the plea for consecration or—viewing the matter technically—the epiklesis of the Roman Mass. This is therefore the proper place to make a comparative study of what is generally called in other liturgies an epiklesis.

At two points in the Mass the sacramental world intrudes into the liturgical activity of the Church: at the consecration and at the Communion. God Himself is operative, giving us invisible grace by means of visible sacramental signs. Man can do nothing here except place the signs and—early reflection had soon deemed this proper—beg for the divine operation. Just how this appeal will be worded depends on the mode of theological thought, whether to call upon God in a formal request for this operation, or (more in line with pre-Christian forms of expression) to implore the assistance of divine power. Both of these modes of approach were designated in Christian antiquity as *epikalesthai, epiklesis*, because in both cases God’s name is invoked and God’s power is elicited. The earliest record of an epiklesis is found in reference to Baptism, in the consecration of the baptismal water, but there is also early mention of it in reference to the Eucharist.

Coming now to particulars, it could be sufficient simply and bluntly to implore God for the hallowing of the gift and for its salutary and fruitful enjoyment, as actually happens in the Roman Mass at the *Quam oblationem* and the *Supplices*. One could attempt to define and designate the divine power by name. Christian terms which could be considered include: the Spirit of God, the power or the grace of God or His blessing, the Wisdom or the Word of God, the Holy Ghost; one could even think of an angel of God. In the early Christian era there was no hard and fast rule in this regard. In Greek, where λόγος and πνεῦμα appear with the meaning “spirit,” where, besides, in the theological consideration of the matter, a major role was taken by the idea that God had created and accomplished everything through the Logos, it was natural that mention should be made oftener of the Logos as the power by which the gift is sanctified. In the *Mystagogic Catecheses*, with which (according to the prevailing opinion) Cyril of Jerusalem concluded his baptismal instructions in the year 348, we find the earliest record of the basic form of that epiklesis which became typical of the oriental liturgies: “Then... we call on the good God to send the Holy Ghost upon the gifts, so that He might change the bread into the Body of Christ and the wine into the Blood of Christ.” This epiklesis, taken in the narrow sense as a plea to God...
epiklesis pronounced after the words of consecration, there was another in the Church of Egypt—originally, it is evident, the only one—which preceded the words of consecration. The basic form of this reads as follows: Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory; fill this gift, too, with Thy blessing. It was not till later that the Egyptian Liturgy of St. Mark also adopted the Syro-Byzantine epiklesis.

Thus the consecratory epiklesis following the words of institution became, by degrees, a distinctive feature of the entire Eastern Church, and in the dissident churches was given a theological interpretation consonant with the wording of the prayer. But viewed in the light of tradition it represents the fourth century custom of only one of the three great patriarchates, namely, that of Antioch, while in the other two, Alexandria and Rome, the traditional practice, going back at least to the same early period, involved an invocation of the divine power before the words of institution. The fact that more and more emphasis was given to the invocation of the Holy Ghost coincides with a basic trend of oriental theology, a trend noticed at a very early stage; for Eastern theologians are wont to consider the Holy Ghost as “the executor and accomplisher of every divine work,” and in general their theological thinking is built more strongly on the mystery of the Trinity.

However, there is no solid and unimpeachable evidence in the original sources of the Roman liturgy that the Roman Mass also at one time had an epiklesis of the Holy Ghost as a plea for the consecration. The pertinent remark in a letter of Pope Gelasius I is indeed striking but not un-
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12. The Consecration: The Account of Institution

In all the known liturgies the core of the eucharistia, and therefore of the Mass, is formed by the narrative of institution and the words of consecration. Our very first observation in this regard is the remarkable fact that the texts of the account of institution, among them in particular the most ancient (whether as handed down or as reconstructed by comparative studies), are never simply a Scripture text restated. They go back to pre-biblical tradition. Here we face an outgrowth of the fact that the Eucharist was celebrated long before the evangelists and St. Paul set out to record the Gospel story. Even the glaring discrepancies in the biblical texts themselves regarding this very point are explained by this fact. For in them we evidently find segments from the liturgical life of the first generation of Christians.

Later on, because liturgical texts were still very fluid, the account of the institution was developed along three different lines. First of all, the two sections on the bread and the chalice were refashioned to gain greater symmetry. Such a symmetrical conformation, undoubtedly introduced in the interest of a well-balanced audible performance, is seen already in the phrases of the rather simple account of the institution as recorded by Hippolytus: Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis confringitur—Hic est sanguis meas qui pro vobis efunditur. The parallelism was even more advanced in a liturgy a good hundred years after, namely, the Liturgy of Serapion, where the single account has been broken up into two independent parallel accounts separated by a prayer. The trend reached its crest before the middle of the fifth century in the basic form of the main oriental liturgies, the anaphoras of St. Mark, St. James and St. Basil.

Here, for example, in both passages we find εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογών, ἄρτης; and the additional phrase from Matthew 26:28 regarding the chalice, ἔρχεται καὶ παραδίτῃσιν, is transferred also to the bread.7 Then came the second phase, wherein symmetry was abandoned in favor of a word-for-word dependence on the biblical accounts, some expressions from the Scriptures being interwoven bit by bit with the traditional text. And finally, along with these, a third phenomenon appeared, the effort to refit the account of the institution from some other source to the anaphora of the Apostles (cf. Brightman 285); this was done in the Syro-Malabar rite since the 16th century. Concerning the development of the consecration formula in the main oriental liturgies, the anaphoras of St. Mark, St. James and St. Basil.

—An earlier work on the symmetrical development of the consecration formula in K. J. Merk, Der Konsekrationstext der römischen Messe (Rottenburg a. N., 1918).

7 See the textural criticism and the historical research of F. Hamm Die liturgischen Einsetzungsberichte im Sinne vergleichender Liturgieforschung untersucht (LQP, 23; München, 1928). A good review of the relationship of the texts in P. Cagin, L'Eucharistie canon primifit de la messe (Paris, 1912), where, pages 225-244, the four biblical and the 76 liturgical accounts of the institution are printed side by side in 80 columns; in this way 79 distinct textual parts in the accounts are differentiated.

8 See above I. 8, Hamm, 33 f.

9 Above I, 29.

10 Above I, 34 f.; Hamm, 94.

11 Hamm, 16 f., 21 f., 95. Further examples in comparative juxtaposition in Hanssens, III, 417 f.
phrases in decorative fashion, to underscore certain theological concepts,* and to make more room for a reverential participation. In addition, ele-
ments of local table etiquette, or elements from the customs of worship** were frequently re-projected into the biblical account.

Viewed against such a background, the account of the institution in our Roman Mass *** displays a relatively ancient character. The trend towards parallelism and biblicism has made great progress, but further transformation has remained within modest limits. The parallelism is manifested in the double occurrence of the ornamental phrase, *sancds ac venera-
biles manus suas;* further, in the words, *tibi gratias agens benedicit
dedite discipulis suis dicens: acclipte,* of which only *gratias agens, dedit,* dicens *are biblical,* and only *dedit, dicens* are found in parallel in the scriptural text (of Matthew and Mark); and lastly in the words, *ex hoc omnes* and *enim,* both found in Matthew 26:28, but with reference only to the chalice.

The inclusion of the biblical wording is almost complete. Of the entire stock in the various biblical accounts, only one text-phrase is missing in our canon, aside from the command to *manus suas;* which is found in Paul-Luke right after the institution of the bread, and were frequently re-projected into the biblical account.

Parallelism and biblicism has made great progress, but further transfor-
mation has remained within modest limits. The parallelism is manifested in the double occurrence of the ornamental phrase, *quod pro vobis datur,* is an amazingly significant omission. Its absence is all the more remarkable because it already appeared (in the form *quod pro nobis* [resp. *pro multis*]) in both of the older texts of the Roman tradition. So it must have been expunged some time between the fourth and the seventh century, for a reason unknown to us.** On the other hand, in the oldest known text of the Roman Mass, the one in Hippolytus, almost half the biblical text is wanting.**

---

*Of this type are the terms found in oriental liturgies where, besides the inten-
tion “for the forgiveness of sins,” we find other paraphrases of the purpose of Christ’s gift, “as an atonement of trans-
gressions,” “for eternal life,” “for the life of the world.”** For those who believe in me.” Cugin, 231 ff., 235 ff. Also the attri-
butes given to the hands of Our Lord, and the word *ḥēdōn = consecrare are the result of theological reflection.

**Oriental liturgies often mention the mingling (κραμά) and also the tasting (*κραμά) of the chalice; the idea that the Lord as host drank from the chalice first of all was already advanced by Ireneus; that He also partook of the bread was frequently mentioned by the Syrians; Hanssens, III, 444; Hamm, 51; 59.

***In this category are included the raising of the eyes and the making of the sign of the cross (*benedixit*) over the gift-offer-
ings. The present-day text is the same as that of the oldest sacrificial tradition with this difference, that in three places the verbs are often joined without a con-

**The decision of the exegetes leans towards Mark 14:24: *Tō mov evn το αἷμα μου τῆς ἀνθρώπου τινί σεμνότατοι υπὲρ πᾶλλον,* because of its agreement with Ex. 24:8, which Our Lord probably had in mind. The remapping in Paul seems to have been done with the view of bringing the spiritual con-

***Supra I, 52. However, as Hamm, 95, emphasizes, the Ambrosian text and our canons do not necessarily to be the same in the line of development. In some points the former is even further developed than our canons; namely, in the twice-repeated *ad te sancte Pater omnipotens aterne Deus* and *apostolus et discipulis suis.* Besides, it has *sancds ac venera-
biles manus suas;* which is found in isolated MSS.; see Bott, 38-46.

* Botte, 61, conjectures that the suppression is connected with the simplification of the rite of the fraction. The likelihood of this is slim.*

* Cf. supra I, 29.
Passion. Similarly there is in the occidental text a special addition which emphasizes the redemptive quality of Christ's Passion: qui pridie quam pro nostra omniumque salute patetur. This addition is used at present only on Maundy Thursday, but in Gallic texts it is also employed on other occasions.

In all probability it was formerly a part of the everyday text, and may originally have been incorporated to underscore the all-embracing character of the redemption as a protest against the gloomy predestinationism rampant in the fifth and sixth centuries.

An opening for the expression of reverence and awe was found by augmenting the word acceptit in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas. The same motif appeared even earlier in oriental texts, and especially in Egypt reached even richer expansions, but as a rule this occurred only in reference to the bread because with it was to be joined an offering gesture which suited the bread: The Lord (it reads) takes the bread upon His holy hands, looks up (ἐναθέλει τον κοιλιαν ἐπι σάλας αὐτοῦ τοι τε θεον και τα πατρι.)

Our Roman text also makes mention of looking up: elevatis oculis, and the reason for its introduction here is probably the same, the idea of oblation. It does not derive from the biblical account of the Last Supper, but is borrowed, as in some of the liturgies of the Orient, from other passages of the New Testament. Moreover, the attitude of prayer, which also dominates the account and gives it the note of worship, is emphasized by the solemn wording of this mention of the venerable hands, since the meal ritual included raising the cup on high.

The chief liturgies of the East also mention here the rite of admixture, usually balancing the commingling of the chalice against the taking of the bread: ὁμιλο οις κα τ τὸ ποτήριον κεράσας εἰς σάλας καὶ ἀκάθας, εὐλογήσας... The blessing of the chalice, which is commonly expressed by the word ἀγίας, as in the case of bread, is given greater emphasis in one portion of the Greek texts after the Ecumenical Council of 381, the words πνεύματος ἁγίου being added. This practice parallels the development of the Holy Ghost epiklesis.

The most striking phenomenon in the Roman text is the augmentation of the words of consecration said over the chalice. The mention of the New Testament is turned into an acknowledgment of its everlasting duration: novi et aeterni testamenti. And then, in the middle of the sacred text, stand the enigmatic words so frequently discussed: mysterium fidei. Unfortunately the popular explanation (that the words were originally spoken by the deacon to reveal to the congregation what had been performed at the altar, which was screened from view by curtains) is poetry, not history. The phrase is found inserted in the earliest texts of the sacra-
CONSECRATION: ACCOUNT OF INSTITUTION

not have referred them so much to the obscurity of what is here hidden from the senses, but accessible (in part) only to (subjective) faith. Rather it would have taken them as a reference to the grace-laden sacramentum in which the entire (subjective) faith, the whole divine order of salvation is comprised. The chalice of the New Testament is the life-giving symbol of truth, the sanctity of our belief.

How or when or why this insertion was made, or what external event occasioned it, cannot readily be ascertained.

The sacred account concludes with the command to repeat what Christ had done. The text is taken basically from St. Paul; however, the entire Roman tradition, from Hippolytus on, has substituted for the Pauline phrase "whenever you drink it," the phrase "whenever you do this." In some form or other our Lord's injunction is mentioned in almost all the liturgical formularies. Where it is missing, it is presupposed. It is in the very nature of the Christian liturgy of the Mass that the account of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament should not be recited as a merely historic record, as are other portions of the Gospels. Indeed, the words of the account are spoken over the bread and a chalice, and, in accord with our Lord's word, are uttered precisely in order to repeat Christ's action.

This repetition, is, in fact, accomplished in all its essentials by rehearsing the words of the account of the institution.

200 MASS CEREMONIES IN DETAIL—THE SACRIFICE

As the Expositio of the Gallican Mass (ed. Quasten, 18) shows, it was already contained in the 7th century chalice formula, which was taken over from the Roman into the Gallican liturgy. Such a general diffusion can be explained only by postulating a Roman origin; cf. also Wil- mart, DACL, VI, 1086.

As the Expositio of the Gallican Mass (ed. Quasten, 18) shows, it was already contained in the 7th century chalice formula, which was taken over from the Roman into the Gallican liturgy. Such a general diffusion can be explained only by postulating a Roman origin; cf. also Wilmart, DACL, VI, 1086.

33 In the Milanese Sacramentary of Biasca, contained in the 7th century chalice formule, 1586, p. 57; the other 35

36 Despite all studies of philological pos-

35

37 Some few Ethiopian anaphora have similar formularies. For instance, the famous Hymn to the Holy Trinity (in the Commentary on the 10th cent.; Binterim, II, 1 (1825), 132-137. The natural Eng.
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302 f., to take the 31 Th. Michels, "Mysterium fidei" in Einsetzungsericht der römischen Liturgie, Catholica, 6 (1937), 81-88, refers to Leo the Great, Sermo 4, de Quadr. (PL, 54, 279 f.); the pope points out that at that time the Manicheans here and there par
took of the body of Our Lord, but shunned "to drink the blood of our Redemption." He supposes that in opposition to them Leo wanted to accentuate the chalice by adding the words mysterium fidei.

31 Hammond, 87 f.—In the Roman Liturgy, un
til the Missal of Pius V, some indecision is apparent, whether the words Hoc quotienscumque are to be said over the chalice, or else during or after the elevation. Lebrun, 1, 423 f.
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The sacred account concludes with the command to repeat what Christ had done. The text is taken basically from St. Paul; however, the entire Roman tradition, from Hippolytus on, has substituted for the Pauline phrase "whenever you drink it," the phrase "whenever you do this." In some form or other our Lord's injunction is mentioned in almost all the liturgical formularies. Where it is missing, it is presupposed. It is in the very nature of the Christian liturgy of the Mass that the account of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament should not be recited as a merely historic record, as are other portions of the Gospels. Indeed, the words of the account are spoken over the bread and a chalice, and, in accord with our Lord's word, are uttered precisely in order to repeat Christ's action.

This repetition, is, in fact, accomplished in all its essentials by rehearsing the words of the account of the institution.

31 Th. Michels, "Mysterium fidei" in Einsetzungsericht der römischen Liturgie, Catholica, 6 (1937), 81-88, refers to Leo the Great, Sermo 4, de Quadr. (PL, 54, 279 f.); the pope points out that at that time the Manicheans here and there partook of the body of Our Lord, but shunned "to drink the blood of our Redemption." He supposes that in opposition to them Leo wanted to accentuate the chalice by adding the words mysterium fidei.

31 Hammond, 87 f.—In the Roman Liturgy, until the Missal of Pius V, some indecision is apparent, whether the words Hoc quotienscumque are to be said over the chalice, or else during or after the elevation. Lebrun, 1, 423 f.
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13. The Consecration: The Accompanying Actions

A rehearsal of the sacred narrative is included in the Lord’s injunction to do what He had done—that comes clearly to light in the actions accompanying the words as they are said at Mass.

As the priest mentions the Lord’s actions, one after the other, he suits his own actions to the words in dramatic fashion. He speaks the words at a table on which bread and wine stand ready. He takes the bread into his hands, as also the chalice; the gesture of presentation that seems to lie hid in this “taking” was and is made even plainer by thus acting it out. Praying, he lifts his eyes to heaven, “unto Thee, God, His almighty Father.” At the words gratias agens he bows, just as he had done in reverence at the gratias agimus and gratias agamus that he himself had spoken earlier in the Mass. At the benedictio, by way of giving to an older biblical expression a more modern interpretation, he makes the sign of the Cross. In the West Syrians and the Copts go even further, and acting out the fregit, crack the host without however separating the parts. This imitating of the actions, which expresses as clearly as possible the priest’s desire of fulfilling here and now the Lord’s commission to do as He had done, is lacking in the East only in the Byzantine rite, and even there it would seem to have existed at one time.  

It is likely that in the ἀνάφορα mentioned above and in the gesture of raising the bread aloft connected with it in the oriental liturgies, we have a survival of a Palestinian table custom, a custom the Lord Himself observed. Likewise the taking and raising of the cup must have been done as one movement; cf. above I, 21, n. 63. Jungmann, “Acceptit panem,” Zeitchrift f. Ascet an u. Mystik, 18 = 2 KTh, 67 (1943), 162-165.

In the Roman liturgy, too, the elevating of the consecrated host came into vogue as a means of presenting it to the view of the people, the taking and raising at this point was understood as an oblation; see Honorius Augustod., Sacramentarium, c. 88 (PL, 172, 793 D) : Exemplo Domini accipit sacerdotes oblatam et calicem in manus et elevat, ut sit Deo acceptum sicut sacrificium Abel. 

In the biblical text (in Matt. and Mark) we find άνάφορα without gratias agens. It indicates the short blessing formula that was said over the bread. Likewise in place of the customary lengthy table prayer we have the εὐχαριστήριον without benedictio over the chalice; cf. above I, 9. 

Hanssens, III, 422, 424; cf. Brightman, 177, 1; 232, 20. A hint of the breaking is found also among the Maronites; Hanssens, III, 423. Moses bar Kepha (d. 903) in his Mass explanations, ibid., 447, already testifies to this breaking among the Jacobite West Syrians. The same practice can be proven to have existed within the Roman liturgy since the 13th century, chiefly in England and France, where different Mass books present the rubric: Hic facti signum fractionis or fingat frangere, or at least: Hic tangat hostiam; see anent this the excursion in Legg, Tracts, 259-261. Also in the Ordinale of the Carmelites (about 1312), ed. Zimmermann, 81; and still in the Missale O. Carm. (1935), p. XXX.

6 Hanssens, III, 446, expresses the opinion that all this was removed in order to stress the exclusive consecratory power of the epiklesis. Similarly the signs of the cross for the blessing at the εὐχαριστήριον, εὐλογία, ψάλτης are missing only in the Byzantine Rite, ibid., 447. Still the Byzantine Mass has the practice, that the deacon point with his oration to the diskos, resp. the chalice, while the priest says the Λαός, εὐλογεῖται, resp. Πάσα ἡ ἱερᾶ πάντες. The priest also takes part in this rite of “showing”; cf. J. Doens, De hl. Liturgie van H. V. J. Chrysostomus, (3rd ed.; Chevetogne, 1950), p. XXIV. The obvious meaning of these gestures is denied, however, in a note attached to these orthodox texts; Blondel, 386. —The purpose behind this dramatic copying of Our Savior’s actions is perhaps best described by the term suggested in a recent study: intention applicatrix, applied intent, which plainly establishes the function of the words of institution; A. Chavasse, “L’épître eucharistique dans les anciennes liturgies orientales. Une hypothèse d’interprétation,” Mélanges de science religieuse, 1946, 197-206.

"Above, p. 115 f.—Hanssens, III, 353 ff., 425 ff., espouses the opinion that from the beginning only the words of Christ spoken over the bread and wine at the time of the institution were considered as the fulfillment of Christ’s mandate; that the prayer of thanks is not a copying of the εὐλογία, εὐλογεῖται uttered by Christ; that the prayer said by Him over the chalice survives rather in the thanksgiving prayers after Communion. There may be a certain amount of justification for such a consideration if one has in mind only the external order in which the prayers follow one upon the other, but hardly when one considers the meaning and purpose of each separate part. Justin, e.g., attaches no significance to the prayer of thanks after Communion. On the other hand, it is hardly conceivable that the eucharistia in Justin, which in fact was underscored even before him and in the entire tradition after him, should have arisen without any relation whatever to the prayer of thanks spoken by Our Lord. Through the fusion of the two consecrations required by the circumstances and by the anticipation of the prayer of thanksgiving, the essence of the latter is not thereby changed; cf. above I, 16 f. The rather late and secondary origin of the prayer assumed by Hanssens, III, 355 ff., is excluded not only by such considerations, but by the Gratias agamus which, in all likelihood, originated already in the primitive community."

"The same idea in the Ethiopian anaphora of Gregory of Alexandria (Cagin, 233, div. 35): Similiter respetit super hunc calicem, aquam vitæ cum vino, gratias agamus... . Cf. the pointing gestures in the Ethiopian liturgy with the same meaning, supra, p. 145, n. 37.

Brinktrine, Die hl. Messe 191, sees there in more definitely an indication that the sacred words spoken by Christ at the Last Supper extend their efficacy to all Masses that would be celebrated in the future."

"In the West it is Ambrose especially, who with complete clarity utters the conviction that the consecration takes place by repeat-
Numerous usages in oriental rites are understandable only from this same viewpoint. Thus, for example, the fact that the whole eucharistic prayer (aside from the Sanctus, which is sung in common) is spoken softly by the priest up to this passage, and then the words “take and eat, this is My body,” and the corresponding words over the chalice are spoken in a loud voice; in fact, they are chanted in a solemn melody. And this is done over the bread held in the hands, and over the chalice grasped by the hands. In the West-Syrian anaphora of St. James the people answer Amen both times the priest says the words of consecration. This was already an established custom in the ninth century, when Moses bar Kepha was vainly tilting against it, for he rightly saw in the custom an acknowledgment of the completed transubstantiation, for which he contended the epiklesis was still requisite. This Amen is found also in the Byzantine and the Armenian Masses. In the present-day Ethiopian liturgy the Amen is repeated three times on each occasion, and followed by acts of faith. In the Coptic liturgy the dramatic element is heightened by inserting the Amens between the phrases of the introductory words of the priest: “He took bread . . . and gave thanks”—Amen, “blessed it”—Amen; “consecrated it”—Amen. And after the words of consecration in each instance comes a profession of faith:

In the Greek, and therefore a tradition from as early as the sixth century at least. In comparison with these we must confess that the Roman liturgy of the first millenary lacked the impulse to direct the attention at once to the completion of the sacramental process, or to draw ritual deductions from it. Only in the eleventh century do we begin to find, hand in hand with an increased care for everything connected with the Sacrament, the first signs of a new attitude. According to the Cluniac Customary, written about 1068 by the monk Bernhard, the priest at the consecration should hold the host quattuor primis digitis ad hoc ipsum ablatus. After the consecration, even when praying with outstretched arms, some priests began to hold those fingers which had “touched” the Lord’s Body, pressed together, others even began this at the ablation of the fingers at the offertory. In one form or another this idea soon became a general rule.

---


13 There must have been a very lively sentiment in the Irish-Celtic tradition for the definitive wording of the words of the institution. The Stowe Missal, ed. Warner (HBS, 32), 37; 40, stresses the fact that when the priest begins: accept Jesus panem, nothing is to distract or divert him; for that reason it is called the oratio periculosae. The Penitentialis Cummeani fixed three days of double fasting, according to another version even quinquaginta plagas, as a penance for a priest who was guilty of a mistake in any passage where periculum adscitutur. Jungmann, Geistesd. Liturgie, 94 f.; 117, n. 232. A reminiscence of this is still retained in the Pontificale Romanum in the warning given to this effect: atque instar periculosa. So, in view of this awed regarding the words of consecration it is strange that it was apparently not until the 14-15th century that it became the practice to make the consecration prayers more prominent by means of special lettering. P. de Pumieu, “La consecration, Cours et Conferences, VII, (Louvain, 1929), 193.

14 Cf. The rite regarding the preparation of the host, above, p. 35.
Even in the twelfth century, however, the special takings of honor were not as closely connected to the consecration as to other parts of the Mass. 22 Now, however, the people entered to dominate the scene. A religious movement swept over the faithful, prompting them, now that they hardly presumed to receive Communion, at least to look at the sacred species with their bodily eyes. 23 This impulse to see fastened itself upon the precise moment when the priest picked up the host and blessed it, as he was about to pronounce over it the words of consecration. The presentation of the Host by elevating it a little, which we find more clearly expressed in the oriental rites, had also become more pronounced in the Roman Mass. 20

Towards the end of the twelfth century 22 stories were in circulation of visions imparted at this very moment: the Host shone like the sun; 24 a tiny child appeared in the priest's hands as he was about to bless the host. 25 In some places the priest was accustomed to replace the host upon the altar after making the sign of the Cross over it, and only then to recite the words of consecration; in other places, on the contrary, he would hold it aloft as he spoke these words. 26 Thus the people were not to be blamed if, without making any further distinction, they reverenced the host as soon as they were able to see it.


23 Regarding the ramifications of this movement see above, I, 120 ff. The history of the elevation was finally presented by E. Dumoutet, Le désir de voir l'hostie, Paris, 1926; P. Browe, Die Verehrung der Eucharistie im Mittelalter, (Munich, 1933, 26-69; = 2 Kap.: "Die Elevation," first published, JL, 9 (1929), 20-66). Cf. also Franz, Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter, 32 f., 100-105.

24 This elevation was developed in the 12th century to such an extent that Radolphus Ardens d. 1215, Homil., 47 (PL, 155) 1836 B), already regarded it as a representation of Christ's elevation on the cross. Further data in Browe, Die Verehrung, 29 ff.; cf. Dumoutet, 47.

25 An example cited among others by Dumoutet, 46 f., from Wilbert of Nogent (d. about 1124), De pignoribus sanctorum, I, 2, 1 (PL, 156, 616), can also refer to the elevation at the end of the canon.

26 Cassarius of Heisterbach, Dialogus miraculorum (written about 1230), IX, 33 (Dumoutet, 42, n. 3): vision of the nun Richmdus. In vouching for the story, he adds the remarkable note: necum pati factam futur tran substantationem.

27 Magna vita Hugonis Lincolnensis, V, 3 (Dumoutet, 42-4 n. 2): This occurred at a Mass of the bishop, who died in 1200. The life was written by his chaplain.

28 For the latter method see Hildebert of Le Mans (d. 1133), Versus (PL, 171, 1186); Stephan of Baugé (d. about 1140), De sacris. altarum, c. 13 (PL, 172, 1292 D). Browe, Die Verehrung, 30. As numerous Mass-books testify, the practice continued for a long time: until into the 15th century: Dumoutet, 42 f. But, along with this practice, that of today was also followed; cf. Mass-ordo of York (about 1425; Simmonis, 106): the QUI pridie is said inclinato capite super linteamina.
printed Roman Missals of 1500, 1507, and 1526 make no mention of it. Various difficulties stood in the way of a rapid spread of the rite, especially
the danger of spilling the contents of the chalice. Then there was the fact
that the chalice used to be covered with the back part of the corporal
folded up over it. 22 But particularly cogent was the objection that in seeing
the chalice one does not "see" the Precious Blood. 23 For this last reason,
even where the elevation of the chalice took place, it was little more than
a mere suggestion: the chalice was merely lifted up to about the level of
the eyes. 24 Not till the Missal of Pius V was the second elevation made to
correspond with that of the Host.

The desire of gazing upon the Lord's Body was the driving force which,
since the twelfth century, brought about this intrusion of a very notable
innovation into the canon which for ages had been regarded as an in-
violable sanctuary. The obligatory elevation before the words of consecra-
tion lost its importance, 25 and the displaying of the Host after the words,
instead became the new pivot and center of the canon of the Mass. From
the intrusion of this new element a further development had to follow.
It was at bottom only a pious idea to regard seeing the Host, "contacting"
the species with the organs of sight, as a participation in the Sacrament
and its streams of grace, and even to value it as a sort of Communion.
But it was a logical conclusion that, the moment the consecration took
place, all honor and reverence are owing to the Lord's Body and Blood.
This conclusion, as we have seen, was actually realized in oriental rites. 26
So any further regulation of the new usage had to be directed to keeping

22 Thus, a second corporal, or the pall that later developed from it, was required to be able to elevate the covered chalice; cf. Braun, Die liturgischen Parameter, 210 f. Still, Durandus already recognizes the elevation of the uncovered chalice in his Const. synodales (ed. Berthelé, 69); Browe, 40. Both methods were still in existence in the 14-15th century; Browe, 47.
23 Durandus, IV, 41, 52. 53.
24 Browe, 47; cf. Franz, 105, n. 1. To this day the Carthusians recognize only this restricted elevation; Ordinarium Cart. (1932), c. 27, 16. However, the chalice was frequently held aloft until the Unde et memores. Thus according to Italian Mass-books of the 13th century: Ebner, 315; 329; 349.
25 Strictly speaking, there is still an optional elevation at the consecration, since the priest "takes" the host in his hands. In fact, this original idea is not excluded even in the elevation for the view of others; now the obligatory elevation takes place with the consecrated gift in place of the unconsecrated one, and is performed in such a way that it might be seen by more people. But this idea has not generally been fostered since the 12th century. However, traces of this older conception are still found even in modern times. Thus, among the Reformers, Karlstadt not only insisted that the elevation be dropped, but considered it an expression of oblation and therefore abominable and sinful; L. Fendt, Der lutherische Gottesdienst des 16. Jh. (Munich, 1923), 95; cf. also Berthold of Chiemsee, Kelligpach, (Munich, 1535). It is only in the Papal Mass that the turning to the right and left at the elevation has been retained until the present time; Brinkrüm, Die feierliche Papstmesse, 27.
26 The practice was still retained in Chartres, Rosen, and other French cathedrals around 1700; de Moléon, 226 f., 367 f., 433, 435; Dumoutet, 58-60. In Spain it existed in some single instances even in the 19th century; Legg, Tracts, 234 f.
27 Such was the arrangement of the Carthusians about the middle of the 13th century; DACL, III, 1057. According to the Mass-ordo of John Burchard (1502) the candle was to be lit at the Hanc igitur, exalted after the elevation of the chalice; Legg, Tracts, 155; 157; cf. Dumoutet, 57; Swiss church books of the 15-17th century mention "belekenen" and "kerten der uelhebung" (elevation candles); Krönler, Der Kult der Eucharistie in Sprache und Volkstum der deutschen Schweiz (Basle, 1949), 57. Elsewhere it was lit sooner, or also extinguished only after Communion. Hence it turned into an expression of veneration for the Blessed Sacrament; for this development see H. L. Verwall, Die Dominikanische Messe (Düsseldorf, 1948), 25 f. Concerning the history of this consecration candle, see P. Browe, Die Elevation in der Messe (IL, 9 [1929], 20-66), 40-43.
28 The Carmelite Ordinal of 1312 (Zimmermann, 81 f.). Cf. Browe, Die Verhehrung, 56. The incensing of the Blessed Sacrament at the consecration on feast days is already provided for in the Ordinarium P. of 1256 (Guerrini, 241 f.). However, for a long time, it was not customary; see more details in Atchley, A History of the Use of Incense, 264-266. 29 Browe, Die Verhehrung, 55 f.
early as 1201." It makes its appearance first as a signal accompanying the elevation of the Host, and then the corresponding elevation of the chalice. Soon we hear of the signal's being anticipated, when the priest makes the sign of the Cross over the Host and the chalice. Further, the bell was used not only to direct the attention to the moment of the "showing," but also to call the people in to worship the Sacrament. So by the end of the thirteenth century the signal with the little bell was augmented by a signal from the large church bell, so that those who were absent, busy at home or in the field, might pause at this moment, turn towards the church and adore our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament.

It was self-evident from the start that honor should be paid to the Sacrament when it was elevated, all the more so when heresy had made an assault on faith in the Eucharist. Clergy and faithful were to kneel down—this was the admonition of the first decrees and synods that dealt with the new consecration practices. Or at least a humble bow was ordered, as in a regulation of Honorius III in the year 1219, and in several later decrees. Especially canons in various cathedral churches continued

[Cf. above, p. 207, n. 30. Cf. Braun, Das christliche Alltagserz. 573-575. Durandus, IV, 41, 53. In England this was called the "sacring bell." Librorum ordinarius of Ligue (Volk, 94, 1. 29). Cf. H.(erbert) T(hurston) "The Cross Bell in the Mass," The Month, 172 (1938), 451-454. More details regarding the ringing of the elevation bells at home or in the field, might pause at this moment, turn towards the church and adore our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. Soon we hear of the signal's being anticipated, when the priest makes the sign of the Cross over the Host and the chalice. Further, the bell was used not only to direct the attention to the moment of the "showing," but also to call the people in to worship the Sacrament. So by the end of the thirteenth century the signal with the little bell was augmented by a signal from the large church bell, so that those who were absent, busy at home or in the field, might pause at this moment, turn towards the church and adore our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament.

It was self-evident from the start that honor should be paid to the Sacrament when it was elevated, all the more so when heresy had made an assault on faith in the Eucharist. Clergy and faithful were to kneel down—this was the admonition of the first decrees and synods that dealt with the new consecration practices. Or at least a humble bow was ordered, as in a regulation of Honorius III in the year 1219, and in several later decrees. Especially canons in various cathedral churches continued

[Cf. above, p. 304, n. 30. Durandus, IV, 41, 53. In England this was called the "sacring bell." Librorum ordinarius of Ligue (Volk, 94, 1. 29). Cf. H.(erbert) T(hurston) "The Cross Bell in the Mass," The Month, 172 (1938), 451-454. More details regarding the ringing of the elevation bells at home or in the field, might pause at this moment, turn towards the church and adore our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. Soon we hear of the signal's being anticipated, when the priest makes the sign of the Cross over the Host and the chalice. Further, the bell was used not only to direct the attention to the moment of the "showing," but also to call the people in to worship the Sacrament. So by the end of the thirteenth century the signal with the little bell was augmented by a signal from the large church bell, so that those who were absent, busy at home or in the field, might pause at this moment, turn towards the church and adore our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament.

It was self-evident from the start that honor should be paid to the Sacrament when it was elevated, all the more so when heresy had made an assault on faith in the Eucharist. Clergy and faithful were to kneel down—this was the admonition of the first decrees and synods that dealt with the new consecration practices. Or at least a humble bow was ordered, as in a regulation of Honorius III in the year 1219, and in several later decrees. Especially canons in various cathedral churches continued

"The oldest report is the disposition made by Cardinal Guido in the year 1201; above, p. 207, n. 30. Further reports in Browe, Die Verehrung, 34-39 in the notes. However, there is evidence that this was done down sooner, at accept panem; see Kennedy, The Moment of Consecration, 149. Gregory IX, Decretales, III, 41, 10 (Friedberg, II, 642); cf. Browe, Die Verehrung, 37.

P. Browe, "L'atteggiamento del corpo durante la messa" (Eph. liturg., 50 [1936], 402-414), 408f. As a minimum requirement it was expected that those who, according to the custom of the time were squatted on the floor, would, as a mark of respect, at least stand up. Still in many a place the Beghards and Beguines refused even this, a condition that induced the Council of Vienne (1311-12) to take a hand in the matter; Denzinger-Umbreg, Euchirodion, n. 478. Likewise, according to a report from Flanders in the year 1349, the Flagellants refused to remove their head covering at the consecration; Browe, loc. cit., 403; cf. 411. On the other hand again, a complete prostratio often became customary, especially in monasteries; see, e.g., the Statutes of the Carthusians: Martène, 1, 4, XXV (1, 633 C). Cf. also the illustration from S. Marco in Venice in Ch. Rohault de Fleury, La Messe, I (Paris, 1883), Tablet XVIII. Browe, "L'atteggiamento," 409f. In the decree of the Congregation of the Canons of St. Peter in Rome, in Ebner, Geschichte der brauche der Glaubigen in den aussereutschen Ländern" (StZ, 1927, II), 360. Cf. Browe, "L'atteggiamento del corpo durante la messa" (Eph. liturg., 50 [1936], 402-414), 408f. As a minimum requirement it was expected that those who, according to the custom of the time were squatted on the floor, would, as a mark of respect, at least stand up. Still in many a place the Beghards and Beguines refused even this, a condition that induced the Council of Vienne (1311-12) to take a hand in the matter; Denzinger-Umbreg, Euchirodion, n. 478. Likewise, according to a report from Flanders in the year 1349, the Flagellants refused to remove their head covering at the consecration; Browe, loc. cit., 403; cf. 411. On the other hand again, a complete prostratio often became customary, especially in monasteries; see, e.g., the Statutes of the Carthusians: Martène, 1, 4, XXV (1, 633 C). Cf. also the illustration from S. Marco in Venice in Ch. Rohault de Fleury, La Messe, I (Paris, 1883), Tablet XVIII. Browe, "L'atteggiamento," 409f. In the decree of the Congregation of the Canons of St. Peter in Rome, in Ebner, Geschichte der
on their knees till the Communion. After the close of the Middle Ages the desire to honor the Sacrament, which led to this kneeling, had gained the ascendancy over the desire to sing. As early as the beginning of the twentieth century it even became customary in almost all countries to bow the head while kneeling at the consecration. Even at the elevation hardly a thought was given to looking up at the Host, and this was not changed until Pius X, in 1907, gave a new incentive by granting an indulgence to those who, while contemplating the sacred Host, recited the prayer "My Lord and my God." It would be quite natural to expect the celebrant also to participate in giving these signs of reverence to the Blessed Sacrament. Yet for a long time the only form thus given was a slight bow made to our Lord's Body after the words of consecration, just before elevating the Host. Here and there the practice grew of kissing the Host; this was during the thirteenth century, the time which witnessed the multiplication of the altar kisses. But these well-intentioned efforts were countered at once by various prohibitions, subsequently repeated. Our form of genuflection—falling on one knee and then rising at once—was not at that time recognized as a religious practice, and therefore was not used at this moment. To kneel on both knees during the consecration was demanded early of deacon and subdeacon, but appears to have been impracticable for the priest, although the insertion of a lengthy prayer—as was sometimes done after the Paternoster—seems to have been thought desirable. The first evidence of a short genuflection made by the priest at the consecration is found in Henry of Hesse (d. 1397), who was teaching theology at Vienna. Still, even in the fifteenth century the simple bow was still prevalent, and provision is made for it even in some of the Mass ordinaries of the sixteenth century. In Roman Mass books the genuflection appears from 1498 on, and from the start the arrangement is the one we have today, with a genuflection before and after the elevation of the species. It was made definitive in 1570 by the Missal of Pius V.

While the priest genuflects, the Mass-server grasps the edge of the chasuble. Because of the shape which the chasuble has commonly assumed since the close of the Middle Ages, the precise sense of this little ceremony is no longer evident. Nowadays it gives the general impression of being a gesture of readiness, not at all out of keeping with the sacredness of the moment. The explanation usually offered is that the chasuble is lifted so that the celebrant might not be impeded when genuflecting; and this might be understandable on the supposition that—as was the case in the last years of the Middle Ages—the chasuble used to reach in back down to the heels. But at that time this reason was not actually given; but instead a very different one, the same reason still found in the Roman Missal. According to this, the server should take hold of the edge of the planetæ ne ipsum Celebrantem impedit in elevatione brachiorum. This explanation, it must be granted, is even less obvious today than the other. But that it is the true one can be deduced from the fact that the same gesture had already been prescribed for the deacon long before there was any thought of a genuflection. And in the thirteenth century it was definitely
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although the insertion of a lengthy prayer—as was sometimes done after the Paternoster—seems to have been thought desirable. The first evidence of a short genuflection made by the priest at the consecration is found in Henry of Hesse (d. 1397), who was teaching theology at Vienna. Still, even in the fifteenth century the simple bow was still prevalent, and provision is made for it even in some of the Mass ordinaries of the sixteenth century. In Roman Mass books the genuflection appears from 1498 on, and from the start the arrangement is the one we have today, with a genuflection before and after the elevation of the species. It was made definitive in 1570 by the Missal of Pius V.
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in order. For then they still commonly used the bell-shaped chasuble, and when the arms were raised, the back part, being pulled away by the uplifted arms, presented a very ugly picture unless there was a helping hand to hold it neat. With the return of the ample chasuble the old ceremony is again regaining its full meaning, so that it is once more intelligible.

There remains yet another question: Should our worship of the Blessed Sacrament be manifested by prayers and songs? Prayers spoken aloud and songs during the consecration are not things that would explain themselves. The rule of silence during the canon had indeed been violated often enough in the thirteenth century, but it had not yet lost all its force. At all events, the celebrating priest was permitted to say special prayers, but only in a subdued tone.¹ Such an action was not at all strange in medieval times. True, the apología which had cropped out everywhere between the various prayers had for the most part disappeared from the Mass books by the thirteenth century, and the injunctions, like those of Béniard of Constance, forbidding any and all insertions into the canon,² did not remain ineffective. But a short ejaculatory prayer right after the consecration still appeared admissible and was actually recommended and practiced by many,³ although others again absolutely prohibited any such interpolation,⁴ even before the appearance of the Missal of Pius V.⁵

But the faithful, at any rate, were admonished to pray; at first using prayers which they recite quietly to themselves. About 1215 William of Auxerre, in his Summa aurea, mentions such prayers and asserts: Muli­torum petitiones exaudiatur in ipsa visione corporis Christi.⁶ According to Béthold of Regensburg, the faithful ought at this moment to pray for three things: for forgiveness of sin, for a contrite reception of the last sacraments, and for eternal beatitude.⁷ As outward expression of their prayer, the faithful might strike their breast or sign themselves with the sign of the Cross.⁸ The only vocal prayers commonly recommended were the usual formulas,⁹ or else a simple greeting or invocation. One such salutation which recurs in various versions, both Latin and vernacular, in many prayer books towards the end of the medieval era is the formula: Ave salus mundi, verbum Patris, hostia vera.⁰ Another is the formula: Te adoro, te verum corpus Christi conficio.¹¹ Other more elaborate formulas were probably products of the monasteries. Take, for instance, the fourteen-part invocation which starts with the verse: Ave principium nostrae creationis, ave pretium nostrae redemptionis, ave viaticum nostrae peregrinationis.¹² Such pieces as Adoro te devote,¹³ Anima

---

¹ Berthold of Regensburg, Predigten, ed. Pfeiffer, II, 685 (Franz, 656): cf. I, 459, where he even gives the wording of a prayer. Berthold of Chiense, Kiligiçhekel (Münich, 1535), c. 20, 7, 8, presents comprehensive prayers for the oblation and the memory of the Passion.

² Béthold of Regensburg, Predigten, ed. Pfeiffer, II, 685 (Franz, 656): cf. I, 459, where he even gives the wording of a prayer. Berthold of Chiense, Kiligiçhekel (Münich, 1535), c. 20, 7, 8, presents comprehensive prayers for the oblation and the memory of the Passion.

³ A commentary on the Mass in a 15th century MS. of Stuttgart (in Franz, 611) threatens those priests with excommunication who interpolated prayers at the elevation of the sacred Host, e.g.: Deus propitius est nobis pecatori, or Propitius est nobis pecatori nostra proper memin tum Dom ine, or O vere digna hostia. La Côte de voir l’hostie, 18.


⁵ Dumotet, Le désir de voir l’hostie, 18.

⁶ Berthold of Regensburg, Predigten, ed. Pfeiffer, II, 685 (Franz, 656): cf. I, 459, where he even gives the wording of a prayer. Berthold of Chiense, Kiligiçhekel (Münich, 1535), c. 20, 7, 8, presents comprehensive prayers for the oblation and the memory of the Passion.

⁷ Berthold of Regensburg, Predigten, ed. Pfeiffer, II, 685 (Franz, 656): cf. I, 459, where he even gives the wording of a prayer. Berthold of Chiense, Kiligiçhekel (Münich, 1535), c. 20, 7, 8, presents comprehensive prayers for the oblation and the memory of the Passion.

⁸ Cf. also Wilmart, Auctores spiritualis, 24. In Germany this invocation is certified in the 15th century in the form of a distichon: Salue lux mundi, verbum Patris, hostia vera, vita caro, deitas integra, versus homo; França, 22; German also ibid., 703. A prayer at the consecration beginning with Salue lux mundi, also in England in the meditations of Longford (15th cent.): Legg, Tracts, 24. A German rhythm prayer in 12 verses beginning with "Gott, vater allir christlicher" in a 14th century MS. of Weingarten in França, 22, n. 1. Cf. also the call of Parsifal in "Queste del saint Graal," note 58 above.

⁹ Dumotet, Le Christ selon la chair, 165 f., with parallel French formulas of the 14th century.

¹⁰ Evidenced at the beginning of the 13th century in an English rule for nunneries (Browe, Die Vererhung, 19; cf. also 53, n. 160) and in Peter the Chancellor of Chartres (Kennedy, op. cit., 9). Cf. also Wilmart, Auctores spiritualis, 22 f.

¹¹ F. J. Mone, Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters, I, Freiburg, 1893, 275 f. The hymn appears for the first time in the 14th century, and precisely as a prayer at the consecration. The authorship of St. Thomas Aquinas is uncertain; see Wilmart, Auctores spiritualis, 361-414, especially 399 ff., and also the reference in Bulletin Thomiste, 7 (1943-46), n. 122 f. The last strophes (Die pellicane) were at times combined with the elevation of the
Christi, and Ave verum corpus also served to salute the Blessed Sacrament at the elevation.

Well-shaped texts of this sort were naturally an open invitation for common recitation and singing, even if they were not intended for this from the start. By the end of the Middle Ages a solemn salutation of the Blessed Sacrament at the elevation formed part of the ceremony of high Mass. According to a Strassburg statute of 1450, the antiphon O salutare hostia, with verse and oration, was to be sung on certain occasions in elevatione immediate post Benedictus. A decree issued in 1512 by Louis XII of France ordained that at the daily high Mass in Notre Dame from the start. By the end of the Middle Ages a solemn salutation of the Blessed Sacrament at the elevation formed part of the ceremony of high Mass. According to a Strassburg statute of 1450, the antiphon O salutare hostia was to be sung in elevatione corporis Christi between the Sanctus and Benedictus. A Paris foundation of 1521 presupposes the Ave verum. Other songs, too, are mentioned for the same occasion. We must admit that these songs are all, in general, truly artistic works which fit into the setting with theological propriety. The break in the God-ward motion of the prayer and obligation made by the ceremony of elevating the sacred species and showing them to the people is intelligently shaped and filled out by these hymnic salutations, the product reminding one of a similar creation on Maundy Thursday where, after the holy oils are blessed, a greeting of veneration is likewise offered them. Soon after the expiration of the Middle Ages, and with them, of the Gothic spirit, a rapid decline in the simple desire to contemplate the sacred Host at the moment of the consecration. That meant the disappearance, too, of the hymns which had been sung in honor of the Blessed Sacrament. The elevation ceremony was maintained, but was conducted in utter silence. Often the organ was silenced, although already speak of altissimum silentium (Hartbach, VI, 369), of an altum sanctorum silentium (ibid., VI, 172), that was not to be interrupted by hymns without reason. Elsewhere, though, they remained in use for a longer period. In the Voyage liturgique de Molené, which appeared in 1718, it is remarked as a peculiarity that in individual French cathedrals nothing is sung at the elevation of the host, but that it is adored in silence (117, 142, 147). Among the Frenmonstratensians the prescription of such a hymn (O salutare hostia) was first incorporated in the Liber ordinarius in 1628 and again in 1739, where it still is found; Waelfelghem, 122, n. 2. Even according to Roman directions hymns during elevation were at first permitted. The question, An in elevatione ss. sacramentis in missis sollemnis casi positis, Quintum ergo, etc., vel aliqua antiphona tantum sacramento propria, was answered in the affirmative, April 14, 1753; Decreta auth. SRC, n. 24, f. 6. A later decision of May 5, 1894, permits such hymns only peracta ultima elevatione, as soon as the Benedictus has been sung; Decreta auth. SRC, n. 38, f. 1. The official Enchiridion indulgentiarum (Vatican City, 1950), has a prayerful address in three parts, "Hail, saving victim offered upon the cross . . . (n. 132) and again the prayer which captivated St. Pius X, "My Lord and my God" (n. 133). Cf. also ibid., n. 142.

The official Enchiridion indulgentiarum (Vatican City, 1950), has a prayerful address in three parts, "Hail, saving victim offered upon the cross . . . (n. 132) and again the prayer which captivated St. Pius X, "My Lord and my God" (n. 133). Cf. also ibid., n. 142.

Krampe, Messopfergebräuche der Gläubigen in den ausserdeutschen Ländern" (StZ, 1927, II), 351. In Portugal the prayer reads: "Here is the body, blood, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, as true and complete as in heaven"; "Here is the body, blood, soul, and divinity . . . ibid., 362. In Colombia the prayer, "My Lord and my God" is commonly said; ibid., 365.

B. Lebbe, The Mass: A Historical Commentary (Westminster, 1949), 81-82, lists several ejaculations traditional with the people of Eire, among them a curious expression: "All praise to thee, Lord Jesus, white and red."

Cf. Egyptian liturgies above, p. 204. A similar greeting as in Spain, only more carefully devised from a theological standpoint, is contained in the present German catechism, beginning with "My Lord and my God! Hail, true body of Christ that was offered for me on the cross." It was taken up, e.g., in the diocese of St. Pölten and also in the diocese of Linz (Heiliges Volk, 2nd ed.; St. Pölten, 1930-31, 67 f.) and was used in congregational Mass devotions. Noteworthy discussions have taken place in Germany in the last years from the viewpoint of the children's Mass, among others in the Katholischen Blättern, 40 (1939) and 41 (1940). The discussion turned partly on the assumption that the idea of sacrifice, perhaps even with an address to God the Father, should be plainly expressed, but they inclined to the solution indicated above. However, Victor Schurr, C.S.S.R., in Paulus, 23 (1951), 65, suggests prayers of offering like those at the offertory. With the regulating ideas of the prayers at the altar must be joined the arrangement of external signs of respect. As a general rule it may be stated that besides the raising of the eyes to the Blessed Sacrament, a sign of the cross at most would be proper.
14. Unde et memores

In reciting the account of the institution, the priest simply relates what then took place, and only the actions which are coupled with the words, and the veneration which follows upon them, make it clear that the scene is being re-enacted. But once the Great Prayer is resumed after the consecration, the very first thing done is to interpret the mystery thus accomplished. The link with the preceding account is made by the word Unde, harking back to our Saviour’s injunction which closes the account. Now what is it we are doing at the altar in conformity with this injunction?

In almost all the liturgies two ideas are used to define the mystery, the two being placed side by side and contrasted in various ways. The mystery is a commemoration or anamnesis; and it is an oblation, a sacrifice. In some few instances the oblation is mentioned first, as in the Armenian Mass, where, after pronouncing the words of institution, the priest pursues and expands the thought of the command to do what Christ had done; he takes the gifts in his hands and says: Et nos istis, Domine, secundum illud mandatum, offerimus, sacrificium salutis nostrae, mysterium resedentis in sanguine Unigeniti tui, commemoramus salutares eius pro nobis passiones... As a rule, however, the remembrance is mentioned first, but in participial form, so that, though it is first, yet the main stress will be on the oblation, expressed by means of a verb like offerimus, proferimus.

For both ideas the connection with the command of our Lord is the same: we come before Thee, O God—that is the basic thought—with a grateful memorial of the redemptive work of Christ and offer up to Thee His Body and Blood. And both ideas contain an objective element as

1 A similar link (igitur, ergo) in the oldest Roman formularies; above I, 29, 52; and mostly (τέων, αὐτῶν), though not without exception, in the oriental formularies; Lietzmann, Messe und Herrenmahl, 50-55. The conjunction is missing for the most part in the Gallic texts, though they nevertheless establish, not infrequently, a close connection by the manner in which they take up the last word of Christ’s injunction (cf. faciem, or something similar): Hoc faciendum, Hoc agentem and the like; ibid., 60-68.

2 By way of exception, a definite enunciation of the anamnesis character of the celebration (frequently itself called anamnesis for short) is missing; thus, in the Euchologium of Serapion, 3, 13 (Quasten, Mon., 62; see above I, 34-35), whereas the offering is announced twice therein, once after the consecration of the host and again after the consecration of the chalice. In any event, the sacrifice in the first instance is designated at the same time as a Memento of the Dead: τά ταύτα καὶ Ἰησοῦ τὸ ἐκείνου τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος τοῦ ἄνδρος προσπεργτομένα; cf. O. Cael, IL, 6 (1926), 116 f. On the other hand, either the anamnesis or the offering has been frequently omitted in Gallican formularies; cf. e.g., Missale Gothicum: Muratori, II, 518, 522, 526, 544, 548, etc.

3 Text according to Chosroes, Explicationes precum missae (about 950) ed. Vetter (Freiburg, 1880), 32 f. For today’s text see Brightman, 437: “We therefore, O Lord, presenting unto thee...do remember the saving sufferings”...—For the accompanying rite see Hahnssen, III, 452.

4 The more ancient Byzantine liturgy (Brightman, 328 f.) has also the offering in the grammatical form of a participle:

*Anamnesis,* ed. Vetter (Freiburg, 1880), 32 f. For today’s text see Brightman, 437: “We therefore, O Lord, presenting unto thee...do remember the saving sufferings”...—For the accompanying rite see Hahnssen, III, 452.

5 In the 9th century Florus Dacusus, De actione miss., c. 63 (PL, 119, 54 D): Ilius ergo panis et calicis oblatio moris Christi est commemoratio et annuntiatio, quae non tam verbis quam mysteriis ipsa agitur.

6 Cf. above, p. 116. In this respect it is significant that in the Apostolic Constitutions, VIII, 12, 35, the description of the redemptive Passion, which precedes the account of the institution, is summed up by means of μημην δόσαί του εὐφαγίστον του, not as the true anamnesis that begins after the institution: μημην τον δόσαν (προσ­περγτομένον αὐτοῦ). Cf. above I, 56 f. In the Armenian normal anaphora, the prayer of thanksgiving which was prolonged before the account of the institution to include the Passion of Christ, is brought to a close after it by a reference to the descent into hell and the destruction of its gates (a favorite way the Orient has of representing the Easter victory); Brightman, 437.

remembrance of Me” (Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24 f.) is being fulfilled, and that, moreover, we are thus doing what Paul had demanded in more detail, namely, to “proclaim the death of the Lord” (1 Cor. 11:26). Nevertheless, the concept of Christ's sacrificial death does undergo a certain development, for related—or shall we say component—concepts are disclosed in much the same way as in the ancient professions of faith. The death of the Lord is His victory, it is His triumph over death. The Gallic Mass appears to have mentioned originally only the Passion. Even in Hippolytus the Resurrection is already added: Memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis eius. In Ambrose’s text of the canon there is the further addition of the Ascension, and the passio—or rather, the triplet beginning with it—is characterized by the word gloriosissima. The adjective of our present-day anamnesis follows the same lines. The adjective gloriosa has been transferred to the Ascension, while the passio has acquired the attribute mortis; after it is characterized by the word gloriosissima. The text of our present-day anamnesis follows the same lines. The adjective gloriosa has been transferred to the Ascension, while the passio has acquired the attribute mortis; after it is characterized by the word gloriosissima.
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The mention of various phases in the work of redemption which are to be kept in remembrance is often matched in oriental liturgies by a well-rounded expansion of the words incorporating Christ’s injunction to do as He had done. At first only the words of St. Paul are put on Christ’s lips. But then the addition is made of the Resurrection or of the Resurrection and Ascension, especially in Egyptian liturgies: “As often as you eat this bread . . . you shall manifest My death and profess My Resurrection and Ascension, until I come.”

Similar formations made their way into the area of the Gallic liturgies; thus a Milanese formula reads as follows: 

Hac quotiescumque feceritis, in meam commorationem facietis, mortem meam praedicabitis, resurrectionem meam amnuntiabitis, adventum meum sperabitis, donec iterum de ceolis veniam ad vos.

The remembrance should be realized not only in and by the priest, but also in and by the entire congregation assembled. In the Roman Mass this is brought out by the fact that the subject of the anamnesis is defined as 

nos servi tui, sed et plebs tuae sanctae.

In Egypt, at an early date, it was revealed even more vividly; a solemn outcry of the people, corresponding to the expanded phrases of our Lord’s injunction to do as He had done, followed immediately after it as a sort of response to it, and was then followed by the priest’s prayer. Even today the Coptic Mass retains this anamnesis cry of the people, and since it still employs the Greek tongue it is evidently a heritage of at least the sixth century. 

Τον θανατόν σου, κύριε, και αγέλελομεν και τὴν θανάσαν σου ἀνάσασθαι καὶ ἀνάδοξον ὡμολογοῦμεν.

In the Egyptian the anamnesis of the priest has likewise acquired its own special pattern by the use of the Pauline formulation. The main Egyptian liturgies not only begin with a Memores, Μεμνημένοι, but in addition use a rather expanded schema for what follows by announcing (κατάγελλοντες):

Arnobius the Younger (about 460), In Ps. 110 (PL, 53, 497 B; Botte, 41), presupposes the addition in the Roman Mass, see Botte, 63 f. The probability is slight. More likely it was in some Gallic Masses (for Arnobius is generally regarded as a Gaul) that the birth was already then named. In any case, it is found in substance in the Gothic Missal of the 7th century (Muratori, II, 522): Credimus, Domine, adventum tuum, recolimus passionem tuam. Mozarabic examples stress the 

venisse, incarnatum fuisse, Lietzmann, 65 f. The incarnatio also appears here and there in Roman Mass books of the Middle Ages, e.g., in the Missal of Lagny (11th cent.; Leroquais, i, 171): incarnationis, nativitatis.

Thus Const. Ap., VIII, 12, 37 (Quasten, Mon., 223): 

... τὸν θανατόν τὸν ἑαυτῷ κατάγελλοντες, φίλοι ἐν οἴκῳ. More reference and detailed analysis also for that which follows in Hamm, 90 f. 

The anaphora of St. James (Brightman, 52); Byzantine liturgy of St. Basil (ibid., 328); Papyrus of Dér-Balyzeh (Quasten, Mon., 42). 

Egyptian anaphora of St. Mark (Brightman, 133). 

Hamm, 91 f. 

Hamm, 91. 

Brightman, 177. Cf. also in the Ethiopian liturgy: ibid., 232 f. In a somewhat more original form (κύριε, οὖν and καὶ ἀνάδοξον are missing) in the papyrus of Dér-Balyzeh (Quasten, Mon., 42). It is clear from the address to Christ that we have here a passage said by the people. The continuation after ἐλογίζομεν, which reads καὶ ἐλογίζομεν is to be compared with the cry of the people in the Ethiopian Mass (Brightman, 233, l. 1). 

His death, by confessing (ฎυλογοῦσετε), His Resurrection ... by awaiting (ἐπεκεκόψατε) His second coming, we offer up to Thee ... 

The second point that is expressed in the Unde et memores and then taken up and developed in the following prayers, is the oblation or offering. Here we have the central sacrificial prayer of the entire Mass, the foremost liturgical expression of the fact that the Mass is actually a sacrifice. In this connection it is to be noted that there is reference here exclusively to a sacrifice offered up by the Church. Christ, the high-priest, remains wholly in the background. It is only in the ceremonies of the consecration, when the priest all at once starts to present our Lord’s actions step by step, acting as Christ’s mouthpiece in reciting the words of transubstantiation—only here is the veil momentarily withdrawn from the profound depths of this mystery. But now it is once more the Church, the attendant congregation, that speaks and acts. And it is the Church in concreto, manifest plainly in its membership; it is the congregation composed of the “servants” of God and the “holy people,” which has already appeared as the subject of the remembrance in the anamnesis. To show how aware the Church is of what she is, we must point to the significant words here used, plebs sancta, words which bring to the fore the sacerdotal dignity of the people of God in the sense implied by 1 Peter 2:5, 9.

In oriental liturgies the priest’s prayer does not contain any equivalent expression which so clearly states that priest and people alike are subjects of the remembrance and the oblation. But instead, both for the remembrance and the oblation, they have exclamations by which the people ratify the action of the priest—and these in addition to the primitive and universal Amen at the end of the canon. In the Byzantine Mass the priest utters the words of remembrance and oblation in the form of participles: 

Μεμνημένοι . . . προσφέροντες; the people complete the sentence with the cry: sε νυμνομεν, σε εὐλογομεν, σε εὐχαριστοῦμεν, κύριε, και δοξάζομεν σοι, θεοί ημῶν. It is an oblation of praise, of thanksgiving, of petition.

Brightman, 133; 178. Related formularies appear also in the Gallican and especially in the Mozarabic liturgy, where the anamnesises begin with nun-titamus, praedicamus, or with credimus, confetemur, respectively with (centuram) priestolamur. Lietzmann, 60-67. 

The phrase ordo et plebs for clerics and people, in Tertullian, De exhort. cast., c. 7 (CSEL, 70, 13, l. 18); cf. Rütten, “Philologisches zum Canon missae” (SIZ, 1938, 1) 44 f. For plebs sancta, cf. St. Augustine’s address to the people, sanctitas vestra, or also the designations sacrata plebs, populus sanctus Dei, in other passages of the Roman liturgy. See also the data in Botte, 64 f. The clergy’s designation of themselves as servus finds its justification in Scripture, especially in the Old Testament: servus Domini for the Levites (e.g., Ps. 133: 1), perhaps even in the Lord’s parable of the fideles servus. The plural services is in accord not only with the conditions of the Roman stational services, but also with the rule that the priest must celebrate at least with a deacon; cf. above 1, 208. 

Thus already in the text of the 9th century: Brightman, 329 (as a cry of the people); cf. 386 (now given to the choir). The phrase was also taken up by the remaining liturgies of the Orient.
In the West-Syrian Mass, too, the people add a cry of petition after the oblation; this recurs in all West-Syrian anaphoras. In the Roman Mass just a few impressive words are used for the oblation. In Hippolytus the terseness here as well as in the anamnesis borders on the extreme: Memores ignit tur moris et resurrectionis eius offerimus tibi panem et calicem. In the present Roman canon the expression has hardly blossomed out beyond this, and it is not till the concluding words, the five-part description of the sacrificial gifts, that the phrasing is caught up in the enveloping praise: offerimus proclarae maiestatis tuae de tuis donis ac datis hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam . . . By the use of the words maiestas tua (which we encountered already in the preface) as a term of address, we are brought face to face with the divine greatness before which man crumbles into nothingness. In accordance with this consideration, the gifts which we undertake to present to Him must be regarded as already His own; they are de tuis donis ac datis. This is a biblical concept (1 Paral. 29:14) that reappears time and again in different forms on foundation inscriptions of Christian antiquity. Where the pagan founder of a sanctuary or a memorial, conscious of his own largess, has the words de suo fecit carved on the stone, the Christian benefactor humbly acknowledges that all he has given was granted him by God; his gift is ex donis Dei. Thus, too, every sacrificial gift which we can proffer to God is already “a gift and a present” which He had loaned us. And this is surely true in an eminent way of the gift on our altars. Another concept that might be a contributing factor here is the one proposed by Irenaeus in his opposition to Gnosticism; with regard to the material components of our sacrifice, he argues that we do not offer up an uncreated being, but rather we sacrifice to the Lord of creation something that He himself has created.

Similar thoughts are given solemn utterance in the Byzantine Mass, where the priest, after softly finishing the anamnesis, continues in a loud voice: τά σα ἐν τοιούτῳ σωλήν προσφέρετε κατὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πάντι; this is followed by the exclamation of the people already referred to: The phrase is probably as old as the Roman de tuis donis ac datis. It even occurs, without any change whatever, on inscriptions. For instance, it

decorates a silver chalice of the sixth century, discovered at Orontes. Later, it was to be found on the altar of the Hagia Sophia at Constantinople. In either case, the words were meant to convey not only our acknowledgment that all we can offer God, whether it be celestial or terrestrial, comes from Him, but even more our proud satisfaction in being able to secure from this world of ours the visible garb for the sacred gifts that lie upon the altar.

Next the gifts themselves are given mention, just as they are found in our hands, and the mention turns into a short hymn on the Blessed Sacrament. First, the sacrament is described in three phrases which stress the spotless purity and holiness of the sacrifice: hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam. Our sacrifice is not like that of the heathens or even that of the Jews, who could offer God only a material and bloody sacrifice; ours is spiritualized and therefore clean. Its positive content is next suggested, first of all by the word hostia, which originally implied a living being. The subsequent words also continue the same line of thought: for they are a two-part expression (corresponding to the double form of the sacrificial gifts) proclaiming the preciousness of these gifts, pointing to the results of partaking of them, the everlasting life towards which they tend; panem sanctum vite aeterna et calicem salutis perpetuae.
In the eucharistia of Hippolytus the awareness that the possibility of offering such gifts is the greatest grace suggested the inclusion of a word of thanks at the close of the oblation: gratias tibi agentes quia nos dignos habuisti adstare coram te et tibi ministrare. Some formularies in the East also contain a thanksgiving in the same position. And either then, or else right after the oblation, they make a transition to the epiklesis. The Roman Mass, on the contrary, lingers on the main theme, the oblation, without going into these subsidiary ideas.

15. Supra quæ and Supplices

For man—and even for the ecclesiastical congregation—to offer God gifts, no matter how holy these might be, is certainly the utmost daring. For this reason the obligation is expressed in yet another manner, in words that endeavor to show that it is nothing less than a grace of God to expect the acceptance of the gifts from our hands.

All we can do is make the offering; offerimus. It is up to God to cast a favorable glance upon our offering (respicere) and to consider it with approval (accepta habere). Continuing in this figurative language, we add that it also pertains to God to have our gifts carried up to His heavenly altar of sacrifice. The line of thinking manifested in these words follows easily and naturally from what precedes, and it therefore belongs to the most ancient portion of even the non-Roman liturgy. And yet it gives occasion for more than one problem.

The first thing that strikes us is the fact that these prayers linger wholly over the external performance of the sacrifice, tracing each step of it prayerfully. They are concerned that the symbol be properly executed and also acknowledged by God. But regarding what is symbolized, that sacrificial sentiment from which our action must proceed, that spirit of sacrifice which rightly plays so great a role (perhaps not yet sufficiently stressed) in our present-day religious thinking and in our pastoral considerations regarding attendance at Holy Mass, the wholehearted subjectio of the creature to the Creator, the ever-growing conformity of our will with that of almighty God, the resolute surge of our mind towards that mind "which was in Christ Jesus"—all this is here given no special consideration. But this should in no way astonish us. After all, in view of the sacrificial activity of the community, such a state of mind in the individual is taken for granted; it is presupposed, if not as something already acquired, then surely as something to be sought. Expression must be given not to the subjective striving (which varies from soul to soul), but to the objective act which is valid for all.

A further surprise is the fact that even after the gifts have been consecrated and changed there should still be a plea for acceptance. For there is question here really of the most sacred gifts, of the sacrificial oblation which Christ Himself makes ministerio sacerdotum. Certainly there can be no thought of pleading for its acceptance, since it is antecedently valid in full. On the contrary, all the sacrifices which are cited from the Old Testament, those of Abel and Abraham and Melchisedech, are only earthly shadows of its heavenly grandeur.

As a matter of fact, the Reformers who raised their voices against the Mass and canon also pounced on this point, that the priest undertook to play the part of mediator between Christ and God. Right down to our own day, therefore, modern commentaries on the Mass have assumed a tone of apology when explaining this passage. But if we reflect for a moment that the sacrifice of the New Law, being an act of official worship, was in Christ Jesus—all this is here given no special consideration. But this should in no way astonish us. After all, in view of the sacrificial activity of the community, such a state of mind in the individual is taken for granted; it is presupposed, if not as something already acquired, then surely as something to be sought. Expression must be given not to the subjective striving (which varies from soul to soul), but to the objective act which is valid for all.

A further surprise is the fact that even after the gifts have been consecrated and changed there should still be a plea for acceptance. For there is question here really of the most sacred gifts, of the sacrificial oblation which Christ Himself makes ministerio sacerdotum. Certainly there can be no thought of pleading for its acceptance, since it is antecedently valid in full. On the contrary, all the sacrifices which are cited from the Old Testament, those of Abel and Abraham and Melchisedech, are only earthly shadows of its heavenly grandeur.

As a matter of fact, the Reformers who raised their voices against the Mass and canon also pounced on this point, that the priest undertook to play the part of mediator between Christ and God. Right down to our own day, therefore, modern commentaries on the Mass have assumed a tone of apology when explaining this passage. But if we reflect for a moment that the sacrifice of the New Law, being an act of official worship, was in Christ Jesus—all this is here given no special consideration. But this should in no way astonish us. After all, in view of the sacrificial activity of the community, such a state of mind in the individual is taken for granted; it is presupposed, if not as something already acquired, then surely as something to be sought. Expression must be given not to the subjective striving (which varies from soul to soul), but to the objective act which is valid for all.
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But if we reflect for a moment that the sacrifice of the New Law, being an act of official worship, was in Christ Jesus—all this is here given no special consideration. But this should in no way astonish us. After all, in view of the sacrificial activity of the community, such a state of mind in the individual is taken for granted; it is presupposed, if not as something already acquired, then surely as something to be sought. Expression must be given not to the subjective striving (which varies from soul to soul), but to the objective act which is valid for all.
is essentially placed in the hands of the Church, which in turn relies on the sacrifice of Christ, then it becomes clear at once that we possess therein, despite the solemnity of its essential core, only an external symbol by which the Church—or more immediately, the congregation—honors God. And God can really receive it from her hands as a gift of homage only when at least the lowest degree of an internal will to give on the part of the participants accompanies and quickens the external offering. In this sense, then, it would be quite understandable that the harsh words of the prophets, in which God rejects the purely external and soulless offerings of His people, would refer with equal weight to the sacrifice of the New Law, were it offered by unworthy sacerdotal hands. Besides, in such a case little more would remain of this holiest of sacrifices than a new hic et nunc of Christ's sacrifice long since accomplished, a hic et nunc which is without its complete salvific meaning, since, contrary to its purpose, it is no longer the expression of a willing Christian mind, no longer has its roots in the earth, but hovers aimlessly in the air.

Since corruptible and sinful man can never be sufficiently worthy of the great and holy God this humble plea for God's gracious glance is in any case well-grounded. Joined to it is a confident reference to the illustrative figures of the Old Testament, whose sacrifice had won God's pleasure. The outstanding types from the Old Dispensation are reviewed to encourage the soul, and a certain pride takes possession of our hearts as we link our action with the action of these biblical saints. Three figures are selected: innocent Abel, who made a sacrifice of the firstlings of his flock (Genesis 4:4) and himself succumbed to his brother's hate—our gift is "the Lamb of God," the first-born of all creation, who turned His death, suffered at the hands of His own people, into a sacrifice of redemption. Next, Abraham who, as ancestor of all "who are of faith," is called "our patriarch," the hero of obedience to God, ready to make a sacrifice of his very son, but receiving him back alive (cf. Hebrews 11:19)—our sacrifice, too, the most perfect expression of obedience unto death, has risen again and returned to life. Finally, Melchisedech who, as priest of the most high God," offers up bread and wine—our oblation also is taken from bread and wine." May God (such is our prayer) look down upon our oblation with the same pleasure as He looked upon the oblation of these men; respectit Dominus ad Abel et ad munera ejus, as we read concerning the first of them: on Abel, and on his offering, the Lord looked with favor. That prayer of ours will be fulfilled if the oblation proceeds from an intention pure as theirs, and if the temper of our own hearts accords in some measure with the incomparable holiness of our sacrifice.

This comparative view of the Christian sacrifice in conjunction with the sacrifices of the Old Law, and in particular with those specially mentioned, was not alien to Christian antiquity. In fact, this consideration of the Old Testament as the antecedent shadow of the New was as self-evident to primitive Christianity as was the concept of the continuity of the history of grace. Abraham's sacrifice was one of the favorite subjects of ancient Christian iconography, and at least since the fourth century it appears predominantly as a type of the sacrifice of the Cross, and therefore, mediately at least, as a type of the eucharistic sacrifice. But there is immediate reference to the Eucharist in the representation of the three types mentioned in the canon found in the two large mosaics in the choir of San Vitale in Ravenna. One of these shows Abel and Melchisedech, the former bringing a lamb, the latter bread and wine to the altar. The other pictures Abraham in two different scenes, in one case at the point of sacrificing his son, in the other as host to the three mysterious strangers.

---

*Is. 1: 11; Jer. 6: 20; Amos 5: 21-23; Mal. 1: 10.

**This extreme case is, however, not entirely present even in an unworthy celebration of the priest, not so long as at least one participant takes part with proper dispositions.

The adjective justus is applied to Abel by Christ Himself, Matt. 23: 35; cf. Herb. 11: 4; Fuerti tui = of your servant, but as with πατερός, implying also a father-child relationship. In this sense the word is also applied to Israel in Luke 1: 54. Cf. also J. Hennig, "Abel's Place in the Liturgy," Theological Studies, 7 (1946), 126-141.

† Cf. Hebrew 1: 6; Col. 1: 18; Romans 8: 29.


§ The canon calls him High Priest. Regarding the hypothesis which Baumstark builds upon this appellation, cf. I, 51, note 6.

Facultas, implying also a father-child relationship. In this sense the word is also applied to Israel in Luke 1: 54. Cf. also J. Hennig, "Abel's Place in the Liturgy," Theological Studies, 7 (1946), 126-141.

The identity of the gift offering, which, as is known, is not mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews in the comparison of Christ with Melchisedech, is brought to the fore over and over again in Christian antiquity; thus Cyprian, Ep. 63, 3; Ambrose, De myst., VIII, 45 f.; Augustine, De civ. XIV, 22. Cf. also G. Wuttke, "Melchisedech der Priesterkönig von Jerusalem," Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Exegese (Beilage z. Zeitsschrift f. d. neueste Wiss., 5; Giessen, 1927), 46 f.; J. Danielou, La célébration eucharistique chez les Pères de l'Eglise (Lex orandi, 7; Paris, 1947), 33-72, especially 45 f.; idem, Bible et Liturgie (Lex orandi, 11, Paris, 1951), 196-201.

Gen. 4: 4; cf. Deut. 26: 15. The expression is of course very common in the orations: Respicite quassumus Domine, etc.

It is worthy of note that in the prophecy of Malachi regarding the cult of the future the announcement of a purified priesthood should find its place alongside the announcement of a new, clean oblation, through which the name of the Lord God should be great among all nations (1: 11); "and he will purify the sons of Levi and shall refine them as gold and as silver, and they shall offer sacrifice to the Lord in justice. And the sacrifice of Juda and Jerusalem shall once more please the Lord . . . " (3: 11). Cf. Gihr, 693 f.


Beissel, Bilder, 170 f.; cf. ibid., 189, regarding the related representation in A. Apollinaire in Classe.
A change will be made to the Ordinary Form of the Holy Mass in early 2014.
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