

Hallel cup (p. 71). The words of institution for the chalice are mainly from St. Matthew; "Calix sanguinis mei" is adapted from St. Luke and St. Paul; "pro vobis" from St. Luke, "pro multis" from St. Matthew. The last clause: "Hæc quotiescumque feceritis" etc. is again slightly modified from St. Paul. Two additions, "et æterni" and "mysterium fidei," are not in the Bible. The words "mysterium fidei" have been much discussed.¹ Apost. Const. has for the bread: "this is the mystery of the New Testament" (above p. 336). The only other liturgy that has the words "mysterium fidei" is the Gallican in St. Germanus.² *De Sacramentis* does not have them (p. 130). Probably they are a Gallican addition. It may be that they were once an exclamation said by someone else. Many rites have such an exclamation. In the East the people say Amen after each form;³ there are other exclamations, as at Antioch: "We believe and we confess" by the deacons, and: "We announce thy death, O Lord, and we confess thy resurrection" by the people.⁴ May be that once (in Gaul) the deacon cried out "a mystery of faith" at this moment, meaning that it was only for the faithful, not for catechumens nor strangers.

In the middle ages the last words: "Hæc quotiescumque" etc. were sometimes said after the elevation.⁵

§ 5. The Elevation.

We must distinguish between the idea of an elevation in general and our present elevation immediately after the words of institution. All liturgies, from that of

¹ See Gihl; *op. cit.* p. 599. ² P.L. lxxii, 93.

³ St. James (Brightman, 54); St. Mark (*ib.* 132-133); Byzantine (*ib.* 385-386).

⁴ *Ib.* 52. ⁵ So Ordo Rom. XIV, 53 (P.L. lxxviii, 1166).

the Apostolic Constitutions on, have an elevation of the Blessed Sacrament. The idea is to show it to the people. In all it takes place just before the communion. In the Eastern rites it is accompanied by the words "Holy things for the holy" (*Tὰ ἁγία τοῖς ἁγίοις*, Sancta sanctis)¹ to which the people answer with a suitable exclamation: "One is holy, one Lord, Jesus Christ in the Glory of God the Father,"² or some such words. It is thus an act of reverence to the Blessed Sacrament before communion, with the idea of showing the people what they are about to receive. This elevation forms part of the rite of fraction (p. 359). Rome too has it just before the Pater noster (*ib.*).

Our elevation at the words of institution is quite another matter. It is a late mediæval ceremony. Till about the XIIth century there is no trace of it. The Canon was said straight through. The Elevation at this moment is again a Northern custom. It began in France and was adopted at Rome rather later. By the XIVth century it is established in the Roman Ordo.³ What was the origin of this ceremony? The common opinion, repeated in all the handbooks⁴ is that it began as a protest against Berengar's denial of transubstantiation. This must now be given up. Berengar's heresy had very little to do with it. On reflection it will be seen that, as far as an elevation may be a protest against a denial of transubstantiation, the old elevation at *per quem hæc omnia* was sufficient. Nor is it a declaration of belief in consecration by the words of

¹ Apost. Const. VIII, xiii, 12, Brightman, p. 24; Antioch, *ib.* p. 62; Alex. p. 138; Byz. p. 393; Nest. p. 296. The Mozarabic (and Gallican) rite have the form "Sancta sanctis" (not said aloud, without an answer) at the intinction (P.L. lxxxv, 560-561), probably borrowed from the East.

² Byz. Brightman, p. 393; Alex. has a Trinitarian form: "One holy Father, one holy Son," etc. (*ib.* 138).

³ Ordo Rom. XIV, 53 (P.L. lxxviii, 1166), without genuflection.

⁴ Gühr: *Das h. Messopfer*, 602; Rietschel: *Lehrbuch der Liturgik*, 383, etc.

institution, though it seems to commit us to that belief.¹

Father Thurston has examined the origin of the elevation and has thrown what appears to be new light on the question.² His conclusions, in outline, are these. The lifting of the Host began as raising it *before* the words of institution were spoken. We still lift it from the altar and hold it at the words "acceptit panem". In the XIIth century it was usual to lift it as high as the breast and to hold it thus while the words were spoken.³ Then the priest simply laid it on the altar and went on at once to the consecration of the chalice. While the Host was being consecrated it was held high enough to be seen by the people. Gradually the custom arose of holding it a little longer, that they might still see it. In fact bishops began to fear that the people might worship it before the consecrating words were said; so there is a series of laws forbidding priests to lift it to their sight too soon.⁴ The practice of elevating the Blessed Sacrament immediately the words "Hoc est enim corpus meum" had been spoken, developed as a sign that the bread was consecrated then at once. For, in the XIIth century and chiefly at the University of Paris, there was much dispute as to this point; several theologians maintained the view that the bread was not consecrated till after the consecration of the wine. The question

¹ I am not quite sure. One might perhaps take the elevation as one more dramatic misplacement, like the "immaculata hostia" at the offertory, the Byzantine Cherubikon etc. Is Consecration by the words of Institution *de fide*? It certainly seems to be *sententia catholica*. Pius VII (May, 1822) forbade any other theory to be defended.

² In the *Tablet*, Oct. 19, 26, Nov. 2, 1907. He quotes however Claude de Vert (p. 604) as having already said much of this. See Claude de Vert: *Explication simple, littérale et historique des cérémonies de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1713) iii, pp. 261-264.

³ *Ib.*

⁴ So e.gr. a Scottish Synod about the year 1227 (*Tablet*, loc. cit. 605), etc. See also the rubric of the Sarum missal (ed. Burntisland, 615, note F.).

became practical in the case of an interruption between the consecrations. If there were then found to be no wine in the chalice, or if the celebrant were taken sick and had to leave the altar, should the bread too be consecrated again? Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) was not sure and recommended for safety that it should be.¹ A number of other writers have the same doubt, or even declare that the first consecration alone is certainly invalid.² Meanwhile the other school prevails. They have especially the unanswerable argument that at the Last Supper the apostles received communion in the form of bread, before our Lord consecrated the chalice. The bread had certainly become his body when he gave it to them to eat. So this view eventually became universal; it is supposed as certain in the present Missal.³ Eudes de Sully, Bishop of Paris⁴ (1196-1208), favoured it strongly. He issued a decree ordering that if wine were found missing it should be supplied at once and the consecration, only from "Simili modo," repeated.⁵ He is also the first bishop who ordered our elevation. Priests are not to lift the Host so high as to be seen by the people while they say the words of consecration, but are then to elevate it so that it can be seen.⁶ From that time the custom of elevating in this way spreads rapidly. The Cistercians adopted it in 1215,⁷ a provincial Synod at Trier in 1227,⁸ Walter of Cantilupe, Bishop of Worcester, in 1240.⁹ By the end of the XIIIth century

¹ *de s. altaris mysterio*, iv, 17, 22 (P.L. ccxiv, 868, 872).

² *Tablet*, *loc. cit.* 643-645. ³ Rubric, *de defectibus*, iv, 3 etc.

⁴ Paris did not become an archbishopric till 1622.

⁵ Mansi, xxii, 682 (quoted by Thurston, *Tablet*, *ib.* 644).

⁶ In a diocesan Synod held during Eudes' reign (Mansi, *ib.* and Thurston, *ib.*)

⁷ Domenico Giorgi: *De liturgia romani pontificis* (Rome, 1744) iii, 74 (Thurston *ib.* 645).

⁸ Hartzheim: *Concilia Germaniæ* (Köln, 1760) iii, 527.

⁹ Thurston: *loc. cit.* 605.

the elevation of the Host has spread all over the West. The elevation of the chalice followed, but less universally. The difference is apparently caused by the fact that one sees the Blessed Sacrament at the first elevation, but one does not see the consecrated wine at the second. So the Carthusians still have no real elevation of the chalice. The genuflexion of the celebrant before and after each elevation came later. For a long time he merely bowed. Ordo Rom. XIV says: "Let him first adore the sacred divine body, bowing his head, then let him lift it reverently and carefully to be adored by the people and let him then place the adored sacred Host in its place". So for the chalice; he is to "adore the sacred blood of the Lord, bowing his head slightly"; then to elevate. Neither elevation is to be protracted beyond a moment.¹ The rubric of the Sarum missal is: "inclinat se sacerdos ad hostiam et postea elevet eam supra frontem ut possit a populo videri".² The genuflexion did not become part of the rite, at any rate officially, till it was commanded in the missal of 1570. The Carthusians still only bow profoundly. Meanwhile in the later middle ages popular devotion attached enormous importance to seeing the Blessed Sacrament at the elevation. This became the ritual centre of the Mass. A number of curious examples of this are quoted by Father Thurston.³ If people had not seen it they thought they had not properly heard Mass and waited for another; they came in for that moment and went out again, boys were let out of school for a moment to see the elevation; there are accounts of disorderly scrambling in church so as to see the Host.⁴ John Becon in the Reformation time, attacking the Mass, says that if the celebrant did

¹ Ordo Rom. xiv, 53 (P.L. lxxviii, 1166).

² Missale Sarum (*ed. cit.* 617).

³ *Tablet*, *loc. cit.* 684-686 (*Seeing the Host*).

⁴ *Ib.*

not elevate high enough, "the rude people of the countrey in diverse partes of England will crye out to the priest: houlde up Sir John, houlde up. Heave it a little higher."¹ It was apparently this desire to see the elevation that caused the custom of ringing the bell—at first to call people from without to see it. The server at Low Mass rang a little bell through the low side-window just before the elevation, that people might enter the church in time.² The Roman Ordines have nothing about ringing a bell at the elevation; though they contain the notice that Church bells are not to be rung after the Gloria on Maundy Thursday.³ But Ivo of Chartres († 1115) mentions a bell at the elevation, apparently the great bell of the church.⁴ Durandus says "at the elevation of both (kinds) a little bell (*squilla*) is rung".⁵ In the later middle ages there were regularly two—if not three, bells. A middle sized one (*Sanctus* bell, *Sance* bell) was rung at the *Sanctus*. This was hung up, often in a little bell-cote in the roof, so that it could be heard outside, and was rung with a rope which hung down to near the server's place.⁶ Then there was a little hand-bell (the *sacring-bell*) like the ones we still use for the elevation. The Synod of Exeter in 1287 ordered that there should be in every church "*campanella deferenda ad infirmos et ad elevationem corporis Christi*".⁷ Besides this the great bell of the church was to be tolled when the sacred Host was raised, to let those who were in the fields know the moment of the consecration. So in

¹ Becon: *Displaying of the Popish Mass* (Parker Society ed.) iii. 270; Thurston, *ib.*

² Thurston, *ib.* 685.

³ Ordo Rom. X, 1 (P.L. lxxviii, 1009); XIV, 83 (*ib.* 1205).

⁴ Ep. 142 (P.L. clxii, 148-149). So also William, I Bishop of Paris (1096-1102). S. Binius: *Concilia gen. et prov.* (Köln, 1618) III, ii, p. 442.

⁵ *Rationale* iv, 41, § 53.

⁶ See the picture (apparently XIVth cent.) in Rock: *Church of our Fathers* (ed. cit. iv, p. 178).

⁷ Wilkins: *Concilia* ii, 139; Rock: *op. cit.* iv, p. 179.

inventories of churches in Edward VI's reign there are three kinds of bells, the great church bells, the sance bell and the sacring-bell.¹

Our present reformed Missal determines the ceremony thus: "(the server) rings a little bell with his right hand thrice at each elevation, or continuously until the priest lays the Host on the corporal, and in the same way again at the elevation of the chalice".² Gavanti and his editor Merati both prefer the former way and both note that the third ringing should take place, not at the final genuflexion but sooner, when the Host (or chalice) is replaced on the corporal.³

Other ringing of the bell grew later out of that at the elevation. I have not found any mediæval writer who mentions the bell at the Sanctus. *Ritus cel.* vii, 8 demands it. Gavanti says that "it is expedient (convenit)" to ring the great church bell at the Sanctus in High Mass, the handbell in Low Mass.⁴ Modern books of rubrics all demand the bell at the Sanctus (at least at Low Mass) as is now the law (*Ritus cel.* loc. cit.).⁵ These two ringings (at the Sanctus and elevation) are the only ones demanded by the rubrics. An indefinite number of others have grown up, especially in France, where they love the bell. So you may hear it as the celebrant makes the sign of the cross at the beginning, at the offertory, at the Hanc igitur, at "omnis honor et gloria," at "Domine non sum dignus". There is no authority

¹ See Rock: *op. cit.* iv, 178-183. ² *Ritus celebr. missam*, viii, 6.

³ Gavanti-Merati: *Thesaurus s. rituum*, II, viii (ed. Venice, 1762, i, p. 163). However modern books of ceremonies approve the usual custom. Le Vavas seur: *Manuel de Liturgie* (Paris, 1910) i, 370, n. 2.

⁴ Gavanti, *ib.* II, vii (i, p. 156).

⁵ Le Vavas seur, *ib.* i, 370. (He refers to *Ritus cel.* vii, 10, which says nothing about the bell); De Herdt: *S. liturgiæ praxis* (Louvain, 1894) i, 255.

for any of these ;¹ nor does a perpetual tinkling add to the dignity of Mass. Moreover at High Mass no bell at all is required, though its use is tolerated.² The singing and obvious ceremonies make the order of the service quite plain without the bell. At Rome itself there is no bell at High Mass. The rubrics of the missal also require that a third candle or torch (intorticiu) be lit at Low Mass just before the elevation on the epistle side and remain lighted till after the Communion.³ This is very rarely done, except by the Dominicans. To incense the Blessed Sacrament at the elevation⁴ is a late adornment of that ceremony. It is found first in a Dominican Ordo of the XIIIth cent.⁵ In this the deacon incenses the Blessed Sacrament continuously during the elevation. At the same time at Laon two thuribles are swung, right and left of the altar, all the time from the Sanctus till the Communion.⁶ No incensing at the elevation is provided in the Köln missal of 1626, nor at Nîmes in 1831 ; it has never been done at Lyons. It was introduced at Rome about the end of the XIVth century.⁷

There is some discussion as to what the faithful are to do at the moment of elevation. As the reason

¹ But the S. Rit. Congr. says that the bell at "Domine non sum dignus" may be tolerated where it is the custom, n. 5224, 9 (14 May, 1856). It is commonly justified as necessary so that people may know when to come for Holy Communion. But we could conceivably instruct our people sufficiently that they could follow the Mass without that. When we hear Confessions we do not ring a bell before giving absolution.

² A common custom is (or was) to ring the church bell too at the elevation at High Mass. Gavanti-Merati: *op. cit.* ii, 8 (ed. cit. vol. i, p. 165).

³ *Ritus cel. miss.* viii, 6.

⁴ *Ib.* viii, 8.

⁵ Published by Dr. J. Wickham Legg: *Tracts on the Mass* (H. Bradshaw Soc., London, 1904), p. 80.

⁶ See Martène: *de antiq. eccl. ritibus*, i, cap. iv, art. xii.

⁷ Krazer: *de apost. necnon ant. eccl. occ. liturgiis* (Augsburg, 1786), p. 509; Atchley: *A History of the use of Incense*, pp. 264-266.

of the ceremony is to show them the Blessed Sacrament it seems certainly right to look at it. This was the mediæval practice, as we have seen. Pius X has lately encouraged it by granting an indulgence to all who do so.¹ At the same time we may agree with Fr. Thurston that the other practice, of bowing low, is not wrong.²

It is true that this mediæval ceremony of the elevation has tended to become a new centre of gravity for the Mass. It is possible to exaggerate its importance. A rite unknown till the XIIth century cannot be of first importance in any liturgy. We must teach our people that the essence of the Mass is not the elevation, but consecration and communion.³

§ 6. To the end of the Canon.

Most liturgies end the words of institution by quoting our Lord's command to do this in memory of him (Lk. xxii, 19 ; 1 Cor. xi, 23)⁴ and all continue with a prayer in the form of an assurance that we do indeed remember him always. This prayer in the

¹ Decree of the Congr. Indulg. June 12, 1907.

² *Tablet*, *loc cit.* p. 686.

³ The elevation has passed from Rome to Milan and the Mozarabic Mass. At Milan the ceremony is exactly like ours, except that the celebrant repeats our Lord's command to do as he had done (in an amplified form : "Mandans quoque," *Missale Ambrosianum*, ed. 1902, p. 177) while he elevates the chalice. The Mozarabic missal says nothing about bowing or genuflecting, only : "Hic elevetur Corpus" etc. Our Lord's command is repeated at each elevation and the chalice is shown covered with the pall (*filiola*) ; P.L. lxxxv, 551-552.

⁴ Quoted in variant forms in the different rites. Our Roman text is most like the command after the chalice in 1 Cor. xi, 23, but is not exact. Apost. Const. VIII, xii, 37 (Brightman, p. 20), Antioch (*ib.* 52), Alexandria (133) and Byz. Basil (405) put the words of 1 Cor. xi, 26 with an addition ("and confess my resurrection") into our Lord's mouth. Armen. (*ib.* 437) mentions the command in the next prayer ; Byz. Chrysostom (386) alone does not quote the command at all.