Dom Prosper Guéranger

LITURGICAL INSTITUTIONS, VOLUME I

Institutions liturgiques

From the French of the second edition (Paris: Palmé, 1878)

English translation

Contributed to Mind of the Church by Riverrun (@CTrefugees on X)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

About this translation · 3

Front Matter

Contents of Volume I · 4
Briefs of Pope Pius IX in Honour of Dom Guéranger · 8
Preface to This New Edition, by Dom Alphonse Guépin · 13
Dedicatory Letter to Cardinal Lambruschini · 28
Author's Preface · 29

Part I: Liturgical History

Chapter I. Preliminary Notions · 34
Chapter II. Importance of the Study of the Liturgy · 36
Chapter III. The State of the Liturgy in the Time of the Apostles · 40
Chapter IV. The Liturgy during the First Three Centuries of the Church · 53
Chapter V. The Liturgy in the Church in General in the Fourth Century · 73
Chapter VI. The Liturgy in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries: First Attempts to Establish Unity · 92
Chapter VII. Saint Gregory the Great’s Work on the Roman Liturgy. — The Progress of This Liturgy in the West. — Liturgical Writers of the Seventh and Eighth Centuries · 109
Chapter VIII. Digression on the History of the Other Western Liturgies: Ambrosian, African, Gallican, Gothic or Mozarabic, British, and Monastic · 123
Chapter IX. Another Digression on the History of the Eastern Liturgies: Apostolic; Greek Melkite; Coptic, Ethiopian, Syrian, and Armenian, for the Monophysite Sect; United Coptic, Syrian, and Armenian; Maronite; and Chaldean, for the Nestorian Sect · 136
Chapter X. Abolition of the Gallican Liturgy. Introduction of the Roman Church’s Liturgy and Chant into France. First Origins of the Romano-French Liturgy. Changes Introduced into the Chant. Liturgical Writers of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries · 144
Chapter XII. Revision of the Roman Office by the Franciscans. — Breviary of the Dominicans, the Carmelites, etc. — Office of the Blessed Sacrament. — Character of Ecclesiastical Chant in the Thirteenth Century. — Liturgical Writers of This Period · 188
Chapter XIII. Decline of the Liturgy and Chant during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Need for Reform. — Leo X. Clement VII. Paul III. — Ferreri and Quignonez. — Burchard and Paris de Grassi. — Liturgical Writers of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries · 200
Chapter XIV. On Antiliturgical Heresy and the Protestant Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, Considered in Its Relation to the Liturgy · 221
Chapter XVI. Liturgy in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century. Zeal of the French Episcopate for the Roman Liturgy. Reaction of the Secular Power. — The Roman Pontiffs’ Work on the Liturgy. Paul V. Roman Ritual. Roman Breviary. Monastic Breviary. — Urban VIII. Correction of the Hymns. — Liturgical Authors of This Period · 272

About this translation

Translated from Dom Prosper Guéranger, *Institutions liturgiques*, second edition, volume I (Paris and Brussels: Société générale de librairie catholique, Victor Palmé, 1878). The first edition appeared in 1840–1851; this second edition was published after the author's death by Dom Alphonse Guépin, monk of Solesmes, whose preface it carries, together with the three briefs of Pius IX in Dom Guéranger's honour and the author's own dedication and preface. This volume contains the first sixteen chapters of the first part, the history of the Liturgy from the Apostles to the end of the sixteenth century, each chapter followed by its documentary notes.

The pages of the 1878 edition are given in the text as (p. N) where each begins. The marginal summaries of the edition are given as [margin: …] beside the paragraph they accompany, and the author's footnotes as footnotes. The briefs of Pius IX are printed in the edition in Latin with a French version facing; here the English is given first and the Latin after it.

The documents printed after the chapters (bulls and briefs of the popes, the Fathers, liturgical texts) are in Latin in the edition. They are given in English where the translator has rendered them, and otherwise in the Latin of the edition; so it is with the bulls of Saint Pius V in the notes to chapter XV, which are translated only in their closing paragraphs.

Front Matter

Contents of Volume I

Briefs of Our Holy Father the Pope — p. VII

Preface to This New Edition — p. XXV

Dedicatory Letter — p. LXVII

Author's Preface — p. LXIX

Chapter One

Preliminary Concepts — p. 1

Chapter II

Importance of Studying the Liturgy — p. 6

Chapter III

State of the Liturgy in the Apostles' Time — p. 16

Notes to Chapter III

A. Passage from Tertullian, de Corona militis, ch. III, enumerating many rites of apostolic institution. — p. 40

B. Similar testimony from Saint Basil, de Spiritu Sancto, ch. XXVII. — p. 40

C. Rites common to all Liturgies and not of the essence of the sacrifice are of apostolic institution. Bona, Rerum liturgicar., book I, ch. VI. — p. 41

D. The Apostles must have used different Liturgies according to their locations. Lesleus, in Missale Mozar. præf., no. 161, note. — p. 41

E. Saint Luke's description of an assembly of the faithful. Acts XX, 7–11. F. The sacrifice of the Mass in apostolic times, according to Saint Proclus of Constantinople, de Traditione divinæ liturgiæ. — p. 42

G. Various forms of liturgical prayer, according to Saint Augustine, Epist. CXLIX, ad Paulinum. — p. 42

Chapter IV

The Liturgy during the Church's First Three Centuries — p. 43

Notes to Chapter IV

A and B. Reasons determining the choice of canonical hours of prayer, set out in the Constitutions apostoliques, book VIII, ch. XXXIV, and Saint Cyprian's de Oratione dominica. — p. 76

C and D. Saint Justin's description of Christian assemblies, Apologia, nos. 67 and 65. — p. 77

E. Prayers of the martyrs taken from their Acts. — p. 78

F. Clement of Alexandria's hymn to the Savior. — p. 79

G. Tertullian dissuades Christian women from marrying pagans, because such unions would make it difficult to practice their religion's liturgical and external observances. Ad Uxorem, book II, chs. III, IV, V, VI. — p. 80

H. Passage from Saint Cyprian's de Oratione dominica, misused by seventeenth- and eighteenth-century innovators to establish their theory of the exclusive use of Holy Scripture in the Liturgy. — p. 80

Chapter V

The Liturgy in the Church Generally in the Fourth Century — p. 82

Notes to Chapter V

A. Eusebius's description of the basilica of Tyre, Hist. eccles., book X, ch. IV. — p. 113

B. His description of the basilica of the Holy Sepulcher, Vita Constantini, book III, chs. XXXIV–XXXIX. — p. 115

C. Constantine's gifts to the Lateran basilica, according to the Liber pontificalis. — p. 116

D. Furnishings Saint Sylvester gave the Titulus Equitii, which he had built. Liber pontificalis. — p. 117

E. Antiphonal chant introduced in the Church of Constantinople by Saint John Chrysostom to draw the faithful away from Arian assemblies. Sozomen, Hist. eccles., book VIII, ch. VIII. — p. 117

F. Saint Augustine describes this antiphonal chant's effect on his soul when Saint Ambrose instituted it at Milan. Confession, book IX, chs. VI and VII. — p. 118

G. Prudentius's hymn describing the feast of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul at Rome. — p. 118

Chapter VI

The Liturgy during the Fifth and Sixth Centuries. First Attempts to Establish Unity. — p. 121

Notes to Chapter VI

A. Liturgical prayer formulas incontrovertibly attest the Church's faith. Saint Celestine, Epist. XXI, and Saint Augustine, Epist. CCXVII, ad Vitalem. — p. 152

B. Canon of the Fourth Council of Toledo decreeing liturgical unity for all Spain and the part of Gaul subject to Visigothic rule. — p. 152

C. Letter of Pope Saint Innocent I to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, demanding conformity to Rome's liturgical usages by virtue of the patriarchal right of Peter's see over all those of the West. — p. 152

D. Pope Saint Gelasius's decree on reading the Acts of the martyrs during the Divine Office. — p. 153

Chapter VII

Saint Gregory the Great's Work on the Roman Liturgy, 154. — Its Spread in the West, 166. — Liturgical Authors of the Seventh and Eighth Centuries, 174.

Note to Chapter VII

Saint Gregory's letter to John, bishop of Syracuse, answering those who accuse the holy Pope of sacrificing the Roman Church's ancient customs to those of the Church of Constantinople. — p. 182

Chapter VIII

Digression on the History of the Other Western Liturgies: Ambrosian, 184; African, 192; Gallican, 193; Gothic and Mozarabic, 195; British, 205; and Monastic, 206.

Notes to Chapter VIII

A. Saint Charles Borromeo's letter protesting the pope's permission for the governor of Milan to have Mass celebrated before him according to the Roman rite. — p. 210

B. Poem by Saint Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, describing a feast in the church of Paris under Bishop Saint Germanus. — p. 211

C. Canon of the Fourth Council of Toledo decreeing that hymns must be retained in the Divine Office. — p. 212

Chapter IX

Another Digression: the History of Eastern Liturgies. Melkite Greek, 214; Coptic, Ethiopian, Syrian, Armenian, for the Monophysite Sect, 219; United Coptic, Syrian, Armenian, 221; Maronite, 221; and Chaldean, for the Nestorian Sect, 222.

Chapter X

Abolition of the Gallican Liturgy. Introduction of the Roman Church's Liturgy and Chant into France, 232. — First Origins of the Romano-French Liturgy, 244. — Changes Introduced into Chant, 248. — Liturgical Authors of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, 255.

Notes to Chapter X

A and B. Passage from the Livres carolins attesting that Pepin replaced the Gallican Liturgy with the Roman in his dominions, and Charlemagne completed his work. — p. 264

C. John the Deacon's invectives against Frankish and German cantors, Vita S. Gregor., book II, ch. VII. — p. 264

D. The monk of Angoulême's account of Charlemagne's efforts to restore Gregorian purity to ecclesiastical chant. — p. 265

E. Pope Adrian II as inventor of Tropes, according to a continuator of the Liber pontificalis. — p. 266

F. Charles the Bald's letter to the clergy of Ravenna, declaring that the Roman Liturgy must be followed in preference to every other. — p. 266

Chapter XI

Abolition of the Gothic or Mozarabic Rite in Spain, 268. — Saint Gregory VII's Liturgical Work, 281. — Formation of the Romano-French Rite, 284. — Progress of Ecclesiastical Chant, 291. —Liturgical Authors of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries, 294.

Notes to Chapter XI

A. Saint Gregory VII's letter to Alfonso VI, king of Castile, and Sancho IV, king of Navarre, requesting that the Roman Liturgy replace that of Toledo. — p. 315

B. Saint Gregory VII's letter to Bishop Simeon on the same subject. — p. 315

C. The historian Rodrigo's account of the ordeals by combat and fire to which the Roman and Mozarabic Liturgies were subjected. — p. 316

D. Saint Gregory VII's decree on reading Holy Scripture. — p. 317

E. Saint Bernard's letter to Guy, abbot of Montier-Ramey, on liturgical composition. — p. 318

Chapter XII

Revision of the Roman Office by the Franciscans, 320. — Breviary of the Dominicans, Carmelites, etc., 325. — Spread of the Romano-French Liturgy, 327. — Office of the Blessed Sacrament, 332. — Character of Ecclesiastical Chant in the Thirteenth Century, 335. — Liturgical Authors of This Period, 338.

Chapter XIII

Alteration of the Liturgy and Chant during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Need for Reform, 345. — Leo X. Clement VII. Paul III. Ferreri's Hymnal and Quignonez's Breviary, 353. —Burchard and Paris de

Grassi, 370. — Liturgical Authors of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries, 374.

Notes to Chapter XIII

A. John XXII's bull Docta sanctorum against innovations in ecclesiastical chant. — p. 380

B. Dedicatory letter to Pope Paul III, placed by Quignonez at the head of his Breviary as its preface. — p. 381

C. Censure of Quignonez's Breviary by the Paris Faculty of Theology. — p. 385

D. New letter to Pope Paul III, serving as preface to the second edition of Quignonez's Breviary. — p. 386

Chapter XIV

Antiliturgical Heresy and the Sixteenth-Century Protestant Reformation, Considered in Its Relations with the Liturgy, 388.

Chapter XV

Catholic Reform of the Liturgy, 408. — Work of Paul IV, Pius IV, and the Council of Trent, 409. — Saint Pius V. Roman Breviary. Roman Missal, 414. — Introduction of the Reformed Liturgy into Italy, Spain, France, and the Rest of the West, 426. — Reform of Church Music. Palestrina and Pope Marcellus II's Mass, 455. — Gregory XIII. Calendar Reform. Roman Martyrology, 461. — Sixtus V. Establishment of the Congregation of Rites, 464. — Clement VIII. Roman Pontifical. Ceremonial of Bishops, 466. — Sixteenth-Century Liturgical Authors, 471.

Notes to Chapter XV

A. Saint Pius V's bull Quod a nobis publishing the Roman Breviary. — p. 484

B. Saint Pius V's bull Quo primum tempore publishing the Roman Missal. — p. 487

C. Letter of the Paris Faculty of Theology to the Chapter of Soissons, censuring the Breviary newly printed for that church, July 24, 1529. — p. 490

D. Censure of the Orléans Breviary by the same Faculty, March 1, 1548. — p. 490

E. Deliberation of the Chapter of Paris to retain that church's particular Liturgy, May 2, 1583. — p. 491

F. Consultation by several doctors of the Paris Faculty of Theology on the proposal to replace the Parisian rite with the reformed Roman Liturgy. — p. 492

G. Extract from Sixtus V's bull Immensa establishing the Congregation of Rites. — p. 495

H. Extract from Clement VIII's brief Cum in Ecclesia prescribing future precautions to ensure the correctness of new editions of the Roman Breviary. — p. 496

Chapter XVI

The Liturgy during the First Half of the Seventeenth Century. — The French Episcopate's Zeal for the Roman Liturgy, 498. — Reaction of the Secular Power, 499. — The Roman Pontiffs' Liturgical Work. Paul V Publishes the Roman Ritual, 507, and the Monastic Breviary, 511. — Urban VIII. Correction of the Hymns. Revision of the Breviary and Missal, 515. — Establishment of New Feasts, 519. — Liturgical Authors of This Period, 521.

Notes to Chapter XVI

A. Paul V's brief Apostolicæ sedi publishing the Roman Ritual. — p. 532

B. Paul V's brief Ex injuncto nobis publishing the Monastic Breviary. — p. 533

C. Urban VIII’s brief Divinam psalmodiam publishing the edition of the Roman Breviary revised under his care. — p. 534

Briefs of Pope Pius IX in Honour of Dom Guéranger

I

(p. IX)

Pius IX, Pope

For Future Remembrance

Among the churchmen produced by this age of ours, most distinguished for religion, learning, and zeal and diligence in advancing the Catholic cause, our beloved son Prosper Guéranger, Abbot of Saint Peter’s, Solesmes, and superior general of the Benedictine Congregation in France, must rightly be numbered.

Abundantly gifted with talent, and renowned for outstanding erudition and knowledge of the canonical disciplines, he always directed his mind throughout his long life to defending most vigorously, in weighty published writings, the doctrine of the Catholic Church and the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff, to breaking his adversaries’ efforts and refuting their errors. Nor did this same beloved son Prosper fail in the duty of a Catholic writer when, amid the Christian people’s applause, We confirmed by solemn decree the heavenly distinction of the Immaculate Conception of the holy Mother of God; nor, most recently, when, with the approval of a very numerous assembly of bishops from the entire Catholic world, We defined the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff teaching ex cathedra. Rather, by publishing works filled with faith and sacred learning, he gave fresh testimony to his outstanding talent and unwavering devotion to the Chair of Blessed Peter.

(p. XI) But what above all occupied all his care and thought was that the Roman Liturgy should return to France, as though restored to its former rights. In this undertaking he acted so effectively that, above all others, it is to his writings, as well as to his constancy and singular diligence, that the adoption of the Roman Church’s rites by all the dioceses of France before his death must be credited.

This life, spent almost wholly in promoting the good of the Catholic cause, adds a new splendor to the Benedictine Congregation established in France, already illustrious on other grounds, and thus calls, as it were, for a fresh proof of Our goodwill. Our predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, have left Us very many examples to imitate: they have always assigned particular honors and offices to members of certain religious communities so that these might thereby take greater courage in practicing religion, attaining distinction in learning, and exercising the Christian virtues.

Accordingly, absolving each and all whom these letters favor, solely for this purpose, from any sentences of excommunication or interdict and from other ecclesiastical sentences, censures, and penalties imposed in any manner or for any cause, should they have incurred any, and deeming them absolved, of Our own motion, with certain knowledge and mature deliberation, and from the fullness of Our apostolic power, We will and decree that henceforth, for all future time, the Abbot of Saint Peter’s, Solesmes, for the time being, shall enjoy the use of the cappa magna, with all requisite provisions *(p. XIII)* observed. Moreover, whenever the place becomes vacant, a seat among the consultors of the Congregation of Our venerable brothers, the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church charged with sacred rites, shall be granted and assigned to one of the monks of the Order of Saint Benedict of the Cassinese Congregation; or, if it has already been granted and assigned by this Holy Apostolic See, it shall be confirmed.

These things We will, command, and proclaim, decreeing that these Our letters are and shall always remain firm, valid, and effective; that they shall attain and obtain their full and entire effects, and afford the fullest

benefit to those whom they concern or shall at any time concern; that all judges, ordinary and delegated, including the auditors of causes of the Apostolic Palace, must judge and decide the foregoing accordingly; and that whatever may be attempted otherwise in these matters by anyone, under any authority, knowingly or unknowingly, shall be null and void. Notwithstanding apostolic constitutions and enactments and, insofar as necessary, the statutes and customs of the said Congregation, even if strengthened by oath, apostolic confirmation, or any other guarantee, and all other provisions to the contrary whatsoever.

Given at Rome, at Saint Peter's, under the Fisherman's Ring, on March XIX, MDCCCLXXV, in year XXIX of Our pontificate.

F. Card. Asquini.

The Latin text

(p. VIII)

Pius PP. IX

Ad Futuram Rei Memoriam

Ecclesiasticis viris, quos nostra hæc tulit ætas, religione, doctrina, et Catholicæ rei provehendæ studio atque industria maxime insignes, optimo quidem jure adscribendus est dilectus filius Prosper Gueranger, Abbas ad S. Petri Solesmensis, ac summus in Gallia Magister Congregationis Benedictinæ.

Hic, cum abundaret ingenio, excellentisque eruditionis, atque in canonicis disciplinis scientiæ laude, ad id, per longæ suæ vitæ cursum, semper intendit animum, ut gravissimis editis scriptis, pro Catholicæ Ecclesiæ doctrina, et Romani Pontificis prærogativis strenuissime propugnaret, adversariorum frangeret conatus, erroresque refutaret. Neque vero, quum Nos, plaudente Christiano Populo, Sanctæ Dei Genitrici cæleste Immaculatæ Conceptionis præconium solemni Decreto confirmavimus; neque novissime, quum Romani Pontificis ex Cathedra docentis Infallibilitatem, frequentissimo universi Catholici Orbis Antistitum Consessu approbante, sanximus, idem dilectus filius Prosper catholici scriptoris officio defuit; imo vulgatis operibus fidei, sacræque scientiæ plenissimis, novum dedit præstantis ingenii sui, immotæque erga Beatissimi Petri Cathedram observantiæ testimonium. Sed in quo ipse curas omnes cogitationesque collocavit, potissimum illud fuit, ut Romana Liturgia *(p. X)* in Galliam, veluti postliminio, remearet. Quam quidem in re ita se gessit, ut ejus scriptis, nec non constantiæ, atque industriæ singulari præ cæteris acceptum referri debeat, si antequam ipse ex hac vita migravit, cunctæ Galliæ Diœceses Romanæ Ecclesiæ ritus amplexæ sunt.

Hæc in Catholici nominis procurando bono tota fere vita transacta, veluti in novum splendorem redundat, Congregationis Benedictinæ in Gallia consistentis, satis quidem aliis nominibus claræ, ita novum a Nobis quodammodo postulat propensæ animi voluntatis documentum. Cum igitur a Romanis Pontificibus Prædecessoribus Nostris quam plurima prodierint exempla Nobis ad imitandum relicta, quibus illi certos honores ac munera nonnullorum Religiosorum cœtum Alumnis ita semper addixerunt, ut illi majores inde spiritus sumerent ad Religionem colendam, sapientiæ laudem potiundam, Christianasque virtutes exercendas, hinc est quod Nos, singulos ac universos quibus Nostræ hæ litteræ favent, ab quibusvis excommunicationis et interdicti, aliisque ecclesiasticis sententiis, censuris et pœnis quovis modo vel quavis de causa latis, si quas forte incurrerint, hujus tantum rei gratia absolventes ac absolutos fore censentes, Motu proprio, certa scientia, et matura deliberatione, deque Apostolicæ potestatis Nostræ plenitudine, volumus ac decernimus ut deinceps, perpetuis futuris temporibus, Abbas ad S. Petri Solesmensis pro tempore existens Cappæ Magnæ, servatis servandis, usu fruatur; utque locus inter Consultores Congregationis Venerabilium Fratrum Nostrorum S. R. E. Cardinalium Sacris Ritibus præ- *(p. XII)* positæ, succedente illius pro tempore vacatione, uni ex Monachis Ordinis S. Benedicti Congregationis Cassinensis concedi atque adsignari debeat, vel si alias ab hac S. Sede Apostolica concessus adsignatusque fuerit, confirmetur.

Hæc volumus, mandamus, edicimus, decernentes præsentes Nostras Litteras semper firmas, validas, et efficaces existere et fore, suosque plenarios et integros effectus sortiri atque obtinere illisque, ad quos spectat, ac pro tempore quandocumque spectaverit, plenissime suffragari, sicque in præmissis per quoscumque Judices ordinarios et delegatos etiam causarum Palatii Apostolici Auditores judicari et definiri debere, ac irritum et inane, si secus super his a quoquam quavis auctoritate scienter vel ignoranter contigerit attentari. Non obstantibus Constitutionibus et Sanctionibus Apostolicis, et quatenus opus sit, dictæ Congregationis etiam juramento, confirmatione Apostolica, vel quavis firmitate alia roboratis Statutis et consuetudinibus, cæterisque contrariis quibuscumque.

Datum Romæ, apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XIX Martii MDCCCLXXV, Pontificatus Nostri anno XXIX.

F. Card. Asquinius.

II

(p. XV)

To Our Venerable Brother Louis-Édouard, Bishop of Poitiers

Pius IX, Pope

Venerable Brother, greetings and apostolic blessing.

It was indeed fitting that the funeral tribute of praise to Prosper Guéranger, that most illustrious ornament of the family of Saint Benedict, should be paid by a man who, an excellent judge of virtue and learning and closely acquainted with him, could both set forth the deceased’s deeds and reveal his mind.

We rejoice, Venerable Brother, that you have performed this duty of friendship in such a way as to show in his whole life a most suitable instrument prepared for France by divine providence, both to restore the religious orders that had been destroyed and to display their very great usefulness. For you have clearly shown that he accomplished both: by reviving and spreading monastic life and discipline in France; by urging uniformity of rites with the Roman Church, disrupted through the fault of the times; by defending and illustrating the rights and privileges of this Apostolic See; and finally by refuting all errors, especially the opinions vaunted as the glory of our times. Thus that agreement of views among sincere Catholics, and that common reverence and truly filial love by which France is united to Us, may *(p. XVII)* not unreasonably seem attributable in large measure to his labors, influence, and learning. 1

Moreover, since these achievements have wonderfully fostered or strengthened harmony of minds, which necessarily also brings the greatest benefit to civil society, they secure for the deceased the praise of a true disciple of Benedict, who, in devoting himself wholly to God and the Church, made himself and his sons so great a benefit to civil society.

We hope that God has already bestowed on him an abundant reward for his works. As for you, We are confident that your labor will not be fruitless: both because it is fitting that the deeds of the devout be made known to encourage others, and because the praise merited by the deceased for declaring war on recent errors adds a certain fresh force to the vigorous attack made against these same errors throughout your outstanding pastoral letters. 2

Receive, Venerable Brother, the apostolic blessing, which We most lovingly impart to you and your entire diocese as a pledge of divine favor and a testimony of Our special goodwill.

Given at Rome, at Saint Peter’s, on March 29, 1875, in the twenty-ninth year of Our pontificate.

Pius IX, Pope.

The Latin text

(p. XIV)

Venerabili Fratri Nostro Ludovico Eduardo, Episcopo Pictaviensi

Pius PP. IX

Venerabilis Frater, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem. Decebat profecto funebria laudis officia clarissimo Familiæ Sancti Benedicti ornamento Prospero Gueranger a Viro persolvi, qui optimus virtutum et scientiæ judex, illique familiarissimus, gesta simul et mentem defuncti valeret exponere ac revelare.

Gaudemus autem, Venerabilis Frater, te sic istud obiisse munus amicitiæ, ut in tota ejus vita demonstraveris aptissimum instrumentum a divina providentia paratum Galliæ, cum ad restituendos Regulares Ordines deletos, tum ad amplissimam eorum utilitatem oculis subjiciendam. Luculenter enim ostendisti, ipsum assecutum utrumque fuisse, sive excitando rursum et propagando in Gallia monasticum institutum et disciplinam; sive suadendo rituum uniformitatem, vitio temporum distractam, cum Romana Ecclesia; sive propugnando et illustrando Sedis hujus Apostolicæ jura et privilegia; sive demum configendo errores omnes, ac præsertim jactatas uti nostrorum temporum ornamentum opiniones: ita ut illa sententiarum inter sinceros catholicos concordia, et communis illa observantia et dilectio vere filialis, qua Gallia Nobis conjungitur, ejus operositati, gratiæ, scientiæ magna ex parte non immerito tribuenda videatur.

(p. XVI) Hæc porro cum mirifice consensum foverint aut confirmaverint animorum, qui necessario vertitur in summum quoque civilis consortii beneficium, defuncto elogium asserunt veri Benedicti discipuli, qui dum se totum Deo et Ecclesiæ devovit, tanto se filiosque suos emolumento præbuit civili societati.

Copiosam operum suorum mercedem ipsi jam a Deo collatam esse speramus; tibi vero sterilem non futurum confidimus laborem tuum: tum quod piorum gesta vulgari in aliorum incitamentum expediat, tum etiam quod promeritæ a defuncto laudes ob indictum recentibus erroribus bellum, novam quamdam vim adjiciant oppugnationi illi strenuæ, quam eximiæ tuæ litteræ pastorales iisdem passim objiciunt.

Excipe, Venerabilis Frater, Apostolicam Benedictionem, quam divini favoris auspicem, et præcipuæ Nostræ benevolentiæ testem tibi tuæque Diœcesi universæ peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romæ, apud S. Petrum, die 29 Martii, anno 1875, Pontificatus Nostri anno vicesimo nono.

Pius PP. IX.

III

(p. XIX)

To Our Venerable Brother Charles-Émile, Bishop of Angers

Pius IX, Pope

Venerable Brother, greetings and apostolic blessing.

This saying of the Apostle, Venerable Brother, “piety is valuable in every respect, since it holds a promise of life both for the present and for the future,” could perhaps not have asked for a more eloquent or more lucid commentary than your discourse on the monastic order. 1 For if the monk is a MAN OF GOD, as you clearly showed, and therefore a MAN OF THE CHURCH, and especially of that CHAIR established by God to govern her and to be for all the teacher of truth and center of unity, it certainly follows that the monk displays in his own person a man wholly devoted to God and his neighbors, living for them rather than for himself.

Reason readily understands what is to be expected from an association of such men; and the consistent witness of history throughout the ages teaches, with a voice more powerful than all arguments, how through them the Christian religion was spread, and with its aid barbarian peoples were brought into civil order,

manners tamed, laws enacted, letters and sciences spread, the arts refined, agriculture advanced, and mutual ties *(p. XXI)* of friendship and commerce forged between peoples, and innumerable benefits secured for humanity.

The recurring anniversary of the death of the most devout and illustrious Abbot Prosper Guéranger, who by virtue, piety, zeal, learning, and tireless labor had shown himself a true disciple of Benedict, that is, an outstanding monk, furnished you a ready occasion to discuss these matters.

But nothing could have been more timely or better suited also to the present circumstances, in which piety is not only mocked but hated and reviled, while monks everywhere are harassed, persecuted, and dispersed as enemies of learning, the arts, and civil society, or at least as useless. Indeed, the very light of the sun is offered in vain to those who stubbornly keep their eyes closed. Yet there are also upright men who, misled by perverse doctrines, [hate what they do not know] 2 and blaspheme what they are ignorant of.

We pray that your excellent address may benefit at least these men; and meanwhile, as a pledge of divine favor and a testimony of Our special goodwill, We most lovingly impart the apostolic blessing to you, Venerable Brother, and to your whole diocese.

Given at Rome, at Saint Peter's, on April 10, 1876, in the thirtieth year of Our pontificate.

Pius IX, Pope.

The Latin text

(p. XVIII)

Venerabili Fratri Carolo-Æmilio Episcopo Andegavensi

Pius PP. IX

Venerabilis Frater, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem. Illa Apostoli sententia, Venerabilis Frater, pietas ad omnia utilis est; promissionem habens vitæ, quæ nunc est et futuræ, nec facundius fortasse, nec luculentius commentarium desiderare potuisset sermone illo tuo de Ordine monastico. Nam si monachus est HOMO DEI uti perspicue ostendisti, ac idcirco HOMO ECCLESIÆ illiusque præsertim CATHEDRÆ a Deo positæ ad ipsam regendam, ac ut sit omnibus veritatis magistra et centrum unitatis; profecto sequitur, monachum in se præferre virum Deo proximisque plane devotum, ipsisque potius quam sibi viventem. Quid vero expectandum sit ab hominum hujusmodi consociatione ratio facile assequitur, et constans sæculorum historia, voce argumentis omnibus potiore, docet, quomodo per ipsos diffusa fuerit christiana religio, et ejus ope barbaræ gentes ad civilem ordinem compositæ, cicurati mores, leges latæ, propagatæ litteræ ac scientiæ, artes excultæ, agricultura provecta, mutuæ populorum amicitiæ et commercia conciliata, ac innumera parta hominibus beneficia. Pronam quidem tibi de hisce disserendi occasionem suppeditavit recurrens anniversaria dies obitus piissimi et clarissimi Abbatis Prosperi Guéranger, qui virtute, pietate, zelo, scientia, operositate verum se Benedicti discipulum seu monachum eximium exhibuerat; sed nihil contingere poterat opportunius et accommodatius præsentibus quoque rerum adjunctis, in *(p. XX)* quibus pietas non solum irridetur, sed odio habetur et proscinditur; monachi vero passim, uti scientiæ, artibus, civili consortio infensi, aut saltem inutiles, infestantur, divexantur, disjiciuntur. Equidem lux ipsa solis frustra illis objicitur, qui clausos ipsi oculos obfirmant; verum et honesti non desunt qui, perversis decepti doctrinis, oderunt non quod non norunt, et blasphemant quod ignorant. Istis saltem proficuam adprecamur egregiam orationem tuam, ac interim divini favoris auspicem et præcipuæ Nostræ benevolentiæ testem tibi, Venerabilis Frater, totique diœcesi tuæ Benedictionem apostolicam peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romæ, apud S. Petrum, die 10 aprilis, anno 1876, Pontificatus Nostri anno tricesimo.

Pius PP. IX.

Preface to This New Edition, by Dom Alphonse Guépin

(p. XXV)

[margin: Need for a new edition of Dom Guéranger's works.]

Since the death of the venerable Father Dom Guéranger, Abbot of Solesmes, urgent and repeated requests have continually been heard for a new and complete edition of his works. The praises bestowed by our Most Holy Father Pope Pius IX on the valiant champion of pontifical infallibility and the Roman Liturgy have given him a place apart among the ecclesiastical writers of our time. In extolling "his powerful genius, his marvelous erudition, his unwavering devotion to the Chair of Peter," and enumerating with a supreme judge's discernment the immense results obtained "by his writings filled with faith, authority, and learning," Pius IX has declared, one may say, that the learned abbot's work henceforth forms part of the Catholic family's common inheritance. Filial piety alone, then, no longer imposes on the monks of Solesmes the duty of publishing their father's works anew and in their entirety: it is a debt the Church calls on them to discharge, and which they are eager to pay as promptly as possible.

[margin: Writings collected in these four volumes.]

The Liturgical Year and the Life of Saint Cecilia, the venerable abbot's two most cherished works, have already been published, as has the Essay on the Medal of Saint Benedict; *(p. XXVI)* today we announce four volumes containing the Liturgical Institutions, the Letter on Liturgical Law, and the two Defenses of the Liturgical Institutions: in a word, the whole of Dom Guéranger's polemical writings on the Liturgy. We no longer need to explain their importance, since the Sovereign Pontiff has deigned to say of our father: "The principal object of his labors and thoughts was to restore the Roman Liturgy to its former rights. He conducted this enterprise so well that it is to his writings, together with his constancy and singular skill, more than to any other influence, that we owe the sight of all the dioceses of France embracing the rites of the Roman Church before his death[1]."

After these apostolic words, any praise of the works we offer to the public anew is certainly superfluous. But without anticipating a biography whose composition has already begun, it is necessary to recall briefly for the reader the chief circumstances that marked the appearance of these writings. This short account is indispensable to a full understanding of them.

[margin: Liturgical anarchy in France before Dom Guéranger.]

Having enjoyed the benefit of Roman unity for many years now, the younger generation of clergy cannot itself form an idea of the liturgical anarchy from which Dom Guéranger rescued our country. Twenty different breviaries and twenty different missals were in use in our churches, dividing France among them in the most capricious fashion; two neighboring dioceses rarely had the same liturgy, and one often found two or *(p. XXVII)* three, sometimes even as many as five, in the same diocese[2]. Usually unaware of the suspect origins of most of these breviaries and missals, the clergy readily regarded them as venerable monuments of antiquity, provided they had not seen them being manufactured before their eyes. In each diocese a naive admiration was professed for the local liturgy, equaled only by the supreme disdain with which the Roman Breviary and Missal were treated. By a strange contradiction, these much-praised works were continually revised to attain a greater perfection, the very model of which varied according to the taste of the composers fashionable in each region. In the eighteenth century, the compilers of the new breviaries, too often suspect in doctrine, were at least men versed in the learning of Scripture and tradition; the same could no longer be said of the nineteenth-century makers, and students in rhetoric classes stood in for Santeuil and Coffin as hymn writers. This anarchy and these perpetual variations had caused the clergy to lose their traditional sense, and the faithful their love and understanding of the Church's offices. The sacraments and all holy things were exposed to a thousand profanations through the absence of fixed and sufficiently authorized rules. The duty of public prayer was neglected, and faith itself suffered from these disorders for which there was no remedy.

[margin: Dom Guéranger, a born liturgist.]

Chosen by divine Providence to halt the course *(p. XXVIII)* of these lamentable abuses, Dom Guéranger was born a liturgist. From his earliest childhood he passionately loved the Church's offices, following them with an attention unusual for his age; and on returning to his father's house, his greatest pleasure was to imitate the ceremonies he had witnessed. This innate taste—or rather, this grace received in holy Baptism—gradually developed along with Prosper Guéranger's understanding and education. As a schoolboy he knew by heart all the chants performed in his parish of Sablé, and already felt that divine poetry of the Liturgy whose almost unknown secret he was to reveal to our century. In the upper classes of the royal college at Angers, he preserved his childhood tastes and concerns amid the precocious skepticism and corruption of all too many of his contemporaries, strengthening by increasingly serious study the mysterious gift heaven had bestowed on him.

[margin: Dom Guéranger admires the Gallican liturgies in his early clerical years.]

On completing his rhetoric class, when he entered the seminary at Le Mans, the young Guéranger was already a thoroughly formed cleric, combining an already astonishing ecclesiastical erudition with a taste for manly piety, nourished by Holy Scripture and drawn from the Church's offices.

At that time, however, the young student for the sanctuary shared all his contemporaries' prejudices: he sincerely admired the liturgies prevailing in France and, on others' authority, despised that of Rome, which he did not know. Great was his joy when, through the subdiaconate, he found himself called to pay daily, in the Church's name, the tribute of the canonical Office to the divine Majesty; and *(p. XXIX)* he recited with lively faith his Le Mans Breviary of Bishop de Froullay and Doctor Robinet, without the slightest suspicion that he would one day denounce this book and others like it as radically incapable of fulfilling their purpose.

Father Guéranger was already a priest when Providence placed the Roman Missal in his hands for the celebration of the holy Sacrifice. The study of ecclesiastical history and the Fathers had given him a taste for antiquity and a feeling for the language of the early Church. How astonished he was to hear in the Roman Missal the same accents that delighted his ears in the monuments of Christianity's earliest ages!

[margin: In his first year as a priest,]

[margin: he comes to know the Roman Liturgy and adopts its use.]

He immediately savored "the captivating unction, the ineffable melancholy, the incommunicable tenderness of these formulas, some so simple, others so solemn, in which there appears now the sweet and tender confidence of a royal bride toward the monarch who has chosen and crowned her, now the eager solicitude of a mother's heart alarmed for her beloved children; but always that knowledge of the things of another life, so profound and so distinct, whether she confesses the truth or desires to taste its fruits, that no feeling can be compared with hers, no language set beside her language[3]." The young priest had heard the Church's true prayer, which he had not yet known. As this perception became clearer and more perfect, he perceived at the same time "the provincial flavor and the odor of novelty" of those Gallican liturgies he had hitherto admired without reserve. They offered him *(p. XXX)* only the thought and prayer of private persons, without a mission to speak and intercede in the Church's name. With the clarity of mind and forthright resolve that were to accompany him throughout his career, Father Guéranger immediately decided to adopt the Roman Liturgy for his personal use. Yet he would not carry out this weighty design without the consent of Bishop de la Myre of Le Mans, whose private secretary he was. The venerable prelate had formerly visited Rome, Italy, and Germany; and although imbued with the doctrines of the old Sorbonne, he had seen too much and was too much the great nobleman to share the narrow prejudices of the latter-day Gallicans. He readily granted the priest the permission he requested. Prevented by his infirmities from enjoying the honor of ascending the altar, the old bishop attended each morning the Mass his secretary celebrated in his chapel according to the Roman rite. This was in 1828.

[margin: Considerations on the Liturgy published in the Mémorial catholique.]

Two years later, Father Guéranger began his writing career in the Mémorial catholique, a review whose guiding inspiration was M. de Lamennais and whose principal writers were MM. de Salinis and Gerbet; its influence on France's return to Roman doctrines was considerable. The new contributor supplied this periodical with four articles entitled Considerations on the Liturgy. He sought to express in them the respect and affection he felt for the Roman Liturgy, and established the necessity for the Liturgy to be ancient, universal, authorized, and pious. These principles led directly to the overthrow *(p. XXXI)* of French breviaries and missals. But the author did not draw the conclusions from them or directly attack an abuse he believed too deeply rooted to be destroyed. His chief aim was to discredit the Gallican school once more by showing that its false doctrines and its audacity toward apostolic authority had brought it, on this ground as on so many others, within two steps of heresy, and had so blinded it that it had shut itself off from the principal source of tradition and deprived itself of orthodoxy's surest weapons and the most powerful means of acting upon souls.

[margin: First dispute between Dom Guéranger and M. Picot over these articles.]

This first attack was only a skirmish, but it sufficed to alert the enemy. Gallicanism's official organ at the time was L'Ami de la Religion: its editor in chief, Picot, took alarm and tried to refute Father Guéranger. The latter replied with youth's somewhat daring verve; and Picot, sensing the inadequacy of his own wit and erudition, retreated before the man he already called "a formidable adversary." What cries of despair the Gallican journalist would have raised had he been able to foresee that this young beginner was to deal the deathblow not only to the French liturgies but also to the French doctrines of the eighteenth century, the object of his senile admiration! This quarrel passed unnoticed amid the heated controversies of the moment. The Ultramontanes, absorbed in the philosophical and social questions raised by M. de Lamennais—even the directors of the Mémorial catholique, always armed to defend against the Gallicans the very foundations of the Church's constitution—could scarcely grasp the significance of a question so *(p. XXXII)* apparently secondary. To them, Father Guéranger's articles were a specialist's fancy, forgiven on account of his youth in the hope of better services in the future. The hour of the decisive struggle had not come; and, to tell the truth, the champion of the Roman Liturgy was not yet ready.

[margin: Dom Guéranger begins restoring the Order of Saint Benedict and reestablishes the Roman Liturgy at the priory of Solesmes in 1833.]

Eleven years passed before Father Guéranger took up his thesis again: eleven years of study, prayer, and grievous suffering, and thus of preparation for the work God held in reserve for him. In 1833 the young priest withdrew to the former priory of Solesmes. There, with the help of a few men of faith, he undertook to restore to France the Benedictine Order, destroyed in our country by the Revolution. This generous resolve dedicated him forever to liturgical service, the principal work and center of the Benedictine monk's life. Yet even within the Order of Saint Benedict, traditions had been trampled underfoot. Rejecting the Roman books that its holy patron had been the first to bring to France, the Congregation of Saint-Maur had, in the eighteenth century, provided itself with a Liturgy in the taste of the time, proclaimed a masterpiece. The reputation of this compilation had spread beyond France; it was praised in Italy, and just as the priory of Solesmes was being repopulated, the Benedictines of Hungary were having the Saint-Maur Breviary reprinted and substituting it in their monasteries for the Roman-monastic Breviary. In reaction against these pernicious examples, Dom Guéranger established the Roman Liturgy at Solesmes on July 11, 1833, the day of his small community's canonical installation. He *(p. XXXIII)* thus entered again, by full right, into the most sacred portion of the Benedictine inheritance. From Saint Gregory the Great to Saint Gregory VII and beyond, the pontiffs who shaped the Roman Liturgy were almost all sons of Saint Benedict. And although the patriarch of Monte Cassino prescribed in his Rule a particular form of the Divine Office, the only essential differences between monastic and Roman usages are the distribution of the Psalter and the number of lessons. Benedictine monks have never had responsorials or antiphonaries other than those of the Roman

Church, augmented by numerous pieces of their own composition.

[margin: Character of Dom Guéranger's studies of the Liturgy.]

Filled to overflowing from the very first day with the spirit of his state of life, the young prior of Solesmes was not content to bring ever-watchful attention and holy enthusiasm to the Divine Office. Through that power of synthesis which was one of his genius's chief characteristics, he knew how to bring back to the Liturgy, as to a central point, the studies he pursued with tireless ardor in every branch of ecclesiastical learning. Dogmatic and mystical theology, canon law, history and literature, and aesthetics helped him in turn to discover the mysteries of the sacred rites and to grasp, down to the smallest details, the meaning of the formulas the missal and breviary brought before his eyes. From the most minute questions of rubrics to the hidden depths of the theology and symbolism of the sacrifice of the immaculate Lamb, liturgical learning as a whole soon became familiar to him; and we dare say that no modern scholar has possessed it *(p. XXXIV)* to the same degree. Others may have had as much or more erudition on particular points, but no one has understood and explained as he did the ever-living, ever-active mystery of the Liturgy.

[margin: Dom Guéranger's understanding of the Liturgy.]

For Dom Guéranger, indeed, the Liturgy was not the goal of curious investigations, the object of a more or less arid and human science. It was the instrument of the Church's unceasing prayer, profession of faith, and praise, the principal organ of her life, the mysterious channel of communication between heaven and earth, the principal means of the sanctification of souls. The ecclesiastical year presented itself to him as the manifestation of Jesus Christ and the periodic renewal of his mysteries in the Church. As he understood it, the liturgist's role was to follow attentively this continually recurring movement, to grasp all its outward forms, and to explain them carefully so as to help souls receive its grace. The sacraments and sacramentals likewise appeared to him as the mysterious channels through which divine life came from heaven to earth; and the smallest detail of their history or celebration assumed in his eyes the importance of a supernatural fact. Viewed in this way, liturgical studies were above all, for Dom Guéranger, a preparation for prayer and priestly functions. Love of God and the Church, zeal for his own sanctification and the salvation of souls, became the motives sustaining his ardor in his unceasing, arduous research. Such was the spirit he strove to instill in his disciples, constantly repeating to them that, liturgical service being their first obligation, they *(p. XXXV)* could be true children of Saint Benedict only if they celebrated it not merely with fervor but with a full understanding of its mysteries. He wanted them, like himself, to have a piety after the ancient model, eager for the nourishment offered directly by the Church's hand and accepting other nourishment only with reserve and as a supplement. From the very first day, this guidance gave a distinctive character to the humble community taking shape at Solesmes amid unceasing difficulties. It was the principle of cohesion and life to which the community owed its survival and growth despite severe trials.

[margin: The Benedictine Congregation of France receives from Gregory XVI, its founder, the mission]

[margin: to revive the sound traditions of the Liturgy.]

The necessary consequence of such teaching was to place liturgical studies first among the labors of the monks of Solesmes. This direction, given to the nascent Benedictine family by its head, received the supreme sanction of apostolic authority through Gregory XVI's brief Innumeras inter, which canonically established the Congregation of France, erected Solesmes as an abbey, and conferred the abbatial dignity on Dom Guéranger on September 1, 1837. In this solemn act, after declaring that the new congregation's purpose was to restore the practice of the Rule of Saint Benedict in France and to assist souls desiring the monastic life, the Sovereign Pontiff added that, after this supreme aim, it was to strive, within its powers, to revive the study of ecclesiastical antiquity, and especially to sustain the sound traditions of the sacred Liturgy as they falter: Sanas sacræ Liturgiæ traditiones labescentes confovere. 1

[margin: Significance of this apostolic act.]

Dom Guéranger placed these words as an epigraph *(p. XXXVI)* at the head of his Liturgical Institutions, and often recalled them, rightly, in the course of his polemics when he was reproached for stirring up untimely controversies without a mission. By the apostolic act of September 1, 1837, Gregory XVI certainly had not intended to bring about a liturgical revolution in France, which no one in Rome dared hope for. Yet he truly gave the Benedictine Congregation of France and its head the mandate to work for the propagation and defense of the true principles of liturgical learning, and granted their efforts in advance that blessing of Saint Peter whose efficacy surpasses all human foresight, because it is the very blessing of Jesus Christ. Dom Guéranger, for his part, was one of those servants God loves to employ for his great designs. "He was," we may say with the Bishop of Poitiers, "the man of evangelical perfection, living the life of the Church and keeping every avenue of his soul open to the divine will. Free of the world's defilements, he was that vessel described in the words 'he will be a sanctified vessel, useful to the Lord, ready for every good work': erit vas sanctificatum, et utile Domino, ad omne opus bonum paratum[4]." It is there—that is, in the mysterious order of grace and divine omnipotence, rather than in human wishes—that we must seek the source of the happy revolution which renewed the face of our churches in France.

[margin: Dom Guéranger plans a liturgical summa under the title Institutions.]

In response to the Sovereign Pontiff's invitation, *(p. XXXVII)* Dom Guéranger conceived the plan of a liturgical summa in which he proposed to condense the whole science of the sacred rites. Durand of Mende and other medieval writers had the same design; but their works are now only imperfect sketches. The labors of scholarship in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries brought the materials of liturgical learning out of obscurity and sometimes put them to use on particular points. The discoveries of Christian archaeology are adding new riches before our eyes to these slowly accumulated treasures; no hand has yet known how to build the edifice. Dom Guéranger had the ambition to construct it, and was capable of doing so. In the preface to the first volume of the Institutions, he outlines his plan with a bold and sure hand. Since history is the foundation and framework of all ecclesiastical teaching, he wished first to set forth the vicissitudes of the Liturgy in the Church, indicating, as he encountered them along the way, the sources from which knowledge of it could be drawn. After this historical and bibliographical introduction, the author proposed to give the necessary information about the books of the Liturgy, the calendar, and the mysterious divisions of the ecclesiastical year. A complete study of the Christian sacrifice, the sacraments, and the sacramentals was to form, as it were, the body of the work. Commentaries on the breviary and missal; a series of special treatises on the rules of symbolism, on the language and style, law and authority of the Liturgy as a means of teaching in the Church; and finally a liturgical theology were intended to crown this vast whole, which the author hoped to contain in *(p. XXXVIII)* five volumes, but which in reality might have required fifteen or twenty.

[margin: Publication of the first volume of the Liturgical Institutions in 1840.]

The first appeared in 1840. After some preliminary explanations of the Liturgy and the importance of studying it, Dom Guéranger traced its history from apostolic times to the reform begun by Saint Pius V and completed by Urban VIII, to which the Roman Liturgy owes its definitive form. By simply setting forth the facts, the Abbot of Solesmes demonstrated that, although a certain variety had originally existed in the liturgical usages of the various churches, the Roman Pontiffs had worked, by the fifth century at the latest, to establish unity throughout their Patriarchate of the West; and that since the eleventh century the books and rites of the Roman Church, apart from a few variations of detail, had been the only ones used in Latin Christendom, with the exception of Milan and its territory. France in particular had known no others since Charlemagne. Far from contesting the popes' sovereign authority in matters of Liturgy, she had received Saint Pius V's bulls for liturgical reform with the most filial obedience and fully conformed to them, retaining only a few particular usages whose legitimacy the Apostolic See itself recognized[5].

[margin: The unanimous applause that greets it.]

The consequence of these principles was immediate and crushing for the Gallican liturgies. But since the author did not yet draw it, many readers did *(p. XXXIX)* not perceive it, and the applause was unanimous. No one felt and expressed the work's significance and merit better than a woman whose words we may quote here because of the particular ties uniting her to Dom Guéranger, and above all because of the respect her generous faith, zeal for Catholic interests, and beneficial influence on Parisian high society have won for her memory:

[margin: Mme Swetchine's judgment of this work.]

"This book alone," Countess Swetchine wrote to the Abbot of Solesmes, "would suffice to lead an upright mind to the whole truth; and when you treat only of the Liturgy, the whole Catholic truth appears. What powerful and profound moderation, for which the Church alone gave you the model! What courageous freedom, what independence from your own self! For I do not see in it a single trait that nature could claim as its own. Under your pen truth is always strong without the aid of any exaggeration. The newest propositions, and therefore the boldest, are demonstrated with so much reason, clarity, and precision that one is led quite naturally to the point you wish to reach, as though up a slope one climbs without noticing it. It is truly illuminating, and never has erudition shown itself less dry. The most apparently insignificant details are imbued with a tone of faith and piety; from the third page onward, I was praying with you[6]."

Thirty-seven years have passed since Mme Swetchine wrote these lines. The passions Dom Guéranger fought have died out, the prejudices have been *(p. XL)* overcome. The principles he set forth so lucidly, accepted by all without dispute, no longer need to be demonstrated. But although the times have changed, the book's value has not; and we believe the reader will be unable to read through this first volume without feeling the impressions Dom Guéranger's noble and pious friend knew how to express with such precision and delicacy.

[margin: The second volume, published in 1841, recounts the history of the Gallican liturgies manufactured in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.]

The second volume of the Liturgical Institutions appeared scarcely a year after its predecessor and received a very different welcome. The applause redoubled, it is true, but ceased to be unanimous, and a formidable and noisy opposition organized against the book and its author. From the first pages, Dom Guéranger had entered into the heart of the question. He showed a coalition arising within the sovereign courts (parlements) and the clergy to combat Rome's influence and enslave the Church to the State under the pretext of Gallican liberties. The French judiciary began by laying hands on the Liturgy in the name of a supposed right of the Crown. Soon the bishops themselves, overstepping the limits of their authority, allowed themselves to be swept along by the prejudices of a proud criticism hostile to the holiest traditions; they altered their churches' liturgical books and suppressed venerable formulas and usages, substituting novelties without authority or character. The Jansenist sect appeared next and gained over the clergy of France an influence whose pernicious effects we still feel. To dry up the principal source of Catholic life, it attacked the Roman Liturgy with diabolical art. Taking advantage of the national prejudices *(p. XLI)* of the Gallicans and the arrogant pretensions of the hypercritics, it succeeded in casting discredit and ridicule on the venerable books that for so many centuries had been the instruments of prayer for all Latin Christendom. Once the ancient edifice raised by popes and saints had been shaken, the odious sect also supplied workers ready to remake the entire Liturgy, in the taste of the day and in a single day. With the accents of faith and righteous indignation, Dom Guéranger showed the criminal nature of these attacks and the irreparable harm they had done to religion in France. With vivid colors and compelling verve, he depicted the rapid progress of this coalition of Gallicanism, Jansenism, and a half-rationalist criticism, which gradually spread to all the churches of France and swept along even some of the most Catholic prelates of the eighteenth century.

[margin: Moderation and propriety of the author's language.]

With the frankness of his monastic language, the author concealed nothing and did not fear to point out the weaknesses of the most illustrious men. Yet even when love of the Church and of souls dictated his most impassioned pages, he knew how to maintain the respect due to prelates who had died in communion with the Apostolic See. Eager to bring out everything that could redound to the honor of the old Church of France, he took care to collect the protests these liturgical novelties drew from bishops and priests who had preserved the spirit of Catholic tradition in its fullness. Finally, in tracing France's liturgical history in the nineteenth century, he veiled in tactful language the blame that emerged from the necessary *(p. XLII)* account of certain contemporary facts, while lavishing praise, with an effusiveness that will seem exaggerated today, on the smallest acts in which he could discern a sign of return to sound traditions. An irresistible argument in favor of the Roman Liturgy emerged from this account as a whole. Anyone not blinded by prejudices of education or sect said on closing the book: "We must return to the Roman Liturgy; it is the most powerful means of reviving faith in France and making indissoluble the bonds—alas, all too weakened—that attach us to the Holy See."

[margin: Dom Guéranger did not intend to bring about a liturgical revolution in France.]

Dom Guéranger had neither the intention nor the hope of bringing about such a revolution in a few years. The welcome given his first volume allowed him to think that the second would strike home and perhaps halt the progress of the evil he denounced with such truth and energy. But, to tell the truth, the valiant writer did not pause to calculate the effect of his words. He went where God carried him; he had felt that he had a truth to make heard, and proclaimed it with simplicity. Credidi, he could say, propter quod locutus sum[7]. "I believed, therefore I spoke; it is for God to do what he wills with my words." 1

[margin: The Gallicans' fury against the book and its author.]

The effect of this publication was immense, and the veterans of the French clergy will long remember the passionate controversies it stirred up among them. All the men who, by age and education, were attached to Gallican traditions declared themselves violently opposed to the Liturgical Institutions. A single cry went up from their *(p. XLIII)* camp to denounce the conspiracy being woven at Solesmes against the bishops' authority, against the doctrines of the Church of France, against its purest glories. In vain had Dom Guéranger taken care expressly to reserve the question of liturgical law and condemned every imprudent and rash demonstration by the clergy of the second order against diocesan Liturgies. In vain did he repeat that the return to unity could be accomplished only by the bishops' authority: no account was taken of these precautions. Some people made his name synonymous with that of a fomenter of rebellion, a writer given to exaggeration and paradox. He was fortunate indeed when no still harsher theological characterizations were applied to him!

[margin: This volume wins a whole section of the French clergy to the cause of the Roman Liturgy.]

Very different was the judgment of a section of the French episcopate and clergy, perhaps less numerous than the first, but more independent of fashionable prejudices and more solidly instructed. This was the section which, adhering to the true Catholic doctrines then called Ultramontane, labored to free France from Gallicanism's baleful yoke. For them, the second volume of the Liturgical Institutions gave an unshakable foundation to the convictions the first had brought into being. The reestablishment of the Roman Liturgy in the dioceses of France appeared as the first and most important stage in that return toward Rome which was the object of so many hopes and persevering efforts.

[margin: New breviaries cease to be manufactured.]

Despite the recriminations directed against his book, Dom Guéranger had won an initial advantage. The deathblow had not been dealt to the Gallican liturgies *(p. XLIV)* already in existence; but after the publication of the second volume of the Liturgical Institutions, no one dared manufacture new ones. The breviary with which Canon Quilien had endowed the Church of Quimper in 1840 was the last. The missal already prepared to complement it remained among the author's papers, and the Roman Liturgy remained in force in all or

almost all the diocese's parishes. The same was true in the other churches where it had still survived. We are happy to record here the names of two prelates, today honored with the Roman purple, who were the first to declare themselves in favor of the Roman rite. His Eminence Cardinal Donnet, Archbishop of Bordeaux, reassured the faithful who had always possessed it and knew it to be threatened with imminent destruction. His Eminence Cardinal Saint-Marc, Archbishop of Rennes, while awaiting the hour to restore it to all his people, expressly declared his intention to preserve the remnants that survived in a number of his diocese's parishes.

[margin: The Roman Liturgy saved where it still survived.]

[margin: Pope Gregory XVI's brief to Archbishop Gousset of Reims on the liturgical question.]

Meanwhile, a prelate who, with Bishop Parisis, had taken the lead in France's Ultramontane movement—Archbishop Gousset of Reims—consulted the Holy See about the liturgical situation of our churches and the course the bishops should follow. Pope Gregory XVI replied in a brief of August 6, 1842. While deploring the variety of liturgical books as a misfortune and recalling Saint Pius V's bulls, he nevertheless declared that, for fear of serious dissensions, he would refrain not only *(p. XLV)* from pressing for their enforcement, but even from answering questions addressed to him on the subject[8].

[margin: The Archbishop of Reims puts three questions on liturgical law to]

[margin: Dom Guéranger.]

Unable to obtain from Rome an official solution to his difficulties, the Archbishop of Reims then consulted the Abbot of Solesmes and put these three questions to him:

1. What authority does an individual bishop have in matters of Liturgy in a diocese where the Roman Liturgy is currently in use?

2. What authority does an individual bishop have in matters of Liturgy in a diocese where the Roman Liturgy is not currently in use?

3. What course should a bishop follow in a diocese where the Roman Liturgy has been abolished since the reception of Saint Pius V's bull in that same diocese?

[margin: The Abbot of Solesmes answers in his Letter on Liturgical Law, published in 1843.]

Dom Guéranger answered these three questions in a canonical treatise entitled Letter to the Archbishop of Reims on Liturgical Law. We publish it after the Liturgical Institutions. If, in reading this work, one recalls the circumstances in which it was composed, the storm already unleashed against the author, and the dangers that prevented the Sovereign Pontiff from demanding the observance of liturgical law in France, one will find, we believe, that in this work more than in any other Dom Guéranger displayed the "constancy and singular skill" which our Holy Father Pope Pius IX praised in his conduct during the liturgical controversy[9]. It was indeed necessary to state firmly the *(p. XLVI)* principles, yet to take account of the difficulties that held back even the best-intentioned bishops and alarmed Rome itself. The slightest exaggeration would have compromised the cause of the Roman Liturgy in the episcopate's eyes, and perhaps provoked untimely demonstrations among the clergy of the second order. Both dangers were wisely avoided. The Letter on Liturgical Law is a masterpiece of tact and prudence, as well as of firmness in setting forth and applying principles. Must we say here that, twenty or thirty years later, when the triumph of the Roman Liturgy was assured, some Frenchmen found the Abbot of Solesmes insufficiently absolute in affirming the Roman Pontiff's rights in matters of Liturgy? This assertion does not merit discussion. We would be entitled to reply to its authors that, without Dom Guéranger, they would certainly still be reciting, and might even be compiling, Gallican breviaries. The truth is that the venerable Abbot of Solesmes restored the Holy See to a wider and more sovereign exercise than ever of a right Gregory XVI did not dare to assert and which his predecessors, since the eighteenth century, had believed forever lost in France.

[margin: At the end of this work, Dom Guéranger briefly answers the attacks made against him.]

At the end of his Letter on Liturgical Law, Dom Guéranger briefly answered the charges directed against the Liturgical Institutions. Even then, he could foresee that this first defense would not suffice. In the prefaces to his two volumes, he had undertaken to reproduce fairly the objections made against him and to answer them in the continuation of *(p. XLVII)* his work. Sure of his cause, he desired discussion rather than fearing it; but he would never have expected the sudden stir the controversy caused, and still less to face the champions who entered the lists against him.

[margin: First controversy with Father Tresvaux du Fraval.]

We are not speaking here of Father Tresvaux du Fraval, canon of the metropolitan Church of Paris, a friend of M. Picot and his former ally in his first encounter with Father Guéranger. The Abbot of Solesmes was well acquainted with the Gallican opinions of this respectable and learned priest, imbued though he was with all the prejudices of another age. Their dispute in L'Ami de la Religion was foreseen and inevitable: it was one of those advance-guard engagements that always accompany the opening of a campaign and have no influence on its outcome.

[margin: Archbishop d'Astros of Toulouse publishes a book against the Liturgical Institutions.]

The sudden intervention of Archbishop d'Astros of Toulouse had a very different bearing on the debate. The rank this prelate held in the Church, the memory of his courageous resistance to Napoleon's tyrannical will and of his imprisonment at Vincennes, and his reputation for piety gave his words great authority among the mass of the clergy and faithful, who were unaware of the old archbishop's attachment to Gallican doctrines. Great was the stir when a book appeared bearing Archbishop d'Astros's name and this solemn title: The Church of France Unjustly Defamed in a Work Entitled: Liturgical Institutions, by the Reverend Father Dom Prosper Guéranger, Abbot of Solesmes; by the Archbishop of Toulouse[10].

(p. XLVIII)

[margin: Significance and character of this work.]

After the appearance of such a book, the case was judged for the laity without examination. The work's title and its author's name sufficed: on Archbishop d'Astros's authority, people acquired a ready-made conviction. Even within the priestly tribe, men were so ill prepared for this controversy that sound minds were troubled by the publication and even by the reading of this strange work. Canon law, liturgy, ecclesiastical history itself, and especially learned scholarship properly so called were so neglected at that time that not everyone saw at first glance the weakness of the prelate's arguments. Reviving the methods of the old polemicists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Archbishop d'Astros did not mince words. His first chapter demonstrated the imprudence and rashness of the author of the Liturgical Institutions; the second exposed his injustice and hostile dispositions toward the Church of France. Forty pages were devoted to this general refutation. The work's second part contained a detailed examination of Dom Guéranger's criticisms of the Paris breviaries and missals, and concluded with an examination of the beauties of the Liturgy in use since the eighteenth century in that Church and in a large proportion of France's dioceses. Along the way, the venerable author charged the Liturgical Institutions with imprudence, rashness, injustice, absurdity, calumny, fury, blasphemy, indecency, and obscenity; he called its author an impious young man, and went so far as to predict for him the lamentable fall of M. de Lamennais. How could one fail to be impressed by such language *(p. XLIX)* from lips rightly held in reverence? Archbishop d'Astros's pamphlet quickly sold out and soon appeared in a second edition. In its preface the author announced that nearly fifty bishops had written to thank him for taking up the defense of the Church of France and shared his judgment of Dom Guéranger's writings and doctrines.

[margin: Archbishop Affre of Paris's letter to his clergy, protesting against the Liturgical Institutions and recommending Archbishop d'Astros's book.]

As early as August 14, 1843, Archbishop Affre of Paris had spoken out conspicuously, addressing a circular to his clergy in which, as guardian of his Church's honor, he protested against the Liturgical Institutions' assessments of the Parisian Liturgy and recommended Archbishop d'Astros's work to his priests' attention. Sixty bishops, it was said, endorsed this episcopal act, whose official form and apparently moderate wording gave unexpected authority to the Archbishop of Toulouse's book. The defenders of the Gallican Liturgies, with Their Lordships Affre and d'Astros foremost among them, even treated Gregory XVI's brief to the Archbishop of Reims and the absolute silence Rome was determined to maintain in this controversy as grounds for triumph. From the Sovereign Pontiff's paternal discretion, the most unexpected conclusions were drawn against Dom Guéranger and the importance of the return to liturgical unity.

[margin: Dom Guéranger answers Archbishop d'Astros in his Defense of the Liturgical Institutions.]

As soon as the Abbot of Solesmes learned of Archbishop d'Astros's work, he announced that he would answer it. By descending into the arena of controversy, the venerable prelate had, so to speak, divested himself of his sacred character and taken up the ordinary weapons of writers engaged in public debate to attack the Liturgical Institutions. On the same footing, *(p. L)* Dom Guéranger believed he could reply. Archbishop Affre, on the contrary, had given his letter the form of an act of episcopal authority. The Abbot of Solesmes maintained a humble silence and never departed from this attitude throughout the controversy, although more than one pastoral directive published at that time would have warranted a defense on his part. Even toward Archbishop d'Astros, wishing to show the utmost consideration, Dom Guéranger allowed several months to pass before publishing his Defense of the Liturgical Institutions in reply to the venerable prelate's book. He hoped that, once the discussion's first excitement had passed, the question would be judged with greater calm and reason. He also feared creating a diversion harmful to Catholic efforts, then concentrated on demanding freedom of education. But this forbearance necessarily had to come to an end.

[margin: Plan and character of this work.]

Dom Guéranger's reply appeared in 1844; we shall give it in the fourth volume of this edition. It is divided into two parts. In the first, the author again establishes the importance of liturgical unity, its necessity, and its obligatory character throughout the Patriarchate of the West. He then shows that, in recounting the revolution that deprived France of the benefit of this unity, he neither exceeded a Catholic historian's rights nor insulted the episcopate; and finally that, in seeming to desire and predict the reestablishment of the Roman Liturgy, he neither infringed the hierarchy's rights nor fomented disturbances among the clergy. This general reply is followed by an examination of all the particular accusations brought by *(p. LI)* the Archbishop of Toulouse against the Liturgical Institutions. Following his venerable opponent's book page by page, Dom Guéranger reproduces the very text of its principal passages and places his explanations and replies opposite them, always respectful in form but clear and decisive in substance. On reading these pages, one is not surprised that the Abbot of Solesmes said at the beginning of his defense:

"It would be a pleasure for me to acknowledge myself defeated in the contest if I were conscious of my defeat; unfortunately, I am not conscious of it. I could, it is true, keep silent and refrain from undertaking my defense; but, on the other hand, it seems to me that an imperative duty, that of defending the truth, urges me to speak and present necessary explanations—I will say more (for I flatter myself on this point): a complete vindication."

[margin: After this victorious reply, the return to the Roman Liturgy begins in the dioceses of Périgueux and Gap.]

The serious and disinterested part of the public judged that the Abbot of Solesmes had fulfilled what he announced at the beginning of his defense, and that nothing remained of his adversary's accusations. From then on, the cause of the Roman Liturgy was won, and the movement of return to unity, which was gradually to spread to all our churches, began, never to stop again. A pious prelate whose memory has remained blessed in his diocese, Bishop Georges-Maçonnais of Périgueux, took the initiative in a pastoral directive dated December 1, 1844. Eight days later, the chapter of Gap, by a unanimous deliberation, asked its bishop,

Bishop Depéry, to reestablish the Roman Liturgy. Readily acceding to these wishes, the prelate announced his decision to his *(p. LII)* diocese in a pastoral letter, at the head of which he inserted an extract from the Defense of the Liturgical Institutions.

[margin: Archbishop d'Astros's last, fruitless attempts to halt this movement.]

The controversy, however, was not over. We shall not speak here of the reply attempted by Archbishop d'Astros under the title Examination of Dom Guéranger's Defense, and Short Refutation of His Letter to the Archbishop of Reims[11]. Its public reception spared Dom Guéranger the need for any reply. The venerable Archbishop of Toulouse had tried to check the progress of the Roman Liturgy by another barrier: against the liturgical unity of the whole Latin West he wished to set metropolitan unity. Using his influence over the mind of one of his suffragans, Bishop de Saint-Rome-Gualy of Carcassonne, he had persuaded him to adopt the Toulouse Liturgy. But the other bishops of the province did not accept their metropolitan's system. As early as 1847, Bishop Doney of Montauban promulgated the Roman Liturgy in his diocese; and after a reign of less than ten years, the Toulouse Liturgy was to disappear from Carcassonne at the bidding of His Eminence Cardinal de Bonnechose, today Archbishop of Rouen (1854).

[margin: Bishop Fayet of Orléans publishes a book against the Liturgical Institutions in 1845.]

In 1845, a new defender of the Gallican Liturgies had appeared in the person of Bishop Fayet of Orléans. This prelate's work, entitled On Dom Guéranger's Liturgical Institutions and His Letter to the Archbishop of Reims, written in a style entirely *(p. LIII)* different from Archbishop d'Astros's, was no less severe toward the Abbot of Solesmes and his doctrines[12].

"Almost everything," the author said, "seemed false or dangerous to me in Dom Guéranger's book: the principles, the reasoning, and even the facts."

Bishop Fayet further attributed the most dangerous aims to his adversary.

"It is not," he said, "as a mere writer or a mere teacher that Dom Guéranger attacks the Church of France: it is as a reforming power that he sets himself before the bishops charged with governing her. From this standpoint, the episcopate owes his undertakings more attention than is ordinarily given to mere literary productions (2)."

[margin: The Bishop of Orléans's judgment of Dom Guéranger's doctrine.]

Refuting the Abbot of Solesmes seemed, in any case, an easy matter to the Bishop of Orléans.

"At a time," he said, "when a certain display of learning and erudition suffices to lead minds out of orthodoxy, we propose to demonstrate how little depth learning and erudition have among us, and to what strange novelties they can lead when they leave the beaten paths and set out on a journey to make discoveries in theology. We are quite simply going to pit them *(p. LIV)* against the catechism: for our own learning goes no further[13]."

[margin: Propositions the Bishop of Orléans claimed to establish in his book.]

The witty prelate thus undertook to prove that the Father Abbot of Solesmes's liturgical system rested on a fundamental error in theology and on a false notion of faith, prayer, and divine worship. The first pages of his book were devoted to demonstrating that

"Liturgy properly so called has no necessary relation to the virtue of religion, which of itself produces only interior acts of adoration, praise, sacrifice, etc.; that the Liturgy must be left in its own domain, and divine worship in its own; finally, that through the public exercise of the Liturgy, the Church enters into communication with men rather than with God[14]."

Bishop Fayet then undertook to discuss the principal authorities on which Dom Guéranger based his system. Passing from there to the liturgical facts concerning France, he undertook to prove that most of them were

distorted or drawn from suspect sources, and that they had not had the disastrous influence on the weakening of religion that people were pleased to attribute to them.

[margin: Far from succeeding in his purpose, Bishop Fayet exposes himself to criticism.]

Had the Bishop of Orléans really been capable of carrying out such a program, the publication of his book would have finished the Liturgical Institutions and their author. But the prelate, wittier than he was learned, had written with considerable verve and brilliance a volume of nearly six hundred pages, without suspecting that the very foundations *(p. LV)* of his argument were false, and that on every page he was doing what he reproached Dom Guéranger for doing: making the most surprising discoveries in erudition and especially in theology. The new champion of the Gallican Liturgies was not to save them from ruin; but as long as no refutation was put forward against him, he remained master of the field. Many voices rose on the Gallican side to proclaim him the undisputed victor, and their journalists announced that more than thirty bishops had written to Bishop Fayet to endorse his book.

[margin: Dom Guéranger publishes the first two letters of the New Defense of the Liturgical Institutions in his defense, in 1846.]

Dom Guéranger therefore began a series of letters under the title New Defense of the Liturgical Institutions (1846). The first was devoted to establishing that religion is not complete without external worship, and that the Liturgy is nothing other than the external worship offered to God by the Church—elementary principles a Catholic bishop could never have denied had he not been under the sway of the strangest prejudice. The second letter, an admirable dissertation, proved from the doctrine of Saint Augustine, Bossuet, and all theologians that the Liturgy was the principal instrument of the Church's tradition. Bishop Fayet had gone so far as to deny it any dogmatic character and to maintain that a liturgical error could violate only the laws of discipline.

[margin: Publication of the third letter in 1847.]

The third letter appeared in 1847. After his two surprising theories on the virtue of religion and the Liturgy's doctrinal authority, Bishop Fayet had also sought, with no less offhand assurance, to show that the liturgical question was not of such great importance.

(p. LVI) "The changes made in our churches in the eighteenth century concerned, at most," he said, "only the general or particular regulations the Church has made on this matter"; and he thought himself justified in concluding "that the best breviary was the one best recited[15]."

The Abbot of Solesmes rightly replied that all subordination in the Church was henceforth abolished if one could regard as legitimate a state of affairs opposed by the rules of ecclesiastical discipline. In his third letter, therefore, he strove to show the intimate bond linking discipline to faith; to recall the rights of general discipline, against which isolated attempts are always null; and finally to prove the existence of an apostolic reservation which makes the Liturgy a papal matter, not a diocesan one.

[margin: Bishop Fayet's death interrupts publication of this defense, which was to include two further letters.]

Dom Guéranger intended to complete his defense with two further letters. The first would have set forth his doctrine on anti-liturgical heresy and demonstrated that his teaching on this subject bore no resemblance to what his adversary imputed to him. The second was to be devoted to refuting a host of particular accusations which Bishop Fayet had multiplied in a tone of uninhibited jesting, rather strange in such a controversy on a bishop's lips. Dom Guéranger, who in his letters discussed even the most bizarre objections with the gravity of a scholar and a churchman, might, in concluding, have given freer *(p. LVII)* rein to his subtly caustic wit, without forgetting the consideration due to a sacred character. But a sudden blow interrupted the controversy: Bishop Fayet died in Paris on April 4, 1849, carried off within a few hours by cholera. Dom Guéranger immediately gave up continuing his defense of the Liturgical Institutions. He confined himself to giving, in the preface to his third volume, a brief answer to certain attacks which new adversaries repeated after the Bishop of Orléans, seeking to cast doubt on the Abbot of Solesmes's orthodoxy or the integrity of his

intentions.

[margin: MM. Bernier and Prompsault try in vain to prolong the controversy.]

Writers who had inherited all the prejudices, and sometimes even the most dangerous errors, of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries did indeed try to carry on the struggle in Bishop Fayet's wake. Among them were, in 1847, Father Bernier, Vicar General of Angers, a man of wit and erudition whose judgment, however, had been utterly corrupted by the books of the seventeenth-century French school; and, in 1850, Father Prompsault, whom one may rightly call our country's last Jansenist writer. After his brilliant victory over his first two adversaries, Dom Guéranger had no need to concern himself with his new enemies. The movement of return to the Roman Liturgy was spreading with irresistible force; each year, two or three dioceses rejected their Gallican breviaries and missals to take up the Gregorian books again. MM. Bernier and Prompsault, even reinforced by M. Laborde of Lectoure, could not halt such a triumph. A few explanatory notes sufficed to answer criticisms as ill founded as they were *(p. LVIII)* vehement. They will also be found in the preface to the third volume of the Liturgical Institutions, first published in 1851[16].

[margin: Publication of the Liturgical Institutions suspended after the third volume appeared in 1851.]

In it Dom Guéranger began the didactic part of his work, treating of liturgical books in general: their importance, antiquity, language, translation, publication and correction, their form before and after the invention of printing, and finally their ornaments. In publishing this volume, the author announced that he would immediately take up a complete commentary on the Roman Breviary and Missal, for which requests were reaching him from all sides. He also promised his liturgical theology shortly, and had no doubt, moreover, that he would be granted the means to carry out in its entirety the immense plan outlined at the beginning of his Institutions. Familiar with the smallest details of liturgical learning, Dom Guéranger found at once in his memory and genius the exact notion of everything, the precise solution to difficulties, and the answer to every question. But when it came to composing a book, despite his vast erudition and marvelous facility, he could neither shorten the research, nor lengthen the hours, nor above all free himself from the cares of his pastoral office. Had he continued his Liturgical Institutions, his whole life would have had to be devoted exclusively to this work, and he would probably not have seen its completion. He dreamed of continuing it until the last day of his life; but other, more urgent labors always *(p. LIX)* diverted him from it.

"Several patriarchal lifetimes added one to another," the Bishop of Poitiers said, "would not have sufficed for Dom Guéranger to produce all he had planned. Yet his plans were not dreams and chimeras, because, like the patriarchs, he was to continue acting through those of his own who lived on[17]."

Let us hope that this great bishop's words will one day be fulfilled for the Liturgical Institutions, and that God will raise up among Dom Guéranger's spiritual posterity men capable of gradually building the gigantic work whose foundations the learned abbot laid. To continue, within their powers, the traditions and works of such a father as Dom Guéranger is the greatest honor his sons can aspire to.

[margin: Definitive triumph of the Roman Liturgy in France.]

The Abbot of Solesmes did not complete his Liturgical Institutions; but he wrote enough for his mission of restoring the Roman Liturgy in France to have been fulfilled in its entirety. After the publication of the three letters to Bishop Fayet, the truly serious controversy was closed forever. The clamors of obstinate ignorance and prejudices as narrow as they were invincible still found some echoes in newspaper articles and inconsequential pamphlets. Dom Guéranger, continually attacked in these sad publications, disdained to answer them. Full of respect and reserve toward episcopal authority, he likewise made no attempt to press for the reestablishment of the Roman Liturgy in dioceses whose *(p. LX)* prelates sought to gain time—too long to suit certain impatient tempers. Each year, one or another of the churches of France regained possession of the Roman Liturgy. Dom Guéranger always kept silent, and never was a single word caught on his lips indicating that he claimed for himself the honor of these marvelous changes. God held in reserve for him the

consolation of witnessing the definitive triumph of the cause he had served so valiantly. The Abbot of Solesmes saw the Roman Liturgy replace at Paris the work of Vigier and Mézenguy; and a few months before his death, Orléans, the last diocese to retain the Paris Breviary, rejected it to regain at last that inheritance of Gelasius, Gregory the Great, and Pius V whose loss had been so disastrous for the clergy and people of France.

[margin: Dom Guéranger's Liturgical Institutions and The Liturgical Year are the best manuals of the science of the sacred rites.]

After his victory, Dom Guéranger did not neglect his liturgical studies. Although he no longer wrote on these matters in a polemical or purely didactic form, he devoted himself until his last day to a work which was the most cherished undertaking of his life and contains the exquisite and nourishing marrow of almost the whole science of the sacred rites. The Liturgical Year, begun in 1841 with the publication of Advent and carried through its ninth volume, devoted to the feasts of the Ascension and Pentecost, explains the principal rites and mysteries of the Liturgy during the longest and most important part of the ecclesiastical cycle. The faithful find in it a commentary on all the offices they are called to attend in their parish, and the *(p. LXI)* priest finds the key to his missal and breviary[18]. None of the monuments of erudition that adorn our libraries can take the place of this seemingly modest work. We do not fear being misled by our filial affection in saying that Dom Guéranger's two unfinished works are two indispensable manuals for forming a liturgist worthy of the name. Along with the history of the Liturgy, the Institutions contain an immense accumulation of fundamental information and bibliographical indications found in no other book. They are thus an almost complete introduction to the science of the sacred rites, whose mysteries The Liturgical Year, for its part, largely unveils. By thoroughly studying these two works, one acquires a sense for liturgical studies; one learns how to approach questions and to which sources one must turn. From the first step one glimpses the solution, when one does not already possess it in full. Above all, one becomes imbued with that respect for holy things, that piety at once ardent and intelligent, that enthusiasm for divine worship, without which one will never possess the secret of liturgical learning.

[margin: Need to give liturgical studies in France a new direction.]

Since the reestablishment of the Roman rite in France, some *(p. LXII)* valuable work has been done on the purely material aspect of rubrics and ceremonial. These preliminary studies were indispensable, since a practical tradition broken for more than a century had to be restored. But it is time to understand that, to be a liturgist, it is not enough to have a thorough command of the ceremonial manuals currently accepted in Rome, to know Gavanti and a few other rubricists, and finally to consult with meticulous care the smallest decrees of the Congregation of Rites. This is undoubtedly the first step. Such work gives the skeleton of the science, but not the science itself; and a consummate rubricist sometimes has no conception of it. One is a liturgist only on condition of doing for the sacred rites what the interpreter of the sacred books does for Scripture: calling on all the resources of erudition to explain the text's meaning, breaking through the shell of the letter to grasp the spirit. The least ceremony has a meaning and a history that must be sought in tradition. From Saint Pius V's Liturgy one must go back to the commentators and liturgical monuments of the Middle Ages, to reach the Gregorian sources and even the earliest writings of the Fathers and Holy Scripture itself. Theology, history, and archaeology must constantly be brought to bear. Then, on its interpreter's lips or under his pen, the science of the sacred rites appears as what it truly is: the noble sister and indispensable auxiliary of biblical exegesis and theology. No writing will better convey the importance and sublimity of these studies than the Liturgical *(p. LXIII)* Institutions of Dom Guéranger; and on this account it is one of the best books one can recommend to young clerics. By studying this work, they will learn what a work of erudition is; and as they see wholly new horizons opening before them, they will hear the eloquent cry of a generous and holy soul, consumed with love of the Church and transported with enthusiasm for divine worship. It would be difficult to find a book better suited to communicating these two great passions, without which no soul is truly priestly. We shall dare to say that, from this standpoint, the Liturgical Institutions can

be more useful to seminarians than certain ascetical books given authority by centuries of use.

[margin: Dom Guéranger's plans to recast his Liturgical Institutions.]

One may wonder why Dom Guéranger did not himself reprint a work that enjoyed such brilliant success. Each of the Institutions' three volumes, printed in three thousand copies, sold out almost immediately; the pamphlets we collect in a fourth volume have long been unobtainable. Although often urged to do so, Dom Guéranger did not reissue this work because he wanted to recast it. Like all authors who first advance along an unexplored path, the Abbot of Solesmes had necessarily been incomplete. In the preface to his third volume, he already declared that he was able to fill the gaps in his history of the liturgical revolution in eighteenth-century France[19]. Almost every other part of his work was likewise to be expanded on a *(p. LXIV)* more or less substantial scale; and what the venerable abbot said in 1851 he repeated with still greater reason in 1874, during the last days of his laborious career. He then sometimes spoke of recasting his Liturgical Institutions as the work he reserved for the peaceful hours of extreme old age. God did not grant him the longevity his sons' affection dreamed of, and which so many works already begun required if they were to be completed. The Liturgical Institutions have remained as he first composed them, and it is in this form that we publish them anew. It is a work still unique in its kind, with an appointed place in the library of every man devoted to ecclesiastical studies, or even simply to historical ones.

One could doubtless, after Dom Guéranger and following in his footsteps, recast the history of the Liturgy, especially for eighteenth-century France; it would be the work of an entire lifetime. The Liturgical Institutions will nonetheless retain their place among the most considerable works of ecclesiastical erudition. They will not only be consulted but reread as a model of incisive and often eloquent controversy, always exact and grave. They will remain the monument of that liturgical revolution which is one of the principal events in the religious history of our century. The restoration of the Roman Liturgy in France was the prelude to the Vatican Council and the definitive downfall of Gallicanism. Now, as all admit, friends and enemies alike, this restoration is Dom Guéranger's work, and it was through the Liturgical Institutions that he accomplished it. The future *(p. LXV)* alone will reveal the full extent of the service the Abbot of Solesmes rendered to the Church, and especially to our country. Yet, witnessing the trials that overwhelm the Sovereign Pontiff and anxious about the threats the future holds over our heads, we already feel that the restoration of one of the closest bonds attaching our churches to the center of Catholic unity is for them a source of strength and a pledge of security.

To conclude this preface, we need only say a word about our own role in this publication. It has been confined to that of a mere editor. We could not put ourselves in the author's place—especially such an author as that of the Liturgical Institutions—to make revisions that would have altered his work's character. Our intention has been to maintain the original text everywhere, even in passages where we knew what the author would have wished to add. We have just recounted the reception given the Liturgical Institutions. Rarely has a work of erudition been subjected to criticism so malevolent and so prolonged; yet such was the solidity of the edifice that not one stone of its walls was shaken. Our duty, therefore, was to preserve it intact. Assisted by the devotion of our brothers in religion, we carefully oversaw the correctness of the text and placed in the margins a summary of each paragraph, most often borrowed from the author's own words. We have inserted into the body of the work some additions placed in the third volume and relating to the first two. In sum, Dom Guéranger's work remains in its integrity and thereby retains all its authority.

(p. LXVI) The reader will even find, reverently preserved at the head of this volume, the author's preface and the dedicatory epistle in which he offered his work to Cardinal Lambruschini, His Holiness Gregory XVI's Secretary of State, who had shown him great kindness at the time of the canonical erection of the Benedictine Congregation of France.

For his part, our capable publisher has spared nothing to give the physical production of these volumes the elegant and noble form with which he has already clothed the great publications to which he owes his

renown. We therefore hope that this edition will be a service to the Church and, at the same time, a tribute to one of her greatest servants.

Dom Alphonse Guépin, M. B.

Abbey of Solesmes, November 1, 1877.

---

[1] Brief Ecclesiasticis viris, above.

[2] This was particularly the case in the Diocese of Carcassonne, which had added to its former territory all or part of those of Narbonne, Saint-Papoul, Alet, and Mirepoix. These five dioceses each had its own Liturgy before the Revolution; all five Liturgies were retained until 1842.

[3] Liturgical Institutions, ch. 1, p. 3.

[4] II Tim. II, 21. — Oraison funèbre du T. R. P. Dom Guéranger, by Bishop Pie of Poitiers, p. 9.

[5] The first volume of the Liturgical Institutions ended with chapter XV. Typographical requirements have obliged us to add to it, in this edition, chapter XVI, which begins the history of the Liturgy in the seventeenth century.

[6] Lettres inédites de Mme Swetchine, p. 413. Letter to Dom Guéranger, September 9, 1840.

[7] Ps. CXV, 1.

[8] This brief will be found in the Letter on Liturgical Law.

[9] See the brief Ecclesiasticis viris above.

[10] Toulouse: Delsol et Cie; Paris: Périsse frères, 1843.

[11] Toulouse: Douladoure; Paris and Lyon: Périsse frères, February 14, 1846.

[12] This book reappeared in 1846 under the slightly modified title Examination of Dom Guéranger's Liturgical Institutions and His Letter to the Archbishop of Reims. This difference in title and date, which seems to announce a second edition, was in reality only a publisher's device to dispose of a work printed in an abundance of copies and little sought after by the public. 2. Des Institutions liturgiques, pp. VI and XVIII.

[13] Examen des Institutions liturgiques, p. XVIII.

[14] Ibid., pp. 40, 35, 36, 43.

[15] Des Institutions liturgiques, preface, pp. IX, XLIX.

[16] Paris: Julien, Lanier et Cie; and J. Lecoffre.

[17] Oraison funèbre du T. R. P. Dom Guéranger, p. 21.

[18] The Liturgical Year, published by Oudin frères in Poitiers and in Paris, 68, rue Bonaparte, is divided into sections according to the seasons of the ecclesiastical year. The first, Advent, comprises one volume; the second, Christmastide, two. The next three sections, Septuagesima, Lent, and Passiontide, have one volume each; the last, Paschal Time, has three. The work will be continued in three volumes which will complete the explanation of the ecclesiastical year. Pious souls will soon enjoy the first and gladly find in it a reflection of Dom Guéranger's doctrine and inspiration.

[19] Institutions liturgiques, vol. III, p. XLIII, 1st ed.

Dedicatory Letter to Cardinal Lambruschini

(p. LXVII)

To His Most Eminent Lordship

Louis Cardinal Lambruschini

His Holiness's Secretary of State

Most Eminent Lord,

The LITURGICAL INSTITUTIONS, whose dedication YOUR EMINENCE has deigned to accept, now at last come to seek your exalted patronage.

This book recounts the mysterious beauties and heavenly harmonies that the Holy Spirit has poured upon the forms of divine worship as practiced by the holy Roman Church, Mother and Mistress of all other Churches. By its very subject it commended itself to YOUR MOST EMINENT LORDSHIP, in whom the august dignity of Prince of this holy Church is further enhanced, in the eyes of the whole world, by the striking

marks of the apostolic confidence of Saint Peter's Successor.

Before being raised by your surpassing merit to the highest honors of Christian Rome, YOUR EMINENCE spent many years in the practices of religious life and the labors of scholarship, within that illustrious religious family which has given to Christendom the great *(p. LXVIII)* Barthélemi Gavanti, and to the Sacred Congregation of Rites consultors so renowned for their zeal and knowledge of divine worship. May YOUR EMINENCE recognize in this humble work the sound liturgical doctrines in which you were nurtured and whose purity you so publicly profess!

I dare, MOST EMINENT LORD, to seek a happy presage of the fate awaiting this book in the kindly favor with which YOUR EMINENCE has hitherto deigned to surround both its obscure author and this nascent family. In YOUR MOST EMINENT LORDSHIP this family not only admires the rival and colleague of such men as Gerdil and Fontana, but at the same time reveres, with boundless gratitude, the powerful protector whose name will be forever dear to it.

May the God of mercy long preserve YOUR EMINENCE for the good of his Church and for the consolation of him who has the honor to profess himself, with the deepest respect and the most complete gratitude,

Your MOST EMINENT LORDSHIP'S

most humble and most obedient servant,

Fr. Prosper-Louis-Paschal Guéranger,

Abbot of Solesmes.

Author's Preface

(p. LXIX)

[margin: Neglect of the science of the sacred rites in France: the inevitable consequence]

[margin: of the Liturgy's incessant variations in our churches.]

Our intention in publishing this work has been to meet, at least in some measure, one of the foremost needs of ecclesiastical learning in our country. In all the Catholic schools of the various countries of Europe, the Liturgy forms part of the curriculum: it has its courses and its specialized professors. Why, in France, does it share the neglect into which the science of canon law has temporarily fallen? We must acknowledge the reason: the object of a science must first of all be fixed and determinate. Whereas the various churches of Europe possess an unchanging and ancient Liturgy, our churches have not yet settled upon their breviary and missal. How can one build on this sand? What harmony can one bring to light in rules that did not exist yesterday and will be modified tomorrow, or perhaps replaced by entirely contrary rules? How can one show tradition, that primary necessity of all Catholic institutions, in wholly new formulas and usages?

[margin: The]

[margin: liturgical anarchy into which France has fallen.]

Let us be frank: has not our desire for liturgical perfectibility imperceptibly reduced us to the condition for which Saint Pius V reproached our forefathers in the sixteenth century? What has become of that unity of worship which Pepin and *(p. LXX)* Charlemagne, in concert with the Roman Pontiffs, established in our churches, and which our bishops and councils of the sixteenth century promulgated anew with such zeal and success? Twenty breviaries and twenty missals divide our churches among them, and the oldest of these books did not exist at the opening of the eighteenth century. Some even came into being during the first forty years of the century in which we live.

[margin: These changes received with complete indifference.]

[margin: The laws and history of the Liturgy wholly unknown even to the most learned men.]

If our churches celebrated divine service according to the rules of the Ambrosian rite, or of the Gothic or Mozarabic rite; if, instead of manufacturing from beginning to end Liturgies unknown to previous centuries, we had been restored to possession of that ancient and venerable Gallican Liturgy used in our country until the middle of the eighth century, the science of the sacred rites would have found ample nourishment in the study of such precious monuments. But by a strange reversal of Catholic habits, people have become indifferent to these changes, these substitutions of breviaries and missals which, a few centuries ago, would have stirred clergy and people to revolt. It is not even rare to meet men, otherwise learned, who lack the most elementary notions of the history of liturgical forms and naively imagine that all the prayers resounding in our churches date from the remotest ages. Some even counter with Saint Augustine's words about the harmonious variety produced within unity by local customs, when one points out how these particular usages isolate our churches from the Apostolic See. They *(p. LXXI)* are utterly astonished when shown that our customs do not have antiquity on their side, which alone would make them sacred from Saint Augustine's standpoint, and that, moreover, since that Father's time the Church has expressly manifested her intention to bring the whole West under the law of one and the same Liturgy. But their surprise reaches its height when they are told when, under whose auspices, and by whose hands so momentous a revolution was accomplished.

[margin: The in publishing]

[margin: author's purpose this work.]

We may be asked whether, in raising delicate questions today, we intend to produce a movement in the opposite direction and disturb consciences which have thus far remained at peace. To this we shall first reply that we do not think our feeble voice could have such an effect. We are attempting to treat a grave and thorny subject of ecclesiastical learning, relying on the numerous and imposing school of liturgists who have opened the way for us; and we intend to say nothing that does not conform to the traditions and regulations of the Apostolic See. Readers will judge whether we have introduced any innovation; perhaps they will even perceive that we have studied and reflected somewhat before speaking. But, after all, if our book, attracting the attention of those charged with watching over the churches, were to contribute in the slightest degree to checking grave abuses and, in some measure, preparing a return to the principles of every age concerning liturgical matters, would our crime be so great?

[margin: The question of liturgical law deferred.]

As for the charge that might be made against us of seeking to *(p. LXXII)* disturb consciences, it has no substance. Either we would succeed in awakening unfounded scruples, in which case well-informed people would dispose of our assertions; or we would submit to readers' examination just grounds for alarm, in which case, far from deserving reproach, we think we would have rendered a service. But we declare at once that our zeal is in no way exaggerated. The question of liturgical law is far from occupying the principal place in this work; and, in any case, it is not so easily settled that one should so readily fear we might wish to decide it lightly. A categorical ruling, affirmative or negative, concerning France is not even possible. There are, so to speak, as many questions as there are dioceses. In some, Roman usages have been abolished for ten years; in others, for eighty or a hundred years—a very different matter. Others, including the diocese in which we live, have had books bearing the diocesan title for four or five centuries, subject from time immemorial to revision by the Ordinary. The question, as one sees, is therefore very complex. We repeat: the desire to resolve it was not our motive for undertaking a work in which it will be treated only incidentally.

[margin: The work begins with a general history of the Liturgy.]

In this book we have wished, as its title indicates, to give general instruction in all the subjects pertaining to liturgical learning. Here are the matters we have proposed to treat.

First, since history is the foundation and framework of all *(p. LXXIII)* ecclesiastical instruction, we have undertaken the difficult task, not attempted before us, of presenting a general history of the Liturgy. In this

first volume we carry it to the opening of the seventeenth century. Into this account we have incorporated many details that we could not have placed elsewhere, and which had to be known and appreciated for an understanding of the Liturgy, considered both in general and in its particulars.

[margin: This historical introduction accompanied by bibliographical notices on all liturgical authors.]

In writing this important part of our work, we soon recognized that this historical survey would be insufficient unless we included chronological and bibliographical notices of the authors who have treated the Liturgy or composed liturgical formulas. For this part we have made use of the excellent Bibliotheca ritualis of the illustrious Zaccaria, to which, moreover, we have added more than eighty authors for the first sixteen centuries alone[1]. We have reduced these notices to the smallest possible compass so as not to swell the volume unduly. In the articles we share with Zaccaria, just as we have not always included the books he cites, so more than once we have brought forward books that had escaped his notice.

(p. LXXIV)

[margin: General plan of the work.]

When the liturgical history of the Church, which we are to carry through to the nineteenth century, has been completed, we begin treating the particular subjects. After the necessary information on the books of the Liturgy, the calendar, and the division of time and its mysteries in the Liturgy, we pass to an explanation of the traditions and symbols contained both in the movable part of the ecclesiastical year and in the fixed part of this marvelous cycle.

The Christian sacrifice is then treated with all the details that can contribute to a proper understanding of this divine center of the whole Liturgy. After this we come to the traditions concerning the Sacraments, those seven sources of grace from which the salvation of the Christian people continually flows. The imposing body of Sacramentals next attracts our attention and affords us the opportunity to show the universal restoration of God's work by the power of the Cross, from which the Church's divine power flows. A final part comprises the liturgical Acts and Functions that do not fall under the divisions just indicated.

[margin: Special treatises will complete the Institutions.]

After developing in detail all the parts of this Summa, we follow it with several special treatises in which we examine: (1) the rules of symbolism in liturgical matters; (2) the language and style of the Liturgy; (3) liturgical law; (4) the authority of the Liturgy as a means of instruction in the Church. We conclude this last subdivision of our subject with a short work in which, under the title Theologia liturgica (Liturgical Theology), we have arranged by *(p. LXXV)* subject all the aids to elucidating Catholic dogma and morals contained in the Liturgy as Rome promulgates it today.

[margin: The author declares himself the champion of the Roman Liturgy.]

Such is the task we have imposed upon ourselves: may God grant us to fulfill it adequately! This work, the fruit of twelve years of study, touches an immense number of questions. Its approach is wholly new; its general principles and rules of application are drawn, as they had to be, from an established body of material which, both in fact and in law, often conflicts with the ideas accepted in the country where we write. Need we say it? We are wholly Roman. Surely this will not be made a crime against us. For quite some time it has been customary in France to say that Rome's liturgical books do not measure up to our religious civilization. A century ago we subjected them to the most scathing criticism by repudiating them wholesale and constructing a priori new offices entirely at variance with those of the Mother of Churches, even on the very feasts of Easter and Pentecost. Let us therefore be permitted to take up the gauntlet and for a moment become the champion of the Roman Church and all the churches of the West[2], which still chant—and doubtless will chant until the end of time—the offices that Saint Gregory the Great, twelve centuries ago, collected from among those composed by his predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs. After all, is it not praiseworthy to defend unity in matters of religion? Are there, then, matters in which *(p. LXXVI)* it would become dangerous? Has it

not existed—did this liturgical unity not still exist in France in the seventeenth century? Since we broke it, has our Church enjoyed so much prosperity?

[margin: Undertaking to answer every objection that might be made against this work.]

Let no one, then, be surprised if in this work we wholeheartedly favor the Roman Liturgy. If anyone disapproves, let him attack us. We shall try to satisfy him; and, so that the public may remain judge of the controversy, we undertake to place both the objections and the replies at the beginning of the volume following the one whose facts or principles have been challenged.

[margin: An unhoped-for reaction in France favoring the preservation of monuments of religious and national architecture.]

Nowadays it is all the fashion to champion antiquities of every kind. An innumerable host of archaeologists has arisen throughout the country, and our monuments, especially religious ones, are henceforth safe not only from destruction but from every mutilation and ill-judged repair. The finest harmony reigns on this point between our civil and ecclesiastical authorities. Thanks to so sudden and unhoped-for a revolution, France will enjoy for many centuries yet the trophies of her ancient glory in the Catholic arts. Here, surely, is reason to offer God heartfelt thanksgiving. When, in 1832, we poor unknown priests wrested the admirable monument of Solesmes from the demolishers' hands, after it had pleaded with the country for mercy for so many years, we were far from imagining ourselves on the eve of a universal reaction whose result would be the passionate preservation of every remnant of our ancient religious and national architecture.

(p. LXXVII)

[margin: Our restored old churches ask again for the chants that had echoed]

[margin: in them for centuries.]

Now, then, that the stones of the sanctuary, having become objects of ardent study and admiration, no longer risk being scattered by vandal or unskilled hands; now that every effort is concentrated on complete restorations and, when necessary, exact reproductions of round arches, pointed arches, rose windows, stained glass, and woodwork: is it not time to remember that our churches have suffered not only in their walls, vaults, and ancient furnishings? Above all, they have been widowed of those ancient and venerable chants with which they so loved to resound; they are weary of repeating, for a century now, only new strains unknown to the ages of faith that raised them. After all, the words of the Liturgy are holier and more precious even than the stones it sanctifies.

[margin: The Liturgy they call for is the Roman Liturgy, with which all their]

[margin: memories are connected.]

Is not the Liturgy the soul of your cathedrals? Without it, what are they but immense corpses in which the word of life has been extinguished? Consider, then, restoring what they have lost. If they are Romanesque, they ask you again for that Roman rite which Pepin and Charlemagne made known to them. If their arches soar to a point, they call for those chants which Saint Louis so delighted to hear their echoes repeat. If the Renaissance crowned them with its flowery garlands, did they not see the bishops of the sixteenth century introduce beneath their youthful vaults the new books Rome had just given to the churches? All our national poetry, our customs, and our ancient institutions, religious or civil, are interwoven with memories of the ancient *(p. LXXVIII)* Liturgy whose loss we mourn. This is what we shall show in this book, inadequate though it is. We would even dare to think that, despite its intended clerical readership, the poet, the artist, the archaeologist, and the historian might find something to draw from it.

[margin: The principal aim of this publication is to initiate young clergy into the study of the mysteries of divine worship.]

However that may be, we have left it the modest title Liturgical Institutions, as befits a work especially intended for instruction. Its principal aim is to initiate the youngest of our brethren into the study of those mysteries of divine worship and prayer which must form the principal nourishment of their lives. An ecclesiastical publishing enterprise whose directors knew of our project had asked to include this work

among its publications. It was therefore announced for publication in 1838. We received the most precious encouragement on this subject, and we know in advance that, although this book's subject may displease some, it already enjoys much sympathy. Our physical strength having failed to meet our expectations, we found ourselves obliged to defer publication of this first volume until the present moment, when we issue it on our sole responsibility.

[margin: Announcement of the forthcoming publication of a Liturgical Year.]

The entire work will comprise five volumes. The second will appear during the present year, and the others will follow at very short intervals. Having made long and serious studies of the Liturgy, we plan to publish several special treatises apart from these Institutions. We shall mention here only the project of a Liturgical Year, a work intended to enable the faithful to benefit from the immense aids offered to *(p. LXXIX)* Christian piety by an understanding of the mysteries of the Liturgy in the different seasons of the ecclesiastical year. This work will have nothing in common with the various Christian Years published thus far. It will be intended to help the faithful in attending the divine offices; they will be able to take it to church, where it will take the place of every other prayer book. The first division of The Liturgical Year will appear in duodecimo format, under the title Liturgical Advent, during the autumn of next year, 1841.

[margin: Project of Canonical Institutions.]

As for the Liturgical Institutions themselves, we hope to follow them with another work of the same length and an analogous kind, entitled Canonical Institutions. On all sides people are at last beginning to feel the need to know and study ecclesiastical law. The indifference in which France has lived for forty years concerning the Church's general and particular discipline is unparalleled in the annals of Christianity. The consequences of this prolonged indifference have grown worse with time, and can be remedied only by recourse to the true sources of ecclesiastical legislation, to the grave and learned writings of unimpeachable canonists. Today we no longer have sovereign courts (parlements) to distort notions of law or impede ecclesiastical jurisdiction; no longer any Gallicanism to paralyze the life-giving action of the head of the Church upon all her members.

Our Canonical Institutions, intended like the Liturgical Institutions for the instruction of our young brethren, had been requested from us by the directors of the same *(p. LXXX)* ecclesiastical publishing enterprise we have mentioned, and were announced to the public three years ago. The reasons we have explained having forced us to defer this publication, we shall be able to carry it out after the complete publication of the Liturgical Institutions. We shall therefore refrain from speaking to the reader any longer about a work which is indeed already being prepared, but whose appearance must still await several years.

We shall conclude this preface by submitting this work, in mind and heart, to the judgment and correction of the Apostolic See. We undertook it solely to serve the Church according to our feeble means, looking for success to him alone who, Priest and Victim, is at once the means and the end of all LITURGY.

---

[1] Among the liturgists overlooked by Zaccaria whom we have collected, we shall mention Victorinus, Prudentius, Saint Paulinus, Sedulius, Cassian, Saint Caesarius, Chilperic, Saint Leo II, Saint Chrodegang, Charlemagne, Helisacar, Lupus of Ferrières, Charles the Bald, Fulk II of Anjou, Guy of Auxerre, Hartmann, Ekkehart, Létalde, Adelbode, Alphane, Marbode, Guigues, Abelard, Adam of Saint-Victor, Maurice de Sully, Cenci de Sabelli, Alan of Lille, Blessed Charles of Blois, Claude de Sainctes, Galesini, Erasmus, Democharès, Muret, Silvio Antoniani, etc.

[2] Except Milan and six or seven churches in Toledo, whose Liturgy is ancient and approved.

Part I: Liturgical History

Chapter I. Preliminary Notions

(p. 1)

[margin: Definition of the Liturgy.]

The Liturgy, considered in general, is the whole of the symbols, chants, and actions through which the Church expresses and manifests her religion toward God.

[margin: The Liturgy is prayer in its social character.]

The Liturgy, then, is not simply prayer, but prayer considered in its social character. An individual prayer offered in an individual's name is not Liturgy. Yet individuals may legitimately and fittingly employ the Liturgy's formulas and signs with the intention of giving greater force and efficacy to their acts of prayer, as when they recite established prayers, hymns, or responsories to stir themselves to religion. This kind of prayer is even *(p. 2)* the best form of vocal prayer, since it joins the merit and consecration of the whole Church to the individual's effort.

[margin: Private recitation of the Divine Office is a liturgical act.]

As for the private recitation of the Liturgy's formulas in the Divine Office by clerics, benefice holders, and religious, who are bound to supply in private what they do not perform in choir, it cannot be regarded as an act of private devotion: it is an act of social religion. The person who prays in this way is officially deputed for this purpose. His words, even his intention, belong to the Church. If he sins in this duty, he sins against the Church as well as against himself. Thus the recitation of the Breviary, although in our unhappy times and in our country it now takes place almost exclusively in private, is nevertheless a liturgical thing, a liturgical act.

[margin: The Liturgy includes all forms of the virtue of religion.]

Just as the virtue of religion embraces all acts of divine worship, so the Liturgy, the social form of this virtue, likewise includes them all. One may even say that the Liturgy is the highest and holiest expression of the Church's thought and understanding, for the very reason that the Church exercises it in direct communication with God in Confession, Prayer, and Praise.

CONFESSION, PRAYER, PRAISE: these are the principal acts of religion; these, too, are the principal forms of the Liturgy.

[margin: 1. Confession.]

CONFESSION, by which the Church pays homage to God for the truth she has received from him, repeating a thousand times in his presence the triumphant Creed that contains, written in the language of earth, truths that belong to heaven. She repeats this Creed in abridged form several times each day in the canonical Hours; in a fuller form within the sacrificial action on Sundays and great solemnities; finally, she confesses it on a grand scale in the whole *(p. 3)* of the Christian year, in which it is represented, mystery by mystery, with all the richness of the rites, all the splendor of the language, all the depth of adoration, all the enthusiasm of faith.

[margin: The Liturgy is tradition at its highest degree of power.]

Hence the very great importance always accorded to the words and acts of the Liturgy for understanding dogma. The axiom is well known: Let the rule for prayer determine the rule of belief. In the Liturgy the Spirit who inspired the Sacred Scriptures still speaks; the Liturgy is tradition itself at its highest degree of power and solemnity.

[margin: 2. Prayer]

PRAYER, by which the Church expresses her love, her desire to please God and be united to him: a desire at once humble and strong, timid and bold, because she is loved and he who loves her is God. In Prayer, which follows Confession as hope follows faith, the Church presents her petitions, sets forth her needs, explains her necessities; for she knows what God wills of her and how far she is from it, until the number of the elect is complete.

[margin: with the most varied accents.]

Hence the captivating unction, the ineffable melancholy, the incommunicable tenderness of these formulas, some so simple, others so solemn, in which there appears now the sweet and tender confidence of a royal bride toward the monarch who has chosen and crowned her, now the eager solicitude of a mother's heart alarmed for her beloved children; but always that knowledge of the things of another life, so profound and so distinct, whether she confesses the truth or desires to taste its fruits, that no feeling can be compared with hers, no language set beside her language.

[margin: 3. Praise]

PRAISE, for the Church cannot contain in silent contemplation the transports of love and admiration aroused in her by the sight of the divine mysteries. Like Mary, at the sight of the great things that he who is mighty has done in *(p. 4)* her, she rejoices in him and glorifies him. She therefore celebrates the Lord's victories and her own triumphs as well. The memory of the wonders of ancient times delights and exalts her; she begins a splendid account of them, as though to revive the feelings they inspire in her.

[margin: of God and his elect.]

After God, she celebrates God's elect: first, the incomparable Mary, for whom she has accents of love and prayer of heavenly sweetness; the blessed Spirits, whose relations with her and whose influence adorn and protect her; her own children who have watered her with their blood, illumined her with their doctrine, sanctified her with their glorious confession, perfumed her with the fragrance of their lilies and roses. Each year she recounts their virtues and their struggles with love and motherly care.

[margin: These three forms of divine worship become in the Liturgy a threefold source of inexhaustible poetry.]

Now these three principal parts—Confession, Prayer, Praise—become in the Liturgy a threefold source of inexhaustible poetry: poetry inspired by the same Spirit who dictated the canticles of David, Isaiah, and Solomon; poetry as captivating in its images as it is profound and inexhaustible in feeling. God owed his Church a language worthy of serving such lofty thoughts, such ardent desires.

[margin: To express themselves they necessarily require the aid of chant,]

But since all the great impressions of the soul—faith, love, the feeling of admiration, the joy of triumph—are not merely spoken but sung, and all the more so because every feeling established in order resolves itself into harmony, it follows that the Church must naturally sing praise, prayer, and confession. She produces, through a gradation doubtless somewhat weakened as it recedes from its principle, a chant as beautiful as the words, words as lofty as the feeling, and the feeling itself in a finite but real relation to him who is its object and source.

And since the Church is a society, not of spirits but *(p. 5)* of men, creatures composed of soul and body, who express every truth in images and signs, themselves bearing in their bodies an ineffable form of their soul; in the Church, we say, this heavenly whole of confession, prayer, and praise, spoken in a sacred language and modulated to a supernatural rhythm, also manifests itself through external signs, rites and ceremonies, which are the body of the Liturgy.

[margin: and external signs: rites and ceremonies.]

Thus feeling, word, melody, action: these are the elements which, brought into relation with the true and the good, produce order and perfect harmony. What must they not bring forth when they take on the proportions

of the very Church of God, initiated by the Word into the secrets of eternal life, depositary of immutable and fruitful truth, continually nourished by the supernatural element? Let us not fear to say, then, that the Liturgy contains eminently all beauty of feeling, melody, and form, not merely equal to but infinitely above anything with which it could be compared, apart from the Sacred Books. We shall see the proof at leisure.

Chapter II. Importance of the Study of the Liturgy

(p. 6)

[margin: The Liturgy is the subject matter of a science with several branches,]

It is readily apparent that this whole of confession, prayer, and praise which constitutes the Liturgy must furnish the subject matter of a true science: the science of the Divine Offices, that is, of that part of the Liturgy which consists in the sacrifice of the lips[1]; the science of the real sacrifice, with all its rites and mysteries; the science of the sacraments, instruments of man's sanctification; the science of blessings and sacramentals, through which every created thing is purified and restored by the power of the Cross; finally, the science of supplications and other solemn rites employed by the Church on extraordinary occasions.

[margin: and which broadens further when the study of sources is added.]

But if this simple enumeration of the powers and means of Religion already sets before us so vast and radiant a whole, what will it be when, tracing these various forms of divine worship through tradition, in the writings of the Fathers, in the ordinances of councils, and in the monuments of ecclesiastical antiquity, we are led to question every century and record answers so beautiful in their unity and so fruitful in every kind of inspiration? Such, nevertheless, is liturgical learning as it has been conceived, explored, and taught by so many great doctors, whose glorious names and immense services will be recounted later.

Not all, certainly, are called to pursue an equally extensive course in liturgical learning; but one *(p. 7)* may affirm, without fear of contradiction, that, to speak only of ecclesiastics, it should be for them the object of study no less specialized than casuistry, to which it is now customary in France to devote about half the time allotted to clerical education. Are not the recitation, and often even the celebration, of the Divine Offices the priest's daily occupation? What could concern him more than to be able to follow the chain of wonders unfolding in the succession of feasts and seasons of the Christian year, to break the seals of that daily book which the Church of today has received from the Church of the first centuries with a tradition of hidden mysteries and admirable chants? Each day the priest ascends the altar to sacrifice there the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world[2]. Where will he better understand the holiness and grandeur of this action, as it was formerly called; where will he better learn the purity of heart it requires, than by studying how it has been performed from the eve of the day on which Christ suffered down to times nearer our own, when the Church, moved by the Holy Spirit, irrevocably fixed the rites with whose sacred observance she chose to surround the most august of mysteries? And the sacraments, divine sources of salvation, and the sacramentals through which the Church pours out upon the faithful people the fullness of sanctification within her: if so many learned writings have been composed by the Church's most pious and learned men to explain their rites, clarify their formulas, and unfold all their majesty, how could the priest, minister of this whole dispensation at once merciful and sublime, fail to devote himself to seeking this pearl of infinite price? If he has been told to imitate what he *(p. 8)* handles, imitamini quod tractatis[3], has he not thereby been told to study it and know it?

[margin: The capital importance of this science for the priest.]

[margin: The faithful themselves have always drawn the greatest benefit from instruction based on understanding the Liturgy.]

Oh, who could tell the graces of salvation that would pour out upon the Christian people as the direct effect of instruction based on explaining and understanding the mysteries, words, and rites of the Liturgy, if our peoples knew and savored what mere catechumens knew and savored in the churches of Milan, Hippo, or

Jerusalem, initiated by an Ambrose, an Augustine, a Cyril! And later, what enlightenment did our new churches of the West not draw from the liturgical teaching of a Rabanus Maurus, an Ivo of Chartres, an Honorius of Autun, a Hildebert of Le Mans and Tours, a Durand of Mende, and others! What an influence upon Catholic morals! What a bulwark of the faith! What a disposition to feel the things of supernatural life in those populations carefully and minutely instructed in the secrets which Christ and his Church have hidden beneath the vast and profound emblem of the Liturgy! This is felt daily in those regions of North America where the true Church has, so to speak, no faithful except the souls whom, under the guidance of the divine Spirit, she goes gleaning and gathering amid sweat and toil. Missionaries' letters constantly speak of the great success they obtain in unfolding for their hearers the marvelous symbolism of the Catholic Liturgy. Fortunate enough to possess it entire and free from every national admixture—in a word, as the Apostolic See promulgates it—these new apostles have no difficulty making the harmony and authority of this truly superhuman whole felt. Should a new church be dedicated by the bishop, the mere explanation of the symbols which, in this august ceremony, bring successively *(p. 9)* before the eyes of the faithful the mysteries of the heavenly Jerusalem, of the Church militant, and of spiritual life prepares an abundant harvest. And when, after completing all the profound rites of this solemnity, the bishop prays, "O God, who from living and chosen stones prepare an eternal dwelling for your majesty, help your people who beseech you, so that your Church's increase in material extent may be enlarged by spiritual growth"[4], he soon learns that he has been heard.

[margin: Knowledge of dogma can best enter minds through the means that brings grace into them.]

And indeed, what other means is there of bringing knowledge of dogma into minds than the very means chosen by the author and restorer of our nature to bring into them that invisible grace which sanctifies us? My words are spirit and life[5], says the Savior: they give both light to the understanding and, to the heart, charity, which is life. So it is with the words of the Church, who possesses the fullness of the mysteries and dispenses it to the Christian people through rites and formulas filled with both truth and love.

[margin: The Liturgy always regarded in the Church as lofty instruction in dogma.]

Thus the Liturgy has always been regarded as lofty instruction in dogma, while also being its most popular form. We shall soon see that all the holy doctors were liturgists; that the ecclesiastical writers who followed them ardently cultivated the science of the sacred rites; that the scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages also wished to compose their Summa of the mysteries; that at the Reformation Catholic doctors turned their activity toward this study and were the first to give rise to liturgical collections; and that, finally—a surprise to many—learned Protestants, at the *(p. 10)* risk of exposing the inheritance of the Reformation to the incursions of ecclesiastical antiquity, have also believed, have believed, like all the ancient Fathers and Catholic doctors, that there could be no complete study of Christian dogma unless the subject of rites and sacred formulas were carefully explored, unless they questioned, century by century, those papist books which elsewhere they would present as an instrument for corrupting evangelical doctrine. They have been seen, and are still seen, publishing collections, liturgical libraries, and putting more than one Catholic to shame by their zeal and the importance they attach to such work. Here are the very words of the celebrated Pfaff of Tübingen, in a dissertation de Liturgiis, missalibus, agendis et libris ecclesiasticis Ecclesiæ orientalis et occidentalis, appended to his Institutions of Ecclesiastical History:

[margin: Protestants themselves acknowledge this truth.]

[margin: Testimony of Pfaff of Tübingen.]

"Since ecclesiastical books, Liturgies, and what are called agenda enjoy public ecclesiastical authority and the approval of the whole Church wherever they are used; since, moreover, those most ancient liturgies which once prevailed, and still prevail, in the Eastern and Western Church draw much from apostolic times; since, finally, the form of public worship can be derived and ascertained from liturgies alone, it is easy to see that they shed great light on all ecclesiastical history, especially its dogmatic and ritual aspects, and not

merely feed the curiosity of the learned but also fill the mind with splendid and excellent observations"[6].

(p. 11) Further on, he recommends reading Cardinal Bona's books on liturgical matters as being of the highest scholarly interest, and concludes by saying that polemical theology itself cannot dispense with this kind of auxiliary study[7].

[margin: Specialized teaching of the Liturgy is indispensable in seminaries.]

Let us therefore be permitted to point out here the regrettable gap left in our country's ecclesiastical teaching by the absence of specialized liturgical studies, and to express the wish that our seminaries might imitate the Roman Seminary and most of Italy's principal seminaries, where young clerics, under a professor's direction, devote themselves to studying more or less complete courses of liturgical institutions. The understanding of Catholic dogma will gain from this; the science of canon law, which has so many points of contact with the Liturgy, will derive great advantages from it; finally, ecclesiastical history will be better understood and more attractive once the tradition of sacred rites, which occupies so great a place in it, is better known and better appreciated. These studies of antiquity and archaeology, which there seems to be a desire to introduce in several places with such praiseworthy zeal, prepared by at least a general knowledge of ecclesiastical history, would achieve genuine *(p. 12)* results, once informed by a knowledge, perhaps somewhat minute but indispensable, of the formulas and symbols of divine worship from the origin of Christianity to the present time. Finally, the spirit of faith, so precious in the dispensation of heavenly gifts, in the guardianship of the sanctuary, and in the celebration of sacred splendor, would grow anew and bear all the more lasting fruit, since, of all studies and sciences, that of the Liturgy, having the things of God as its direct and immediate object, least allows man to lose sight of supernatural things, whose attraction alone can prompt him to undertake this kind of labor. But we shall have occasion elsewhere to develop these considerations.

[margin: The spirit of faith would find nourishment in it.]

[margin: LITURGICAL INSTITUTIONS.]

[margin: The study of the Liturgy is necessary for the historian and the antiquarian.]

The study of the Liturgy is necessary for more than clerics alone. Without it, scholars engaged in exploring and recounting the customs of the various European societies since the preaching of the Gospel find it impossible, impossible to take a step without falling into errors of more than one kind, or to avoid losing a multitude of precious observations that would lend great truth and still greater interest to their narratives or their portrayals. Unfortunately, this disadvantage is little felt; and if the craze for the Middle Ages that possesses every mind has not yet induced people to learn, even through disinterested study, the catechism of the peoples whose beliefs they recount, one must also admit that there was little hope of their having the patience to penetrate the mystery of those peoples' rites and sacred formulas. Such zeal can be found, though with results far less easily attained and far less certain, when it is a question of the mysteries and beliefs of India, Persia, or Egypt. For the West, it is true, people ostentatiously cite Dom Martène's De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus; but the uses made of the riches that *(p. 13)* this treasure contains fall far short of the goodwill displayed. Every science, in general, resists anyone who has not studied it, and that of the Catholic rites demands, above all, deep and undivided application, since everything in it is either mystical or rests on established fact. To glimpse a certain general coloring of lofty and graceful poetry, to construct from these elements a more or less pleasing narrative, is easy, since it is superficial; but learning does not lie there. The populations whose customs you depict might not, like you, have analyzed all this poetry; but they knew why they acted, what beliefs they expressed in this or that symbol; and you do not know, because you do not understand the vast and popular economy of Catholicism.

[margin: It is equally required of artists,]

[margin: architects,]

[margin: painters,]

If the study of the Liturgy is necessary for the historian of customs and the antiquarian, it is no less so for the artist. But who knows today that all the arts—architecture, painting, sculpture, music—depend on the Liturgy and, through it, on Catholicism? What artist knows this, apart from Cornelius and Overbeck in Germany and a few unrecognized young talents in France? Yet the Liturgy alone holds the secret of building churches; it alone knows how many mysteries must be expressed by the doors, windows, columns, chapels, towers or spires, and arrangement of the building. It alone knows and can tell the painter under what emblems, fixed by ecclesiastical decrees, the mysteries must be represented, with what attributes saints, both men and women, will be recognized at once and invoked by the faith of the faithful. It alone can enable him to avoid those hideous anachronisms of priestly dress seen pompously displayed on the great canvases that crowd the churches of the capital or the halls of the annual exhibition: anachronisms sometimes all the more laughable because they result from study that has been *(p. 14)* poorly digested. It alone can teach him the rich and important tradition of colors, the expression imparted by contact with the divine mysteries[8]. It alone can reveal to the sculptor those details of pose, those arrangements of drapery, the secret of those mysterious groups formed in the celebration of the sacred rites, those requirements of fitness in place and purpose whose appreciation would prevent misunderstandings sometimes noticed only when a piece of sculpture, after costing much expense and labor, is found incapable of fulfilling its intended purpose. It alone can reveal to the musician those ineffable Gregorian melodies which are both the sole remnant of that ancient music of which so many wonders are told and the product of the noblest and most sublime Catholic inspiration: admirable themes from which people have departed only to fall into barbarism, believing they could substitute melodies as easily as they substituted new formulas for the formulas of antiquity, or to throw themselves into a wholly profane genre that forms the most revolting contrast with the holiness of the place, the majesty of the words, and the sacredness of the mysteries; unless, at other times, they prefer patiently to compose and just as patiently to perform pieces that are insignificant and devoid of any meaning, provided that the harmony is perfect and the time is kept.

[margin: musicians,]

[margin: sculptors,]

[margin: The author will count himself fortunate,]

An attentive study of the Liturgy would have prevented, and would daily prevent, in every field, many *(p. 15)* errors; and however limited our talent and our knowledge of this subject may be, we shall not consider our time wasted in composing this work if we succeed in disturbing, to some degree, an indifference too long prolonged, in awakening a few men and making them perceive a rich and fruitful science where until now they had suspected no scope for serious study. We still have many principles to state, discuss, and establish, some perhaps rather severe; we shall proceed in this work with frankness and, God willing, without losing sight for an instant of the Church's principles on so important a subject. But since we have already had occasion to experience how, for lack of clarification on questions of fact, the truth about liturgical matters could sometimes become a subject of dispute, we have thought it necessary to place a general history of the Liturgy at the head of the discussion; we shall then have only to proceed by corollaries or applications. We trust that justice will be done to the efforts we have made to equip ourselves to treat in a new way subjects which, though now fairly generally unknown, have nevertheless, in all preceding centuries, as will be seen, occupied a great place in ecclesiastical learning. It is understood that in the historical survey that follows we shall dwell only on general facts and on those particular facts necessary to enable the reader to grasp a whole. Questions of detail will be treated in their place in the following volumes, according to the order in which the subjects successively present themselves.

[margin: A general history of the Liturgy is the work's necessary starting point.]

[margin: if he succeeds in awakening interest in a rich and fruitful science.]

---

[1] Hebr., XIII, 15.

[2] Apoc., XIII, 8.

[3] Roman Pontifical, Ordination of a Priest.

[4] Deus, qui de vivis et electis lapidibus æternum majestati tuæ præparas habitaculum, auxiliare populo tuo supplicanti, ut quod Ecclesiæ tuæ corporalibus proficit spatiis, spiritualibus amplificetur augmentis. (Roman Missal, Dedication of a Church, Postcommunion.)

[5] Joan., VI, 64.

[6] Cum libri ecclesiastici, Liturgiæ, atque agenda quas vocant, ecclesiastica publica auctoritate, atque approbatione totius, ubi quidem eorum est usus, ecclesiæ gaudeant, cum etiam antiquissimæ illæ, quæ in ecclesia orientali, atque occidentali olim viguere, atque etiam nunc vigent, liturgiæ ex apostolicis temporibus multa trahant; cum denique non nisi ex liturgiis cultus publici ratio derivari, atque erui possit, facile est perspicere magnam easdem lucem omni historiæ ecclesiasticæ, maxime vero dogmaticæ, et rituali afferre, nec saltem curiositatem eruditorum pascere, sed et præclaris egregiisque observationibus animum imbuere. (Disquisit. de liturg., missalibus, etc. Tubingæ, 1721.)

[7] Furthermore, it is chiefly from these, as from their sources, that we must learn what the ancient Church taught about each of the sacraments. Nor is there anything empty in what we have already said: that the ancient liturgies also fill the mind with excellent ascetical observations and no negligible piety. Whoever dares deny this, let him read, we ask, the Greek liturgies; let him read the one found in the Apostolic Constitutions; let him read that of Chrysostom; let him also read Giovanni Bona's books, in which he explained ancient liturgical matters and interspersed excellent observations. Finally, this study is especially relevant to a more solid treatment of polemical theology. Thus, anyone attempting a careful treatment of the veneration and invocation of saints will accomplish nothing excellent without examining ancient and more recent liturgies. Let the same be said of the veneration of images and relics of the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God. (Ibidem, In Epimetro, p. 72.)

[8] On this subject one may read Count de Montalembert's excellent remarks on the absolute loss of Catholic art in France, in his admirable introduction to the Monuments de sainte Élisabeth. We would only ask him to add to his list of strange paintings in the churches of Paris a certain canvas at the Sorbonne depicting, beside Robert Sorbon, a monk dressed in green, the one color no religious order has ever adopted. Traditions are already so remote from us that we do not flatter ourselves that all readers will grasp the full extent of this blunder.

Chapter III. The State of the Liturgy in the Time of the Apostles

(p. 16)

[margin: The origin of the Liturgy is in God.]

The Liturgy is so excellent a thing that, to find its origin, we must go back to God; for God, in contemplating his infinite perfections, unceasingly praises and glorifies himself, just as he loves himself with an eternal love. Yet these various acts accomplished within the divine essence received a visible and truly liturgical expression only when one of the three Persons, having assumed human nature, could henceforth fulfill the duties of religion toward the glorious Trinity.

[margin: The incarnate Word, who came to earth to instruct the world in carrying out the liturgical work, continues it eternally in Heaven.]

God so loved the world that he gave it his only Son[1] to instruct it in carrying out the liturgical work. After being announced and prefigured for forty centuries, a divine prayer was offered, a divine sacrifice was accomplished; and even now, and into eternity, the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world offers himself on the sublime altar of heaven and fulfills in an infinite manner all the duties of religion toward the ineffable Trinity, in the name of the members whose Head he is. They confess, supplicate, and glorify with him, through the power of the divine Spirit who, animating them with his breath[2] and overshadowing them[3], forms within them that inexpressible groaning[4] which gently resounds in their hearts.

(p. 17)

[margin: The Virgin Mary,]

Infinitely below the Lamb, but incomparably above every other creature, Mary, Mother of God, present in body and soul so that nothing may be lacking to the fullness of her liturgical expression, offers God the purest and most complete prayer after that of the Son of God. To him she presents creation's petitions, completing them with her own perfection, rendering them pleasing through her unfailingly welcome influence.

[margin: the angelic spirits,]

The choirs of angelic spirits also celebrate God's praise. They unceasingly cry out in alternation: Holy, holy, holy! They fulfill all the duties of religion for themselves and also for the rest of creation, particularly for men, to whom, as to them, God has entrusted the honor of his service[5].

[margin: the Saints unite with the incarnate Word to fulfill in heaven all the duties of religion toward God.]

Human beings who are elect and glorified—the saints—established in a perfect harmony of grace and glory, also sing the divine praise, continuing their earthly canticles in a still stronger and more melodious voice; and, so that nothing may be lacking to the conditions of their Liturgy, they will one day take up their bodies again to be able to give it a visible form.

[margin: The Church militant joins this divine concert.]

Finally, the Church militant praises God with the Lamb, her spouse, on whom she leans[6]; with Mary, her merciful queen; with the angels, who govern her under the eye of the Most High; with the saints, who always love her with filial tenderness and draw her upward from above. In this mortal dwelling where divine decrees keep her, and which she is called to sanctify, she admirably fulfills all the conditions of the Liturgy, as we shall show in detail in these Institutions.

But let us first trace the origins and the developments *(p. 18)* of this Liturgy in its general forms. Let us first acknowledge that the world has never been without it; for, just as the Church dates from the beginning of the world, according to St. Augustine's doctrine[7], the Liturgy dates from that same beginning. Indeed, man has never been without knowledge of God, who revealed himself to him at the very outset. Now, knowing God, man has never failed to adore him, to supplicate him, to celebrate his greatness and his benefits; nor have these sentiments ever existed in man without finding expression in words and acts.

[margin: The Liturgy, like the Church, dates from the beginning of the world.]

[margin: God himself deigned to reveal its forms, indicated by the sacrifices of Cain and Abel.]

God deigned to reveal these forms of the Liturgy, just as he gave man thought, just as he gave him speech, just as he manifested himself to him as the author of nature and the author of grace and glory. Thus, from the beginning, we see the first men practicing the Liturgy in the principal and most august of its acts: sacrifice. Despite the difference between their sacrificial offerings, and by reason of that very difference, Cain and Abel attest in their diverse offerings a preestablished order, a common rite, although the second brother's sacrifice is bloody and the first brother's offering is not.

[margin: Enosh enriches these primitive forms.]

Soon, in that same age before the Flood, so rich in divine communications, we read of Enosh, a just man and servant of God, that he began to invoke the name of the Lord[8]: that is, as the Fathers understood it, to enrich with more extensive developments that first form which went back to the very day of man's creation. Throughout this period sacrifice persisted; for Noah, on leaving the Ark, while the Lord's bow shone on the horizon, sacrificed in *(p. 19)* thanksgiving several of the clean animals which, for this very purpose, God had commanded to be preserved in greater numbers[9].

[margin: The Liturgy of the first patriarchs survives the Flood and is practiced by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.]

[margin: The Sacrifice of Melchizedek.]

Thus the liturgical principle had been saved from the fearful cataclysm that engulfed forever most memories of that first world; it survived along with language, along with the sacred traditions of the patriarchs. We see frequent applications of it in the very brief pages of the narrative before Moses. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob offer animal sacrifices[10]; they dedicate to the Lord places where they have felt his presence[11]; they raise stones as an altar (4). These stones, as today, need to be flooded with oil to become worthy of receiving the majesty of God (5); and not only does the altar appear, but the future sacrifice is shown from afar. Suddenly,

a priest-king, holding bread and wine in his hands, offers a peace offering (6), and with such truth that the memory of his sacrifice and consecration remains to be invoked a thousand years later by another prophet-king, who was not himself a priest, as a type of the priesthood and sacrifice of the Messiah to come.

[margin: The unvarying precision of liturgical forms proves that they were imposed by God himself.]

Throughout this primitive age, liturgical traditions are not shifting and arbitrary, but precise and definite: they recur unchanged. It is clearly seen that they are not man's invention but are imposed by God himself; for the Lord praises Abraham for having kept not only his laws and precepts but also his ceremonies (7).

The Mosaic law was then promulgated in its time to give the Liturgy a still more precise and more *(p. 20)* solemn form, to create a body of priests presided over by a high priest, and to fix, through written regulations, traditions hitherto preserved pure but whose integrity was threatened by the general defection of the peoples. Yet before Moses ascended Sinai, where he was to receive this law, the Paschal Lamb had already been slain amid the most mysterious rites, and the leader of the Hebrews had already sung the hymn of the crossing of the Red Sea, while Miriam, at the head of the choir of Israel's virgins, accompanied him with the sound of sacred instruments.

[margin: God reveals to Moses the liturgical rites of the Old Covenant.]

God therefore speaks and reveals this whole body of rites, in which the various kinds of sacrifices, expiations, the offering of firstfruits, sacred fire, incensations, priestly vestments, and so forth appear in admirable order. The Liturgy emerges from infancy and passes into its intermediate age, during which it was no longer to be practiced in a merely domestic form, but in a more social form, through a sacred tribe. On the other hand, however, its symbols, rich as they were, were not to contain the realities they signified. Developing this magnificent picture does not fall within our plan; numerous learned commentators have treated it in specialized works which anyone may consult.

[margin: Tradition completes the rules recorded in the sacred books.]

Moreover, Leviticus did not contain all the ritual details of Mosaic worship, any more than the tablets of the law contained all the beliefs of God's people. Many liturgical particulars were preserved through tradition, such as the rite of the Song of Ascents[12], prayer seven times a day and in the middle of the night[13], the anointing of kings[14], and a thousand other facts scattered through the historical and prophetic books of the Old Testament.

(p. 21)

[margin: Analogy between Gentile forms of worship and the liturgical rites of the Hebrews.]

We must also not fail to point out that remarkable phenomenon which immediately strikes the observer of ancient religions: the striking resemblance between the religious forms employed by most Gentile peoples and the liturgical rites of the Israelite people. This fact is incontestable and, as was observed long ago, it contributed powerfully to preparing the way for the establishment of Christian worship, whether one explains it, with most of the ancient Fathers, by a series of contacts between those peoples and the Jews, or regards it as a remnant of the patriarchal traditions of which Mosaic worship was but a vast development.

[margin: The Word made flesh fulfills and perfects liturgical traditions.]

Be that as it may, when the fullness of time had come, THE WORD BECAME FLESH AND MADE HIS DWELLING AMONG US : he gave himself to be seen, heard, and touched by men[15], and, having descended from heaven to create worshipers in spirit and truth[16], he came not to destroy but to fulfill and perfect the liturgical traditions[17]. After his birth he was circumcised, offered in the temple, and redeemed. At the age of twelve he made the visit to the temple; later, he was frequently seen coming there to offer his prayer. He completed the course of a forty-day fast; he sanctified the Sabbath; by his example he consecrated prayer at night. At the Last Supper, where he celebrated the great liturgical Act and provided for its future

performance until the end of the ages, he began with the washing of feet, which the Fathers called a mystery, and ended with a solemn hymn before going out to the Mount of Olives. A few hours later his mortal life, itself but one great liturgical act, ended in the outpouring of blood on the altar of the Cross; the veil of the old temple, as it was torn, opened, as it were, a passage to new mysteries, proclaimed a *(p. 22)* new tabernacle, an ark of an eternal covenant; and henceforth the Liturgy entered its phase of fullness as worship on earth.

[margin: The Liturgy is completed by the institution of the true sacrifice and the Sacraments.]

For the sacrifice does not cease on that day, although it is consummated. From the rising of the sun to its setting[18], it becomes perpetual, daily, universal. Not only does the sacrifice, the center of the Liturgy, remain, but a new birth through water is offered to the human race; the visitation of the Spirit of sanctification is announced, and his gifts are communicated to the Apostles for the whole Church through breathing upon them and the laying on of hands. Finally, when the risen Mediator has spent forty days instructing his disciples about everything concerning the kingdom of God[19], that is, the Church; when, invoking the power given him in heaven and on earth, he has solemnly told them, Go, baptize all nations; teach them to observe everything I have commanded you, he leaves them, ascending into heaven, leaving open to all the nations of the world seven principal sources of salvation in the sacraments, each of which contains a grace that is active yet invisible, while outwardly signifying it through the most precise and forceful symbols.

[margin: Liturgical power is founded and declared perpetual in the Apostles and their successors.]

Jesus Christ therefore left his Apostles on earth invested with his power, sent as he himself had been sent[20]. Thus they proclaim themselves not simply as propagators of the word of the Gospel, but as ministers and stewards of the mysteries[21]. Liturgical power was founded and declared perpetual to safeguard *(p. 23)* the deposit of the sacraments and the other ritual observances established by the supreme High Priest; to regulate the rites that were to make them still more venerable to the Christian people; to extend and apply, according to the needs of man and society, that grace of sanctification brought into the world by Him who, as the Church sings, undoing the curse, gave blessing[22].

[margin: The Apostles' need to establish a body of rites for the new religion.]

The Apostles therefore had to establish and promulgate a body of rites superior in every respect to the Mosaic Liturgy. Such was the character of the new religion, as of every religion; for, as St. Augustine says, "Men cannot be gathered together under any religious name, whether true or false, unless they are bound together in some fellowship of visible signs or sacraments"[23].

[margin: The Council of Trent's doctrine on the origin of the ceremonies of the Mass;]

This is why the holy Council of Trent, treating in its twenty-second session of the august ceremonies of the holy sacrifice of the Mass, declares with all the authority of religious learning and teaching: "The Church also employed ceremonies, such as mystical blessings, lights, incense, vestments, and many other things of this kind, from apostolic discipline and tradition, so that both the majesty of so great a sacrifice might be set forth and the minds of the faithful be aroused, through these visible signs of religion and piety, to contemplate the most sublime realities hidden in this sacrifice"[24].

(p. 24)

[margin: Tertullian and St. Basil invoke apostolic tradition to account for certain rites.]

Now this holy Council was not led to make this assertion by some uncertain conjecture deduced from vague premises: it spoke as the earliest centuries spoke. It invoked primitive, that is, apostolic, tradition, as Tertullian had so eloquently invoked it as early as the third century to account for so many rites which did not appear to rest on the letter of the holy Gospels: renouncing the devil before Baptism; the triple immersion and the baptized person's profession of faith that preceded it; the milk and honey given him as food; the obligation to abstain from bathing during the week after Baptism; Eucharistic Communion appointed for the

morning, before any other food; oblations for the dead; the prohibition of fasting or praying on one's knees on Sundays and during Eastertide; the particular care taken of the consecrated species; continual use of the sign of the Cross; and so forth[25]. St. Basil likewise points to the same tradition as the source of the same observances, adding, by way of example, such practices as praying toward the east; consecrating the Eucharist within a formula of invocation recorded neither in St. Paul nor in the Gospel; blessing baptismal water and the oil of anointing; and so forth[26]. Not only St. Basil and Tertullian, but all antiquity, without exception, expressly confesses that great rule of St. Augustine, made commonplace by constant repetition: What is held by the universal Church, not instituted by councils but always retained, is very rightly believed to have been handed down only by apostolic authority[27].

[margin: Grotius, Grabe, and other enlightened Protestants]

This is why enlightened Protestants, despite the conclusions Catholics may draw from it against them, have no difficulty acknowledging the apostolic *(p. 25)* institution of the rites accompanying the celebration of the sacred mysteries whenever these rites have a universal character. Grotius frankly confesses that he sees not the slightest ground for doubting it[28]. Grabe goes further, declaring that he cannot understand how a sensible man could persuade himself for an instant of the contrary: "Those rites expressed in all these liturgies, and used long ago everywhere among the sacred mysteries, flowed from apostolic tradition; for what man of sound mind could persuade himself that churches founded by the Apostles received no form or rite for offering the sacrifice, so closely and preeminently connected with religion? Not, however, that I would attribute all apostolic liturgies to those whose names they bear. It suffices that the Apostles were, if not the writers, at least the first originators of the ancient liturgies"[29]. In this both are in complete agreement with the great Cardinal Bona, who admirably sums up the whole question in these words:

[margin: acknowledge the apostolic institution of rites that have a universal character.]

[margin: Testimony of Cardinal Bona:]

"There are certain things in all liturgies on which all Churches agree, since without them the nature of the sacrifice could not in any way subsist: the preparation of bread and wine, the oblation, the consecration, the consummation, and the distribution of the sacrament itself to those wishing to receive Communion. There are also other principal parts which, although they do not pertain to the integrity of the sacrifice, are nevertheless found in all the liturgies of all nations: the chanting of psalms, the reading of Sacred Scripture, the array of ministers, incensation, the exclusion of catechumens *(p. 26)* and other uninitiated persons, the breaking of the Host, the prayer for peace, various prayers, thanksgiving, and any other things of the same kind"[30].

[margin: Different liturgical traditions likewise come from the Apostles.]

But if the Apostles must incontestably be regarded as the creators of all universal liturgical forms, we are no less entitled to attribute to them a great number of those which, though limited in extent, are no less lost in the mists of antiquity as to their origin. Indeed, more than once they must have adapted institutions of this kind, in their changeable part, to the customs of countries and the character of peoples, to facilitate by this accommodation the spread of the Gospel. This is the only way to explain the profound differences between certain Eastern Liturgies, the more or less direct work of one or more Apostles, and the Western Liturgies, one of which, that of Rome, must recognize St. Peter as its principal author. This also explains how the Churches of Asia in the second century upheld as an apostolic tradition their manner of celebrating Easter, contrary to that of the Roman Church, which rightly invoked the most certain and most canonical tradition of the Prince of the Apostles.

[margin: Different rites must have been practiced successively by the same Apostle.]

We are even entitled to conjecture that the same Apostle may, in the course of his preaching career, have had occasion to employ different rites because of the diversity of the places he evangelized in turn. This is the observation of the learned Father Lesleus in the excellent preface to his edition of the Mozarabic Missal; it must nevertheless always be understood with the reservation of those points on which universal agreement is

found in all Liturgies[31]. These differences therefore need cause no *(p. 27)* surprise: they belonged to the necessities of the apostolic age, since even today, were unity restored between East and West, one would not dare flatter oneself that they would disappear. Let us therefore conclude that the apostolic origin of general and particular Liturgies cannot be rejected because those bearing the names of St. Peter, St. James, St. Mark, and others agree neither with one another nor with those of the West in matters of secondary importance, such as the order and wording of formulas of supplication. Nor can that same origin be disputed on the pretext that in their present state they contain several things which visibly appear to have been added in later times. The Apostles drew the first outlines and gave the direction; but the liturgical work had to be perfected under the influence of the Spirit of truth, given to the Church to dwell in her until the end of time. This is the sound way to regard the controversies repeatedly raised by learned men about these Liturgies; fairly generally, both sides have gone to excess by maintaining principles too absolute.

[margin: Consequences of this doctrine for the Liturgies called apostolic.]

[margin: St. Peter, head of the Apostles, founder of the entire universal liturgical order and of Church's]

[margin: the Roman particular Liturgy.]

Let us therefore retain St. James as author of the Liturgy bearing his name, since antiquity believed it so. What matter a few changes or additions? Does it not form the basis of all those of the East? As for St. Peter, two questions must be examined. First, as head and prince of the Apostles, he could not have been unconnected with establishing or regulating the general forms of Liturgy which his brethren were to carry throughout the world. Once we admit his power as head, we must thereby admit his primary influence in this as in everything else, and acknowledge with St. Isidore that St. Peter must be regarded as the founder of every liturgical order observed universally *(p. 28)* throughout the whole Church[32]. Second, as for the particular Liturgy of the Church of Rome, without pausing here to cite authorities that the discussion will bring forward later, common sense alone teaches us that this Apostle could not have lived in Rome for so many years without attending to so important a matter. He could not have failed to establish, in the Latin language and for the service of this Church, which by his free choice he made mother and mistress of all the others, a form at least as worthy as those he had established and practiced in Jerusalem, Antioch, Pontus, and Galatia, allowing for the variations required by differences in customs, character, and habits.

[margin: The Apostles' formation of the Liturgy proceeds gradually.]

Let us admit as readily as anyone wishes that this formation of the Liturgy by the Apostles, like all great things, had to proceed gradually; that the whole body of rites of the holy sacrifice and the sacraments would not have been complete on the very day of Pentecost. Was not the New Testament itself formed in stages? Did not fifty years elapse between the appearance of St. Matthew's Gospel and the publication of St. John's? Let us grant this too: since the needs of Christian instruction naturally absorbed most of the time the Apostles spent in the various Churches, they were obliged to shorten the time allotted to the Liturgy. So it happened at Troas, where the breaking of bread, that is, the celebration of the Eucharist, was delayed until after midnight by the length of the instruction, which the Apostle resumed after the celebration of the Mysteries and continued until daybreak[33]. But once the Christian faith had taken root *(p. 29)* in a city, and the Apostles had been able to establish a bishop, priests, and deacons there, external forms expanded and worship necessarily became more solemn. Thus St. Paul, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians[34], shows us this new Church already possessing the Mysteries of the Lord's body and blood; but he does not consider that he has fulfilled all his duties toward it unless he visits it again and arranges what concerns holy things in a more perfect, more canonical order. This is the meaning the holy doctors have consistently given to the words concluding the passage of this epistle that speaks of the Eucharist: The other matters I shall set in order when I come. St. Jerome, in his brief commentary on this passage, explains: The rest, concerning the sacrament of the Mystery itself. St. Augustine develops this thought further in his letter ad Januarium[35]: "The rest, however, I shall arrange when I come. From this we are given to understand that, since it would have been too much to set out

in a letter that whole order of celebration which the Church throughout the world observes, what is not altered by any diversity of customs was arranged by Paul himself."

[margin: Rites that go back to the apostolic Liturgy.]

But to establish the facts of this matter more precisely and support our observations with definite evidence, we shall try to present some features of the whole primitive Liturgy. We shall draw our information from the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles, and also from the testimony of the tradition of the first five centuries, where these usages appear as reaching back to the very origin of Christianity, while also *(p. 30)* giving an idea of those general rites which, by their very generality, must be deemed apostolic, according to the rule of St. Augustine which we have quoted and which this great doctor expresses elsewhere no less precisely[36].

[margin: In the Eucharistic sacrifice, or Breaking of Bread,]

[margin: the choice of place,]

[margin: the lights,]

Let us begin with the Eucharistic sacrifice. There can be no doubt that everything concerning it stands at the head of liturgical prescriptions. The Breaking of Bread appears on the very first page of the Acts of the Apostles[37], and St. Paul, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, teaches the liturgical significance of this act[38]. But the worship and love the holy Apostles bore toward Him with whom this Breaking of Bread brought them into communion obliged them, in the eloquent observation of St. Proclus of Constantinople, to surround it with a body of rites and sacred prayers that could only be completed over a considerable time[39]. In this the holy bishop merely follows the view of his glorious predecessor, St. John Chrysostom[40]. First, as far as possible, this celebration took place in a fitting and adorned room, for the Savior had done so at the Last Supper: a large, furnished upper room[41]. Sometimes numerous lamps supplied the place of daylight[42].

It must be understood that the Breaking of Bread celebrated in Gamaliel's house in Jerusalem, or in the senator Pudens's house in Rome, must have taken place with greater splendor than *(p. 31)* when it took place in the house of Simon the tanner[43].

[margin: the altar,]

[margin: the arrangement of seats for the members of the hierarchy,]

The place of celebration was distinguished by an altar: it was no longer a table. St. Paul says emphatically: Altare habemus, "we have an altar, and the ministers of the tabernacle have no right to partake of it"[44]. From the very beginning of the Church, according to the traditions of heaven revealed by St. John in the Apocalypse[45], the following were arranged around this altar: first, facing it, the Apostle or the bishop who took his place, as the Apostle took that of the heavenly Father; to the right and left of the seat, the priests representing the twenty-four elders; near the altar, the deacons and other ministers, recalling the angels who likewise attend as servants near the altar upon which, in heaven, stands the Lamb as though slain[46]. Everyone knows that this arrangement of seats in the apse of the Christian church is still observed in the East. Although in the West it has fallen into disuse almost everywhere, Rome has preserved the tradition in the arrangement of the choir in several of its ancient churches; it is followed exactly on days when the Pope celebrates or assists pontifically in one of the Patriarchal Basilicas.

[margin: the reading of the Apostles' Epistles and of the Gospel,]

With the faithful thus gathered in the place of Sacrifice, what did the bishop do in the apostolic age? As today, he first presided over the reading of the Apostles' Epistles and the recitation of some passage of the holy Gospel, which from the beginning formed the Mass of the Catechumens; and we must seek no founders of this usage other than the *(p. 32)* Apostles themselves. St. Paul says to the Colossians: "When this Epistle I am writing to you has been read among you, see that it is read in the church of Laodicea, and then read for yourselves the one addressed to the Laodiceans"[47]. At the end of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, the same Apostle adds: "I adjure you by the Lord that this letter be read to all the holy brothers"[48]. This apostolic

injunction had the force of law from the outset, for in the first half of the second century the great apologist St. Justin attests the fidelity with which it was followed, in his description of the Mass of his time[49]. Tertullian[50] and St. Cyprian[51] confirm his testimony. So much for the Epistle.

As for the reading of the Gospel, Eusebius[52] tells us that St. Mark's account of the Savior's actions was approved by St. Peter to be read in the Churches. St. Paul perhaps alludes to this same usage when, referring to St. Luke, the faithful companion of his apostolic journeys, he calls him the brother who is praised for the Gospel throughout all the Churches[53].

[margin: the greeting to the people,]

The greeting to the people in the words The Lord be with you was in use under the Old Law. Boaz addresses it to his reapers[54], and a prophet to Asa, king of Judah[55]. Behold, I am with you, Christ says to his Church[56]. The Church therefore received this custom from the Apostles, as is proved by the uniformity of the practice in the ancient Liturgies of East and West, *(p. 33)* as the First Council of Braga expressly teaches[57].

[margin: the Collect, its conclusion, and the response Amen,]

The Collect, a form of prayer summing up the petitions of the assembly even before the offering of the sacrifice, also belongs to the primitive institution. St. Augustine teaches this in a passage we shall quote later; the agreement of all Liturgies proves it as well. The conclusion of this prayer and all the others in the words For ever and ever is universal from the earliest days of the Church. St. Irenaeus, in the second century, tells us that the Valentinians misused it to lend authority to their system of Aeons[58]. As for the custom of responding Amen, surely no one will be surprised that we trace it to apostolic times. St. Paul himself alludes to it in his First Epistle to the Corinthians[59].

[margin: mixing water with wine in preparing the sacrifice, and incensing the offerings,]

In preparing the matter of the Sacrifice, water is mixed with the wine to be consecrated. St. Cyprian teaches us to trace this usage, so profound in its symbolism, back to the tradition of the Lord himself[60]. The incensations accompanying the oblation were acknowledged as of apostolic institution by the Council of Trent, quoted above.

[margin: the Preface,]

The same St. Cyprian tells us that, from the cradle of the Church, the Action of the Sacrifice was preceded by a Preface; that the priest cried, Lift up your hearts, to which the *(p. 34)* people replied, We lift them up to the Lord[61]. And St. Cyril, speaking to the catechumens of the Church of Jerusalem, a Church of apostolic foundation if ever there was one, explains this other acclamation, which also resounds in our Western Basilicas: Let us give thanks to the Lord our God! It is right and just![62]

[margin: the Trisagion, taken from Isaiah and the Apocalypse,]

Next comes the Trisagion: Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord! Isaiah, under the Old Law, heard it sung at the foot of Jehovah's throne; under the New, the prophet of Patmos repeated it as he had heard it resound beside the altar of the Lamb. This cry of love and admiration, revealed to earth, was to find an echo in the Christian Church. All Liturgies know it, and one may affirm that the Eucharistic Sacrifice has never been offered without its being uttered.

[margin: the Canon of the Mass]

The Canon then begins, and who will dare fail to acknowledge its apostolic origin? Could the founders of the Churches have left this principal part of the sacred Liturgy unsettled and arbitrary? If they regulated so many secondary things, with what care must they have determined the words and rites of the most awe-inspiring and most fundamental of all Christian mysteries? Pope Vigilius says in his letter to Profuturus of Braga: "We have therefore sent the text of the canonical prayer itself, appended below, which, by God's favor, we have received from apostolic tradition"[63].

[margin: with the different forms]

It is this same canonical prayer that St. Paul has in *(p. 35)* view when, in his First Epistle to Timothy, speaking of the solemn prayers to be addressed to God, he distinguishes supplications, prayers, petitions, and thanksgivings[64]. Here is St. Augustine's commentary on this passage: "I prefer to understand in these words what all, or nearly all, the Church practices: by supplications (precationes), those we make in celebrating the Sacraments before what is on the Lord's table begins to be blessed; by prayers (orationes), when it is blessed, sanctified, and broken up for distribution. Nearly all the Church concludes this whole petition with the Lord's Prayer. Intercessions (interpellationes), or, as our manuscripts have it, petitions (postulationes), take place when the people are blessed. For then the bishops, as advocates, offer those entrusted to their care, through the laying on of hands, to the most merciful goodness. When these things have been accomplished and so great a Sacrament has been partaken of, thanksgiving concludes everything"[65].

[margin: of prayer identified there by St. Paul and St. Augustine,]

[margin: the Lord's Prayer, sung toward the end of the Canon.]

After the divine consecration, with the sanctified gifts resting on the altar and that lengthy prayer of which St. Justin speaks[66], by which he means the Canon, drawing to its close, the Lord's Prayer is uttered with solemn confidence. For, as St. Jerome says, "Christ so taught his Apostles that each day, believing, they might dare to say in the sacrifice of his body: Our Father, who art in heaven"[67].

(p. 36)

[margin: the breaking of the Host,]

The sacrificing priest then proceeds to the breaking of the Host. In this he shows himself an imitator not only of the Apostles[68], but of Christ himself, who took the bread, blessed it, and broke it before distributing it[69].

[margin: the kiss of peace.]

But before partaking of the victim of charity, all must greet one another with a holy kiss[70]. "From this saying," Origen says, "a custom was handed down to the Churches that, after the prayers, the brethren should greet one another with a kiss"[71].

The apostolic origin of the principal rites of the sacrifice, as practiced in all the Churches, is thus established. Our plan does not permit us to treat this matter here in greater detail; we shall add only a few words to complete our account of the Liturgy in the age of the Apostles.

[margin: In administering the Sacraments, many rites are of apostolic institution.]

First, as regards the administration of the Sacraments, we immediately discover a basis, not merely presumed but entirely certain, for a great many apostolic prescriptions. The principal ceremonies preceding, accompanying, and following the application of the essential matter and form, such as the insufflations, exorcisms, laying on of hands, giving of salt, and anointings in Baptism, with their accompanying formulas - all these rites, whose origins are lost in the shadows of earliest antiquity, can have no authors other than the Apostles themselves. The Church teaches it, the ancient Fathers attest it, and reason itself demonstrates it; for otherwise how can the universality of these rites be explained? We must therefore necessarily admit *(p. 37)* an apostolic Ritual, whether written or handed down by tradition (it matters little), containing the details of these august practices with their accompanying formulas of prayer or profession of faith. Thus, for Baptism: insufflations, exorcisms and laying on of hands, anointings, white garments; for Confirmation: Chrism, with the manner of consecrating it, and the laying on of hands, which differs in intention and formulas from that performed over catechumens, from that which reconciles penitents, and from that which, in the sacrament of Holy Orders, brings forth bishops, priests, and deacons for the Church, and so on. It is enough to indicate these general perspectives here; the reader can easily supply the rest.

[margin: The Apostles left teachings on the practice of the Sacramentals.]

We shall merely observe here that, since the Church exercises not only the power of the Sacraments but also that of the Sacramentals, through the power of blessing within her, the Apostles, from whom she received everything, could not have failed to exercise this right to sanctify every creature, making it serve the spiritual and temporal good of God's children. They must consequently have left teachings and a practice on this subject completing the body of rites of which we have just spoken. There would be neither orthodoxy nor logic in disputing this evident consequence, which can displease only those innovators who speak incessantly of antiquity and then reject it when confronted with it.

[margin: Sacred vestments have the same origin.]

Shall we now speak of sacred vestments? How could the Apostles of the New Law, that Law which abolished the empty symbolism of the Old only to replace it with a symbolism full of reality, have borrowed from the Mosaic rites anointings, the mixture of perfumes forming Chrism, incensations, and so many other things, yet neglected the holiness and majesty of priestly vestments? This detail was so important that God himself, on Sinai, had minutely prescribed it for the ministers of the first Tabernacle. The linen tunic St. James wore in *(p. 38)* Jerusalem[72], and the gold plate with which St. John encircled his forehead at Ephesus[73], attest that these fishermen knew how to surround themselves with some splendor in celebrating their mysteries. We shall cite only this one detail here. The testimony of St. Dionysius the Areopagite in his Ecclesiastical Hierarchy would greatly clarify this matter; but we shall refrain from drawing inferences from this author until we have justified elsewhere the authority of the writings attributed to him.

[margin: Feasts established by the Apostles.]

Shall we speak of feasts established by the Apostles? St. Augustine enumerates those of the Passion, the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ, and Pentecost[74]. We shall demonstrate elsewhere the apostolic origin of several others. In this chapter we wish only to sketch the first outlines and establish the starting point of the Christian Liturgy; we shall therefore carry these detailed observations no further here, since there will be occasion to return to them. We shall merely set down here, in conclusion, a few fundamental remarks.

[margin: The necessary scope of the apostolic Liturgy.]

1. The Liturgy established by the Apostles must necessarily have contained everything essential to the celebration of the Christian Sacrifice; to the administration of the Sacraments, both as regards essential forms and the rites required by the dignity of the mysteries; to the exercise of the power of Sanctification and Blessing which the Church holds from Christ through those same Apostles; to the establishment *(p. 39)* of a form of Psalmody and Public Prayer; finally, this liturgical collection must have included everything universal in the forms of worship during the first centuries for which neither author nor origin can be assigned. The study of Christian antiquity cannot fail to reveal to those who pursue it the greatness of this primitive body of Christian rites. At the same time, reflection and serious consideration of the Church's needs even at that period will show them how necessary it was for her, from that time, to complete both her means of salvation and her means of worship, which, together with the deposit of speculative truths, form the principal part of the divine inheritance entrusted to her care.

[margin: From the time of the Apostles, the Liturgy belongs to the domain of Tradition.]

2. Apart from a small number of allusions in the Acts of the Apostles and their Epistles, the apostolic Liturgy lies entirely outside Scripture and belongs purely to the domain of Tradition. These allusions, even the clearest, such as St. James's concerning Extreme Unction, tell us that rites and formulas existed, but tell us nothing of the character of the former or the wording of the latter. From the beginning, then, the Liturgy must be regarded as existing more particularly in Tradition than in Scripture, and consequently as requiring interpretation, judgment, and application according to that source of all ecclesiastical knowledge. No long study or reflection is needed to know that the Liturgy was practiced by the Apostles and by those whom they had consecrated bishops, priests, or deacons long before the New Testament had been completely written. Later we shall see important consequences follow from this principle.

(p. 40)

Notes to Chapter III

Note A

If no Scripture has prescribed this (observance), custom has certainly confirmed it, and custom undoubtedly flowed from tradition; for how can anything come into use unless first handed down? Even when tradition is alleged, you say, must written authority be required? Let us therefore ask whether tradition should not be received unless written. We shall certainly deny that it should be received if no precedents are supplied by other observances which we defend without any written warrant of Scripture, on the sole ground of tradition and thereafter the support of custom. To begin with Baptism: when about to enter the water, there and also somewhat earlier in the Church under the bishop's hand, we solemnly declare that we renounce the devil, his pomp, and his angels. We are then immersed three times, giving somewhat fuller answers than the Lord prescribed in the Gospel. On being lifted out, we first taste a mixture of milk and honey; from that day we abstain from the daily bath for a whole week. We receive, even in gatherings before dawn and from no hands but those of the presiding ministers, the sacrament of the Eucharist, which the Lord prescribed for mealtime and for all. We make annual offerings for the dead, for their "birthdays." On the Lord's Day we deem it unlawful to fast or worship on our knees. We enjoy the same exemption from Easter Day until Pentecost. If anything from the cup or bread, even our own, falls to the ground, we are distressed. At every step and movement, every entrance and departure, in dressing, putting on shoes, bathing, at table, at the lamps, on our beds and seats, in every occupation of life, we mark our forehead with the sign of the cross. If you demand a law of Scripture for these and other such observances, you will find none: tradition will be cited as their author, custom as their confirmation, and faith as their keeper. (Tertullian, De Corona Militis, ch. III.)

Note B

For if we try to reject unwritten customs as of little importance, we shall unwittingly inflict the gravest injury on the Gospel; indeed, we shall reduce the very proclamation of the faith to a mere name. For example, to mention first what is first and most common, who taught in writing that we should mark with the sign of the cross those who have placed their hope in Christ? What Scripture taught us to pray facing east? Which of the saints left us in writing the words of invocation when the bread of the Eucharist and the cup of blessing are consecrated? For we are not content with what the Apostle or *(p. 41)* the Gospel records; we also say other things both before and after, as being of great importance to the mystery, which we have received by tradition without writing. From what writings do we consecrate the baptismal water, the oil of anointing, and also the person receiving Baptism? Is it not from silent and secret tradition? What written teaching taught the anointing with oil itself? Again, from what Scripture was the triple immersion of a person drawn? From what Scripture do we have the other things done in Baptism, such as renouncing Satan and his angels? Is it not from this unpublished and hidden tradition? (St. Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, ch. XXVII.)

Note C

Sunt quædam in omnibus Liturgiis, in quibus omnes Ecclesiæ conveniunt, utpote sine quibus sacrificii ratio nullo modo subsisteret, cujusmodi sunt panis et vini præparatio, oblatio, consecratio, consummatio, et ipsius sacramenti communicare voluntatibus distributio. Aliæ item præcipuæ partes sunt, quæ licet ad sacrificii integritatem non spectent, in omnibus tamen omnium gentium Liturgiis reperiuntur, Psalmorum scilicet modulatio, lectio Sacræ Scripturæ, ministrorum adparatus, thurificatio, catechumenorum et aliorum profanorum exclusio, fractio hostiæ, precatio pacis, preces diversæ, gratiarum actio, et si quæ aliæ sunt ejusdem generis. (Bona, Rerum Liturgic., lib. I, cap. VI, 1.)

Note D

The Apostle Peter celebrated the Eucharist more than once in Palestine, Antioch, Syria, Pontus, Galatia, Rome, Italy, and other provinces of East and West. Was it everywhere by the same rite? If you say yes, I ask: the Roman or the Jerusalem rite? If Roman, why did the Roman Liturgy prevail nowhere in the East? If Jerusalem, why was this rite not admitted in Rome and the West? It is therefore credible that St. Peter and the other Apostles did not constantly adhere to one and the same Liturgy. (Lesleus, in Missale Moçarab., Preface, no. 161, note.)

Note E

7. On the first day of the week, when we had met to break bread, Paul, due to depart the following day, was addressing them and prolonged his discourse until midnight.

8. There were abundant lamps in the upper room where we had assembled.

9. A young man named Eutychus, seated on the window sill, was sinking into deep sleep as Paul spoke at length. Overcome by sleep, he fell from the third story and was taken up dead.

(p. 42) 10. Paul went down to him, lay upon him, and embraced him, saying, “Do not be troubled, for his life is in him.”

11. Then, having gone up, broken the bread and tasted it, and spoken at length until daylight, he departed. (Acts, XX, 7-11.)

Note F

After our Savior was taken up into heaven, the Apostles, before dispersing throughout the whole world, gathered with united hearts and devoted an entire day to prayer. Finding great consolation in that mystical sacrifice of the Lord’s body, they chanted the Mass at very great length and with lengthy forms of words; for they thought that this, together with the work of teaching, should take precedence over all other things as more excellent. With the greatest eagerness and most abundant joy they devoted time to this divine sacrifice and persisted earnestly in it, ever mindful of the Lord’s words: “This is my Body”; and, “Do this in memory of me”; and, “Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood remains in me, and I in him.” Thus, too, contrite in spirit, they chanted many prayers, earnestly imploring the divine Majesty. (St. Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople, De traditione divinæ Liturgiæ.)

Note G

Eligo, in his verbis hoc intelligere, quod omnis, vel pene omnis frequentat Ecclesia, ut precationes accipiamus dictas, quas facimus in celebratione Sacramentorum, antequam illud, quod est in Domini mensa, incipiat benedici: orationes quum benedicitur, et sanctificatur, et ad distribuendum comminuitur, quam totam petitionem fere omnis Ecclesia Dominica oratione concludit. Interpellationes autem, sive ut nostri codices habent, postulationes fiunt, quum populus benedicitur. Tunc enim antistites veluti advocati susceptos suos per manus impositionem misericordissimæ offerunt pietati. Quibus peractis, et participato tanto Sacramento, gratiarum actio cuncta concludit. (S. Augustin. Epist. CXLIX, ad Paulinum. Opp. tom. II, pag. 509.)

---

[1] Joan., III, 16.

[2] Psalm. XXXII, 6.

[3] Luc, I, 35.

[4] Rom., VIII, 26.

[5] O God, who dispose in marvelous order ministries both angelic and human, etc. Roman Missal, at the dedication and apparition of St. Michael.

[6] Cant., VIII, 5.

[7] The very reality now called the Christian religion also existed among the ancients; nor was it lacking, from the beginning of the human race, right up to Christ’s own coming in the flesh. From that time the true religion, which already existed, began to be called

Christian. (St. Augustine, Retract., bk. I, ch. XIII, no. 3, vol. I, col. 19.)

[8] Gen., IV, 26.

[9] Gen., VIII, 20.

[10] Gen., XV, 9; XXII, 13.

[11] Gen., XII, 7, 8; XXVI, 25; XXVIII, 16; XXXII, 30. — (4) Gen., XXVIII, 18, 22; XXXIII, 20. — (5) Gen., XXVIII, 18; XXXI, 13; XXXV, 14. — (6) Gen., XIV, 18. — (7) Because Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my precepts and commandments, and observed my ceremonies and laws. (Gen., XXVI, 5.)

[12] Psalm. CXIX.

[13] Psalm. CXVIII.

[14] I Reg., X, XVI.

[15] I Joan., I, 1.

[16] Joan., IV, 23.

[17] Matth., V, 17.

[18] Malach., I, 11.

[19] Act., I. St. Leo says on this subject: “For those days which elapsed between the Lord’s Resurrection and Ascension did not pass by idly: rather, great sacred mysteries were confirmed in them, and great mysteries were revealed.” (Serm. LXXII, Ballerin ed., p. 291.)

[20] Joan., XX, 21.

[21] Thus should one regard us: as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God. (I Cor., IV, 1.)

[22] Qui solvens maledictionem, dedit benedictionem. (Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, antiphon for the Magnificat at Second Vespers.)

[23] In nullum autem nomen religionis, seu verum, seu falsum coagulari homines possunt, nisi aliquo signaculorum vel sacramentorum visibilium consortio colligentur. (Lib. contra Faustum, XIX, cap. IX.)

[24] Cæremonias item adhibuit ecclesia, ut mysticas benedictiones, lumina, thymiamata, vestes, aliaque id genus multa, ex apostolicà disciplinâ et traditione, quo et majestas tanti sacrificii commendaretur, et mentes fidelium per hæc visibilia religionis et pietatis signa ad rerum altissimarum quæ in hoc sacrificio latent, contemplationem excitarentur. (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXII, cap. V.)

[25] See this important passage in Note A at the end of this chapter.

[26] See ibid., Note B.

[27] De Baptism. contra Donat., bk. IV, ch. XXIV.

[28] The agreement of liturgies in all places and times in those prayers that God may sanctify the gifts through his Spirit and make them the body and blood of Christ does not allow me to doubt that this comes from the earliest institution of the Apostles. (De pace Ecclesiæ, p. 670.)

[29] Illos qui omnibus istis Liturgiis exprimuntur, quique jam olim ubique inter sacra mysteria usitati fuerunt, ritus ex apostolicà traditione fluxisse; ecclesias enim ab apostolis institutas formam aliquam et ritum offerendi sacrificium, cui tam arcta sit, et præcipua cum religione connexio non accepisse, quis sanus sibi persuadeat? Non quod tamen liturgias omnes apostolicas iis quorum nomina insigniuntur, adjudicare velim. Sufficiat liturgiarum antiquarum si non scriptores, saltem primos auctores fuisse apostolos. (In S. Ireneum, lib. I, cap. III, annotat.)

[30] See the text in Note C.

[31] See Note D below.

[32] The order of the Mass, or of the prayers by which the sacrifices offered to God are consecrated, was first established by St. Peter; the whole world carries out its celebration in one and the same manner. (De Eccles. Officiis, bk. I, ch. XV.)

[33] See Note E.

[34] I Cor., XI, 34.

[35] Cætera autem cum venero ordinabo. Undè intelligi datur, quia multum erat ut in epistolâ totum illum agendi ordinem insinuaret quem universa per orbem servat ecclesia, ab ipso ordinatum esse quod nullâ morum diversitate variatur. (S. Augustin. Opp., vol. II, p. 127.)

[36] There are many things held by the universal Church and therefore rightly believed to have been commanded by the Apostles. (De Baptismo, bk. V, ch. XXIII.)

[37] Acts, II, 46.

[38] I Cor., X, 16.

[39] See Note F.

[40] When the Apostles partook of those sacred suppers, what did they do then? Did they not turn to prayers and hymns? To holy vigils? To that lengthy teaching, full of profound wisdom? (Homil. XXVII in I ad Cor.)

[41] Luke, XXII, 12.

[42] Acts, XX, 8.

[43] Some details about the splendor of worship in the age of persecutions may be found in the first volume of Origines de l'Église romaine, p. 273. They will be confirmed and enriched with further particulars in the following volumes.

[44] Hebr., XIII, 10.

[45] Apoc., IV.

[46] Apoc., V, 6.

[47] Col., IV, 16. -

[48] I Thess., V, 27. -

[49] The memoirs of the Apostles and the writings of the Prophets are read, as time permits. (S. Justin. Apolog. II.)

[50] Apologet., ch. XXXIV. -

[51] Epist. XXXIII and XXXIV. -

[52] Hist. Eccles., bk. II, ch. XV.

[53] Cujus laus est in Evangelio per omnes ecclesias. (II Cor., VIII.)

[54] Ruth, II. -

[55] II Paral., XV. -

[56] Matt., XXVIII, 20.

[57] It was decreed that bishops and priests should not greet the people differently, but in one manner, saying, "The Lord be with you," as is read in the book of Ruth, and that the people should respond, "And with your spirit," as the whole East retains it, handed down by the Apostles themselves, and not as Priscillianist depravity altered it. (Concil. Braccaren., can. XXI.)

[58] Adv. Hæres., bk. I, ch. I.

[59] I Cor., XIV.

[60] Know, however, that we have been admonished to observe the Lord's tradition in offering the cup…on which point we find that the cup the Lord offered was mixed. (Epist. LXIII, p. 276 ff.)

[61] Therefore, before the prayer, the priest prepares the brethren's minds with a preliminary preface, saying, "Lift up your hearts," so that when the people respond, "We lift them up to the Lord," they may be reminded that they ought to think of nothing but the Lord. (De Orat. Domin., p. 107.)

[62] Then the priest says, "Let us give thanks to the Lord"; surely we ought to give thanks.…To this you reply, "It is right and just!" etc. (Cateches. Mystagog. V.)

[63] Quapropter et ipsius Canonicæ precis textum direximus subter adjectum, quam Deo propitio ex apostolicà traditione accepimus. (Vigil. ad Profuturum Braccarensem. Labb., vol. V, p. 313.)

[64] First of all, then, I ask that supplications, prayers, petitions, and thanksgivings be offered for everyone, etc. (I Tim., II, 1.)

[65] See Note G.

[66] Apolog. I, no. 65, p. 82.

[67] Sic docuit Christus apostolos suos, ut quotidie in corporis illius sacrificio credentes audeant dicere: Pater noster, qui es in cœlis. (Adv. Pelag., bk. I, ch. XVIII.)

[68] I Cor., X, 16.

[69] Matt., XXVI, 26; Mark, XIV, 22; Luke, XXII, 19.

[70] Rom., XVI, 16; I Cor., XVI, 20; II Cor., XIII, 12; I Thess., V, 26; I Pet., V, 14.

[71] Ex hoc sermone mos ecclesiis traditus est ut post orationes, osculo invicem se recipiant fratres. (Origen. in Epist. ad Rom., ch. XVI.)

[72] Euseb., Hist. Eccles., bk. IV, ch. VIII.

[73] Ibid., bk. V, ch. XXIV.

[74] Those things we preserve unwritten but handed down, which are observed throughout the whole world, are understood to be retained as commended and established either by the Apostles themselves or by plenary councils, whose authority in the Church is most salutary. Such are the annual solemn celebrations of the Lord's Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension into heaven, and of the coming of the Holy Spirit from heaven, and any other such thing observed by the universal Church wherever she extends. (Epist. ad Januar. Opp., vol. II, p. 124.)

Chapter IV. The Liturgy during the First Three Centuries of the Church

(p. 43)

[margin: In this period liturgical institutions still directly express the Apostles' will.]

This chapter is, so to speak, simply a continuation of the preceding one. For if we sought above to prove the apostolic origin of certain rites and ceremonies, we find again in the liturgical institutions of the first three centuries not only the Apostles' influence but the direct expression of their will in establishing this essential part of Christianity as a whole. Nevertheless, like everyone else, we have thought there was sufficient reason to distinguish two ages within the primitive period. The first extends from the beginning of the Apostles' preaching to the disappearance of the last of them, that is, about the year 100, when St. John died. The other embraces the whole period from the proclamation of the Gospel to the conversion of the emperors and the outward liberation of Christianity.

[margin: The liturgical element then possesses its full vigor.]

We may say that during the first three centuries the liturgical element, if we may so call it, possessed its full vigor and scope; for Confession, Praise, and Prayer embraced the entire lives of Christians at that time. Drawn away from the profane mysteries of paganism, the neophytes joyfully felt religion grow within them; and while the Holy Spirit *(p. 44)* created new hearts within them, their inspired lips gave voice to rapturous songs unknown until then. Thus we see the Apostle urging the faithful of his time not only to pray but to sing, as at a continual feast:

[margin: The Apostle urges the faithful to sing as at a continual feast.]

"Do not get drunk on wine, in which there is debauchery," he tells them, "but be filled with the Holy Spirit, addressing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and chanting psalms to the Lord in your hearts[1]."

And again: "Let the peace of Christ exult in your hearts, to which you were also called in one body; and be thankful. Let the word of Christ dwell in you abundantly; in all wisdom teach and admonish one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing to God in your hearts with gratitude[2]." T2

[margin: The first Christians' fervor in celebrating divine praise in fixed forms and at precisely determined hours.]

In the writings of the Fathers of this primitive age and in the Acts of the Martyrs, we do indeed see Christians engaged almost unceasingly in psalmody and the celebration of divine praise. They used forms that were precise and determined, rather than vague and arbitrary; and they prayed at precise hours full of mystery, fixed by apostolic institution, rather than at indefinite and capricious times. This is the character of Liturgy in the proper sense.

[margin: The Apostolic Constitutions distinguish the]

If we open the Apostolic Constitutions, an important liturgical collection whose compilation the least prejudiced critics readily place at the end *(p. 45)* of the second century, or at the latest during the third, we read these words:

[margin: hours of canonical prayer.]

"Offer prayers in the morning, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, in the evening, and at cockcrow. In the morning, give thanks that the Lord has dispelled the night, brought in the day, and enlightened us. At the third hour, because at that hour the Lord received the sentence of condemnation from Pilate. At the sixth, because at that hour he was crucified. At the ninth, because all things were shaken when the Lord was crucified, shuddering at the audacity of the impious Jews and unable to bear the outrage inflicted on the Lord. In the evening, give thanks that he has given us the night as rest from the day's labors. At cockcrow, because that hour announces the coming of the day, for doing the works of light. If, because of unbelievers, it is impossible to go to the church, you, bishop, shall hold the assembly in some house[3]."

[margin: The Latin Fathers attest this discipline in the West.]

But this discipline was not confined to the East, to which the Apostolic Constitutions seem principally to belong. The Latin Fathers of the same age attest the same practice in the West.

[margin: Tertullian.]

"Moreover," says Tertullian, "since that same commentary of Luke (the Acts of the Apostles) points out the third hour of prayer, at which those initiated by the Holy Spirit were thought drunk; the sixth, at which Peter went upstairs; and the ninth, at which they entered the Temple: why should we not understand that, while the unrestricted freedom to pray always, everywhere, and at any time remains fully intact, these three hours, more notable in human affairs, which divide the day, distinguish its occupations, and are publicly announced, *(p. 46)* were also more solemn in prayers to God[4]?"

Further on, he uses the word Officium to designate the ecclesiastical prayers offered at these hours: Sexta diei hora finiri Officio huic possit[5], "the sixth hour of the day may be fixed as the limit for this duty."

[margin: St. Cyprian.]

St. Cyprian also gives explicit testimony to this use of the canonical Hours, saying in his beautiful treatise On the Lord's Prayer:

"In celebrating prayers we find that the three youths with Daniel, strong in faith and victorious in captivity, observed the third, sixth, and ninth hours, signifying the mystery of the Trinity, which was to be manifested in the last times. For the first hour, reaching the third, displays the completed number of the Trinity. Likewise, the fourth, advancing to the sixth, again declares the Trinity. And when the ninth is completed from the seventh, the perfect Trinity is counted in each group of three hours. Long ago, worshipers of God, spiritually marking these intervals of hours, served him at established and prescribed times of prayer. It later became manifest that these had formerly been signs of mysteries, since the righteous had prayed thus before. For at the third hour the Holy Spirit descended on the disciples and filled them with the grace promised by the Lord. Likewise Peter, going up to the rooftop at the sixth hour, was instructed both by a sign and by God's admonishing voice to admit all *(p. 47)* to the grace of salvation, since previously he had doubted about the cleansing of the Gentiles. And the Lord, crucified at the sixth hour, washed away our sins in his blood at the ninth and then completed his victory through his Passion, that he might redeem us and give us life. But for us, dearest brothers, beyond the hours observed of old, both the times and the mysteries of prayer have now increased. For there should also be prayer in the morning so that the Lord's resurrection may be celebrated by morning prayer. This the Holy Spirit formerly indicated in the psalms, saying: My King and my God, for to you I shall pray, Lord: in the morning you will hear my voice; in the morning I shall stand before you and gaze upon you. And again the Lord speaks through the prophet: At dawn they will keep watch for me, saying: Let us go and return to the Lord our God. Again, as the sun withdraws and the day ends, we must necessarily pray. For Christ is the true sun and the true day; when this world's sun and day withdraw, and we pray and ask that light may come upon us anew, we implore the coming of Christ, who will bestow the grace of eternal light[6]."

[margin: The hour before daybreak is the principal time for prayer.]

To celebrate God's praises in this way, Christians assembled at the hours we have just indicated, but chiefly at the hour before daybreak. They kept vigil in psalmody and, facing east, stood ready to greet with their songs the divine Sun of justice, of whom the visible sun has always been the image in the records of the universal Liturgy.

[margin: Testimony of Pliny the Younger.]

As early as the year 104, Pliny the Younger, writing to Trajan for advice on how to deal with Christians, attests that the religious gatherings of this new sect *(p. 48)* took place before daybreak and that hymns were sung there to Christ as to a God[7]. Tertullian frequently calls Christian assemblies Antelucani cœtus, "gatherings before dawn." They were also held at other hours, however; for St. Cyprian attests that the Eucharistic offering was made in the afternoon as well as in the morning, although he considers it better to make it in the morning[8].

[margin: Feasts observed in apostolic times.]

[margin: The Church's care in celebrating the Martyrs' birthday.]

Besides the commemorations of Jesus Christ's Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension, and the Descent of the Holy Spirit, mentioned in the preceding chapter, the feasts observed during the first three centuries were the Savior's Nativity, on the twenty-fifth day of the ninth month, and his Epiphany, on the sixth day of the tenth month[9]. To these we must add the anniversary of the Martyrs' glorious death. The day on which they suffered was recorded with the greatest care. Each year it became a day of festival and religious assembly, when oblations and sacrifices were offered, as St. Cyprian attests very clearly[10].

(p. 49) Long before him, the Church of Smyrna had observed this custom, declaring in its memorable letter on the martyrdom of its bishop, St. Polycarp, its hope of celebrating each year, with the Lord's help, the birthday of his martyrdom[11]. We see how carefully it records not only the month but the day and even the hour of this glorious confession[12]. Thus the Christian Church's calendar grew richer day by day through feasts commemorating the mysteries of the world's salvation, and through the addition of new triumphs won by her children.

[margin: Meeting places of the faithful during the first centuries.]

In times of persecution, the meeting places were the Cemeteries or Catacombs where the Martyrs rested. In intervals of peace these dark refuges still received Christians' prayers on the anniversaries of the deaths of Christ's soldiers[13]. They also assembled in private houses dedicated by their owners to the new worship, such as the house of the senator Pudens at Rome. We can see in Lucian's dialogue Philopatris that the halls in which the faithful met were sometimes sumptuously decorated[14]. But the *(p. 50)* Christians also had temples in the proper sense for carrying out their liturgical practices. Eusebius tells us that Diocletian's edicts ordered their destruction throughout the empire: they therefore existed. Moreover, we know from Origen that one effect of the persecution of Maximin, which began in 236, was the burning of churches[15]; the same author says elsewhere that they already existed throughout the Empire[16].

[margin: Form of the primitive sanctuaries.]

It would be impossible today to determine precisely the form of these primitive sanctuaries. Apart from certain chambers in the Catacombs, adorned with paintings and mosaics, several of which date from the second and third centuries, nothing remains of these holy places, witnesses to the religious assemblies of the earliest Christians. Yet we may reasonably conjecture that the first temples erected at the peace of the Church, whose magnificent descriptions have come down to us, must have been modeled on those that preceded them. The conversion of the emperors to Christianity could not have brought different liturgical habits; and the form that seemed best for these buildings under Diocletian and Galerius must surely still *(p. 51)* have been suitable twenty years later, in Constantine's reign.

[margin: The churches' opulence even in the age of persecutions.]

The emperors' munificence enriched and sumptuously adorned the churches of the fourth century; those of preceding centuries had not been neglected by the faithful. We see not only that they were endowed with fixed revenues, often coveted by proconsuls or simoniacal clerics, but also that incontestable records show the objects used in worship to have displayed real opulence. We need only recall the Acts of St. Lawrence, archdeacon of Rome[17], and the inventory of sacred furnishings of the church of Carthage, as recorded in the proceedings of an inquiry ordered by the emperors into the origin of the Donatist schism[18].

[margin: Ceremonial splendor enhanced by numerous clergy.]

The splendor of the ceremonies must also have been greatly enhanced by the presence of the numerous clergy who gathered around the bishop in the great cities. In Rome, for example, in the time of Pope St. Cornelius, that is, in the middle of the third century, there were no fewer than forty-six priests, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, and fifty-two exorcists, readers, and doorkeepers

altogether[19].

(p. 52)

[margin: Importance of the altar and the bishop's chair.]

When most of these ministers surrounded the altar, it must surely have appeared invested with a certain majesty. Thus we see St. Cyprian frequently using this term, altar, as we would today. Indeed, speaking of the consecration of holy oil, he says clearly that the performance of this sacred rite requires both an altar and a church[20]. And elsewhere:

"Or [because] Novatian strives to set up an altar and offer sacrifices unlawfully, must we cease from altar and sacrifices, lest we seem to celebrate the same and similar things with him[21]?"

In the same letter, addressed to Jubaianus, the holy Bishop of Carthage speaks emphatically of the bishop's chair, the inalienable seat established in every church at the center of the apse, on which only the one chosen by the Holy Spirit could sit. Such chairs have been found in the very depths of the Catacombs. There, down to our own day, has been kept the chair on which Pope St. Stephen was murdered and which still bore traces of his blood. The basilica of St. Peter still preserves today the chair of the prince of the Apostles. But details of this kind belong in our Origines de l'Église romaine.

[margin: The Sacrifice offered every day.]

On this altar of which we have just spoken was offered the Christians' Sacrifice; for the Breaking of bread is henceforth designated by this name in the writings of the Fathers who follow the apostolic writers. Tertullian is *(p. 53)* explicit[22]; St. Cyprian is no less so[23]. He even explains, with depth and eloquence, how Christ, prefigured by Melchizedek, offered a sacrificial victim whose oblation continues in the Church[24]; and he affirms that in his time the priests offered sacrifice to God every day[25]. We would undoubtedly regard as precious a liturgical collection containing the exact form of the sacrifice, sacraments, and sacramentals used during the first three centuries. But we possess such a collection only in the body of essential formulas, which could not have changed because they are universal and therefore divine, or at least apostolic. We shall accordingly content ourselves here with presenting certain particulars related by writers of the second and third centuries.

[margin: St. Justin's description of Christian assemblies.]

Let us begin with the description of Christian assemblies on Sunday, as presented to the emperors by the apologist St. Justin in the second century of Christianity. The extreme reserve maintained in this account doubtless leaves much to be desired, yet the general picture it offers will be no less pleasing and useful to the reader.

"On the day called the Sun's day, all who dwell in cities *(p. 54)* or in the countryside assemble in one place. The memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the Prophets are read, for as long as time allows. When the reader stops, the presiding minister gives a spoken admonition and exhortation to imitate such excellent things. Afterward we all stand together and offer prayers. As we have already said, when we finish praying, bread, wine, and water are brought; and the presiding minister offers prayers and thanksgivings with all his strength, while the people acclaim, Amen. The things over which thanks have been given are distributed to each of those present, who share in them; they are sent to the absent through the deacons. Those with ample means who are willing give, at their own discretion, whatever each wishes; what is collected is deposited with the presiding minister. He assists orphans and widows, those in need through sickness or any other cause, those in chains, and strangers arriving from abroad; in a word, he takes care of all in need. We all gather on the Sun's day, both because it is the first day, on which God, having transformed darkness and matter, created the world, and because Jesus Christ our Savior rose from the dead on that same day. For they crucified him on the day before Saturn's day; on the day after it, that is, the Sun's day, he appeared to his Apostles and disciples and taught the things we have handed on for your consideration also[26]."

[margin: The holy Sacrifice described by St. Justin.]

Elsewhere in the same apology, St. Justin supplies further details to complete those just given. Speaking of Baptism and its accompanying rites, he ends the description with an account of the divine sacrifice attended by the neophyte.

"After we have thus washed the one who has testified *(p. 55)* to his faith and assent to our teaching, we lead him to those called brothers, where they are assembled. With earnest hearts we offer common prayers for ourselves, for the one who has been enlightened, and for all others everywhere, that, having attained knowledge of the truth, we may also be deemed worthy of this grace: that we may be found living uprightly in our deeds and keeping the commandments, and so attain eternal salvation. When we have finished praying, we greet one another with a kiss. Then bread and a cup of water and wine are brought to the one presiding over the brothers. Receiving them, he offers praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; and he offers at length the Eucharist, that is, thanksgiving, for these gifts received from him. When he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving, all the people acclaim, Amen. In Hebrew Amen has the same meaning as 'So be it.' When the presiding minister has finished the prayers and all the people have acclaimed, those whom we call deacons distribute to each person present, for participation, the bread, wine, and water over which thanks have been given, and carry them to the absent[27]."

In this brief account we see clearly set forth the whole of the Eucharistic sacrifice as it still exists today. Sunday is the day of the general assembly. The Mass called that of the Catechumens takes place, as today, through readings from the books of the Old and New Testaments. Next comes the Homily, addressed to the congregation by the bishop as a commentary on the readings just given. After the Homily the congregation stands, and the prayers for the needs of the Church and the whole world take place; in every Liturgy these precede the Consecration. The Consecration, as today, is preceded by the Thanksgiving, a lengthy formula, prolixa, to which belongs *(p. 56)* in particular the name Eucharist: it is the Canon. The people's acclamations, the kiss of peace, Communion, the ministry of the deacons—in a word, the whole sacrifice—are set forth in brief in this admirable and moving account, despite the apologist's care not to reveal the mysteries beyond the limits permitted him.

[margin: Christians' posture in prayer.]

Christians of this period took part in the Church's prayers facing east, with their hands extended in the form of a cross. The Latin Church has retained this gesture for the priest during most of the sacrifice; it is rendered so expressively in the paintings of the Roman Catacombs. Tertullian explains its mystery in his book On Prayer[28].

[margin: Baptismal ceremonies according to Tertullian.]

Just as we borrowed from St. Justin the description of the primitive Church's Sacrifice, we shall relate here several ceremonies that accompanied Baptism at that time, following Tertullian, whom we have just cited. Here are some particulars he mentions in passing:

Before entering the place where the water was, the catechumen, under the bishop's hand, solemnly declared his renunciation of the devil, his pomp, and his angels. He was then immersed three times, pronouncing words belonging to Tradition and not to the Gospel. On being lifted from the font, he was given milk and honey to taste; from that day he had to abstain from ordinary bathing for a whole week[29]. Preparation for Baptism included frequent *(p. 57)* prayers, fasting, kneeling, and the secret confession of sins[30]. The feasts of Easter and Pentecost were the times for solemnly administering this great Sacrament[31]. Indeed, there would be no end if we tried to recall here all the rites and observances that this author enumerates in his various writings concerning the administration of this first sacrament of Christians.

[margin: Christian funerals according to the same author.]

We shall therefore not attempt to catalogue the liturgical riches filling Tertullian's writings, those vigorous works in which the customs of the African Church appear in their true colors. We shall content ourselves with a word from him on the important subject of Christian funerals. A most valuable passage of his treatise De Anima shows that Christians in those early times were taken to burial under a priest's guidance. As he committed these mortal remains to the earth, the priest wished peace, as today, to the soul that the supreme will had temporarily separated from the body[32]. Such was the Christians' zeal to testify to their faith in the resurrection of the body that they held *(p. 58)* nothing too precious when it came to the religious observance of the tombs.

"Certainly we do not buy incense," Tertullian tells the Roman Senate. "If the Arabias complain, the Sabaeans will know that more of their wares, and costlier ones, are lavished on Christian burials than on fumigating the gods[33]."

[margin: The law of secrecy, necessary in the first centuries, obscures certain forms of the primitive Liturgy.]

This single detail shows the Christians' zeal for the practices of their worship and reveals the splendor of their ceremonies, both public and domestic. But how many other details, how many precious liturgical formulas, would we still possess today had the secrecy surrounding the Christian mysteries at that time allowed them to be disclosed in public writings! Anyone wishing to write or summarize anything on the Liturgy must always bear this in mind—not only for the first three centuries, but, one might even say, for the three or four that followed. This is not the place to prove the existence of that august secrecy which so faithfully kept Christian traditions free from all profane contact. Testimony to it abounds in the Fathers' writings, both before and after the peace of the Church; and no one, to our knowledge, now disputes so palpable a material fact. We shall merely repeat what we said a moment ago: for the centuries in which we live, the chief result of this secrecy has been to leave certain forms and incidental features of the primitive Liturgy more or less obscure. Yet a considerable number of parts remain clear, as though to help us supply the rest through probable conjectures.

[margin: Liturgical records.]

Nevertheless, as we said in the preceding *(p. 59)* chapter, we are strictly entitled to date the text of the so-called Apostolic Liturgies, the Canon of the Latin Mass, and the formulas accompanying the administration of the Sacraments to the period we are now describing, if not to the Apostles' own time. Thus no one can reasonably deny that liturgical style, as expressed throughout all these records and imitated in succeeding centuries, is a product of the Christian genius of the primitive age. We shall offer a proof that may perhaps never have been advanced, but is no less indisputable for that.

[margin: Liturgical style, a product of the Christian genius of the first centuries.]

[margin: of the primitive age.]

[margin: Proof drawn from the Acts of the Martyrs.]

In the Acts of the Martyrs, we see most of these generous confessors of Christ, at the moment of consummating their sacrifice, summing up their desires and adorations in a prayer of solemn style. All these formulas resemble one another, whether spoken by bishops such as St. Ignatius of Antioch, laymen such as St. Theodotus of Ancyra, or ordinary women such as St. Afra. Nothing is more evident than the identity of style between these prayers and the Church's prayers in celebrating the mysteries. Relying on analogy as a rule of certainty, we could therefore legitimately date the composition of these ancient formulas to the heroic age, the age of martyrs. But we owe it to ourselves to justify our assertion with examples. We shall quote St. Polycarp's prayer here in the text; the reader will find several others in the Notes following this chapter[34]. Here is the prayer:

[margin: St. Polycarp's prayer at the moment of his immolation.]

"Lord God almighty, Father of your beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, through whom we have received knowledge of you; God of angels and powers, of all creation, and of the whole race of the righteous who live in your presence: I bless you because on this day and at this hour *(p. 60)* you have counted me worthy to share among your martyrs in the cup of your Christ, for the resurrection to eternal life of soul and body, in the incorruptibility of the Holy Spirit. May I be received among them today in your presence as a rich and acceptable sacrifice, as you have prepared, foretold, and fulfilled, God who cannot lie and is true. Therefore, for all things I praise you, I bless you, I glorify you, with the eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ, your beloved Son; with whom be glory to you and to the Holy Spirit, both now and in the ages to come. Amen[35]."

[margin: The Apostolic Canons, valuable sources for studying]

[margin: the primitive Liturgy.]

Another source that must be consulted for knowledge of the Liturgy's condition in the first three centuries is the collection of that period's general discipline. We shall put first the Apostolic Canons, so ancient that their final redaction cannot be dated later than the second century.

In the third canon we read the prohibition against placing honey, milk, or anything other than the matter of the Lord's Sacrifice on the altar; after which it adds:

"Let nothing else be offered at the altar except oil for the lighting, and incense at the time of the holy oblation[36]."

This canon is important chiefly as evidence for the antiquity of burning incense at the altar. Moreover, since this practice existed under the Mosaic law and in every religion, it was naturally to take its place among Christian observances. If we have seen Tertullian affirm above that Christians did not buy *(p. 61)* incense, he meant that, since they used it only in celebrating the sacrifice, and only by the bishop's hand, their consumption was far smaller than that of the pagans, among whom private individuals themselves burned incense at every hour before the thousand vain objects of their idolatry.

The seventh canon fixes the day of Easter, the center of the annual Liturgy, so as to prevent a shared observance with the Jews[37].

The eighth canon commands the bishop, priest, deacon, and every cleric to receive Communion at the oblation, unless there is sufficient reason otherwise, under pain of separation from the rest of the people[38]. The following canon imposes the same penalty on those of the faithful who enter the church and hear the reading of the Scriptures that forms what is called the Mass of the Catechumens, but do not remain to take part in the prayers and Communion[39].

The forty-second canon orders exclusion from communion for a subdeacon, reader, or chanter who gives himself over to games of chance. Thus the Church already had chanters for the divine offices. They are, moreover, mentioned in several places in the Apostolic Constitutions[40].

(p. 62) The seventy-first and seventy-second canons impose grave penalties on any cleric or layman who dares to steal from the holy Church wax or oil, a gold or silver vessel, or a veil consecrated to worship[41].

Such are the chief particulars concerning the Liturgy that we find in the Apostolic Canons. They clearly correspond perfectly to the kind of details we have already pointed out from the records of that period.

[margin: Canons of the Council of Elvira concerning the Liturgy.]

We shall now give some canons of the famous Council of Elvira, held at the end of the third century, to show that the Liturgy already occupied an important place in ecclesiastical prescriptions, and to continue depicting the Church's customs from this perspective.

The twenty-eighth canon decrees that the bishop shall not receive the offering of one who does not receive Communion[42].

The twenty-ninth forbids reciting the name of a possessed person at the altar during the oblation, or allowing him to serve with his own hands in the church[43]. In this the bishops of Spain were stricter than those of Africa, who entrusted possessed persons with sweeping the church floor[44].

(p. 63) The thirty-fourth canon forbids lighting candles in cemeteries in broad daylight, so as not to disturb the spirits of the Saints[45], that is, so as not to disturb the faithful who prayed there.

The forty-third canon says that, to reform an abuse, Pentecost shall be celebrated, according to the Scriptures, fifty rather than forty days after Easter; those who do not conform to this practice shall be marked as introducing a new heresy[46].

[margin: Does this Council condemn sacred images?]

Much has been written about this same council's thirty-sixth canon, which says:

"It was decided that pictures ought not to be in the church, lest what is worshiped and adored be painted on the walls[47]."

Certain Protestant authors have sought to find here a condemnation of sacred images. But the evidence we have elsewhere of Christians' practice of representing the objects of their worship through painting and sculpture obliges every person of good sense to interpret the cited canon otherwise. Tertullian tells us, indeed, that even the chalices bore the image of the Good Shepherd. The many objects preserved in the Vatican's Christian Museum, or engraved by Bosio, Arringhi, Boldetti, Bottari, and Buonarotti, have enabled scholars of our day to study Christian art of this period quite comprehensively. Perhaps the Council of Elvira forbids wall paintings here only because there was reason to fear that, since they could not be removed *(p. 64)* in times of persecution, they might be profaned by unbelievers.

[margin: Objection from Minucius Felix against the existence of Christian temples.]

A similar objection appears in a passage of Minucius Felix in which the author seems to admit that Christians had no temples for worshiping their God. The answer is easy: he intends to show the difference between Christianity and paganism. Paganism is so enslaved to matter that, when the objects of its worship are destroyed, its very life is struck; Christianity, being eminently spiritual, survives the ruin of buildings that cannot contain the majesty of the God it adores. Indeed, these few sentences of a philosophical tract cannot undo the innumerable testimonies of the history of the first three centuries, which speaks continually of churches and the faithful's meeting places.

[margin: The Apostolic See's solicitude concerns the Liturgy in the first centuries.]

If the councils in the period we are describing had to concern themselves—and did concern themselves—with liturgical regulations, the Apostolic See's solicitude at that same time must have extended no less zealously to regulating and satisfying this primary need of all the churches. Providence permitted one of the most characteristic acts of pontifical authority in the first three centuries to be, at the same time, a sovereign exercise of Roman power over liturgical matters.

In the second century, the Churches of Asia followed a practice different from the Roman Church's in celebrating Easter. Instead of keeping it on Sunday, the day of light's creation, Christ's Resurrection, and the Holy Spirit's descent, they followed the Jewish practice of solemnizing it on the fourteenth day of the March moon.

This divergence in the manner of celebrating Christianity's central event gravely offended the unity of worship, the first consequence of unity of faith. The persistence within Christian society of the usages of the Synagogue, buried forever beneath the ruins *(p. 65)* of its temple, dangerously assailed the full worth of Christian rites. Finally, prudence obliged the Church to use every means of separating itself from the Jewish sect, which had become, seemingly beyond recall, the object of the human race's abhorrence.

[margin: Pope St. Victor's intervention in the controversy over the celebration of Easter.]

All these grave reasons moved Pope St. Victor to make a vigorous attempt to restore unity on so important a point. He therefore ordered councils to be held throughout the Church on this question. Having been able to judge that the Roman practice of celebrating Easter on Sunday was accepted almost universally, he thought it his duty to deal severely with the churches of the province of Asia, which seemed determined to persist in the opposite custom. He went so far as to cut them off from ecclesiastical communion—a severe penalty, undoubtedly, and so severe that it was later revoked. Yet the bishops, especially St. Irenaeus, who thought it their duty to remonstrate with the Pope on this matter, did not reproach him with having exceeded the limits of his apostolic authority. They merely begged him not thus to place in a state of separation so many Churches otherwise attached to the soundest traditions[48]. The Apostolic See's forbearance soon restored peace. But this important act remained a manifestation of the Roman Church's undisputed power over liturgical matters, and a prelude to her later efforts to unite all the Churches in the communion of the same rites and the same prayers.

[margin: Catalogue of Roman Pontiffs who issued liturgical regulations in this period.]

Pope St. Victor's regulation on Easter is not the only one issued by the Roman Pontiffs in the first three centuries. The importance of liturgical matters, joined to the sovereign dignity of their see, to which Eusebius, St. Cyprian, and St. Irenaeus show us *(p. 66)* that recourse was made in every grave circumstance, must often have enabled them to issue decrees or responses on the sacred rites. The text of these regulations has been lost through the ravages of time. Only a half-effaced trace remains in the all-too-brief notices of the Liber pontificalis, a chronicle whose authority we have already established in our Origines de l'Église romaine. In the continuation of that work will also be found a full history of Pope St. Victor's dispute with the Asians and a thorough discussion of the decrees whose substance follows.

[margin: St. Linus.]

St. Linus ordered that women enter the church with their heads veiled[49].

[margin: St. Anacletus.]

St. Anacletus built the memorial, or tomb, of St. Peter and fixed the burial place of the bishops of Rome.

[margin: St. Evaristus.]

St. Evaristus distributed Rome's tituli, or churches, among the priests, and decreed that the bishop be assisted by seven deacons when proclaiming God's word.

[margin: St. Alexander.]

St. Alexander ordered that a commemoration of the Lord's Passion be inserted in the prayers of the sacrifice, and that water be blessed with salt for sprinkling people's dwellings.

[margin: St. Sixtus I.]

St. Sixtus I decreed that sacred vessels be touched only by the ministers, and confirmed the practice of singing this hymn during the Action, or Canon: Sanctus, Sanctus ("Holy, Holy"), etc.

[margin: St. Telesphorus.]

St. Telesphorus ordained that the sacrifice be celebrated on the night of the Lord's Birth; on other days it was not to take place before the third hour. At the beginning of that same sacrifice, the angelic hymn was to be sung: Gloria in excelsis Deo ("Glory to God in the highest").

[margin: St. Anicetus.]

St. Anicetus forbade clerics to let their hair grow long.

[margin: St. Pius I.]

At the request of the virgin Praxedes, St. Pius dedicated as a church *(p. 67)* the Baths of Novatus, on the Vicus Patricius. He made rich offerings to this new sanctuary and often offered sacrifice to the Lord there.

He had a baptismal font built there, and with his own hand baptized many catechumens in the name of the Holy Trinity.

[margin: St. Soter.]

St. Soter forbade deaconesses to touch the sacred palls or put incense into the thurible.

[margin: St. Zephyrinus.]

St. Zephyrinus decreed that the ordination of priests, deacons, and even ordinary clerics take place in the presence of the clergy and faithful.

[margin: St. Callistus.]

St. Callistus fixed the Saturday fast four times a year, in the fourth, fifth, seventh, and tenth months. He dedicated the Basilica of St. Mary across the Tiber, and enlarged and adorned the famous cemetery on the Appian Way that bears his name.

[margin: St. Urban.]

St. Urban had the sacred vessels made of silver and offered twenty-five patens of the same metal.

[margin: St. Fabian.]

St. Fabian had many structures built in the cemeteries.

[margin: St. Cornelius.]

St. Cornelius removed the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul from their resting place in the Catacombs and reinterred them, one in the Vatican plain, the other on the road to Ostia.

[margin: St. Stephen.]

St. Stephen forbade priests and deacons to use in ordinary life the garments they wore at the altar.

[margin: St. Felix I.]

St. Felix I recommended celebrating the sacrifice over the memorials of the martyrs, and dedicated a basilica on the Via Aurelia.

[margin: St. Eutychian.]

St. Eutychian decreed that only the firstfruits of beans and grapes be blessed at the altar. He buried martyrs with his own hands and ordered the faithful, when committing these courageous athletes of Christ to the earth, to cover their bodies with rich garments.

Here we end this enumeration, admittedly very *(p. 68)* incomplete, of the laws of the earliest Roman Pontiffs concerning the Liturgy. We shall merely observe, as we have elsewhere, that some of these regulations must be regarded as ordinances for the Church of Rome alone; others as renewals of older canons; and still others as laws addressed to all the Churches, like St. Victor's decree on Easter.

[margin: Character of these regulations.]

[margin: Liturgical writers of the first three centuries.]

Having thus presented the Church's general character in this important respect through the liturgical laws and canons of the first three centuries, we still have to survey the writers of that period for the resources and explanations they can furnish concerning the Liturgy.

[margin: The compiler of the Apostolic Constitutions.]

If St. Clement of Rome were indeed the author or compiler of the important collection entitled Apostolic Constitutions, he would deserve to head the liturgists of the Church's first age, just as he deserves first place among ecclesiastical writers. The eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions contains a Liturgy of the Sacrifice so complete, and so full of majesty and unction, that Grancolas could not help calling it one of the most beautiful and one of the greatest to be found in antiquity[50]. But we can offer no proof supporting the

opinion that attributes its composition to St. Clement. In any case, it must have been composed before the peace of the Church, since the compilation to which it belongs itself dates from the period we are describing—not only in the judgment of Catholic scholars[51], but even in that of several *(p. 69)* Protestant scholars[52]. We shall therefore record it here as a document of the period we are recounting, without attempting to identify its author precisely.

[margin: St. Justin, martyr.]

We have quoted most of what St. Justin relates in his first Apology concerning the Christians' sacrifice, which he had to vindicate against the gross calumnies by which it had been misrepresented. He also explains Baptism in the same place; but we preferred to quote some particulars from Tertullian on this sacrament, since they describe Christian usages in greater detail than St. Justin could in a book intended for pagans.

[margin: Melito, bishop of Sardis.]

Melito, bishop of Sardis, who lived in 170, wrote a treatise on the celebration of Easter. We now know this treatise only through a fragment of another book on Easter, written by Clement of Alexandria. That book too is lost, except for a passage quoting Melito, preserved for us by Eusebius[53]. In it Melito says that he wrote his book when Servilius Paulus was proconsul of Asia; that Sagatis, bishop of Laodicea, suffered martyrdom; and that a great controversy arose in that city over the Easter solemnity. This controversy, earlier than the one under St. Victor, is noteworthy. Melito also left a treatise On the Day of Sunday, which is likewise lost.

[margin: Clement of Alexandria.]

The great Clement of Alexandria ranks among the liturgical writers of the first three centuries. As we have just seen, he too wrote on the important question of Easter. He also authored a book On Fasting, which has likewise perished; but we still possess from *(p. 70)* him an admirable hymn to the Savior, placed after his Paedagogus. This hymn is the oldest that has come down to us. It is one of the spiritual canticles of the kind the Apostle speaks of; we shall try to convey its enchanting melody here.

[margin: His hymn to the Savior.]

"Bridle of untamed colts, wing of birds that do not stray, true helm of children, shepherd of royal lambs: gather your simple children to praise in holiness, to sing sincerely with innocent mouth Christ, the children's guide.

King of saints, Word who tames all things, ruler of the Most High Father's wisdom, support in labors, rejoicing in eternity, Savior of the human race, Jesus!

Shepherd, farmer, helm, bridle, heavenly wing of the most holy flock; fisher of men who are saved, luring with sweet life the chaste fish from the hostile waters of the sea of vice.

Lead, shepherd of rational sheep! Holy One, lead, King of unspotted children! The footsteps of Christ, the heavenly way!

Everlasting Word, boundless eternity, eternal light, fountain of mercy, worker of virtue, upright life of those who praise God!

Christ Jesus! Heavenly milk, pressed from the sweet breasts of the Bride of graces, from your wisdom! Let us, little children nourished with tender mouth, filled with the dewy Spirit of the breast of Reason, sing together simple praises, true hymns to Christ the King.

Let us sing the holy rewards of the teaching of life. Let us sing simply the mighty Child. Choir of peace, born of Christ, modest people, let us sing together the God of peace[54]."

(p. 71)

[margin: Tertullian.]

Tertullian offers the richest resources for studying the liturgical usages of the Church in his time. The particulars we have quoted in this chapter and the list of Christian practices in the passage quoted above in chapter III[55] give only a faint idea of the abundant harvest that students of the sacred rites can glean from his writings as a whole. We especially recommend the treatises De Jejuniis, De Virginibus velandis, De Cultu feminarum, and Ad Uxorem.

In the last of these books, speaking of the serious disadvantages of a Christian woman's marriage to a pagan, he gives these remarkable details about the customs of the third-century Church:

[margin: Remarkable details this author gives on the customs of the third-century Church.]

"If a Station must be observed, her husband will arrange a daytime visit to the baths; if fasts must be kept, he will hold banquets that very day; if she must go out, household business will never arise more pressingly. Who will allow his wife to go from street to street into other people's cottages, especially the poorest, to visit the brethren? Who will willingly bear her being taken from his side for night assemblies, if need be? Who, indeed, will calmly endure her spending the night away at the Easter solemnity? Who will let her go without suspicion to that banquet of the Lord which people defame? Who will let her creep into prison to kiss a martyr's chains? … But someone tolerates our practices and does not object. This, then, is the offense: that Gentiles know our practices. … Will you escape notice when you sign your bed or your body, when you blow away something unclean, when you even rise at night to pray? Will you not seem *(p. 72)* to be doing something magical? Will your husband not know what you taste secretly before any food? And if he knows it is bread, does he not believe it to be what people say it is[56]?"

[margin: St. Irenaeus.]

Further on, speaking of the happiness of Christian marriage, he tells us that even then it was contracted in the Church's presence, at the foot of the altar: "How can we adequately tell the happiness of that marriage which the Church joins together, the oblation confirms, and the blessing seals; which the angels announce and the Father ratifies[57]?"

As regards the Liturgy, St. Irenaeus is known to us only through his letters in the Easter controversy. Eusebius has preserved a fragment of one of them in his history. From the same author we know that Theophilus of Caesarea in Palestine and Polycarp of Ephesus also wrote letters on this subject: the former in support of orthodoxy, the latter on the Quartodeciman side[58].

[margin: St. Hippolytus, bishop and martyr.]

[margin: St. Dionysius of Alexandria.]

St. Hippolytus, bishop and martyr, drew up a cycle for calculating the feast of Easter. This cycle can still be read today, engraved on the learned bishop's marble chair, which, with the beautiful statue seated in it, is itself a liturgical monument of the period we are considering and one of the Vatican Library's chief ornaments.

In the middle of the third century, St. Dionysius of Alexandria wrote several Paschal letters and a canonical epistle addressed to Bishop Basilides on the same subject, the celebration *(p. 73)* of Easter; a letter on Saturday; and another De officio diaconi (On the Office of a Deacon)[59].

[margin: St. Cyprian.]

St. Cyprian must be ranked among the most important writers on our subject. It is enough to recall his admirable epistle to Caecilius on the Christian sacrifice, and countless passages in his treatises and letters, writings which, like Tertullian's, reflect the Church's customs at that time with the greatest accuracy and vividness. His book On the Lord's Prayer is also very important. But a phrase in this book became, as we shall see in later periods, the text for many dangerous sophisms subversive of all Liturgy. Despite our desire to shorten this survey of the ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries, we shall therefore place the

famous passage here, inviting the reader to return to it whenever necessary in the continuation of this account.

[margin: Famous passage from his book On the Lord's Prayer.]

"He had already foretold that the hour would come when true worshipers would worship the Father in spirit and truth; and he fulfilled what he had promised, so that we, who have received spirit and truth through his sanctification, might also worship truly and spiritually according to his tradition. For what prayer can be more spiritual than that truly given to us by Christ, who also sent us the Holy Spirit? What petition can be truer before the Father than that spoken from the mouth of the Son, who is truth? Thus, to pray otherwise than he taught is not merely ignorance but also a fault, since he himself laid down the rule and said: 'You reject God's commandment to establish your own tradition.' Let us therefore, dearly beloved brothers, pray as God our Teacher has taught us. It is a friendly and intimate prayer to ask God with what is *(p. 74)* his own, to have Christ's prayer ascend to his ears. Amica et familiaris oratio est Deum de suo rogare, ad aures ejus ascendere Christi orationem[60]."

[margin: Anatolius of Laodicea and St. Peter of Alexandria.]

We shall close this survey with the names of Anatolius of Laodicea and St. Peter of Alexandria, both of whom wrote on Easter[61], a question which, as we see, occupied almost all the liturgical writers of the first three centuries.

[margin: Heresy already seeks to corrupt the Liturgy to spread its errors.]

[margin: Paul of Samosata.]

[margin: The Donatists.]

[margin: Valentinus and Hierax.]

While the Liturgy was thus regarded as one of Christianity's principal strengths, heresy, which always seeks to counterfeit orthodoxy and turn to its own guilty purposes the means orthodoxy uses to preserve the holy traditions, was already laying hands on this sacred weapon. Arius's precursor, Paul of Samosata, abolished the chants that had until then resounded in his church in Christ's honor, substituting other canticles in which he received his followers' sacrilegious flattery[62]. The schismatics known as Donatists, who wearied the Church of Africa from the end of the third century into the fifth, also fabricated, as St. Augustine relates, chants in the form of psalms, intended to spread the venom of their errors among the multitude gathered for prayer[63]. Indeed, long before this, the famous Valentinus too had composed his Psalms, "with great imprudence," as Tertullian says[64]; and St. Epiphanius tells us *(p. 75)* that another sectarian, Hierax, imitated him, with the same aim of corrupting faith through false prayer[65]. In different periods we shall see further applications of this perfidious system, common to almost all separated societies.

[margin: Conclusions.]

In concluding this chapter, we shall observe that after the Apostles' death the Liturgy retained the same traditional character we recognized in it while they were still alive;

That the most learned doctors treated it as a fundamental part of Christianity;

That heretics were already attempting to poison this source of faith and doctrine;

That its forms were the object of the most solemn ecclesiastical prescriptions;

That tendencies toward unity were already beginning to appear, at least in the principal rites;

And finally, that the Roman Church was already the center of the Liturgy, as it was of the faith; so that even in the respect we are considering, one must apply St. Irenaeus's solemn words in his third book Against Heresies: "Indeed, with this Church, on account of its preeminent authority, it is necessary that every Church be in concord—that is, the faithful everywhere."

(p. 76)

Notes to Chapter IV

Note A

Precationes facite mane, et tertia hora, ac sexta, et nona, et vespere, atque in gallicinio. Mane: gratias agentes, quod Dominus, abducta nocte, et inducto die, illuminavit nos. Tertia hora: quoniam in ea Dominus sententiam damnationis excepit a Pilato. Sexta: quod in ea crucifixus est. Nona: quia cuncta, crucifixo Domino, commota sunt, dum horrent impiorum Judæorum temeritatem, nec ferre possunt contumeliam Domino illatam. Vespere: gratias agentes, quod noctem nobis dederit, laborum diurnorum requietem. In gallorum cantu: eo quod illa hora nuntiat adventum diei, ad facienda opera lucis. Si propter infideles impossibile est ad Ecclesiam procedere, in domo aliqua congregationem facies, Episcope. (Constit. apost. lib. VIII, cap. XXXIV.)

Note B

In orationibus vero celebrandis invenimus observasse cum Daniele tres pueros in fide fortes, et in captivitate victores, horam tertiam, sextam, nonam, sacramento scilicet Trinitatis; quæ in novissimis temporibus manifestari habebat. Nam et prima hora in tertiam veniens, consummatum numerum Trinitatis ostendit. Itemque ad sextam quarta procedens, declarat alteram Trinitatem. Et quando a septima nona completur, per ternas horas Trinitas perfecta numeratur; quæ horarum spatia jampridem spiritaliter determinantes adoratores Dei, statutis et legitimis ad precem temporibus serviebant: et manifestata post modum res est sacramenta olim fuisse; quod ante sic justi precabantur. Nam super discipulos hora tertia descendit Spiritus Sanctus, qui gratia dominicæ repromissionis implevit. Item Petrus horâ sexta in tectum superius ascendens, signo pariter et voce Dei monentis instructus est, ut omnes ad gratiam salutis admitteret, cum de emundandis gentilibus ante dubitaret. Et Dominus hora sexta crucifixus, ad nonam peccata nostra sanguine suo abluit, et ut redimere et vivificare nos posset, tunc victoriam suam passione perfecit. Sed nobis, fratres dilectissimi, præter horas antiquitus observatas, orandi nunc et spatia et sacramenta creverunt. Nam et mane orandum est, ut resurrectio Domini matutina oratione celebretur. Quod olim Spiritus Sanctus designabat in psalmis dicens: Rex meus et Deus meus, quoniam ad te orabo, Domine: mane exaudies vocem meam: mane assistam tibi, et contemplabor te. Et iterum per prophetam loquitur Dominus: Diluculo vigilabunt ad me dicentes: Eamus et revertamur ad *(p. 77)* Dominum Deum nostrum. Recedente item sole ac die cessante, necessario rursus orandum est. Nam quia Christus sol verus, et dies est verus, sole ac die seculi recedente quando oramus et petimus ut super nos lux denuo veniat, Christi precamur adventum, lucis æternæ gratiam præbiturum. (S. Cyprianus, De Oratione dominica, versus finem.)

Note C

Solis, ut dicitur, die, omnium sive urbes sive agros incolentium in eumdem locum fit conventus, et commentaria Apostolorum, aut scripta Prophetarum leguntur, quoad licet per tempus. Deinde ubi lector desiit, is qui præest admonitionem verbis et adhortationem ad res tam præclaras imitandas suscipit. Postea omnes simul consurgimus, et preces emittimus: atque, ut jam diximus, ubi desiimus precari, panis affertur et vinum et aqua: et qui præest, preces et gratiarum actiones totis viribus emittit et populus acclamat, amen, et eorum, in quibus gratiæ actæ sunt, distributio fit et communicatio unicuique præsentium, et absentibus per Diaconos mittitur: qui abundant et volunt, suo arbitrio, quod quisque vult, largiuntur, et quod colligitur apud eum, qui præest, deponitur, ac ipse subvenit pupillis et viduis, et iis qui vel ob morbum, vel aliam ob causam, egent, tum etiam iis qui in vinculis sunt et advenientibus peregre hospitibus; uno verbo omnium indigentium curam suscipit. Die autem solis omnes simul venimus, tum quia prima hæc est dies, qua Deus, cum tenebras et materiam vertisset, mundum creavit, tum quia Jesus Christus salvator noster eadem die ex mortuis resurrexit. Pridie enim Saturni eum crucifixerunt, et postridie ejusdem diei, id est, solis die apostolis suis et

discipulis visus ea docuit, quæ vobis quoque consideranda tradidimus. (S. Justinus, Apologia I, n° 67.)

Note D

Nos autem postquam eum, qui fidem suam et assensum doctrinæ nostræ testatus est, sic abluimus, ad eos, qui dicuntur fratres, deducimus, ubi illi congregati sunt, communes preces et pro nobismetipsis, et pro eo qui illuminatus est, et pro aliis ubique omnibus intento animo facturi, ut veritatis cognitionem adepti, hac etiam gratia dignemur, ut rectam operibus vitam agentes et præceptorum custodes inveniamur, quo salutem æternam assequamur. Invicem osculo salutamus, ubi desiimus precari. Deinde ei, qui fratribus præest, panis affertur, et poculum aquæ et vini: quibus ille acceptis, laudem et gloriam universorum Parenti per nomen Filii et Spiritus Sancti emittit, et Eucharistiam, sive gratiarum actionem, pro his ab illo acceptis donis prolixe exsequitur. Postquam preces et Eucharistiam absolvit, populus omnis acclamat, amen. Amen autem hebræa lingua idem valet ac fiat. Postquam vero is, qui præest, preces absolvit, et populus omnis acclamavit, qui apud nos dicuntur dia- *(p. 78)* coni panem et vinum et aquam, in quibus gratiæ actæ sunt, unicuique præsentium participanda distribuunt, et ad absentes perferunt. (Ibidem, n° 65.)

Note E

Now when God's holy martyr (Irenaeus) came to the bridge called Basentis, he stripped off his garments, stretched his hands toward heaven, and prayed: "Lord Jesus Christ, who deigned to suffer for the world's salvation, may your heavens open, that the angels may receive the spirit of your servant Irenaeus. I suffer these things for your name and for your people, brought forth from your Catholic Church of Sirmium. I ask you and implore your mercy: deign both to receive me and to strengthen these people in your faith." Then, struck with the sword by the executioners, he was cast into the river Sava. (Act. S. Irenæi, Episc. Sirmiensis, in Ruinart.)

When they (Lucian and Marcian) had been brought to the place, they gave thanks to God as if with one voice, saying: "Lord Jesus, our praises of you are inadequate. You deigned to rescue us, wretched and unworthy, from pagan error and bring us to this supreme and venerable suffering for your name, making us sharers with all your saints. To you be praise, to you glory; to you also we entrust our soul and spirit." When they had finished praying, the torturers immediately set the fire beneath them. (Act. SS. Luciani et Marciani, ibid.)

When they reached the place, the martyr (Theodotus) began to pray in these words: "Lord Jesus Christ, creator of heaven and earth, who do not abandon those who hope in you, I thank you for making me worthy to be a citizen of your heavenly city and a sharer in your kingdom. I thank you for granting me victory over the dragon and the crushing of its head. Give peace to your Church, delivering her from the devil's tyranny." After ending his prayer with "Amen," he turned and saw the brethren weeping, etc. (Act. S. Thodoti Ancyrani et septem Virginum, ibid.)

When these words had been spoken, Afra was surrounded with brushwood and fire was set beneath her. Her voice was heard saying: "I thank you, Lord Jesus Christ, who deigned to accept me as a victim for your name. You alone were offered as a victim on the cross for the whole world: the just for the unjust, the good for the wicked, the blessed for the accursed, the sinless for all sinners. To you I offer my sacrifice, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit live and reign, God forever and ever. Amen." Saying this, she gave up her spirit. (Acta S. Afræ, ibid.)

Kneeling, she (Julitta) prayed: "I thank you, Lord, who called my son before me and graciously willed that, leaving this present, vain life, he should be joined to that eternal life with the saints for your holy and awesome name. Receive me also, your unworthy handmaid, and grant me that great good: to be numbered with the wise virgins allowed to enter the heavenly and incorruptible bridal chamber, *(p. 79)* and may my spirit bless your Father, God who preserves all things and fashioned the universe, and the Holy Spirit forever.

Amen.” (Act. SS. Cyrici et Julittæ, ibid.)

[margin: PART I… CHAPTER…]

Note F

Frænum pullorum indocilium,
Penna volucrum non errantium
Verus clavus infantium,
Pastor agnorum regalium,
Tuos simplices
Pueros congrega,
Ad sancte laudandum,
Syncere canendum
Ore innoxio
Christum puerorum ducem.
Rex sanctorum,
Verbum, qui domas omnia,
Patris altissimi
Sapientiæ rector,
Laborum sustentaculum,
Ævo gaudens,
Humani generis
Servator Jesu,
Pastor, arator,
Clavus, frænum,
Penna cœlestis
Sanctissimi gregis.
Piscator hominum,
Qui salvi fiunt.
Pelagi vitii
Pisces castos
Unda ex infesta
Dulci vita inescans.
Sis dux, ovium
Rationalium pastor.
Sancte, sis dux,
Rex puerorum intactorum.
Vestigia Christi,
Via cœlestis,
Verbum perenne,
Ævum infinitum,
Lux æterna,
Fons misericordiæ,
Operatrix virtutis,

(p. 80) Honesta vita
Deum laudantium, Christe Jesu;
Lac cœleste
Dulcibus uberibus

Nymphæ gratiarum,
Sapientiæ tuæ expressum.
Infantuli
Ore tenero
Enutriti,
Mammæ rationalis
Roscido spiritu
Impleti,
Laudes simplices,
Hymnos veraces,
Regi Christo,
Mercedes sanctas
Vitæ doctrinæ,
Canamus simul,
Canamus simpliciter
Puerum valentem.
Chorus pacis,
Christo geniti,
Populus modestus,
Psallamus simul Deum pacis.

Note G

Si statio facienda est, maritus de die condicat ad balnea; si jejunia observanda sunt, maritus eadem die convivia exerceat; si procedendum erit, numquam magis familiæ occupatio obveniat. Quis autem sinat conjugem suam visitandorum fratrum gratia, vicatim aliena et quidem pauperiora quæque tuguria circumire? Quis nocturnis convocationibus, si ita oportuerit, à latere suo adimi libenter feret? Quis denique solemnibus Paschæ obnoctantem securus sustinebit? Quis ad convivium illud dominicum, quod infamant, sine sua suspicione dimittet? Quis in carcerem ad osculanda vincula martyris reptare patietur?..... Sed aliquis sustinet nostra, nec obstrepit. Hoc est igitur delictum quod gentiles nostra noverunt..... Latebisne tu cum lectulum, cum corpusculum tuum signas, cum aliquid immundum flatu explodis, cum etiam per noctem exurgis oratum? Et non magicæ aliquid videberis operari? Non sciet maritus quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes? Et si sciverit panem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur? (Tertullianus, Ad Uxorem, lib. II, cap. III, IV, V, VI.)

Note H

Jam prædixerat horam venire, quando veri adoratores adorarent Patrem in spiritu et veritate, et implevit quod ante promisit; ut qui spiritum *(p. 81)* et veritatem de ejus sanctificatione percepimus, de traditione quoque ejus vere et spiritaliter adoremus. Quæ enim potest esse magis spiritalis oratio, quam quæ vere a Christo nobis data est, a quo nobis et Spiritus Sanctus missus est? Quæ vera magis apud Patrem precatio, quam quæ a Filio qui est veritas, de ejus ore prolata est? Ut aliter orare quam docuit, non ignorantia sola sit, sed et culpa: quando ipse posuerit et dixerit: Rejicitis mandatum Dei, ut traditionem vestram statuatis. Oremus itaque, fratres dilectissimi, sicut magister Deus docuit. Amica et familiaris oratio est Deum de suo rogare; ad aures ejus ascendere Christi orationem. (S. Cyprianus, De Orat. Dominica, in principio.)

[1] Nolite inebriari vino in quo est luxuria: sed implemini Spiritu sancto, loquentes vobismetipsis in psalmis, et hymnis, et canticis spiritualibus, cantantes et psallentes in cordibus vestris Domino. (Eph., V, 18, 19.)

[2] Et pax Christi exultet in cordibus vestris in qua et vocati estis in uno corpore: et grati estote. Verbum Christi habitet in vobis abundanter, in omni sapientia, docentes et commonentes vosmetipsos in psalmis, hymnis et canticis spiritualibus, in gratia cantantes in cordibus vestris Deo. (Col., III, 15, 16.)

[3] See Note A.

[4] Porro, cum in eodem commentario Lucæ, et tertia hora orationis demonstretur, sub qua Spiritu sancto initiati, pro ebriis habebantur; et sexta, qua Petrus ascendit in superiora; et nona, qua templum sunt introgressi, cur non intelligamus salva plane indifferentia semper et ubique et omni tempore orandi, tamen tres istas horas, ut insigniores in rebus humanis quæ diem distribuunt, quæ negotia distinguunt, quæ publice resonant, ita et solemniores fuisse in orationibus divinis. (Tertullian., de Jejuniis, cap. X.)

[5] Ibid.

[6] See Note B.

[7] They affirmed, however, that the whole of their guilt or error had been this: they had been accustomed to assemble on a fixed day before dawn and to sing a hymn to Christ as to a God, taking turns with one another. (Report of C. Pliny the Younger, Propraetor of Bithynia, to Trajan.)

[8] St. Cyprian, Epist. LXIII.

[9] Observe the feast days, brothers; first, the Lord's birthday, to be celebrated by you on the twenty-fifth of the ninth month. After this day, hold the day of the Epiphany in the highest honor, for on it the Lord revealed his divinity to us; let it be kept on the sixth of the tenth month. (Apostolic Constitutions, book V, ch. XIII.)

[10] Finally, note also the days on which they depart, so that we may celebrate their commemorations among the memorials of the martyrs, although Tertullus, our most faithful and devoted brother, in keeping with all the other concern and care he bestows on the brothers in every act of service (nor does he fail in this in caring for their bodies), has written and continues to write, informing me of the days on which our blessed brothers in prison pass to immortality through the departure of a glorious death. Let oblations and sacrifices be celebrated here by us for their commemorations; with the Lord's protection, we shall soon celebrate these with you. (Epist. XII, p. 188.)

[11] When we gather at that place as opportunity permits, the Lord will grant us, in exultation and joy, to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom, both in memory of those who have endured the contests and for the training and encouragement of those yet to come. (Epist. Eccles. Smyrnens., in Ruinart, Acta sincera martyrum.)

[12] The blessed Polycarp suffered martyrdom on the second day of the beginning of the month Xanthicus, on the seventh day before the Kalends of May, on the great Sabbath, at the eighth hour. (Ibid.)

[13] In volumes II and following of our Origines de l'Église Romaine, we intend to give everything concerning the Catacombs and the religious uses to which the first Christians put them. We are obliged to abbreviate considerably this rapid history of the Liturgy and its forms, and to indicate the subjects rather than treat them exhaustively.

[14] The passage from Lucian may be found in the first volume of our Origines de l'Église Romaine, p. 273. There we treat this important question at some length; but we intend to pursue it in its full scope and all its details in the subsequent volumes of the same work.

[15] We know, moreover, that among us too there was an earthquake in certain places and some buildings fell, so that the impious outside the faith said that Christians were the cause of the earthquake; because of this the Churches suffered persecutions and were burned. (Origen, Tractat. XXVIII in Matthæum.)

[16] Formerly, in one place at Jerusalem there was one winepress, where they gathered and offered prayers, of which Isaiah speaks in these words: And I built a tower and dug a wine-vat in it. The tower signifies the temple, and the wine-vat the altar. But since he threatened to destroy them, and in fact destroyed them, he afterward established many winepresses in place of one: namely, Churches founded throughout the world. (Origen, in Psal., p. 81, Hexapl., vol. I.)

[17] This is reported as the custom And practice of your mysteries, The rule of your covenant: Your priests pour libations from gold. In silver cups, they say, The sacred blood gives off its vapor; And at your rites by night Wax candles stand fixed in gold. (Prudentius, Peristephanon, in S. Laurent.)

[18] Two gold chalices, also six silver chalices, six small silver jugs, a small silver vessel (cucumellum), seven silver lamps, two candle stands (cereofala), seven short bronze lampstands with their lamps, also eleven bronze lamps with their chains, etc. (Baluze, Miscellan., vol. II, p. 93.)

[19] He (Novatian) did not know that there ought to be one bishop in the Catholic Church, in which he nevertheless knew there were forty-four priests, seven deacons, as many subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, and fifty-two exorcists and readers together with doorkeepers. (St. Cornelius, Epist. ad Fabium Antiochen., no. 3, col. 150, in Coustant.)

[20] Moreover, the oil sanctified on the altar, with which the baptized are anointed, is Eucharistia (a thing over which thanks have been given). But one who had neither altar nor church could not sanctify the creature of oil. (Epist. LXX, p. 301.)

[21] Aut quis Novatianus altare collocare, et sacrificia offerre contra fas nititur, ab altari et sacrificiis cessare nos oportet, ne paria et similia cum illo celebrare videamur? (Epist. ad Jubaianum de hæreticis baptizandis.)

[22] What prayer is complete when separated from the holy kiss... what sort of sacrifice is one from which people depart without peace? (De oratione, ch. XIV.) Will not your station be more solemn if you also stand at the altar? Once the Lord's Body has been received and reserved, both remain secure: participation in the sacrifice and fulfillment of the duty. (Ibid.)

[23] For if Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is himself the High Priest of God the Father, was the first to offer himself as a sacrifice to the Father, and commanded this to be done in remembrance of him, then that priest truly acts in Christ's place who imitates what Christ did; and he offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father if he begins to offer as he sees Christ himself offered. (Epist. LXIII, p. 281.)

[24] Ibid., p. 277.

[25] So that we priests, who celebrate God's sacrifices daily, may prepare offerings and victims for God. (Epist. LVII, p. 253.)

[26] See Note C.

[27] See Note D.

[28] We do not merely raise our hands; we also spread them out, taking our pattern from the Lord's Passion, and in praying we make confession to Christ. (De Oratione, ch. XII.)

[29] To begin with Baptism: when about to enter the water, there and also somewhat earlier in the Church under the bishop's hand, we solemnly declare that we renounce the devil, his pomp, and his angels. We are then immersed three times, giving somewhat fuller answers than the Lord prescribed in the Gospel. On being lifted out, we first taste a mixture of milk and honey; from that day we abstain from the daily bath for a whole week. (De corona militis, ch. III.)

[30] Those about to enter Baptism must pray with frequent prayers, fasts, kneeling, and vigils throughout the night, and with confession of all past sins... we should be glad if we do not publicly confess our iniquities or shameful deeds. (De baptismo, ch. XX.)

[31] Easter provides a more solemn day for Baptism, since the Lord's Passion, into which we are immersed, was then accomplished..... Afterward Pentecost affords the widest period for arranging baptisms..... Yet every day is the Lord's; every hour, every time is suitable for Baptism. If solemnity differs, grace makes no distinction. (Ibid., ch. XIX.)

[32] I know of a woman brought up in the Church who died in the fullness of her beauty and youth. Having fallen asleep in peace after one brief marriage, while burial still awaited her and a presbyter's prayer was being offered over her, at the prayer's first breath she moved her hands from her sides into a posture of supplication; when peace had been pronounced, she restored them to their former position. (De Anima, ch. LI.)

[33] Thura plane non emimus. Si Arabiæ queruntur, scient Sabæi pluris et carioris suas merces Christianis sepeliendis profligari, quam diis fumigandis. (Apologet., cap. XLII.)

[34] See Note E.

[35] Epist. Eccles. Smyrnens., in Ruinart.

[36] If any bishop or presbyter brings to the altar, [contrary to] the Lord's ordinance concerning sacrifice, other things—honey or milk, strong drink instead of wine, prepared foods, birds, any animals, or vegetables contrary to the ordinance—let him be deposed, except for fresh vegetables at the proper season. Ne liceat autem aliquid aliud ad altare offerre, quam oleum ad luminare, et incensum tempore sanctæ oblationis.

[37] If any bishop, presbyter, or deacon celebrates the day of holy Easter with the Jews before the spring equinox, let him be deposed. (Labb., vol. I, p. 26.)

[38] If any bishop, presbyter, deacon, or one on the roll of the clergy does not receive Communion when the oblation has been made, let him state the reason. If it is reasonable, let him be excused; otherwise, let him be excluded from communion, as one who causes scandal to the people and casts suspicion upon the one who offered, as though he had not offered worthily.

[39] All the faithful who enter and hear the Scriptures, but do not remain for prayer and Holy Communion, must be excluded from communion as causing disorder in the Church.

[40] A subdeacon, reader, or chanter who does such things must either cease or be excluded from communion.

[41] If any cleric or layman takes wax or oil from the holy Church, let him be excluded from communion. Let no one henceforth turn a gold or silver vessel, or a sanctified veil, to his own use; for this is done contrary to right and against the laws. If anyone is caught, let him be punished.

[42] It was decided that bishops must not accept gifts from one who is not in communion. (Labb., vol. I, p. 973.)

[43] The name of a possessed person tormented by a wandering spirit must neither be recited at the altar with the oblation, nor may he be permitted to serve with his own hands in the church.

[44] Let possessed persons sweep the floors of the houses of God. (Fourth Council of Carthage, can. XCI, p. 1207, Labb., vol. II.)

[45] It was decided that candles should not be burned in the cemetery by day; for the spirits of the saints are not to be disturbed. Those who do not observe this shall be excluded from the Church's communion.

[46] It was decided to correct a perverse practice, according to the authority of the Scriptures, so that we all celebrate Pentecost after Easter, on the fiftieth day, not the fortieth. Let whoever fails to do so be marked as having introduced a new heresy.

[47] Placuit picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur.

[48] Euseb., Hist. eccles., bk. V, ch. XXIII and following.

[49] Liber pontificalis, entries for Linus, Anacletus, etc.

[50] Anciennes Liturgies, p. 96.

[51] Fronto, Prænotationes ad Kal. Rom., § 5; Morin, De Sacris Ordinat., pt. III, p. 20; De Marca, Concord., bk. III, ch. II; Bona, Rerum Liturgicarum, bk. I, ch. VIII, § 4; Schelestrate, Antiq. illustr., pt. II, dissert. II, ch. II; Pagi, Critic. Baron., for the year 100, no. 10; Lebrun, Explication de la Messe, vol. II.

[52] Henry Hammond, Cave, Thomas Brett, Collectio præcipuarum Liturgiarum Ecclesiæ christianæ.

[53] Hist. eccles., bk. IV, ch. XXVI.

[54] Clement of Alexandria, Opera, Potter ed., Oxford, vol. I, p. 267.

[55] P. 24.

[56] See Note G.

[57] Unde sufficiamus ad enarrandam felicitatem ejus matrimonii quod Ecclesia conciliat, et confirmat oblatio, et obsignat benedictio; Angeli renuntiant, Pater rato habet? (Ad Uxorem, lib. II, cap. IX.)

[58] Eusebius, Hist. eccles., bk. V, ch. XXIII and following.

[59] Eusebius, Hist. eccles., bk. VII, throughout.

[60] See Note H.

[61] Eusebius, Hist. eccles., bk. VII, ch. XXXII.

[62] He abolished the psalms customarily sung in honor of our Lord Jesus Christ, on the pretext that they were new and composed by more recent men. But he appointed women to sing certain psalms in his own praise in the midst of the church on the great day of Easter. (Eusebius, Hist. eccles., bk. VII, ch. XXX.)

[63] The Donatists reproach us for soberly singing the Prophets' divine canticles in church, while they inflame their own drunken revels with the singing of psalms composed by human ingenuity, as though with trumpets of exhortation. (St. Augustine, Epist. XXXIV.)

[64] Tertullian, De Carne Christi, bk. IV, ch. XVII.

[65] St. Epiphanius, Adv. Hæreses, bk. II, heresy LXXVII.

Chapter V. The Liturgy in the Church in General in the Fourth Century

(p. 82)

[margin: The Church emerges from the catacombs.]

At last the Church emerges forever from the crypts whose shadows had too often shrouded the majesty of her mysteries. She displays in broad daylight those rites whose splendor and holiness will complete the victory over paganism already assured her by the august truth of her dogmas and the beauty of her moral teaching. Following our usual practice, we shall gather in this chapter the general facts that give an overall view of the liturgical period under consideration.

[margin: Triumph, the general character of this period, is especially stamped upon the Liturgy.]

The character of this period is triumph. Now the Savior's words are fulfilled: What was spoken in the ear, preach from the rooftops[1]. The mysteries, hidden or confined within the temples, burst into broad daylight. The splendor and wealth of worship, however magnificent through the generosity of Christ's patrician disciples, surpass all measure once the emperors have crossed the Church's threshold. Just as faith, hope in the good things to come, and fraternal charity had until then intimately bound Christians throughout the empire, so now liturgical forms, having become social forms, proclaim their mighty nationhood.

"If that temple in a single city of Palestine was worthy of admiration," exclaims Eusebius, *(p. 83)* "how much more wonderful are the number, size, and beauty of the churches of God raised up in every place! For the whole world is full of churches[2]!"

Elsewhere he says: "If you see men adorned in this life with royal dignity and eminence gathered in God's Church with the poor of the lowest common people, do not hesitate to say that in this respect too Scripture has been fulfilled[3]."

[margin: Splendor of the ceremonies inaugurating churches rising everywhere.]

Everywhere, then, churches demolished during the persecution were being rebuilt, and new ones erected throughout the empire. These temples were dedicated with ever-increasing splendor. Bishops gathered for them in great numbers, and the Father of ecclesiastical history has preserved the memory of these august

ceremonies in accounts full of enthusiasm.

[margin: Dedication of the basilica of Tyre around 315.]

The first church dedication we encounter after the peace of Constantine is that of the basilica of Tyre, inaugurated around 315. This city, whose bishop was Paulinus, had seen its church destroyed during Diocletian's persecution. The pagans had even tried to disfigure its site by heaping every kind of filth upon it. Another place to build a church could easily have been found when peace was restored to Christianity; but Bishop Paulinus preferred to have the original site cleared and lay the second basilica's foundations there, to make the Church's victory still more evident. The glory of this second temple exceeded that of the first. Eusebius was commissioned to preach the solemn dedication homily amid *(p. 84)* an immense crowd that had flocked to take part in this celebration.

[margin: Eusebius of Caesarea's homily at this celebration.]

First addressing the bishops present at the ceremony, he begins: "Friends and priests of God, clothed in the sacred ankle-length tunic, adorned with the crown of heavenly glory, anointed with divine unction, and robed in the priestly garment of the Holy Spirit[4]." Fleury himself recognized here a clear designation of the pontifical vesture and sacred diadem that bishops already used, at least in celebrating the mysteries. Since we find no ecclesiastical regulation fixing these usages at that time, we must trace their institution to the preceding period, in which we have already encountered several significant traces of them.

[margin: Importance of this discourse, revealing the form of the earliest churches.]

He then celebrates the triumph God has just granted his people over their enemies and the victorious power he has placed in his Christ, who alone, by the might of his arm, has wrought so marvelous a change. Next he dwells on the praise of Bishop Paulinus, comparing him now to Bezalel, architect of the Mosaic tabernacle, now to Zerubbabel, restorer of the temple. But what interests us more is Eusebius's description of the basilica as a whole and in its parts, detailing the mysteries signified in its construction. This passage is important because it reveals the form of the earliest Christian churches, as we observed in the preceding chapter. Yet so far we have not found it quoted, or even known, by any of those countless talkers about religious architecture with whom the country has been overrun in recent years, and who flaunt, with such grotesque self-satisfaction, the full splendor of their improvised learning.

The eloquent panegyrist says of Paulinus:

(p. 85)

[margin: Description of the basilica of Tyre.]

"Having therefore marked out a much larger site, he fortified its entire outer circuit with a wall, to serve as the whole work's safest bulwark. He then extended a great, lofty vestibule toward the rays of the rising sun, affording those far outside the sacred enclosure a full view of what is hidden within, and in some way inviting the eyes of those alien to our faith to contemplate its thresholds. But once you enter the gates, he did not permit you immediately to enter the sanctuary with impure, unwashed feet. Leaving a very large interval between the temple and the vestibule, he enclosed this space in a square and adorned it on every side with four transverse porticoes, supported throughout by columns. He enclosed the spaces between the columns with wooden lattice screens rising to a moderate, suitable height. He left the central space open and uncovered, to provide a view of the sky and air bright with sunlight. Here he placed the signs of sacred expiation: fountains built opposite the church, supplying abundant water for washing to those about to enter the inner sanctuary. This is the first resting place of those entering, offering everyone beauty and splendor, and a fitting station for those still needing instruction. Passing beyond this sight, he opened approaches to the temple through several further inner vestibules, again constructing three doors in a row on the same side, facing the rays of the rising sun. He wished the middle door to exceed the other two greatly in both height and width, adorning it especially with bronze panels bound with iron and with various carvings; he joined the

others to it as attendants to a queen. Likewise, after arranging a matching number of vestibules with the porticoes built on either side of the temple, he devised openings above these porticoes to pour abundant light down into the building, and adorned these windows with *(p. 86)* various wooden carvings of the most delicate workmanship. He furnished the royal building itself with richer, more precious materials, displaying lavish magnificence of expenditure. Here it seems superfluous to describe the building's length and breadth, its splendid beauty and indescribable size, the radiant appearance and splendor of its works, its roofs reaching to heaven and, rising above them, the most precious cedars of Lebanon, not passed over even by the divine oracles, which say: "The trees of the Lord will rejoice, and the cedars of Lebanon which he planted." Why now discuss more precisely the skillful, ingenious arrangement of the whole structure or the surpassing beauty of its several parts, especially when the eyes' testimony supersedes all knowledge received through the ears? Having thus completed the temple and adorned it with lofty thrones in honor of those presiding, and with benches arranged in order throughout the temple, he finally placed the holy of holies—the altar—in the middle. To make these sacred precincts inaccessible to the multitude, he again enclosed them with wooden screens, wrought in minute detail to the highest perfection of art, presenting a marvelous sight to beholders. Nor did he think even the floor should be neglected. Having wonderfully adorned it with marble, he turned to the parts outside the temple, skillfully constructing spacious exedras and halls on either side, joined to one another along the basilica's sides and connected with the doors leading into its interior. Our truly peaceful Solomon, the builder of this temple, erected these buildings for those needing expiation and purification through water and the Holy Spirit. …"

After these descriptive details, of which we give here only a free and abridged translation, the bishop of Caesarea again yields to the transports of enthusiasm inspired in him by the Church's deliverance, represented in the splendor of the glorious building raised by Paulinus's hand; but *(p. 87)* soon he returns to his subject and explains in this way some of the mysteries expressed in the structural forms of the temple he has just described.

[margin: Mysteries expressed by the temple's very form.]

"This work is indeed a marvel beyond all admiration, especially for those who attend only to outward appearances. More marvelous than all marvels are the archetypes and their original images, the spiritual exemplars worthy of God: restorations of that divine and rational building in our souls. The Son of God himself built it in his own image and wished it to bear God's likeness in all things, bestowing an incorruptible, incorporeal nature free from all earthly matter, and giving it a rational and wholly intellectual substance. After first creating it once from nothing, he made it a holy bride and a sacred temple for himself and his Father. … After making the place of your minds pure and bright, he entrusted it to this most wise and God-loving prelate. Gifted in other matters with singular judgment and skill in reasoning, and especially perceptive in recognizing and discerning the thoughts of the souls entrusted to his care, this man has never ceased building, almost from the beginning down to this day. In each of you he joins now the brightest gold, now pure, tested silver, now the most precious stones, so that by his works for you he may again fulfill the sacred, hidden prophecy: "Behold, I prepare for you carbuncle as your stone, sapphire as your foundations, jasper as your battlements, crystal stones as your gates, and choice stones as your wall; all your sons taught by God, your sons in great peace; and you will be built in righteousness." Building in righteousness, therefore, he duly distinguished the whole people's powers and capacities. Some he enclosed only within the outer wall, that is, firm faith. This class is an immense multitude that cannot bear a more excellent structure. Others he permits to enter the temple, directing them to stand at its gates and guide those coming in; these are not unreasonably compared with the temple's vestibules. He supported others with the first columns arranged outside around the quadrangular atrium, bringing them within the first boundaries of the literal sense of the four Gospels. Still others, who remain catechumens, he places along either side *(p. 88)* of the royal building. They are advancing and progressing, yet are not far from the actual contemplation of God's deepest mysteries that the faithful enjoy. Taking from these those whose souls are spotless and purified like gold by

divine washing, he supported some with columns far superior to the outer ones: the secret, inmost meanings of sacred Scripture. Others he illuminates through windows made to admit light. He adorned the entire temple with one very great vestibule: the worship of the one God, the supreme king of all. On either side of the Father's authority he sets Christ and the Holy Spirit as a second light. In every remaining article of our faith he displays throughout the basilica the abundant, most excellent light and clarity of truth. … In this temple there are also thrones, countless seats and benches: in all those souls where the gifts of the Holy Spirit rest, such as once appeared to the most holy Apostles, when divided tongues like fire were seen resting on each. In the one who leads and presides over all, Christ himself, as is likely, dwells in his fullness; in those of the second rank in dignity, in proportion as each can receive the allotted gifts of Christ's power and of the Holy Spirit. Some people's souls are also seats for angels, to whom their instruction and guardianship have been entrusted. What else is that august, great, unique altar but the pure mind of the chief priest of all, truly the holy of holies? At its right stands that greatest High Priest of all, Jesus himself, the only-begotten Son of God[5]."

[margin: All fourth-century churches built on one type predating the peace of Constantine.]

We have recorded these words of Eusebius as the starting point of the written traditions concerning the construction of basilicas, so important a part of liturgical learning. All churches built in the fourth century, in East and West alike, appear to us in the form so eloquently described above. This proves beyond *(p. 89)* doubt that this type, to be so universal, predated the peace of Constantine[6]. The mysteries hidden in the details of the building, and so magnificently described by the bishop of Caesarea, were known to the faithful people, familiar with the language of symbols in a religion that sanctified every part of creation. We shall see this symbolism grow richer still in the Western Church, until the time when the matter-of-fact spirit of the Reformation, influencing even Catholic peoples, came to dictate church plans that were mute and bereft of every remembrance of tradition. As for the rites by which temples were consecrated in the Eastern Church in the fourth century, we should be reduced to pure conjecture if we attempted to reproduce them. It is beyond doubt that the singing of psalms and hymns held a large place; that consecratory prayers, in the style of the rest of the Liturgy, must have summed up the prelates' prayer and given it greater sanctifying power; that on these occasions bishops appeared in rich pontifical vestments; and finally, that a dedication was, as it is today, a sublime spectacle of religion, intended to impress upon peoples' minds and hearts a deep sense of the holiness and majesty of this dwelling that the Lord deigns to choose for himself among men.

[margin: Uncertainty about the rites used in the East for the dedication of churches.]

[margin: Saint Sylvester regulates these rites in the West as early as the fourth century.]

In the West, the traditions of the Roman Church tell us that, as early as the fourth century, Pope Saint Sylvester instituted and regulated in detail the rites we practice today in dedicating churches and altars[7].

(p. 90)

[margin: Dedications of Rome's Constantinian basilicas.]

This pontiff had the most magnificent occasions to practice them at the inauguration of the basilicas founded in Rome through Constantine's munificence. In his Lateran palace this emperor built a church that he dedicated under the title of the Savior. Now known as Saint John Lateran, it has become the seat of the Roman Pontiff, the Mother and Mistress of all the churches of Rome and the whole world, as the inscription on its principal façade declares. Besides this church, Constantine raised Saint Peter's over the Apostle's very body, in the Vatican Field; Saint Paul's over the body of the Apostle of the Gentiles, on the road to Ostia; Saint Lawrence's Outside the Walls, on the Via Tiburtina; Holy Cross in Jerusalem, on the Sessorian estate; Saint Agnes's, on the Via Nomentana; Saints Marcellinus and Peter's, on the Via Lavicana; and several others in Rome and around this capital.

[margin: Constantinople endowed with sumptuous churches by its founder.]

Not content with rebuilding the sanctuaries of old Rome with truly imperial magnificence, the pious emperor wished, as far as he could, to sanctify the new Rome he was building on the site of ancient Byzantium. There he constructed magnificent basilicas, including the one he dedicated to Eternal Wisdom under the name Hagia Sophia; Hagia Irene, which was the Great Church during his reign; the Twelve Apostles, which he intended for his burial; and many others in the city and its surroundings, chiefly over martyrs' tombs. His zeal for solemn manifestations of faith also appeared in his care to place the figure of the Cross in public places in the new capital. He also delighted in having two subjects especially dear to Christians of the earliest age represented on fountains in the public squares: the Good Shepherd and Daniel in the lions' den[8].

(p. 91)

[margin: Saint Helena's restoration of the holy places of Palestine.]

[margin: The basilica of the Holy Sepulcher.]

One undertaking, however, particularly moved Christians in this century and occasioned the most splendid acts of the Liturgy: Saint Helena's restoration of the holy places of Palestine that had witnessed the life, miracles, and sufferings of the God-man. Zealously supporting his mother's pious intentions, Constantine placed the empire's treasures at the disposal of Saint Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, so that the church to be built over the Holy Sepulcher might surpass in magnificence every building in every city of the world[9]. Eusebius has likewise preserved a description of this basilica, built in six years. We place this precious passage in the notes at the end of the present chapter[10]. After displaying all the splendors of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher's construction, the historian concludes: "It would be impossible for us to describe the sumptuousness, refinement, grandeur, number, and variety of the ornaments and other offerings, sparkling with gold, silver, and precious stones, that imperial magnificence heaped up in the temple of the Resurrection[11]."

[margin: Gifts offered to Rome's churches by Constantine.]

But if we must deplore Eusebius's silence on a matter as important for the Liturgy as the sacred vessels and other gifts surrounding the altar in the basilica of the Holy Sepulcher, Providence has at least allowed inventories of several churches in Rome from the same century to reach us. They compensate us in some measure for what historians' negligence has caused us to lose. The important chronicle known as the Liber pontificalis, which we have begun *(p. 92)* publishing in our Origines de l'Église romaine, contains, in the entry for Saint Sylvester, a list of the objects offered to several churches in Rome both by this holy pontiff and by Constantine himself. These details give some idea of divine service as it was carried out in basilicas so richly supplied with all the necessities of worship. We shall give only a few particulars here, referring readers to the notes following this chapter for the Chronicle's actual text.

[margin: The Lateran basilica's treasury according to the Liber pontificalis.]

"In his day Constantine Augustus built and adorned these basilicas," says the pontifical chronicle. "In the Constantinian basilica he placed these gifts: a hammered-silver superstructure (fastigium), bearing on its front the Savior seated on a chair, five feet high, weighing 120 pounds; the twelve Apostles, five feet high apiece, weighing ninety pounds each, with crowns of purest silver. On the back, facing the apse, the Savior seated on a throne, five feet high, of purest silver, weighing 140 pounds; four silver angels, five feet high, holding spears bearing crosses, each weighing 105 pounds, with Alavandine gems for eyes. The superstructure itself, on which the angels or Apostles stand, weighs 2,025 pounds of wrought silver. A lamp of purest gold hangs beneath the superstructure with fifty dolphins that, with their chain, weigh twenty-five pounds. Four crowns with twenty dolphins, of purest gold, weighing fifteen pounds each. The basilica's vaulting of gold leaf, extending five hundred feet in length and breadth. Seven altars of hammered silver, each weighing 200 pounds. Seven gold patens, each weighing thirty pounds. Thirteen silver patens, each weighing thirty pounds. Seven gold cups, each weighing ten pounds; a single metal cup adorned with coral and, all around, with green gems and jacinths set in gold, weighing altogether twenty pounds *(p. 93)* and

three ounces. Twenty silver cups, each weighing fifteen pounds. Two pitchers of purest gold, each weighing fifty pounds and holding three medimni; twenty silver pitchers, each weighing ten pounds and holding one medimnus. Forty smaller chalices of purest gold, each weighing one pound. Fifty smaller chalices for service, each weighing two pounds."

"Furnishings in the basilica: a bowl-shaped chandelier of purest gold before the altar, in which burns pure oil of nard, with eighty dolphins, weighing thirty pounds, where lights burn with pure oil of nard in the body of the church. A silver bowl-shaped chandelier with 120 dolphins, weighing fifty pounds, where pure oil of nard burns. Forty silver bowl-shaped chandeliers in the body of the basilica, each weighing thirty pounds, where the aforesaid oil burns. On the basilica's right side, forty silver lamps, each weighing twenty pounds. On its left side, twenty-five silver bowl-shaped chandeliers, each weighing twenty pounds. Fifty silver candleholders in the body of the basilica, each weighing twenty pounds. Three one-pound measures of purest silver, each weighing 300 pounds and holding ten medimni. Seven brass candelabra before the altars, ten feet high, with their ornamentation of silver inlaid with figures of the prophets, each weighing thirty pounds, etc.[12]."

This brief fragment gives some idea of the wealth of the churches built and adorned by the emperors. The following passage shows the scale of a fourth-century Pope's munificence toward an ordinary church he founded in Rome.

[margin: Saint Sylvester's munificence toward the basilica called the Titulus of Equitius.]

"He built a church in the city of Rome on the estate of one of his priests, called Equitius, and established it as a Roman titular church near the Baths of Domitian. To this day it is called Titulus Equitii[13]. There he bestowed these gifts: a silver paten weighing twenty pounds, a gift of Constantine

(p. 94) Augustus. He also gave two silver cups, each weighing ten pounds; a gold chalice weighing two pounds; five chalices for service, each weighing two pounds; two silver pitchers, each weighing ten pounds; a silver paten for chrism, overlaid with gold, weighing five pounds; ten crowned lamps, each weighing eight pounds; twenty bronze lamps, each weighing ten pounds; twelve bronze candleholders, each weighing thirty pounds, etc.[14]."

Elsewhere we have established the authority of the chronicle that supplies these details and shown that several librarians of the Apostolic See compiled it successively from the oldest and most authentic records.

[margin: Development of the Liturgy.]

[margin: The Church uses it to combat the Arian heresy.]

These vast, sumptuous basilicas resounded day and night with the singing of clergy and people. Yet the rites continued to grow in majesty, the chant became more melodious, and the sacred formulas daily acquired greater grandeur and eloquence. Later we shall discuss the various Liturgies of both East and West. Their earliest origins coincide with the very origins of the churches that practiced them, but they underwent new developments in this age of peace. Great bishops, illustrious either for the splendor of their sees or for the breadth of their learning, devoted their care to perfecting rites and prayers, enriching the holy traditions of antiquity with fresh inspiration. But since, in Providence's plans, everything serves to accomplish God's designs for his Church, the Arian heresy, so disastrous in its ravages, became the occasion for further developments in liturgical forms. Just as heresy in every age will seek to *(p. 95)* poison the sources of the Liturgy, so the Catholic Church has known in every age how to turn this ever-victorious weapon against her mortal enemy. We shall therefore note two great events here, one belonging to the Eastern Church and the other to the Western Church. Both attest the all-powerful genius of the Christian priesthood when it must act upon the masses and awaken the energy of the faithful people.

[margin: Regular attendance at the divine offices, the chief feature of Christian life in these first centuries.]

We should know that during Christianity's first six centuries and beyond, the lives of Christians of every age, sex, and condition were deeply marked by the habits of religious life. Prayer, psalmody, and the study of the divine Scriptures formed, so to speak, their substance. In the habits of the great majority, the Church had replaced the theater and the forum. This religious activity explains the people's constantly passionate interest in the theological disputes that marked this period of the Christian Church. Regular attendance at the divine offices, day and night, was therefore the principal fact in Christians' lives during these centuries, which might be called theological. All antiquity's testimony attests it. We shall recall only these words of Saint Augustine to the people of Hippo: "Rise early for the vigils; assemble for Terce, Sext, and None before all else. Let no one withdraw from this holy work, unless illness, public service, or perhaps some definite and grave necessity has kept him occupied[15]."

[margin: To combat the Arians effectively, Diodore]

When the city of Antioch was prey to the Arians through the treachery of its bishop Leontius, two illustrious members of this great church—Diodore, who later became bishop of *(p. 96)* Tarsus, and Flavian, who later ascended the episcopal see of Antioch itself—opposed this torrent of iniquities with unflagging courage and vigilance. Wishing to protect the people from the heretics' seduction and strengthen them in the firmness of faith through the Liturgy's most solemn practices, they thought the time had come to give psalmody a new beauty. Until then, the cantors alone performed it in church, and the people listened to their voices in recollection. Diodore and Flavian were the first to divide the choirs of singers into two groups and teach them to sing David's hymns in alternation[16]. Having thus won the people over in a holy way through this new harmony, they used to spend the night with those devoted to divine things who had gathered at the martyrs' basilicas, praising God in hymns[17]. Theodoret adds after this account that the practice, first begun then at Antioch, spread from there to others and reached the very ends of the earth[18].

[margin: and Flavian establish antiphonal psalmody at Antioch and involve the faithful in it.]

A few years later, the Church of Constantinople followed Antioch's example, provoked to it, so to speak, by the Arians' insolence. These heretics, following the custom of all sects and seeking every means of attracting the multitude, conceived the idea of appropriating the antiphonal chant that the orthodox had recently inaugurated at Antioch.

[margin: Saint John]

[margin: Chrysostom brings this practice to Constantinople.]

For when the Arians, under the reign of *(p. 97)* Theodosius, had been deprived of their churches in Constantinople, they held their ecclesiastical assemblies outside the city walls. First they gathered at night in the public porticoes. Divided into groups, they sang antiphonally, adding certain phrases composed according to their own doctrine. At daybreak, singing the same things publicly, they proceeded to the places where they held their assemblies. They were accustomed to do this on all the more solemn feasts and on the first and seventh days of each week. Eventually they also added songs tending to quarrel and contention: "Where are those who say that three are a single power?" They interspersed other such things in their hymns. John, therefore, fearing that anyone from his church might be deceived by these means, urged the people under him to sing in the same way. Soon becoming more distinguished, they far surpassed the Arians both in numbers and in the splendor of their display. For silver standards of the cross, preceded by candles, went before them[19].

In the West, antiphonal psalmody had begun in the Church of Milan around the same time it was established at Antioch, and with the same purpose: to repel Arianism by displaying a new liturgical form. Saint Augustine, who witnessed this happy innovation, left us an account that we shall give here in full. This is how he speaks in the ninth book of his Confessions:

[margin: This happy innovation extended to the Church of Milan by Saint Ambrose.]

[margin: Augustine's emotion, while still a sinner, on hearing these sacred chants.]

"How I wept, deeply moved by your hymns and canticles, at the voices of your sweetly singing Church! Those voices flowed into my ears, and *(p. 98)* truth was distilled into my heart. From it the ardor of devotion welled up, tears ran, and I was happy with them. Not long before, the Church of Milan had begun to practice this form of consolation and exhortation, as the brethren sang together with great zeal in voice and heart. It was a year, or not much more, since Justina, the mother of the boy emperor Valentinian, had persecuted your man Ambrose for the sake of her heresy, into which the Arians had seduced her. The devout people kept watch in the church, ready to die with their bishop, your servant. There my mother, your handmaid, foremost in concern and vigils, lived by prayer. We were still cold, lacking the warmth of your Spirit; yet the city's consternation and turmoil roused us. Then it was instituted that hymns and psalms be sung according to the custom of the Eastern regions, lest the people waste away from the weariness of grief. Retained from then until today, this practice has already been imitated by many, indeed almost all, of your flocks throughout the rest of the world[20]."

We should observe here that Saint Ambrose instituted not only antiphonal psalmody in the Church of Milan, but also the singing of hymns he had composed: hymni et psalmi ("hymns and psalms"). This is confirmed not only by the testimony of Paulinus, the deacon, in the life of his holy bishop that he left us, but also by Saint Ambrose's own words:

[margin: Saint Ambrose has hymns of his own composition sung; they serve as a model for all the West's hymnographers.]

"They also say that the people have been led astray by the strains of my hymns. I certainly do not deny this. This is a great song, and nothing is more *(p. 99)* powerful. For what is more powerful than the confession of the Trinity? Thus all have become teachers who could scarcely be disciples[21]." Indeed, in the hymns he composed, whose form served as a model for all the hymnographers of later centuries, Saint Ambrose always sought to confess vigorously the faith in the mystery of the Trinity.

[margin: The history of antiphonal chant's introduction proves that the Liturgy is prayer in its social character.]

Such is the history of the introduction of antiphonal chant into the various Churches of East and West: an important event in the annals of the Liturgy. The circumstances in which it occurred confirm once again the maxim we set forth at the beginning: the Liturgy is prayer in its social character.

[margin: From the fourth century, heresy spreads errors about the sacred rites, especially seeking to undermine the authority of everything in the Liturgy that belongs properly to Tradition.]

Moreover, if the Church employed the Liturgy's forces against heresy, we must also say that, as early as the fourth century, heresy sought to parry the blow by spreading treacherous errors concerning the sacred rites. Throughout the rest of this history we shall see it remain faithful to this diabolical plan. Either it will adapt the popular forms of worship to its own needs, or it will denounce those same forms as dangerous, superstitious, or human inventions. Above all, it will repeat the sophism that whatever in the Liturgy is unsupported by Holy Scripture must be removed as contrary to the purity of divine service. In this way it willfully disregards the great principle established above: every Liturgy belongs particularly to tradition. We have already seen a striking example in the Quartodecimans' error, which the Church characterized as heresy. Yet, by celebrating Easter on the fourteenth day of *(p. 100)* the moon, these sectarians conformed to the letter of the Scriptures. More than that, they claimed to be upholding a tradition. For there are traditions of error as well as of truth, and they can be distinguished only by comparing them with the ever-pure source of the Apostolic See.

[margin: Vigilantius the Gaul, precursor of the antiliturgist heretics, vigorously refuted by Saint Jerome.]

Now, in the fourth century, a Gaul named Vigilantius was raised up by hell to be the precursor of the antiliturgist heretics whose succession we shall soon trace. He too found and maintained that worship was increasingly burdened with new practices capable of corrupting its purity. The splendor of outward worship,

the crowds flocking to the martyrs' tombs, the veneration paid to fragments of their bones, the torches and candles lit in broad daylight to express the Church's joy, the multitude of feasts—all these things aroused an unparalleled fury in Vigilantius's soul. Saint Jerome, with his incisive eloquence, undertook to confound this new Pharisee. The arguments he used to annihilate his sophisms seem to have been prepared against modern sectarians, just as their errors are only a pale copy of our Gallic heresiarch's declamations. We lack space to insert here the pages full of warmth and conviction that the learned priest of Bethlehem devoted to refuting his adversary. His treatise Contra Vigilantium would have to be quoted in full. We invite the reader to reread it among the holy Doctor's works.

[margin: From the fourth century, monks have churches and offices of their own.]

We must still record here a liturgical fact of another kind, whose course we shall have to follow throughout this history: the monks' churches and the forms of worship practiced in them. Monasteries could not long exist under the conditions of peace enjoyed by the Church herself without requiring the means to enable those who *(p. 101)* lived there to fulfill the duties of Christianity. They therefore had to contain a church, an altar for the sacrifice, and ministers for the sacraments. Moreover, since the Divine Office was the monks' principal occupation, its manner of celebration had to be governed by special liturgical regulations. While remaining in accord with the Church's general usages, these were to express in a particular way the principles and ways of life of the cloister. We shall discuss the form of the various monastic Offices in the part of this work containing the explanation of the Divine Office.

[margin: Despite the contrary view of some early Fathers of the monastic order, the Church seeks to increase the number of priests among monks, whose state she regards as preparation for the priesthood.]

The celebration of the sacred mysteries required the presence in each monastery of one or more priests or deacons, whether they belonged to the monks themselves or to the clergy of some neighboring Church. Yet the earliest Fathers of the monastic order—Saint Pachomius, for example—had little interest in having men ordained who had already professed the monastic life. They preferred to employ at the altar priests already honored with the priesthood when they embraced the perfect life of the desert. The Church soon manifested her intentions on this subject. The letters of the Supreme Pontiffs, like the councils' decrees, laid down rules for ordaining monks, whose state they regarded as a true preparation for the priesthood. We shall cite only, as an authority from the fourth century, Saint Siricius's famous decretal to Himerius of Tarragona. These are the Pope's words: "We both desire and will that monks too, provided their seriousness of conduct and holy discipline of life and faith commend them, be admitted to clerical offices[22]."

(p. 102)

[margin: The current discipline in this regard.]

Successive ecclesiastical ordinances have continually confirmed this principle in every century. Clement VIII's decree Cum ad regularem, which today governs the law of religious concerning admission to profession, expressly forbids admitting anyone among the choir religious who does not offer a well-founded hope of one day being raised to the priesthood[23]. Finally, among the propositions condemned by Pius VI in the bull Auctorem fidei, we read this:

"Let those who join this (monastic) order not become members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, nor be advanced to holy orders, except at most one or two to be ordained as curates or chaplains of the monastery, with the rest remaining in the simple rank of laymen."

It is regrettable that this proposition is identical to several found in Fleury's Discours and in some other French works daily in the clergy's hands. But these questions do not belong to our subject here. We wished only, so to speak, to open the monasteries' churches, which we shall later have occasion to enter in order to study either the Church's general rites or the monks' particular rites.

Before summarizing the liturgical work of the writers of the period before us, we shall say a word about ecclesiastical laws on this subject during the same period.

[margin: The Supreme Pontiffs of the fourth century enact numerous laws concerning the]

[margin: sacred rites.]

[margin: Liturgical regulations of Saint Sylvester,]

The Supreme Pontiffs of the fourth century inherited the zeal and solicitude of those of the first three in everything concerning the sacred rites. Saint Sylvester made regulations on the consecration of holy chrism and on supplying the baptismal ceremonies for those who *(p. 103)* had received this sacrament during illness. He established that deacons should wear the dalmatic in church and carry a linen handkerchief on the left arm, which later became the maniple; and that the sacrifice should be celebrated on an altar covered with linen cloth rather than a silk covering or some dyed fabric, in imitation of the shroud in which the body of Jesus Christ was buried[24].

[margin: of Saint Mark]

Saint Mark ordered that the bishop of Ostia, who already possessed the right to consecrate the Pope, should have the use of the pallium[25].

[margin: and of Saint Julius.]

Saint Julius decreed that the Church's notaries should keep an exact register of all donations made to the basilicas and an inventory of all their title deeds. We certainly owe to this measure the precious inventories of the treasuries of Rome's churches in Saint Sylvester's time[26].

[margin: Saint Damasus assisted by Saint Jerome in his important work on the Liturgy.]

Saint Damasus, as a reading of his works shows, composed several hymns in praise of the saints and adorned with verse inscriptions both the place in the Catacombs where the bodies of the holy Apostles had rested and the tombs of many martyrs. He also undertook to regulate the Divine Office. Saint Gregory the Great[27] tells us that, at Saint Jerome's urging, he introduced several usages of the Eastern churches into the Roman offices. This testimony of Saint Gregory, attesting Saint Damasus's relations with Saint Jerome concerning the Liturgy, seems to us to lend greater authority to an opinion found among all medieval liturgists: that Saint Jerome had played a large part in a revision of the Divine Office undertaken by Saint Damasus[28].

(p. 104)

[margin: Solemnity with which Saint Siricius promulgates his liturgical decrees.]

Saint Siricius, Saint Damasus's successor, in the decretal cited above, corrects the rashness of those who conferred baptism at Christmas, Epiphany, and even the Apostles' feasts, and confirms the tradition of all the churches of administering this sacrament only at Easter and Pentecost[29]. Several similar instances occur in this holy Pope's letters, collected with such care by Dom Coustant. But we must observe the solemnity with which he enjoins the Apostolic See's will in matters of the Liturgy.

"Let the error committed thus far in this matter suffice. Now let all priests who do not wish to be torn away from the firmness of the apostolic Rock on which Christ has built the universal Church observe the rule set forth above[30]."

There is no doubt that the earlier Pontiffs' decrees were issued with this same solemnity. The Apostolic See's power has been the same since the Church's origin, and the Popes' vigor has always been unshakable when it came to upholding and preserving traditions.

[margin: Fourth-century councils' canons concerning divine service.]

Turning now to the fourth-century councils, we find Nicaea with its famous canon on the celebration of Easter; Antioch, held in 332, with regulations on the same subject; Laodicea, around 362, prescribing several

rules for psalmody and its accompanying readings; Gangra, around 370, condemning those who blame the assemblies held at the memorials of the martyrs; the Third Council of Carthage, in 397, which, renewing prescriptions already issued in 393 by a council held at Hippo, *(p. 105)* promulgated very important canons on the celebration of Easter, liturgical prayers, the administration of the sacraments, the offering of the holy sacrifice, and the public reading of Holy Scripture; the Fourth Council of Carthage, in 398, which sets out the rites of ordination in such valuable detail[31].

[margin: Fourth-century liturgical writers.]

[margin: Eusebius of Caesarea.]

The list of fourth-century writers who treated liturgical matters is long and imposing. At its head we shall place Eusebius, whose Ecclesiastical History offers so many remarkable details on our subject, as on a thousand others. We have drawn on it in this chapter, as we have just seen. We deeply regret that the loss of two works by this illustrious writer has deprived us of the great assistance we could have derived from them. These two short works are a special description of the Church of Jerusalem and a book On the Feast of Easter.

[margin: Saint Eustathius of Antioch.]

Saint Eustathius of Antioch, an orthodox doctor, composed a Syriac Liturgy still found, though interpolated, in the Maronite Missal.

[margin: Saint Athanasius.]

Saint Athanasius, the invincible vindicator of the faith of Nicaea, is regarded among Eastern Christians as the author of the Anaphora beginning with the words Deus fortis Domine (“O God, mighty Lord”). The Greeks call the part of the prayers of the Mass containing the offering and the Canon the Anaphora.

[margin: Saint Cyril of Jerusalem.]

Saint Cyril of Jerusalem must be counted among the fourth-century liturgical writers for his precious Catecheses, in which he often expounds the rites of the sacraments and the holy sacrifice with as much depth as eloquence.

[margin: Saint Hilary of Poitiers.]

Saint Hilary of Poitiers, according to the testimony of Saint Jerome and Saint Isidore, is the author of a Book of Hymns and Sacred Mysteries that has not come down *(p. 106)* to us. Only one of these hymns has survived the shipwreck: the one the holy bishop sent to his daughter Abra, beginning with the line Lucis largitor splendide (“O splendid Giver of light”). George Cassander and Gregory Fabricius also attributed to him the Pentecost hymn Beata nobis gaudia, the Lenten hymn Jesu, quadragenariæ, and, finally, the Epiphany hymn Jesus refulsit, omnium. Blessed Tommasi also ascribes this last hymn to him. Zaccaria seems inclined to attribute to him the long piece beginning Hymnum dicat turba fratrum (“Let the company of brethren sing a hymn”); Hincmar of Reims holds this view. Finally, Dom Coustant appended another hymn, Ad cœli clara non sum dignus sidera (“Toward heaven’s bright stars I am not worthy”), to Lucis largitor splendide. The learned Benedictine did not thereby claim to attribute it to Saint Hilary; he wished only to save it from perishing. Pseudo-Alcuin names Saint Hilary as having completed the hymn Gloria in excelsis. We have also come across a dissertation printed at Poitiers, without a date, under the name of Abbé Cousseau, which seeks to make Saint Hilary the author of the hymn Te Deum. This short work is not without some merit, especially today, when so few people seem interested in liturgical studies. Nevertheless, it seemed to us quite inadequate to prove the difficult thesis its author had set himself.

[margin: Saint Pacian of Barcelona.]

Saint Pacian of Barcelona left a book On Baptism, Addressed to Catechumens.

[margin: Saint Ephrem.]

Saint Ephrem, a monk, Syrian by birth and deacon of Edessa, composed an immense number of hymns in Syriac. Through orthodox poetry he sought to destroy the disastrous effects produced among the Syrians by the verses of the heretic Harmonius. These hymns number fifteen on the Nativity of Jesus Christ, fifteen on Paradise, fifty-two on the Faith and the Church, fifty-one on Virginity, eighty-seven on the Faith against the Arians and the Eunomians, fifty-six *(p. 107)* against Heresies, eighty-five hymns for the dead, fifteen exhortatory hymns, etc. All these poems sparkle with genius, Eastern imagery, and biblical reminiscences, and are filled with admirable unction. Rather strangely, most were given the title Sermons in the Vatican edition of Saint Ephrem. The Coptic Church uses a large proportion of these hymns in the divine services.

[margin: Saint Basil of Caesarea.]

Saint Basil of Caesarea, besides his books On Baptism, is the author of the Greek Liturgy that bears his name.

[margin: Saint Gregory of Nazianzus.]

Saint Gregory of Nazianzus is reputed to be the author of a Greek Liturgy and several prayers of the same kind found in the office books of the Syrians and Copts, which are said to have been translated from Greek.

[margin: Apollinaris of Laodicea.]

Apollinaris the Younger, who was bishop of Laodicea and was later condemned as a heretic by Saint Damasus at a Roman council, composed hymns and canticles for the people to sing in the divine services.

[margin: Saint Ambrose.]

[margin: Eleven hymns seem securely attributable to him.]

Saint Ambrose's writings, especially his letters, provide important materials for understanding the fourth-century Liturgy. His transfers of martyrs' relics, for example, are of the greatest interest in this respect. His treatise On the Duties of Ministers and his treatise On the Mysteries belong directly to our subject. As for the six books On the Sacraments, there is no agreement on whether they are the work of the learned bishop of Milan. Their great antiquity and the liturgical riches they contain nevertheless make them no less important. Foremost among the hymns attributed to Saint Ambrose with the greatest certainty are the eleven acknowledged as his by Dom Ceillier: Æterne rerum conditor. Deus creator omnium. Jam surgit hora tertia. Veni, redemptor gentium. Illuminans Altissimus. Orabo mente Dominum. Æterna Christi munera. Somno refectis *(p. 108)* artubus. Consors paterni luminis. O Lux beata Trinitas. Fit porta Christi pervia. In his Hymnal, Blessed Tommasi adds the following on the authority of manuscripts:

[margin: Hymns attributed to Saint Ambrose by Blessed Tommasi on the evidence of ancient manuscripts.]

Intende qui regis Israël. Hymnum dicamus Domino. Hic est dies verus Dei. Optatus votis omnium. Jesu, nostra redemptio. Jam Christus astra ascenderat. Conditor alme siderum. Agnes beatæ virginis. A solis ortus cardine. Mysterium ecclesiæ. Agathæ sacræ virginis. Grates tibi, Jesu, novas. Apostolorum passio. Magni palmam certaminis. Apostolorum supparem. Mediæ noctis tempus est. Rerum creator optime. Nox atra rerum contegit. Tu Trinitatis unitas. Summæ Deus clementiæ. Splendor paternæ gloriæ. Æternæ lucis conditor. Fulgentis autor ætheris. Deus æterni luminis. Christe, rex cœli, Domine. Æterna cœli gloria. Diei luce reddita. Jam lucis orto sidere. Certum tenentes ordinem. Nunc, sancte nobis Spiritus. Bis ternas horas explicans. Jam sexta sensim volvitur. Dicamus laudes Domino. Rector potens, verax Deus. Ter hora trina volvitur. Perfecto trino numero. Rerum Deus tenax vigor. Deus qui certis legibus. Sator princepsque temporum. Lucis creator optime. Immense cœli conditor. Telluris ingens conditor. Cœli Deus sanctissime. Magnæ Deus potentiæ. Plasmator hominis Deus. Christe cœlestis medicina Patris. Obduxere polum nubila cœli. Squalent arva soli pulvere multo. Tristes nunc populi, Christe redemptor. Sævus' bella serit barbarus horrens.

Almost all these hymns form part of the Roman and Ambrosian Breviaries; the others are found in the Mozarabic Office. We do not, however, present this last enumeration as authentic in every respect. On the

contrary, we shall restore several of these hymns to Saint Gregory. Blessed Tommasi himself claimed only to collect the traditions of ancient hymnals, without always assuming responsibility for them. In addition, *(p. 109)* the monastic hymn Te decet laus ("Praise is due to you") has been attributed to Saint Ambrose, though we must admit that this has no foundation whatsoever. The Te Deum laudamus ("You are God: we praise you") is ordinarily entitled the Hymn of Saint Ambrose and Saint Augustine. This title can be supported only by conjectures and an established usage that is not very ancient. These two prose hymns have nothing in common with Saint Ambrose's genuine hymns, which are metrical. Yet they date from a period close to that holy Doctor's own, since they are cited in the Rule of Saint Benedict, which must have been written in the first half of the sixth century.

[margin: The Te Deum called the Hymn of Saint Ambrose and Saint Augustine.]

[margin: Theophilus of Alexandria.]

Theophilus of Alexandria, besides his Easter cycle, wrote On the Sacred Mysteries, or On the Sacred Furnishings of the Church of God, a work no longer extant, which Saint Jerome had translated from Greek.

[margin: Saint Augustine supplies material for liturgical scholarship through his picture of the Church's life and customs.]

[margin: The Easter Exultet is wrongly attributed to him.]

Saint Augustine, in all his writings, but especially in his sermons, letters, and many special treatises—such as De catechizandis rudibus (On Instructing Beginners), De cura gerenda pro mortuis (On Care for the Dead), De symbolo ad catechumenos (On the Creed, Addressed to Catechumens), and his Letters to Januarius—presents the fullest and truest picture of the life and customs of the Church of his time. He thus supplies the observer with innumerable details to nourish liturgical scholarship. We do not, however, find that he composed anything directly concerned with this subject. We shall show elsewhere that the chant of the Paschal candle, Exultet jam angelica, has wrongly been attributed to him.

[margin: Fabius Marius Victorinus.]

Fabius Marius Victorinus, a man of consular rank, orator, rhetorician, and grammarian—the same whose conversion to Christianity Saint Augustine recounts in Book VIII of his Confessions—composed three prose hymns On the Trinity. Several fragments of these hymns entered into the composition of the Office of the Holy Trinity in the Roman Breviary.

(p. 110)

[margin: Saint John Chrysostom.]

Saint John Chrysostom is not the author of the Greek Liturgy that bears his name. We shall have occasion to return to this question when we discuss the liturgical books of the East. His Homilies and Treatise on the Priesthood contain a wealth of exceedingly valuable details on the celebration of the holy mysteries, feasts, and Christian assemblies.

[margin: Saint Jerome.]

Saint Jerome, whose works belong largely to the fourth century, is exceedingly rich in details on the liturgical forms of his time, especially in his letters and short works against heretics. We shall discuss elsewhere the Martyrology and the book called Comes, which have been attributed to him.

[margin: Prudentius, prince of Christian poets.]

Prudentius, a man of consular rank and the prince of Christian poets, rendered great service to the Liturgy through the beautiful hymns with which he enriched the divine services of both the Roman Church and the Gothic Church of Spain. His first collection, entitled Cathemerinon, or collection of daily prayers, contains the following: AT COCKCROW. Ales diei nuncius. MORNING HYMN. Nox et tenebræ et nubila. BEFORE FOOD. O crucifer bone, lucisator. AFTER FOOD. Pastis visceribus, ciboque sumpto. ON THE NEW LIGHT OF HOLY SATURDAY. Inventor rutili, dux bone, luminis. BEFORE SLEEP. Ades, Pater

supreme. HYMN OF THOSE FASTING. O Nazarene, lux Bethlem, Verbum Patris. AFTER FASTING. Christe, servorum regimen tuorum. AT EVERY HOUR. Da, puer, plectrum, choris ut canam fidelibus. AT THE FUNERAL OF THE DECEASED. Deus, ignee fons animarum. VIII DAYS BEFORE THE KALENDS OF JANUARY. Quid est quod arctum circulum. ON THE EPIPHANY. Quicumque Christum quæritis.

[margin: The Peristephanon.]

The second collection of hymns is entitled Peristephanon (On Crowns), because in it the poet celebrates the triumph of a great many martyrs: Saints Emeterius and Celedonius, Saint Lawrence, Saint Eulalia, the *(p. 111)* eighteen martyrs of Saragossa, Saint Vincent, Saints Fructuosus, Eulogius, and Augurius, Saint Quirinus, Saint Cassian, Saint Romanus, Saint Hippolytus, the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, Saint Cyprian, and Saint Agnes. Below, in the notes to this chapter, we shall give the magnificent hymn in which Prudentius sings of the holy Apostles' feast at Rome[32]. It describes the churches of Saint Peter and Saint Paul as they then were. It contains precious details on the splendor of that great day, notably the two Masses the Pope celebrated on that occasion. Prudentius's hymns and most of his other poems are filled with liturgical details of the greatest interest. We cannot recommend their study to our readers too strongly.

As we conclude this picture of the fourth-century Liturgy, we shall draw the following conclusions from all that precedes:

[margin: Conclusions.]

The beauty, grandeur, and richness of the churches were a characteristic of this age of peace.

The Church turned the powerful weapon of the Liturgy against heresy by instituting antiphonal psalmody against the Arians and opposing orthodox hymns to canticles inspired by error.

Heresy, fearing the extraordinary effect of liturgical forms on the people, then attacked the splendor and traditional character of worship with arguments repeated by the sectarians of later ages.

In this century, monasteries began to have churches, and a monastic Liturgy took shape.

The highest authority in Christendom, the Apostolic See, continued to promulgate laws on the Liturgy, *(p. 112)* thus preparing the unity that was later to shine forth in this sphere, as in every other. The councils of this century ranked liturgical questions among the most important, and the most illustrious doctors gladly devoted themselves to explaining and regulating the forms of divine worship.

(p. 113)

Notes to Chapter V

Note A

Itaque multo ampliorem locum metatus (Paulinus), exteriorem quidem ambitum muro undique communivit, qui totius operis tutissimum esset propugnaculum. Magnum deinde atque excelsum vestibulum ad ipsos solis orientis radios extendit; iis qui a sacro loci ambitu longius remoti sunt, conspectum quemdam eorum quæ intus reconduntur abunde exhibens, et oculos eorum qui a nostra fide alieni sunt, ad conspicienda limina quodam modo invitans. Cæterum ubi portas ingressus sis, non statim impuris et illotis pedibus in sacrarium introire permisit. Sed inter templum ac vestibulum maximo intervallo relicto, hoc spatium in quadrati speciem circumseptum quatuor obliquis porticibus circumquaque exornavit, quæ columnis undique attolluntur. Intercolumnia porro ipsa septis e ligno reticulatis, in mediocrem et congruam altitudinem elatis circumclusit. Medium autem spatium apertum et patens reliquit, ut et cœli aspectum præberet, et aerem splendidum solisque radiis collustratum præstaret. Hic sacrarum expiationum signa posuit; fontes scilicet ex adverso Ecclesiæ structos, qui interius sacrarium ingressuris copiosos latices ad abluendum ministrarent. Atque hoc primum intrantium diversorium est; cunctis quidem ornatum ac nitorem concilians; iis vero qui

institutione adhuc opus habent, congruentem præbens mansionem. Jam vero hoc spectaculum prætervectus, pluribus aliis interioribus vestibulis aditus ad templum patentes effecit: rursus ad ipsos solis orientis radios tribus ordine januis in uno eodemque latere constructis. Quarum mediam duabus aliis utrimque positis et altitudine et latitudine plurimum præstare voluit, eamdemque æreis tabulis ferro vinctis, et sculpturis variis præcipue decoravit; ei tanquam reginæ satellites alias adjungens. Ad eumdem modum cum porticibus ad utrumque templi latus fabricatis parem vestibulorum numerum disposuisset, diversos aditus quibus copiosum lumen superne in ædem infunderetur, supra ipsas porticus excogitavit, easque fenestras variis e ligno sculpturis minutissimi operis ornavit. Ipsam vero ædem regiam opulentioribus magisque pretiosis speciebus instruxit, prolixa sumptuum magnificentia ad hoc usus. Hic jam mihi superfluum videtur ædis ipsius longitudinem ac latitudinem describere, et hunc splendidissimum decorem, atque inexplicabilem magnitudinem; radiantem operum speciem ac splendorem; fastigia ad cœlum usque tendentia; et supra hæc eminantes Libani pretiosissimas cedros oratione prosequi, quarum mentionem ne divina quidem oracula *(p. 114)* prætermiserunt, in quibus dicitur: Lætabuntur ligna Domini, et cedri Libani quas plantavit. Quid jam attinet de solerti et ingeniosa totius fabricæ dispositione, ac de excellenti singularum partium pulchritudine accuratius disserere, præsertim cum oculorum testimonium omnem quæ auribus percipi potest notitiam excludat. Porro cum templum in hunc modum absolvisset, thronisque altissimis in honorem præsidentium, ac præterea subselliis per universum templum ordine dispositis exornasset; postremo sanctum sanctorum, altare videlicet, in medio constituit. Utque hæc sacraria multitudini inaccessa essent, ea rursus lignis cancellis munivit, minutissimo opere ad summum artis fastigium elaboratis, adeo ut admirabile intuentibus spectaculum exhibeant. Quin etiam ne ipsum quidem solum negligendum putavit. Quod cum mirum in modum marmore exornasset, inde ad ea quæ extra templum posita sunt conversus, exhedras et œcos amplissimos utrimque summa cum peritia fabricavit, qui sibi invicem ad latera ipsius basilicæ conjunguntur, portisque quibus in medium templum intratur connexi sunt. Quas quidem ædes in gratiam eorum qui expiatione et purgatione per aquam et Spiritum Sanctum opus habent, Salomon noster vere pacificus templi hujus conditor exstruxit.

…… Est quidem hoc opus miraculum, et omni admiratione majus, iis præsertim qui ad solam rerum exteriorum speciem attendunt. Omnibus vero miraculis mirabiliora sunt archetypa, et primitivæ eorum imagines, spiritalia Deoque digna exemplaria: instaurationes divini illius et rationalis in animabus nostris ædificii. Quod quidem ædificium cum ipse Dei Filius ad imaginem suam condidisset, atque in omnibus Dei similitudinem præferre voluisset, incorruptibilem ei naturam et incorpoream atque ab omni terrena materia segregatam largitus, rationalem quoque substantiam et prorsus intellectualem ei tribuens; posteaquam semel ex nihilo primum eam creavit, sponsam sanctam et sacrum templum sibi ac Patri suo constituit.

…… Cumque mentium vestrarum locum purum ac nitidum reddidisset, huic sapientissimo post hæc Deique amantissimo præsidi eum tradidit. Qui cum in aliis rebus singulari judicio et ratiocinandi solertia præditus, tum in animarum quarum curam sortitus est, cogitationibus dignoscendis ac discernendis perspicacissimus ab initio fere ad hunc usque diem ædificare non destitit: nunc aurum splendidissimum, nunc purum ac probum argentum, nunc pretiosissimos lapides in uno quoque vestrum coagmentans; ut suis erga vos operibus sacram denuo et arcanam prædictionem adimpleat, quæ sic habet: Ecce ego præparo tibi carbunculum lapidem tuum, et fundamenta tua sapphirum, et propugnacula tua jaspidem, et portas tuas lapides crystalli, et murum tuum lapides electos: et omnes filios tuos doctos à Deo, et in multa pace filios tuos: et in justitia ædificaberis. In justitia igitur ædificans, totius populi vires ac facultates congrua ratione distinxit: hos quidem exteriore duntaxat cingens muro, id est firma fide. Cujus generis infinita est multitudo, quæ præstantiorem *(p. 115)* structuram ferre non potest. Illis vero aditus in templum permittens; ad portas stare et intrantes deducere eos jubet: qui non absurde templi vestibulis comparantur. Alios primis columnis quæ forinsecus circa atrium in quadranguli speciem dispositæ sunt suffulsit, intra primos litteralis quatuor evangeliorum sensus obices eos inducens. Jam vero nonnullos circa regiam ædem utrimque lateribus applicat, qui adhuc quidem catechumeni sunt; et augmentum ac progressum faciunt, non tamen procul absunt

ab ipsa abditissimorum Dei mysteriorum inspectione qua fideles fruuntur. Ex horum numero eos quorum animæ immaculatæ sunt et divino lavacro instar auri purgatæ assumens; alios columnis, quæ exterioribus illis longe præstantiores sunt, arcanis scilicet et intimis sacræ Scripturæ sententiis suffulsit. Alios vero fenestris ad lumen in ædes immittendum factis illustrat. Ac universum quidem templum uno maximo vestibulo, unius scilicet Dei summi omnium Regis adoratione exornavit. Christum vero et Spiritum Sanctum utrimque ad latus paternæ auctoritatis, quasi secundum lumen præbet. Sed et in reliquis singillatim fidei nostræ sententiis, per totam basilicam copiosissimam ac præstantissimam veritatis lucem atque evidentiam ostendit. …… Insunt etiam in hoc templo throni; et subsellia scamnaque innumera; in cunctis scilicet animabus in quibus Sancti Spiritus resident dona, cujusmodi olim visa sunt sacrosanctis Apostolis; quibus linguæ instar ignis divisæ, et singulis insidentes apparuerunt. Verum in ipso quidem omnium principe ac præside, totus, ut verisimile est, insidet Christus. In iis vero qui secundum dignitatis locum obtinent, quatenus quisque dispertita virtutis Christi Sanctique Spiritus dona capere potest. Subsellia quoque Angelorum sunt quorumdam animæ, quorum institutio et custodia illis demandata est. Augustum vero magnumque et unicum altare quodnam aliud est, quam summi omnium sacerdotis purissima mens prorsusque sanctum sanctorum. Cui dexter assistens maximus ille omnium Pontifex, ipse scilicet Jesus unigenitus Dei Filius. (Euseb. Hist. eccles., lib. X, cap. IV.)

Note B

The emperor’s magnificence first of all adorned this tomb, I say, as the chief part of the whole work, with outstanding columns and the richest decoration, and made it splendid with ornaments of every kind. From there he proceeded to a vast space open to the sky. He paved its floor with shining stone, adding very long porticoes all around on three sides. Adjoining the side which lay opposite the cave and faced the rising sun was a basilica: a truly marvelous work, raised to an immense height and extending to a very great length. Its interior was covered with slabs of many-colored marble; the outer surface of its walls, adorned with polished stones well fitted together, displayed *(p. 116)* a remarkable beauty, in no way inferior to the appearance of marble. As for the roof and vaults, he fortified the outer roofs with lead, as a very strong defense against the winter rains. The inner ceiling, joined together with carved coffers and spread like a vast sea over the whole basilica in closely fitted panels, was entirely covered with purest gold, making the whole basilica shine as if with rays of light. On either side, paired porticoes, both belowground and rising above ground, equaled the basilica’s entire length; their vaulting was likewise patterned in gold. Those at the front of the basilica were supported by enormous columns; the inner ones rested on piers richly decorated on the outside. Three doors, suitably arranged toward the rising sun, received the entering crowd. Opposite these doors was a hemispherical space, the chief part of the whole work, extending to the basilica’s very summit. Twelve columns surrounded it, corresponding to the number of our Savior’s holy Apostles. Their capitals were adorned with very large silver bowls, which the emperor had dedicated to his God as a most beautiful offering. From here, for those proceeding to the approaches in front of the church, he set a court in between. In that place came first an atrium, then porticoes on either side, and finally the atrium’s gates. Beyond these, the entrances to the entire work, sumptuously decorated and set in the very middle of the street where the market for goods is held, gave passersby outside a view of what could be seen within, not without some astonishment. (Eusebius, Vita Constantini [Life of Constantine], Book III, chs. XXXIV–XXXIX.)

Note C

Hujus temporibus fecit Constantinus Augustus basilicas istas, quas et ornavit: basilicam Constantinianam, ubi posuit ista dona. Fastigium argenteum battutile, quod habet in fronte Salvatorem sedentem in sella in pedibus 5. pens. libras 120. Duodecim Apostolos in quinis pedibus, qui pensaverunt singuli libras nonagenas, cum coronis argenti purissimi. Item à tergo respiciens in absida, Salvatorem sedentem in throno in pedibus quinis ex argento purissimo, qui pens. libras 140. Angelos quatuor ex argento, qui sunt in pedibus quinis costas cum crucibus tenentes, qui pensaverunt singuli libras 105, cum gemmis alavandinis in oculos.

Fastigium ipsum ubi stant Angeli vel Apostoli, pensat libras duo millia viginti quinque ex argento dolatico. Farum ex auro purissimo, quod pendet sub fastigio cum delphinis quinquaginta, quæ pensant cum catena sua libras 25. Coronas quatuor cum delphinis viginti ex auro purissimo pensantes singulæ libras 15. Cameram Basilicæ ex auro trimme in longum, et in latum in pedibus quingentis. Altaria septem ex argento battutili pens. sing. libras 200. Patenas aureas septem, quæ pensant singulæ libras 30. Patenas argenteas 13 pensantes singulas libras 30. Scyphos aureos 7, qui pens. singuli libras decem; scyphum singularem ex metallo, corallo ornatum undique de gemmis prasinis, et hyacin- *(p. 117)* thinis auro interclusum qui pensat ex omni parte libras viginti et uncias tres. Scyphos argenteos viginti pensantes singulos libras 15. Amas ex auro purissimo duas, pensantes sing. libras quinquaginta portantes sing. medemnos tres. Amas argenteas viginti, quæ pensant singulæ libras decem, portantes singulæ medemnæ singulas. Calices minores ex auro purissimo quadraginta, pensantes singulos libras singulas. Calices minores ministeriales quinquaginta pensantes singuli libras binas. Ornamenta in basilica. Farum cantharum ex auro purissimo ante altare, in quo ardet oleum nardinum pisticum cum delphinis octuaginta, qui pensant libras triginta, ubi candelæ ardent ex oleo nardino pistico in gremio Ecclesiæ. Pharum cantharum argenteum cum delphinis centum et viginti, quod pensat libras quinquaginta, ubi oleum ardet nardinum pisticum. Phara canthara argentea in gremio basilicæ quadraginta pens. singula libras triginta, ubi ardet oleum quod supra. Parte dextra basilicæ: Phara argentea quadraginta pens. singula libras viginti. Phara canthara in læva Basilicæ argentea viginti quinque pens. singula libras viginti. Canthara cyrostrata in gremio basilicæ argentea quinquaginta pens. singula libras viginti. Singularum librarum metræ tres ex argento purissimo, quæ pensant singulæ libras 300, portantes singulæ medemnas decem. Candelabra aurichalcha septem ante altaria, quæ sunt in pedibus 10, cum ornatu suo ex argento interclusa sigillis Prophetarum pens. singula libras triginta, etc. (Liber pontificalis, in Silvestrum.)

Note D

Hic fecit in urbe Roma Ecclesiam in prædio cujusdam presbyteri sui, qui cognominabatur Equitius; quem titulum Romanum constituit juxta thermas Domitianas: qui usque in hodiernum diem appellatur titulus Equitii, ubi et hæc dona contulit: Patenam argenteam pensantem lib. 20, ex dono Constantini Augusti. Donavit autem scyphos argenteos 2, pensantes singulos lib. 10. Calicem aureum pensantem lib. 2. Calices ministeriales 5, pensantes singulos lib. 2. Amas argenteas 2, pensantes singulas lib. 10. Patenam argenteam auro clusam chrismalem, pensantem lib. 5. Phara coronata 10, pensantia singula lib. 8. Phara ærea 20, pensantia singula lib. 10. Canthara cerostrata ærea 12, pensantia singula lib. 30, etc. (Ibidem.)

Note E

Nam cum ariani, quibus, regnante Theodosio, ademptæ fuerant ecclesiæ Constantinopoli, extra urbis mœnia conventus ecclesiasticos agerent, noctu in publicis porticibus primum congregabantur. Et in cœtus divisi, antiphonatim psallebant, clausulas quasdam juxta ipsorum dogma compositas adjicientes. Prima autem luce, eadem publice canentes, pergebant ad loca in quibus collectas celebrabant. Atque id facere consueverant in *(p. 118)* celebrioribus quibusque festivitatibus, et primo ac septimo cujusque hebdomadis die. Tandem vero cantica quoque adjecerunt, quæ ad rixam et contentionem spectarent: Ubinam sunt qui tres dicunt esse unicam potentiam? Et alia ejusmodi hymnis suis intermiscentes. Joannes itaque, veritus ne quis ex ecclesia sua per hæc in fraudem induceretur, plebem quæ sub ipso erat, ut similiter psalleret incitavit. Qui brevi tempore illustriores facti, arianos et multitudine et apparatus splendore longe superarunt. Nam et crucum argentea signa, præcedentibus cereis, eos anteibant. (Sozomen., Hist. eccles., lib. VIII, cap. VIII.)

Note F

Quamtum flevi in hymnis et canticis tuis, suave sonantis Ecclesiæ tuæ vocibus commotus acriter! Voces illæ influebant auribus meis, et eliquabatur veritas in cor meum; et exæstuabat inde affectus pietatis, et currebant lacrymæ, et bene mihi erat cum eis. Non longe cœperat Mediolanensis ecclesia genus hoc consolationis et exhortationis celebrare, magno studio fratrum concinentium vocibus et cordibus. Nimirum annus erat, aut

non multo amplius, cum Justina Valentiniani regis pueri mater, hominem tuum Ambrosium persequeretur, hæresis suæ causa qua fuerat seducta ab arianis. Excubabat pia plebs in Ecclesia, mori parata cum episcopo suo, servo tuo. Ibi mater mea, ancilla tua, sollicitudinis et vigiliarum primas tenens, orationibus vivebat. Nos adhuc frigidi a calore spiritus tui, excitabamur tamen civitate attonita atque turbata. Tunc hymni et psalmi ut canerentur secundum morem orientalium partium, ne populus mœroris tædio contabesceret, institutum est; et ex illo in hodiernum retentum, multis jam ac pene omnibus gregibus tuis, et per cætera orbis imitantibus. (S. Augustin., Confessionum lib. IX, cap. VI et VII.)

Note G

More than usual gather in joy: tell me, friend, what is it?
They race and exult throughout all Rome.
This festive day of apostolic triumph returns to us,
ennobled by the blood of Paul and Peter.
One day, though renewed after a full year,
saw both crowned by a glorious death.
The Tiber’s marshland, lapped by the nearby river, knows
the turf dedicated to the two trophies,
witness to cross and sword, by which a shower of blood
flowed twice, watering the same grass.
The first sentence took Peter, ordered under Nero’s laws
to hang upon the towering wood.
Yet he, fearing that by rivaling the honor of such an exalted death

(p. 119) he might seek the glory of so great a Master,
demands that his head be plunged down, his feet turned upward,
so that his head may face the foot of the stake.
So his hand is fixed below, his soles toward the summit:
greater in spirit because lower in form.
He knew that heaven is reached more quickly from lowliness:
about to yield his spirit, he lowered his face.
When the round wheel had run the course of a turning year,
and the risen sun brought back the same day,
Nero spews his burning fury upon Paul’s throat,
orders the teacher of the nations struck down.
He himself had said beforehand that his end would soon come:
“I must go to Christ; now I am being released,” he says.
No delay: dragged to punishment, he is sacrificed by the sword;
neither hour nor day deceived the prophet.
As the Tiber, sacred on either bank, divides the bones,
flowing between the hallowed tombs,
the right bank keeps Peter beneath golden roofs,
silvered with olive trees, murmuring with a stream.
For water rising at the rock’s brow has called forth
a perennial bough that bears chrism.
Now it rushes over precious marble, gliding down the slope,
until it ripples in a green pool.
Within the tomb is the place where, with sounding cascades,
a pool swirls in snowy depths.

A painting of every color tints the glassy waters from above;
mosses gleam, and gold grows green.
The blue water draws the shade of the purple overhead:
you would think the coffered ceiling moved upon the waves.
There the shepherd himself feeds his sheep with the fountain's icy
coolness,
those he sees thirsting for the streams of Christ.
On the other side the Ostian Way keeps Paul's shrine,
where the river grazes the turf of its left bank.
The place has royal splendor: a good ruler consecrated these halls,
and lavished mighty sums in talents on their circuit.
He spread gold leaf upon the beams, so that all the light
within was golden, like the glow at sunrise.
Beneath the tawny coffers he placed Parian columns,
ranged there in a fourfold order.
Then with splendid glass he traced the curved arches in many colors:
so meadows gleam with spring flowers.
Behold the faith's two endowments, bestowed by the Father on high,
which he gave the city in her toga to venerate.
Look: the people of Romulus pour through the branching streets;
one day blazes with two feasts.

(p. 120) Yet let us hasten with quickened step to both,
and delight in hymns at this shrine and at that.
We shall go farther, where the way of Hadrian's bridge leads,
then make for the river's left bank.
The watchful priest first performs the rites across the Tiber,
then hurries back here and repeats his prayers.
It is enough for you to have learned this at Rome: returning home,
remember to observe thus the day of two feasts.

(Prudentius, Peristephanon, Hymn XII, on the Holy Apostles.

---

[1] Matt. X, 27.

[2] Quod si templum illud in una Palæstinæ urbe admiratione dignum erat; quanto magis mirabilis illa frequentia, magnitudo et pulchritudo ecclesiarum Dei in omni loco excitatarum! Nam totus orbis plenus ecclesiis est. (Euseb., Comment. in Isaiam, pag. 560.)

[3] Quod si videas regios dignitate ac præstantia in hac vita ornatos, in Ecclesia Dei cum pauperibus ex infima plebe congregatos, ne cuncteris dicere etiam hac ratione impletam esse Scripturam. (Euseb., ibid., pag. 402.)

[4] Amici et sacerdotes Dei, qui sacra tunica talari induti, et cœlestis gloriæ corona decorati, divinaque unctione delibuti, et sacerdotali Sancti Spiritus veste amicti estis. (Euseb., Hist. eccles., lib. X, cap. IV.)

[5] See Note A.

[6] Beside Eusebius's words we shall set this passage from the Apostolic Constitutions: "First, let the building be oblong, facing east, with side chambers (pastophoria) toward the east on either side, and let it resemble a ship." (Constitut. apostol., lib. II, cap. LVII. Cotelier, pag. 261.)

[7] Blessed Pope Sylvester first instituted the rites that the Roman Church observes in consecrating churches and altars. (Brev. Rom., IX Novemb.)

[8] Euseb., Vita Constantini, passim.

[9] See Constantine's letter to Saint Macarius in Eusebius, Vita Const., lib. III, cap. XXX, XXXI, XXXII.

[10] See Note B.

[11] Euseb., Vita Constant., lib. III, cap. XL.

[12] See Note C.

[13] This church is now called Saints Sylvester and Martin ai' Monti.

[14] See Note D.

[15] Ad vigilias maturius surgite; ad tertiam, ad sextam, ad nonam ante omnia convenite. Nullus se a sancto opere subtrahat, nisi quem infirmitas, aut publica utilitas, aut forte certa et grandis necessitas tenuerit occupatum. (Sermo LV de tempore.)

[16] Hi primi psallentium choros duas in partes diviserunt; et Davidicos hymnos alternis canere docuerunt. (Théodoret, Hist. eccles., lib. II, cap. XXIV.)

[17] Idem, divinarum rerum studiosis ad martyrum basilicas congregatis, una cum illis pernoctare consueverant, Deum hymnis celebrantes. (Ibidem.)

[18] Quod quidem tunc primum Antiochiæ fieri cœptum, hinc ad reliquos pervasit, et ad ultimos usque terrarum fines perlatum est. (Ibidem.)

[19] See Note E.

[20] See Note F.

[21] Hymnorum quoque meorum carminibus deceptum populum ferunt. Plane nec hoc abnuo. Grande carmen istud est, et quo nihil potentius; quid enim potentius quam confessio Trinitatis? Facti sunt igitur omnes magistri qui vix poterant esse discipuli. (Opusc. de Spiritu Sancto, in Epist. XXXI.)

[22] Monachos quoque quos tamen morum gravitas, et vitæ ac fidei institutio sancta commendat, clericorum officiis aggregari et optamus et volumus. (Coustant, Epist. Rom. Pont., tom. I, pag. 635.)

[23] Everyone to be received into any religious order, including the mendicants, must possess such literary learning, or show certain hope of acquiring it, as will enable him to receive minor orders and, in due time, major orders, in accordance with the decrees of the sacred Council of Trent.

[24] Lib. pontificalis, in Silvestrum.

[25] Ibid., in Marcum.

[26] Ibid., in Julium.

[27] Lib. XII, Epist. IX.

[28] Grancolas, Commentaire historique sur le Bréviaire romain. Tome I, pag. 26.

[29] Coustant, Epist. Rom. Pontificum, tom. I, pag. 626.

[30] Hactenus erratum in hac parte sufficiat: nunc præfatam regulam omnes teneant sacerdotes qui nolunt ab apostolicæ Petræ, super quam Christus universalem construxit ecclesiam, soliditate divelli. Pag. 627.)

[31] Concil. Labb. Tom. II.

[32] See Note G.

Chapter VI. The Liturgy in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries: First Attempts to Establish Unity

(p. 121)

[margin: The Church's need, once peace is restored, to multiply the applications of unity, her fundamental law.]

The regime of peace under which the Church now lived and her freedom from all external attacks gave her the leisure to regulate the accidental forms of her government and institutions. Yet nothing was more urgent for her than to multiply the applications of that great principle of unity which she had received from Christ as her fundamental law, and thanks to which she had passed through three centuries of slaughter and the no less terrible storms of Arianism. The dissensions that had arisen among her children—family wars so formidable that the very principle of Christianity, the consubstantiality of the Word, had been called into question—inspired the pastors of the churches to tighten ever more closely the bond uniting the faithful in the profession of the same dogmas and obedience to the same authority. Perfecting liturgical forms through unity thus became indispensable from that time onward.

[margin: The need for liturgical unity from the standpoint of ecclesiastical government.]

First, from the standpoint of ecclesiastical government, it was time to provide for liturgical unity. The Liturgy is the Church's language, not only when she speaks to God, but when she makes her solemn voice resound in the sanctuary, when her children sing with her their faith, joys, fears, and hopes. Now, in a state or

a society, language must be one, like the authority governing them. One of the principal causes *(p. 122)* of the dissolution of an empire formed by conquest will always be the divergence between the provinces' idiom and the language spoken in the metropolis. Earthly politics strives in a thousand ways to eliminate these dissonances; it knows that the endurance and stability of kingdoms are at stake. Insofar as she is a human society, the Church has the same needs and necessities, increased still further by the full importance of her heavenly mission. As this account proceeds, we shall have all too many occasions to show that defections of provinces in the Church's history have depended on the greater or lesser degree of unity those provinces preserved in the Liturgy, or, again, have become irrevocable only through changes introduced into this most important form of Christianity.

[margin: The extent this unity was to attain.]

Let us note carefully that the unity in question here does not concern the essentials of divine worship, such as the matter and form of the sacrifice and sacraments, the general rites accompanying them, and so many other details. We have shown that on these points unity had always been perfect from the Church's beginning. What is in question is a further degree of unity in formulas not essential to the validity of the sacraments or the integrity of the sacrifice: in profession of faith, prayer, and praise, in the ceremonies enriching developed worship—in a word, in the whole body of rites expressing in their entirety either the mysteries of Christian initiation or the service offered by the redeemed city[1], as Saint Augustine says, to the author and perfecter of faith[2].

[margin: Divergences inevitable during the persecutions were to disappear with peace.]

The first apostles of the various churches that together formed so magnificent an empire for Christ as early as Constantine's time had brought with them the usages of the mother Churches that sent them; they had completed and *(p. 123)* interpreted whatever required it. After them, their successors, always maintaining unity in the substance unchangeable everywhere, had added new parts to the original work with varying success, to meet new needs. But this divergence, felt less keenly during the persecutions and the violent upheavals of Arianism, became a serious disadvantage once the Church had to attend to institutions suited to the age of peace opening before her. Even as the Church adapted to local conditions and customs, much remained, as much will always remain, to be regulated, corrected, and perfected. This work, these constant and enlightened efforts, we shall set before the reader in succession. First, however, we must develop another consideration, no less important, which prompted the Church of the fifth and sixth centuries to pursue the project of liturgical unity through effective measures.

[margin: Liturgical unity, a necessary consequence of unity in faith, according to Pope Saint Siricius.]

Some admirable words of Pope Saint Siricius, spoken at the end of the fourth century, reveal the full gravity of the consequences of unity observed or violated in the Liturgy. "Apostolic discipline has established that the profession of faith of Catholic bishops must be one. If, then, faith is one, tradition too must remain one. If tradition is one, one discipline must be kept throughout all the churches[3]." Such is the fundamental axiom of catholicity: one faith, one form of one faith. That being so, if the Liturgy is one in God's Church, it must be an authentic expression of that Church's faith, a permanent resolution of controversies that *(p. 124)* might arise over points of dogma professed in the sacred formulas.

[margin: Pope Saint Celestine declares that the rule of faith flows from the rule of prayer.]

This conclusion, natural enough in itself, will be supplied by a fifth-century pope. Here is what Saint Celestine writes to the bishops of Gaul in his celebrated letter against the error of the Pelagians: "Besides these inviolable decrees of the most blessed and Apostolic See, by which the most pious Fathers, with the arrogance of pestilential novelty overthrown, taught us to attribute to Christ's grace the beginnings of good will, the growth of praiseworthy endeavors, and perseverance in them to the end, let us also consider the sacred mysteries of priestly supplication, handed down by the Apostles and celebrated uniformly throughout the world and throughout the entire Catholic Church, so that the law of praying may establish the law of

believing; UT LEGEM CREDENDI LEX STATUAT SUPPLICANDI .” He then enumerates the graces asked by the priest in the sacrificial action[4]. The same enumeration, in almost the same words, is used in an argument of the same kind by Saint Augustine in his Letter CCXVII[5]. Its purpose is to show that all supernatural help comes from God, since all supernatural help is asked of God in the Liturgy.

[margin: Liturgical unity first applied within each province, as the Council of Milevis in 416 decrees for Numidia.]

The interests of the faith, no less than disciplinary order, therefore required early measures to check innovations tending to divide the Churches rather than unite them. One of the earliest records of this fact is a canon among those of the Second Council of Milevis, attended in 416 by sixty-one bishops of the province of Numidia during the troubles of Pelagianism. It reads:

“It was also decided that prayers or orations, or Masses, approved in a council—whether prefaces, commendatory prayers, or the laying on *(p. 125)* of hands—be used by all. No others at all are to be said in the Church except those considered by the more prudent or approved in a synod, lest anything have been composed contrary to the faith, or through ignorance, or with insufficient care[6].”

Limits are thus set to the effects of ill-informed zeal, as well as to that love of novelties which so often troubles men, even without their knowledge. Henceforth a council’s scrutiny will be required to give force and legitimacy to new formulas anyone might wish to introduce into the Church of Africa; those whose use is lawful have already received this high approval in the past. Let us now turn to Gaul, where we shall see liturgical unity proclaimed still more forcefully by the bishops of a council in Brittany.

[margin: The Council of Vannes in 461 establishes the same principle for the province of Tours.]

In 461 the Council of Vannes, presided over by Saint Perpetuus, bishop of Tours, issues this decree in its fifteenth canon:

“We have also judged it right that, at least within our province, there should be one order of sacred rites and one custom of psalmody. Just as we hold one faith by the Trinity’s grant, let us also keep one rule for the offices, lest variation in any observance lead anyone to believe that our devotion differs[7].”

(p. 126) Certainly, nothing more precise could be said. The centuries that followed did not profess the doctrine of liturgical unity more frankly than the Breton bishops did at this council. Speaking with a more solemn voice and with their universal and sovereign authority, the Roman pontiffs have never used more precise and forceful language. Bound by so many ties to this noble metropolis of Tours, we are glad to record this beautiful testimony, which, moreover, will not be the last. If today this illustrious province is sadly fragmented, so that its voice no longer rises in unison in the eight cathedrals still standing within it, at least its days of liturgical unity were long and glorious.

[margin: Similar decrees issued by the councils of Agde in 506 and Épaone in 517 for other parts of Gaul.]

Forty years later we find another council in Gaul, that of Agde in 506, proclaiming the same doctrine in its thirtieth canon:

“Since it is fitting that the Church’s order be observed equally by all, care must be taken that, as is done everywhere, after the antiphons the collects are said in order by the bishops or priests; that morning or evening hymns are sung every day; and that, at the conclusion of the morning or evening offices [missarum], after the hymns, short passages from the Psalms are said, and the people, after the evening collect, are dismissed by the bishop with a blessing[8].”

But in every society, for unity to become possible, there must be a center with which agreement is necessary. Again in Gaul, at the Council of Épaone in 517, we find an established rule which, however imperfect it is, can still bring great benefits in this intermediate age before the great unity of *(p. 127)* the Liturgy. The following is solemnly laid down in its twenty-seventh canon:

“When celebrating the divine offices, provincial bishops must observe the order kept by their metropolitans[9].”

[margin: In the Iberian peninsula this rule of liturgical unity is sanctioned by the councils of Girona]

In the same year, the Gothic Church of Spain felt the same need for unity and sanctioned the same rule, while awaiting the Roman unity it was to enjoy only long after France. Here is the first canon of the Council of Girona:

“As for the ordering of Masses, let the usage of the metropolitan church be observed, in God’s name, throughout the province of Tarragona, both in the order of the Mass itself and in the custom of psalmody or ministering[10].”

[margin: and Braga in 563.]

In another region of the same peninsula, some forty years later, we find conciliar regulations framed in the same spirit. The Council of Braga in 563 decrees the following canons:

“Canon 1. It was resolved by all, with common consent, that one and the same order of psalmody be kept in the morning or evening offices, and that diverse and private customs, or those of monasteries, not be mixed with the ecclesiastical rule[11].”

“Canon 2. It was also resolved that at the *(p. 128)* vigils or Masses of solemn days, all read the same readings in church, and not different ones[12].”

“Canon 3. It was also resolved that bishops not greet the people one way and priests another, but in a single manner, saying, ‘The Lord be with you,’ as is read in the Book of Ruth; and that the people reply, ‘And with your spirit,’ as the whole East observes what was handed down by the Apostles themselves, and not as Priscillianist depravity has altered it[13].”

“Canon 4. It was also resolved that Masses be celebrated by all in the same order which Profuturus, formerly bishop of this metropolitan church, received in writing from the authority of the Apostolic See itself[14].”

“Canon 5. It was also resolved that no one neglect the order of baptizing which the metropolitan Church of Braga had already kept, and which, to remove the doubts of some, the aforesaid Bishop Profuturus received in writing, directed to him by the See of the most blessed Apostle Peter[15].”

[margin: The Fourth Council of Toledo.]

By the following century, carried along by the force of these principles, the Gothic Church of Spain issued a regulation to *(p. 129)* establish liturgical unity, no longer within the narrow limits of a province, but throughout the Peninsula. Here is the second canon of the Fourth Council of Toledo, in 633:

[margin: establishes liturgical unity throughout the Iberian peninsula, 633.]

“After the profession of the true faith, which is preached in God’s holy Church, it was resolved that all of us priests, embraced in the unity of the Catholic faith, should no longer do anything diverse or discordant in the ecclesiastical mysteries, lest any diversity among us seem to the ignorant or worldly to display an error of schism, and the variety of the churches become a scandal to many. Let one order of prayer and psalmody, then, be kept among us throughout Spain and Gaul, one manner in the solemn celebrations of Masses, one in the evening and morning offices; and let there no longer be diversity of ecclesiastical custom among us, since we are united in one faith and kingdom. For the ancient canons too decreed this: that each province keep a uniform custom both in psalmody and in ministering[16].”

[margin: A tendency throughout the Patriarchate of the West to draw closer to the usages of the Roman Church.]

One step more, and Spain would enter into Roman unity in the Liturgy. Beyond the borders of this kingdom extended the Patriarchate of the West; and the principles expressed in the canons cited, aided by circumstances, were to bring about the fusion of all the liturgical usages of our regions into the mother

Liturgy, from whose bosom most of them had issued at various times.

Meanwhile, we have seen in the canons of the Council of Braga the care councils took to conform to the liturgical prescriptions imposed by the Holy See. At other times these same councils, without being compelled in any way, adopted certain *(p. 130)* usages of the Roman Church. Witness the Third Council of Vaison, in 529, which in its third and fifth canons established the singing of Kyrie eleison ("Lord, have mercy") and the addition of Sicut erat in principio ("As it was in the beginning") to the Gloria Patri ("Glory be to the Father"), because this was the usage of the Apostolic See and all the Churches of the East[17]. On this Thomassin makes the following observation, which seemed to us to support our view:

"This shows that, although the Roman offices were not followed entirely, at least there was an ever closer approach to them. Indeed, all the reasons that led a province to follow certain practices prompted all the Churches of the West to embrace them, so that, as far as possible, customs and the celebration of the office would be uniform throughout the West[18]."

[margin: The Roman Pontiffs take care to guide this movement slowly and wisely.]

While great improvements were being prepared, and unity in worship tended to become throughout the West the pure and faithful image of unity in faith, the Roman Pontiffs, attentive to all the needs of the Lord's inheritance entrusted to their care, did not unduly hasten the completion of this happy revolution. Rather, they prepared for it well in advance, taking every opportunity to decide the liturgical controversies submitted to their tribunal according to the forms and traditions in *(p. 131)* use in the Church of Rome. In the preceding chapter, we saw from the words of Saint Siricius how vigorously they demanded submission to their decisions on this matter. In the period now before us, another pope, Saint Innocent, will tell us why the Holy See so strictly demands the obedience of the Western Churches to its decrees on discipline, and particularly on the Liturgy.

[margin: Pope Saint Innocent's decretal to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, demanding obedience to the liturgical usages of the Roman Church.]

"If the Lord's priests," he says to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, in a decretal of 416, "were willing to preserve intact the ecclesiastical institutions as handed down by the blessed Apostles, there would be no diversity, no variation in the orders of service and consecrations themselves. But when each thinks he should keep, not what has been handed down, but what seems good to him, different things are seen to be observed or celebrated in different places or churches. This causes scandal among the peoples. Not knowing that ancient traditions have been corrupted by human presumption, they think either that the churches disagree among themselves or that the Apostles or apostolic men introduced contradictions.

"For who does not know or recognize that what was handed down to the Roman Church by Peter, prince of the Apostles, and has been kept to this day, must be observed by all? Nothing is to be added or introduced that lacks authority or seems to take its example from elsewhere. Especially since it is manifest that throughout Italy, the Gauls, the Spains, Africa, Sicily, and the intervening islands, no one founded churches except those whom the venerable Apostle Peter or his successors appointed priests. Let them read whether any other *(p. 132)* Apostle is found or recorded to have taught in these provinces. If they cannot read of one, because none is to be found, they must follow what the Roman Church keeps, from which they undoubtedly received their origin, lest, by devoting themselves to foreign assertions, they seem to forsake the source of the institutions[19]."

[margin: Abuses whose correction the Pope demands.]

After this preamble, the Pope corrects the abuses that had entered the Church of Eugubium in liturgical matters. He lays down several regulations: on the Peace communicants were to give one another; on the moment in the Sacrifice when the names of those for whom it was offered were to be recited; on the sacrament of confirmation; on Saturday fasting; on the prohibition of celebrating the Mysteries during the

two days before Easter; on the relations of the mother church with the other titular churches; on exorcisms, penitents, extreme unction, and so forth. He then concludes in these terms:

"Thus, dearest brother, we have endeavored, as far as we could, to answer what your charity asked of us; and your Church will now be able to keep and observe the customs of the Roman Church, from which it derives its origin. As for the rest, which it is not permitted to write, when you are here we shall be able to satisfy your requests[20]." The questions concerned the very words of the Canon or the form of the sacraments, details still covered at that time by the greatest secrecy.

[margin: Rights already claimed by the Apostolic See over the Patriarchate of the West, from which liturgical unity will come to all these regions.]

In considering this important document, we must first note the zeal with which the Apostolic See watched over the preservation of sound liturgical traditions, its desire to bring everything back to unity, and especially the particular rights it claimed over the Churches of Italy, the Gauls, the Spains, Africa, Sicily, and *(p. 133)* the other adjacent islands, as daughters of the preaching of Saint Peter and his successors and as forming the Patriarchate of the West. We see that these rights, later developed in more perfect institutions, will bring about in the smallest details that meticulous unity which Saint Innocent does not yet demand. The British Isles and vast Germany, barely illuminated by the torch of faith at a few almost imperceptible points, do not appear in this enumeration. But soon Rome's apostolic zeal will have wholly torn them from the shadows of death and incorporated them, through this peaceful conquest, into the blessed Patriarchate of the West. From their earliest infancy they will submit to the sacred yoke of the Roman Liturgy, thus attaining at once the fullness of the churches' mature age.

[margin: In the East, the Roman Pontiffs content themselves with preserving unity in the essential rites.]

The East, on the contrary, did not experience the benefits of this complete unity. Too many obstacles checked the popes' zeal for them to think, even for a moment, of establishing absolute zeal for the Roman Liturgy in the patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. They contented themselves with watching over the preservation of that more general unity which consists in celebrating Easter and the other principal solemnities on the same days, in the integrity of the rites of the sacrifice, in the valid and fitting administration of the sacraments, in maintaining the hours of the Divine Office and psalmody, and, later, in the veneration of sacred images.

Thus, according to times and places, the Apostolic See has known how to apply in varying degrees the fullness of power residing in it, so that the Roman Pontiffs have never forgotten the teaching of the first among them: to shepherd the flock with foresight and gentleness, and not in a spirit of domination[21]. But this was *(p. 134)* the repose of strength, and woe to those who resist the will of this paternal power, which waits with patient forbearance and, working with the centuries, prepares the great results the Holy Spirit holds in store for it! Woe to those who do not act when it has told them to act, who do not carry out what it has commanded! For all its wishes are just, and the Lord has declared himself their avenger.

[margin: Many papal letters of this period concern the Liturgy.]

[margin: Their zeal is directed especially to perfecting the Roman Liturgy.]

In reading the letters of the Roman Pontiffs who occupied the See in the fifth and sixth centuries, we shall find many acts of their authority in liturgical matters, always in the spirit of the measures taken by Saint Innocent. To enumerate these facts would take too much space and add little to the force of this chapter's arguments. We shall prefer to show the popes' labors to perfect the Liturgy of the local Church of Rome. In this part of our work we shall not depart from our general aim, since the Roman Liturgy is destined, with almost imperceptible exceptions, to become the Liturgy of the entire West; and by thus bringing it to greater perfection than all the others, the Roman Pontiffs indirectly ensured its triumph on the day appointed by Providence.

[margin: Liturgical formulas were put into writing before the fifth century.]

[margin: Father Lebrun's contrary view, refuted by Muratori.]

This would be the place to examine the interesting question of when the mysterious formulas of the Christian sacrifice, and those accompanying the rites of initiation, were committed to writing. The learned Father Lebrun, in volume III of his excellent Explication de la Messe ("Explanation of the Mass"), maintained that before the fifth century none of the ancient Liturgies, Greek or Latin, had yet been put into writing; they were transmitted simply by oral tradition. With Muratori[22], we think this assertion exaggerated, and that we can *(p. 135)* give a more reasonable meaning to the passages from antiquity cited by the learned Oratorian. How, indeed, can we imagine that this uniformity in formulas and general rites—which we have shown above to have been preserved intact during the Church's first centuries—could have been maintained if each Church had not possessed a written text to correct innovations and check the effects of carelessness or negligence? Grant, if you will, that this formulary did not appear at the altar, that it was kept in some secret place, away from profane eyes. At least its authority could be invoked when needed to support a failing memory and correct anything that might have entered less in keeping with antiquity. With these precautions the secrecy of the mysteries was no less secure. Consider, moreover, the special formulas required by the various rites of the catechumenate, for example; by the ordination of deacons, priests, and bishops; and by the solemn celebration of Easter and the other great days. For all these things we find positive evidence throughout antiquity. We shall agree that burdening the memories of bishops and priests with so many prayers or addresses would have been both unreasonable and impossible in practice. The holy Doctors on whom Father Lebrun relies spoke of Tradition in contrast to Holy Scripture, not to say that the Liturgies were unwritten. Here, among other examples, is what Saint Basil said:

[margin: Explanation of some passages of the Fathers that seem to favor this opinion.]

"For we are not content with what the Apostle or the Gospel records; we also say other things both before and after (the consecration), as being of great importance to the mystery, which we have received by tradition without writing[23]."

(p. 136)

[margin: The writings of Saints Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Hilary demonstrate that the Liturgies were fixed in writing before the fifth century.]

It is evident that the holy bishop means a source distinct from Holy Scripture, and that he says the formulas of the Canon of the Mass issued from this source through tradition. We readily grant this; we say nothing else. But it does not follow that these traditions did not rest on a text written by human hands and kept in the Church's archive. Do we not know from the testimony of the Greeks, especially Saint Gregory of Nazianzus[24], that Saint Basil himself had composed a Liturgy? Had he not, then, written it down, and indeed long before the end of the fourth century? Do we not find, in Saint Cyril of Jerusalem's Catecheses, composed about 347, a very large part of the Liturgy observed in baptism and in the sacred Synaxis? Yet these Catecheses were intended for the initiation of Christianity's elect. At the same time, in the Gauls, did not Saint Hilary compose a Book of Mysteries, according to Saint Jerome, his contemporary? Thus, in matters of scholarship as in purely abstract matters, we must guard vigilantly against the encroachments of a systematizing spirit, into which it is always so easy to fall. Certainly, in studying antiquity, it is most important to establish the universal secrecy that for so many centuries covered the majesty of our mysteries. But it is also important to show that the principal forms of Christian worship originated before the Church's external peace.

[margin: The Roman Pontiffs' labors on the Liturgy.]

When, therefore, the popes of the fifth century turned their attention to improvements to be introduced into the Liturgy of the Church of Rome, there is no doubt that this Church already possessed a body of liturgical formulas *(p. 137)* suited to the present needs of divine worship. The first pope of this period whom we find

mentioned in the Liber pontificalis as having made regulations for the Divine Office is Saint Celestine, who held the See in 422.

[margin: Saint Celestine establishes the chants of the Introit and Gradual.]

"He ordained," says this chronicle, "that the one hundred fifty psalms of David be sung antiphonally by everyone before the sacrifice. This had not been done before: only the Epistle of the blessed Apostle Paul and the holy Gospel were recited, and thus Masses were celebrated. He also ordained that the Gradual be sung at Masses after the office, that is, a responsory on the steps[25]."

This psalm with its antiphon, sung before Mass, is what we call the Introit. The Gradual has kept the name this chronicle gives it. It is a responsory because, like all responsories formerly, it was sung with the repetitions still used today in the short responsories of the Office and the Alleluia of the Mass. Thus the Mass acquired a solemn introduction; it no longer began with the readings of the Epistles and the Gospel, as in Saint Justin's time.

[margin: Saint Leo the Great adds a few words to the Canon of the Mass.]

Ten years after Saint Celestine, Saint Leo the Great ascended the Chair of Saint Peter. He too perfected the Liturgy. The chronicle tells us that he added these words to the sixth prayer of the Canon: Sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam ("a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim")[26]. The memory preserved of this slight addition shows the religious veneration surrounding this august prayer: history recorded as an event the act of a Roman *(p. 138)* Pontiff who adds four words to that same formula which, elsewhere, we have seen Saint Justin call the lengthy prayer.

[margin: Sacramentary attributed to Saint Leo.]

In the previous century, in 1755, Joseph Bianchini, an Oratorian priest and nephew of the illustrious prelate François Bianchini, brought out of the library of the chapter of Verona a mutilated manuscript bearing this title: Codex Sacramentorum vetus Romanæ Ecclesiæ a S. Leone Papa confectus ("Old Book of Sacraments of the Roman Church, compiled by Pope Saint Leo"). The learned editor presented this fragment as part of a Leonine Sacramentary; and, as usually happens, scholars divided over the work's authenticity. Certain Frenchmen drew a practical conclusion from their affirmative judgment, as we shall relate later in this history. Elsewhere we shall set out our reasons for not accepting Saint Leo as the author of this supposed Sacramentary. Here, however, we shall cite Honorius of Autun, who attests that this great Pontiff also composed Prefaces[27]. With Blessed Tommasi[28] and Father Quesnel[29], we shall readily grant that Saint Leo's style is often found in the Prayers and Prefaces of the Gelasian Sacramentary. Our difficulties concern only the actual manuscript published by J. Bianchini.

[margin: Saint Gelasius compiles the Sacramentary bearing his name.]

At the end of the fifth century, Saint Gelasius held the See. The Liber pontificalis reports that he also composed Prefaces of the mysteries and prayers in carefully chosen language[30]. This valuable indication alludes to the publication of the Sacramentary called Gelasian, which this Pontiff compiled partly from formulas drawn up by his predecessors and partly from those he added in a truly liturgical style.

(p. 139) This Sacramentary remained in use in the Church of Rome until Saint Gregory's time. According to John the Deacon's testimony, he made numerous improvements to it. We shall give an account of the Gelasian Sacramentary in the part of this work devoted to the survey and critical examination of liturgical books.

[margin: Saint Gelasius's decree on the canon of Holy Scripture and apocryphal books.]

Saint Gelasius's name is also attached to that famous decree of the Roman Council held in 494, which fixes the canon of Holy Scripture while giving a catalogue of apocryphal books. The council decrees that the Acts of the Martyrs—at least those whose authors are unknown or suspect—are not to be read in the Church of

Rome, lest some people find in them an occasion for scandal or contempt[31]. We shall return to this regulation and its applications at various periods in the Liturgy of the divine offices, and show that its spirit has always been faithfully kept in the Roman Church.

We shall not discuss Saint Gregory the Great's work on the Roman Liturgy here, although this great Pontiff belongs more to the sixth century than to the seventh, having ascended the Holy See in 590 and died in 604. Because of their importance in the general and particular history of the Liturgy, we shall devote the next chapter to his labors.

[margin: Catalogue of liturgical writers of the fifth and sixth centuries.]

Let us now give an account, from our present standpoint, of the work undertaken during the fifth and sixth centuries by the holy Doctors and other ecclesiastical writers.

[margin: Severian, bishop of Gabala.]

About 401, Severian, bishop of Gabala in Syria and a friend of Saint John Chrysostom, wrote a treatise On Baptism and the Solemnity of the Epiphany, which has perished.

(p. 140)

[margin: Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia.]

(407). Theodore, bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, a man of more than suspect orthodoxy, produced a new Liturgy which Leontius of Byzantium says was filled with blasphemies rather than prayers. The one found under Theodore's name in Renaudot's collection of Eastern Liturgies contains nothing to justify Leontius of Byzantium's charges.

[margin: Saint Maruthas, bishop of Tagrit. Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais.]

(408). Saint Maruthas, bishop of Tagrit in Mesopotamia, left an Anaphora in Syriac which is found in the Maronite Missal.

(410). Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais and formerly a philosopher, after returning to more definite beliefs composed hymns of great beauty, ten of which survive. We doubt that they were ever used in the Liturgy.

[margin: Saint Paulinus of Nola.]

(410). Saint Paulinus, a Roman senator and consul and later bishop of Nola, composed, according to Gennadius, a Sacramentary and a Hymnal which we no longer possess. His interesting letters and elegant poems supply many details valuable for a picture of fourth- and fifth-century Liturgy. To lovers of early Christian architecture we especially recommend letter XXXII, Ad Severum, and poems XXVI and XXVII, in which he describes the church he was having built at Nola in honor of Saint Felix. But who today will take an interest in the Christian architecture of the fourth and fifth centuries?

[margin: Saint Cyril of Alexandria.]

(412). Saint Cyril of Alexandria is the author of an Anaphora in honor of Saint Mark the Evangelist, included by Assemani in his great liturgical compilation.

[margin: Sedulius.]

(412). Sedulius, a priest and Christian poet, composed hymns still used by the Church today at Christmas (A solis ortus cardine, "From the point of the sun's rising") and the Epiphany (Hostis Herodes impie, "Impious Herod, enemy"). Both are taken from a long acrostic of twenty-three stanzas, each of which *(p. 141)* begins with a letter of the alphabet. The Introit Salve, Sancta Parens ("Hail, Holy Mother") and the antiphon Genuit puerpera regem ("The mother has borne a king") are both taken from Sedulius's poems.

[margin: John Cassian.]

(420). John Cassian, in his Monastic Institutes, gives interesting details about the form of the divine offices followed in the monasteries of the East. These usages combine the rites practiced in the psalmody of those regions' Churches with particular observances established by the Fathers of the Eastern deserts.

[margin: Saint Lupus, bishop of Troyes, and Saint Euphronius, bishop of Autun.]

(426). Saint Lupus, bishop of Troyes, and Saint Euphronius, bishop of Autun, left a valuable letter to Talatius, bishop of Angers, answering in a most interesting way his questions about the celebration of the Divine Office at the vigils of Easter, Christmas, and the Epiphany.

[margin: Nestorius.]

(428). The heresiarch Nestorius also composed a Liturgy, found in Renaudot's collection.

[margin: Saint Proclus of Constantinople.]

(434). Saint Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople, left a very short work entitled De Traditionibus Missæ divinæ ("On the Traditions of the Divine Mass"). We have cited it above.

[margin: Salvian.]

(440). Salvian, a priest of Marseille, composed many Homilies on the Mysteries, Homilias Sacramentorum, according to Gennadius's testimony. Dom Mabillon understands this to mean sermons on the Liturgy, or even prayers and Prefaces intended to be recited in the sacrifice.

[margin: Philoxenus, bishop of Hierapolis.]

(445). Philoxenus, also called Xenaias, bishop of Hierapolis, a disciple of Peter the Fuller and one of the most fiery apostles of Monophysitism, is the author of a Syriac Liturgy whose text is found in Renaudot's collection.

[margin: Narses Garbana.]

(446). Narses, surnamed Garbana, or the Leper, a zealous partisan of the Nestorian heresy, composed at Nisibis, says the learned Father Zaccaria, a Liturgy, an Exposition of the Mysteries, and a book of the Rites of Baptism.

(p. 142)

[margin: Isaac the Great, priest of Antioch. Musaeus, priest of Marseille.]

(450). Isaac, surnamed the Great, a priest of Antioch, is the author of the two hymns that form part of the Holy Week office in the Syriac Liturgy of the Maronites.

(458). Musaeus, a priest of Marseille, was one of the principal compilers of the Gallican Liturgy. At the request of his bishop, Saint Venerius, he selected passages from Holy Scripture to supply the readings for the entire year, as Gennadius relates. He likewise drew from it Responsories and Antiphons proper to the season, so that readers would not be troubled by searching for the passages, and the people would take greater delight in celebrating the solemnities. Later, at the request of Saint Eustasius, Venerius's successor, he composed a Sacramentary of great beauty and considerable size.

[margin: Voconius, bishop of Castellanum.]

(460). Voconius, or Buconius, an African and bishop of Castellanum in Mauretania, compiled an excellent Sacramentary, according to the same Gennadius.

[margin: Claudianus Mamertus.]

(462). Claudianus Mamertus, a priest of Vienne and brother of Saint Mamertus, bishop of that Church, arranged a collection of psalms and readings for the Church of Vienne and composed hymns. The Passion hymn Pange, lingua, gloriosi, prælium certaminis ("Sing, O tongue, the battle of the glorious contest") is attributed to him.

[margin: Theoctistus, monk of Palestine.]

(472). Theoctistus, companion of Saint Euthymius, archimandrite of Palestine, left, says Zaccaria, a series of sacred canticles in honor of the saints throughout the month of April.

[margin: Saint Sidonius Apollinaris.]

(472). Saint Sidonius Apollinaris, bishop of Clermont, is the author of several Masses of the Gallican Liturgy, according to Saint Gregory of Tours.

[margin: Saint Sabbas and his Typikon.]

(484). Saint Sabbas, the illustrious abbot of the Great Lavra of Palestine, wrote for his monastery a Typikon, or Order for Reciting the Ecclesiastical Office throughout the Year, divided into fifty-nine chapters. This book soon came into use in all the monasteries subject to the bishop of Jerusalem. Having become *(p. 143)* corrupted through the ravages of time, it was restored by Saint John Damascene.

[margin: Saint Caesarius, bishop of Arles.]

(501). Saint Caesarius, bishop of Arles, showed great zeal for divine worship. He compiled the first known Homiliary, a collection of sermons of the holy Fathers intended to be read at Matins. He gave the monks a Rule containing interesting details about the form of the canonical Hours in that century.

[margin: Simeon, bishop of Betharsam.]

(510). Simeon, bishop of Betharsam, a Monophysite heretic, is the author of a Liturgy sometimes confused with that of Philoxenus, just as Philoxenus's has been confused with his. On this question one may consult Father Zaccaria, who presents scholars' opinions without drawing a conclusion of his own.

[margin: Saint Ennodius, bishop of Pavia.]

(511). Saint Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, left two Blessings of the Paschal Candle, differing from those used in the Roman, Ambrosian, and Gallican Churches; a prayer before Mass for a bishop's use; and eleven hymns which do not appear, thus far, to have been used in any Church.

[margin: John Bar-Aphtonius.]

(514). John, called Bar-Aphtonius, abbot of the monastery of Seleucia, a Monophysite heretic, composed Syriac hymns on the Nativity of Jesus Christ.

(518). Severus, first bishop of Antioch and later expelled from that See for his Monophysite doctrine, compiled a liturgical book still held by the Jacobite sectarians, entitled Rites of Baptism and of the Sacred Synaxis.

(519). Jacob, bishop of Sarug, a prelate whose orthodoxy Assemani has victoriously established, composed, among other liturgical prayers, an Anaphora found in the Syriac and Ethiopian Liturgies. He is also the author of an Order for Holy Baptism included in the Maronite Ritual.

[margin: Elpis, wife of Boethius.]

(520). Elpis, wife of Boethius, also illustrious for her faith *(p. 144)* and her love of letters, is the author of two hymns in honor of Saint Peter and Saint Paul. The Roman Church has taken several verses from them, which she sings on the various feasts of these two holy Apostles. One begins Aurea luce et decore roseo ("With golden light and rosy splendor"); the other, Felix per omnes festum mundi cardines ("A happy feast throughout all the world's bounds"). The latter is also attributed to Saint Paulinus of Aquileia, perhaps with greater certainty.

[margin: Saint Simeon Stylites the Younger.]

(527). Saint Simeon Stylites the Younger composed one of the hymns which the Greek Church calls a troparion, in honor of Saint Demetrius the martyr, and some prayers to Christ and the Mother of God.

[margin: Saint Nicetius, bishop of Trier.]

(527). Saint Nicetius, bishop of Trier, left a treatise De Vigiliis servorum Dei (“On the Vigils of God’s Servants”) and another, De Bono psalmodiæ (“On the Benefit of Psalmody”).

[margin: Saint Benedict, patriarch of the monks of the West.]

(528). Saint Benedict, patriarch of the monks of the West, gave in his admirable Rule the plan of the monastic Office as his numerous disciples have always kept it, from the sixth century to the present day.

[margin: Thomas of Edessa and Marabas. Jacob, bishop of Edessa.]

(530). Thomas of Edessa, a Nestorian, and his disciple Marabas (536) worked on the Liturgy of the Syrian Church.

(541). Jacob, bishop of Edessa, who gave his name to the sect of the Monophysites—known in the East as Jacobites—is the author of an Anaphora found in Renaudot’s collection.

[margin: Maximian, archbishop of Ravenna. Saint Aurelian, bishop of Arles.]

(546). Maximilian, archbishop of Ravenna, put that Church’s books in better order and made several corrections to them.

(547). Saint Aurelian, bishop of Arles, is the author of a Rule for monks and another for nuns. Following his illustrious predecessor Saint Caesarius, he included many interesting details about the form of the divine offices.

[margin: Saint Germanus, bishop of Paris.]

(555). Saint Germanus, bishop of Paris, appears to be *(p. 145)* the author of an exposition of the Gallican Mass which Dom Martène included in his De antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus (“On the Ancient Rites of the Church”).

[margin: Saint Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, and his hymns.]

(560). Saint Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, composed, among his many poems, several hymns still used in the Church today: the hymn in honor of the Holy Cross, Vexilla Regis prodeunt (“The King’s banners advance”); that in praise of holy Chrism, O Redemptor, sume carmen temet concinentium (“O Redeemer, receive the song of those who sing of you”). To these, according to Blessed Tommasi’s Hymnal, we must add Pange, lingua, gloriosi prælium certaminis (“Sing, O tongue, the battle of the glorious contest”), already attributed to Mamertus Claudianus; the Marian hymns Quem terra, pontus, æthera (“Whom earth, sea, and heavens”) and O gloriosa Domina (“O glorious Lady”); one for Christmas, Agnoscat omne seculum (“Let all the world acknowledge”); and the solemn Easter canticle Salve, festa dies, toto venerabilis ævo (“Hail, festive day, venerable throughout all time”). Nor should we forget Fortunatus’s hymn in honor of Saint Denis, beginning Fortem fidelem militem (“A brave and faithful soldier”), in which he bears witness to the mission given to this holy Apostle by Pope Saint Clement.

[margin: Ananus of Adiabene.]

(570). Ananus of Adiabene, head of the school of Edessa, wrote De Causa solemnitatis Hozannarum (“On the Reason for the Solemnity of Hosannas”) and De Causa feriæ sextæ Auri (“On the Reason for the Friday of Gold”). This is the Friday in the octave of Pentecost, when the passage from the Acts of the Apostles is read in which Saint Peter says: Argentum et aurum non habeo (“I have neither silver nor gold”). He also wrote a treatise On Public Supplications and another On the Finding of the Holy Cross.

[margin: Chilperic, king of the Franks.]

(572). Chilperic, king of Soissons and son of Clotaire I, was the first of all the French princes to concern himself with the Liturgy. He composed hymns and Masses, says Saint Gregory of Tours, but they are of no use and could not be used. Charlemagne and Robert were more successful. In any case, these minor works of Chilperic no longer survive.

(p. 146)

[margin: Saint Gregory, bishop of Tours.]

(573). Saint Gregory, bishop of Tours, historian of the Franks and one of the foremost hagiographers of his century, composed an antiphon in honor of Saints Medard and Gildard, bishops and brothers. A sequence in honor of Saint Martin has also been attributed to him, though it is rather a Preface, or contestatio, to use the Gallican Liturgy's term. It begins Sacerdotem Christi Martinum ("Martin, the priest of Christ").

[margin: Jesuiab, patriarch of the Nestorians.]

(580). Jesuiab, patriarch of the Nestorians, is the author of twenty-two questions De Sacramentis Ecclesiæ ("On the Sacraments of the Church").

[margin: Joseph, a Nestorian heretic.]

(580). Joseph, a heretic of the same sect, wrote many treatises, among which Zaccaria cites De Causis celebriorum festivitatum ("On the Reasons for the More Celebrated Feasts").

[margin: John the Faster, patriarch of Constantinople.]

(582). John the Faster, patriarch of Constantinople, is the author of a Penitential Book and a treatise On Confession and Penance, both published by Father Morin in his great work De Pœnitentia ("On Penance"). Saint Isidore tells us that he also wrote a book On the Sacrament of Baptism, addressed to Saint Leander, bishop of Seville.

[margin: Licinianus, bishop of Cartagena.]

(584). Licinianus, or Lucinianus, bishop of Cartagena in Spain, wrote a letter On the Sacrament of Baptism, cited by Saint Isidore.

[margin: Saint Leander, bishop of Seville.]

(585). Saint Leander, bishop of Seville, also wrote a Letter on Baptism. Moreover, he took a very great part in correcting and perfecting the Gothic or Mozarabic Office. According to his brother Saint Isidore, he composed many Prayers, both to be recited with the psalms and to be read in the celebration of the holy mysteries. Elsewhere we shall discuss the Mozarabic Liturgy at length.

[margin: Babaeus the Great, patriarch of the Chaldeans.]

(589). Babaeus the Great, first a monk of Mount Izla near Nisibis and later raised to his nation's patriarchal See, wrote, according to Zaccaria, De Causa Hozannarum ("On the Reason for Hosannas"), De Causa festi Crucis ("On the Reason for the Feast of the Cross"), and another book in which he arranges, according to the cycle of the year, the triumphs of the *(p. 147)* Blessed Virgin Mary and Saint John, as well as those of the other solemnities and commemorations. In the Chaldean Liturgy, the name Triumphs is given to what we call Hymns in the Western Liturgies.

[margin: Saint Columbanus.]

[margin: The Antiphonary of Benchor, published by Muratori.]

(590). Saint Columbanus, an Irishman and celebrated abbot of Luxeuil and Bobbio, is the author of a famous Rule which survives. In it he establishes for monks a form of Divine Office different from Saint Benedict's. This Rule, as is known, soon disappeared, overcome by the superiority of that of the patriarch of Western monks. Since Saint Columbanus had been a monk in the celebrated monastery of Benchor in Ireland, we shall mention here a valuable record of that monastery's Liturgy, published by Muratori in volume IV of his Anecdota Bibliothecæ Ambrosianæ. It is an Antiphonary which the learned editor conjectures was transcribed about 636. Among other curiosities, it contains a hymn in honor of Saint Patrick, Apostle of Ireland, recounting most of the facts related by the hagiographers about this illustrious person. This invincibly refutes certain critics who claimed that Saint Patrick's existence was far from proved and that these acts, in substance as in form, were a romance forged by some twelfth- or thirteenth-century monk.

[margin: Saint Isidore, bishop of Seville and Doctor of the Church.]

[margin: His books De Divinis Officiis ("On Divine Offices").]

(595). Saint Isidore, successor to his brother Saint Leander in the See of Seville and the most learned of the Fathers of the Gothic Church of Spain—which led the Roman Church to confer on him the title Doctor of the Church—treated liturgical matters in several writings, notably his book of Origins. But his two excellent books De Divinis seu Ecclesiasticis Officiis ("On Divine or Ecclesiastical Offices") placed him honorably at the head of the liturgical writers whose works must be read by those who *(p. 148)* wish to study this science thoroughly. We shall set down here the chapter titles of this important treatise, to give the reader an idea of its riches.

In Book I: 1. On the Church and the Name of Christians. 2. On Temples. 3. On Choirs. 4. On Canticles. 5. On Psalms. 6. On Hymns. 7. On Antiphons. 8. On Responsories. 9. On Supplications. 10. On Readings. 11. On the Books of the Testaments. 12. On the Writers of the Sacred Books. 13. On Praises. 14. On Offertories. 15. On the Mass and Prayers. 16. On the Nicene Creed. 17. On Blessings among the People. 18. On the Sacrifice. 19. On the Offices of Terce, Sext, and None. 20. On Vespers. 21. On Compline. 22. On Vigils. 23. On the Morning Office. 24. On Sunday. 25. On the Nativity of the Lord. 26. On the Epiphany. 27. On Palm Sunday. 28. On the Lord's Supper. 29. On the Preparation Day (Good Friday). 30. On Holy Saturday. 31. On Easter. 32. On the Ascension of the Lord. 33. On Pentecost. 34. On the Feasts of Martyrs. 35. On Dedications. 36. On the Fast of Lent. 37. On the Fast of Pentecost. 38. On the Fast of the Seventh Month. 39. On the Fast of the Calends of November. 40. On the Fast of the Calends of January. 41. On the Custom of a Three-Day Fast. 42. On Fasts on Various Days and at Various Seasons. 43. On the Differing Usages of Churches. 44. On Eating Meat or Fish.

In Book II: 1. On Clerics. 2. On the Rules for Clerics. 3. On the Kinds of Clerics. 4. On the Tonsure. 5. On Priests. 6. On Chorepiscopi (Rural Bishops). 7. On Presbyters. 8. On Deacons. 9. On Custodians of Sacred Things. 10. On Subdeacons. 11. On Readers. 12. On Psalmists. 13. On Exorcists. 14. On Doorkeepers. 15. On Monks. 16. On Penitents. 17. On Virgins. 18. On Widows. 19. On Married Persons. 20. On Catechumens, Exorcism, and Salt. 21. On the Competentes (Candidates for Baptism). 22. On the Creed.

(p. 149) 23. On the Rule of Faith. 24. On Baptism. 25. On Chrism. 26. On the Laying On of Hands, or Confirmation.

Hittorp placed this most valuable work at the head of his liturgical collection, where it may be consulted—unless one prefers the much better course of reading it in the holy Doctor's works, especially Arévalo's excellent edition[32].

Saint Isidore is the author of the two hymns of Saint Agatha found in her Office in the Mozarabic Breviary: Adesto, plebs fidissima ("Be present, most faithful people") and Festum insigne prodiit coruscum ("The illustrious feast has come forth radiant").

[margin: Eutropius, bishop of Valencia.]

(599). Eutropius, bishop of Valencia, addressed a letter to Licinianus, bishop of Cartagena, on anointing children with chrism after Baptism; this document, however, is no longer extant.

Here ends the library of the principal liturgical writers of the fifth and sixth centuries. As will have been seen, it falls naturally into two classes: those who drew up or corrected liturgical formulas, and those who treated, from a didactic standpoint, the particulars and reasons of the mysteries and the Divine Office.

[margin: Conclusions.]

Turning now to the conclusions arising from the facts set out in this chapter, we find:

That unity, the essential element of Christianity, tended early to be reflected not only in the essential forms of the Liturgy, from which it has never been absent, but even in those forms concerned only with the fittingness

and simple solemnity of divine worship;

That the pastors of the Churches, in their councils, as early as the fifth and sixth centuries, were not content *(p. 150)* to recognize this tendency, but made laws to establish it as a definite legal norm;

That the pastors of the Churches, in their councils, based their decrees in favor of liturgical unity on the need to manifest unity of faith to the peoples and prevent the scandal already caused by the diversity of usages admitted in celebrating the divine offices;

That the Roman Pontiffs, by recalling the bishops of the West to observance of the usages and tradition of the Apostolic See, and claiming a special right in sacred rites over the Churches of Italy, the Gauls, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the islands adjacent to Italy, already laid the foundation of the right we shall see them develop later;

That, moreover, these same Pontiffs neglected no opportunity to show the intimate union of Faith and Liturgy, so that even then they proclaimed their great maxim: Let the rule for prayer determine the rule of belief (Legem credendi statuat lex supplicandi)—a maxim whose application we shall continually see throughout the rest of this history;

[margin: The definitive compilation of the various Liturgies dates from this period.]

That while the Church in this age of peace worked to establish liturgical unity, she was everywhere engaged in perfecting the forms of divine worship. Thus the definitive compilation of the various Liturgies, chiefly in the West, dates from the fifth and sixth centuries: the Roman, by Saints Gelasius and Gregory the Great; the Gallican, by Salvian, Musaeus, Sidonius Apollinaris, and others; the African, by Voconius; the Gothic, by Saints Leander and Isidore; and the monastic, by Saints Benedict, Caesarius, Aurelian, and Columbanus;

That in this century too, heretics, chiefly those of the East, eagerly sought to defile the Liturgy with their errors and innovations, acting on the same principle that led councils and the Roman *(p. 151)* Pontiffs to proclaim the Liturgy the most sacred and most popular form of doctrine. Seeing how many heretics in the period under discussion drew up sacred formulas which have survived the centuries and remained so strong a bulwark of their errors, we understand more than ever what a formidable weapon against orthodoxy falls into innovators' hands whenever, in a Christian nation, liturgical authority is not itself the sovereign and infallible authority in the Church;

That the Liturgy is therefore, like all the great things of this world, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil: for in this chapter, which has given us occasion to enumerate several of the most venerable Doctors of the Church, we could not avoid adding an ignoble list containing Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorius, Philoxenus, Severus of Antioch, Jacob of Edessa, and others.

(p. 152)

Notes to Chapter VI

Note A

Præter has autem beatissimæ et apostolicæ Sedis inviolabiles sanctiones, quibus nos piissimi patres, pestiferæ novitatis elatione dejecta, et bonæ voluntatis exordia, et incrementa probabilium studiorum, et in eis usque in finem perseverantiam ad Christi gratiam referre docuerunt; obsecrationum quoque sacerdotalium sacramenta respiciamus, quæ ab Apostolis tradita in toto mundo atque in omni Ecclesia catholica uniformiter celebrantur; ut legem credendi, lex statuat supplicandi.

For when the pastors of the holy peoples fulfill the embassy entrusted to them, they plead the cause of the human race before the divine clemency. With the whole Church groaning together with them, they ask and pray that faith be given to unbelievers; that idolaters be freed from the errors of their impiety; that, the veil of

their heart removed, the light of truth appear to the Jews; that heretics recover sound judgment by receiving the Catholic faith; that schismatics receive the spirit of revived charity; that remedies of penance be granted to the lapsed; and finally that the hall of heavenly mercy be opened to catechumens brought to the sacraments of regeneration. (St. Celestine, Epist. XXI, apud D. Coustant.)

Bring forth your arguments against the Church's prayers; and when you hear the priest of God at the altar exhorting the people of God to pray for unbelievers, that God may convert them to the faith; for catechumens, that he may inspire in them a desire for regeneration; and for the faithful, that by his gift they may persevere in what they have begun to be—scoff at those devout words. (St. Augustine, Epist. CCXVII, ad Vitalem.)

Note B

Post rectæ fidei confessionem, quæ in sancta Dei Ecclesia prædicatur, placuit ut omnes sacerdotes, qui catholicæ fidei unitate complectimur nihil ultra diversum, aut dissonum in ecclesiasticis sacramentis agamus, ne quælibet nostra diversitas apud ignotos seu carnales schismaticis errorem videatur ostendere, et multis existat in scandalum varietas ecclesiarum. Unus igitur ordo orandi atque psallendi nobis per omnem Hispaniam atque Galliam conservetur, unus modus in Missarum solemnitatibus, unus in vespertinis matutinisque officiis, nec diversa sit ultra in nobis ecclesiastica consuetudo; quia in una fide continemur et regno; hoc enim et antiqui canones decreverunt, ut unaquæque provincia et psallendi et ministrandi parem consuetudinem teneat. (Conc. Toletan. IV, can. II, Labb., tom. V.)

Note C

Si instituta ecclesiastica, ut sunt a beatis Apostolis tradita, integra vellent servare Domini sacerdotes, nulla diversitas, nulla varietas in ipsis *(p. 153)* ordinibus et consecrationibus haberetur. Sed dum unusquisque non quod traditum est, sed quod sibi visum fuerit, hoc æstimat esse tenendum, inde diversa in diversis locis vel ecclesiis aut teneri, aut celebrari videntur; ac fit scandalum populis, qui dum nesciunt traditiones antiquas humana præsumptione corruptas, putent sibi aut ecclesias non convenire, aut ab Apostolis vel apostolicis viris contrarietatem inductam. Quis enim nesciat aut non advertat, id quod a principe Apostolorum Petro Romanæ ecclesiæ traditum est, ac nunc usque custoditur, ab omnibus debere servari; nec superduci aut introduci aliquid, quod auctoritatem non habeat, aut aliunde accipere videatur exemplum? Præsertim cum sit manifestum, in omnem Italiam, Gallias, Hispanias, Africam atque Siciliam, et insulas interjacentes, nullum instituisse ecclesias, nisi eos quos venerabilis apostolus Petrus aut ejus successores constituerint sacerdotes. Aut legant, si in his provinciis alius Apostolorum invenitur, aut legitur docuisse. Qui si non legunt, quia nusquam inveniunt, oportet eos hoc sequi, quod ecclesia Romana custodit, a quas eos principium accepisse non dubium est; ne dum peregrinis assertionibus student, caput institutionum videantur omittere.

There is no doubt that your charity has often come to the City, met with us in church, and learned the custom it observes in consecrating the mysteries and celebrating the other secret rites. We should have been quite certain that this would suffice to instruct your Church—or to reform it, if your predecessors had observed anything less fully or differently—had you not judged that you should consult us on certain matters. We therefore answer these, not because we believe you ignorant of anything, but so that with greater authority you may instruct your own people or, if any deviate from the Roman Church's institutions, warn them or not delay in reporting them, so that we may know who they are that introduce novelties or think the custom of a Church other than Rome's ought to be observed. (St. Innocent I, Ad Decentium Eugub., apud D. Coustant.)

Note D

Likewise, the acts of the holy martyrs, who are illustrious for the manifold agonies of torture and the marvelous triumphs of their professions of faith. Who would doubt that these are deeds of Catholics, that they suffered still greater things in their struggles, and that they endured everything, not by their own

strength, but by God's grace and help? Yet, according to ancient custom and with particular caution, they are not read in the holy Roman Church: the names of those who wrote them are entirely unknown, and unbelievers or uneducated persons are thought to have written superfluous details, or things less in keeping with the course of events. Such are the Passions of a certain Cyricus and Julitta, of George, and others of this kind, which are reported to have been composed by heretics. Therefore, as has been said, lest even a slight occasion for mockery arise, they are not read in the holy Roman Church. Nevertheless, with the aforesaid Church, we venerate with all devotion all the martyrs and the glorious struggles known better to God than to men. (Gelasii Papæ decret., in conc. Rom., apud Labb., pag. 1263.)

---

[1] De Civitate Dei, lib. X, cap. VI.

[2] Hæbr. XII, 2.

[3] Catholicorum episcoporum unam confessionem esse debere apostolica disciplina composuit. Si ergo una fides est, manere debet et una traditio. Si una traditio est, una debet disciplina per omnes ecclesias custodiri. (Coustant, pag. 692.)

[4] See Note A.

[5] See ibid.

[6] Placuit etiam et illud, ut preces vel orationes, seu missæ quæ probatæ fuerint in concilio, sive præfationes, sive commendationes, seu manus impositiones ab omnibus celebrentur. Nec aliæ omnino dicantur in Ecclesia, nisi quæ a prudentioribus tractatæ vel comprobatæ in synodo fuerint, ne forte aliquid contra fidem, vel per ignorantiam, vel perminus studium sit compositum. (Concil. Milev. Labb., tom. II, pag. 1540.)

[7] Rectum quoque duximus, ut vel intra provinciam nostram sacrorum ordo et psallendi una sit consuetudo: et sicut unam cum Trinitatis concessione fidem tenemus, unam et officiorum regulam teneamus: ne variata observatione in aliquo devotio nostra discrepare credatur. (Concil. Venet. Labb., tom. IV, pag. 1057.)

[8] Et quia convenit ordinem ecclesiæ ab omnibus æqualiter custodiri, studendum est, ut sicut ubique fit, et post antiphonas collectiones per ordinem ab episcopis vel presbyteris dicantur, et hymni matutini vel vespertini diebus omnibus decantentur, et in conclusione matutinarum ve vespertinarum missarum, post hymnos capitella de psalmis dicantur et plebs, collecta oratione ad vesperam, ab episcopo cum benedictione dimittatur. (Concil. Agath. Labb., tom. IV, pag. 1388.)

[9] Ad celebranda divina officia, ordinem quem metropolitani tenent provinciales eorum observare debebunt. (Concil. Epaun. Labb., tom. IV, pag. 1579.)

[10] De institutione missarum, ut quomodo in metropolitana ecclesia fuerit, ita, Dei nomine, in omni Tarraconensi provincia tam ipsius missæ ordo quam psallendi, vel ministrandi consuetudo servetur. (Concil. Gerund. Labb., tom. IV, pag. 1568.)

[11] Placuit omnibus communi consensu, ut unus atque idem psallendi ordo in matutinis vel vespertinis officiis teneatur; et non diversæ, ac privatæ, neque monasteriorum consuetudines cum ecclesiastica regula sint permixtæ.

[12] Item placuit, ut per solemnium dierum vigilias vel missas, omnes easdem et non diversas lectiones in ecclesia legant.

[13] Item placuit, ut non aliter episcopi, et aliter presbyteri populum, sed uno modo salutent, dicentes: Dominus sit vobiscum, sicut in libro Ruth legitur; et ut respondeatur a populo: Et cum spiritu tuo, sicut et ab ipsis apostolis traditum omnis retinet Oriens, et non sicut priscilliana pravitas permutavit.

[14] Item placuit, ut eodem ordine missæ celebrentur ab omnibus, quem Profuturus quondam hujus metropolitanæ ecclesiæ episcopus ab ipsa apostolicæ Sedis auctoritate suscepit scriptum.

[15] Item placuit, ut nullus eum baptizandi ordinem prætermittat, quem et antea tenuit metropolitana Bracarensis ecclesia, et pro amputanda aliquorum dubietate, prædictus Profuturus episcopus scriptum sibi et directum a Sede beatissimi apostoli Petri suscepit. (Labb., tom. V, pag. 840.)

[16] See Note B.

[17] Since both in the Apostolic See and throughout all the eastern provinces and those of Italy a sweet and most salutary custom has been introduced, that Kyrie eleison ("Lord, have mercy") be said more frequently with great fervor and compunction, we too have resolved that, God being gracious, this most holy custom be introduced into all our churches at Matins, Masses, and Vespers. ..... And since not only in the Apostolic See, but throughout the whole East, all Africa, or Italy, because of the craftiness of heretics who blasphemously claim that the Son of God was not always with the Father but began in time, Sicut erat in principio ("As it was in the beginning") is said after Gloria ("Glory") at every conclusion, we too decree that it is to be said in this way in all our churches. (Labb., tom. IV, p. 1680.)

[18] Discipline de l'Église, tom. I, page 991.

[19] See Note C.

[20] See Note C.

[21] I Pet. V, 2-3.

[22] Liturgia Romana vetus. Dissertatio de reb. liturg., pag. 3 et seq.

[23] Non enim his contenti sumus, quæ commemorat Apostolus, aut Evangelium; verum alia quoque et ante et post (consecrationem) dicimus, tanquam multum habentia momenti ad mysterium, quæ ex traditione non scripta accepimus. (S. Basil., de Spiritus Sancto, cap. XXVII.)

[24] Orat. XX. In Basilii laudem ("In Praise of Basil").

[25] Constituit, ut psalmi David CL ante sacrificium psallerentur antiphonatim ex omnibus: quod ante non fiebat, nisi tantum epistola beati Pauli Apostoli recitabatur, et sanctum Evangelium, et sit missæ fiebant. Et constituit Gradale post officium ad missas cantari, id est, responsorium in gradibus. (Liber pontif., in Cœlestinum).

[26] Liber pontif., in S. Leonem.

[27] Hic (Leo) et præfationes composuit (Gemma animæ, cap. XLIX.)

[28] Præfatio ad Sacramentar. Gelasian. Opp., tom. IV.

[29] S. Leonis Opp., tom. I, ad sermonem XCVI.

[30] Fecit etiam sacramentorum præfationes et orationes cauto sermone. (Liber pontif., in Gelasium).

[31] See Note D.

[32] Rome, 1805, 7 vols., quarto.

Chapter VII. Saint Gregory the Great's Work on the Roman Liturgy. — The Progress of This Liturgy in the West. — Liturgical Writers of the Seventh and Eighth Centuries

(p. 154)

[margin: The accession of Pope Saint Gregory the Great prepares the extension of the Roman Liturgy throughout the patriarchate of the West.]

At the end of the sixth century, a man ascended the Apostolic See whose pontificate of thirteen years and six months ended in 604, but left to all succeeding centuries the renown of a glory that has been equaled but never surpassed. Saint Gregory the Great—whose immense correspondence so vividly portrays his solicitude for all the Churches, and whose writings, so full of gravity and unction, justify by the purest and most excellent doctrine the title of fourth Doctor assigned him by the Church—turned his enlightened care to the Liturgy of the Church of Rome. Through the improvements he introduced, he securely prepared the way for its introduction, sooner or later, into every province of the immense patriarchate of the West.

[margin: The need for a reform of the Roman Liturgy.]

In the preceding chapter we related the labors of Saints Celestine and Gelasius during that fifth century, a brilliant period for the Liturgy throughout the Church, when the greatest bishops devoted all their care to perfecting it. By the end of the sixth century it had become necessary to complete and improve the work of previous centuries. For the Liturgy, like the Church's Creed and the collection of her *(p. 155)* discipline, must be enriched over the centuries, although it cannot change fundamentally. This progress, directed by the competent authority, meets new needs without ever endangering the integrity of ecclesiastical rites or introducing jarring variations into the holy formulas consecrated by the centuries.

[margin: Saint Gregory gives a new form to the Sacramentary, called Gregorian after him.]

Thus Saint Gregory undertook the reform of the Roman Liturgy in the very first years of his pontificate. His historian, John the Deacon, left us most interesting details on this subject. They are confirmed not only by the testimony of all subsequent authors, but even by the authority of several who lived before John, such as Walafrid Strabo, Saint Hadrian I, and Egbert, who occupied the See of York in 732. Here are John the Deacon's words in chapter XVII of the second book of our holy Pontiff's life:

"He also compressed the Gelasian book of the solemn celebrations of Mass into the compass of a single volume, removing many things, changing a few, and adding some others, for the exposition of the Gospel readings[1]."

Walafrid Strabo, who died in 849, twenty-eight years before the pontificate of John VIII, at whose command John the Deacon wrote Saint Gregory's life, says in his treatise De Rebus Ecclesiasticis ("On Ecclesiastical Matters"): "For Pope Gelasius, the fifty-first in succession, is also said thus to have arranged prayers composed both by himself and by others. The Churches of the Gauls used their own prayers, which many still possess. And because many things seemed to have been inserted by uncertain authors and did not possess

(p. 156) "completeness of meaning, blessed Gregory took care to gather together whatever was reasonable. Excluding what seemed excessive or ill-arranged, he composed the book called Of the Sacraments, as its title most plainly declares. If anything is found in it that falls short in this respect, it was not inserted by him, but must be believed to have been added later by others who were less careful[2]."

Such is the origin of the Gregorian Sacramentary. Joined to the Antiphonary, which we shall discuss shortly, it still forms, with a few modifications, the Roman Missal used by the whole Western Church, apart from exceptions in fact or in law.

[margin: During a Lombard attack on Rome, Saint Gregory adds a few words to the Canon of the Mass.]

Saint Gregory's historiographer also tells us, in agreement with the Liber pontificalis, that this holy Pontiff added a few words to the Canon of the Mass. Let us observe for the second time that adding a single line to the Canon of the Mass was an event that concerned the whole West and could never thereafter be unknown to succeeding centuries. Here are John the Deacon's words: "He added to the Canon of the Mass: Order our days in your peace, and command that we be delivered from eternal damnation and counted among the flock of those you have chosen[3]." This *(p. 157)* addition, which expresses a petition for peace, seems to belong to 594, when Agilulf, king of the Lombards, came to besiege Rome. The city, then without a garrison, was plunged into the greatest terror. Anxious for his flock's safety, Saint Gregory suspended his work on the prophet Ezekiel. His earnest prayers, joined to his vigilance and the Romans' courage, brought about the city's deliverance after a year's siege[4].

[margin: He regulates the outward ceremonies and organizes the Stations.]

Saint Gregory did not confine himself to correcting and completing liturgical formulas. He also sought to give the ceremonies of worship an outward splendor that would make them still more effective in instructing and edifying the people. He arranged the days and places of the Stations in an order preserved almost entirely to this day[5].

"He carefully arranged," John the Deacon continues, "the Stations in the basilicas or the cemeteries of the holy martyrs, to which the Roman people still hasten in eager rivalry, as though he were alive. Going about these Stations himself, while he was still able to speak, he delivered twenty Gospel homilies before the Church at different times. He dictated as many more, but, his stomach afflicted by continual weakness, entrusted their delivery to others. The Lord's army followed Gregory as he went before them here and there; and innumerable voluntary cohorts of every sex, age, and condition flocked from every side to hear the word of doctrine. As commander of the heavenly army, he supplied them all with spiritual arms alone[6]."

(p. 158)

[margin: Saint Gregory's solicitude for the veneration of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul. The Roman Ordines and Gregorian Sacramentary give the form of the papal Mass on stational days.]

"He decreed that solemn Masses be celebrated over the bodies of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul. Having acquired very many olive groves, whose total he recorded on marble tablets before the doors of that same basilica[7], he added lights and arranged for diligent service[8]."

The various copies of the Gregorian Sacramentary, published from manuscripts of varying purity, and the ancient Roman Ordines, the first two of which are most certainly contemporary with Saint Gregory, show the

form of the papal Mass as celebrated on stational days. Even Fleury did not think he could dispense with recounting several details in his Ecclesiastical History. We reserve this account, together with a description of the papal Mass as celebrated today, for the part of our work that will treat the Christian sacrifice and its mysteries thoroughly.

[margin: Complaints against Saint Gregory's reforms.]

The modifications Saint Gregory had introduced into the Liturgy had not failed—as happens *(p. 159)* always with general administrative measures—to provoke complaints from several people. By making regulations for divine service in the Church of Rome, the holy Pope had also bound the Churches of Italy and the adjacent islands to observe them. These Churches, as should be known, belong to the Roman Church's primatial domain, just as the entire West forms her patriarchal territory. John the Deacon preserved an important fragment of Saint Gregory's letter to John, bishop of Syracuse, answering the outcry in Sicily. We reproduce it here with our observations.

[margin: The holy Pope's reply in his letter to John, bishop of Syracuse.]

"Someone coming from Sicily told me that some friends of his—Greeks or Latins, I do not know—as though zealous for the holy Roman Church, were murmuring about my arrangements, saying: He proposes to curb the Church of Constantinople, yet follows her customs in everything. When I asked, 'What customs do we follow?' he answered: You have caused Alleluia to be said at Mass outside the Pentecost season; subdeacons to proceed unvested; Kyrie eleison ('Lord, have mercy') to be said; and the Lord's Prayer to be said immediately after the Canon. I replied that in none of these things had we followed another Church.

"For the saying of Alleluia here is said to have been derived from the Church of Jerusalem, through the tradition of blessed Jerome, in the time of Pope Damasus of blessed memory. In this See, then, we have rather curtailed the custom handed down here from the Greeks[9]. As for my having subdeacons proceed unvested, it was the ancient *(p. 160)* "custom of the Church. But it pleased one of our Pontiffs—I do not know which—to order them to proceed vested. Have your Churches received their tradition from the Greeks? Whence, then, do they have the present custom of subdeacons proceeding in linen tunics, unless they received it from their mother, the Roman Church?

[margin: The difference between Rome and Constantinople in chanting the Kyrie eleison.]

"We neither have said nor say Kyrie eleison as the Greeks do: among them everyone says it together; among us the clergy say it and the people respond. Christe eleison ('Christ, have mercy') is also said the same number of times, whereas among the Greeks it is not said at all. At daily Masses we omit other customary things and say only Kyrie eleison and Christe eleison, to spend a little longer on these words of supplication. We say the Lord's Prayer immediately after the prayer because it was the Apostles' custom to consecrate the sacrificial offering at that prayer alone[10].

"It seemed to me most unfitting that we should say over the oblation a prayer composed by a scholar, yet leave unsaid over his body and blood the very form of prayer handed down, which our Redeemer composed. Moreover, among the Greeks the Lord's Prayer is said by all the people; among us, by the priest alone.

"In what, then, have we followed the Greeks' customs, we who have either restored our own old usages or instituted new and useful ones, in which, nevertheless, we are shown *(p. 161)* "to imitate others? Therefore, Your Charity should instruct by discussion those whom you believe or understand may have murmured about this matter, when opportunity permits a visit to the city of Catania, or in the Church of Syracuse; and you should not cease to instruct them, as if on some other occasion. As for what they say about the Church of Constantinople, who doubts that she is subject to the Apostolic See? Both the most pious lord Emperor and our brother, that city's bishop, continually profess it. Yet if she or any other Church has something good, I am ready to imitate even my inferiors in what is good, while forbidding them unlawful things. For he is a fool who thinks himself first in such a way that he scorns to learn the good things he sees[11]."

[margin: This letter bears witness to the Roman Pontiffs' apostolic solicitude and wisdom concerning the Liturgy.]

In this remarkable letter we see Roman supremacy exercised in liturgical matters. The Pontiff restores usages fallen into disuse and institutes others he finds useful. From the rites of Churches subject to Rome he chooses those he thinks fit to adopt. He professes his received sovereign right to repress abuses, even in the See of Constantinople. At the same time he declares that wise disposition, so often put into practice by the Holy See, to imitate what is best in the usages of the various Churches. Throughout the centuries we shall constantly see the Popes follow this course, so wisely and firmly marked out.

[margin: Saint Gregory undertakes the correction of ecclesiastical chant.]

Saint Gregory's tireless zeal led him beyond reforming the Liturgy's prayers and ceremonies. He also undertook the correction of ecclesiastical chant, whose majestic melody was to add new splendor to divine service. We *(p. 162)* saw in the preceding chapter Pope Saint Celestine instituting the chant of antiphons and responsories known as the Introit and Gradual. There can be no doubt that these pieces were composed on the model of others of the same kind already used in the psalmody of the Hours or the celebration of Mass. As we have also seen, there were Prefaces and other recitations that could not be sung without some musical system. This is not the place to consider the character of ecclesiastical chant. We need only remind the reader in passing that all learned writers on music's origins have recognized in ecclesiastical or Gregorian chant the rare and precious remnants of that ancient Greek music of which so many marvels are related. This music, grand in character yet simple and popular, had early become naturalized at Rome. The Christian Church readily appropriated this inexhaustible source of grave and religious melodies. Yet reverence for the holy formulas—often drawn from Scripture—which had to be set to chant did not permit imposing a meter that would often have altered their simplicity and sometimes even their meaning. Thus the Church's chant, though drawn from the ancient modes, took as its material only prose pieces, with an indeterminate and often irregular rhythm. Clearly, the Pontiffs had sought to instruct the faithful through the doctrine in the sacred words rather than ravish their ears with the richness of an over-elaborate harmony.

[margin: The character of Gregorian chant, preserving the last traditions of Greek music.]

Nevertheless, the needs of worship had given rise in the Church of Rome to many chant pieces, all with prose texts: unlike the Church of Milan and almost all others, she admitted no hymns. The themes of most of these *(p. 163)* chants were inspired by recollections of familiar, easily performed airs, which a trained ear still recognizes in the Gregorian repertory and which could readily be restored to their original coloring.

[margin: The Gregorian Antiphonary.]

This collection of chants also called for correction. God, who had given Saint Gregory the noble, cadenced diction that enabled him to revise Saint Gelasius's Sacramentary, had likewise given him a sense for ecclesiastical music, to which his name was to become attached.

"Then," says his historian, "in the Lord's house, after the manner of the most wise Solomon, for the compunction arising from musical sweetness, he most usefully compiled an Antiphonary as a cento, being most devoted to singers[12]."

The expressions compilavit ("compiled") and centonem ("a cento," a compilation from existing material) show that Saint Gregory cannot be considered the author, properly speaking, of the pieces in his Antiphonary. Ecclesiastical chant is thus like all the great institutions of Catholicism: when first encountered in the records of tradition, they appear as an already existing fact, and their origin is lost in impenetrable antiquity. Yet we may believe that Saint Gregory did more than collect melodies. He must have not only corrected but himself composed several chants in his Antiphonary, by work analogous to his work on the Sacramentary. It can only be as an enlightened reviser and even a composer that John the Deacon praises the unction and sweetness of his music. Today we could not identify with certainty, piece by piece, which portions of the Gregorian Antiphonary belong properly to the great Pontiff of whom we are *(p. 164)*

speaking. Yet in the Middle Ages the Western Churches still felt such gratitude toward the inspired composer to whom they owed their chants that, on the First Sunday of Advent, the following verses were solemnly sung before intoning the Mass Introit Ad te levavi ("To you I have lifted up"), as a kind of tribute owed to the memory of so important a service:

[margin: Chants through which the Western Churches expressed their gratitude to Saint Gregory in the Middle Ages.]

Gregory, a prelate worthy in merits and in name, Where his lineage springs, ascends the highest honor; With splendor of life and his mind's keen Genius he adorned that honor more than it adorned him. Following the Fathers' records, he himself renewed and increased The chants which the year's cycle retains in the Offices, For the clergy to offer the Lord in sweet melody While in supplication they handle life's mystic offerings. This sweetness gently preserves its own radiance If in a faithful heart the mind bears what the voice utters. No lofty clamor draws as near to the Lord's ears As a cry humble in voice from a tranquil heart. Let the love of the young pursue these; let one of riper age, Steadfast in these praises, strive toward eternal Hours. These expressive verses, with some variants, stand at the beginning of the various copies of Saint Gregory's Antiphonary published from ninth-, tenth-, and eleventh-century manuscripts by Pamelius, Dom Denys de Sainte-Marthe, and Blessed Tommasi.

[margin: The Mass Antiphonary, now called the Gradual, and the Divine Office Antiphonary, called the Responsorial in antiquity.]

Saint Gregory's Antiphonary had two parts. One contained the chants used at Mass and has long been known as the Gradual. The other, called the Responsorial in antiquity, contained the Office's responsories and antiphons and has retained the name Antiphonary. The Saint Gall manuscript, one of the two from which Blessed Tommasi published the Responsorial, begins with these verses in praise of Saint Gregory:

[margin: A verse prologue praising Saint Gregory at the beginning of the Saint Gall Responsorial.]

Gregory also, following the Fathers as was his custom, Restored this work and enlarged it for the better. Let the clergy with watchful effort submit their minds *(p. 165)* To these orders, feeding their hearts with this honeycomb, Which pious diligence, with painstaking efforts, Has gathered and unfolded from Scripture's whole field. These chants are to be sung at the various Hours; Apply an attentive mind to the proper tones. Learn to tread the lawful paths of words, And join sweet words to excellent modes. Let care for words not undo the tones, nor care for tones Have power to annul the rules of words. Whatever is celebrated in God's honor with worthy zeal Joins gentle hearts to the highest choirs.

[margin: A school of singers established and endowed by Saint Gregory.]

To ensure the perfect performance of the chants he had so carefully collected and renewed, Saint Gregory established a school of singers.

John the Deacon, in whose time the school still existed, writes: "He also established a school of singers which still chants in the holy Roman Church under these same arrangements. He endowed it with several estates and built it two dwellings: one beneath the steps of the Basilica of blessed Peter the Apostle, the other beneath the buildings of the Lateran patriarchal residence. There, to this day, his bed, in which he reclined and chanted, and his whip, with which he threatened the boys, are preserved with fitting veneration, together with the authentic Antiphonary[13]."

The college of singers founded by Saint Gregory has survived the centuries. After various modifications and the grant of great privileges by the Apostolic See, it still exists in Rome today. It alone provides the chant in the papal chapel and the basilicas when the Supreme Pontiff celebrates the sacred mysteries there. In accordance with ancient custom, when the papal chapel's singers occupy the choir, the organ and musical instruments are forbidden. As for Gregorian chant in the strict *(p. 166)* sense, we shall have occasion in various places to discuss its fortunes and the changes and alterations it has undergone.

[margin: Saint Gregory allows Saint Augustine to borrow certain customs from the Churches of Gaul for England, which he was evangelizing.]

Saint Gregory's letter to John of Syracuse has shown us how important this holy Pope considered the adoption of the Roman Liturgy, as he had reformed it, by the Churches immediately subject to the Apostolic See. But the time had not yet come for the Roman Pontiffs to decree its extension to the other Western Churches. Saint Gregory's express will on this matter is evident in his reply to the difficulties proposed by the holy monk Augustine, Apostle of England. Augustine consulted him about the customs to follow in celebrating the Divine Office and complained of the lack of agreement between the rites of the Roman Church and those of the Churches of Gaul. Saint Gregory replied:

"Your Fraternity knows the custom of the Roman Church, in which you remember being brought up. But it pleases me that, if you have found anything in the holy Roman Church, the Churches of Gaul, or any other Church that may be more pleasing to almighty God, you should choose it carefully, and by a special institution instill in the Church of the English, still new in the faith, the customs you have been able to gather from many Churches. For we are to love things not for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things[14]."

(p. 167) We ask the reader to note this remarkable passage, just as in chapter IV we recommended remembering a famous text of Saint Cyprian. As this history proceeds, we shall be able to examine the practical applications that people have claimed to make of both passages in a certain country. Here we have only to record the fact and state its significance at the time it occurred.

[margin: False conclusions people have sought to draw from this accommodation.]

We therefore say that this text puts beyond doubt that Saint Gregory did not intend to bind England's new Church to Roman usages in a way that forbade imitating practices used in Gaul or any other country. We shall even add, if desired, and with still greater reason, that our great Pope likewise did not intend to abolish the holy customs still surviving in the ancient Church of the Britons, which had not entirely disappeared throughout England when Saint Augustine's mission began. But this permission to adopt various usages, given later by Saint Gregory to his missionaries, does not prove that he had failed to furnish them at their departure with the Roman Church's liturgical books for their new Christian community. Little reflection is needed to see that Saint Augustine and his companions cannot have waited to celebrate the sacred mysteries and Divine Offices until they had formed a supposed body of Liturgy from so many heterogeneous materials. When Saint Augustine put to Saint Gregory the question answered in the passage just quoted, permitting him to draw usages from various approved sources, Saint *(p. 168)* Augustine had already organized his new Christian community, baptized many unbelievers, and ordained priests and even bishops. By what rite other than that of the Roman Church had the holy Apostle done all this? Only the rashness of certain prejudiced men could have led them astray here: they saw what they wished to see, rather than what was really there. A more patient study of the records of the Church's liturgical history would also have taught them that—whether the usages Saint Gregory mentioned concerned only minor details, or England's bishops did not think fit to use the holy Pope's permission—the Roman Liturgy, purified at its source, alone prevailed in Great Britain from Saint Augustine's preaching until the sixteenth-century Reformation, which, admittedly, nowhere showed a strong predilection for the Roman Liturgy.

[margin: The Roman Liturgy has always been England's Liturgy.]

[margin: Saint Peter's archcantor, sent to Great Britain by Pope Saint Agatho at Saint Benedict Biscop's request, to regulate the annual order of Divine Office chant.]

Bede reports that around 676 Saint Benedict Biscop, England's illustrious abbot, went to Rome and also obtained Pope Saint Agatho's permission to take John, archcantor of Saint Peter's, with him to Great Britain to teach in his monastery

"the annual cycle of chant (cursum annuum) as performed at Saint Peter's in Rome. John, who was also abbot of Saint Martin's monastery, carried out the Pontiff's command by teaching that monastery's singers orally the order and rite of singing and reading, and committing to writing what the whole year's cycle required in celebrating feast days. These writings are still preserved in that monastery and have already been copied by many far and wide[15]."

(p. 169) Recall that all England's cathedrals were served by monks, so that the monks' liturgical customs were, so to speak, those of all the Churches of that kingdom. Notice too that the service requested by Saint Benedict Biscop and provided by the archcantor John chiefly consisted in restoring chant traditions, which are usually the first to be lost. Nothing in Bede indicates that any change had until then been made in the liturgical text of the Divine Offices. From that time onward there is no trace of the introduction of Roman books into England; on the contrary, all later records, without exception, agree in showing them in use.

[margin: A canon of the Second Council of Clovesho in 747 orders the Roman Church's liturgical tradition to be followed in everything.]

As proof, we shall simply cite canon thirteen of the Second Council of Clovesho, held in 747. It provides: "By the thirteenth decree it is defined that the most holy festivals of the Lord's dispensation in the flesh are to be celebrated in one and the same manner, according to the exemplar we have in writing from the Roman Church, *(p. 170)* "in everything duly pertaining to them: the office of Baptism, the celebration of Masses, and the manner of chant. Likewise, throughout the year's whole cycle, the saints' feast days are to be honored, each on the same day, according to that same Roman Church's Martyrology, with the psalmody or chant appropriate to each[16]."

[margin: All Churches newly founded by the Roman Pontiffs necessarily receive their mother Church's Liturgy, by the principle laid down by Saint Innocent I.]

This necessarily had to occur in all the Churches Rome was founding in the West: England through Saint Augustine; the various Germanic or Slavic lands through Saints Boniface, Adalbert, and so many others; and the northern kingdoms through Saints Ansgar, Rimbert, and others. These Apostles, Benedictine monks sent by the Apostolic See, could carry only the books of the Roman Church from which they received their mission. We have seen what liturgical right Saint Innocent I, as early as 400, derived for the Apostolic See simply from the founding of the Churches of Italy, Gaul, Spain, and Africa by Saint Peter and his successors. This principle, laid down then and founded also on the nature of things—a daughter should speak her mother's language—was one day to unfold its consequences. Even before bringing about the total destruction of the Gallican and Gothic Liturgies, it already obliged the Roman Pontiffs to tolerate no further dissonance in the new Churches rising with such admirable speed in the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries. Unity continually grew in proportion to charity. Our assertion

(p. 171) —which, moreover, no one has ever contested—proves itself by a mere examination of the ecclesiastical annals of the kingdoms just listed. At every period we find the Roman Liturgy in use, with no trace of its later introduction.

[margin: Saint Gregory II orders Bishop Martinian, his legate in Bavaria, to preserve the Roman tradition of the Divine Office in that country's new Churches.]

Moreover, we have positive evidence that the Roman Pontiffs themselves watched over the execution of their wishes in this matter. Around 720, Saint Gregory II addressed a capitulary to Bishop Martinian, whom he was sending as legate to visit Bavaria's new Christian communities. Among other things, he told him to investigate the canonical ordination of priests and deacons and the purity of their faith. If they met these conditions, "you are to hand on to these men, in the Church's order, the authority to offer sacrifice, to minister, or also to chant psalms according to the form and tradition of the holy apostolic and Roman See[17]."

The Pope further orders Martinian: "Providing for the places of the individual Churches, you are to arrange how each priest or minister ought to conduct himself toward the Church, or how he should take care to

observe the sacred solemnities of Mass, or the other Offices of the daytime and nighttime Hours, or also the ordered proclamations in the reading of the sacred New and Old Testament, according to the ancient order handed down by the Apostolic See[18]."

(p. 172) When Saint Boniface, the great Apostle of Germany, consulted Pope Saint Zachary about certain blessings given by the bishops of France that did not occur in the order of the Roman Liturgy, the Pontiff replied:

[margin: Pope Saint Zachary's severe judgment on certain liturgical customs peculiar to the Churches of France.]

"As for the blessings given by the Gauls, brother, you know that they show many faulty variations. For they do not do this according to apostolic tradition, but act out of vainglory, bringing condemnation upon themselves, since it is written: If anyone preaches to you a gospel other than what has been preached, let him be anathema. You have received the rule of Catholic tradition, most beloved brother. Preach accordingly to all, and teach everyone as you have received from the holy Roman Church, which, by God's appointment, we serve[19]."

[margin: The Apostolic See's vigilance did not forbid minor variations in Germany's Churches that left Roman usages pure.]

This severity of the Apostolic See toward the Church of France, at a time when it was stained by no error, shows the Roman Pontiffs' great desire for liturgical unity and foreshadows the impending destruction of the Gallican Liturgy. It also shows how carefully Rome guarded the purity of Roman usages in Germany's Churches. Yet this solicitude did not prevent certain minor variations from creeping into the Liturgy of those vast lands, as always happens. The learned Gerbert, abbot of Saint Blaise in the Black Forest, published an excellent work *(p. 173)* entitled Liturgia Alemannica ("German Liturgy"), describing in detail how the Roman Liturgy was observed in Germany's various Churches. That country's particular usages clearly detracted in no way from liturgical unity, which, among Catholics at least, has never been broken in Germany.

[margin: The Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum, a precious monument for liturgical science.]

Before listing the liturgical writers of this period, we shall say a few words about a precious monument of ecclesiastical antiquity that everyone wishing to possess the sources of liturgical science in their entirety must study. This book is known as the Liber diurnus Romanorum Pontificum. The story of its publication, attempted several times and finally accomplished in 1680 by Father Garnier, a Jesuit, is long and curious, but would take us too far from our subject. We shall therefore say only that the Liber diurnus collects the formulas used by the Popes during the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries. It contains the rites of their ordination and of the Italian bishops required to come to Rome for episcopal consecration, professions of faith, privileges, mandates, grants, and similar acts. The collection has seven chapters, each subdivided into several articles. The first contains formulas for letters to princes and other secular persons, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, priests, deacons, primicerii, and secundicerii. The second contains formulas for all the letters and acts preceding and following a Pope's election. The third gives formulas for the letters, rites, and acts used in ordaining bishops consecrated at Rome. Among the new bishop's sworn promises, we note that of always celebrating *(p. 174)* the Divine Offices according to the Roman rite[20]. Dom Mabillon attributes this injunction to Saint Gregory the Great[21]. The fourth chapter concerns the use of the pallium and thus directly concerns the Liturgy, as does the fifth. This contains formulas for rescripts or mandates for ordaining a priest, dedicating an oratory, consecrating a church, baptistery, or altar; granting saints' relics, raising them from the earth and enclosing them in shrines, and so forth. The sixth chiefly contains formulas for letters and commissions to those responsible for administering the Churches' patrimony or handling the affairs of the Apostolic See. Finally, the seventh contains formulas for privileges granted to monasteries, diaconiae, and hospices.

[margin: The Roman Ordines, the most important liturgical writings of this period.]

Foremost among the seventh- and eighth-century writings and compositions on the Liturgy we place the Roman Ordines belonging to this period. As is doubtless known, the Roman Ordines are writings of varying length detailing the ceremonies of the papal Mass, the administration of the sacraments, and so forth. Since we must elsewhere provide a reasoned list of all records of this kind, we shall say nothing of them here and proceed at once to the liturgical writers of the period we are describing.

[margin: The hymns of Saint Gregory the Great.]

(604). We have a further word to say about Saint Gregory's liturgical works: his hymns remain to be discussed. Dom Denys de Sainte-Marthe attributes the following to him, almost all of which occur in the Roman Breviary: Primo dierum omnium ("On the first of all days"); Nocte surgentes, vigilemus omnes ("Rising at night, let us all keep vigil"); Ecce jam noctis tenuatur umbra ("See, now the shadow of night grows thin"); Lucis ("Of light, *(p. 175)* creator optime—most excellent Creator"); Clarum decus jejunii ("The bright glory of fasting"); Audi, benigne conditor ("Hear, gracious Creator"); Magno salutis gaudio ("With great joy in salvation"); Rex, Christe, factor omnium ("King, O Christ, Maker of all").

[margin: Cyriacus, bishop of Nisibis.]

(608). Cyriacus, bishop of Nisibis, a Nestorian heretic, wrote an Exposition of the Mysteries and a treatise on the Nativity and Epiphany.

[margin: Conantius, bishop of Palentia.]

(609). Conantius, bishop of Palentia, composed new hymns for the Gothic Office and set them to music. He also composed prayers on all the Psalms.

[margin: John, bishop of Saragossa.]

(615). John, first a monk and then bishop of Saragossa, also composed several prayers for the Gothic Liturgy, remarkable for their style and harmony.

[margin: John, bishop of Bostra.]

(617). John, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, a Monophysite heretic, wrote an Anaphora translated into Latin by Renaudot.

[margin: John Moschus.]

(620). John Moschus, a monk of Palestine, gives a wealth of curious details about the Liturgy of his time in his famous Spiritual Meadow, particularly the story of the children of Apamea.

[margin: Saint Protadius, bishop of Besançon.]

(620). Saint Protadius, bishop of Besançon, is known for his liturgical works only through what his anonymous biographer tells us. He says that the clergy of Besançon's churches often had difficulties over the ceremonies they should observe. Saint Protadius therefore compiled a book in the form of a Ritual, prescribing how to conduct oneself in the assembly of the Brethren; what the church should practice or avoid; how many ministers should attend the altar on solemn feasts; when to hold public processions and where they should go; on what day the city's Congregations should visit the mother church; and, finally, what should be observed in church each day of the year.

(p. 176)

[margin: Saint Donatus, bishop of Besançon. Saint Maximus, abbot of Chrysopolis.]

(626). Saint Donatus, bishop of Besançon, composed a celebrated Rule for religious women, containing many important details about the Divine Office.

(645). Saint Maximus, abbot of Chrysopolis, the vindicator of orthodoxy against the Monothelites, also deserves a place among liturgical writers for his excellent Mystagogy, or Exposition of the Liturgy, and his valuable commentary on Saint Dionysius the Areopagite's Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.

[margin: Eugene II, bishop of Toledo.]

(646). Eugene II, bishop of Toledo, corrected the Gothic Church's books as regards chant, according to Saint Ildephonsus. Blessed Tommasi, agreeing with Alcuin, attributes to him the hymn Rex Deus immensi quo constat machina mundi ("King and God, by whom the frame of the boundless world endures").

[margin: James the Commentator, bishop of Edessa.]

(651). James, called the Commentator from the nature of his works, was bishop of Edessa. The Maronites honor him as a saint and orthodox Doctor. His liturgical compositions include an Anaphora in honor of Saint James the Apostle, and another included in Renaudot's collection. He also produced an Order of Holy Baptism, found in several Eastern Rituals; a Letter to the priest Thomas describing the Syrians' Mass; another to John the Stylite, on blessing water; another to the priest Adeus, on various ecclesiastical rites; ten hymns for the feast of Palms, another in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and so forth.

[margin: Jesuiab of Adiabene, patriarch of the Nestorians.]

(651). Jesuiab of Adiabene, patriarch of the Nestorians, arranged the Office for the year's cycle, says Amro, as cited by Zaccaria. He also regulated the order of Baptism, Penance, ordinations, and the Dedication of a Church, and composed many hymns.

[margin: Saint Ildephonsus, bishop of Toledo.]

(657). Saint Ildephonsus, a monk and later bishop of Toledo, one of the brightest lights of the *(p. 177)* Gothic Church of Spain, left an excellent short work on the ceremonies of Baptism. He also composed two Masses with marvelous chant, in honor of Saints Cosmas and Damian.

[margin: George, bishop of Syracuse.]

(661). George, also called Gregory, bishop of Syracuse, composed Tropes in honor of Our Lord's Nativity and Epiphany.

[margin: Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury.]

(668). Theodore, a monk and later archbishop of Canterbury, is known for his famous Penitential Book, which gives an idea of how the sacrament of Penance was administered in the seventh-century Latin Church.

[margin: Saint Julian, archbishop of Toledo.]

(675). Saint Julian, Saint Ildephonsus's successor in the see of Toledo, besides composing hymns, compiled a book of Masses for the whole year, correcting old ones and adding new ones.

[margin: Pope Saint Leo II, renowned for his knowledge of ecclesiastical chant.]

(682). Pope Saint Leo II is called in the Liber pontificalis "a most eloquent man, outstanding in chant and psalmody, and refined by the most exacting study in the understanding of their meaning." Platina also praises this Pope's musical skill and says that he regulated psalmody and reformed the chanting of hymns. Abbé Lebeuf readily attributes to him some share in the Responsorial Book, whose substance belongs to Saint Gregory.

[margin: John Maron, first patriarch of the Maronites.]

(685). John Maron, first patriarch of the Maronites, who take their name from him, wrote an Anaphora and a book On the Priesthood.

[margin: Johannicius of Ravenna.]

(691). Johannicius of Ravenna arranged the sacred Books, the Antiphons, and all the rites of the Church of Ravenna, according to Zaccaria's account, drawn from de Rubeis and Ginanni.

[margin: Ecbert, monk of Lindisfarne.]

(700). Ecbert, a Swede and monk of Lindisfarne, wrote a book de Ritibus catholicorum ("On the Rites of Catholics").

[margin: Saint Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne.]

(700). Saint Aldhelm, abbot of Malmesbury and later bishop of Sherborne, distinguished himself, says Abbé Lebeuf, by his ability to compose ecclesiastical chant.

(p. 178)

[margin: The Venerable Bede.]

(701). The Venerable Bede, an English monk, wrote the Martyrology bearing his name and several hymns. Blessed Tommasi attributes these to him: Hymnum canentes Martyrum ("Singing a hymn of the Martyrs"), for the feast of the Holy Innocents; Hymnum canamus gloriæ ("Let us sing a hymn of glory"), for the Ascension; Emitte, Christe, Spiritus ("Send forth, O Christ, the Spirit's…"), for Pentecost; Præcursor altus luminis ("Exalted forerunner of the Light"), for Saint John the Baptist's Nativity; Præcessor almus gratiæ ("Gracious forerunner of grace"), for his Beheading; Apostolorum gloriam ("The glory of the Apostles"), for the holy Apostles Peter and Paul; Adesto, Christe, vocibus ("Attend, O Christ, to [our] voices"), for the Blessed Virgin's Nativity; Nunc Andreæ solemnia ("Now Andrew's solemn rites"), for Saint Andrew; Hymnum dicat turba fratrum ("Let the company of brethren sing a hymn"), for the Night Office; and Primo Deus cœli globum ("First, God, heaven's sphere…"), on the work of the six days.

[margin: Acca, an English monk. Saint Andrew, archbishop of Crete.]

(705). Acca, an English monk and friend of the Venerable Bede, wrote a book On the Ecclesiastical Offices.

(710). Saint Andrew, archbishop of Crete, wrote many hymns on various feasts of the year, the Blessed Virgin Mary, and several other saints.

[margin: Babaeus, a Nestorian heretic.]

(720). Babaeus, a Nestorian heretic, established schools of sacred music in the province of Adiabene and composed various blessings and hymns.

[margin: Cosmas, bishop of Maiuma.]

(730). Cosmas, first a monk and then bishop of Maiuma in Palestine, was Saint John Damascene's teacher. He wrote several hymns sung in the Greek Church's offices.

[margin: Saint John Damascene.]

(730). Saint John Damascene also composed various sacred hymns found in his works, several of which form part of the Greek Liturgy.

[margin: Saint Chrodegang, bishop of Metz.]

(742). Saint Chrodegang, bishop of Metz, included in his Rule for Canons many details valuable for understanding the Liturgy of his time.

(750). Around this year Zaccaria places the anonymous author to whom *(p. 179)* we owe the Exposition of the Roman Mass, included by Dom Martène in volume one of his great work de Antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus ("On the Ancient Rites of the Church").

[margin: The anonymous author of the Exposition of the Roman Mass.]

(760). Theodosius, bishop of Syracuse, composed hymns to be sung at Vespers on fast days.

[margin: Theodosius, bishop of Syracuse.]

[margin: Florus, monk of Saint-Trond.]

(760). Florus, a monk of Saint-Trond, made important additions to Bede's Martyrology.

[margin: Charlemagne.]

(768). Charlemagne was zealous for the Liturgy. We shall soon see his measures to secure uniform forms of worship throughout his vast empire. He wrote the hymn Veni, Creator Spiritus ("Come, O Creator Spirit")[22];

a book addressed to Alcuin, de Sacrificio Missæ et ratione Rituum Ecclesiæ (“On the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Rationale of the Church’s Rites”); and a circular letter, de Baptismo ejusque ritibus (“On Baptism and Its Rites”), addressed to Odilbert, archbishop of Milan.

[margin: Saint Sturmius, abbot of Fulda.]

(770). Saint Sturmius, first abbot of Fulda, published a short work entitled Ordo Officii in domo, seu Ecclesia Frisingensi, ante Pascha (“Order of the Office in the House, or Church, of Freising before Easter”).

[margin: Gregory of Systre.]

(770). Gregory of Systre, a Nestorian heretic, wrote on the reasons for the feasts, and a canticle beginning Estote parati (“Be ready”).

[margin: Cyprian, metropolitan of Nisibis.]

(773). Cyprian, metropolitan of Nisibis, composed an Order of the Laying On of Hands.

[margin: Paul, deacon and monk of Monte Cassino.]

(774). Paul, deacon of Aquileia, a monk of Monte Cassino and a distinguished historian, wrote the hymn of Saint John, Ut queant laxis (“So that they may, with loosened…”). He also compiled a Homiliary, a collection of homilies of the Holy Fathers to be read in the Church’s Offices. Around the same time we find another Homiliary compiled by Alan, a monk of Farfa.

[margin: Saint Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia.]

(776). Saint Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia, composed seven hymns in iambic trimeters. Among these, *(p. 180)* Blessed Tommasi and Madrisius, Saint Paulinus’s editor, include the hymn for Saints Peter and Paul, one of the two attributed to Elpis, Boethius’s wife: Felix per omnes festum mundi cardines (“A happy feast throughout all the world’s regions”).

[margin: Alcuin.]

(780). Alcuin, an English monk, was very famous among the liturgical writers of his time. A Sacramentary, a Homiliary, and especially the book de Divinis Officiis (“On the Divine Offices”) were long attributed to him. The last is an exposition of the Roman Ordo composed after 1000. He certainly wrote, however: Liber Sacramentorum (“Book of Sacraments”); Officia per ferias (“Offices for Weekdays”); de Ratione Septuagesimæ, Sexagesimæ et Quinquagesimæ, Epistola ad Ethelardum (“On the Rationale of Septuagesima, Sexagesima, and Quinquagesima: Letter to Ethelard”); and de Psalmorum usu (“On the Use of the Psalms”). Add another letter to the priest Oduin, de Baptismi cæremoniis (“On the Ceremonies of Baptism”).

[margin: Cyriacus, patriarch of Antioch.]

(793). Cyriacus, patriarch of Antioch, seems to have composed a Chaldean Liturgy, although the question presents difficulties among the scholars whose opinions Zaccaria reports.

[margin: Theodulf, bishop of Orléans.]

(794). Theodulf, bishop of Orléans, besides a book de Ordine et Oratione rituum Baptismi (“On the Order and Prayer of the Rites of Baptism”), composed during his imprisonment at Angers the famous Palm Sunday hymn Gloria, laus et honor (“Glory, praise, and honor”).

[margin: Leidrad, archbishop of Lyon.]

(798). Leidrad, archbishop of Lyon, addressed to Charlemagne a book On the Sacrament of Baptism and a letter on the same subject.

[margin: Jesse, bishop of Amiens. Magnus, archbishop of Sens.]

(799). Jesse, bishop of Amiens, wrote a letter to his clergy and people explaining the rites observed by the Church in Baptism.

Finally, around 800, Magnus, archbishop of Sens, composed at Charlemagne's command a short work de Mysterio Baptismatis ("On the Mystery of Baptism"), included by Dom Martène in volume one of his Ecclesiastical Rites.

[margin: Conclusions.]

We shall conclude this chapter with the following observations:

During the seventh and eighth centuries, the Liturgy followed the *(p. 181)* same movement toward perfection imparted to it as early as the fourth and fifth;

All the great Doctors, great bishops, and great abbots were liturgical writers; in the East, heretics continued to defile the books of sacred prayers with their impure hands;

Without yet declaring an intention to unite the entire Western patriarchate under the law of one Liturgy, the Apostolic See required Italy's bishops to swear to preserve the Roman Church's usages, and allowed no others to the new Churches its apostles were founding in part of Europe;

Finally, Saint Gregory's work on the Divine Offices, the correction of the Antiphonary—in a word, all the improvements this great Pope and his successors introduced into the Roman Liturgy—made it increasingly worthy of the Western Churches' respect and admiration. They still venerate and practice it, except for the Church of Milan, whose uninterrupted possession entitles it to preserve a Liturgy venerable for its pure origin, and a few others which, in evil days, separated themselves from the harmonious concert established throughout the Latin world by liturgical unity.

(p. 182)

Notes to Chapter VII

Note A

Veniens quidam de Sicilia mihi dixit, quod aliqui amici ejus, vel Græci vel Latini, nescio, quasi sub zelo sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ de meis dispositionibus murmurarent, dicentes: Quoniam Ecclesiam Constantinopolitanam disponit comprimere, qui ejus consuetudines per omnia sequitur. Qui cum dicerem: Quas consuetudines sequimur? respondit: Quia alleluia dici ad missas extra Pentecostes tempora fecistis; quia subdiaconos spoliatos procedere; quia Kyrie eleison dici; quia orationem Dominicam mox post canonem dici statuistis. Cui ego respondi: Quia in nullo eorum aliam Ecclesiam secuti sumus. Nam ut alleluia hic diceretur, de Hierosolymorum Ecclesia, ex beati Hieronymi traditione, tempore beatæ memoriæ Damasi Papæ, traditur tractum: et ideo magis in hac sede illam consuetudinem amputavimus, quæ hic a Græcis fuerat tradita. Subdiaconos autem ut spoliatos procedere facerem, antiqua consuetudo Ecclesiæ fuit. Sed quia placuit cuidam nostro Pontifici, nescio cui, qui eos vestitos procedere præcepit. Nam vestræ Ecclesiæ numquid traditionem a Græcis acceperunt? Unde habent ergo hodie, ut subdiaconi lineis in tunicis procedant, nisi quia hoc a matre sua Romana Ecclesia perceperunt? Kyrie eleison autem nos neque diximus neque dicimus, sicut a Græcis dicitur: quia in Græcis simul omnes dicunt; apud nos autem a clericis dicitur, et a populo respondetur, et totidem vicibus etiam Christe eleison dicitur, quod apud Græcos nullo modo dicitur. In quotidianis autem Missis alia quæ dici solent tacemus, tantummodo Kyrie eleison et Christe eleison dicimus, ut in his deprecationis vocibus paulo diutius occupemur. Orationem vero Dominicam idcirco mox post precem dicimus, quia mos apostolorum fuit, ut ad ipsam solummodo orationem oblationis hostiam consecrarent: et valde mihi inconveniens visum est, ut precem quam Scholasticus composuerat, super oblationem diceremus, et ipsam traditionem quam Redemptor noster composuit, super ejus corpus et sanguinem taceremus. Sed et Dominica oratio apud Græcos ab omni populo dicitur, apud nos vero a solo sacerdote. In quo ergo Græcorum consuetudines secuti sumus, qui aut veteres nostras reparavimus, aut novas et utiles constituimus, in quibus tamen alios comprobamur imitari? Ergo vestra charitas, cum occasio dederit,

ut ad Catanensem civitatem pergat, vel in Syracusana Ecclesia, eos quos credit aut intelligit, quia hac de re murmurare potuerunt, facta collatione doceat, et quasi alia ex occasione eos instruere non desistat. Nam de Constantinopolitana Ecclesia quod dicunt, quis eam *(p. 183)* dubitet Sedi Apostolicæ esse subjectam? Quod et piissimus domnus Imperator, et frater ejusdem civitatis Episcopus assidue profitentur. Tamen si quid boni vel ipsa vel altera Ecclesia habet, ego et minores meos quos ab illicitis prohibeo, in bono imitari paratus sum. Stultus est enim qui in eo se primum existimat, ut bona quæ viderit, discere contemnat.

(S. Gregorii Epist. ad Joannem Syracus., lib. IX, epist. XII.)

---

[1] Sed et Gelasianum codicem de missarum solemniis, multa subtrahens, pauca convertens, nonnulla vero adjiciens, pro exponendis Evangelicis lectionibus, in unius libri volumine coarctavit. (Joann. Diac. Vita S. Gregorii, lib. II, cap. XVII.)

[2] Nam et Gelasius Papa, in ordine LI, ita tam a se quam ab aliis compositas preces, dicitur ordinasse. Et Galliarum Ecclesiæ suis orationibus utebantur, quæ adhuc à multis habentur, et quia tam incertis auctoribus multa videbantur inserta, et sensus integritatem non habentia, curavit beatus Gregorius rationabilia quæque coadunare, et seclusis his, quæ vel nimia vel inconcinna videbantur, composuit librum qui dicitur Sacramentorum, sicut ex titulo ejus manifestissime declaratur: in quo si aliqua inveniuntur ad hunc sensum claudicantia, non ab illo inserta, sed ab aliis minus diligentibus postea credenda sunt superaddita. (Walafrid. Strabo. de Rebus Ecclesiast., cap. XXII.)

[3] In canone missæ apposuit: Diesque nostros, etc. (Joan. Diac., Vit. S. Gregorii M., lib. II, cap. XVII.)

[4] Ciacconi, Vitæ Pont. Rom., tom. I, page 404.

[5] Elsewhere we shall identify these Stations and describe in detail what was observed at them.

[6] Stationes per basilicas, vel sanctorum martyrum Cœmeteria secundum quod hactenus plebs Romana quasi eo vivente certatim discurrit, sollicitus ordinavit: per quas et ipse simul discurrens, dum adhuc eloqui prævaleret, viginti homilias Evangelii coram Ecclesia diverso tempore declamavit: reliquas vero ejusdem numeri dictavit quidem, sed lacessente stomacho languore continuo, aliis pronunciandas commisit. Sequebatur exercitus Domini ultra citraque Gregorium præeuntem, et audituræ verbum doctrinæ innumerabiles undique diversi sexus, ætatis ac professionis voluntariæ confluebant cohortes: quibus ille, utpote ductor cœlestis militiæ, cunctis duntaxat arma spiritalia suggerebat. (Joan. Diac., ibid., cap. XVIII et XIX.)

[7] These tablets still survive, perfectly preserved, beneath the portico of the present Basilica of Saint Peter.

[8] Super corpora beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum, missarum solemnia celebrari decrevit, acquisitis numerosissimis olivetis, quorum summam in tabulis marmoreis, præ foribus ejusdem basilicæ annotavit, luminaria superaddidit officia sedula deputavit. (Joan. Diac., ibid., cap. XX.)

[9] As is known, the Greeks sing Alleluia during Lent, and even at funerals.

[10] It should be known that consecrate, applied to the Eucharist in the Fathers' language, has a quite different sense from its meaning in present-day theology. It signifies a certain use of the holy Host in ordine ad communionem ("with a view to Communion"). Thus Saint Ambrose, in De officiis ministrorum ("On the Duties of Ministers"), has the deacon Saint Lawrence say that Pope Saint Sixtus entrusted him with the "Consecration of the Lord's Blood," Dominici Sanguinis consecrationem.

[11] See Note A.

[12] Deinde in domum Domini, more sapientissimi Salomonis propter musicæ compunctionem dulcedinis, Antiphonarium centonem cantorum studiosissimus nimis utiliter compilavit. (Joan. Diac., ibid., cap. VI.)

[13] Scholam quoque cantorum, quæ hactenus eisdem institutionibus in sancta Romana ecclesia modulatur, constituit: eique cum nonnullis prædiis duo habitacula, scilicet alterum sub gradibus basilicæ beati Petri Apostoli, alterum vero sub Lateranensis patriarchii domibus fabricavit: ubi usque hodie lectus ejus, in quo recubans modulabatur, et flagellum ipsius, quo pueris minabatur, veneratione congrua cum authentico Antiphonario reservatur. (Joan. Diac., ibidem.)

[14] III. Augustine's question. Why, though there is one faith, are the Churches' customs so different, with one custom of Masses in the Roman Church and another observed in the Churches of Gaul? Responsio Gregorii Papæ. Novit fraternitas tua Romanæ ecclesiæ consuetudinem, in qua se meminit enutritam. Sed mihi placet ut sive in sancta Romana, sive in Galliarum, sive in qualibet ecclesia, aliquid invenisti, quod plus omnipotenti Deo possit placere, sollicite eligas, et in Anglorum ecclesia, quæ adhuc in fide nova est, institutione præcipua quas de multis ecclesiis colligere potuisti infundas. Non enim pro locis res, sed pro bonis rebus loca nobis amanda sunt. (Labb. Concil., tom. V, pag. 1568.)

[15] The venerable John attended this synod and likewise confirmed the decrees of the Catholic faith. He was archcantor of Saint Peter's church and abbot of the monastery of blessed Martin. He had recently come from Rome by Pope Agatho's command, led by the most reverend Abbot Biscop, surnamed Benedict, whom we mentioned above. When this Benedict had built a monastery in Britain, in honor of the most blessed Prince of the Apostles, near the mouth of the river Wear, he went to Rome, as he had often done before, with Ceolfrid, his fellow worker and companion in that undertaking, who later succeeded him as abbot of that monastery. Pope Agatho of blessed memory received him honorably. To safeguard the freedom of the monastery he had founded, he asked for and received from him a letter of privileges confirmed by apostolic authority, in accordance with what he knew King Egfrid had desired and permitted; with that king's consent and grant of land he had built the monastery; accepit et præfactum Joannem abbatem in Britanniam

perducendum, quatenus in monasterio suo cursum canendi annuum, sicut ad sanctum Petrum Romæ agebatur, edoceret. Egitque abbas Joannes, ut jussionem acceperat Pontificis, et ordinem, videlicet, ritumque canendi ac legendi viva voce præfati monasterii cantores edocendo, et ea quæ totius anni circulus in celebratione dierum festorum poscebat, etiam litteris mandando: quæ hactenus in eodem monasterio servata, et a multis jam sunt circumquaque transcripta. (Bed., Hist. eccles., lib. IV, cap. XVIII.)

[16] Tertio decimo definitur decreto, ut uno eodemque modo dominicæ dispensationis in carne sacrosanctæ festivitates, in omnibus ad eas rite competentibus rebus, id est in baptismi officio, in missarum celebratione, in cantilena modo celebrentur, juxta exemplar videlicet quod scriptum de Romana habemus ecclesia. Itemque ut per gyrum totius anni natalitia sanctorum uno eodemque die, juxta martyrologium ejusdem Romanæ ecclesiæ, cum sua sibi convenienti psalmodia seu cantilena venerentur. (Concil. Cloveshaviæ II, can. XIII. Labb., tom. VI, pag. 1577.)

[17] After our letters have been delivered, you are to deliberate with the province's duke so that an assembly may be gathered of priests, judges, and all the leading men of that people; and, from the priests and ministers examined, to those whose promotion you have approved as having been canonical, and who hold or accept the rule of the right faith, his sacrificandi, et ministrandi, sive etiam psallendi ex figura, et traditione sanctæ apostolicæ, et Romanæ sedis ecclesiæ ordine tradetis potestatem (Capitulare Gregorii II, Labb. Concil., tom. VI, pag. 1452.)

[18] Ut loca singularum Ecclesiarum providentes, quomodo unusquisque sacerdos seu minister, erga ecclesiam debeat conservare, vel qualiter sacra missarum solemnia, sive cetera diurnarum, atque nocturnarum horarum officia, sive etiam lectionem sacrorum Novi atque Veteris Testamenti ordinabilia prædicamenta studeat observare, secundum traditum apostolicæ Sedis antiquitatis ordinem disponatis. (Ibidem.)

[19] Pro benedictionibus autem quas faciunt Galli, ut nosti, frater, multis vitiis variantur. Nam non ex apostolicà traditione hoc faciunt, sed per vanam gloriam hoc operantur, sibi ipsis damnationem adhibentes, dum scriptum est: Si quis vobis evangelizaverit præter id quod evangelizatum est, anathema sit. Regulam catholicæ traditionis suscepisti, frater amantissime: sic omnibus prædica, omnesque doce, sicut a sancta Romana, cui Deo auctore deservimus, accepisti ecclesia. (Zachariæ Papæ Epist. XII. Apud Labb., tom. VI, pag. 1526.)

[20] Liber diurnus, ch. III, tit. VII.

[21] Musæum Italicum, vol. I, p.196.

[22] Acta SS. Aprilis, vol. I, In Vita B. Notkeri Balbuli.

Chapter VIII. Digression on the History of the Other Western Liturgies: Ambrosian, African, Gallican, Gothic or Mozarabic, British, and Monastic

(p. 184)

[margin: The need for some account of the particular Liturgies.]

The needs of the history we are writing oblige us to interrupt our narrative and give some account here of various Liturgies already mentioned several times, some of which still exist. We shall devote this chapter to the Western Liturgies and the next to those of the East.

[margin: The Ambrosian Liturgy, the oldest in the West after the Roman.]

The oldest Western Liturgy after Rome's is that of Milan, known as the Ambrosian. If Jean Visconti[1] is to be believed, Saint Barnabas, whom the Milanese have venerated for several centuries as their apostle, arranged the order of Mass; Saint Mirocles, bishop of that same Church, regulated psalmody; and Saint Ambrose finally completed and perfected the whole. Unfortunately, these assertions entirely lack proof. It is much simpler to acknowledge that the origins of divine worship's forms in the Church of Milan coincide with those of Christianity itself. Had circumstances allowed other Churches of equal antiquity to retain their primitive usages, we should find the same uncertainty in them. Nevertheless, the name Ambrosian, always given to Milan's Liturgy, most certainly proves that so great a Doctor as Saint *(p. 185)* Ambrose, like all antiquity's most illustrious bishops, must have worked to correct his Church's Liturgy. We may therefore credit him with work analogous to that of Saints Gelasius and Gregory on the Roman Sacramentary. Yet Pamelius[2], without any proof whatsoever, specifically attributes to Saint Ambrose the composition of most Masses, prayers, and Prefaces in the present Ambrosian Missal. When the holy Doctor ascended the see of Milan, having received Baptism and the episcopate within a few days, he doubtless found a fully formed Liturgy. He must have applied himself to carrying it out before considering changes and improvements[3]. In volume two of the Musæum Italicum, Dom Mabillon lists the allusions in Saint Ambrose's various writings to contemporary liturgical usages, using them to establish, to a degree, the form of divine service in

sixth-century Milan[4]. Elsewhere he says the famous books On the Sacraments seem to underlie most Ambrosian rites[5]. This learned man, however, did not think fit to distinguish usages instituted by Saint Ambrose from those preceding him. That task would indeed have been very difficult, if not impossible. Nevertheless, besides instituting antiphonal chant in the West, Saint Ambrose can certainly be credited with many hymns enthusiastically welcomed by numerous Churches—so much so that, according to Walafrid Strabo[6], they were even sung at Mass in some places; moreover, *(p. 186)* the Masses of the martyrs whose bodies the holy bishop discovered—Saints Nazarius and Celsus, Gervasius and Protasius, Vitalis and Agricola; several Prefaces, which Walafrid Strabo calls Tractatus ("discourses") in the passage already cited; and the prayers for the Dedication of a church, consecration of the holy Oils, and blessing of the Paschal Candle, all headed with Saint Ambrose's name in the oldest Sacramentaries, and so forth. As for the prayers of preparation for Mass, Summe Sacerdos ("Supreme Priest") and Ad mensam dulcissimi ("To the table of the sweetest…"), included in Missals and Breviaries under Saint Ambrose's name, we see nothing that could justify that attribution. Our holy Doctor's Benedictine editors found the first in no manuscript, and the second in only one, no more than seven hundred years old.

[margin: Saint Ambrose's work on the Liturgy bearing his name.]

[margin: Frequent conformity of the Ambrosian Liturgy with the Roman.]

A noteworthy feature of the Ambrosian Liturgy is its frequent conformity with the Roman. Not only is the Canon almost entirely similar, but many Introits, prayers, Epistles, and Gospels are identical in the two Churches' Missals. The Breviary also offers several similarities of the same kind. It even seems that the Roman books were imitated at Milan with a very particular intention: the Ambrosian Missal contains Saint Anastasia's commemoration in the second Christmas Mass, a commemoration appropriate only to the Station held at her church in Rome, as we shall explain elsewhere[7]. The Canon also contains Saint Gregory's addition: And order our days in your peace. Must we attribute this conformity to *(p. 187)* a requirement of the Apostolic See, which would have wished the Church of Milan—within its primatial jurisdiction, like all Italy's Churches—to share at least something in its usages with the Church of Rome, especially the Canon? Or should we explain these shared rites and prayers by voluntary, perhaps reciprocal, borrowing? The Roman Church has always made a practice of adopting what seemed praiseworthy in others; Saint Gregory's Sacramentary contains several prayers headed with Saint Ambrose's name. Both hypotheses probably contain some truth. Since we shall describe the Ambrosian Mass and Office in their proper place, we shall confine ourselves here to a brief history of this rite's vicissitudes.

[margin: The origin of this resemblance.]

[margin: The Church of Milan, always jealous of its usages' integrity, defends them against Charlemagne.]

The Church of Milan has always jealously guarded the integrity of its usages. Charlemagne, having planned to establish the Roman rite in all the Western Churches, as we shall soon relate, wished to extend this forceful measure even to Milan. He was compelled to retreat, so profound was the veneration attached to Saint Ambrose's reputed work. A miracle even confirmed the clergy's and people's opposition, if we believe Landulf, historian of the Church of Milan, writing in 1080, whom Beroldus and Durand of Mende copied. According to this account, a bishop of Gaul named Eugene, Charlemagne's spiritual father, is said to have interceded with that prince at Rome itself to preserve the Ambrosian rite, which he called the Mystery of Mysteries. Opinions being divided, a fast and prayers are appointed, asking God to decide which of the two Sacramentaries should be preferred, the Gregorian *(p. 188)* or the Ambrosian. The two books, tied and sealed, are placed on Saint Peter's altar; whichever opens without being touched will be preferred. The church doors remain closed for three days. After this interval, they return to consult the Lord: suddenly, the basilica doors open of themselves. They approach the altar; the books are still motionless and closed. They groan and pray again. Suddenly both Sacramentaries open at once with a great noise. Then this cry resounds in the assembly: "Let the universal Church praise, preserve, and keep intact the Gregorian mystery and the

Ambrosian mystery!”

[margin: Heaven’s miraculous intervention in favor of the Ambrosian Liturgy.]

Muratori[8] regards this highly dramatic story, related by Dom Mabillon and Father Lebrun from the writers just cited, as suspect. He does not, however, dispute Charlemagne’s fruitless efforts to abolish the Ambrosian rite. We must also say that the Milanese scholar offers no evidence to support his judgment.

[margin: Nicholas II and Saint Peter Damian, acting on this Pontiff’s orders, try in vain to abolish the Ambrosian rite.]

Nicholas II, who in 1060 had attempted to abolish the Gothic rite in Spain, also tried to abolish the Ambrosian rite. He employed for this purpose the zeal of Saint Peter Damian, an energetic man capable of making the undertaking succeed, had success been possible. This great cardinal failed in his legation. Soon Nicholas II was replaced in Saint Peter’s Chair by Alexander II, a Milanese who did not disturb his compatriots’ enjoyment of their usages. We find no attempt against the Ambrosian Liturgy by Saint Gregory VII, so zealous in spreading the Roman rite.

At about this time, this Liturgy even experienced a measure of *(p. 189)* expansion, owing to the undeniable beauty of its formulas and the veneration inspired by its presumed author. In the Musæum Italicum, Dom Mabillon published several letters in which Paul and Gebehard, priests of the Church of Regensburg, addressed Martin, priest and treasurer of Saint Ambrose’s church in Milan, around 1024, asking him for the books of the Ambrosian Office to disseminate them in Germany[9]. Around the middle of the fourteenth century, Emperor Charles IV established this same Office of Milan in Saint Ambrose’s church in Prague[10]. The tripartite Sacramentary published by Abbot Gerbert in his Liturgia Alemannica[11], drawn from Saint Gall’s abbey, comprises the Ambrosian, Gelasian, and Gregorian Sacramentaries. These, however, are our only indications of any export of Ambrosian usages beyond Milan. Let us resume the history of the attacks they endured, down to their definitive recognition by the Holy See.

[margin: The Church of Milan’s Liturgy taken to Germany and later to Bohemia.]

[margin: Milan’s people rise to defend their Ambrosian rite against Cardinal Branda de Castiglione, Eugene IV’s legate.]

In the work cited above, Muratori relates that Cardinal Branda de Castiglione, sent to Lombardy as legate by Eugene IV in 1440, planned to abolish the Ambrosian rite. He went so far as to seize an ancient Sacramentary believed to come from Saint Ambrose himself, and on Christmas Day had Mass sung in the Roman rite in the holy Doctor’s own church. The enraged people immediately rushed to surround the legate’s residence, threatening to set it on fire unless he returned the Sacramentary he had taken. Frightened by this sedition, the cardinal threw the book out of the window and left the city the very next day.

Toward the end of that same century, in 1497, Alexander VI *(p. 190)* solemnly acknowledged and confirmed, in a Bull reproduced by Ughelli[12], the right of Milan’s dukes and people to celebrate according to the Ambrosian rite the Masses, ceremonies, chant, and Offices by day and night, without changing anything. The Pope admittedly specifies Saint Ambrose’s church and monastery, but does not expressly exclude the city’s and diocese’s other churches. Books for Ambrosian use were therefore gradually printed to meet these various churches’ needs. When Saint Pius V, in Bulls we shall soon discuss, exempted Churches whose Breviaries went back more than two centuries from the obligation to adopt the Roman books, the Ambrosian rite was thereby indirectly, yet effectively, recognized for Milan and its territory. With this right now clear, Saint Charles Borromeo protested vigorously when he learned that Milan’s governor had obtained a papal Brief authorizing him to have Mass said for him in the Roman rite in any church he chose to visit. His letter against this permission, addressed to a friend in Rome, is preserved as a relic in the Barnabites’ church of Saint Alexander in Milan. Father Lebrun published this letter; we place it at the end of this chapter[13]. It is not the only letter the pious cardinal wrote to Rome in defense of the Ambrosian Liturgy: several others are still kept in the Vatican Library. To explain his zeal in this matter, this great man used to say that the Ambrosian Liturgy was less Milanese than Roman, having received the Sovereign Pontiffs’ express approval so often[14].

[margin: Saint Pius V's Bulls publishing the Roman Breviary and Missal strengthen the Milanese Church's right rather than weaken it. Saint Charles Borromeo's zeal for preserving the Ambrosian rite.]

[margin: Alexander VI confirms the Ambrosian rite.]

(p. 191)

[margin: The Milanese people's attachment to their Liturgy carried to intolerance even toward the Roman.]

Such has always been the Milanese people's zeal for preserving their rite. They have, moreover, kept its integrity fairly faithfully, apart from adding many saints' feasts. Yet we may say they carry intolerance toward other Liturgies, the Roman included, beyond the most exclusive conduct ever charged against the Apostolic See. One example will allow readers to judge our statement's truth. In 1837 we were in Rome and had just celebrated the holy mysteries at the Confessio of Saint Peter, when a canon of Milan's cathedral appeared with a Milanese cleric. The latter carried an Ambrosian Missal and placed it on the altar beneath which the whole world venerates the mortal remains of the Prince of the Apostles. The Milanese canon immediately began Mass and peacefully completed it according to that foreign rite. A few months later we ourselves were in Milan and asked to celebrate the holy sacrifice over Saint Ambrose's body. We were shown a formal regulation forbidding the holy mysteries to be offered on that altar in any form except the Ambrosian; the Roman rite was not excepted. We therefore had to sacrifice our pious wish.

[margin: The disadvantage of particular Liturgies felt even in Milan.]

[margin: This Church has not dared to pay liturgical honor to Saint Gregory VII.]

Moreover, the usual disadvantage of particular Liturgies has been felt in Milan as elsewhere. Secular power was bound to claim oversight of forms that are merely national, rather than common to all the Churches. Naples, Florence, and Venice celebrate Saint Gregory VII's feast despite their rulers' displeasure, often openly expressed. These Churches enjoy this freedom because they are bound to the Roman Breviary published by the Holy See. The Church of Milan has not yet dared to pay liturgical honor to the great Pontiff whom enlightened Europe today proclaims the heroic vindicator of human dignity and civilization. Like our Churches of France, it has not *(p. 192)* obeyed the Roman Pontiff's injunction a century ago that all Churches of the Latin rite solemnly commemorate the glorious Hildebrand. These Churches lacked the strength that unity and universality of forms alone can give, and that those same qualities maintain even when courage fails.

[margin: The African Church, daughter of the Roman Church like Milan's.]

After the Church of Milan, daughter of the Roman Church[15], founded in the apostolic age, comes the Church of Africa, which likewise owes its origin to the See of Rome, during Hadrian's reign[16]. This Church, one of the Western patriarchate's principal divisions, comprised the province called Consularis, whose capital was Carthage, as well as Mauretania and Numidia. Its origin sufficiently indicates the conformity that must have existed, at least to some degree, between its liturgical usages and the Roman Church's.

[margin: The African Liturgy must originally have conformed to the Roman, although this cannot be proved from that Church's Fathers.]

Some fragments or allusions in Tertullian, Saint Cyprian, and Saint Augustine seem to correspond quite closely to Roman liturgical forms; others diverge more or less. Admittedly, the Roman Liturgy in these writers' time must have differed somewhat from its appearance in the work of Saints Gelasius and Gregory. Be that as it may, writers of great weight maintain that the African and Roman Liturgies' original identity is beyond doubt[17]. It has been asserted, without proof, that Saint Augustine introduced Milan's Liturgy into Africa. In any case, that fact could not prove that the Roman Liturgy was not followed in Africa before Saint Augustine. Moreover, it did not rest with the bishop of Hippo alone *(p. 193)* to change the usages of all Africa's Churches, so numerous and so attached to their ancient practices. In any case, we think the African Liturgy's conformity with the Roman did not prevent it from having and retaining certain particular usages, whose traces we find in the writers already cited, to whom we may add Marius Mercator and Saint

Fulgentius. Moreover, what was the order of the Sacramentary published by Voconius around 460, thirty years after Saint Augustine's death? How did it conform to the Church of Rome's? How did it differ? The question seems insoluble to us. Yet nowhere in antiquity do we find a trace of an African Liturgy: tradition speaks only of Rome, Milan, Gaul, and Spain. We shall therefore maintain our opinion until new discoveries compel us to abandon it.

[margin: III. The Gallican Liturgy has a distinctively Eastern character, recalling the origins of Gaul's first apostles.]

The Church of Gaul's Liturgy differs too greatly from the Roman for us to believe it derived from it. On the contrary, we have every reason to judge its origin Eastern. First, it closely resembles the Eastern Churches' rites in itself; considering the lands from which Gaul's first apostles came readily explains this conformity. Saint Trophimus, founder of the Church of Arles, was Saint Paul's disciple; Saint Crescens, likewise that holy Apostle's disciple, preached in Gaul; Saints Pothinus and Irenaeus, apostles of Lyon, came from Asia, as did Saint Saturninus, apostle of Toulouse. Finally, the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyon to those of Asia and Phrygia, together with all these facts, incontestably shows that Gaul's Churches are daughters of the East: their Liturgy must therefore be so too. Undoubtedly, all these apostles passed through Rome, the center of every legitimate *(p. 194)* mission: for such is the tradition of all our Churches. Yet it would not have been natural, in that age of conquests, for the Apostolic See to put imprudent obstacles in the way of the courageous preachers whom the East sent to the West, imposing usages different from those they had drawn from the regions they left to evangelize with such zeal. We showed above how tendencies toward liturgical unity, until then held in check by circumstances, developed once peace had been given to the Churches.

[margin: The splendor and destiny of this Liturgy.]

Together with the Ambrosian, then, the Gallican Liturgy is one of the most precious monuments of the Church's earliest age; we shall describe its details as occasions arise. We shall soon recount its destruction through the combined efforts of the Apostolic See and the Carolingian princes. We shall therefore suspend what remains to be said about this important Liturgy. Our illustrious Mabillon described all its splendor in a special work[18], reproducing the mutilated remnants of the books containing it. If time and space permitted, we should gladly recount the Gallican rite's solemn splendor as it appears in Saint Sidonius Apollinaris and Saint Gregory of Tours. Yet we cannot resist offering the reader a picture of the sixth-century Church of Paris, drawn by Saint Venantius Fortunatus in praise of Saint Germanus and his clergy. It displays the gravity and majesty of the divine Office, harmonious psalmody, and the use of organs, flutes, and trumpets to accompany sacred chant[19]. In the preceding chapters we gave the names of the liturgical writers to whom the Gallican Church *(p. 195)* owed the beauty and eloquence of its sacred formulas.

[margin: Spain's Gothic or Mozarabic Liturgy.]

[margin: Scholarly controversies over its origin.]

The Church of Spain now presents its liturgical usages for our examination. Were we to explore in these Institutions every question concerning the Mozarabic rite's origins, an entire volume would not suffice to set out and resolve this subject's many difficulties. We must therefore limit ourselves here to a few observations.

[margin: Affinity between the earliest liturgical usages of Rome and Spain.]

The first disputed question concerns the Liturgy originally celebrated in Spain after Christianity was established there. Several writers, foremost among them the learned Father Lebrun[20], maintain that the Roman Church's usages were first observed in Spain. They appeal to that Church's foundation by the seven bishops sent by Saint Peter, and to canons of ancient Spanish councils showing several practices identical to Rome's in force: Saturday fasting, reading only one Epistle at Mass, and so forth. The learned Father Pinius, in his excellent dissertation prefacing the sixth July volume of the Acta Sanctorum, and Flórez, in a dissertation on the same subject[21] in his Spagna Sagrada, also acknowledge the Roman origin of Spain's earliest Liturgy[22]. They are vigorously opposed by the Jesuit Lesleus, whose remarkable preface to the Mozarabic Missal we have already cited[23]. The latter *(p. 196)* relies on canons of various fifth- and

sixth-century Spanish councils that mention features of the divine Office seemingly more consistent with the Mozarabic Office than with Rome's. Yet one may apparently say, with some show of reason, that these facts do not prove that the Roman Church's usages were not originally those of the Church of Spain. No one has ever claimed that any Church could then conform its usages to Rome's with the rigor possible today. Moreover, very few monuments remain from which to establish the precise state of Rome's Liturgy, whether Mass or the divine Offices, before Saints Gelasius and Gregory. We may add that no stronger evidence of the affinity between Roman and Spanish liturgical usages could be given than Pope Vigilius's sending the Order of the Roman Mass to Profuturus, bishop of Braga, in 538. Certainly no pope ever sent anything similar to the patriarch of Constantinople or Alexandria. Spain's bishops must therefore have appealed to the Apostolic See as the source of their liturgical traditions. This conjecture is all the more certain because, as related above, thirty years later a Spanish council decreed that all priests should celebrate the holy mysteries in the form the Apostolic See had given Bishop Profuturus.

[margin: The Gothic invasion brings Eastern rites into Spain.]

Now, considering the Spanish Churches' Liturgy in the form established by Saint Leander, Saint Isidore, and the other liturgical writers mentioned in the preceding chapter, one cannot but be struck by its complete dissimilarity to the Roman Church's customs. The very name Gothic that it already bears *(p. 197)* attests an entirely different origin. Here again a fresh controversy arises between Father Lesleus and Fathers Lebrun and Pinius. True to his system, the former maintains that the features constituting the so-called Gothic rite have been practiced in Spain from remotest antiquity. The others, however, have firmly established that Eastern rites were introduced into Spain by the Goths, who conquered it at the beginning of the fifth century and established so firm and imposing a dominion there. These barbarians, as Philostorgius[24], Sozomen[25], and Theodoret[26] tell us, embraced Christianity during their wanderings through Asia Minor. Their famous bishop Ulphilas, who translated the holy Gospels into the Goths' language, came to Constantinople. There, unhappily, he imbibed the errors of Arianism, then dominant in that capital under Valens's protection. Yet he must also have become more familiar with the Greek Liturgy, the only one the Goths knew, since they had been converted to Christianity in the East. A letter of Saint John Chrysostom[27] then shows his special care for the Gothic Church, to which he even gave a bishop named Unilas. It is natural to believe that this bishop, coming from Constantinople, would have practiced its Liturgy. Once the Goths were established in Spain, we find previously unknown relations arising between the Church of that Peninsula and Constantinople's. In the sixth century Saint Martin of Braga translated conciliar canons from Greek into Latin for Spanish use, thereby occasioning the establishment of many *(p. 198)* liturgical practices prescribed by these canons, most of which were drawn up at Eastern councils. Around the same time John, later abbot of Biclar and bishop of Girona, a Goth by nation, spent seventeen years in Constantinople and became very learned there. Saint Leander too lived several years in Constantinople. There he became a close friend of Saint Gregory the Great, then resident as the Apostolic See's apocrisiarius, and of John the Faster, patriarch of Constantinople, whose intimacy with Saint Leander led him to dedicate a short liturgical work on Baptism to him.

[margin: The Goths' complete conversion to orthodoxy at the Third Council of Toledo in 589 settles the triumph of Eastern rites in Spain. Saint Leander, chief compiler of the Gothic Liturgy, which alone prevails in the Iberian Peninsula.]

Since the Goths conquered Spain and brought their own liturgical usages, the pre-conquest Liturgy could not long remain unmixed; everything even suggested it would eventually succumb. This transformation doubtless had its stages. Protests must have arisen both from councils and from the Apostolic See: Pope Vigilius's letter to Profuturus naturally belongs here, as does the Council of Braga of 563, cited above. One great event settled the Gothic Liturgy's complete triumph over the earlier one: the whole Gothic nation's conversion to orthodoxy at the Third Council of Toledo in 589. Saint Leander, who was, so to speak, the author of this great work, was also the chief compiler of the Gothic Liturgy, which henceforth became Spain's sole Liturgy. It is natural to think that the preference he and subsequent liturgical writers gave Eastern forms, hitherto the only ones the Goths followed, arose from the need to attach them more securely

to the ancient Spanish Church's Creed, removing everything that might prove a temptation to *(p. 199)* a still wavering faith. As just stated, moreover, the transformation of the two rites was already virtually accomplished even before the Council of Toledo. After that great event, however, the Spanish Church, now wholly Gothic, worked to unite all its provinces in the same usages. This was the intention behind the Fourth Council of Toledo's canon of 633, whose express provisions we quoted above in chapter VI.

[margin: The Gothic Liturgy's relations with the Roman and Gallican Liturgies.]

The Gothic Liturgy did not, however, consist solely of a body of Eastern prayers. It occasionally contains prayers, responsories, and feasts of wholly Roman origin, though few in number, indicating the earliest source of Spain's sacred rites. Its many analogies with the Gallican Liturgy have also occasioned controversy among scholars treating the Gothic Liturgy. Some, such as Fathers Lesleus and Pinius in the works already cited, maintain that the Gallican Liturgy issued from the Gothic. Others, including Dom Mabillon[28] and Father Lebrun, prove against them that the Gallican Liturgy predates the period when the Gothic must have taken shape.

We have indeed shown the Eastern origin of Gaul's principal Churches. This sufficiently explains a Liturgy there entirely different from Rome's and consequently similar in some respects to the Gothic, which has the same source. We have named the Gallican Liturgy's principal authors—Saint Hilary, Musaeus, Saint Sidonius Apollinaris, and others—who certainly did not seek in Spain the ancient usages they corrected and reformed rather than instituted. Moreover, one could not explain *(p. 200)* such close influence of Spain's Church upon Gaul's. No historical monument would justify it; no kind of primacy of either Church over the other would even make it possible. The Fourth Council of Toledo's canon admittedly provides that one order of prayer and psalmody be kept among us throughout Spain and Gaul. Yet everyone knows that this can mean only Narbonese Gaul, then subject to the same laws as Spain. Besides the Gallican rite's having been formulated long before this council and remaining generally different from the Gothic rite proper on many points, it would be absurd to suppose that Narbonese Gaul induced the other Gallic provinces to adopt all its usages. On the contrary, the undeniable relations between the Gallican and Gothic rites must be explained by the latter's compilers' very reasonable intention to retain or insert something analogous to Narbonese Gaul's usages. The same motive led them to retain several Roman formulas and feasts and to preserve Eastern prayers as the Gothic Liturgy's principal foundation.

We shall conclude our discussion of the Gothic Liturgy, later called Mozarabic after the name given Christians living under Moorish rule, with two observations:

[margin: The Gothic Church establishes liturgical unity within itself but cannot guarantee its books' orthodoxy. Only the Roman Liturgy is free from]

[margin: all error.]

1. Spain's Gothic Church established liturgical unity within itself, owing this advantage to its bishops' zeal and kings' protection. Yet although it could make uniform prayer resound in all its churches, it could not always guarantee those prayers' complete purity and orthodoxy. Only the Roman Liturgy is free from all error, like the Church that *(p. 201)* promulgates it. Toward the end of the eighth century Felix, bishop of Urgell, and Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo, briefly troubled the Church by preaching a heresy that would have taken Christianity back to Arius's impious dogmas. Not content with false quotations from the Fathers, they invoked the Spanish Liturgy's authority, producing passages applying adoptive and adoption to Jesus Christ. They added that Saints Eugene, Ildephonsus, and Julian, bishops of Toledo, had recited and therefore approved these prayers. Felix and Elipandus may also themselves have altered the passages. Either way, in both hypotheses the danger of national Liturgies was fully exposed. The bishops assembled at Frankfurt in 794 understood this. Their following words eloquently show that only one Liturgy can be cited as truly and necessarily pure and orthodox: the Roman Church's.

[margin: Late in the eighth century Felix, bishop of Urgell, and Elipandus, archbishop of Toledo, preach a heresy like Arianism and seek support for it in Gothic liturgical texts.]

[margin: The reply of the council held at Frankfurt in 794.]

"It is better," they tell the two faithless bishops, "to believe God the Father's testimony about his own Son than your Ildephonsus's, who composed for you, in the solemn celebrations of Masses, prayers such as the universal and holy Church of God does not have; nor do we think you are heard in them. And if your Ildephonsus called Christ adoptive in his prayers, our Gregory, Pontiff of the Roman See and most illustrious Doctor throughout the world, always called him the Only Begotten in his prayers without hesitation[29]."

The Council Fathers *(p. 202)* then cite several prayers from the Gregorian Sacramentary.

[margin: Alcuin writes against Felix and refutes him by the Roman Liturgy's authority.]

Shortly afterward Alcuin composed a treatise in seven books against Felix, duly refuting the objection these sectarians drew from the Gothic Missal's prayers.

"Whether you have presented these same testimonies altered or as they were spoken by those men," he tells Felix, "is of little concern. For we wish to be supported more by Roman than Spanish authority in the truth of our assertion and faith, though we do not reject those testimonies insofar as what they say is Catholic. Let each man know himself refuted insofar as he dissents from the universal Church. Thus the Roman Church, which Catholics and right believers are shown to be obliged to follow, customarily professes, both in the solemn celebrations of Masses and in all its other writings or letters, that he who deigned to become man for our salvation and undergo the torment of the Cross is the true Son of God[30]."

Alcuin then cites prayers from the Christmas Mass, Wednesday of Holy Week, and so forth. This event led Spain's bishops to watch strictly over the Gothic Liturgy's purity; today these *(p. 203)* books retain no trace of the errors or inaccuracies charged against them in the eighth century. Rome had nevertheless been disturbed: in 918, when Ordoño, king of León, and Sisenand, bishop of Compostela, sent a priest named John to the Apostolic See, a dispute arose over the Gothic Missal. Certifying its full orthodoxy required the judgment of a Roman council held before the Pope, which carefully examined this Missal's prayers[31]. We shall soon see the Apostolic See's solicitude again alarmed by the dangers of this great Church's particular Liturgy and finally decreeing its abolition.

[margin: A council assembles at Rome in 918 to examine the Gothic Missal.]

[margin: An antiliturgical principle admitted by the Council of Braga of 563: only Psalms and Scriptures may be sung in churches, with no poetic composition.]

2. Spain's Gothic Church, which so unhappily experienced the dangers that will always threaten a particular Liturgy's orthodoxy, also saw arise within itself a false opinion we shall encounter elsewhere. Its application would destroy the Liturgy's traditional character. The Council of Braga held in 563 states in its twelfth canon:

"It was also resolved that, apart from the Psalms or the canonical Scriptures of the New and Old Testaments, nothing poetically composed should be sung in church, as the holy canons also prescribe[32]."

The Council Fathers doubtless allude to a provision of the Council of Laodicea, in 300, ordering the rejection of certain psalms that had been fabricated and circulated among the people[33]. Yet the wise and precise measure *(p. 204)* of the Council of Laodicea had nothing in common with Braga's vague and general prohibition. The latter, moreover, would not halt the Gothic Liturgy's development and was vigorously condemned by the Fourth Council of Toledo's protest. Here are its words in canon XIII, entitled De non renuendo pronunciare Hymnos ("On not refusing to sing hymns").

[margin: The Fourth Council of Toledo's protest.]

"For the singing of hymns too, we have the example of the Savior and the Apostles. For the Lord himself is reported to have sung a hymn, as Matthew the Evangelist testifies: And after singing a hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives (Matt. XXVI). And the Apostle Paul wrote to the Ephesians, saying: Be filled with the Spirit, speaking in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs (Eph. V). Certain hymns are known to have been composed by human effort in praise of God and to celebrate the triumphs of the Apostles and Martyrs, such as those published by the most blessed Doctors Hilary and Ambrose. Yet some specifically reject them because they do not come from the canonical Scriptures or apostolic tradition. Let them therefore reject also that hymn composed by men which we say daily in the public and private Office at the end of all the psalms: Glory and honor to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, for ever and ever. Amen. As for the hymn the Angels sang when Christ was born in the flesh—Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to people of good will—the ecclesiastical Doctors composed the remainder that follows there. Thus this hymn too must not be sung in churches, because it is not found in the books of Holy Scripture. Hymns, then, are composed just as Masses are composed, or prayers or orations, or commendatory prayers, or the laying on of hands; and if none *(p. 205)* of these are said in the Church, all ecclesiastical Offices fall idle[34]."

This wise canon vindicated true liturgical principles. There is no sign that this indiscreet zeal for making Holy Scripture the Liturgy's sole material ventured to manifest itself again in Spain thereafter. We shall soon encounter it in France.

In the preceding two chapters we took care to collect the names and works of the liturgical writers of Spain's Gothic Church. Later we shall have occasion to describe its rites and Offices in detail.

[margin: The British Isles' Churches must have received their earliest Liturgy from Rome, but seem later to have imitated Gallican rites.]

If we now turn to the British Isles to investigate the Liturgy observed there before the Roman rite's establishment, we find great difficulty in saying anything certain. This Liturgy must originally have come from Rome, since the faith was planted among the Britons by missionaries sent in the second century by Pope Saint Eleutherius at the request of a king of that island named Lucius. At that time, however, the Roman Liturgy must still have been in its infancy. Transplanted to so remote a region and soon isolated from its source, it must have undergone more than one alteration, or at least developments suited to the country's customs. There are also grounds for thinking that the Gallican Liturgy may have supplied its forms, more or less completely, to these islands' Churches. Saints Patrick, Germanus of Auxerre, and Lupus of Troyes, whose influence upon the British Isles' Churches was so great, were, as we know, Gauls, or at least had been educated in Gaul. Saint Augustine's question to Saint Gregory about the diversity of *(p. 206)* Liturgies, and the Pope's reply allowing him to combine Roman and Gallican rites, seem to show quite clearly that Saint Augustine found traces of the latter on the island he was evangelizing. Although largely fallen back into idolatry after the Saxon invasion, it still preserved a small remnant of the Britons' ancient Church. As for Ireland considered separately, Mabillon thinks that when Saint Bernard, in Saint Malachy's life, recounts how this great bishop exchanged the island's Christians' barbarous customs for Roman usages, we should understand that a particular rite had been preserved there until then[35]. We have elsewhere discussed the Antiphonary of Benchor monastery, published by Muratori, the sole surviving remnant of the liturgical forms anciently observed in Ireland.

[margin: V. The monastic or Benedictine Liturgy, as Saint Benedict fixed it, spreads with his Rule throughout the West's monasteries.]

Finally, we must discuss the monastic or Benedictine Liturgy. Just as Saint Benedict's Rule almost immediately replaced the monastic Rules preceding it in the West, so the form of Office established in it soon succeeded the other orders of psalmody hitherto observed in monasteries. We shall detail this Liturgy's distinctive features elsewhere, but must first explain why the monastic Office's form differs from that of Rome's Offices.

[margin: The holy patriarch knowingly departs from Roman usages.]

The very text of Saint Benedict's Rule shows that this holy patriarch deliberately departed from Roman usages, as when he says: "Every day at Lauds a canticle from the Prophets shall be sung, namely the same one as chanted by the Roman Church, sicut psallit Ecclesia Romana[36]."

Amalarius Fortunatus says on this subject: "Therefore we must by no means say that *(p. 207)* such a Father arranged everything without mystery. And just as the clerical Office does not prejudice the monastic, so, reciprocally, the monastic confirms the clerical[37]."

[margin: Reasons for these differences according to Amalarius, Fortunatus, Walafrid Strabo, and Honorius of Autun.]

Walafrid Strabo explains this difference in Offices: "Also praiseworthy," he says, "is the order of Offices the blessed Father Benedict established for monks to observe: those distinguished from others by their profession should also strive, in fulfilling the duty of continual service, to render something more than others[38]."

Honorius of Autun, in turn explaining this divergence, adds another consideration: "It is asked why Saint Benedict arranged the Hours for monks differently from the Church's custom, or why Gregory, foremost among the popes, approved this by his authority. But we must know that this was most wisely provided for, since it was the work of a man filled with the Spirit of all the just: namely, that the contemplative life should be distinguished from the active in Office as in habit, and the religious observance of monastic discipline commended by this privilege[39]."

Thus we see that the Apostolic See has always sanctioned the form *(p. 208)* of the Benedictine Office as a precious remnant of antiquity and a monument of monastic piety, which must appear especially in the unceasing celebration of the divine Offices.

[margin: Points of contact between the monastic and Roman Liturgies.]

On the other hand, to show its attachment to the Roman Church, the Benedictine Order early made it a duty to complete its body of Offices by adopting, along with the Roman Calendar's feasts, all the pieces of the Gregorian Responsorial compatible with the monastic Office's form. As for the holy sacrifice of the Mass, it has always and everywhere used the Roman Sacramentaries and Antiphonaries. Several ancient manuscripts of Europe's principal monasteries show, however, that until a fairly recent period the monks' Sacramentaries, though formed mostly from the Gregorian, had retained various elements of the Gelasian.

[margin: Families of monks following the monastic Liturgy.]

The monastic Liturgy is followed by all the families of monks observing Saint Benedict's Rule. This means not only the Black Monks properly so called, but also the Camaldolese, Cistercians, Olivetans, Vallombrosans, Celestines, and even Carthusians, although the latter have retained various customs of their own.

[margin: Conclusions.]

We shall conclude this chapter by bringing out, as is our custom, the inferences suggested by the facts it has set forth.

First, we see that several Liturgies more or less different from the Roman Liturgy have existed in the West, and some still exist; but these Liturgies go back to a very high antiquity;

Second, that these particular Liturgies have always tended to merge more or less into the Roman; *(p. 209)* Third, that their character as particular Liturgies has often exposed them to the danger of alteration and corruption;

Fourth, that in liturgical matters it is a false and contradictory notion to insist on using only the words of Holy Scripture in the divine Offices, excluding the language of tradition;

Fifth, that in all Churches the Liturgy has always been considered a matter of capital importance, in which clergy and people took the most ardent interest; hence it could not be touched without arousing considerable disturbances.

(p. 210)

Notes to Chapter VIII

Note A

Excerpt from a letter of Saint Charles Borromeo to Monsignor César Speciano, Apostolic Protonotary, in Rome. (Lebrun, Explication de la Messe, vol. II.)

M. R. S. I owe and maintain such respect for our Holy Father that he may be assured I shall always take favorably whatever he orders. Yet I feel bound to represent to him how contrary to God's service would be the consequences I foresee from the decision wrested with little sincerity and with aims ill suited to His Holiness's goodwill. I say this concerning the Brief granted, as you inform me, to the governor, allowing him to have Mass said according to the Roman rite in every church he visits. Unless our Holy Father remedies this concession, I am convinced it will cause many difficulties you yourself can foresee, given the use he may make of the permission he has obtained with such eagerness.

This city has many churches of religious where Mass may be heard according to Roman usage. His Holiness had already allowed him to have it said in his chapel, and I have never refused him similar permission. What can have led him now to abuse His Holiness's goodness to obtain something he never thought of requesting in his many years as governor, any more than his predecessors, the King, this State's sovereigns, or even the legates who have passed through or resided here, as far as I can know? I can cite an example I witnessed: Cardinal Moroni, although a legate with full authority, came to the Duomo and heard a Low Mass according to the Ambrosian rite. The Apostolic Visitor has never said Mass there, to avoid introducing into this church a usage different from its ancient one.

When necessary for the convenience of visiting priests or religious collecting alms, I have readily allowed them to say Mass according to their rite in places in the diocese with no church or chapel of the Roman rite. Although I have done so with restrictions, this has sometimes caused murmuring and displeasure among the clergy. Once, to favor a religious's devotion, I allowed him to say it in Milan's church of Saint Ambrose, only in an obscure and secluded chapel; such an outcry was *(p. 211)* raised and so many depositions were made that I was at once obliged to revoke my permission, so that it had no effect.

I leave it to be judged what this permission would produce when granted to so important a magistrate as the governor, who would use it without any need in the city's principal churches, where he is accustomed to go with a large company, especially on feast days and when there is music..... You will speak to our Holy Father in accordance with this letter, so that he may remedy this concession.....

From the Valley of Gerça, November 12, 1578.

Note B

Glory of an honored company, ranks of a great order, Fathers I cherish in heart, in faith, in reverence: Though long my plectrum lay forgotten, its song unused, You compel me to renew my ancient lyre. You urge my numb fingers to touch the strings, Though my hand moves awkwardly in its unfamiliar art. My tongue now echoes words made rough with rust, And a hoarse din comes from my unpolished mouth. A whetstone can scarcely give an edge through old rust, Nor does color gleam on bronze stained with smoke. But since your sweetness strikes and presses like a hammer, And care, struck back as on an anvil, wears me down, And you kindle the furnace of my breast with fire, From which heat is supplied within my heart's stronghold, I obey: for, as though fired anew in a furnace, Your love has driven me to the service of my art. The lofty,

potent dignity of the Parisian clergy, The Church's genius, glory, gift, and honor, Sings divine poems in the song of David, Sweetly repeating its work in unceasing rounds. There the priests shine; here the order of Levites, Gray hair covers the former, fair vesture the latter. Those are pale; a blush plays on these faces, And lilies gleam white, mixed with ruddy roses. Those are white with age, these with fine garments, That a many-colored wreath may please God Most High. In their midst is Germanus, honored as bishop, Guiding the young here, sustaining the old there. The Levites lead; the grave order follows their guidance; By his steps he moves these; by his direction draws those. Yet he himself walks gently, like another Aaron, Not splendid in dress, but pleasing in piety.

(p. 212) Neither gems nor scarlet deck his turban; gold, purple, linen Do not adorn his shoulders; life-giving faith shines. He is a far better priest than under the ancient Law, For he worships realities that were formerly a shadow. Holding future things great, rejecting all things present, Free of the flesh before his flesh falls at its end. Anxious lest the wolves' fury devour anyone, The bountiful shepherd gathers sheep into the folds. Called by ceaseless warnings to savory pastures, The flock knows his voice and runs, following in love. The soldier, swift to arms, when the signal rings in his ears, Shakes off sleep and raises his limbs from bed. He hastens before the others, seeking the sacred mysteries, From every quarter each must seek the churches from his place. With burning zeal the house waters all the people, They urge each other, vying to see who can go first. Joining sleepless nights to the first light of dawn, The venerable throng forms angelic choirs. Steadfast in holy work, with resolute steps, It wields the weapons of song to storm heaven. Weaving the psalter's warp with lyre-like melody, It draws out in love the song woven in verses. Here a boy tunes instruments with slender pipes; There an old man pours a full trumpet blast from his mouth. Cymbal-like voices blend with piercing reeds, And the pipe sounds sweet in varied strains. A boy's flute soothes the old men's hoarse drums, And men's melodious words renew the lyre. One melody draws gently, another sweeps along with vigor; Thus the work varies with sex and age. Christ's busy threshing floor threshes the wheat, For it is to build the granaries of God. Remembering the Creator's words: blessed are those Whom the Lord finds watchful when he himself returns. In their merits, spirit, virtue, and faith, What lights lie hidden under the cloak of the body! At the bishop's urging clergy, people, and child sing psalms; Thus, with brief labor, he will be filled with fruit. This army is blessed under Germanus as its leader. Moses, stretch out your hands and help your camp.

(Venantii Fortunati opera, bk. II, ch. XIII. Luchi edition.)

Note C

De hymnis etiam canendis, et Salvatoris et Apostolorum habemus exemplum: nam et ipse Dominus hymnum dixisse perhibetur, Matthæo Evan- *(p. 213)* gelista testante: Et hymno dicto, exierunt in montem Oliveti. (Matth. XXVI.) Et Paulus Apostolus ad Ephesios scripsit, dicens: Implemini Spiritu, loquentes vos in psalmis, et hymnis, et canticis spiritualibus. (Ephes. V.) Et quia nonnulli hymni humano studio in laudem Dei, atque Apostolorum et Martyrum triumphos compositi esse noscuntur, sicut hi quos beatissimi Doctores Hilarius atque Ambrosius ediderunt, quos tamen quidam specialiter reprobant, pro eo quod de Scripturis sanctorum canonum, vel apostolica traditione non existunt; respuant ergo et illum hymnum ab hominibus compositum, quem quotidie publico privatoque Officio, in fine omnium psalmorum dicimus: Gloria et honor Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui sancto, in secula seculorum. Amen. Nam et ille hymnus, quem, nato in carne Christo, Angeli cecinerunt: Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis; reliqua quæ ibi sequuntur, ecclesiastici Doctores composuerunt. Ergo nec idem in Ecclesiis Scanendus est, quia in Scripturarum sanctarum libris non invenitur. Componuntur ergo hymni, sicut componuntur missæ, sive preces vel orationes, sive commendationes, seu manus impositiones: ex quibus si nulla dicantur in Ecclesia, vacant Officia omnia ecclesiastica. (Concil. Toletanum IV, canon. XIII.)

[1] De Ritibus Missæ, bk. II, ch. XII.

[2] Liturgia, vol. I, p. 451.

[3] Lebrun, Explication de la Messe, vol. II, p. 176.

[4] Musæum Italicum, vol. I, p. 101.

[5] De Liturgia Gallicana, bk. I, ch. 2, no. 7, p. 8.

[6] De Rebus ecclesiasticis, ch. XXV.

[7] This commemoration no longer appears in Cardinal Gaysruk's Missal, printed in 1830. Besides the manuscripts, however, this characteristic fact is supported by the Gothic Missal, in quarto, printed at Milan in 1500, and several subsequent Missals.

[8] Antiquitates Italiæ, vol. IV, p. 834.

[9] Musæum Italicum, vol. I, pp. 95-99.

[10] Gerbertus, Vetus Liturgia Alemannica, vol. I, p. 63.

[11] Ibidem, vol. II.

[12] Italia Sacra, Ecclesia Mediolanen., vol. IV, p. 385.

[13] See Note A.

[14] Sala, Not. in Bonæ Rerum liturgic., bk. I, ch. X, p. 185.

[15] S. Petri Damiani, Opusc. V, vol. III, p. 78.

[16] Schelestrate, Antiquitas Ecclesiæ illustrata, vol. II.

[17] Bona, Rerum liturgicarum, bk. I, ch. VII, § III. Lebrun, Explication de la Messe, vol. II, p. 157.

[18] De Liturgia Gallicana libri III. 1685.

[19] See Note B.

[20] Explication de la Messe, vol. II, dissertation V, art. 1.

[21] Tractatus historico-chronologicus de Liturgia antiqua Hispanica, ch.1.

[22] Spagna Sagrada, vol. III, pp. 187 ff.

[23] Missale mixtum secundum Regulam Beati Isidori, dictum Mozarabes, furnished with a preface, notes, and appendix by Alexander Lesleus, S.J., priest. Rome, 1755.

[24] Bk. II, no.5, ed. Vales., p. 470.

[25] Hist. eccles., bk. VI, ch. XXXVII.

[26] Bk. IV, final chapter.

[27] Ad Olympiadem, Letter XIV, vol. III, p. 722. Gaume edition.

[28] De Liturgia Gallicana, bk. I, ch. IV.

[29] Melius est testimonio Dei Patris credere de suo Filio quam Ildefonsi vestri, qui tales vobis composuit preces in missarum solemniis, quales universalis et sancta Dei non habet Ecclesia, nec vos in illis exaudiri puta- mus. Et si Ildefonsus vester in orationibus suis Christum Adoptivum nominavit, noster vero Gregorius, Pontifex Romanæ Sedis, et clarissimus toto orbe Doctor, in suis orationibus semper eum Unigenitum nominare non dubitavit. (Concil. Franco fordiense. Labb., tom. VII, pag. 10[3?]4.)

[30] Sed sive mutata, sive ut ab eis sunt dicta hæc eadem testimonia a te sint posita, non magnopere curandum est; nos enim Romana plus auctoritate quam Hispana, veritate adsertionis et fidei nostræ fulciri desideramus; licet nec illa reprobemus, in his tamen quæ catholice dicuntur. Unusquisque in hoc se refutatum sciat, in quo ab universali dissentit Ecclesia. Romana igitur Ecclesia quæ a catholicis et recte credentibus sequenda esse probatur, se per verum Filium Dei et in missarum solemniis, et in cæteris quoque omnibus scriptis suis, vel in epistolis fateri solet, eum qui pro nostra salute homo fieri dignatus est, et crucis subire tormentum. (Alcuinus contra Felicem Urgelitanum, lib. VII, Opp. tom. II, pag. 856.)

[31] Baronius, Annal., for the year 918. Ambros. Morales, Chron. Hispan., bk. XV, ch. XLVII.

[32] Item placuit ut extra Psalmos, vel canonicarum Scripturarum Novi et Veteris Testamenti, nihil poetice compositum in Ecclesia psallatur: sicut et sancti præcipiunt canones. (Concil. Bracar., Canon. XII. Labb., Tom. IV.

[33] De privatis et vulgaribus psalmis rejiciendis ("On rejecting private and popular psalms"). (Conc. Laodic., Canon LIX. Labb., vol. I, p. 1508.)

[34] See Note C.

[35] De Liturgia Gallicana, bk. I, ch. II. Gerbert, de Veteri Liturgia Alemannica, disquisition II, ch. I.

[36] Reg. S. Benedicti, ch. XIII.

[37] Nequaquam itaque fatendum est hunc talem patrem absque mysterio cuncta disposuisse: et sicut clericale officium monastico non præjudicat, ita reciproco actu monasticum clericale comprobat. (Amalarius, De Officiis divinis, cap. XLVIII. - D. Mabillon, Vet. Analecta, tom. II, pag. 96.)

[38] Est etiam ille ordo officiorum laudabilis quem beatus Pater Benedictus monachis constituit observandum, scilicet ut qui proposito a cæteris discernuntur, etiam continuæ servitutis penso, aliquid amplius cæteris persolvere studeant. (Walafrid. Strabo, de Rebus ecclesiasticis, cap. XXV.)

[39] Quæritur cur sanctus Benedictus aliter monachis horas ordinaverit, quam mos Ecclesiæ habuerit, vel cur præcipuus Apostolicorum Gregorius hoc sua auctoritate probaverit. Sed sciendum est hoc sapientissima dispositione provisum, utpote a viro pleno Spiritu omnium justorum, scilicet ut contemplativa sicut habitu, ita etiam officio ab activa discerneretur et monasticæ disciplinæ religio hoc privilegio commendaretur. (Honorius Augustodun. Gemma animæ, lib. II, cap. LXV.)

Chapter IX. Another Digression on the History of the Eastern Liturgies: Apostolic; Greek Melkite; Coptic, Ethiopian, Syrian, and Armenian, for the Monophysite Sect; United Coptic, Syrian, and Armenian; Maronite; and Chaldean, for the Nestorian Sect

(p. 214)

[margin: In the ninth century the Eastern Churches present a very different spectacle from the Western Churches, especially with regard to the Liturgy.]

The Eastern Churches' Liturgies present the observer with a very different spectacle from the Western Liturgies. Our history has already reached the ninth century. Far from stopping, the Liturgy's progress in the Latin Church promises further extension and development in the centuries to come. In the Eastern Church, by contrast, everything is already approaching its end in the ninth century—for the Liturgy as for Christianity's unity and dignity.

[margin: The Liturgy's imposing beginnings in the East.]

Yet the Liturgy's beginnings in the East were imposing. It began as Christian Liturgy at Jerusalem, not only through the acts and words of mankind's Redeemer, but also through the Apostles' ordinances, which fixed, as we have said, the form in which the Christian mysteries were to be celebrated.

Since a special division of this work will treat everything concerning all the Churches' liturgical books, we shall give here only a brief enumeration of the various forms used in the Eastern Churches for the divine Offices.

[margin: I. Apostolic Liturgies.]

First come the Apostolic Liturgies. That *(p. 215)* attributed to Saint James is the principal and most authentic, at least in its general tenor. It was long followed in Jerusalem's Church to the exclusion of every other, and it is quite clear that this is the Liturgy Saint Cyril explains in his Catecheses.

[margin: Saint James's Liturgy, the most authentic, still used in Jerusalem's Church in the ninth century, is now celebrated there only once a year.]

It seems established that Jerusalem's Church still kept it in the ninth century, since Charles the Bald, in a letter to Ravenna's clergy, attests that he had the holy mysteries celebrated in his presence according to Jerusalem's Liturgy, composed by the Apostle Saint James. Since then, the Patriarch of Constantinople's authority has forbidden this Liturgy's use even at Jerusalem, except on October 23, when that Church celebrates Saint James's feast. On every other day of the year the Liturgies used at Constantinople, which we shall shortly discuss, must be employed.

[margin: Antioch's Church, which must originally have used a Liturgy instituted by Saint Peter, follows Constantinople's Liturgy like all Melkite Greeks.]

Antioch's Church must originally have used a liturgical form instituted by Saint Peter, since the Prince of the Apostles was that city's first bishop. Was this Liturgy of Saint Peter not the same as Saint James's? If it differed, what was its form? These questions have now become almost insoluble. Admittedly, the Syrian Jacobites, whose books contain many Liturgies or Anaphoras, have one bearing Saint Peter's name; but these sectarians' authority in scholarly criticism is absolutely nil.

[margin: Origin of the name Melkite.]

However that may be, Antioch's Melkite Patriarch and all the clergy under his jurisdiction have been compelled, like Jerusalem's, to follow Constantinople's Liturgy at least since the twelfth century. We shall recall here the origin of the name Melkite. After Dioscorus, champion of Monophysitism, was condemned at the Council of Chalcedon, there arose between the Catholics of Alexandria and Antioch and Eutyches's disciples a *(p. 216)* violent schism that still endures. The Monophysites gave the Catholics the name Melkites, formed from the Arabic melek, meaning supporters of the Prince, because they complied with Emperor Marcian's edict for the publication and reception of the Council of Chalcedon. For a long time Melkite was synonymous with orthodox; since the Greek schism, it designates only the Greeks united to the Patriarch of Constantinople. Today, Antioch having been almost entirely destroyed by wars or earthquakes, the Melkite Patriarch has transferred his see to Damascus. But such is the ignorance and degradation of this patriarchate's clergy that the Liturgy must be translated from Greek into Arabic, both for the people's use and so that the clerics may read and understand its words.

[margin: Today it designates Greeks united to the Patriarch of Constantinople.]

[margin: Saint Mark's Liturgy, used at Alexandria and abolished in the twelfth century.]

Alexandria's Church, founded by Saint Mark, used in antiquity a Liturgy bearing that Evangelist's name, completed by Saint Cyril. Since the twelfth century its use has been entirely abolished in the churches dependent on Alexandria's Melkite Patriarch. This patriarch, residing at Grand Cairo, is bound, like all his clergy, to Constantinople's Liturgy.

[margin: II. Constantinople's Greek Melkite Church uses the two Liturgies of Saint John Chrysostom and Saint Basil.]

Finally, the Greek Melkite Church's principal see, New Rome, Constantinople, which subjects the churches still faithful to it to the yoke of its Liturgy, knows only two Liturgies for celebrating divine service throughout the year. The first, called Saint John Chrysostom's Liturgy, serves every day except as specified below; it alone contains the Order of Mass and rubrics. The second, Saint Basil's, is used only on the vigil of Christmas, the vigil of Lights or Epiphany, the Sundays of Lent except Palm Sunday, the Holy and Great Feria *(p. 217)* or Holy Thursday; Holy Saturday; and finally Saint Basil's feast day. It is longer than the first, but lacks the Order of Mass and rubrics; these are taken from Saint Chrysostom's Liturgy. This holy Doctor is not the author of the Liturgy bearing his name; it even appears that as late as the sixth century it was called the Liturgy of the Apostles. There is better evidence that the Liturgy known by Saint Basil's name belongs to that holy Doctor.

[margin: The first record attesting the Patriarch of Constantinople's power over the other Greek-rite patriarchal Churches' Liturgy is a passage of Theodore Balsamon, a twelfth-century canonist.]

The first record manifesting the Patriarch of Constantinople's power over the other Melkite patriarchal Churches' Liturgy is a passage of Theodore Balsamon, cited by Leunclavius in book V of his Graeco-Roman Law. This jurist, a distinguished member of Constantinople's Church, was promoted to Antioch's see in 1186. He recounts that Mark, Patriarch of Alexandria, came to Constantinople and sought to celebrate the holy mysteries according to a particular Liturgy. Balsamon himself argued against Mark in the Emperor's presence and maintained as an incontestable truth:

"Therefore all the Churches of God must follow the custom of New Rome, namely Constantinople, and celebrate the sacred rites according to the tradition of the great Doctors and luminaries of piety, Saint John Chrysostom and Saint Basil[1]."

[margin: Constantinople's liturgical books adopted by all Churches of the Greek rite, united or non-united.]

Not only is the Liturgy proper—that is, the form and prayers of the Mass—used by Constantinople's Church followed in all the Melkite Churches; the books of divine Offices used at Constantinople for celebrating the Christian year's feasts are also the only ones used in the *(p. 218)* patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Constantinople's Liturgy has even extended its influence beyond these Churches' excessively

restricted boundaries. It is followed by all Churches of the Greek rite, united or non-united, found in the West: in Rome itself, Venice, Apulia, Calabria, Sicily, Corsica, and elsewhere.

[margin: Constantinople's liturgical books translated into Slavonic by Saints Cyril and Methodius.]

[margin: Their spread in this form.]

Constantinople's Liturgy spread still farther in a new form given it in the ninth century by Saints Cyril and Methodius. These two valiant missionaries, brothers in zeal as in blood and monastic profession, began their apostolate among the Slavs on the Danube's banks. To facilitate their conquests, they judged it useful to adopt Slavonic in divine service. They or their disciples translated all the books of Constantinople's Liturgy into that language. In this form they remain in use in Bulgaria, Serbia, Albania, Dalmatia, Slavonia, and Hungary. Likewise, they alone were used in the immense metropolitan province of Kiev, founded in the tenth century and separated from Catholic unity around the thirteenth.

[margin: The Ruthenian Church and its sister, the Muscovite Church, adopt these books.]

This ecclesiastical province, Christendom's largest, comprised Ruthenia and Muscovy. In the fourteenth century, following the Mongol invasions, Ruthenia was incorporated into Poland. Thanks to this union with a Catholic State, the Ruthenian Churches—Kiev's metropolitan see itself and its oldest suffragan sees—returned to the bosom of Catholic unity in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Muscovy's Churches, by contrast, persisted ever more obstinately in schism and suffered its most humiliating consequences.

[margin: The Ruthenian Church, having become Uniate while the Muscovite Church remained]

For a moment they enjoyed the ephemeral honor of a patriarchate established at Moscow in 1588 by the Patriarch of Constantinople. Peter the Great, however, suppressed it and obliged his States' bishops henceforth to be subject only to a *(p. 219)* synod of prelates appointed by him. The Muscovite Church, which became the Russian Church when Catherine II substituted the name Russia for her empire's former title, has no bond of subordination to Constantinople, but faithfully keeps its Liturgy. The same was true of Poland's Uniate Churches. We shall see later how this conformity of rites with Russia's schismatics proved fatal to them. Today all the Uniate Churches in the former Polish provinces subject to Russia have successively been absorbed by the schismatic Church. Only two remain; situated in Galicia, in territory occupied by Austria, they have escaped persecution. Like their unfortunate sisters, they still follow Constantinople's Liturgy.

[margin: schismatic, is again plunged into schism; its conformity of rites with the schismatics facilitates its ruin.]

[margin: Constantinople's liturgical books translated into Georgian and Romanian.]

This Church's books have also been translated into Georgian, and later into Romanian. In the first language they have served only a small Caucasian people, now reduced to a few hundred thousand souls. In the second they are now used in Moldavia and Wallachia, and even tend to prevail there completely over the original Greek texts.

[margin: III. Liturgies of the Monophysites.]

[margin: Coptic Liturgies.]

If we now investigate the Liturgies of Eastern Churches that do not recognize the Melkite patriarchs' authority, we first find those used by the Copts, who live under the jurisdiction of Alexandria's Jacobite Patriarch. The Coptic Church, as we know, is a still substantial remnant of the Monophysite heresy. These Liturgies are that called Saint Gregory of Nazianzus's, used on Our Lord's feasts and the most solemn days; Saint Cyril's, used during Lent and Advent and for the Commemoration of the Dead; and finally Saint Basil's, used on the year's other days. These Liturgies are translated into Coptic. Such is the Jacobite clergy's ignorance that the books containing them, for *(p. 220)* use at the altar, have an Arabic version facing the Coptic text, which the priests almost never understand.

[margin: Ethiopian Liturgies.]

[margin: The Ethiopian Church fallen into the Monophysite heresy.]

The Ethiopian or Abyssinian Church, founded in the fourth century by Saint Frumentius, sent from Alexandria by Saint Athanasius, preserved itself from Arianism but had the misfortune in the fifth century to fall into Monophysitism, in which it has remained immersed ever since. It has only one bishop, bearing the title of Metropolitan, who receives institution from Alexandria's Jacobite Patriarch, resident at Grand Cairo. Besides the three Coptic Liturgies just discussed, the Ethiopians use ten others: those of Saint John the Evangelist, Saint Matthew, the three hundred and eighteen orthodox Fathers, Saint Epiphanius, Jacob of Sarug, Saint John Chrysostom, one entitled of Our Lord Jesus Christ, those of the holy Apostles, Cyriacus, and finally the impious Dioscorus. These Liturgies are in Ethiopic, a dialect different from vernacular Arabic.

[margin: Liturgy of Syria's Monophysites.]

Besides the Copts and their Jacobite patriarchate of Alexandria, the Monophysite sect has many adherents in Syria, living under the jurisdiction of a so-called Patriarch of Antioch who resides in a monastery named Saphran, two days' journey from Diarbekir. This branch of Eutychians chiefly uses Saint James's Liturgy, but its books contain many more Liturgies. There are over thirty, most composed by Monophysitism's chief exponents, such as Jacob of Edessa and Philoxenus. These Liturgies are generally in Syriac.

[margin: Armenian Liturgy.]

The third Church infected with Eutychianism, after the Coptic and Syrian, is the Armenian Church. It is headed by a patriarch bearing the title of Catholicos and residing at Etchmiadzin, near Erivan. Three other, subordinate patriarchs follow him: those of Sis in Cilicia, Cachabar, and Achtamar *(p. 221)* in Asia Minor. The Armenian Church has a Liturgy of its own, a compilation in Armenian of various prayers drawn from the Greek Liturgies, which have even retained the names of Saint Basil, Saint Athanasius, and Saint John Chrysostom. The remainder belongs exclusively to the Armenian Church. One cannot deny that this Liturgy, written in the national language, is of great beauty.

[margin: This Liturgy's beauty.]

[margin: Catholic Copts, Syrians, and Armenians follow their nation's Liturgy, with the corrections required by orthodoxy.]

Among the Copts, Syrians, and Armenians are a certain number of Catholics who acknowledge the distinction of the two natures in Jesus Christ and are subject to the Apostolic See's authority. They observe their nation's Liturgy, except for changes ordered at Rome to ensure orthodoxy.

[margin: IV. Maronite Liturgies.]

Nor must we pass over the small Maronite nation, peaceful inhabitants of Mount Lebanon, who, after following the errors of Monophysitism and Monothelitism, abjured them in the twelfth century to embrace the Roman Church's faith, to which they have since remained inviolably attached. They are governed by a patriarch who receives the pallium from Rome. Their Liturgies, in Syriac, have been printed at Rome for their use. They number fourteen: those of Saint Sixtus, Pope of Rome; Saint John Chrysostom; Saint John the Evangelist; Saint Peter, Prince of the Apostles; the twelve Apostles; Saint Dionysius, disciple of Saint Paul[2]; Saint Cyril; Saint Matthew, pastor; John Barsusan; Saint Eustathius; Saint Maruthas; Saint James, brother of the Lord; Saint Mark; and a second of Saint Peter.

Besides the Liturgies, which are, properly speaking, the *(p. 222)* prayers of the altar, the various Churches just named have other books for the divine Offices and the celebration of feasts. These differ in many respects from the Melkite Church's, though retaining certain affinities with them in the prayers' style and form.

[margin: The books of the Divine Office in these Churches. V. Nestorian Liturgies.]

[margin: The Nestorians called Chaldeans or Eastern Christians.]

We must still discuss the Nestorians and their Liturgies. These sorry remnants of an unhappy sect, no less subversive of Christianity's fundamental mystery than the Monophysitism that succeeded it without destroying it, are commonly called Chaldeans or Eastern Christians. Their patriarch takes the title of Catholicos and resides at Baghdad. The Nestorian Church, which once extended as far as the Indies and is now considerably reduced, has three Liturgies: Theodore of Mopsuestia's, used from Advent to Easter; that of the twelve Apostles, used from Easter to Advent; and Nestorius's, used only five days a year.

[margin: Goa's archbishop, Menezes, corrects a Nestorian Liturgy in the sixteenth century and translates the Roman Missal into Syriac, hoping to facilitate the Chaldeans' conversion.]

In the sixteenth century, after the Portuguese had established important settlements in the East Indies and founded Goa's archiepiscopal see, its archbishop, Menezes, earnestly applied himself to converting Malabar's Nestorian Christians. To safeguard the orthodoxy of those he had brought back to the true faith, he corrected the Liturgy of the twelve Apostles, the most widely used. He even had the Roman Missal translated into Syriac, the Nestorian Liturgy's language. Yet no great results appear to have come from these measures, which perhaps showed more zeal than discernment.

Such is the general survey of the Eastern Liturgies. We shall add the following considerations to this picture.

[margin: The principle of liturgical unity]

First, one must have noticed the principle of liturgical unity enshrined in the Melkite Church of Constantinople, *(p. 223)* Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and elsewhere. This fact has great significance. First, it explains the preservation of unity in faith and discipline among the Greek schism's different families. They would long ago have split apart had this bond not held them. But how can one separate from Constantinople's see while obliged to follow Constantinople's Liturgy? Does the authority of that Church's patriarch not rest on the very text of the sacred prayers, in which his name and his see's greatness and supremacy are read? Do the people, as well as the clergy, not thus learn the rights of the Ecumenical Bishop, who confirms the patriarchs as they confirm metropolitans and bishops? So much for the bond of discipline and subordination. The Liturgy has also preserved unity of faith. Without doubt, if the Melkite Church has retained the primitive faith until now, except for a few articles, it owes this to the inviolability of the holy formulas. These are inviolable only because, being universal, they could not be changed without protest. We should recall the upheaval aroused in 1622 in the Melkite Church by Patriarch Cyril Lucaris, who had embraced Calvinist doctrine on the Eucharist. The other patriarchs, in their Council of Jerusalem, anathematized him as a violator of holy traditions, an innovator overthrowing the Fathers' authority.

[margin: enshrined in the Melkite Church, maintains unity of faith and discipline among the Greek schism's different families.]

[margin: Unity of faith constantly threatened in the Russian Church since its Liturgy has been at the secular power's mercy.]

Second, we must observe what has happened to that great province of the Melkite Church called the Russian Church. Unity of faith within it has been constantly threatened since Peter the Great violently severed it from the bond uniting it to the Patriarch of Constantinople, and thereby to his Liturgy. This Liturgy admittedly still exists in fact in the Russian Churches; but what authority will prevent the Holy Synod, accountable only to the Autocrat, from *(p. 224)* introducing into this Liturgy, henceforth defenseless, whatever dogmas and practices it pleases? Since the Liturgy is the most accessible to the people and at the same time the most exalted form of preaching, who will restrain Russia's Churches, carried from error to error by the ever-irresistible influence of liturgical forms? Here indeed we must acknowledge that the unity sustained by the authority of the Patriarch of New Rome could last only for a time. It is the retreat of an army in rout. As long as the Greeks lived under Islam's scepter, their orthodoxy ran no risk: neither the Sultan nor his pashas could lay any claim to determining the form of the mysteries of a religion they abhorred. For Greeks subject to a Christian prince, however, matters are quite different. Their Church has only human authority, since the center on which it rests has no divine sanction. Sooner or later the prince will find his own human authority quite as good as his prelates', and will command in the Church whatever he wishes. The emperors of old

Byzantium did not fail to do this; Russia's emperors and empresses have done it; and it has already begun to appear in the little kingdom of Greece, whose King Otto has just detached it from obedience to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

[margin: Liturgical unity, which gives life in the Latin Church, is powerless to maintain that life in the Greek Church.]

Third, even apart from the time of dissolution properly so called, which must infallibly come for every separated Church, there is another important consideration concerning the kind of unity the Greek Church preserves in its Liturgy. Undoubtedly, the patriarchal authority's efforts to maintain this unity and the benefits it has produced by delaying Christianity's complete ruin in the East are praiseworthy. They also pay homage to the Apostolic See's holy policy in the West. But why is the unity that gives *(p. 225)* life in the Latin Church powerless to revive it in the East? Unity, the condition of every society's existence, is truly constitutive only insofar as it results from the various members' adherence to their true and natural center. Rome is the Catholic Church's vital force because Rome is immovable in faith, because it is the foundation laid by Jesus Christ, not by man. A Liturgy conforming to Constantinople's may therefore be orthodox in fact; one conforming to Rome's is orthodox both in fact and by right. Admittedly, the Melkite Churches' Liturgy has so far contained no errors by affirmation, but it contains them by negation. The Pope's name is no longer recited in the Diptychs as in the first centuries, and the points agreed between the two Churches at Lyons and Florence receive no express confession in the Office's prayers, while the pastors and their faithful expressly deny them.

[margin: Although the Melkite Churches' Liturgy contains no error by affirmation, it is not free of error by negation.]

[margin: Although separated from Catholic unity, the Greek Church continues in its Liturgy to pay homage to the See of Rome's primacy.]

Yet a curious fact appears in the Greek Church's liturgical customs. While remaining violently separated from the See of Rome, while expressly denying its primacy over all the Churches, it pays homage to that primacy in several passages of its Liturgy. Joseph de Maistre collected these passages in his admirable Du Pape, where everyone has read them with astonishment[3]. They resound alike in Slavonic beneath the domes of Kiev and Moscow, and in Greek in Constantinople's churches.

[margin: The Greek Church is like a new Jewish people, attesting through its usages and beliefs the antiquity of the Latin Church's usages and beliefs.]

What does this inconceivable contradiction prove? Two things, in our opinion. First, the intention of divine Providence, which willed to set the Greek Church before the nations as a new Jewish people, so that, as custodian of antiquity's testimonies, it might attest, by the very fact *(p. 226)* of its beliefs and usages, the antiquity of the Latin Church's beliefs and usages. No one could suspect the Greek Church of having borrowed anything from that Church.

[margin: By retaining texts that condemn them, the Greeks obey the innate sentiment that requires the Liturgy to be immutable.]

For our part, we see in this fact further proof of the sentiment innate in all Churches and grounded in the nature of things: the sentiment, we say, that an immutable Liturgy is necessary once the forms of worship have been solemnly fixed. The Greeks have preferred to keep these texts that condemn them rather than scandalize the peoples through changes, or injure their Church's unity by setting a disastrous example of attacking the integrity of the Liturgy, which alone sustains that unity.

[margin: The Greek Liturgy's character of immobility makes it inaccessible to all progress, a sign of the degradation of the Church in which it is practiced.]

Fourth, a particular character must be observed in the Greek Liturgy that strikingly reveals the degradation of the Church that uses it. This character, opposed to the advance of all true orthodoxy, is a brute immobility that makes it inaccessible to any progress. In the Latin Church, as successive heresies have furnished matter for developments of dogma, those developments have themselves sought expression in the Liturgy. New feasts have become necessary; new rites and new Offices have successively enriched the Christian year with

their splendor and sanctified the faithful people by applying the graces of which they are the source. Moreover, no less fruitful than in its ancient days, the Church has produced new apostles, new martyrs and new doctors in every century. Bishops, confessors and virgins have added their names to the triumphant roll of heroes bequeathed to us by Christianity's first ages. The Latin Liturgy reflects the radiance of these brilliant constellations that adorn heaven from century to century. In vain would one seek their traces in the Greeks' Menaia: not only are the saints *(p. 227)* of the Latin Church absent there, but the Greek Church has become as though powerless to proclaim new saints within its own fold since schism and heresy paralyzed its heart. For eight centuries its calendar has not advanced a step; for eight centuries no new feast has attested this Church's love, hope or gratitude toward him who once had it for his bride. It knows nothing of the solemnity of the Blessed Sacrament, of that great day's splendors, at once so magnificent and so moving. It knows nothing of all that has happened in the Christian world since it died to the great Roman Unity. Once again, do these liturgical books, composed in the age of faith and life, now mute, uncomprehended and motionless in the Greek bishops' hands, not recall the Bible preserved, read and recited by the Jews with a reverence as sterile as it is inviolable? Thus this Liturgy, bearing the revered names of Basil, Chrysostom and John Damascene, has been powerless to protect the unhappy clergy that celebrates it from brutish degradation. If in some places this degradation is not synonymous with crass ignorance, if Russia, for example, presents a clergy more enlightened by the day, we know what to think of the morality of priests and bishops who have ceased to see Christianity's Head in the bishop of Byzantium, to venerate him instead in a Peter called the Great, a Catherine II, a Nicholas I.

[margin: The Greek Liturgy is powerless to preserve the clergy that celebrates it from brutish degradation.]

This work's limits prevent us from developing these considerations further, just as they have forced the strictest brevity upon our account of the respective situations of the various Eastern Liturgies. We shall conclude our treatment of the Greek Church's Liturgy with this reflection. Suppose that, from the peace of the Church onward, the Apostolic See had been able freely and prudently to bring all Eastern Churches to the practice of the *(p. 228)* Roman Liturgy and the use of Latin. Suppose that the Sovereign Pontiffs had, as in the West, regulated every particular of the Divine Office in the minutest detail, received all the Eastern Churches' inquiries on this subject and settled all questions concerning sacred formulas or ceremonies; that they had prevented or checked the danger of innovations in doctrine or discipline by establishing new feasts, promulgating obligatory prayer formulas—in short, by all the means that have made the Roman Breviary's calendar a kind of record of the Church's needs and the Holy See's provision for them. Suppose, we say, that this had been so: what could Photius and Michael Cerularius have done against the mere passive resistance of this whole fabric, embracing people and priesthood alike? It is highly probable that schism would not so easily have won a victory that was, moreover, long contested, although so many causes of isolation arising from language and the nature of patriarchal institutions already seemed to have prepared it. Yes, we say with conviction that Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem would still be Catholic today had it been possible to bind these Churches to the Latins' rite and language. Had these Churches remained fraternally united with those of the West, it is also probable that Islam would not have enslaved the fortunate lands they long illuminated with the true light. Civilization would not have perished there; the human race would not have seen its dignity extinguished beneath the yoke of the most ignoble slavery. In short, the destinies of Europe and Asia, compromised and delayed a thousand years by schism, would have been fulfilled; no one knows what would have resulted from so much glory and strength united with so much truth and love. But invincible obstacles opposed this union: so much *(p. 229)* happiness was not of this earth. Let us, at least, Catholics of the West, learn from this to value liturgical unity in all its consequences. As long as we remain faithful to it, this unity will always be our foremost means of orthodoxy and therefore the strongest bond of Catholic nationality. If it exists, let us not be so unfortunate as to break it; if it has existed, let us pity those rash enough to raise a hand against it.

[margin: Had the Roman Pontiffs been able to establish liturgical unity and Latin in the East as in the West, the schism of Photius and Michael Cerularius would not so easily have triumphed, and the destinies of half the world, compromised by this revolt, would have taken an altogether different course.]

[margin: The Liturgies of the other Eastern Churches, subject to the same disadvantages as the Melkite Liturgy, have also become expressions of heretical dogmas.]

[margin: The use of a heretical Liturgy puts a Church in a kind of impossibility of returning to orthodoxy.]

Most of our considerations on the Greek Melkite Church's Liturgy naturally apply to the Liturgies of the Coptic, Ethiopian, Syrian, Armenian and Chaldean Churches. Moreover, the isolation in which each of these families of a degenerate Christianity lives in relation to the others early exposed them to the danger of liturgical corruption and of their Liturgy becoming the expression of heretical dogmas. In this respect these unhappy Churches bear traces of a degradation that places them indisputably below the Melkite Church. At least the latter's various provinces, so long as they remain Churches united to an ecclesiastical center, preserve the ancient forms of worship. The errors that paralyze them do not even find affirmative expression in the Liturgy. The Monophysites and Nestorians, by contrast, bear shameful traces of their defection from the true faith: the names of Dioscorus, Philoxenus, Jacob of Edessa, Theodore of Mopsuestia and finally Nestorius defile even the altar books. This produces a kind of impossibility of returning to orthodoxy, for that would require changing the Liturgy, and the Liturgy is by nature an immutable thing, rooted in the most sacred habits. History confirms this inference in the most lamentable way. Partial reunions of these various Churches with the Apostolic See have often occurred: *(p. 230)* but they have always failed against the prejudice, so praiseworthy in itself, that assails every change in the Liturgy. Yet Rome could receive these separated families into a real and lasting unity only after taking measures to end heresy's reign by reforming the liturgical text where it was impure. It is now three centuries since the Sovereign Pontiffs established at Rome a special Congregation for the correction of the books of the Eastern Church. But these expurgated Liturgies have often been a stumbling block, a theme for furious declamations by obstinate sectarians, an occasion of relapse for many who had momentarily opened their eyes to orthodoxy's glimmer.

[margin: The Sovereign Pontiffs' work to correct the Eastern Liturgies.]

Let us conclude from all the facts stated in this chapter that the Liturgy's unity and immutability are so great a good that the separated Eastern sects owe entirely to it whatever Christianity they have preserved;

That this unity can have important results only insofar as it comes from the conformity of the various Churches' liturgical usages to those of a mother and principal Church;

That, once this conformity is destroyed, a Church thus isolated runs the greatest risks, since it remains without oversight and can possess only an orthodoxy in fact, not even assured for the following day;

That the Liturgy falls under the prince's power in proportion as it separates from the authority of its higher ecclesiastical head;

That the Liturgy, even of a great Church, by being distinct from that promulgated by the mother Church, thereby becomes foreign to the improvements made in the mother Church; *(p. 231)* That the Liturgy, destined to seal the peoples' faith since it is that faith's highest and holiest expression, sometimes becomes the accursed instrument that uproots this faith and prevents its return;

That, finally, the Western Churches, considering Christianity's misfortunes in the East, must hold firmly to liturgical unity, which alone could not only have averted but even have rendered forever impossible the schism and heresy that prepared those misfortunes.

---

[1] Quapropter omnes Ecclesiæ Dei sequi debent morem novæ Romæ, nimirum Constantinopolis, et sacra celebrare juxta traditionem magnorum doctorum, et luminarium pietatis sancti Joannis Chrysostomi et sancti Basilii. (Leunclavius, Juris Græc. Rom., lib. V, pag. 263.)

[2] It is rather that of Dionysius Bar Salibi, the famous Jacobite.

[3] Du Pape, book I, chap. X.

Chapter X. Abolition of the Gallican Liturgy. Introduction of the Roman Church's Liturgy and Chant into France. First Origins of the Romano-French Liturgy. Changes Introduced into the Chant. Liturgical Writers of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries

(p. 232)

[margin: From the ninth century onward, all the interest of liturgical history centers on the Western Church.]

From now on the Western Church alone will occupy our attention. Nevertheless, we shall continue to record the names and works of the few liturgical writers still found in the Eastern Church during the centuries remaining to be narrated. In our present subject, as in all others, the ecclesiastical history of the Greeks and other Eastern Christians draws toward its end once the ninth century's opening has passed: all life, all interest shift to the West. There, as we shall see, the Liturgy is called to great developments through the application of those principles of unity we have already seen promulgated so often, either by the Apostolic See or by councils of the various provinces of Western Christendom.

[margin: The Roman Liturgy triumphs in France over the Gallican Liturgy.]

We left our narrative when the Roman Liturgy, emerging from Saint Gregory the Great's hands, was preparing the way for its future conquests through its peaceful introduction into the new Churches that Saint Benedict's sons were founding day by day in Great Britain, Germany and the kingdoms of northern Europe. Now a new spectacle meets our gaze. A *(p. 233)* great Church, always orthodox since its origin—the Gallican Church, possessing a national Liturgy composed by the holiest doctors and pure of every error—renounces that Liturgy and embraces Rome's, to tighten further its bonds with the Mother and Mistress of the Churches and secure forever within itself the perpetuity of an inviolable orthodoxy. France owed this benefit to its great leaders, Pepin and Charlemagne; but justice requires us to say that the clergy supported the sovereign's pious intentions with zeal and sincerity. Why must we, at another period, have to recount this same clergy's efforts to annihilate the liturgical unity so dear to our fathers for so many centuries?

[margin: The mission of the Carolingian princes.]

The Carolingian dynasty, which owed the consolidation of its rise to sovereign power to the Apostolic See in the person of Pope Saint Zachary, had been destined by Providence to render Christian society the greatest of all services: to establish the Roman Pontiffs' temporal independence and lend the support of public force to the reform of the clergy through the immortal Capitularies drawn up by this dynasty's first princes. It was time for Europe, gasping for breath, to find rest in the unity of a strong, protective government. Charlemagne would soon appear; but Pepin was to announce him to the world and the Church.

[margin: The close relations established between the Holy See and its defenders, the Frankish princes.]

The Lombards' violence, which the Eastern emperors could no longer restrain, now forced the Popes to throw themselves into the arms of the French, whom they had always found faithful to the Apostolic See. The French seemed on the verge of receiving and carrying out, in concert with the Church, the high mission of organizing a new Roman Empire. Rome's dealings with France thus grew more frequent day by day; as ever, the Apostolic See's majesty could not fail to subdue those about to conclude with it so close an *(p. 234)* alliance. Pepin the Short proved equal to his mission: Charles Martel's military harshness toward the Church had not passed to his son. With filial tenderness he received the appeal for help made to him in 754 by Pope Stephen II, oppressed by Aistulf, King of the Lombards. When the Pontiff expressed his wish to seek temporary refuge in France, Pepin sent Saint Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, to him.

[margin: Pepin the Short sends Saint Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, to Pope Stephen II, 754. Chrodegang, founder of the canons regular.]

This illustrious bishop was then preparing a work of great importance for the renewal of the clergy's morals. Everyone knows that the institution of canons living under a rule, serving the cathedral church and observing common life, religious poverty and a vow of obedience to the archdeacon goes back to Saint Chrodegang. Under Charlemagne, most of France's bishops imitated this institution, so fruitful in salvation for the people and edification for the clergy themselves.

[margin: He introduces the Roman Church's chant and order of Offices into his cathedral.]

Having therefore gone to Rome to fetch Pope Stephen, Saint Chrodegang was confirmed in his plans, doubtless after witnessing the exemplary life of the various ecclesiastical communities serving the basilicas, particularly the monks of the Lateran church's Patriarchium. To unite the clergy of the Church of Metz more closely to the Roman Church and give the Divine Offices a more august form, he introduced the Roman Church's chant and order of Offices into his cathedral[1].

[margin: Stephen II, a refugee in France, asks Pepin to establish the Roman Liturgy in that country's Churches.]

This important but isolated event was soon followed by another, general and solemn. Pope Stephen entered France and was received by Pepin with every sort of honor. He discussed with this prince not only the freedom and defense of the Church of Rome against the Lombards, but also the present needs of the Church in *(p. 235)* France. As a sign of the faith uniting France to the Apostolic See, he asked the king to support his efforts to introduce the Roman Church's Offices into that kingdom, to the exclusion of the Gallican Liturgy. The king supported this pious design, so consonant with his heart's sincere orthodoxy, and the clerics in Stephen's retinue taught the French cantors how to celebrate the Offices[2]. On this subject we shall quote the author of the Caroline Books, a work that was indeed not written by Charlemagne, but whose substance and form that emperor later declared he adopted. The author therefore speaks in this prince's name:

[margin: The king accedes to the Pope's wishes.]

[margin: Charlemagne attests in the Caroline Books and one of his Capitularies that his father abolished the Gallican Liturgy for closer union with the Roman Church.]

"Although many have withdrawn from the Roman Church's holy and venerable communion, the Church in our lands has never withdrawn. Instructed by her in apostolic tradition, and endowed by him from whom comes every good gift, it has always received venerable charisms. From the faith's earliest days it remained with her in the unity of holy religion, though differing somewhat from her in the celebration of the Offices—which, however, is not contrary to faith. Through the care and diligence of our most illustrious father, King Pepin of venerable memory, or the coming into Gaul of the most holy man Stephen, Bishop of the city of Rome, it was joined to her also in the order of psalmody. Thus those whose ardor in believing was alike should not differ in their order of psalmody; the Churches united in the sacred reading of one holy Law should also be united in the venerable tradition of one melody; and differing celebrations of the Offices should not separate those whom the pious devotion of a single faith had joined[3]."

(p. 236) In the Capitulary drawn up at Aachen in 789, Charlemagne formally states the sovereign act by which Pepin suppressed the Gallican Office, for unanimity with the Apostolic See and peaceful concord in the holy Church of God[4].

[margin: Pepin establishes the Roman Pontiffs' temporal power at the same time.]

After securing this signal triumph for liturgical unity, Stephen recrossed the mountains. A few months later Fulrad, Abbot of Monte Cassino, laid on Saint Peter's Confessio the keys of twenty-two cities Pepin had wrested from Aistulf. Thus the Roman Pontiffs' temporal power began together with the reign of the Roman Liturgy in the Churches of the Most Christian Kingdom.

[margin: Stephen II sends twelve cantors to the king to establish Gregorian traditions in France.]

The monk of Saint Gall tells us in his Chronicle that Pope Stephen, to satisfy Pepin's wish, sent him twelve cantors who, like twelve apostles, were to establish the sound traditions of Gregorian chant in France[5].

[margin: Saint Paul I's concern for the purity of liturgical usages and the development of civilization in France.]

Saint Paul I soon succeeded Stephen in the See of Rome. He too had dealings with Pepin concerning the recent introduction of Roman usages into the Church of France. With the same aim, Remedius, Pepin's brother and Archbishop of Rouen, had sent some monks to Rome to learn ecclesiastical chant. The Pope writes to Pepin that these monks have been placed under Simeon, the Roman Church's first cantor, and will be kept until they are thoroughly *(p. 237)* trained in ecclesiastical chant[6]. In another letter the Pontiff writes to the King: "We are sending you all the books we have been able to find: the Antiphonary, the Responsal, Aristotle's Dialectic, the books of Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, Geometry, Orthography, Grammar, and a night clock[7]." This truly curious passage shows the detailed care with which the Roman Pontiffs fulfilled their task of civilizing the West. It also shows how the French Churches' adoption of Rome's liturgical usages belonged to the whole set of events that was to raise our nation's preeminence so high, once the great man called to combine so many rich elements had appeared.

[margin: Charlemagne, King of the Franks.]

Charlemagne came at last. It is beyond our subject to describe here such greatness, such genius, and the sublime and holy use Charlemagne knew how to make of them. We shall give only a few facts of his life that belong to the course of events we are recounting.

[margin: At Pope Saint Hadrian's urging, Charles completes the work of liturgical unity begun by his father.]

Charlemagne's filial love for Pope Saint Hadrian, who ascended the Holy See in 772, is well known. Scarcely had this holy Pontiff taken his seat on Saint Peter's Chair when he most earnestly urged King Charles to imitate Pepin's example by spreading the Roman Liturgy. This is reported in the Caroline Books immediately after the passage quoted above: "We too did this when God conferred the kingdom of Italy upon us, desiring to exalt the holy Roman Church's dignity and striving to obey the salutary exhortations of the Most Reverend Pope Hadrian: namely, that several Churches of that region which once refused to receive *(p. 238)* the Apostolic See's tradition in psalmody should now embrace it with all diligence; and that they should adhere in the order of psalmody also to her to whom they had adhered through the gift of faith. This is known to be done not only by the provinces of all Gaul, Germany and Italy, but also by the Saxons and certain peoples of the northern regions, converted through us, with God's favor, to the rudiments of faith[8]."

[margin: Charlemagne asks Saint Hadrian for a fresh copy of the Gregorian Sacramentary and prescribes its use in all his empire's Churches.]

To use sources of unquestionable purity in establishing liturgical unity, Charlemagne nevertheless asked Saint Hadrian for a fresh copy of the Gregorian Sacramentary, although several copies had already been sent from Rome to Pepin[9]. We have just cited the Capitulary of Aachen of 789, in which this prince requires observance of the Roman rite both in the Divine Offices and at Mass itself, per nocturnale et gradale officium—in the Night Office and the Gradual Office. The Capitularies abound in allusions to this measure in all its implications. It was likewise at Charlemagne's inspiration that the Council of Mainz in 813 decreed faithful adherence to the Gregorian Sacramentary in administering Baptism[10].

[margin: Despite the efforts of Pepin and Charlemagne,]

Yet there was one point on which the French genius, despite itself, resisted the pious intentions of Charlemagne *(p. 239)* and Pepin. The latter had indeed been able to introduce the Roman Church's chant into the Churches of France; but it was beyond his power to have it performed with the Roman cantors' perfection, or to protect it everywhere from the supposed improvements with which the French clerics' skill would think it ought to enrich it. Within a few years, therefore, those pure sources of Gregorian melody contained in the antiphonaries sent by Stephen II and Paul I had already become corrupt. In his Life of Saint

Gregory the Great, John the Deacon gives, with an artist's candor, the reasons why Gregorian chant had not remained unaltered in our churches. Here are his words, full of unaffected simplicity and somewhat redolent of invective. Today's reader may judge at leisure how far our cathedral cantors, reinforced by serpents and ophicleides, do or do not deserve the reproach of perpetuating the ways of those barbarians whom Saint Gregory's historian sacrifices with such severity.

[margin: the French cantors distort Gregorian chant.]

[margin: Complaints these alterations draw from Saint Gregory's biographer.]

"Among the other peoples of Europe, the Germans or French have shown remarkable ability to learn, and repeatedly relearn, the sweetness of this melody. Yet they have been wholly unable to preserve it uncorrupted, both through levity of mind, since they mixed some things of their own into Gregorian chants, and through their natural savagery. For their Alpine bodies, resounding loudly with their voices' thunder, do not properly echo the sweetness of the melody they have learned. As the barbarous savagery of a drunken throat strives to produce a gentle song through inflections and repeated notes, with a kind of natural crash it hurls out stiff tones, like wagons rumbling confusedly over steps. Thus, instead of soothing its listeners' minds as it ought, *(p. 240)* it disturbs them by vexing them and assailing them with noise[11]."

[margin: Dispute between Roman and French cantors during Charles's stay in Rome in 787.]

Charlemagne, with his deep feeling for the fine arts, could not long endure a dissonance that threatened nothing less than to destroy all the fruit of his noble efforts to advance French civilization through the harmony of the Church's chants, the most morally edifying and most popular of all songs. In Rome at Easter in 787, he witnessed a dispute between Roman and French cantors. The French claimed their chant was superior and, proud of the king's protection, severely criticized the Romans. The latter, relying on Saint Gregory's authority and the traditions that had always accompanied his antiphonary in Rome, laughed at the French cantors' ignorance and barbarity. Charlemagne wished to end the dispute and said to his cantors: "Which is purer and which is better: the living spring, or its streams flowing far away[12]?" They agreed it was the spring. Then the king continued: "Return to Saint Gregory's spring, for you have manifestly corrupted ecclesiastical chant[13]."

[margin: The King asks the Pope for skilled cantors to restore Gregorian traditions in France.]

Wishing to remedy this difficulty at once, Charlemagne asked the Pope for skilled cantors who could bring the French back into line with sound tradition. Saint Hadrian gave him Theodore and Benedict, who had been trained in the school of chant founded by Saint Gregory. He also presented the king with that same Saint Gregory's antiphonaries, notated by Hadrian himself according to Roman *(p. 241)* notation. There was therefore already a way of notating ecclesiastical chant at that time. On returning to France, Charlemagne placed one of these two cantors at Metz and the other at Soissons. He ordered all the singing masters in France's other cities to submit their antiphonaries to them for correction and to learn the true rules of chant from them. Thus France's antiphonaries were corrected: everyone had corrupted them at will, adding or subtracting without rule or authority. All the cantors of France learned the Roman notation, since called French notation[14]. In this interesting narrative we have followed the monk of Angoulême, Charlemagne's historian, whose account is confirmed by John the Deacon in his Life of Saint Gregory the Great and by Ekkehard in his Life of Blessed Notker, called the Stammerer[15].

[margin: The school of cantors at Metz becomes the most renowned in all France.]

These three authors add that Gregorian chant reached a higher degree of perfection at Metz: the school of Metz surpassed France's other schools as much as it was itself surpassed by Rome's. The chronicler of Angoulême adds: "Likewise, the aforementioned Roman cantors instructed the Frankish cantors in arte organandi [the art of organ-playing or of singing in parts][16]."

(p. 242)

[margin: The school of Metz's superiority, maintained until the twelfth century, is partly due to the discipline Saint Chrodegang introduced among his canons.]

The superiority over the chant schools of France's other cathedrals for which Metz's school was still renowned in the twelfth century was doubtless due to the discipline Saint Chrodegang had established among his canons. Such traditions were bound to remain purer in a church whose clergy so regularly kept the observances of canonical life. It has long been observed that traditions of ecclesiastical chant were better preserved in religious communities than among the secular clergy. Examples would not be lacking; we have simply wished here to establish a fact that has its own kind of importance.

(p. 243)

[margin: Charlemagne is zealous for ecclesiastical chant because he regards the Liturgy as the most effective means of civilization.]

Thus Charlemagne showed his zeal for ecclesiastical chant and did not hesitate to give this great subject paramount importance. He followed Saint Gregory's striking example: Gregory did not think it beneath him to teach children to chant himself. The great lawgivers of mankind have always acted thus: they have happily grasped the essential things and applied themselves to them steadfastly. Later, the vulgar have understood nothing of it—and the vulgar are numerous. Who today would consent to see in the Liturgy the greatest motive force in a people's civilization? Admittedly, we now have peoples without liturgical habits. Posterity will judge the morality of the means employed to open other sources of beauty and enthusiasm to them.

[margin: The great emperor's assiduous attendance at all the Offices, by day and by night.]

Let us say one more word about Charlemagne, that great liturgical figure. We have seen elsewhere that he is the author of the hymn Veni, Creator Spiritus ("Come, O Creator Spirit"). Let us add that he faithfully attended the Offices, by day and by night, in the palace chapel. His Life by Einhard contains most precious details of this incomparable prince's zeal for divine service. We see Charlemagne presiding at the Offices with the bearing proper to a Christian prince filled, as he was, with the greatest respect for the priesthood. He did not presume to make his voice heard as priests may: he sang only softly, and even then only when laymen could join the choir. He had, however, reserved the task of designating the lessons his clerics were to read, so that they would always be ready to perform this duty correctly. He tolerated no one in his chapel who could not read and chant properly. He invited Paul the Deacon, the famous monk of Monte Cassino, to compile selected homilies of the holy Fathers for use in the Church's Offices throughout *(p. 244)* the year. There would be no end if we wished to recount everything Charlemagne did for the Liturgy: the material is so abundant that it would require, so to speak, a separate work.

[margin: The extent of the Roman Liturgy at Charlemagne's death.]

The Church and the world lost him in 814. At his death, the Roman Liturgy reigned throughout the West except in Spain, which was soon to embrace it too; Milan had barely managed to save its Ambrosian rite.

[margin: Louis the Pious imitates his father's zeal for the Liturgy.]

[margin: He sends Amalarius, a priest of the Church of Metz, to Rome to bring back a fresh copy of the Antiphonary.]

[margin: Amalarius composes his De Ordine Antiphonarii.]

Louis the Pious showed few traits of his father's greatness in his character; but he had at least inherited his piety and zeal for divine service. That was much for this age of civilization through Christianity. The wisdom of the regulations in Louis's Capitularies scarcely yields to Charlemagne's. Early on he concerned himself with ecclesiastical chant and the means of ensuring its purity. He therefore sent the famous liturgical writer Amalarius, a priest of the Church of Metz, to Rome with orders to bring back a fresh copy of the Antiphonary. This had doubtless become necessary because of new alterations already made to Saint Gregory's text and notation. Pope Gregory IV could not satisfy the emperor: he had previously given the only copy of the Antiphonary still at his disposal to Wala, a monk of Corbie. On returning to France,

Amalarius visited that illustrious abbey. There he compared the Antiphonary newly brought from Rome with those used in France. After this comparison he was able to compose his precious book De Ordine Antiphonarii.

When we say that the Gallican Liturgy remained irrevocably destroyed in France, we do not mean that no remnants survived and merged into Roman usages. The Churches of Lyon and Paris doubtless preserved the greatest number of *(p. 245)* these ancient Gallican forms; yet all the other Churches preserved some portions to a greater or lesser extent. Their traces can still be found in usages departing from the Roman rite in most of the Office books formerly followed in France. Thus, with Grancolas and Father Lebrun, we shall identify as practices of the Gallican Liturgy in the Divine Office: repeating the Invitatory antiphon in full between the verses of Psalm XCIV; adding a responsory after the ninth lesson at Matins; saying Gloria Patri ("Glory be to the Father") at the end of each responsory of the Nocturns and repeating the third, sixth and ninth of these responsories on the principal feasts; saying a versicle called sacerdotal ("priestly") between Matins and Lauds; using only one antiphon at Vespers when there are no proper antiphons drawn from the Psalms; saying the weekday Psalms at First Vespers of solemn feasts; singing a responsory at Vespers; and so forth. At Mass the principal Gallican rite that survived, now scarcely practiced anywhere except Paris, is the episcopal blessing after the Pater (Our Father). We shall also mention the general prayers said at the Prône (parish instruction); the custom of bringing the Book of the Gospels to the clergy to kiss; mixing water and wine in the chalice while saying a prayer recalling the blood and water that flowed from Jesus Christ's opened side; suspending the Blessed Sacrament above the altar in a vessel usually shaped like a dove; and so forth. Several of these usages have now fallen into disuse, and little trouble is taken to discover the origin of those retained. We shall relate how, in the eighteenth century, the Church of Lyon—which had preserved more ancient Gallican usages than any other—saw them perish irrevocably under Gallicanism's blows. But let us return to Amalarius.

[margin: Gallican usages preserved in many Churches of France, especially Lyon and Paris.]

His work was a compilation, which we still *(p. 246)* possess, of various pieces from the Roman and French Antiphonaries. He made a whole of them, correcting each by the others. To make his sources recognizable at a glance, he carefully placed the letter R in the margin when following the Roman Antiphonary and M when adhering to Metz's. In a few places where he thought fit to depart from both, he placed I and C in the margin, as if to ask for Indulgence and Charity[17]. This collection, which attests the French people's incorrigible mania for endlessly retouching the Liturgy, became the standard for ecclesiastical chant in our Churches. No one henceforth returned to Rome for fresh Antiphonaries. Such were the first origins of the Romano-French Liturgy that we shall discuss later in this history. In fairness, however, we must acknowledge that for most Offices of the year Amalarius's compilation presents no variants from the purely Roman books. The few Offices in which differences occur depart from the Roman only by substituting or adding a few responsories or antiphons for or to other responsories or antiphons in the Gregorian Antiphonary. The Apostolic See found these differences so slight that it did not think fit to protest. The Gallican Liturgy was nonetheless irrevocably destroyed and Roman usages introduced—though not, alas, irrevocably—into the flourishing empire of the Franks.

[margin: His book becomes the standard for ecclesiastical chant in France.]

[margin: The nature of Amalarius's work on the Antiphonary.]

[margin: Agobard, Archbishop of Lyon, violently criticizes Amalarius's work.]

Amalarius's work nevertheless met with sharp criticism in the Church of Lyon. That see was occupied by the famous Agobard, a prelate whom his Church honors with a cult that the Apostolic See has not ratified. He lashed out violently against Amalarius in a short work he entitled *(p. 247)* On Divine Psalmody, reproaching him with having attacked the holy Church of Lyon, both orally and in writing, as failing to follow legitimate usage in celebrating the Offices. Agobard had a personal quarrel to avenge in this. He too had undertaken his

own correction of the Antiphonary: “To the best of our ability we have corrected the Antiphonary in large part, cutting out what seemed superfluous, trivial, false or blasphemous”; so as to leave in it only what came from Holy Scripture, in accordance with the intention of the canons[18].

The Antiphonary of Metz, by contrast, contained a number of pieces in ecclesiastical style, not formed from the words of Scripture.

[margin: In De Correctione Antiphonarii, Agobard maintains that only the words of Holy Scripture should be sung in the Offices and applies this theory to his Church’s books.]

It is rather strange that the Roman Antiphonary, established at Lyon by Pepin and Charlemagne so few years earlier, should have contained so many reprehensible things. Our astonishment ceases, however, when we read Agobard’s own De Correctione Antiphonarii. This bishop was no stranger to the theories disapproved in Spain at the Fourth Council of Toledo, an interesting canon of which we quoted above. Agobard too maintained that only the very words of Holy Scripture should be sung in the Offices. To bring the Liturgy into agreement with his system, he had begun by cutting from the Gregorian books everything that might contradict it.

[margin: The injustice of Agobard’s attacks on Amalarius.]

In this last work, he chiefly attacks Amalarius’s De Ordine Antiphonarii, bitterly and violently criticizing several antiphons and responsories that he claims were composed by the liturgical writer of Metz. It is unfortunate for Agobard’s reputation—he has, in any case, never enjoyed *(p. 248)* that of an impartial man—that most pieces he imputes to Amalarius have always formed part of Saint Gregory’s own Antiphonary, as Blessed Tommasi noted in his annotations on the Responsorials and Antiphonaries[19]. On this our illustrious Dom Mabillon remarks: “Thus strict censors sometimes draw upon themselves the just censure of others[20].” If Amalarius was therefore blameworthy for inserting something into the Antiphonary, Agobard was far more so: he had not feared to cut out on his private authority everything not drawn from the very words of Holy Scripture. One had infringed, at least to some extent, on the Liturgy’s purity; the other had gravely infringed on it and had even dared to contest one of the chief characteristics of every Liturgy: its traditional character.

[margin: Agobard’s system does not outlive him, even in his own Church.]

Amalarius’s work endured because it was grounded in truth, despite certain bold innovations. Agobard’s, by contrast, did not outlive him, at least in its systematic part. The ancient Liturgy of Lyon indeed contains many pieces in ecclesiastical style. We need only recall the magnificent antiphon Venite, populi, ad sacrum et immortale mysterium (“Come, O peoples, to the sacred and immortal mystery”), etc., sung during Communion. Elsewhere in this work we shall give a sufficient account of the Offices of the Church of Lyon as preserved until the last century.

[margin: Tropes, the forerunners of sequences, are introduced into the]

[margin: Liturgy.]

The controversy between Amalarius and Agobard leads us to a development that arose in the Liturgy in their age: the tropes, which were a kind of *(p. 249)* first sketch of the sequences that succeeded them. Tropes were a sort of prologue preparing for the Introit. In Chapter VII we quoted the one sung in Saint Gregory’s honor on the First Sunday of Advent. Later, tropes were inserted into the chants themselves: within Introits, between the words Kyrie (“Lord”) and eleison (“have mercy”), and at certain points in the Gloria in excelsis (“Glory in the highest”), Sanctus (“Holy”) and Agnus Dei (“Lamb of God”). They were also placed after the Alleluia verse, taking as their musical theme the melisma called Neuma or Jubilus, which always follows that verse. This last kind of trope was called a sequence, from the name then given to that succession of notes on one and the same final syllable[21].

[margin: The invention of tropes, commonly attributed to Blessed Notker Balbulus, goes back to the eighth century.]

Cardinal Bona and most writers generally agree in attributing the first invention of sequences to Blessed Notker Balbulus, the monk of Saint Gall whom we shall discuss later. But a precious discovery by Abbé Lebeuf in a manuscript of the King's Library compels us to date the institution of tropes earlier. Properly understood, they do not constitute a different genre from sequences themselves. The learned subcantor of Auxerre points to a manuscript of the Liber pontificalis—a work attributed, as is known, to Anastasius the Librarian—followed by the life of Pope Hadrian II[22]. Unlike the manuscripts edited by Bianchini, Vignoli and Muratori, where this pope's life is presented in truncated form, the manuscript cited by Lebeuf offers curious details absent from those published by these authors. We place this passage in the notes to the present chapter[23]. It states that Hadrian II, following the example of the *(p. 250)* first pope of that name, completed the Roman Antiphonary in various places and placed at the beginning of the Mass of the First Sunday of Advent a prologue in hexameter verse to be sung. This prologue begins in the same way as the one Hadrian I composed, but contains more verses. The first origin of this eulogy of Saint Gregory, quoted above, must therefore be traced back to the eighth century—and with it that of tropes, for this eulogy is a true trope[24].

[margin: According to the Liber pontificalis, Hadrian II restores tropes as their use is falling into disuse.]

The chronicle adds that Hadrian II ordered that even in monasteries, at solemn Mass on the principal feasts, the inserted hymns that the Romans call festivæ laudes ("festal praises") and the French tropes should be sung both in the Gloria in excelsis and at the Introit. The same pope also wished the melodies called sequences to be sung before the Gospel. And the chronicle adds: "Because these festal chants had been instituted and arranged by the Lord Pope Gregory I and afterward by Hadrian together with Abbot Alcuin, the favorite of the great Emperor Charles, who took great delight in them, but already seemed to be lapsing through the cantors' negligence, they were so firmly established by the beneficent prelate of whom we speak, to the praise and glory of Our Lord Jesus Christ, that thereafter, through the diligence of those devoted to this work, alongside the Antiphonary *(p. 251)* the Troper too should be used on solemn days for fitting chants at the principal Mass."

This important fragment shows that sequences already existed in Hadrian II's time—he occupied the see in 867—and that this pope renewed a usage already quite old. We do not think, however, that the claim made here about Saint Gregory's having instituted this form of chant can be maintained: some other trace of it would have survived in antiquity. Perhaps, with some probability, it could be understood of Saint Gregory II, who seems to have concerned himself with ecclesiastical chant. Be that as it may, Notker was therefore not the author of tropes and sequences, though he helped spread their use, as we shall relate later.

[margin: The introduction of these rhythmic pieces increasingly establishes the principle of using ecclesiastical style in the Liturgy.]

[margin: The Church of Rome, which had not yet adopted hymns, admits them by about the eleventh century at the latest.]

The institution of these poetic narratives, adorned with a certain rhythm, had important consequences for the Liturgy's future. First, in the composition of sacred formulas, they increasingly established the principle contested by Agobard and the Council of Braga: sacred chants are not composed exclusively of the words of Holy Scripture. As we have just said, the Roman Antiphonary and Responsorial doubtless already contained a number of pieces in ecclesiastical style; but the ever-growing number of tropes and sequences brought this principle into ever-clearer light. Rome, which had not initially adopted hymns, seems in this to have followed the Ambrosian, Gallican and Gothic Churches by about the eleventh century at the latest. The use of tropes and sequences had naturally prepared it to do so. Moreover, despite Agobard, the Church of Lyon also adopted these poetic excrescences early and retained the tropes of the Kyrie eleison ("Lord, have mercy") and the Sanctus ("Holy") longer than any other Church. No stronger refutation could have been given to those scandalized at sometimes hearing *(p. 252)* the Church's own mighty voice resound in the interludes of the psalmody.

[margin: The introduction of tropes brings a revolution in the course of ecclesiastical chant.]

[margin: The genius of the new peoples of the West finds expression in these new compositions.]

Another consequence of the introduction of tropes was a revolution in the course of ecclesiastical chant. People did not at first seek meter in it, properly speaking. Yet the rhythmic and almost always rhymed composition of these pieces required a different shaping of the Gregorian phrase if it was to be felt in the chant. The chant's original character was therefore necessarily modified in these new portions. The character of the various Western nations—or rather the genius of Western Christendom—emerged by its own powers in these still tentative efforts. The French played a great part in this powerful innovation, which had reached full maturity by the opening of the eleventh century: the age that saw the struggle between priesthood and empire, the crusades, and the rebuilding of our cathedrals according to so mysteriously sublime a plan. The pieces of the Gregorian repertory were nevertheless preserved fairly faithfully, apart from the inevitable variants whose cause we have indicated. Henceforth, however, they contrasted with the kind of pieces appended to them to celebrate new feasts, those of patron saints and other local solemnities. We feel that a separate work would be needed here; we would not lack materials. For the present, we shall say only that the pieces of ecclesiastical chant composed from the eighth to the eleventh century fall into two broad classes. One consists of pieces treated wholly or partly in the grand Gregorian style[25]; the other bears a new character, at once rough and ponderously melodious[26]. This latter class is further subdivided into *(p. 253)* pieces adorned with rhyme and a certain meter, and prose pieces clothed in an elaborate melody entirely foreign in character to that of the Gregorian phrase.

[margin: Despite the work of many writers seeking a comprehensive account of music, the traditions suffer during this revolution. They would have perished completely had the Roman books not been introduced into France.]

This revolution in so essential a part of the Liturgy greatly stirred the composers of chant, especially in the monasteries, which for many centuries, together with the cathedrals, were the West's only schools of music. Many writers during these two centuries sought to give a comprehensive account of music or to devise new ways of writing it. Amid this ferment, however, the true traditions were suffering. We may affirm that, had the Roman books not already been introduced into France by the powerful will of Pepin and Charlemagne, and had the whole ordering of the feasts of the Christian year not already rested on this admirable repertory, today we would know the ancient musical modes only in theory; in this art, we would know nothing of a past stretching back two thousand years. Thus, in all things, Catholicism has known how to join the immutability of its forms to the effects of each nation's own activity. From this comes that union of movement and solidity which is living order. Degradation has occurred only when people have sought to separate what God and his Church had joined.

[margin: Charles the Bald's zeal for the Roman Liturgy.]

Charles the Bald, son and successor of Louis the Pious, showed no less zeal than the leaders of his dynasty for establishing Roman usages throughout France. In a letter to the clergy of Ravenna he says: "For until the time of our forefather Pepin, the Gallic and Spanish Churches celebrated the divine services differently from the Roman or Milanese Church, as we have seen and heard from those *(p. 254)* who came to us from the region of the Church of Toledo and celebrated the sacred rites of Mass in our presence according to that Church's custom. The sacred rites of Mass were also celebrated in our presence according to the custom of Jerusalem, with James the Apostle as their author, and according to that of Constantinople, with Basil as their author. But we judge that the Roman Church is to be followed in the celebration of Mass[27]."

[margin: Several princes of this age show admirable respect for the divine Offices.]

[margin: Lothair, son of Louis the Pious.]

These words of Charles the Bald show so well the interest this emperor took in liturgical matters that they prompt us to mention here the princes of this age who showed the greatest respect for the divine Offices. Thus we shall recall the piety of Lothair, Louis the Pious's eldest son, who, according to Leo of Ostia, heard three Masses every day[28].

[margin: Emperor Otto I.]

Otto I, emperor in 962, attended the entire Office every day. On solemn feasts, according to the contemporary historian Ditmar, he went to church with pomp and in procession, accompanied by the bishops and all the clergy, with crosses, relics and censers, to attend Vespers, Matins and Mass. He never withdrew before the end.

[margin: Alfred the Great, King of England.]

In ninth-century England flourished Alfred, a prince as great as the all too narrow theater of his glory allowed him to be. He too loved the divine Offices. This great warrior, this powerful lawgiver, this true sage divided the day's twenty-four hours into three equal parts: eight for prayer and reading, eight for bodily needs, and eight for his kingdom's affairs. During the eight hours devoted to prayer, he attended all the Offices of day and night. William of Malmesbury tells us that he always carried the book of divine Offices in his bosom, so that he could consult it *(p. 255)* to pray in every free moment he might have. Such was the profound religion of these great leaders of peoples who worked in concert with the Church to draw Europe out of barbarism.

[margin: The Seventh General Council's decision in favor of holy images is one of this age's great liturgical events.]

While liturgical unity, and through it orthodoxy, were striking such deep roots in the West, the Eastern Church was being drenched in blood by the fury of the iconoclast heresy. The Seventh General Council's decision in favor of holy images was a great liturgical event. By this decision the Church sanctioned forever the use of outward form in the objects of Christian worship and saved art as it was about to expire under the blows of the most brutal fanaticism. We lack space here to recount this victory in detail, but we had at least to record it in our narrative. The same sentiment that led the faithful to venerate the saints' relics was naturally bound to lead them to honor their images. We shall see the antiliturgical heresy follow the same course in its blasphemies and violence.

[margin: Liturgical writers of the ninth and tenth centuries.]

It is time to give the list of writers who worked on the Liturgy during the period before us, that is, the ninth and tenth centuries.

[margin: Oldibert, Archbishop of Milan.]

We shall begin our list with Oldibert, or Odelpert, who became Archbishop of Milan about 804. At Charlemagne's request, like several other bishops of his time, he composed a book De Baptismo.

[margin: Joseph the Studite, Archbishop of Thessalonica.]

(808). Joseph the Studite, brother of Saint Theodore the Studite and Archbishop of Thessalonica, is the author of several hymns in the Greek Liturgy.

[margin: Philoxenus, Bishop of Baghdad.]

(810). Philoxenus, Bishop of Baghdad, wrote a treatise on the divine services and composed an Anaphora found in Renaudot's collection.

[margin: Amalarius Fortunatus, Archbishop of Trier.]

(810). Amalarius Fortunatus, Archbishop of Trier, is the author of a book De Ratione rituum sacri Baptismatis.

(812). Amalarius, a priest of the Church of Metz, is, in *(p. 256)* chronological order, the most important writer on the Liturgy as a whole after Saint Isidore of Seville. His four books De Ecclesiasticis Officiis are of the highest value for explaining the mysteries of divine service. We shall draw on them often later. We lack space to insert the table of chapters of this work here, as we did for Saint Isidore's Ecclesiastical Origins. Amalarius has been reproached for carrying the search for mystical meanings in liturgical matters to excess. There may be some foundation for this reproach. Elsewhere we shall examine the rules to follow in the

mystical explanation of the details of divine service, so as to avoid any excess in either direction. We have discussed above Amalarius's book entitled De Ordine Antiphonarii. Following his Capitularies, Baluze published a short work by the same author entitled Eclogæ in Canonem Missæ.

[margin: Saint Theodore the Studite.]

(813). Saint Theodore the Studite, archimandrite and intrepid defender of holy images, composed a great number of hymns and prayers used in the Greek Liturgy during Lent.

[margin: Agobard, Archbishop of Lyon.]

(813). Agobard, Archbishop of Lyon, wrote against Amalarius of Metz, as we have related: 1. De Psalmodia; 2. De Correctione Antiphonarii; 3. Liber adversus Amalarium.

[margin: Maxentius, Patriarch of Aquileia.]

(813). Maxentius, Patriarch of Aquileia, also composed, at Charlemagne's request, a letter De Ritibus Baptismi, eorumque significatu.

[margin: Theodore and Theophanes Graptus.]

(818). Theodore and Theophanes Graptus, monks of Saint Sabas and illustrious defenders of holy images, are the authors of several hymns of the Greek Liturgy.

[margin: Joshua, Nestorian Patriarch.]

(820). Joshua, Patriarch of the Nestorians, wrote On the Distinction of the Offices, On Their Interpretation, and On the Power of Hymns.

[margin: Icasia, a Greek]

[margin: princess.]

(820). Icasia, a Greek princess who came close to *(p. 257)* wearing an empress's diadem and winning the hand of Emperor Theophilus, ended her days in the leisure of study and contemplation. She composed several ecclesiastical hymns, some of which entered the Greek Liturgy.

[margin: Helisacar, Abbot of Saint-Maximin in Trier.]

(830). Helisacar, chancellor of Louis the Pious, Abbot of Saint-Riquier and afterward of Saint-Maximin in Trier, put the Roman Antiphonary in order for the use of several churches.

[margin: Florus, a deacon of Lyon.]

(837). Florus, a deacon of Lyon, left an Exposition of the Canon of the Mass.

[margin: Lupus, Abbot of Ferrières.]

(840). Lupus, Abbot of Ferrières, is the author of two hymns in honor of Saint Wigbert.

[margin: Grimoald, Abbot of Saint Gall.]

(841). Grimoald, Abbot of Saint Gall and archchaplain to Louis the Pious, revised Saint Gregory's Sacramentary.

[margin: Walafrid Strabo.]

(842). Walafrid Strabo, Abbot of Reichenau, is the author of a valuable short work entitled De Officiis divinis, sive de exordiis et incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum. This book remains one of the chief sources for medieval liturgical scholarship.

[margin: Eldephonsus, a Spanish bishop.]

(845). Eldephonsus, or Ildephonsus, a Spanish bishop, left a short work in which he treats of the hosts intended for the Eucharistic sacrifice and explains the mysteries signified by their shape, weight, number, inscription and so forth.

[margin: Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mainz.]

(847). Rabanus Maurus, first Abbot of Fulda and then Archbishop of Mainz, is also one of the chief medieval liturgists. He merits this title through his three books De Institutione clericali, which contain the richest instruction. To these must be added several hymns, a short work De Sacris Ordinibus, sacramentis divinis et vestimentis sacerdotalibus, and finally the Martyrology that bears Rabanus Maurus's name.

(p. 258) (850). Wandelbert, a monk of Prüm, is the author of a Martyrology in verse.

[margin: Wandelbert, a monk of Prüm. Aurelian, a monk of Moutier-Saint-Jean. Rodradus, a priest of Amiens. Joseph the Hymnographer.]

(850). Aurelian, a monk of Moutier-Saint-Jean, composed a treatise on chant, which he dedicated to Bernard, the chief cantor. We no longer possess this work.

(853). Rodradus, a priest of Amiens, revised the Gregorian Sacramentary for that church's use, dividing it into two books.

(853). Joseph of Sicily, surnamed the Hymnographer, is the author of many hymns used in the Greek Liturgy. His fertility in this genre was so great that he left no fewer than six hundred in honor of the Blessed Virgin. These canticles are full of unction and often sublime in their poetry.

[margin: Angelomus, a monk of Luxeuil. Ado, Archbishop of Vienne. Emperor Charles the Bald.]

(856). Angelomus, a monk of Luxeuil in Burgundy, wrote a book De Divinis Officiis.

(859). Ado, Archbishop of Vienne, is the author of the famous Martyrology that bears his name.

(860). Emperor Charles the Bald is said to have composed an Office in honor of the Holy Shroud, with which the church of Compiègne was enriched in his time. He is also credited with a responsory of Saint Martin beginning with the words O quam admirabilis ("O how wonderful").

[margin: Salvus, Abbot of Alvelda. Moses Barcepha, a Jacobite bishop.]

(862). Salvus, Abbot of Alvelda in Navarre, composed hymns and ecclesiastical prayers.

(863). Moses Barcepha, also called Severus, Bishop of Mosul, of the sect of the Jacobites, is the author of an anaphora in the Syriac Missal; two treatises, one on holy Chrism and the other on Baptism; and an explanation of the ceremonies used in the tonsure of monks.

[margin: Emperor Basil the Macedonian and his Menologion.]

(867). Basil the Macedonian, Emperor of Constantinople, had an edition of the Menologion prepared, enlarged and adorned with images of the saints. It is the one that bears his name and was published by order of Benedict XIII at Urbino in *(p. 259)* 1727. Allatius attributes this Menologion to Basil the Younger, who reigned in 977.

[margin: PART I CHAPTER X Usuard, a monk of Saint-Germain-des-Prés.]

(876). Usuard, a monk of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, compiled, by Charles the Bald's order, a Martyrology drawn from those already published.

[margin: Adelhelm, Bishop of Séez.]

(878). Adelhelm, Bishop of Séez, composed a collection of blessings for Mass, following the custom preserved in France even after the introduction of Roman usages. This collection contains thirty-six, for the Sundays following Christmas and Epiphany, up to but not including Lent.

[margin: Remigius, a monk of Auxerre,]

[margin: Saint-Germain in preserves the tradition of ecclesiastical chant.]

(880). Remigius, a monk of Saint-Germain in Auxerre, was a cantor of the first rank, as his manuscript commentary on Martianus Capella's De Musica proves. Abbé Lebeuf says that he received his knowledge of

chant from Heiric, who received it from Rabanus and Haymo of Halberstadt. They had conversed with the Roman cantors who came to France under Charlemagne, or with their first pupils. The Lyon Bibliothèque des Pères assigns him an exposition of the Mass. Trithemius also attributes to him a book De Festivitatibus Sanctorum. Finally, Dom Martène's great work De antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus contains a short treatise attributed to the same Remigius of Auxerre, entitled De Dedicatione Ecclesiæ.

[margin: George, Archbishop of Nicomedia. Emperor Leo the Philosopher.]

(880). George, Archbishop of Nicomedia, is the author of several hymns of the Greek Liturgy.

(886). Leo the Philosopher, Emperor of Constantinople, also composed several pieces of the same genre, likewise found in the Greeks' Office books.

[margin: Regino, Abbot of Prüm.]

(892). Regino, Abbot of Prüm, addressed to Radbod, Archbishop of Trier, a treatise De harmonica Institutione and compiled a Lectionary for the whole year.

[margin: Hucbald, a monk of Saint-Amand.]

(899). Hucbald, a monk of Saint-Amand in the Diocese of Tournai, was a famous cantor. During a stay at Reims, he composed the chant and words of an Office *(p. 260)* in honor of Saint Thierry, for the monks of that abbey. He also enriched other churches with his melodies, chiefly those of Meaux and Nevers. He had composed two treatises on music, in one of which he established signs to mark the different tones of the octave.

[margin: Aurelian, a cleric of Reims.]

(900). Aurelian, a cleric of the Church of Reims, wrote De Regulis modulationum, quas tonos, sive tenores appellant, et de earum vocabulis.

[margin: Mark, a Greek monk. Stephen, Bishop of Liège.]

(901). The monk Mark composed many hymns found in the Greek Liturgy at the Offices of Holy Week.

(903). Stephen, Bishop of Liège, is the author of an Office in honor of the Holy Trinity, much of which is found in the one the Roman Church uses on this solemnity. He also composed its chant, and made another Office for the feast of the Finding of Saint Stephen's Relics.

[margin: Helperic, a monk of Saint Gall. Notker the Stammerer, a monk of Saint Gall.]

(903). Helperic, a monk of Saint Gall, wrote a book De Musica and another De Computo ecclesiastico.

(904). Notker the Stammerer, a monk of Saint Gall, produced a Martyrology that bears his name. He also composed many sequences and hymns, which may be found in volume II of Canisius's Lectiones antiquæ and volume I of Dom Bernard Pez's Anecdotes. We do not identify them more explicitly because these pieces are not used in the Church's Offices. Notker also wrote a treatise on the notes used in music. He was one of the most famous cantors at the Abbey of Saint Gall, which was an academy of ecclesiastical chant for monks, as the school of the Church of Metz was for the secular clergy of France.

[margin: Stephen, Abbot of Lobbes. Saint Radbod, Bishop of Utrecht.]

(910). Stephen, Abbot of Lobbes, notated the chant of an Office in honor of Saint Lambert.

(917). Saint Radbod, Bishop of Utrecht, composed the chant of an Office in honor of Saint Martin; he also left *(p. 261)* two hymns in honor of Saint Switbert and Saint Lebwin.

[margin: Saint Odo, Abbot of Cluny.]

(926). Saint Odo, illustrious Abbot of Cluny and founder of the Order bearing that name, is the author of seven antiphons in honor of Saint Martin, two hymns for the same saint's feast, and another on Saint Mary Magdalene.

[margin: Gobert, Bishop of Laon.]

(930). Gobert, Bishop of Laon, wrote a kind of poem De Tonsura, vestimentis et vita clericorum.

[margin: Fulk the Good, Count of Anjou, very zealous for the divine Offices.]

(944). Fulk II, called the Good, Count of Anjou, was a great prince. Yet his lofty qualities did not prevent him from showing, like Pepin, Charlemagne and Alfred the Great, an eager zeal for the divine Offices. He attended them in clerical dress and sang the Office with the clergy. When King Louis d'Outremer mocked him for this, the count sent him word that an unlettered king is a crowned ass. These great leaders of peoples regarded the Liturgy as the noblest and most powerful vehicle for ideas of progress. Fulk was skilled in chant and composed twelve responsories in honor of Saint Martin.

[margin: George, Patriarch of the Nestorians.]

(945). George, Patriarch of the Nestorians, wrote a book entitled Explanation of All the Ecclesiastical Offices and Their Purpose, with an Explanation of the Divine Economy and the Feasts of the Lord.

[margin: Guy, Bishop of Auxerre.]

(945). Guy, Bishop of Auxerre, worked on ecclesiastical chant. To words of his own choice in honor of Saint Julian of Brioude, he adapted the melody of the responsories that Heiric and Remigius, monks of the Abbey of Saint-Germain, had composed for their holy patron's feast.

[margin: Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus.]

(949). Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Emperor of the East, wrote a Ceremonial, both for the use of the court of Constantinople and to set out what concerned processions and the Church's other rites on solemn feasts.

(p. 262) (961). Saint Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, is the author of an Archiepiscopal Benedictional.

[margin: Saint Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury. Notker, Bishop of Liège. Hartmann and Ekkehard, monks of Saint Gall.]

(971). Notker, or Notger, Bishop of Liège, formerly a monk of Saint Gall like his namesake, likewise worked on ecclesiastical music and made a collection of sequences.

(978). Hartmann and Ekkehard, monks of Saint Gall trained in the school of Notker Balbulus, composed various hymns, litanies in verse, and other rhymed and metrical pieces collected in volume II of Canisius's Lectiones antiquæ.

[margin: Elijah, Bishop of Cascare.]

(980). Elijah, Bishop of Cascare, wrote Blessings and Prayers, a book On the Use of the Psalms, and another On the Ecclesiastical Sacraments.

[margin: John, Abbot of Saint-Arnould in Metz. Sabarjesus, a Nestorian priest. Robert, King of France. Létalde, a monk of Micy.]

(982). John, Abbot of Saint-Arnould in Metz, composed chants for the feast of Saint Lucy and Saint Glosside.

(985). Sabarjesus, a Nestorian priest, wrote a Blessing, or formula, for dismissing the people at the end of Mass.

(997). Robert, King of France, is the author of several chants that we shall discuss in the following chapter.

(997). Létalde, a monk of Micy, came to Le Mans to visit the Abbey of Saint-Pierre de la Couture. Bishop Avesgaud asked him to revise the life of Saint Julian. When he had completed this work, the same bishop asked him to compose an entire Office in honor of this holy apostle of Maine. Létalde also notated its chant. In this work he adhered to the old Gregorian style, already being altered in several places: "For I do not like the novelty of certain musicians," he says, "who employ a manner so different that they utterly disdain to follow the old masters[29]." This Office, so valuable for *(p. 263)* its chant and its words, remained in use in the Church of Le Mans until 1750, when it had to disappear, together with all the ancient melodies so dear to our

fathers, before Lebeuf's mute and ponderous compilation.

[margin: Heribert, Archbishop of Cologne.]

(999). Heribert, Archbishop of Cologne, who closes the list of tenth-century liturgists, composed a book De Ecclesiasticis Officiis.

[margin: Conclusions.]

Let us conclude this chapter with the following observations:

In the eighth century, the Apostolic See begins to lay down as a principle the necessity for the ancient Churches of the West to embrace the Roman Liturgy in all its fullness.

The Gallican Church sees its ancient usages fall before those of Rome and renounces traditions that are undoubtedly venerable, but does so to embrace others still more sacred.

The aim of the popes and French princes in this great work is to tighten the bond of unity by destroying a liturgical divergence whose consequences they judge dangerous.

The French spirit willingly adopts this new liturgical order, but soon shows its changeability, which it often disguises under the pretext of improvement, by altering the deposit of the Roman Liturgy in several respects.

Nevertheless, these variants do not affect the substance. The eighth century sees the beginning of the roughly thousand-year period during which the Church of France will glory in having one and the same prayer as the Roman Church.

The age of liturgical unity becomes an age of high Christian civilization. Charlemagne uses this powerful means to accomplish his great designs. In the next chapter we shall see the Church's Charlemagne, Saint Gregory VII, hasten Spain's great destinies by bringing it, through the Roman Liturgy, to share the ways of Western Christendom.

(p. 264)

Notes to Chapter X

Note A

A cujus Romanæ Ecclesiæ sancta et veneranda communione multis recedentibus, nostræ tamen partis nunquam recessit Ecclesia, sed ea apostolica traditione instruente, et eo a quo est omne donum optimum tribuente, semper suscepit reverenda charismata. Quæ dum a primis fidei temporibus cum ea perstaret in religionis sacræ unione, et ab ea paulo distaret, quod tamen contra fidem non est, in Officiorum celebratione, vener. mem. genitoris nostri illustrissimi Pipini regis cura et industria, sive adventu in Gallias sanctissimi viri Stephani Romanæ urbis Antistitis, est ei etiam in psallendi ordine copulata, ut non esset dispar ordo psallendi, quibus erat compar ardor credendi, et quæ unitæ erant unius sanctæ legis sacra lectione, essent etiam unitæ unius modulationis veneranda traditione, nec sejungeret Officiorum varia celebratio, quas conjunxerat unicæ fidei pia devotio. (Contra Synodum Græcorum de imagin., lib. I.)

Note B

Quod quidem et nos, collato nobis a Deo regno Italiæ, fecimus, sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ fastigium sublimare cupientes, reverendissimi Papæ Adriani salutaribus exhortationibus parere nitentes: scilicet ut plures illius partis Ecclesiæ, quæ quondam Apostolicæ Sedis traditionem in psallendo suscipere recusabant, nunc eam cum omni diligentia amplectantur; et cui adhæserant fidei munere, adhæreant quoque psallendi ordine. Quod non solum omnium Galliarum provinciæ, et Germania, sive Italia, sed etiam Saxones, et quædam Aquilonaris plagæ gentes, per nos, Deo annuente, ad fidei rudimenta conversæ, facere noscuntur. (Ibidem.)

Note C

Hujus modulationis dulcedinem inter alias Europæ gentes, Germani, seu Galli, discere, crebroque rediscere insigniter potuerunt: incorruptam vero tam levitate animi, quia nonnulla de proprio Gregorianis cantibus miscuerunt, quam feritate quoque naturali, servare minime potuerunt. Alpina siquidem corpora, vocum suarum tonitruis altisone perstrepentia, susceptæ modulationis dulcedinem proprie non resultant: quia bibuli gutturis barbara feritas, dum inflexionibus et repercussionibus mitem nititur *(p. 265)* edere cantilenam, naturali quodam fragore, quasi plaustra per gradus confuse sonantia rigidas voces jactat, sicque audientium animos, quos mulcere debuerat, exasperando magis ac obstrependo conturbat. (Johan. Diac. Vita S. Gregorii, lib. II, cap. vii.)

Note D

The most pious King Charles returned (from the Duchy of Benevento, that is) and celebrated Easter at Rome with the lord Pope. Behold, during the Easter feast days a dispute arose between the Roman and Gallic cantors. The Gauls said that they sang better and more beautifully than the Romans. The Romans said that they performed ecclesiastical chants with the greatest skill, as Pope Saint Gregory had taught them, while the Gauls sang corruptly and mangled the sound chant, destroying it. This dispute came before the lord King Charles. The Gauls, confident of King Charles's protection, vehemently reproached the Roman cantors. The Romans, relying on the authority of their great learning, declared them stupid, rustic and unlearned, like brute animals, and preferred Saint Gregory's teaching to their rusticity. As neither side brought the dispute to an end, the most pious lord King Charles said to his cantors:

Dicite palam, quis purior est, et quis melior, aut fons vivus, aut rivuli ejus longe decurrentes?

They all answered with one voice that the spring, as the head and source, was purer, while its streams were more turbid and corrupted with dirt and impurities the farther they flowed from the spring. And the lord King Charles said:

Revertimini vos ad fontem sancti Gregorii, quia manifeste corrupistis cantilenam ecclesiasticam.

Soon the lord King Charles asked Pope Hadrian for cantors to correct chant in France. He gave him Theodore and Benedict, most learned cantors of the Roman Church, who had been instructed by Saint Gregory, and gave him antiphonaries of Saint Gregory which he himself had notated in Roman notation. Returning to France, the lord King Charles sent one cantor to the city of Metz and the other to Soissons. He ordered the schoolmasters from all the cities of France to submit their antiphonaries to them for correction and to learn to sing from them. Thus the Frankish antiphonaries were corrected, which everyone had corrupted at his own discretion by adding or subtracting. All the cantors of France learned the Roman notation, which they now call Frankish notation, except that the Franks could not perfectly render in chant the tremulas ("tremulous"), tinnulas ("ringing"), collisibiles ("struck together") or secabiles ("divided") notes. With naturally barbaric voices, they broke the notes in their throats rather than rendering them. Greater mastery of singing remained in the city of Metz. As much as Roman mastery surpasses that of Metz in the art of song, so much does Metz's singing surpass the other Gallic schools.

Similiter erudierunt Romani cantores supradicti cantores Francorum in arte organandi.

The lord King Charles also brought masters of grammar and computation from Rome to France with him again, and ordered the study of letters to be spread everywhere. For before *(p. 266)* the lord King Charles himself, there had been no study of the liberal arts in Gaul. (Caroli Magni vita per monachum Engolismensem, in Duchesne, vol. II.)

Note E

Hadrian, the 108th Pope, held the see for five years. He was a Roman, the son of Julius. He furnished the churches with many precious ornaments. Like the earlier Hadrian, he strengthened the Roman Antiphonary in various places. He also instituted a second prologue in hexameter verse to be chanted at the principal Mass on the first day of Advent of the Lord Jesus Christ. It begins in the same way as the earlier Hadrian's proem, which that pope had composed in an extremely brief form to be chanted at all Masses on that same First Sunday of Advent; but this one consists of more verses. He ordained that in the monasteries, at the principal Mass on the chief solemnities, they should sing interspersed hymns, called Laudes ("praises"), not only in the angelic hymn Gloria in excelsis Deo ("Glory to God in the highest"), but also sing inserted chants in the Psalms of David, which they call Introits. The Romans call these Festivas Laudes ("festal praises"), the Franks Tropos ("tropes"), which means "figurative adornments in the praises of the Lord." He also handed down melodies to be sung before the Gospel, which they call Sequences because the Gospel follows them.

Et quia a Domino Papa Gregorio primo et postmodum ab Adriano una cum Alcuino Abbate, delicioso magni Imperatoris Caroli, hæ cantilenæ festivales constitutæ accomodatæ fuerant, multum in his delectato supradicto Cæsare Carolo, sed negligentia cantorum jam intermitti videbantur; ab ipso almifico Præsule de quo loquimur, ita corroboratæ sunt ad laudem et gloriam Domini nostri J.-C., ut diligentia studiosorum cum Antiphonario simul, deinceps et Tropiarius in solemnibus diebus ad missam majorem cantilenis frequentetur honestis.

He ordained that the Roman clergy should instruct the poor of our Lord Jesus Christ, our brothers, that during the three days before the most sacred Sunday of Easter—that is, the Lord's Supper, the Preparation, and the holy burial of our Lord Jesus Christ—they should seek alms throughout this city of Rome[30] in no other way than by loudly chanting through the streets and before the monasteries and churches in these words: "Lord, have mercy; Christ, have mercy; Lord, have mercy on us; Christ the Lord became obedient to death." (In Lebeuf, Traité historique et pratique sur le Chant ecclésiastique, 1741, p. 103 and following.)

Note F

Nam et usque ad tempora abavi nostri Pipini Gallicanæ et Hispanicæ Ecclesiæ aliter quam Romana vel Mediolanensis Ecclesia divina officia *(p. 267)* celebrabant sicut vidimus et audivimus ab eis, qui ex partibus Toletanæ Ecclesiæ ad nos venientes, secundum morem ipsius Ecclesiæ coram nobis sacra Missarum officia celebrarunt. Celebrata sunt etiam coram nobis sacra Missarum officia more Hierosolymitano, auctore Jacobo Apostolo, et more Constantinopolitano, auctore Basilio. Sed nos sequendam ducimus Romanam Ecclesiam in Missarum celebratione. (Baluze, Capitularia Regum Francorum, t. II, p. 730. Glossarium Fr. Pittæi in Epistola Caroli Calvi imperatoris ad Clerum Ravennatum.)

---

[1] He ordered this clergy, thoroughly instructed in divine law and Roman chant, to observe the custom and order of the Roman Church. (Paul the Deacon, in Duchesne, Hist. Franc., vol. II, p. 204.)

[2] Walafrid Strabo, De Rebus ecclesiasticis, chap. XXV.

[3] See Note A.

[4] Monachi ut cantum Romanum pleniter et ordinabiliter per nocturnale et gradale officium peragant, secundum quod beatæ memoriæ genitor noster Pipinus rex decertavit ut fieret, quando Gallicanum cantum tulit, ob unanimitatem apostolicæ Sedis et sanctæ Dei Ecclesiæ pacificam concordiam. (Baluz. Capitul.-Aquisgranen. 789, chap. XC.) [English of the opening: Monks are to perform the Roman chant fully and in due order in the Night Office and the Gradual Office, as our father King Pepin of blessed memory strove to ensure when he abolished the Gallican chant. The purpose clause is translated in the main text.]

[5] Pope Stephen, assenting to Pepin's goodwill and divinely inspired endeavors, sent him in France twelve clerics most expert in chant from the Apostolic See, corresponding to the number of the twelve Apostles. (Chronicon San-Gallense, book I, chap. X.)

[6] Labbé, Concil., vol. VI, p. 1688.

[7] Paul I, Epist. XXV, in Gretser.

[8] See Note B.

[9] As for the Sacramentary arranged by our holy predecessor, the divinely inspired Pope Gregory, Paul the grammarian asked us for it on your behalf some time ago; and according to our holy Church's tradition we sent it to Your Excellency through Abbot John.

(Duchesne, Hist. Franc., vol. III, p. 798.)

[10] We therefore wish the baptismal rites to be celebrated among us concordantly and uniformly in each parish according to the Roman order, in accordance with your holy admonition. (Council of Mainz, canon IV; Labbé, vol. VII, p. 1242.)

[11] See Note C.

[12] Quis purior est et quis melior, aut fons vivus, aut rivuli ejus longe decurrentes? (Caroli Magni vita per monachum Engolismen. Duchesne, vol. II, p. 75.)

[13] Revertimini vos ad fontem sancti Gregorii, quia manifeste corrupistis cantilenam ecclesiasticam. (Ibid.)

[14] See Note D.

[15] Acta SS. Aprilis, vol. I, April 6, p. 582.

[16] Similiter erudierunt Romani cantores supradicti cantores Francorum in arte organandi. Ibid. [Editor's note.] The three writers cited here by the author agree perfectly on the substance of this history but differ in some details. They give the same account of the dispute between Roman and French cantors, Charlemagne's intervention and his wise decision. The monk of Angoulême then relates that the Pope gave the emperor two Roman cantors, Theodore and Benedict, who came to Metz to found the school of chant. John the Deacon and Ekkehard, by contrast, say that Charles left two clerics of his chapel with the Pope; Hadrian instructed them in Roman tradition, and on returning to France they taught it at the school of Metz. After their death, confusion again arose in the usages of France's churches. Charlemagne then appealed to Hadrian a second time. Hadrian sent two cantors from the school founded by Saint Gregory. John the Deacon does not name them; he says only that they found tradition much better preserved at Metz than in other churches and that their lessons secured a complete and lasting superiority for that school. Ekkehard is more explicit: he names the two cantors sent by Hadrian, Peter and Romanus, and adds that the Pope gave them two antiphonaries perfectly conforming to Saint Gregory's authentic exemplar. The two envoys set out; but while crossing the Alps at the Septmer Pass near Lake Constance, Romanus fell ill and lacked the strength to continue. With great difficulty he reached the abbey of Saint Gall, bringing one of the two antiphonaries, which his companion had left him, though reluctantly. The monks welcomed him as an envoy from heaven. They desired to reform their monastery's chant according to pure Gregorian tradition; in the most unexpected way Providence was sending them the means of fulfilling this design. Charlemagne likewise saw in what had happened a sign of heaven's will. When Peter told him of his companion's adventure, he ordered Romanus to remain at Saint Gall and establish a school of chant there. At Rome, Saint Gregory's authentic Antiphonary was kept in a case called a cantarium, in a place where anyone could consult it to correct faults in antiphonaries and detect the errors of ignorant cantors. Saint Gall did the same: Romanus's precious manuscript was placed near the Apostles' altar in a rich casket. It is said to have survived time and revolutions, and is believed to be identifiable with the eighth-century antiphonary that Father Lambillotte of the Society of Jesus published in facsimile at Paris in 1851 as the Antiphonary of Saint Gregory. (EDITOR'S NOTE.)

[17] Biblioth. Max. Patrum, vol. XIV, pp. 1032–1061.

[18] Antiphonarium pro viribus nostris magna ex parte correximus, amputatis his quæ vel superflua, vel levia, vel mendacia, aut blasphema videbantur. (Agobard, De Correctione Antiphonarii. Biblioth. Max. Patrum, vol. XIV, p. 322.)

[19] Ven. viri Josephi-Mariæ Tommasii, S. R. E. Cardinalis Opera, vols. IV–V, passim.

[20] Sic rigidi censores aliquando in se provocant justam censuram aliorum. (Musæum Italicum, vol. II, p. 4.)

[21] Bona, Rerum liturgicarum, book II, chaps. III and VI; Sala ed., vol. III, pp. 54 and 137.

[22] Lebeuf, Traité historique sur le Chant ecclésiastique, p. 103.

[23] See Note E.

[24] Here are the verses found in most ancient manuscripts of the Gregorian Antiphonary. According to the chronicle we follow, they must be by Saint Hadrian I, since they are fewer and less complete than those quoted above. Gregorius Præsul meritis et nomine dignus, Unde genus duxit summum conscendit honorem, Renovavit monumenta patrumque priorum. Tunc composuit hunc libellum musicæ artis Scholæ cantorum anni circuli. Eia, dic Domine, eia. Gregory, a prelate worthy in merits and in name, Where his lineage sprang, ascended the highest honor; And renewed the records of the earlier Fathers. Then he composed this little book of the musical art For the school of cantors, [for] the year's cycle. Come, speak, Lord, come.

[25] The Gradual, Alleluia and Communion of All Saints; the antiphons of the same feast. It is also possible that these pieces were composed at Rome.

[26] The antiphons of the feast of the Holy Trinity; the hymn Gloria laus ("Glory, praise"), for Palm Sunday; O Redemptor ("O Redeemer"), sung at the consecration of the Holy Oils; and so forth.

[27] Baluze, Capitularia Regum Francorum, vol. II, p. 730. See Note F.

[28] Chronic. Cassinense, book IV, chap. 125.

[29] Non enim mihi placet quorumdam musicorum novitas, qui tanta dissimilitudine utuntur, ut veteres sequi omnino dedignentur auctores. (Annal. ord. S. Bened., vol. IV, p. 110.)

[30] These words, Urbem hanc Romanam ("this city of Rome"), plainly show that this was written at Rome.

Chapter XI. Abolition of the Gothic or Mozarabic Rite in Spain. Saint Gregory VII's Work on the Liturgy. Progress of Ecclesiastical Chant. Romano-French

Rite. Liturgical Writers of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries

(p. 268)

[margin: Christian Spain's situation in the eleventh century calls for it to share the benefits of the West's liturgical unity.]

A great liturgical event marks the period covered in this chapter. The Gothic or Mozarabic Liturgy succumbs in Spain to Saint Gregory VII's efforts, as the Gallican Liturgy had succumbed in France to Charlemagne's blows. It was indeed time for Christian Spain, already enlarged, if not liberated, by its heroic leaders' conquests, to take its place in the great European unity. Its particular Liturgy obstructed this intimate union. Prayer, which in those times of faith was the bond of nations—prayer was not shared by Spain and the other provinces of European Christendom. The Sacrifice, though the same in substance, differed essentially in the forms that met the people's eyes: the chants and sacred formulas were wholly dissimilar. Moreover, heresy had hoped for a time to find support in the words of a Liturgy whose purity nothing guaranteed, since it came from an authority that could not rely on infallibility. It was time for the Church of Spain to emerge from childhood and attain maturity.

[margin: This change was long in preparation.]

This great change was long in preparation, as always happens, and the Pontiff who brought it to fulfillment *(p. 269)* was only an instrument guided by Providence, which wills that the Church display, chiefly in the forms of worship, the unity that is her life. Pepin's and Charlemagne's work must have had powerful repercussions in Spain, the West's only country not subject to the laws of the Roman Liturgy. It was known that the Gallican Church now had no other rite than the Roman Church's. So much was this the case that Spanish chroniclers, whose passages may be read in Father Pinius's dissertation cited above[1], use the term Officium Gallicanum ("Gallican Office") to designate the Roman rite.

[margin: The Council of Jacca in 1063 orders celebrations to follow only the Roman manner.]

First we find, in 1063, a council held at Jacca in Aragon[2], under Don Ramiro I or his son Sancho Ramírez, issuing a decree that celebrations must henceforth follow the Roman manner, no longer the Gothic[3]. History does not expressly state the direct causes of this measure; Rome's influence must undoubtedly have played some part. This may be judged from what happened six years later at Barcelona. That city, conquered with its territory in 801 by Charlemagne, had undoubtedly adopted the Roman Liturgy. This itself explains the designation Gallican applied to the Roman Liturgy in Spain during the Middle Ages: by this name the Spaniards meant the Liturgy used in the French colony of Catalonia. But that vast province was not wholly subject to the French, and the Gothic Liturgy still prevailed in several places. The year 1068 saw it abolished forever through the efforts of Cardinal Hugh the White, *(p. 270)* legate of Alexander II. At a council held in Barcelona, this great measure was brought to completion. The Church owed this benefit to the great zeal of Princess Adelmodis, wife of Raymond Berengar, Count of Barcelona. She was French, and all the chronicles of the time agree in depicting her as a princess of great character. Her authority, combined with the legate's, secured the Roman Liturgy's triumph in Catalonia[4].

[margin: The Mozarabic Liturgy abolished in Catalonia in 1068 through Cardinal Hugh the White, legate of Alexander II. Saint Gregory VII resolves to complete the Roman Liturgy's victory in Spain.]

Alexander II's illustrious successor, the man who had been the soul of his pontificate, Saint Gregory VII, soon ascended Saint Peter's Chair and resolved to complete the Roman Church's victory over the Gothic Liturgy. The flourishing kingdoms of Castile and León still practiced it with chivalrous patriotism. But the great Hildebrand, who tirelessly pursued the work of European unity, could not be stopped by considerations of narrow nationality in so grave a matter as the Liturgy. In his collected letters we find one addressed in 1074 to Sancho Ramírez, King of Aragon. He congratulates this prince on his zeal for Roman usages in these expressive terms, which clearly show his underlying disposition toward the important subject before us:

[margin: His letter to Sancho Ramírez, King of Aragon.]

"Now, in stating that through your zeal and commands the Office according to the Roman order is celebrated under your rule, you are recognized as a son of the Roman Church, possessing the same concord and the same friendship with us that the kings of Spain once had with the Roman Pontiffs. Remain steadfast, then; have firm confidence, and complete what you have begun. For we trust in the Lord Jesus Christ that the blessed *(p. 271)* Apostle Peter, whom the Lord Jesus Christ, the King of glory, has appointed prince over the kingdoms of the world, and to whom you show yourself faithful, will bring you to the honor you desire; he himself will make you victorious over your adversaries[5]."

[margin: Gregory writes on the same subject to Alfonso VI, King of Castile, and Sancho IV, King of Navarre.]

In the same year the Pope wrote the following letter to Alfonso VI, King of Castile and León, and Sancho IV, King of Navarre:

"Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Alfonso and Sancho, kings of Spain (in identical letters), and to the bishops established under their rule, greeting and apostolic blessing.

Since the blessed Apostle Paul indicates that he visited Spain, and Your Diligence is not unaware that seven bishops were afterward sent from Rome by the Apostles Peter and Paul to instruct the peoples of Spain—bishops who destroyed idolatry, founded Christianity, planted religion, taught the order and Office for the celebration of divine worship, and dedicated churches with their own blood—it is sufficiently clear how great a concord Spain had with the city of Rome in religion and the order of the Divine Office. But after the kingdom of Spain had long been polluted by the madness of the Priscillianists, depraved by the perfidy of the Arians, and separated from the Roman rite, with the Goths first rushing in and the Saracens invading afterward, not only was religion diminished, but worldly resources too were undermined. Therefore

(p. 272) I exhort and admonish you as most beloved children that, as good offspring, even after long divisions, you may at last recognize the Roman Church as truly your mother, in whom you will also find us as brothers. Receive and keep, like the other kingdoms of the West and the North, the Roman Church's order and Office—not that of Toledo or of any other Church, but of that Church which, through Christ, was founded by Peter and Paul upon the firm rock and consecrated with their blood, and against which the gates of hell—that is, the tongues of heretics—have never been able to prevail. For from the very source where you do not doubt you received the beginnings of religion, it remains for you also to receive the Divine Office in ecclesiastical order. Pope Innocent's letter to the Bishop of Eugubium teaches you this; Hormisdas's decrees sent to the bishop of Seville indicate it; the Councils of Toledo and Braga demonstrate it. Your own bishops who recently came to us likewise promised in writing to do this according to a council's decision, and confirmed it in our hand[6]."

[margin: The energy with which Saint Gregory VII combats the resistance provoked by his decision.]

When vigorous resistance arose in several places, as was to be expected, the Pontiff was not shaken. We have another letter in which, writing to a Spanish bishop, he shows all the energy of his apostolic soul in defending the Holy See's ordinances. It reads as follows:

"Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Simeon, a Spanish bishop, greeting and apostolic blessing.

Having read Your Fraternity's letters, we were filled with joy, for in them we fully recognized the faith and devotion that you bear toward *(p. 273)* the Roman Church, and your desire not to desert her as an illegitimate child would, but to embrace her as one in the succession of legitimate offspring. Therefore, dearest brother, what has been well begun must advance along a straight path: what is known to have been sanctioned by apostolic tradition must not be diminished by heretical perversity. For the Apostolic See, over which, unworthy though we are, we preside by God's authority, has remained firm from its very beginnings under his governance, and under his protection will remain inviolate forever. The same Lord bears witness: 'I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and you, when you have turned back, strengthen your brothers.'

Supported by these defenses, the Roman Church wishes you to know that she does not wish to feed the children whom she nourishes for Christ from different breasts or with different milk, so that, according to the Apostle, they may be one and there may be no divisions among them; otherwise she would be called not mother, but division. Therefore let it be known to you and all Christ's faithful concerning whom you have consulted: it is our will that the decrees enacted or confirmed by us—or rather, as is established, by the Roman Church—for your celebration of that same Church's Offices remain unshaken. Nor will we acquiesce in those who seek to infect you with wolves' bites and poisonous plots. We do not doubt that, according to the Apostle, dangerous wolves, ravenous wolves, sparing nothing, are entering among you; you must resist them firmly in the faith. Therefore, most beloved brother, fight and toil even to the shedding of blood, if need be. For it would be unworthy and could be held ridiculous for men of the world, for so paltry a price and for commerce so hateful to God, to expose themselves *(p. 274)* willingly to danger, and for each believer to turn his back before the enemies rushing upon him. For virtue cannot be acquired by those who readily collapse wherever they are dragged. As for the claim of these sons of death that they have received letters from us, know that it is wholly false. See, therefore, that throughout Spain and Galicia, and wherever you can, the Roman order is observed more faithfully in all respects. Given at Rome, in the month of May, in the fourteenth indiction[7]."

[margin: Letter to Bishop Simeon in which Gregory demands obedience by virtue of apostolic authority and the ancient tradition of Spain's Churches.]

[margin: Richard, Abbot of Saint-Victor in Marseille and cardinal, Saint Gregory VII's legate in Spain, definitively abolishes the Gothic rite with the support of King Alfonso VI and his wife Constance of Burgundy.]

To press more effectively for the fulfillment of his wishes, Saint Gregory VII, following his custom, sent a legate to Spain's Churches. He chose for this mission Richard, Abbot of Saint-Victor in Marseille and cardinal of the Roman Church, who made the journey to Spain twice for so important a purpose. At a council held at Burgos in 1085, the legate, supported by Alfonso VI's authority, promulgated still more solemnly the abolition of the Gothic Liturgy in the kingdoms subject to this great prince. Alfonso himself did not stop there. In 1091 he ordered, for uniformity and to facilitate dealings with foreign nations, the abolition of Gothic characters[8] and the adoption of Latin ones as then used, though somewhat altered, in France and Europe's principal provinces. In carrying out all these vigorous measures, Alfonso was powerfully supported by the advice of Constance of Burgundy, whom he had married in 1080, and to *(p. 275)* whose influence the historian Rodrigo chiefly attributes the introduction of the Roman Liturgy into Spain[9]. This must be understood chiefly of the destruction of the Gothic rite at Toledo, since the first attacks it experienced in Spain took place, as we have seen, at the Council of Jacca in 1063.

[margin: Alfonso VI, master of Toledo by conquest, establishes the Roman Liturgy there despite the clergy's and people's resistance.]

On May 25, 1085, the day Pope Saint Gregory VII died, Alfonso VI entered Toledo victorious. He immediately devoted every effort to restoring the Church of this illustrious city to its high dignity. He endowed it generously and called Bernard, Abbot of Sahagún and French by nationality, to govern it. But the prince was to encounter great difficulties in his plan to abolish the Mozarabic rite at Toledo, where it was so firmly established that throughout Spain it was ordinarily called the rite of Toledo. We borrow the historian Rodrigo's narrative to recount this great event and the dramatic circumstances accompanying it.

"Before the recall (of Legate Richard), the clergy and people of all Spain are in turmoil because they were being compelled by the legate and the prince to receive the Gallican Office. On the appointed day, when the king, the primate, the legate, and a great multitude of clergy and people had assembled, there was a prolonged dispute. The clergy, soldiery and people firmly resisted a change of Office, while the king, persuaded by the queen, thundered the opposite demand with threats and intimidation. Finally, the soldiery's obstinacy brought matters to a decision that this dissension should be settled by combat in a single *(p. 276)* duel. Two knights were chosen to fight, one by the king for the Gallican Office, the other by the soldiery and

people for the Toledan Office. The king's knight was immediately defeated, and the people rejoiced that the knight of the Toledan Office was victorious. But Queen Constance so goaded the king that he did not abandon his purpose, declaring that a duel did not establish right. The knight who fought for the Toledan Office belonged to the house of Matanza, near Pisorica, whose line survives to this day[10]."

[margin: Duel between two knights, one fighting for the Roman Office, the other for the Office of Toledo.]

Whatever the truth of this story—which would have force to establish the Toledan Office's right only if judgment by single combat were accepted as God's own irrefragable judgment—Father Lebrun was mistaken when he wrote that the event was found only in the history of Rodrigo, who died in 1247[11]. The Chronicle of Saint-Maixent, a century earlier than Rodrigo's death since it ends in 1134, recounts the same story, though briefly[12]. Cardinal Bona also appears to have been unaware of this second testimony[13]. Moreover, we have not yet said everything about the obstacles heaven seemed to place—if we are to believe Rodrigo—in the way of destroying the venerable rite that recalled to the Spanish Church the beloved names of Saint Isidore and Saint Leander.

[margin: According to the historian Rodrigo, the two rival Liturgies undergo the trial by fire, and heaven declares for the Gothic rite.]

"When a great sedition arose among the people over this, it was finally decided to place the book of the Toledan Office and the book of the Gallican Office on a great bonfire. After a fast had been proclaimed for all by the primate, the legate and the clergy, and after *(p. 277)* prayer had been devoutly offered by all, the book of the Gallican Office is consumed by the fire. The book of the Toledan Office leaps above all the blaze's flames, completely unharmed (and) untouched by its burning, while everyone watches and praises the Lord[14]."

[margin: The authority of these accounts is not beyond dispute.]

This double prodigy should remind the reader of the one we recounted in Chapter VIII concerning the Ambrosian Liturgy. At least Rodrigo's account offers another testimony to the zeal with which peoples and clergy once approached everything concerning the Liturgy—a zeal that contrasts sadly indeed with the profound indifference that in our day has greeted, and still greets in France, the gravest changes in the same matter. As for the trial by fire, we must observe with Father Pinius[15] that Pelagius of Oviedo, Alfonso VI's contemporary, who recounted this prince's deeds in great detail, said not a single word about it. Neither did Luke of Tuy, who lived in Archbishop Rodrigo's century. It is difficult, moreover, to believe that, had a genuine prodigy occurred, the Apostolic See would have persisted in intending to destroy the Gothic Office. It would be the first miracle opposed to the Church's will. As for this particular event, if it were demonstrated (which it is not), Catholic theology might perhaps still explain it without recourse to divine intervention.

[margin: Despite everything, the Roman Office is definitively adopted in Spain.]

Rodrigo concludes his narrative as follows: "And then, while all wept and grieved, the proverb took root: Quod volunt reges, vadunt leges—'As kings will, so go the laws.' And from that time the Gallican Office, which had never before been received *(p. 278)* either in the Psalter or in other respects, was observed in the Spanish lands, although in some monasteries the Toledan Office was retained for some time; and the translation of the Psalter is still recited to this day in very many cathedral churches and monasteries[16]."

[margin: This measure, which destroyed precious traditions, was a necessity of European public order.]

Such were the circumstances accompanying the abolition of the Gothic Liturgy in Spain. It was therefore a solemn act of the Roman Pontiffs' zeal and the kings' piety, one of the necessities imposed by the sublime plan of Catholic social unity. Precious national traditions undoubtedly perished in this measure. But the Church recognizes no nations: she sees only one family in the human race. If the Christian societies of the East have broken into so many pieces and have seen the salt of Christianity grow insipid within them, such

great misfortunes would not have occurred if Rome, as we have said elsewhere, could have bound these vast provinces to those of European Christendom by the double bond of a common language and a universal Liturgy. Yet if this is so, what will history's judgment be on those who later, in Europe, in France, took pleasure in destroying the work of centuries, the result of the efforts of the most pious pontiffs and princes—this liturgical unity so dearly bought, so laboriously won?

[margin: Providence did not will the Church of Spain to lose entirely the memory of her ancient]

[margin: glories.]

Whatever the case, Providence did not will the Church of Spain to lose forever the memory of her ancient Gothic glories. When the danger had passed, *(p. 279)* when Spain, entirely freed from the Saracen yoke and now incorporated into European society, had earned on so many grounds the name of Catholic Kingdom, something happened to her that had never happened to any other nation. The past was brought forth from the dust, and Toledo thrilled to see the august mysteries of Isidore and Leander once again celebrated openly.

[margin: Cardinal Ximénès, archbishop of Toledo, restores the Mozarabic rite in several churches of Toledo, with Pope Julius II's permission.]

One of those men who belong less to the nation that produced them than to humanity as a whole, the great Cardinal Ximénès, archbishop of Toledo, lovingly gathered the small remnant of the Mozarabs. With the kings of Castile's toleration, they had continued to practice their fathers' rites in a few humble sanctuaries of Toledo. He had their books printed, though the ravages of time had mutilated them in places. He assigned them a chapel in the cathedral and six churches in the city for the celebration of the Gothic Liturgy, and provided for the support of worship and its ministers. But to make this restoration lawful, Ximénès appealed to the Sovereign Pontiff. At the cardinal's request, Julius II issued two bulls to establish the Gothic rite canonically in the churches assigned to it. In the first of these bulls, dated the twelfth day before the Kalends of October, 1508, the pope greatly praises Ximénès's zeal for divine service and describes the Mozarabic Office as "very ancient and marked by great devotion," antiquissimum et magnæ devotionis[17].

Superficial minds that might think they saw Julius II here contradicting Saint Gregory VII would have failed to *(p. 280)* appreciate the different kinds of reasons that dictated these two pontiffs' conduct. Unity, with all its consequences, is the foremost good for the Church. Her social development, her beneficial influence for humanity's good, and the preservation of the deposit of faith depend on it. Even a good of a secondary order must therefore, in certain cases, be sacrificed to it. Now the antiquity and beauty of certain prayers are a good, but one that cannot be weighed equally with the Church's general needs. These are the ideas under whose influence Saint Gregory VII acts. Yet, on the other hand, once unity is secured with all the goods that flow from it, nothing prevents granting something—even much—to legitimate desires whose fulfillment cannot impair what has been so beneficially and so laboriously established. Confined to the six or seven churches of Toledo, the Gothic rite no longer obstructs the Spanish kingdom's assimilation to the ways of Western Catholic Christendom. In Toledo itself, far from being overshadowed by it, the Roman Liturgy is instead enhanced. Our ancient dogmas, celebrated in the majestic language of the great and holy doctors of Seville and Toledo, become only more invulnerable to the innovators' attacks.

[margin: Julius II's conduct in this instance does not contradict Saint Gregory VII's.]

[margin: This concession, beneficial to the Church, does no harm to the principle of liturgical unity.]

Reduced to these proportions, the Gothic rite could do no harm and could be useful. This was the reason for the leniency Julius II showed. Rome has never feared antiquity: it is the firmest foundation of her rights, as of those of the Church, whose foundation stone Rome is. She loves to see the Ambrosian and Gothic rites still standing, like two ancient monuments of Christianity's earliest age. She would not tolerate other churches going backward toward their cradle, renouncing the forms of maturity to assume those of infancy. But she delights in giving innovators *(p. 281)* the opportunity to compare the beliefs and symbols used in these ancient Liturgies with the symbols and beliefs contained in that other Liturgy which the Catholic world has

seen grow through the centuries. It is true that if the Ambrosian and Gothic Liturgies dated, like those of a certain country, from the eighteenth or even the nineteenth century, Rome would have no grounds to praise their great antiquity or—to speak plainly—their venerable authority. But let us resume the thread of our history.

[margin: Saint Gregory VII reforms the Roman Liturgy.]

In history, Saint Gregory VII appears to us as more than the zealous propagator of the Roman Liturgy. His name also follows those of Leo, Celestine, Gelasius, and Gregory the Great, charged by the Holy Spirit with reforming it. Four centuries had elapsed since the work of the last of these pontiffs; it was time for a strong hand to intervene and improve it. As always happens in great undertakings, Saint Gregory VII may not have been fully conscious of what he was accomplishing for the ages to come. His work—which, moreover, does not appear to have affected the Sacramentary, now the Roman Missal, the Liturgy's most ancient and most immutable part—concerned the shortening of the Divine Office. The great affairs besieging an eleventh-century pope, the endless details of administration into which he had to enter, no longer allowed regular attendance at the long Offices used in earlier centuries to be reconciled with the duties of so vast a solicitude.

[margin: He shortens the Divine Office for the use of the Roman court.]

Saint Gregory VII shortened the order of prayers and simplified the Liturgy for the use of the Roman court. It would be difficult today to determine with complete precision the full form of the Office before this shortening. Since then, however, it has remained much as it was at the end of the eleventh century. We have *(p. 282)* as our witness the ancient writer known as Micrologus, from the title of his book, which appears to have been written about 1097[18]. This author indicates that he based his observations on the Office sanctioned by Saint Gregory VII. This valuable little work contains the following details: the author lists Offices cum pleno officio ("with the full Office"), or with three responsories, or with nine lessons. He mentions Sunday, ferial, and votive Offices. At Matins he specifies three psalms and three lessons from Easter Day through Saturday in albis ("in white garments"), and from Pentecost through the Saturday of the same week. On other days of the year, if it is a feast, nine psalms, nine lessons, and as many responsories; on Sundays, eighteen psalms and nine lessons. These details show that Saint Gregory VII's Breviary conformed to today's. Besides the details supplied by the Micrologus, however, an important document tells us in the greatest detail the order established by this great pope, following earlier traditions, for the distribution of the lessons at Matins. That order conforms to the one we still observe at present.

[margin: The form of the Office sanctioned by Saint Gregory VII, described in the Micrologus.]

[margin: A canon of the same pope regulates the order for reading Holy Scripture at Matins.]

This document is a canon inserted in Gratian's Decretum[19], following Saint Gelasius's canon on apocryphal books. The most learned liturgists—Grancolas, Merati, Azevedo, and Zaccaria—agree in recognizing Saint Gregory VII as the author of this second canon. Here is its text:

"Moreover, we have judged it proper to note, for the faithful's edification, which books some read in the ecclesiastical Offices through the yearly cycle—a rite which the Apostolic Church does not reject, but follows. Some *(p. 283)* assign the Pentateuch at Septuagesima, until the fifteenth day before Easter. On that fifteenth day they assign Jeremiah until the Lord's Supper. At the Lord's Supper they read three lessons from the Lamentation of Jeremiah: How the city sits alone, etc.; three from Saint Augustine's treatise on Psalm LIV: Hear, O God, my prayer, and do not despise; and three from the Apostle, where he says in the Epistle to the Corinthians: When you come together. The second lesson begins: Likewise also the cup, after he had eaten supper. The third: Now concerning spiritual things, we do not wish you to be ignorant, brothers. On Good Friday, three lessons from the Lamentation of Jeremiah; three from Saint Augustine's treatise on Psalm LXIII: Hear, O God, my prayer when I entreat; and three from the Apostle, where he says in the Epistle to the Hebrews: Let us hasten to enter that rest, etc. The second lesson: For every High Priest. The third: Of this we

have much to say. On Holy Saturday, three lessons from the Lamentation of the prophet Jeremiah; three from Saint Augustine's treatise on the same Psalm LXIII: Hear, O God, my prayer when I entreat; and three from the Apostle, where he says in the Epistle to the Hebrews: Christ appearing as High Priest of things to come. The second lesson: For where there is a testament. The third: For the Law, having a shadow of the good things to come. At the Lord's Easter feast, homilies proper to the day; during the week, homilies. At the octave of Easter they assign the Acts of the Apostles, the Canonical Epistles, and the Apocalypse, until the octave of Pentecost. At the octave of Pentecost they assign the Books of Kings and Paralipomenon, until the Kalends of September. On the first Sunday of September they assign Job, Tobias, Esther, and Esdras until the Kalends of October. On the first Sunday of October they assign the book of Maccabees until the

(p. 284) Kalends of November. On the first Sunday of November they assign Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Minor Prophets until the Kalends of December. On the first Sunday of December they assign the prophet Isaiah until the Lord's Nativity. At the Lord's Nativity they first read three lessons from Isaiah. First lesson: At first the land of Zebulun was lightly touched, etc. Second: Be comforted, be comforted. Third: Arise, arise. Then sermons or homilies proper to the day are read. On Saint Stephen's feast, the homily for that day. On Saint John's feast, likewise. On the Innocents' feast, likewise. On Saint Sylvester's feast, likewise. On the octave of the Lord's Nativity, the homily for that day. On the first Sunday after the Lord's Nativity they assign Paul's Epistles until Septuagesima. At Epiphany, three lessons from Isaiah. The first begins: All you who thirst. The second: Arise, be illumined, Jerusalem. The third: I will greatly rejoice in the Lord. Then sermons or homilies proper to that day are read[20]."

[margin: The shortening of the Divine Office carried out by Saint Gregory VII is adopted in all Rome's churches except the Lateran basilica.]

The shortening of the Divine Office carried out by Saint Gregory VII was originally intended solely for the pope's chapel. In fact, it soon became established in Rome's various churches. The Lateran basilica alone did not accept it, as Peter Abelard already attests in the following century, in an apologetic letter against Saint Bernard[21]. The responsorial book of Saint Peter's basilica, published by Blessed Tommasi from a twelfth-century manuscript, provides material proof that this second church of Rome had also adopted the new order of the Office. The churches of the rest of *(p. 285)* the West remained more or less unaffected by this innovation. It should be observed that the author of the Micrologus, who seems to have been Ivo of Chartres, wrote outside Rome, yet speaks of Saint Gregory VII's ordinances as having the force of law in liturgical matters. Nevertheless, it does not appear that this great pope ever obliged the churches to accept his regulations on this matter. This can be inferred from a remark by Ralph, dean of Tongres, a fourteenth-century writer, who says of the shortening of the Divine Office:

[margin: The other churches of the West accept Saint Gregory's ordinances only in part.]

"The other nations of the world, however, have their books and Offices directly from the Roman churches themselves, and not from the pope's chapel, as is clearly gathered from the books and treatises of Amalarius, Walafrid, the Micrologus[22], the Gemma, and others who write on the Office[23]."

[margin: Many churches in France and elsewhere consequently retain a Liturgy closer to Saint Gregory the Great's than to Saint Gregory VII's.]

This remark by Ralph of Tongres naturally brings us back to the state of the Liturgy in the West during the eleventh and twelfth centuries. It thus came about that many churches in France and the other provinces of Christendom had a Liturgy more closely related, at least in some respects, to Saint Gregory the Great's than to the new one Saint Gregory VII had inaugurated in Rome. Everything contained in the latter, moreover, was present in the older Liturgy, of which it was an abridgment. Roman usages *(p. 286)* therefore still prevailed. Respect for these holy formulas did not, however, prevent certain countries—chiefly France—from inserting, over time, a number of pieces and even entire Offices bearing the stamp of the age and country that produced them. As in Amalarius's time, Rome continued to view these national accretions

without disapproval, just as today she still approves local Offices and usages in a diocese where the Roman Breviary prevails. More than once, indeed, she adopted prayers, chants, and Offices borrowed from a particular church's books. Europe's various churches also exchanged liturgical usages that had gained greater popularity in their countries of origin. Yet just as the Church of France excelled among these churches in the fertility of her liturgical genius and the beauty of her chants, so within our own country, at the period we are considering, the Church of Paris possessed and deserved an incontestable superiority.

[margin: In this respect the Church of Paris surpasses all those of France and Christendom.]

[margin: Numerous accretions are added to Roman formulas with at least the Sovereign Pontiffs' tacit consent.]

[margin: This superiority is determined in part by the influence of the French kings' chapel.]

[margin: Robert the Pious's zeal for the Divine Office.]

One cause that kept the Romano-Parisian Liturgy so flourishing was the influence of our kings' court at that time, whose chapel was served with marvelous splendor and devotion. In the kings of the third dynasty, Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and Charles the Bald found worthy successors to their zeal for the Divine Offices. At their head we shall place Robert the Pious and Saint Louis. Robert, who ascended the throne in 996, so ordered his time that he devoted one part to works of piety, another to affairs of state, and another to literary studies. Each day he recited the Psalter and taught the clerics to chant the Office's lessons and hymns. Diligent in attending the Divine Offices, and even more zealous than Charlemagne, he joined the cantors, wearing a cope and holding his *(p. 287)* scepter in his hand. The eleventh century, so illustrious for the rebuilding of so many cathedral and abbey churches, opened under the auspices of this pious king, who himself founded fourteen monasteries and seven churches. A great lover of ecclesiastical chant, he applied himself to composing several pieces of sweet and mystical melody. One would search the Parisian books in vain for them today: they were brutally expelled in the eighteenth century. Yet they held sway in all the churches of France from Robert's time until the Gallican regeneration of the Liturgy. This pious prince delighted in enriching the Paris Offices with the finest chants used in other churches. He sent pieces of his own composition to his kingdom's bishops and abbots; their noble harmony, even more than his authority, readily secured their adoption everywhere. Having gone to Rome in fulfillment of a vow, about 1020, he attended a Mass celebrated by the pope. When he went to make his offering, he presented, wrapped in costly cloth, his beautiful responsory in honor of Saint Peter, Cornelius Centurio ("Cornelius the centurion"). The pontiff's attendants at the altar hurried over, believing the prince had offered something of great value. They found this responsory written out and notated in its royal author's own hand. They greatly admired Robert's devotion and, at their request, the pope ordered that this responsory should henceforth be chanted in honor of Saint Peter[24].

[margin: Robert as a composer of liturgical chant.]

[margin: The king's friendship with Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, composer of famous responsories honoring the Blessed Virgin's Nativity.]

Robert formed a close friendship with the great Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, celebrated for so many reasons, including the admirable responsories he composed in honor of the Blessed Virgin's Nativity. The feast of this mystery was indeed established in France during Robert's reign; he issued an edict requiring its solemn celebration. These *(p. 288)* three responsories are entirely in King Robert's style as regards their chant. Fulbert probably communicated them to him to spread them throughout the kingdom in this way. They appear in all French liturgical books predating the eighteenth century, even those of Provence and Languedoc. Such was Robert's method of spreading the chants he loved: he had them performed in his palace chapel or at the abbey of Saint-Denis, then in the church of Paris itself; from there they passed to the other cathedrals.

[margin: The greatest warriors of this age are full of fervor for the Divine Office. William the Conqueror.]

[margin: Godfrey of Bouillon.]

Robert's piety toward the Divine Offices was nothing singular in those centuries of faith. The greatest warriors showed themselves just as devout as this peaceable king. If we turn to England, we find the same examples in a prince such as William the Conqueror. William of Malmesbury tells us that this conqueror of the Saxons attended not only Mass each day but Matins and the other Hours of the Office[25]. He attributes the catastrophe that afflicted England to the Saxon lords' negligence. They had not, it is true, ceased to hear Mass and the Office, but now fulfilled this daily duty only in a lax and negligent way[26]. Matthew Paris speaks in the same terms. Departing for the crusade, Godfrey of Bouillon took with him a company of exemplary religious who, throughout the journey, recited before him all the Divine Offices of day and night[27]. Such *(p. 289)* was also the conduct of the pious and invincible Simon de Montfort in the crusade against the Albigensians[28]. We prefer to choose the examples of these illustrious warriors, who knew how to imitate in the camps the peaceable piety of a Saint Gerald, count of Aurillac, or a Saint Elzear of Sabran, whose life, proclaimed holy by the peoples, unfolded amid acts of the most generous charity and the most august observances of the Liturgy.

[margin: Saint Gerald and Saint Elzear.]

[margin: Simon de Montfort.]

[margin: In the twelfth century, devotion to the saints inspires liturgical composers' finest chants.]

[margin: Contrary to some scholars' opinion, the Office of the Dead was not completed at this period.]

The twelfth century was no less fruitful than the eleventh in happy innovations in the Roman Liturgy as practiced by the French, Germans, and Belgians. Devotion to certain saints inspired the finest chants in their honor. We shall mention chiefly Saint Nicholas and Saint Catherine, who supplied the subject matter for antiphons and responsories of enchanting melody. Relying on Saint Antoninus and Democharès, Gavanti assigns to this same period the composition, or at least the completion, of the Office of the Dead through the addition of several new responsories. He credits Maurice de Sully, bishop of Paris, who is said to have had these pieces of his own composition chanted in his church in 1196. Unfortunately, this attribution is difficult to sustain. Several responsories of the Office of the Dead already appear in the Gregorian antiphonaries and responsorial books published by Blessed Tommasi. The others—Domine, quando veneris ("Lord, when you come"); Peccantem me ("Me, sinning …"); Domine, secundum actum meum ("Lord, according to my deed"); Libera me, Domine, de viis inferni ("Deliver me, Lord, from the ways of hell"); and Libera me, Domine, de morte æterna ("Deliver me, Lord, from eternal death")—are indeed more recent, yet are found in *(p. 290)* tenth-century antiphonaries, nearly two hundred years before Maurice de Sully.

[margin: The Church of France's influence on the universal Liturgy completes and enriches the Gregorian repertoire, whose substance remains intact.]

[margin: Newly composed tropes and sequences spread less widely than responsories.]

Although we are obliged to correct this opinion of Gavanti and Democharès[29], the Church of France's influence on the universal Liturgy remains incontestable. She helped complete, perfect, and enrich the Gregorian repertoire, whose substance always remained intact. These additions consisted only of a few sequences and responsories to embellish the Divine Offices, or of adding a number of saints' feasts to the Roman calendar. The Book of Masses, in both its recited formulas and its chanted portions, always remained the same, apart from the tropes and sequences produced in such numbers by those centuries of faith and melody. These last pieces ordinarily did not spread beyond the country that produced them: their inspiration was generally too national. Responsories composed in a graver character, by contrast, spread throughout Western Christendom. Their spread was, it is true, largely due to the new religious orders' influence, as we shall recount in the next chapter.

[margin: The Benedictine order's influence on the Liturgy in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.]

We must not conclude this picture of the eleventh and twelfth centuries' liturgical period without saying a few words about the Benedictine order's activity in this branch of ecclesiastical discipline. To appreciate this

influence, it will suffice to remind the reader that, from the eighth to the twelfth century, monks filled all the Church's principal posts, while being almost the sole custodians of learning and traditions. They furnished popes such as Saint Gregory the Great, Saint Boniface IV, Saint Agatho, Saint Leo III, Saint Paschal I, *(p. 291)* Saint Leo IV, Saint Leo IX, Alexander II, Saint Gregory VII, Urban II, Paschal II, Callistus II, and Innocent IV; teachers on the Liturgy and every kind of doctrine, such as Saint Leander, Saint Ildephonsus, Bede, Alcuin, Walafrid Strabo, Rabanus Maurus, Usuard, Remigius of Auxerre, Notker the Stammerer, Hermann Contractus, Saint Peter Damian, Bruno of Asti, Hildebert of Le Mans and Tours, Guido of Arezzo, Rupert of Deutz, Saint Bernard, Peter the Venerable, and so forth. Consequently, several Benedictine usages became incorporated into the Western Liturgy. Thus the Chapter Office at Prime; the short lesson and the Confiteor ("I confess") before Compline; the prayer Visita, quæsumus ("Visit, we pray"); the antiphons Salve, Regina ("Hail, Queen"), Alma Redemptoris ("Loving … of the Redeemer"), and so forth; the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin added to the day's Office; the use of hymns and sequences; the sprinkling and procession before Mass on Sundays—all these usages and many others have a monastic origin. It is also known that the Commemoration of All the Departed on November 2 passed from the abbey of Cluny, where Saint Odilo instituted it, to the whole Western Church. Likewise, Saint Hugh had established in that same monastery the custom of chanting the hymn Veni, Creator ("Come, O Creator") at Terce during the Pentecost octave, before it was adopted at Rome and extended to all the provinces of Catholic Christendom. Elsewhere we shall have occasion to give many other details of the same kind. In this general survey we wished only to point out one of the principal sources of Western liturgical usages.

[margin: Numerous Benedictine usages are introduced into the general Liturgy of the West.]

[margin: Ecclesiastical chant flourishes greatly in the monasteries.]

If we now consider the Divine Office as celebrated in the monasteries at this period, we see ecclesiastical chant in particular flourishing ever more abundantly there. The Offices of the patron saints were celebrated with hymns, responsories, and antiphons newly composed by the abbots, *(p. 292)* or by learned monks. Much greater concern for Gregorian purity was shown there than in the cathedrals: they consulted various old copies and zealously sought to maintain the traditions. We see a famous example in the conduct of the first fathers of Cîteaux. A letter of Saint Bernard tells us that, since the Metz Antiphonary's reputation had not yet faded in the twelfth century, the monks of this reform had copied it for their use. Soon, however, they recognized that its chant was defective and had suffered both from the ravages of time and from the spirit of innovation. The order's Chapter commissioned Saint Bernard to correct the choir books. For this purpose he enlisted those of his brethren considered most skillful. The Antiphonary, thus revised, was approved by the Chapter, and all Cistercian monasteries were ordered to use it. Following the letter of Saint Bernard just mentioned, one finds among the holy doctor's works a very curious treatise, De Ratione cantus, intended as a preface to the Cîteaux Antiphonary. There are reasons to doubt that this work is by the abbot of Clairvaux. Whatever the case, its detailed account of the principles governing the correction of Cistercian chant makes it highly interesting. The first fathers of Cîteaux were clearly skillful musicians. Yet perhaps one might say that at times, by their own admission, they reformed the Metz Antiphonary on the basis of theories rather than by comparing the churches' various copies. Nevertheless, it is clear that, if one is sometimes entitled to believe one possesses the Gregorian phrase in its purity in a particular piece, it is when copies from several distant churches agree on the same reading. But this would take us too far and open discussions wholly foreign to the purpose of our narrative.

[margin: Saint Bernard is commissioned by his order's Chapter to revise the Cistercian Antiphonary, originally copied from Metz's.]

(p. 293)

[margin: The orders of Cîteaux and Prémontré enrich the Gregorian foundation with material from French churches' particular usages, especially Paris's.]

The oldest Cîteaux breviaries show that this reform adopted, as a supplement to the Gregorian Antiphonary, several usages and chants belonging to the churches of France, especially Paris. The same observation applies to the order of Prémontré, founded in 1120, whose books offer material for the same remark. These books remained pure, serving as one of the repositories of the ancient Romano-French Liturgy, until the end of the eighteenth century. Then the last abbot general—M. Lécuy, vicar general of Paris, who died a few years ago—thought fit to abolish them and substitute usages drawn from the most exquisite offerings of the modern Gallican regeneration.

[margin: The character of chant in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.]

We must still say a word about chant in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In its general color it retained the character we recognized in the preceding chapter, most fully expressed in King Robert's responsories. Its chief characteristic is a dreamy, somewhat pastoral melody of great sweetness. This is produced by frequent rests on the final and the dominant, intended to mark a certain loosely defined measure, and by a long run of notes on the last word, not without a certain charm.

Saint Catherine's responsory Virgo flagellatur ("The virgin is scourged") has a livelier, more animated movement up to the verse, which forms an interlude of tender, sweet melody. But none of these pieces retains the grand simplicity of the motifs whose inspiration the Gregorian Antiphonary drew from Greek music.

[margin: The sequence takes its definitive form.]

At this period the sequence was perfected. It ceased to be a trope of slow movement and irregular rhythm. It became a kind of hymn in regular meter, thereby offering an opportunity for a valuable development of *(p. 294)* ecclesiastical music. In the twelfth century, Abelard's sequence Mittit ad Virginem ("He sends to the Virgin") was adorned, probably by its author, with that delightful melody which modern Parisians have at least preserved for the modern words of the present sequence, Humani generis ("Of the human race"). We are approaching the age of the Dies iræ ("Day of wrath") and the Lauda, Sion ("Praise, O Zion").

[margin: Guido of Arezzo simplifies the teaching of chant by establishing the use of the musical staff.]

The eleventh century also witnessed a great event in ecclesiastical chant. Guido of Arezzo simplified and improved the method of teaching chant by establishing the use of the musical staff, henceforth consisting of four parallel lines, one above another, on which he arranged the notes. It is quite commonly said that he was the first to provide a method of writing chant. This is an error: there were notes before him, as we have seen above. His method simply relieved the eye and the memory considerably and displaced all the others.

[margin: Liturgical writers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.]

This period was therefore truly fruitful for the Liturgy. We shall judge this still better by going through the list of works then produced in this field. We shall therefore begin it without further delay.

[margin: King Robert.]

[margin: His sequences and responsories.]

At the head of the eleventh-century liturgical writers we place King Robert, of whom we have already said so much in this chapter. He composed sequences for various feasts. Besides the Pentecost sequence, Sancti Spiritus adsit nobis gratia ("May the grace of the Holy Spirit be with us"), which several writers confused with the hymn Veni, Creator Spiritus ("Come, O Creator Spirit"), which is by Charlemagne, he composed others for Christmas, Easter, the Ascension, the Blessed Virgin's Nativity, and the feasts of Saint Martin, Saint Denis, Saint Aignan, bishop of Orléans, and so forth. He celebrated the Blessed Virgin in Latin verse, at which he excelled, and was accustomed to call her the Star of his Kingdom. We have spoken of his beautiful responsory Cornelius centurio ("Cornelius the centurion"). Another, beginning Judæa et Jerusalem ("Judea and Jerusalem"), was no less appreciated in our French churches *(p. 295)* in the Middle Ages. Everyone knows the innocent trick Robert played on Queen Constance, making her believe that she was the

subject of a responsory he had composed, beginning O constantia martyrum (“O constancy of the martyrs”). We give here the words of this responsory, which the vaults of our cathedrals have forgotten and which certainly very few of our readers know. It is sad that a single century sufficed to erase almost every point of contact between the Liturgy in France and history. We have been given national rites that our fathers never knew.

R. O praiseworthy constancy of the martyrs, O inextinguishable charity, O unconquerable patience, which, though it seemed contemptible amid the oppressions of persecutors, *Will be found unto praise, glory, and honor at the time of recompense. V. We ask, therefore, that they, honored by the Father who is in heaven, may help us by their holy merits.* Will be found. Glory to the Father. O constancy of the martyrs.

This beautiful responsory, whose melody is as moving as its words are noble, was the ninth at Matins in the Common of Several Martyrs in certain Romano-French breviaries. Happy times, when kings composed chants for their subjects, when national melodies were innocent responsories or antiphons full of peace and unction!

[margin: Fulbert, bishop of Chartres.]

(1007). Robert’s friend Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, composed, as we have said, three responsories of the greatest beauty for the Blessed Virgin’s Nativity. They are in verse, but without rhyme, which became fashionable later, in the thirteenth century. We insert them here because they have perished throughout France[30]. We wish we could also give their chant, full of sweet melody.

(p. 296)

[margin: His responsories in honor of the Blessed Virgin’s Nativity.]

I. R. She who would bear the Sun of justice, the supreme King— *Mary, star of the sea—has risen today. V. Rejoice, faithful ones, to behold the divine light.* Mary, the star.

II. R. The stock of Jesse brought forth a branch, and the branch a flower; *And on this flower rests the life-giving Spirit. V. The Virgin Mother of God is the branch; the flower is her Son.* And on this.

III. R. At the command of the Lord, who enriches our honor, *Judea brought forth Mary as a thornbush brings forth a rose. V. That virtue might cover vice, and grace guilt.* As a thornbush.

Such are these admirable responsories, composed for the Church of Chartres by the bishop who laid the foundations of the marvelous cathedral that shines with so sublime a halo. A king set them to chant; all France adopted them; Europe repeated them after France. Today these sweet chants no longer resound in the Divine Offices, and even Chartres, unfaithful to her Fulbert and to the gentle Virgin he sang, knows them no longer!

We have allowed ourselves to insert these few lines from our fathers’ ancient Liturgy, unable to resist the desire to give our readers some features of this Romano-French Liturgy, which now lies incomplete in the dust of libraries. For many years we have undertaken to exhume it from there. The following volumes will give us more than one opportunity to bring to light its inspirations, which, we are sure, will be found noble and moving.

Fulbert also composed several sequences and hymns. Among the latter, the Eastertide hymn Chorus novæ Jerusalem (“The choir of the new Jerusalem”) deserves mention.

[margin: Berno, abbot of Reichenau.]

(1008). Berno, abbot of Reichenau, is the author of a valuable treatise entitled De institutione missarum; a dialogue entitled De Quatuor Temporum jejuniis, per sua sabbata observandis, ad Aribonem, Archiepiscopum *(p. 297)* Moguntinum; and an epistle to the same Aribo, De quatuor Adventus dominicis. He also wrote a book on chant entitled Libellus tonarius, or Opus symphoniarum et tonorum, and dedicated it to

Piligrin, archbishop of Cologne. Trithemius mentions three works by Berno on chant: De musica, seu de tonis; De instrumentis musicis; and De mensura monochordi.

[margin: Adalbold, bishop of Utrecht, and Heriger, abbot of Lobbes.]

(1010). Adalbold, bishop of Utrecht, composed the chant for the Night Office on Saint Martin's feast. He wrote from Rome an interesting letter on the celebration of Advent. It must not be confused with a treatise in dialogue form that Heriger, abbot of Lobbes, had composed on the same subject.

[margin: Arnold, provost of Saint Emmeram in Regensburg.]

(1012). Arnold, provost of Saint Emmeram in Regensburg, composed antiphons and responsories for this holy bishop's feast.

[margin: Guido of Arezzo.]

(1014). Guido of Arezzo, abbot of Saint Peter of Avellana, was called to Rome by Benedict VIII and worked under this pope and his successor John XIX to perfect ecclesiastical music. He established, as we have said, the use of the musical staff. To impress the scale of sounds upon his pupils' memory, he conceived the idea of using the melody of the first stanza of the hymn to Saint John the Baptist:

Ut queant laxis resonare fibris
Mira gestorum famuli tuorum,
Solve polluti labii reatum,
Sancte Johannes.

So that the servants may sing with unfettered voices
the wonders of your deeds,
remove the guilt of polluted lips,
Saint John.

[margin: Invention of the system of the present scale.]

In this stanza, the pitch rose by one step on each of the syllables ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la. By repeating it, the pupils learned to distinguish the different notes of the scale. They naturally acquired the habit of naming them by these syllables, which recalled them to mind. Later si was added to designate the seventh note, and the system of our present scale was invented. This method *(p. 298)* was so simple, reducing the practice of the scale to a purely mechanical procedure, that it made the study of chant vastly easier. Children could be taught it as easily as they were taught to spell and read. This monk, truly worthy of the name Great for so eminent a service, wrote a treatise on music in two books, called the Micrologus, which he dedicated to Theodald, bishop of Arezzo, and a short work De mensura monochordi. Finally, he arranged an antiphonary according to his method of notation. Benedict VIII was so struck by this work's superiority that, according to Guido himself, he regarded it as a kind of marvel.

[margin: Oldert, abbot of Gembloux.]

(1020). Olbert, abbot of Gembloux, was skilled in the science of ecclesiastical chant. Among other compositions of this kind belonging to him, his monastery's chronicle attributes to him the chants and hymns of Saint Veron and Saint Waldetrude.

[margin: Saint Odilo, abbot of Cluny.]

(1025). Saint Odilo, abbot of Cluny, who instituted the Commemoration of the Departed on November 2, left us hymns in honor of the Blessed Virgin, Saint Adelaide, and Saint Majolus, his illustrious predecessor.

[margin: Arnulf, monk of Saint Andrew of Andaone.]

(1026). Arnulf, a monk of Saint Andrew of Andaone, besides his writings on ecclesiastical computation, composed an abridged martyrology, or rather a calendar of the year's saints.

[margin: Saint Leo IX.]

(1027). Saint Leo IX, formerly Bruno, bishop of Toul, was highly skilled in ecclesiastical chant. With great artistry he composed the responsories for the Offices of Saint Gregory the Great, Saint Cyriacus the martyr, Saint Odile the virgin, Saint Nicholas, and Saint Hydulf, bishop of Trier. This Office of Saint Hydulf was chanted at the abbey of Moyenmoutier until 1775. After his elevation to the papacy, while at Metz, he *(p. 299)* composed responsories for the Office of Saint Gorgonius the martyr.

[margin: Adhemar, monk of Saint Martial in Limoges.]

(1030). Adhemar, a monk of Saint Martial in Limoges, is regarded by several writers as the author of the supplement to Amalarius's De divinis Officiis, published by Dom Mabillon in the second volume of the Analecta.

[margin: Angelran, abbot of Saint Riquier.]

(1035). Angelran, abbot of Saint Riquier, set to chant the Offices of Saint Valery and Saint Wulfram.

[margin: Gottschalk, provost of Aachen.]

(1039). Gottschalk, provost of Aachen and chaplain to Henry III, composed a great number of sequences for Mass.

[margin: Hermann Contractus, monk of Reichenau.]

(1040). Hermann Contractus, educated first at Saint Gall and then a monk of Reichenau, was a prodigy of learning for his age. Here we must speak only of his liturgical works. He wrote three treatises on chant: De musica, De monochordo, and De conflictu sonorum. Passing from theory to practice, he composed the words and the most melodious chant of the antiphons Salve, Regina ("Hail, Queen") and Alma Redemptoris Mater ("Loving Mother of the Redeemer"); the sequences Ave, præclara maris Stella ("Hail, most glorious star of the sea"), O florens rosa ("O blooming rose"), and Rex omnipotens ("Almighty King") for Ascension Day; and many others, among which several writers include the Veni, Sancte Spiritus ("Come, Holy Spirit"), attributed by others to Innocent III; the responsory Simon Barjona ("Simon, son of Jonah") for Saint Peter; those for the Annunciation and the Holy Angels; and so forth.

[margin: Aaron, abbot of Saint Pantaleon in Cologne.]

(1040). Aaron, abbot first of Saint Martin and then of Saint Pantaleon in Cologne, wrote a book De utilitate cantus vocalis et de modo cantandi et psallendi.

[margin: John of Garland.]

(1040). John of Garland, an Englishman, composed a poem entitled De mysteriis Missæ and dedicated it to Fulk, bishop of London.

[margin: Michael Psellus.]

(1050). Michael Psellus, who had been tutor to the emperor Michael Ducas, later embraced the monastic life. Allatius makes known to us the following works of his relating to the Liturgy: Expositio in illud *(p. 300)* quod in solemni Christi Ascensionis die dicitur: Hodie Sancta Condura et cras Ascensio [Exposition of the saying used on the solemn feast of Christ's Ascension: "Today is holy Condura and tomorrow the Ascension"]; Expositio in illud: Domine, Jesu Christe, Deus noster, miserere nostri, Amen [Exposition of "Lord Jesus Christ, our God, have mercy on us. Amen"]; Paraphrasis carmine iambico in canonem S. Cosmæ, Maiumæ episcopi, sancta et magna feria quinta canendum [Paraphrase in iambic verse of the canon of Saint Cosmas, bishop of Maiuma, to be sung on Holy and Great Thursday].

[margin: John the Geometer.]

(1050). John, called the Geometer, often cited by Saint Thomas Aquinas in his Catena aurea on the Gospels, lived in the eleventh century. He is the author of four great hymns in honor of the Blessed Virgin, found in the Lyons Bibliotheca Patrum and elsewhere. Allatius tells us that he had composed other hymns for the

various feasts of the year.

[margin: Humbert, monk of Moyenmoutier.]

(1050). Humbert, a monk of Moyenmoutier, notated several antiphons in honor of Saint Gregory, pope, Saint Hydulf, and Saint Columban.

[margin: Odo, monk of Saint-Maur-des-Fossés.]

(1050). Odo, a monk of the abbey of Les Fossés near Paris, is the author of the responsories formerly chanted on the feast of Saint Babolen, that monastery's first abbot.

[margin: John Mauropus.]

(1054). John, called Mauropus ("with black feet"), first a monk and then metropolitan of Euchaita in Asia Minor, composed many hymns: twenty-four supplicatory canons to Christ the Savior; two other canticles likewise addressed to the Incarnate Word; sixty-seven to the Blessed Virgin; one to the holy Guardian Angel; two to Saint John the Baptist; and others for the feasts of Saints Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, and John Chrysostom.

[margin: Saint Peter Damian.]

(1057). Saint Peter Damian, first a monk and abbot and then cardinal and bishop of Ostia, left many monuments of his liturgical genius and learning. We shall mention here the treatise De septem horis canonicis; the book on Dominus vobiscum ("The Lord be with you"); another, Contra sedentes tempore Divini Officii; and finally a great number of hymns, antiphons, and other liturgical pieces found at the *(p. 301)* beginning of the fourth volume of his works, published by Constantine Gaetani. Among these we shall mention the beautiful hymns of the Cross, Easter, the Blessed Virgin's Annunciation and Assumption, Saint Peter, Saint Paul, Saint Andrew, Saint John the Evangelist, Saint Vincent, Saint Gregory the Great, Saint Benedict, and so forth.

[margin: Alberic, monk of Monte Cassino.]

(1057). Alberic, a monk of Monte Cassino and later a cardinal, wrote a dialogue De musica and hymns for Easter, the Ascension, the feasts of the Holy Cross, the Blessed Virgin's Assumption, Saint Paul, Saint Apollinaris, and so forth.

[margin: Einhard II, bishop of Speyer.]

(1057). Einhard II, first a monk and abbot and then bishop of Speyer, composed a very important work in four books, De cæremoniis Ecclesiæ.

[margin: Goscelin, monk of Saint Bertin.]

(1058). Goscelin, a monk of Saint Bertin, followed Hermann, bishop of Salisbury, to England and became famous there for his great knowledge of ecclesiastical chant. He composed a sequence in honor of Saint Etheldreda.

[margin: Vitmond, monk of Saint-Évroul.]

(1060). Vitmond, a monk of Saint-Évroul, was also a skillful composer of ecclesiastical chant. Orderic Vitalis says that, in his own time, antiphons and responsories composed by Vitmond were still chanted at Saint-Évroul, as were hymns he had notated to most melodious tunes.

[margin: Lambert, abbot of Saint Lawrence in Liège.]

(1060). Lambert, abbot of Saint Lawrence in Liège, composed the chant and words of an Office in honor of Saint Heribert, archbishop of Cologne.

[margin: Franco, scholaster of Liège.]

(1060). Franco, scholaster of Liège Cathedral, wrote, according to Sigebert, a treatise on ecclesiastical chant.

[margin: Alfanus, archbishop of Salerno.]

(1060). Alfanus, a monk of Monte Cassino and archbishop of Salerno, left hymns in honor of Saint *(p. 302)* Christina, Saint Sabina, Saint Matthew, Saint Nicholas, Saint Maurus, and so forth.

[margin: John, archbishop of Rouen.]

(1061). John, count of Bayeux, first bishop of Avranches and then archbishop of Rouen, wrote a celebrated book, De divinis Officiis.

[margin: John Bar-Susan, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch.]

(1064). John Bar-Susan, Jacobite patriarch of Antioch, is the author of an anaphora found in the Chaldean Missal, and of a book in which he claims to justify, against the Copts, the practice of mixing salt and oil into the Eucharistic bread.

[margin: William, abbot of Hirsauge.]

(1068). William, abbot of Hirsauge, composed a treatise De musica et tonis and another, De psalterio. He also collected the customs of his monastery; this collection contains many interesting liturgical particulars.

[margin: Bonizo, bishop of Piacenza.]

(1070). Bonizo, bishop of Piacenza, cruelly massacred by the schismatics who supported Emperor Henry IV, wrote a book De Sacramentis, addressed to Walter, prior of the monastery of Léon, and published by Muratori.

[margin: Osbern, cantor of Canterbury. Blessed Victor III, pope.]

(1070). Osbern, cantor and subprior of Canterbury, a friend of Archbishop Lanfranc, published a treatise De musica.

(1070). Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino and later pope under the name Victor III, was very zealous for ecclesiastical chant and the splendor of the Divine Offices. He himself composed chants or hymns in honor of Saint Maurus.

[margin: Raynald, bishop of Langres.]

(1071). Raynald, bishop of Langres, himself compiled the Office of Saint Mammes, martyr and patron of his Church. He took its text from Walafrid Strabo’s poems and composed the chant himself.

[margin: Nicholas III, patriarch of Constantinople.]

(1074). Nicholas III, patriarch of Constantinople, is the author of a poem De jejuniis et festis totius anni and an ecclesiastical regulation De oblationibus liturgicis.

(p. 303)

[margin: Lanfranc, monk of Bec and archbishop of Canterbury.]

(1075). Lanfranc, a monk of Bec and later archbishop of Canterbury, having secured confirmation of the monks’ established right to serve the cathedrals in England, compiled statutes concerning the discipline to be observed in all the monasteries of that kingdom, especially the celebration of the Divine Offices. These statutes are among the most precious sources for knowledge of the monks’ liturgical usages in the Middle Ages.

[margin: Thomas, archbishop of York.]

(1075). Thomas, archbishop of York, composed the chant for a great number of hymns. William of Malmesbury says of this prelate that he had a very beautiful voice and that, whenever he heard a pleasing tune, he immediately adapted it to hymns and ecclesiastical chants. But he would not tolerate effeminate music lacking gravity in the Church.

[margin: Durand, abbot of Saint Martin in Troarn.]

(1080). Durand, abbot of Saint Martin in Troarn, composed antiphons and responsories with their chant for various feasts of the year, in honor of Our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, the Angels, the Apostles, the Martyrs, and other saints venerated in the Church.

[margin: Udalric, monk of Cluny.]

(1080). Udalric, a monk of Cluny, collected the usages of that illustrious monastery. His work, published by Dom Luc d'Achery, is one of the most important monuments of the Benedictine Liturgy.

[margin: Irene, wife of Emperor Alexios Komnenos.]

(1080). Irene, wife of Emperor Alexios Komnenos, having founded a monastery of nuns in Constantinople, gave them constitutions contained in the book called the Typikon. The ceremonial in this book is of the greatest interest for knowledge of cloistered usages in Eastern monasteries of nuns.

[margin: Aribo, author of a treatise De musica.]

(1091). Aribo, a person whose condition and rank are unknown today, wrote a treatise De musica, which he dedicated to a bishop named Ellenhard. In it he spoke enthusiastically of William, abbot of Hirsauge, whom we *(p. 304)* mentioned above, calling him the foremost of musicians, the modern Orpheus and Pythagoras.

[margin: John Saïd Bar-Sabuni, Jacobite bishop.]

(1094). John Saïd Bar-Sabuni, Jacobite bishop of Melitene, is the author of an acrostic hymn which the Jacobites chant during the ceremony of monastic tonsure.

[margin: Nevelon, monk of Corbie.]

(1096). Nevelon, a monk of Corbie, compiled a Martyrology abridged from Ado's.

[margin: Bruno of Asti.]

(1097). Bruno of Asti, abbot of Monte Cassino and then bishop of Segni, is one of the great eleventh-century liturgical writers. To him we owe the following books: De ornamentis ecclesiæ; De Sacrificio azymi; and De Sacramentis ecclesiæ, mysteriis, atque ecclesiasticis ritibus.

[margin: The unknown author of the Micrologus.]

(1097). Micrologus is the title of an anonymous work also entitled De observationibus ecclesiasticis. This book, one of the principal monuments of liturgical learning, was written shortly after the death of Saint Gregory VII in 1085. It explains the Office in the form to which this pope had reduced it. This little work must not be confused with Guido of Arezzo's Micrologus, which deals only with music and chant. Zaccaria believes he can attribute it to Ivo of Chartres.

[margin: Ivo, bishop of Chartres.]

(1097). Ivo, first abbot of Saint Quentin and then bishop of Chartres, was one of the greatest, most learned, and holiest prelates of his time. He excelled in explaining the mysteries of the Liturgy, as may be seen from many of his sermons, which are authoritative in this field. Listing these sermons would take us too far: the Bibliotheca Patrum or Hittorp's collection may be consulted.

[margin: Saint Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury.]

(1097). Saint Anselm, abbot of Bec and later archbishop of Canterbury, composed hymns and a Psalter of the Blessed Virgin with the unction evident in all his writings.

(p. 305)

[margin: Hildebert, archbishop of Tours.]

(1097). The Venerable Hildebert of Lavardin, bishop of Le Mans and then archbishop of Tours, left, among other compositions relevant to our subject, an exceedingly valuable poem entitled Versus de mysteriis et ordine Missæ. We shall also mention the following short works: Liber, seu prosa de Natali Domini; De

Sacramentis; De utraque parte altaris; De tribus Missis in Natali Domini.

[margin: Odo, bishop of Cambrai.]

(1105). Odo, scholaster of Orléans, then abbot of Saint Martin in Tournai, and finally bishop of Cambrai, is the author of a short exposition of the Canon of the Mass.

[margin: Geoffrey, abbot of the Trinity in Vendôme.]

(1110). Geoffrey, abbot of the Trinity in Vendôme, composed four hymns, the first in honor of the Blessed Virgin and the other three on Saint Mary Magdalene's conversion. Several of his short works contain important particulars for understanding the liturgical doctrines of that age.

[margin: Marbode, bishop of Rennes.]

(1110). Marbode, bishop of Rennes, is the author of three hymns in honor of Saint Mary Magdalene.

[margin: Robert, prior of Saint Lawrence in Liège.]

(1111). Robert, prior of Saint Lawrence in Liège, wrote a treatise De divinis Officiis.

[margin: Rupert, abbot of Tuy.]

(1111). Rupert, abbot of Tuy, distinguished himself as a liturgical writer by his work De divinis Officiis per anni circulum, divided into twelve books. He also composed several hymns: two in honor of the Holy Spirit, and the others for the feast of several holy martyrs.

[margin: Stephen, bishop of Autun.]

(1113). Stephen, bishop of Autun, who died a monk of Cluny, left a book De Sacramento Altaris, et iis quæ ad illud variosque Ecclesiæ ministros pertinent.

[margin: Saint Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux and Doctor of the Church.]

(1115). Saint Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux and Doctor of the Church, besides his work on the Antiphonary, composed a complete Office in honor of Saint Victor, confessor, at the request of Guy, abbot of Montier-Ramey. This Office, elegant in style and full of unction, *(p. 306)* but little in keeping with the character of antiquity, contains hymns wholly lacking meter and quantity. The same criticism may be made of the hymn of Saint Malachy, also composed by Saint Bernard and published by Dom Martène. These hymns contrast strikingly with the little poem in iambic meter, so melodious, beginning Jesu, dulcis memoria ("Jesus, sweet remembrance"), from which the Church drew the three hymns of the Office of the Holy Name of Jesus. Dom Mabillon included among Saint Bernard's probable works the hymn in honor of Our Lord's Five Wounds beginning Salve, mundi salutare ("Hail, salvation of the world"), and a moving prayer to Christ and Mary whose first line reads Summe summi tu Patris unice ("O highest, you only Son of the highest Father"). As for the graceful Christmas sequence Lætabundus ("Full of joy"), it is found in all the old Missals under Saint Bernard's name.

Saint Bernard's principles of liturgical composition are too important to omit from this work; one wishes they had never been lost from view. Here are some observations on this subject by the holy Doctor, drawn from his letter to Guy, abbot of Montier-Ramey:

[margin: Saint Bernard's principles of liturgical composition.]

"Yet, even out of regard for your own judgment, you ought to have considered my place in the Church rather than your affection for me. The loftiness of the undertaking calls for a learned and worthy man, not a friend: one whose greater authority, holier life, and more mature style may both adorn the work and accord with its sacred character. How insignificant am I among the Christian people, that my writings should be repeatedly read in the churches? How slight is my power of invention or expression, that festive and celebratory compositions should be sought from me above all? What! Shall I begin anew on earth to praise one whom the heavens hold worthy of praise and already praise? To wish to add to heavenly *(p. 307)* praises is to

diminish them. This does not mean that men should not dare to praise those already glorified by the Angels. Rather, at a solemn celebration it is unfitting to hear things novel or frivolous; what is heard should assuredly be authentic and ancient, building up the Church and breathing ecclesiastical gravity. But if there is a desire to hear new things, and the occasion requires them, I would judge, as I said, that such things should be admitted as the dignity of both their language and their author makes all the more useful to the hearers' hearts as it makes them more pleasing. Let their thoughts shine with unquestionable truth, proclaim justice, commend humility, and teach equity. Let them bring forth the light of truth in minds, right form in conduct, a cross for vices, devotion in the affections, and discipline in the senses. If there is chant, let it be full of gravity, sounding neither wantonness nor rusticity. Let it be sweet without being frivolous, soothing the ears so as to move hearts. Let it relieve sadness and temper anger; let it enrich the meaning of the words rather than empty it. It is no slight loss of spiritual grace to be diverted by the frivolity of the chant from the benefit of its meaning, and to attend more to shaping the sounds than to instilling the realities themselves[31]."

[margin: Theotger, bishop of Metz.]

(1118). Theotger, bishop of Metz, wrote a treatise on ecclesiastical chant.

[margin: Hugh, canon regular of Saint Victor in Paris.]

(1120). Hugh, a canon regular of Saint Victor in Paris and one of the most illustrious mystical writers of the Middle Ages, has been regarded as the author of several liturgical writings found among his works. But the three books De cæremoniis, Sacramentis et Officiis ecclesiasticis, which are by Robert *(p. 308)* Paulus; nor the short work entitled De Canone Mystici libaminis, ejusque ordinibus, which is by John of Cornwall. The attribution of the Speculum de Mysteriis Ecclesiæ to Hugh of Saint Victor appears little more certain.

[margin: Hugh Metellus, canon regular of Toul.]

(1120). Hugh Metellus, a canon regular of Toul, left fifty-five letters on various subjects. Letters LII and LIII, ad Constantinum, explain the Church's rites during Lent and the three preceding weeks.

[margin: Blessed Guigo, prior of the Grande Chartreuse.]

(1120). Blessed Guigo, fifth prior of the Grande Chartreuse, compiled the famous Statutes bearing his name, which also form one of the most remarkable monuments of monastic Liturgy.

[margin: Gilbert, bishop of Limerick.]

(1120). Gilbert, bishop of Limerick, wishing to help establish liturgical unity in Ireland, published a circular letter to all the bishops and priests of that country. This letter is the prologue to a short work entitled De Statu Ecclesiæ, in which Gilbert sets out, in interesting detail, the sacred functions of the bishop and the priest.

[margin: Suger, abbot of Saint Denis.]

(1123). Suger, the illustrious abbot of Saint Denis in France, left a short work on the dedication of his abbey church, which he had rebuilt.

[margin: Peter the Venerable, abbot of Cluny.]

(1123). Peter Maurice, called the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, left several hymns, particularly those which the whole Order of Saint Benedict chants on its holy Patriarch's feast: Laudibus cives resonent canoris ("Let the citizens resound with melodious praises"); Inter æternas superum coronas ("Among the eternal crowns of those above"); and Quidquid antiqui cecinere vates ("Whatever the ancient poets sang"). The French Benedictines also chant the hymn which the same Peter the Venerable composed on the translation of Saint Benedict's relics to France and their ceremonial reception: Claris conjubila, Gallia, laudibus ("Rejoice together, O Gaul, with resounding praises").

[margin: Drogo, bishop of Ostia.]

(1128). Drogo, abbot of Laon and then bishop of Ostia, left a book De divinis Officiis, seu horis Canonicis.

(p. 309)

[margin: Honorius, scholaster of the Church of Autun.]

(1130). Honorius, scholaster of the Church of Autun, is the author of the fine liturgical summa entitled Gemma animæ. By publishing in the second volume of his Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus the important work entitled Sacramentarium, or De Sacramentis, sive de causis et significatu mystico rituum divini in Ecclesia Officii, Dom Bernard Pez almost doubled the liturgical riches we owe to Honorius of Autun.

[margin: Berold, custodian of the Church of Milan.]

(1130). Berold, custodian and Cicendelarius (keeper of the lamps) of the Church of Milan, wrote a remarkable book entitled Ordo et cæremoniæ Ecclesiæ Ambrosianæ Mediolanensis.

[margin: Hervé of Le Mans, monk of Déols.]

(1130). Hervé of Le Mans, a monk of Déols in the diocese of Bourges, explained the canticles chanted in the Divine Offices and wrote a book of observations on the alterations the biblical text had suffered in the Lectionaries of certain churches.

[margin: William of Somerset, monk of Malmesbury.]

(1130). William of Somerset, a monk of Malmesbury, abridged Amalarius's books on the Divine Offices.

[margin: Peter Abelard.]

(1130). Peter Abelard, who after a career as brilliant as it was troubled embraced monastic life at Saint Denis, became abbot of Saint Gildas in Rhuys, and died in the Order of Cluny, composed at Heloise's request a little book of hymns and sequences for the use of the monastery of the Paraclete. The most celebrated of these sequences is that for the feast of the Annunciation; we have spoken of it above.

[margin: Rudolf, abbot of Saint Trond.]

(1130). Rudolf, abbot of Saint Trond, was very skilled in ecclesiastical chant and notated an Office in honor of Saint Quentin.

[margin: Rinald II, abbot of Monte Cassino and cardinal.]

(1136). Rinald II, abbot of Monte Cassino and cardinal, composed three hymns in honor of Saint Maurus, three for Saint Placid, and one for Saint Severus, abbot of Monte Cassino.

[margin: Anselm.]

(1140). Anselm, archbishop of Magdeburg and later *(p. 310)* of Ravenna, wrote a treatise De ordine pronuntiandæ Litaniæ.

[margin: archbishop of Ravenna. Benedict, canon of Saint Peter's. Isaac, abbot of Stella. Aelred, abbot of Rievaulx. Hugh, abbot of Prémontré.]

(1143). Benedict, a canon of Saint Peter's, wrote the book entitled Pollicitus, in which he describes the Offices of the whole year, especially matters relating to papal functions. Dom Mabillon placed this short work among the Roman Ordines, where it occupies the eleventh place.

(1147). Isaac, abbot of Stella in the diocese of Poitiers, wrote a fairly long epistle on the Canon of the Mass.

(1150). Aelred, abbot of Rievaulx in the diocese of York, left a book De Officiis ministrorum.

(1150). Hugh, abbot of Prémontré, compiled the ceremonial book of that Order under the title Ordinarium Præmonstratensis Ecclesiæ.

[margin: Richard, canon regular of Saint Victor in Paris.]

(1150). Richard, a canon regular of Saint Victor in Paris and Hugh's friend, wrote, according to Trithemius, a book De Officiis Ecclesiæ.

[margin: Damian, Premonstratensian.]

(1150). Damian, a Premonstratensian in the Low Countries, is said to have composed admirable chants in honor of Saint Cornelius and Saint Cyprian.

[margin: Anonymous twelfth-century author.]

(1150). At this date we place the anonymous twelfth-century author whose interesting work, entitled Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Rituum, divinorumque Officiorum explicatio, Zazzera published in 1784 from a Vatican manuscript.

[margin: Adam, canon regular of Saint Victor in Paris.]

(1150). Adam, a canon regular of Saint Victor in Paris, is renowned for the beautiful sequences he composed. Among them are those of Saint Stephen, the Blessed Virgin's Purification, the Holy Cross, the Holy Trinity, Saint Nicholas, Saint John the Baptist, Saints Peter and Paul, Saint Lawrence, and Saint Martin—not forgetting that of Saint Denis, Gaude prole, Græcia ("Rejoice in your offspring, O Greece"), so disgracefully travestied by modern Parisians.

(p. 311) (1150). Lisiard, a cleric of the Church of Tours, compiled the Ordinal, or ceremonial book, for the use of the Church of Laon.

[margin: Lisiard, cleric of the Church of Tours.]

[margin: Dionysius Bar-Salibi, Jacobite bishop of Amida.]

(1154). Dionysius Bar-Salibi, Jacobite bishop of Amida, left many monuments of his liturgical learning in Syriac. We shall mention the following works: Exposition of the Mysteries Contained in Holy Chrism; Exposition of the Mysteries Contained in the Laying On of Hands, or Ordination; Exposition of the Mass, or Commentary on the Liturgy of Saint James. Three anaphoras, one of which slipped even into the Maronite Missal, as we observed in its place; and so forth.

[margin: Maurice de Sully, bishop of Paris.]

(1160). As we said above, several responsories of the Office of the Dead have been attributed to Maurice de Sully, bishop of Paris. Perhaps he was the author of some of the many verses added at that time to the responsory Libera me, Domine, de morte æterna ("Deliver me, Lord, from eternal death"); but all the pieces that currently make up the Office of the Dead seem to predate this prelate.

[margin: John Beleth, rector of the University of Paris.]

(1162). John Beleth, rector of the University of Paris, published the Rationale divinorum officiorum, a very important liturgical treatise.

[margin: Michael, called the Great, patriarch of the Jacobites.]

(1164). Michael, called the Great, patriarch of the Jacobites, put the Jacobite Syrians' Pontifical and Ritual in order and composed an anaphora.

[margin: Nerses, patriarch of Armenia.]

(1166). Nerses, patriarch of Armenia, reunited with the Roman Church and published an entire book of hymns of the greatest beauty, still in use in the Church of Armenia.

[margin: Thomas of Bayeux, surnamed the Englishman.]

(1169). Thomas of Bayeux, surnamed the Englishman, composed chants for the Church and put in order the book of Offices (Officiarium) for the use of York Cathedral.

[margin: John of Cornwall.]

(1170). John of Cornwall, an Englishman, is the author of the book *(p. 312)* entitled Summa qualiter fiat Sacramentum Altaris per virtutem Sanctæ Crucis et de septem Canonibus, vel ordinibus Missæ.

[margin: Robert Paululus, priest of Amiens.]

(1170). Robert Paululus, a priest of Amiens, composed the three books De Cæremoniis, Sacramentis et Officiis, found among the works of Hugh of Saint Victor.

[margin: Arnulf, canon regular of Arras.]

(1170). Arnulf, a canon regular of Arras, addressed a commentary on the Canon of the Mass to Frumald, bishop of that city.

[margin: Sicard, bishop of Cremona. Ordonius, prior of Cella-Nova. Adam of Corlandon, monk of Cîteaux.]

(1185). Sicard, bishop of Cremona, is the author of a valuable work entitled Mitrale, vel summa de divinis Officiis.

(1189). Ordonius, a Spanish monk and prior of Cella-Nova in Galicia, published a kind of Rationale of the Divine Offices.

(1190). Adam of Corlandon, a monk of Cîteaux and dean of Notre Dame in Laon, wrote an Ordinal of the Divine Office for the use of the Church of Laon.

[margin: Conrad, monk of Hirsauge. Richard, abbot of Prémontré. Stephen, bishop of Tournai. Cencio de Sabelli, cardinal deacon.]

(1190). Conrad, a monk of Hirsauge, composed, according to Trithemius, a treatise De Musica et tonis.

(1190). Richard, an Englishman and abbot of Prémontré, composed a book De Canone Missæ.

(1191). Stephen, bishop of Tournai, notated the chant for an Office of Saint Gerard of La Sauve-Majour.

(1192). Cencio de Sabelli, cardinal deacon of the title of Saint Lucy and chancellor to several popes, compiled a book De Censibus Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, a considerable part of which concerns the ceremonies of the Roman Court. It is this part that Dom Mabillon inserted among the Roman Ordines, in twelfth place.

[margin: Reiner, Benedictine monk.]

(1197). Reiner, a Benedictine monk who attended the Lateran Council in 1215, wrote a commentary on the nine antiphons chanted before Christmas and composed seven hymns in honor of the Holy Spirit.

(p. 313)

[margin: Innocent III.]

(1198). Innocent III left, among his writings, three books De Mysteriis Missæ, which rank him among the most profound liturgical writers of the Middle Ages. This work, truly worthy of its illustrious author, has had no edition since that of Antwerp in 1540; it has therefore become almost impossible to find today. One wishes that a complete edition of this great pope's works might be undertaken: there is not even a collection containing all his letters. Several writers make him the author of the sequences Veni, Sancte Spiritus ("Come, Holy Spirit") and Stabat Mater dolorosa ("The sorrowful Mother stood").

[margin: Conclusions.]

If we now turn to sum up the reflections suggested by the momentous events recounted in this chapter, we find that liturgical unity, sought with such great effort by the holiest popes and the greatest princes, could well be one of Catholic society's necessities. Saint Hadrian I and Charlemagne, Saint Gregory VII and Alfonso VI: these surely provide a counterweight to modern theories invented and propagated by obscure or suspect names;

That national pride must sometimes be sacrificed to bring about a great good in the religious and social order;

That the Catholic peoples of the Middle Ages might not have viewed the overturning of the Liturgy with the same composure as the French of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries;

That France, although otherwise wholly Roman in her Liturgy, was no less fruitful in the embellishments her genius suggested adding to the body of ancient chants; that liturgical unity therefore does not stifle national genius; that the ages of faith produced national chants in the Liturgy, which the ages of innovation certainly did not;

Finally, that those charged with composing *(p. 314)* liturgical pieces must unite gravity, authority, and holiness of life to the inspiration of genius. If Saint Bernard does not add orthodoxy in the faith to these conditions, it is because, before a certain period, no one could have imagined that heretics would come to be commissioned to compose the Office's hymns and to determine, at their own whim, its substance, order, and distribution.

(p. 315)

Notes to Chapter XI

Note A

Gregorius episcopus, servus servorum Dei, Alphonso et Sancio regibus Hispaniæ, a paribus, et episcopis in ditione sua constitutis, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Cum beatus Apostolus Paulus Hispaniam se adiisse significet, ac postea septem Episcopos ab urbe Roma, ad instruendos Hispaniæ populos, a Petro et Paulo Apostolis directos fuisse, qui, destructa idololatria, Christianitatem fundaverunt, religionem plantaverunt, ordinem et officium in divinis cultibus agendis ostenderunt, et sanguine suo Ecclesias dedicavere, vestra diligentia non ignoret, quantam concordiam cum Romana urbe Hispania in religione et ordine divini Officii habuisse satis patet: sed postquam vesania Priscillianistarum diu pollutum, et perfidia Arianorum depravatum, et a Romano ritu separatum, irruentibus prius Gothis, ac demum invadentibus Sarracenis, regnum Hispaniæ fuit, non solum religio est diminuta, verum etiam mundanæ sunt opes labefactatæ. Quapropter ut filios carissimos vos adhortor et moneo, ut vos sicut bonæ soboles etsi post diuturnas scissuras, demum tamen ut matrem revera vestram, Romanam Ecclesiam recognoscatis, in qua et nos fratres reperiatis, Romanæ Ecclesiæ ordinem et Officium recipiatis, non Toletanæ, vel cujuslibet aliæ, sed istius quæ a Petro et Paulo supra firmam petram per Christum fundata est, et sanguine consecrata, cui portæ inferni, id est linguæ hæreticorum, nunquam prævalere potuerunt, sicut cetera regna Occidentis et Septentrionis teneatis. Unde enim non dubitatis vos suscepisse religionis exordium, restat etiam ut inde recipiatis in Ecclesiastico ordine divinum Officium; quod Innocentii Papæ ad Eugubinum directa Episcopum vos docet epistola, quod Hormisdæ ad Hispalensem missa decreta insinuant, quod Toletanum et Bracarense demonstrant concilia: quod etiam Episcopi vestri, ad nos nuper venientes, juxta constitutionem concilii, per scripta sua facere promiserunt, et in manu nostra firmaverunt. (Labb., tom. X, pag. 53.)

Note B

Gregorius episcopus, servus servorum Dei, Simeoni Hispanorum episcopo, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Cognitis fraternitatis tuæ litteris, gaudio sumus repleti, quoniam eam quam erga Romanam Ecclesiam fidem et devotionem geris, in eis plene *(p. 316)* agnovimus, et quod non adulterino eam more deserere, sed legitimæ prolis successione amplecti desideras. Quapropter, carissime frater, necesse est ut bene inceptum recto itinere gradiatur: nec hæretica debet pravitate minui, quod apostolica constat traditione sancitum. Apostolica enim Sedes, cui, quamvis immeriti, Deo auctore præsidemus, ipso gubernante firma permansit ab ipsis primordiis, eoque tuente illibata perpetuo permanebit, testante eodem Domino: Ego pro te rogavi, ut non deficiat fides tua; et tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos. His itaque fulta præsidiis Romana te cupit scire Ecclesia, quod filios quos Christo nutrit, non diversis uberibus, nec diverso cupit alere lacte, ut

secundum Apostolum sint unum, et non sint in eis schismata: alioquin non mater, sed scissio vocaretur. Quapropter notum sit tibi cunctisque Christi fidelibus super quibus consuluisti, quod decreta, quæ a nobis, imo a Romana constat Ecclesia prolata sive confirmata, in peragendis a vobis ejusdem Ecclesiæ Officiis inconcussa volumus permanere, nec eis acquiescere, qui luporum morsibus et veneficiorum molimine vos inficere desiderant. Nec dubitamus quod, secundum Apostolum, introeant in vos lupi graves, lupi rapaces, non parcentes, quibus resistendum fortiter est in fide. Ideoque, dilectissime frater, certa, et usque ad sanguinis effusionem, si opportunum fuerit, desuda. Indignum enim et pro ridiculo potest haberi, quod sæculares homines, pro tam vili pretio, tamque Deo odibili commercio, se ipsos periculo ultraneos exhibeant, et fidelis quisque irruentibus cedat hostibus terga. Non enim ab eis poterit acquiri virtus qui facile corruunt quo trahuntur. Quod autem filii mortis dicunt se a nobis litteras accepisse, sciatis per omnia falsum esse. Procura ergo, ut Romanus ordo per totam Hispaniam et Galliciam, et ubicumque poteris, in omnibus rectius teneatur. Data Romæ, mense maii, indictione decima quarta. (Labb., tom. X, p. 144.)

Note C

Ante revocationem (legati Richardi) clerus et populus totius Hispaniæ turbatur, eo quod Gallicanum Officium suscipere a legato et principe cogebantur; et statuto die, rege, primate, legato, cleri et populi maxima multitudine congregatis, fuit diutius altercatum, clero, militia et populo firmiter resistentibus, ne Officium mutaretur, rege a regina suaso, contrarium minis et terroribus intonante. Ad hoc ultimo res pervenit, militari pertinacia decernente, ut hæc dissensio duelli certamine sedaretur. Cumque duo milites fuissent electi, unus a rege, qui pro Officio Gallicano; alter a militia et populis, qui pro Toletano pariter decertarent, miles regis illico victus fuit, populis exultantibus, quod victor erat miles Officii Toletani. Sed rex adeo fuit a regina Constantia stimulatus, quod a proposito non discessit, duellum indicans jus non esse. Miles autem qui pugnaverat pro Officio Toletano, fuit de domo Matantiæ prope Pisoricam, cujus hodie genus exstat. (Rodricus Toletanus, de Rebus Hispaniæ, lib. VI, cap. xxvi.)

(p. 317) Cumque super hac magna seditio in populo oriretur, demum placuit, ut liber Officii Toletani, et liber Officii Gallicani in magna ignis congerie ponerentur. Et indicto omnibus jejunio a primate et legato, et clero, et oratione ab omnibus devote peracta, igne consumitur liber Officii Gallicani; et prosilit super omnes flammas incendii, cunctis videntibus et Dominum laudantibus, liber Officii Toletani illæsus omnino (et) a combustione incendii alienus. (Ibidem.)

Note D

Ceterum, qui libri in Ecclesiasticis Officiis per anni circulum a nonnullis legantur (quod ritum illum Apostolica non reprobat, sed sequitur Ecclesia), pro fidelium ædificatione adnotandum censuimus. Quidam, quod in Septuagesima ponunt Pentateuchum usque in XV diem ante Pascha, XV die ponunt Hieremiam usque in Cœnam Domini. In Cœna Domini legunt tres lectiones de Lamentatione Hieremiæ: Quomodo sedet sola civitas, etc., et tres de Tractatu S. Augustini in Psalmum LIV: Exaudi, Deus, orationem meam, et ne despexeris et tres de Apostolo, ubi ait in Epistola ad Corinthios Convenientibus vobis in unum. Secunda ilectio sic incipit: Similiter et calicem, postquam cœnavit. Tertia: De Spiritalibus autem nolumus vos ignorare, fratres. In Parasceve tres lectiones de Lamentatione Hieremiæ, et tres de Tractatu Sancti Augustini in Psalmum LXIII: Exaudi, Deus, orationem meam cum deprecor; et tres de Apostolo, ubi ait in Epistola ad Hebræos: Festinemus ingredi in illam requiem, etc.. Secunda lectio: Omnis namque Pontifex. Tertia: De quo grandis nobis sermo. In Sabbato Sancto tres lectiones de Lamentatione Hieremiæ Prophetæ, et tres de tractatu Sancti Augustini in eumdem Psalmum LXIII: Exaudi, Deus, orationem meam cum deprecor, et tres de Apostolo, ubi ait in Epistola ad Hebræos: Christus adsistens Pontifex futurorum. Secunda lectio: Ubi enim testamentum est. Tertia: Umbram enim habens lex futurorum bonorum. In Pascha Domini homilias ad ipsum diem pertinentes, infra hebdomadam homilias. In Octavis Paschæ ponunt Actus Apostolorum, et Epistolas Canonicas, et Apocalypsim usque n Octavas Pentecostes. In Octavis Pentecostes ponunt libros Regum, et

Paralipomenon usque in kalendas septembris. In Dominica prima septembris ponunt Job, Tobiam, Hester, Esdram usque in kalendas octobris. In Dominica prima mensis octobris ponunt librum Machabæorum usque in kalendas novembris. In Dominica prima mensis novembris ponunt Ezechielem, et Danielem, et minores Prophetas usque in kalendas decembris. In Dominica prima mensis decembris ponunt Esaiam prophetam usque ad Nativitatem Domini. In Natali Domini legunt primum de Isaia tres lectiones. Prima lectio Primo tempore alleviata est terra Zabulon, etc. Secunda: Consolamini, consolamini. Tertia: Consurge, consurge. Deinde leguntur sermones, vel homiliæ ad ipsum diem pertinentes. In natali sancti Stephani homilia de ipso die. In natali sancti *(p. 318)* Johannis similiter. In natali Innocentium similiter. In natali sancti Silvestri similiter. In Octava natalis Domini homilia de ipso die. In Dominica prima post Nativitatem Domini ponunt Epistolas Pauli usque in Septuagesimam. In Epiphania lectiones tres de Esaia. Prima lectio incipit: Omnes sitientes. Secunda: Surge, illuminare, Hierusalem. Tertia: Gaudens gaudebo in Domino. Deinde leguntur sermones, vel homiliæ ad ipsum diem pertinentes. (Decretum. Part. I, Distinct. XV, cap. Sancta Romana.)

Note E

To the venerable Guy, abbot of Montier-Ramey, and the holy brothers with him, Bernard, servant of their holiness: may you serve the Lord in holiness.

You, my very dear Abbot Guy, and together with you the brothers who are with you, ask me to compose some pieces for you to read solemnly or chant on the feast of Saint Victor, whose most sacred body rests among you. You press me as I hesitate and urge me as I hold back, yourself overlooking my diffidence, just though it is. You bring other petitioners to me as well, as if anything could be more compelling in bending me to your will than your will itself.

Verum tu vel proprio judicio consulens, cogitare debueras non affectum erga me tuum, sed meum in Ecclesia locum. Sane altitudo negotii non amicum desiderat, sed eruditum, sed dignum; cujus auctoritas potior, vita sanctior, stylus maturior et odus illustret, et consonet sanctitati.

Quantulus ego in populo christiano, cujus litteræ in Ecclesiis lectitentur? Aut quantula mihi ingenii eloquiive facultas, ut a me potissimum festiva et plausibilia requirantur? Quid? quem cœli habent laudabilem et laudatum, ego de novo laudare incipio super terram? Supernis velle addere laudibus, detrahere est. Non quod glorificatos ab Angelis, homines jam laudare non audeant; sed quia in solemnitate celebri non novella audiri decet vel levia, sed certe authentica et antiqua, quæ et Ecclesiam ædificent, et ecclesiasticam redoleant gravitatem. Quod si nova audire libet, et causa requirit, ea, ut dixi, recipienda censuerim, quæ cordibus audientium quo gratiora, eo utiliora reddat et eloquii dignitas et auctoris. Porro sensa indubitata resplendeant veritate, sonent justitiam, humilitatem suadeant, doceant æquitatem: quæ etiam lumen veritatis mentibus pariant, formam moribus, crucem vitiis, affectibus devotionem, sensibus disciplinam. Cantus ipse si fuerit, plenus sit gravitate, nec lasciviam resonet, nec rusticitatem. Sic suavis, ut non sit levis; sic mulceat aures, ut moveat corda. Tristitiam levet: iram mitiget; sensum litteræ non evacuet, sed fœcundet. Non est levis jactura gratiæ spiritualis, levitate cantus abduci a sensuum utilitate et plus sinuandis intendere vocibus quam insinuandis rebus.

See, then, what the things that come to the Church's hearing ought to be, and what their author ought to be. Am I such a man, or are the things I have prepared of this kind? Yet from my poverty, with you knocking and disturbing me—even if not because you are a friend, *(p. 319)* certainly because of your persistence—I rose, according to the Lord's saying, and supplied what you asked. I supplied, I say, what I could bring to hand, rather than what would meet your wishes: according to my ability, certainly, not according to your desire. Yet, preserving the truth of the ancient accounts you had sent me, I composed two sermons on the saint's life in my own style, such as it is, taking all the care I could lest brevity make them obscure or length make them wearisome. Then, as regards chant, I composed a hymn, disregarding meter so as not to fail in meaning. I arranged twelve responsories with twenty-seven antiphons in their proper places, adding one responsory

which I assigned to First Vespers, and two other short ones to be chanted on the feast itself according to your monastic custom, one at Lauds and the other at Vespers. For all this I demand a reward and seek recompense. Why should I not? Whether they please or not does not concern me; I have given what I had. My reward, then, is your prayer. (S. Bernardi Opera, vol. I, Epistle CCCXII.)

---

[1] Chapter VIII, p. 195.

[2] D'Aguirre, Conc. Hispan., vol. III, p. 228.

[3] A law was given to the priests that they should pray in no manner other than the Roman, and that Gothic rites of expiation should not be performed, since they were foreign. (Conc. Labb., vol. IX, p. 1112.)

[4] Pinius, Tractatus historico-chronologicus. De Liturgia antiqua Hispanica, ch. VI, p. 43 and following.

[5] In hoc autem quod sub ditione tua Romani ordinis officium fieri studio et jussionibus tuis asseris, Romanæ ecclesiæ te filium, ac eam concordiam et eamdem amicitiam te nobiscum habere, quam olim reges Hispaniæ cum Romanis pontificibus habebant, cognosceris. Esto itaque constans, et fiduciam firmam habeas, et quod cœpisti perficias; quia in Domino Jesu Christo confidimus, quia beatus Petrus Apostolus, quem Dominus Jesus Christus, rex gloriæ, principem super regna mundi constituit, cui te fidelem exhibes, te ad honorem desiderii tui adducet, ipse te victorem de adversariis tuis efficiet. (Labb., tom. X, pag. 52.)

[6] See Note A.

[7] See Note B.

[8] There is surely no need to point out that the Gothic characters mentioned here are not those commonly designated by that name, but those Bishop Ulphilas seems to have given the Goths in the fourth century. Calling the Latin characters of the Middle Ages Gothic is just as absurd as applying that term to the Christian architecture of the same period.

[9] And because Gothic script, the translation of the Psalter, and the Office of the Mass instituted by Bishops Isidore and Leander—which, together with the translation and script, is called Toledan—were still observed throughout Spain, at the urging of his wife, Queen Constance, who came from Gaul, he sent a request to Pope Gregory VII at Rome that the Roman or Gallican Office might be observed in the Spanish lands, with the Toledan omitted. (Rodericus Toletanus, De Rebus Hispanicis, book VI, ch. xxv.)

[10] See Note C.

[11] Explication de la Messe, vol. II, p. 296.

[12] Chronicon S. Maxentii, vulgo Malleacense, in Labbe, Biblioth. Mss., vol. II, p. 190.

[13] Rerum Liturgicarum, book I, ch. xi.

[14] See Note C.

[15] Tract. Hist. Chron. de Liturgia antiq. Hispan., ch. VI, § V, p. 50.

[16] Et tunc cunctis flentibus et dolentibus inolevit proverbium: quod volunt reges, vadunt leges. Et ex tunc Gallicanum officium tam in psalterio quam in aliis numquam ante susceptum, fuit in Hispaniis observatum. Licet in aliquibus monasteriis Toletanum fuerit aliquanto tempore custoditum: et etiam translatio psalterii in plurimis ecclesiis cathedralibus et monasteriis, adhuc hodie recitatur. (Roderic. Toletan. De Rebus Hispanicis. Ibidem.)

[17] Besides the churches in the city of Toledo authorized to follow the Gothic rite, Pinius cites two others: the small church of the Holy Savior in Salamanca and a chapel in the parish church of Saint Mary Magdalene in Valladolid. Leo X confirmed the former and Pius IV the latter, permitting the holy mysteries to be celebrated there according to the Gothic rite, but only on certain days of the year.

[18] Micrologus, De ecclesiasticis observationibus. Biblioth. vet. Patrum Lugdunen., vol. XVIII, pp. 472–490.

[19] Decretum. Chapter Sancta Romana Ecclesia.

[20] See Note D.

[21] Not even the city itself observes the ancient custom of the Roman See. Only the Lateran Church, which is the mother of all, keeps the ancient Office; none of her daughters follows her in this, not even the basilica of the Roman Palace itself. (Abailardi Opera, Epistle V, p. 232.)

[22] Ralph of Tongres is justified in citing the Micrologus here alongside Amalarius and the others. Although this little work speaks in several places of the Office according to Saint Gregory VII's reform, it contains many features belonging to an earlier form of Liturgy.

[23] Aliæ autem nationes orbis libros, et officia sua habent e directo ab ipsis Ecclesiis Romanis, et non a Capella Papæ, sicut ex libris et tractationibus Amalarii, Walafridi, Micrologi, Gemmæ, et ceterorum de officio scribentium colligitur evidenter. (Radulph. Decani Tungren, De Canonum observantia. Proposition XXII. Biblioth. Patrum., vol. XXVI, p. 313.)

[24] Trithem. Chronic. Hirsaug., vol. I, p. 141.

[25] He practiced the Christian religion as assiduously as a layman could: each day he attended Mass and heard the evening and morning hymns. (Guillelm. Malmesb. De Gestis Regum Anglor., book III.)

[26] The nobles, given over to gluttony and lust, did not go to church in the morning according to Christian custom. Instead, in their bedchambers and amid their wives' embraces, they merely tasted with their ears the solemnities of Matins and Masses performed by a hurrying priest. (Ibidem.)

[27] He had brought distinguished monks from well-disciplined monasteries, who throughout the journey, at the Hours of day and night, performed the Divine Offices for him according to the Church's custom. (Guillelm. Tyr., book IX, ch. IX.)

[28] Although he was most valiant in war, he nevertheless heard Mass and all the canonical Hours every day, always under arms. (Rigord., In Philipp. August., year 1213.)

[29] Editor's note.

[30] The Church of Le Mans still chants the second, Stirps Jesse ("The stock of Jesse"), but outside the Office, at the procession on the Blessed Virgin's Assumption, before Mass.

[31] See Note E.

Chapter XII. Revision of the Roman Office by the Franciscans. — Breviary of the Dominicans, the Carmelites, etc. — Office of the Blessed Sacrament. — Character of Ecclesiastical Chant in the Thirteenth Century. — Liturgical Writers of This Period

(p. 320)

[margin: Liturgical unity in the patriarchate of the West threatened, at least for the Divine Office, by the diversity and multiplicity of local usages.]

In reforming the books of the Roman Office, Saint Gregory VII had chiefly had the papal chapel in view. Most of the churches of Rome could, over time, have adopted this reduced form of the Office. But neither this great Pontiff nor his successors had required the various Western Churches subject to the Roman Liturgy to reform their books according to this latest revision. A kind of confusion had therefore resulted, which would later necessitate a solemn and final correction. This confusion was further increased by the Offices of Saints being added everywhere to the old calendar. Together with the usages of an earlier Liturgy that had survived, though few in number, this increasingly threatened liturgical unity in the patriarchate of the West, at least as regards the Divine Offices. For we never tire of recalling that the Gregorian Sacramentary, soon to take the name of Roman Missal, had remained generally intact.

[margin: Providence's remedy for this evil.]

While awaiting the vigorous measures that would come only in the sixteenth century, it was therefore greatly to be desired that the breviary of the papal chapel, which, as early as *(p. 321)* the twelfth century, had already won over all the Churches of Rome except the Lateran basilica, and would sooner or later replace the old Office everywhere, should spread throughout the rest of the West, in practice or by law. To achieve this most desirable end, Providence used the influence suddenly gained over medieval societies by an institute whose humble beginnings only displayed more clearly the admirable wisdom of Him who uses what is weakest to confound what is strongest. Saint Francis of Assisi appeared on earth. Destining his numerous children for apostolic preaching, this great patriarch expressly enjoined them to keep inviolable fidelity to the Roman Church. To confirm this fundamental law by an outward bond, he ordered them to observe in every respect the order of the Office followed by this mother and mistress of all the Churches[1].

[margin: Saint Francis prescribes that his disciples observe in every respect the order of the Office followed by the Roman Church, 1210.]

[margin: The Friars Minor adopt the abbreviated Office of the papal chapel.]

Since Saint Francis had given this law to his children in 1210, it was natural that, when they asked Rome which Office they should follow, she should assign them the one observed both by the papal chapel and by the various Churches of this capital of Christendom.

"And it was this abbreviated Office," says Ralph of Tongres, "that the Friars Minor followed. For this reason they entitle their breviaries and Office books according to the custom of the Roman Curia, secundum consuetudinem Romanæ Curiæ[2]."

Moreover, since this Office was shorter than the old one and could therefore be copied at less expense, and since its bulk would cause less inconvenience on journeys, the Franciscans could not *(p. 322)* fail to prefer it to the old Office still kept by the Lateran church.

[margin: Most European churches' breviaries in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries follow the arrangement of the abbreviated Office.]

Many churches in Italy had already adopted the abbreviated Office. The marvelous spread of the Institute of the Friars Minor throughout Europe and beyond soon made this new form of the Liturgy known everywhere. Today it would be difficult, indeed impossible, to assess the influence this exerted in the various countries of the West. It varied from place to place. Yet it is natural to believe that the Franciscans who, as early as the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, were raised to the episcopate in such great numbers did not all forget, on changing their habit, the form of the Divine Office they had practiced until then. Be that as it may, whether one attributes it to the Franciscans' influence or to the favor that would eventually attach to the most abbreviated Office, anyone who has so much as leafed through liturgical books in libraries must acknowledge that the breviaries of all or almost all the churches of Europe, written or printed in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, or even in the first half of the sixteenth—and therefore before Saint Pius V's Bull—are generally arranged according to the form of the abbreviated Office, rather than the form in use before Saint Gregory VII.

[margin: Revision of the Roman Breviary by Haymo, the Franciscans' fourth minister general.]

But the Friars Minor attached their name to the Roman Breviary in another capacity besides that of mere propagators. Haymo, their fourth minister general, must be included among the revisers to whom it owes the form it has retained ever since. We have no precise details about the circumstances that brought this about, but the fact is no less incontestable. Wading thinks that Gregory IX gave Haymo this commission[3]. Be that as it may, this *(p. 323)* Franciscan minister general's correction of the Roman Breviary is expressly attested by his successor, John of Parma, in a letter he wrote to the superiors of his Order[4].

[margin: What Haymo's correction consisted in.]

Now, in what did Haymo's correction of the Roman Breviary consist? This question seems insoluble to us today. Yet however slight the changes or improvements he introduced, they were nevertheless considerable enough that the books then in use in the churches of Rome, though conforming to those of the papal chapel according to Abelard's testimony, no longer agreed with those of the Friars Minor. Ralph of Tongres tells us this when he says of Nicholas III:

"He [Nicholas] had antiphonaries, graduals, missals[5], and fifty other old Office books removed from the churches of the city. He commanded that henceforth the city's churches use the books and breviaries of the Friars Minor, whose Rule he also confirmed. Hence all the books in Rome today are new and Franciscan[6]."

Several authors have called into *(p. 324)* question this assertion of Ralph of Tongres, relying on Abelard's statement that, as early as the twelfth century, the churches of Rome, except the Lateran, no longer followed the old Office. We reply, however, that they could nevertheless have retained the old books while taking care to omit, in the choir's chant, the parts removed by Saint Gregory VII. Since Haymo's correction involved greater changes, perhaps additions, these books, had they been retained, could have become an obstacle to uniformity.

[margin: Whatever Ralph of Tongres may say, the Franciscan correction did not bring great changes to the Roman Liturgy.]

Ralph of Tongres, who is in any case very ill-disposed toward the Friars Minor, bitterly points out the defects of Haymo's correction. He accuses the Franciscans of having disfigured the Roman Office, saying that their breviary differs greatly from the antiphonary as found in Amalarius, Walafrid Strabo, and the other liturgical writers of the ninth and tenth centuries. He bitterly reproaches them for increasing the number of double feasts and inserting many saints who belong only to Rome's local calendar, and so forth. On these latter

charges he has grounds, if not in reason, at least in fact; as for the first, it collapses in the face of the facts. In Blessed Tommasi's liturgical collection we have a complete Antiphonary for the use of Saint Peter's church, written during the pontificate of Alexander III, who occupied the See in 1159. Now this antiphonary, containing the Office reduced by Saint Gregory VII, is almost entirely similar to the present Roman Breviary, which is at once the abridgment of the Gregorian antiphonary and the breviary of the Friars Minor. If, then, there are differences between the Roman books as found in Amalarius and the Franciscans' breviary, they must be attributed chiefly to Saint Gregory VII's reductions. One must also recall that the Metz antiphonary contained several pieces not of Roman origin. Let us therefore *(p. 325)* conclude from all this that the Franciscan correction did not bring great modifications to the Roman Liturgy, and that the ancient Gregorian body of material has always remained the same.

[margin: The Friars Minor add Offices of their saints to the breviary's Proper for their own use, in rhythmic prose of unaffected unction.]

The Friars Minor added to the breviary's Proper the Offices of the saints their Order soon brought forth, especially that of Saint Francis. All these Offices, composed in cadenced and rhymed prose, are among the literary riches of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. We regret that space prevents us from inserting a few passages of unaffected unction, like all the Seraphic Order's works in this period of its great glory. Since then, the eighteenth century has blown its icy wind over these flowers, so fresh and tender. Before dying out under the blows of secularization, the Franciscans of the French provinces prepared a series of new Offices for their Order. In these one no longer finds the slightest trace of those moving canticles which the heroic age of the Friars Minor had consecrated to the glory of Saint Francis, Saint Clare, Saint Bonaventure, Saint Anthony of Padua, and so forth. Clement XIV, a Conventual Franciscan, acceded to his Order's wishes by approving the reformed Offices presented to him.

[margin: The Friars Preachers adopt a missal and breviary that are fundamentally Roman, with many borrowings from the usages of the Churches of France, especially Paris.]

The Friars Preachers, whom God gave his Church through Saint Dominic's ministry a few years before the Friars Minor, deserve a distinguished place in the annals of the Liturgy. Founded in France and soon established in Paris by Saint Louis, in their illustrious convent on the rue Saint-Jacques, from which they took the name Jacobins, they have remained faithful to their liturgical usages. These acquaint us with the usages of the Churches of France, particularly the Church of Paris, in the thirteenth century. For Mass they have kept several rites and prayers, most of which are found in French missals from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century; otherwise, the missal's text is the Roman text *(p. 326)* in its purity, apart from a few slight differences. As for the breviary, it was compiled in the convent on the rue Saint-Jacques in 1253 by Humbert of Romans, who later became the Order's general. Except for the Order's feasts and a few rites, everything in this breviary that seems added to the Roman is found in the old Parisian breviary[7]. This makes it exceedingly interesting, especially since the Church of Paris has abjured the bulk of its traditions.

[margin: The liturgical inspiration the Dominicans have always preserved, with its triumphant tone and grandeur of language, contrasts markedly with the unaffected simplicity of the Franciscan Offices.]

In the Dominican breviary, the Offices of the Order's saints consist entirely of measured and rhymed prose, like those of the Friars Minor. But their triumphant tone and the grandeur of language that chiefly characterizes them stand in marked contrast to the unaffected simplicity of the Franciscan Offices. It must also be said to the Dominican Order's praise that it has known how to defend its breviary against the attempts of the spirit of innovation, and that in recent times it alone has preserved liturgical inspiration in the compositions required by the feasts of its new saints. The Offices of Saint Pius V, Saint Rose of Lima, Saint Louis Bertrand, and Saint Catherine de' Ricci are as perfectly in the spirit of the thirteenth century as the oldest in the Dominican repertory. The Office of the Holy Rosary, compiled in recent years, shows that this illustrious Order has not lost its traditions. One regrets only that the new edition of the Dominican breviary, dated 1834, no longer contains in full the admirable Office of All the Saints of the Order found in earlier

editions. Unfortunately, several antiphons and eight lessons have been changed. They were inspired by that noble esprit de corps which should animate all religious orders, but which is so fitting in *(p. 327)* this feast, common to them all, which is intended to celebrate all the favors with which God has honored them and all the great men they have produced.

[margin: The Carmelite breviary. Its French origin.]

The Carmelite breviary also has many affinities with the Romano-Parisian breviary. These religious have indeed claimed that their Office was that of the Latin Church of Jerusalem, received from Saint Albert, their restorer, and brought with them when they came to the West. But having been Jerusalem's Office did not make it any less French in origin. William of Tyre expressly relates that Godfrey of Bouillon, instituting the Latin rite in the church of the Holy Sepulchre, established the Divine Office and ceremonies as in the great churches of France, and appointed Anselm, a canon of Paris, cantor of the basilica[8].

[margin: Other breviaries following the use of Paris.]

The Trinitarians, the Augustinians, the religious of the Holy Cross, and several other bodies founded around the same period likewise celebrated the Office according to the use of Paris for several centuries.

[margin: Spread of the Romano-French Liturgy beyond the kingdom.]

From all these facts one can readily understand how the Romano-French Liturgy spread far beyond the kingdom's boundaries. The institutes just named, which together with the Orders of Cîteaux and Prémontré expanded so rapidly, completed the work of acquainting Europe with the beautiful chants France had added to the Gregorian melodies. They were adopted everywhere and readily blended with the breviary reformed by Saint Gregory VII and the Friars Minor. Each Church drew more or less abundantly from this fruitful source. One then saw a thing never repeated since: the nations that had pooled the treasures of faith and unity cemented *(p. 328)* this marvelous union by an exchange of religious canticles. But it cannot be said too often: France had the chief share in the supremacy of chant. It was given to her to complete Saint Gregory's work. If she has since forgotten this glory, she may, whenever she wishes, consult the liturgical books of foreign Churches, or those of the religious orders she has expelled from her midst. There she will rediscover the sweet melodies that her bishops, monks, and kings composed for all Europe in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

[margin: The Romano-French Liturgy enters the Church of Jerusalem and Sicily,]

This is the place to speak in greater detail of the propagation of the Romano-French Liturgy. We have just seen Godfrey of Bouillon establish it in the Church of Jerusalem according to the use of Paris. The Norman princes had previously established it in Sicily, as ancient liturgical manuscripts attest. The dukes of Anjou maintained it there, as is proved by missals and breviaries contemporary with their rule over the island[9]. More remarkably, several missals printed in Venice in the first half of the sixteenth century still exist under the title Missale Gallicanum juxta usum Messanensis Ecclesiæ, as does a breviary of 1512, also printed in Venice and entitled Breviarium Gallicanum ad usum Ecclesiarum Sicularum.

Only Saint Pius V's Bull, of which we shall speak shortly, could uproot from this country the liturgical usages introduced there by our arms, which, as one sees, outlived French rule.

[margin: and the Churches of Rhodes and Malta.]

We find the Parisian liturgy elsewhere as well. Definite documentary evidence tells us that the French grand masters of the Order of Saint John of Jerusalem instituted it even in the Churches of Rhodes and *(p. 329)* Malta[10]. During his overseas journeys Saint Louis had it celebrated in his presence with all the ceremonial splendor and precision of chant permitted by the greater or lesser convenience of his various encampments.

[margin: It accompanies the king's chapel on his travels and is adopted in the royal castles and several other churches.]

Our kings of old esteemed this Liturgy so highly that they extended its use to several places in the kingdom, even beyond the boundaries of the diocese of Paris. First, wherever they were, they had it celebrated in their presence with meticulous observance of this rite's order. They were not satisfied with the Liturgies of other Churches that mingled their own usages with those of Paris. Moreover, this Church's breviary was the only one that could be followed in the Sainte-Chapelles of the Palais, Vincennes, Dijon, Champigny in the diocese of Chartres, Châteaudun, and generally all the royal castles. To these must be added the royal churches of Bourges, Bourbon, Gué-de-Maulny or Saint-Pierre-la-Cour at Le Mans, Saint-Clément in Compiègne, and Saint-Firmat in Mortain, in the diocese of Avranches. Grancolas, from whom we borrow this valuable enumeration, also names several churches in the town and vicariate of Pontoise: the collegiate church and the parishes of Saint-André, Saint-Maclou, and Saint-Pierre; and finally the parishes of Annery, Nivelières, Génicourt, Osny, and Pizeux, which depended on the chapter of Saint-Mellon[11]. We shall see later how the Liturgy of Paris was removed from the king's chapel to make way for books containing the Roman Office in all its purity.

[margin: The kings' zeal for the Liturgy in this period.]

Details of this kind naturally lead us to speak of the piety of kings in the period we are describing, and to *(p. 330)* recount the acts of their zeal for the Liturgy. At the head of the thirteenth-century sovereigns most devoted to the holy Offices we must place the most devout of them, Saint Louis, of heroic memory. One may say that the history of this great prince's piety has yet to be written. Here we shall borrow from one of his contemporary biographers a few details that show him from the standpoint that concerns us. Geoffrey of Beaulieu, Saint Louis's confessor, relates, among other things, that for a time this pious king observed the custom of rising at midnight. Having thus torn himself from sleep, he sang Matins with his chaplains, then remained in prayer as long as he knew the same Matins usually lasted in the cathedral church. When these long vigils began to harm his health, he decided to rise in time to hear Prime, Mass, and the other Hours soon after the singing of Matins had ended. From their youth he had the princes, his children, attend all the canonical Hours. After Compline the antiphon to the Blessed Virgin was sung, a custom later adopted in the rest of the Church, and everything ended with the sprinkling of holy water. He also required his sons to recite the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin privately.

[margin: His love of the Divine Office.]

[margin: Saint Louis.]

[margin: He does not interrupt these pious habits during the crusade.]

For the voyage to the crusade he had obtained permission to have the Eucharist carried aboard his ship. He had the canonical Hours, and even Mass, sung there. Only the Canon was omitted; but the priests and ministers wore their sacred vestments.

We should like to follow the royal knight on his visits to the holy places and recount the fervor with which he had the sacred mysteries celebrated in the very places where they had been accomplished. We shall content ourselves with citing a single detail from Geoffrey of Beaulieu's narrative. He relates *(p. 331)* how the holy king celebrated the feast of the Annunciation at Nazareth, and speaks as follows:

"Those who were present can testify how devoutly he conducted himself there and how solemnly and gloriously he had Vespers, Matins, Mass, and the other observances belonging to so celebrated a solemnity performed. Some of them could truthfully attest or declare that, since the Son of God assumed flesh from the glorious Virgin in that same place, so solemn and devout an Office had never been celebrated there[12]."

[margin: Saint Ferdinand, king of Castile.]

Saint Louis's glorious contemporary, a king and knight like himself, Saint Ferdinand, king of Castile and León, was no less zealous for the Divine Offices. Rodrigo recounts his acts of piety in detail: how he attended all the Hours of day and night, even on campaign; how he sang the divine canticles with the clerics,

and did not disdain sometimes to perform the cantor's office himself[13].

[margin: Richard the Lionheart.]

Shall we speak of that other brilliant knight, Richard the Lionheart, who filled East and West with the fame of his glory? The chronicles of England tell us how he rose early every morning to seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; how he went to church and did not leave until he had heard the entire ecclesiastical Office[14].

[margin: Henry III.]

Henry III, one of his successors, heard three Masses en note, that is, in plainchant, every day, *(p. 332)* besides the low Masses he had attended. When Saint Louis urged him to spend at least part of this time listening to sermons, the pious king of England gave this admirable reply, which so well portrays the tender piety of the Middle Ages: "I would still rather see the one I love more often than merely hear him spoken of[15]."

[margin: The influence of liturgical princes on the piety of their peoples.]

Such were still the kings of Catholic Christendom in the thirteenth century. How could the peoples have failed to possess an ineffable understanding of the things of the mystical life, when a Louis IX and a Richard I, for example—princes otherwise so different—were united in their passionate love of chant and liturgical prayer, and spent long hours every day living a life of faith and love of heavenly things? But after the thirteenth century this line of princes called liturgists, beginning with Pepin and Charlemagne, suddenly breaks off. Philip the Fair had quite other things to do than sing responsories: men like Pierre Flotte and Guillaume de Nogaret seemed to him more advantageous recruits than his grandfather's Friars Preachers and Friars Minor.

[margin: The Christian year receives its completion in the thirteenth century through the institution of the feast of the Blessed Sacrament.]

The thirteenth century witnessed a liturgical event of such great consequence that nothing like it has occurred since. We mean the institution of the feast of the Blessed Sacrament: for the universal feasts subsequently established by the Apostolic See are not of so high a rank, have no octave, and entail no obligation to cease servile work. One may therefore say that in the period narrated in this chapter the Christian year received its completion, at least in the main outlines of the calendar.

(p. 333)

[margin: Established by Urban IV in 1264, this solemnity affirms the faith against Sacramentarian heresies.]

This solemnity, so dear to all Catholic Christendom, was established as a solemn testimony to the Church's faith in the august mystery of the Eucharist. As early as the eleventh century, Berengarius's heresy had made a new liturgical affirmation of the ancient belief necessary. The rite of elevating the Host and chalice immediately after the consecration, for the people to adore them, had promptly been instituted and spread everywhere. In the thirteenth century new attacks were being prepared against this central dogma of a religion founded on the mystery of the Word made flesh to unite himself to human nature. Already the precursors of the Sacramentarians had appeared. The Waldensians and Albigensians were preparing the way for Wycliffe and John Hus, themselves precursors of Luther and Calvin. It was time for the Church to make her mighty voice heard. The feast of the Blessed Sacrament was therefore decreed by Urban IV in 1264, amid marvelous circumstances to be recounted elsewhere. Not only was a solemnity of the first rank added to the ancient feasts instituted by the Apostles, but a splendid procession in which the Body of the Lord would be carried was soon added to the ancient processions of Palm Sunday and the Rogation Days.

[margin: Composition of the Office of the Blessed Sacrament; even the innovators respected it.]

To celebrate so great a mystery, a new Office had to be composed that would answer the Church's enthusiasm and the grandeur of the subject. On this occasion the Liturgy did not disappoint the Christian

people. The Office of the Blessed Sacrament is so imposing a monument that the innovators of the last century, who overthrew the ancient Liturgy to create another from the ground up for the use of the Churches of France, thought fit to retain several parts of it, even while they mercilessly tore apart the Offices that all the rest of Latin Christendom, except the Church of Milan, employs in celebrating the *(p. 334)* mysteries of Christmas, Easter, the Ascension, and Pentecost.

[margin: This Office appears to be attributable to Saint Thomas Aquinas.]

But the Office of the Blessed Sacrament has shared the fate of all great monuments beloved by peoples: a kind of mystery has veiled its origin. Its true authorship has been disputed. No one, it is true, has ever doubted that the angelic Doctor, Saint Thomas Aquinas, had the principal part in it. But in composing this Office, did he not have before him the one already in use in the Church of Liège, where the feast of the Blessed Sacrament had begun? The records of the thirteenth century have not sufficiently clarified this point for us, although all the testimony of history places beyond doubt that Urban IV commissioned Saint Thomas to compose the Office of this new feast for the universal Church[16].

[margin: The majesty of the scholastic form and the happy combination of Old and New Testament sentences in this composition.]

What chiefly strikes one in this Office, as it came from Saint Thomas's hands, is its majestically scholastic form. Each Matins responsory consists of two sentences, one drawn from the Old Testament and the other from the New, thus bearing concordant witness to the great mystery that is the subject of the solemnity. This idea, with its touch of grandeur, was unknown to Saint Gregory and the other authors of the ancient Liturgy. One must acknowledge that, as puerile and forced as it is in the new breviaries that make it a general rule, it is beautiful and sound when applied only with restraint and on great occasions.

[margin: The same methodical genius in Saint Thomas's Lauda, Sion]

[margin: ("Praise, O Zion").]

The same methodical genius of the thirteenth century appears in the sequence Lauda, Sion ("Praise, O Zion"), an astonishing work indisputably by Saint Thomas. There the mighty power *(p. 335)* of a scholasticism, not emaciated and truncated as it is today, but complete as in the Middle Ages, effortlessly adapted to the rhythm and movement of the Latin language a faithful, precise exposition of a dogma as abstract to the theologian as it is sweet and nourishing to the heart of the faithful. What majesty in the opening of this sublime poem! What delicate precision in the exposition of the Church's faith! And with what grace and naturalness its conclusion recalls the figures of the Old Law that foretold the Bread of Angels, the Paschal Lamb, and the Manna! Finally, what an ineffable conclusion in that majestic and tender prayer to the divine Shepherd who feeds his sheep with his own flesh! We are his table companions here below, awaiting the eternal day when we shall become his coheirs. Thus is verified what we said above, that every feeling of order necessarily resolves itself into harmony. Saint Thomas, the most perfect of the thirteenth-century scholastics, was thereby also its most sublime poet.

[margin: The Dies iræ ("Day of wrath"), another masterpiece of the same period.]

We have another work from the same period that deserves the same appreciation: the sequence Dies iræ ("Day of wrath"). There is no agreement on the name of the inspired poet who endowed Christendom with this canticle, so tender and so somber, which will doubtless accompany the Church on that last day whose terrors it expresses with such lamentation. But what majesty, what unction, what a rhythm worthy of so fearsome a subject! One feels inclined to believe that a special assistance of the Holy Spirit must have guided the authors of the Dies iræ ("Day of wrath") and the Lauda, Sion ("Praise, O Zion"), revealing to them the heavenly accents that alone harmonized with such subjects.

[margin: Ecclesiastical chant at its height in the thirteenth century; its perfection shines above all in the sequences.]

If we now consider the chant itself that clothes and further embellishes these incomparable poems, we are forced to acknowledge that no century has surpassed the thirteenth in the art of expressing *(p. 336)* the

passions of the Liturgy with the apparently so limited resources of ecclesiastical chant. We shall make just one observation: the thirteenth century succeeded chiefly in sequences rather than in responsories and other prose pieces. This relates to the observations we made in Chapter XI. Medieval composers were more at ease with pieces they could treat according to the national genius than with unrhythmic pieces, which the reminiscences of Greek music applied by Saint Gregory had, moreover, invested with such majesty. A work predating the Office of the Blessed Sacrament had already attested this musical faculty in the twelfth century: the beautiful melody of Abelard's sequence Mittit ad Virginem ("He sends to the Virgin") no longer belonged to the family of ancient sequences. Nothing could be more tender or more mystically joyful. We have said that this melody belongs to France, as do the words to which it was set. Italy, in return, has given us Lauda, Sion ("Praise, O Zion") and Dies iræ ("Day of wrath"). France and Belgium supplied the responsories, antiphons, and other pieces of the Office of the Blessed Sacrament.

[margin: Lack of originality in the chants of the Office and Mass of the Blessed Sacrament; the thirteenth century disdains working on prose pieces.]

Certainly nothing could be more remarkably melodious than these responsories and antiphons; but, to be fair, one must add that they are anything but original. We shall even surprise more than one reader by saying that all, or almost all, the prose pieces in the Office of the Blessed Sacrament are merely pastiches of older pieces, nearly all from the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Thus the responsory Homo quidam ("A certain man") is taken from Virgo flagellatur ("The virgin is scourged") for Saint Catherine; Immolabit ("He will sacrifice"), from Te Sanctum Deum ("You, holy God") for the holy Angels; Comedetis ("You will eat"), from Stirps Jesse ("The stock of Jesse") for the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin; Unus Panis ("One bread"), from Ex ejus tumba ("From his tomb") for Saint Nicholas; Misit me ("He sent me"), from Verbum caro ("Word, flesh") for Christmas Day. The antiphon O quam suavis ("O how sweet") is modeled on O Christi pietas ("O Christ's loving-kindness") for Saint *(p. 337)* Nicholas, and so on. The Mass, so beautiful and melodious, is no more original. The Introit Cibavit ("He fed") belongs properly to Pentecost Monday; the Gradual Oculi omnium ("The eyes of all"), to the twentieth Sunday after that feast. The Offertory Sacerdotes ("Priests") is taken from Confirma hoc ("Confirm this"), and the Communion Quotiescumque ("As often as") from Factus est repente ("Suddenly there came"), both pieces belonging to the Mass of Pentecost Day. Nor is this all. In several of these pieces the musical composition flagrantly contradicts the meaning of the words: for example, the antiphons O quam suavis est ("O how sweet it is"), Sapientia ("Wisdom"), and O Sacrum convivium ("O sacred banquet"). This gives grounds for thinking that they were treated by composers skilled in musical melody but ignorant of Latin. From this twofold observation one may conclude that the thirteenth century, so divinely inspired in rhythmic compositions, disdained working on prose pieces and took little trouble beyond transferring familiar motifs to new words: an almost mechanical task that unlettered musicians could perform.

[margin: Analogies between the vicissitudes of medieval ecclesiastical chant and the course of religious architecture.]

If we may explore the analogies between the vicissitudes of ecclesiastical chant in the Middle Ages and the course of religious architecture—which has always shared the fortunes of the Liturgy, forming so great a part of it and, as it were, its frame—we shall submit the following considerations to our readers. The tenth and eleventh centuries produced grave, austere, melancholy chants, like the dark, mysterious vaults that Romanesque architecture cast over our cathedrals, especially during the general rebuilding that marked the early years of the eleventh century. Thus the Gregorian form can still be found in King Robert's responsories, just as the basilica is still visible beneath the Byzantine arches of the same period. The twelfth century, a transitional period that in architecture we should call *(p. 338)* florid Romanesque tending toward the pointed arch, has its delightful Offices of Saint Nicholas and Saint Catherine, Abelard's sequence, and the like, in which the Gregorian phrase gradually fades to make way for a dreamy melody. Then comes the thirteenth century, with its pure lines soaring with such precision and harmony. Beneath vaults with such regular pointed arches, measured chants were needed above all: a rhythm both sweet and strong. The merely

melodious but incomplete attempts of past centuries no longer suffice: Lauda, Sion (“Praise, O Zion”) and Dies iræ (“Day of wrath”) are created. Yet this period is short. Such exquisite purity in architectural forms deteriorates; excessive refinement withers it. Ornament clogs, encumbers, and soon breaks those harmonious lines. Then, too, ecclesiastical chant enters the period of degradation of which we shall shortly speak. Unfortunately not all our readers will be able to follow these relationships and study the progress and decline of chant. The books containing the works we recall disappear every day. Yet it must be known what treasures of melody were sacrificed when chants our forefathers had never heard were introduced into our churches—chants that resound noisily beneath vaults long accustomed to echo others.

[margin: List of thirteenth-century liturgical writers. Alan of Lille, a Cistercian monk.]

We shall now give the bibliography of the liturgical writers who flourished in the great age of the thirteenth century.

We find first Alan of Lille, a Cistercian monk who flourished at the University of Paris at the beginning of the thirteenth century and was called the Universal Doctor. Among his works are two sequences, one on the Incarnation of the Word and the other on the frailty of human nature.

[margin: Hugh des Noyers, bishop of Auxerre.]

(1206). Hugh des Noyers, bishop of Auxerre, composed several hymns, among them Plaude, Can- *(p. 339)* tuaria (“Rejoice, Canterbury”), in honor of Saint Thomas of Canterbury, long used in the Auxerre breviary, according to Hurter. (Tableau des institutions au moyen âge, vol. I, p. 384.)

[margin: John the Scribe or the Acemete, patriarch of the Jacobites.]

(1208). John, called the Scribe or the Acemete, patriarch of the Jacobites, appears to be the author of an anaphora included by Renaudot in the second volume of his collection of Eastern Liturgies.

[margin: Saint Francis of Assisi.]

(1215). Saint Francis of Assisi, patriarch of the Seraphic Order, exercised a marked influence on the Liturgy by requiring his children to embrace the rite of the Roman Church. Among his works is a short treatise entitled Ordo recitandi officium dominicæ Passionis.

[margin: William of Seignelay, bishop of Paris.]

(1220). William of Seignelay, bishop of Auxerre and later transferred to the see of Paris, had composed a book, De Divinis Officiis, which has not been printed.

[margin: Germanus II, patriarch of Constantinople.]

(1222). Germanus II, patriarch of Constantinople, is the author of an interesting short work on the Liturgy entitled Theory of Ecclesiastical Things. Unfortunately we do not possess it as it left its author’s hands: it has suffered serious interpolations.

[margin: Godfrey, bishop of Cambrai.]

(1230). Godfrey, bishop of Cambrai, wrote a book De Divinis Officiis, which we no longer possess.

[margin: James, bishop of Tagrite.]

(1230). James, bishop of Tagrite, of the sect of the Nestorians, is the author of an Exposition of the Offices and Prayers.

[margin: Guyard of Laon, chancellor of the University of Paris.]

(1238). Guyard of Laon, chancellor of the University of Paris and later raised to the bishopric of Cambrai, appears to be the author of a short work De Officiis divinis, sive ecclesiasticis, and another, De Officiis sacerdotum.

[margin: Haymo of Feversham, minister general of the Friars Minor.]

(1239). Haymo of Feversham, minister general of the Friars Minor, corrected the Roman breviary, as we have said, and also wrote a book De Missæ cæremoniis.

[margin: Simon Taylor, a Dominican.]

(1240). Simon Taylor, a Dominican, was skilled in the *(p. 340)* theory of ecclesiastical chant, and composed two books De Pentachordis, two De Tenore Musicali, and one De Cantu Ecclesiastico corrigendo.

[margin: Vincent of Coventer, a Franciscan. John Bar-Maadani, patriarch of the Jacobites. Humbert of Romans, fifth general of the Dominicans.]

(1251). Vincent of Coventer, a Franciscan and professor at Cambridge, is the author of an Exposition of the Mass.

(1253). John Bar-Maadani, patriarch of the Jacobites, composed an anaphora found in Renaudot's collection.

(1254). Humbert of Romans, fifth general of the Dominicans and compiler of his order's breviary, wrote Commentaries on the Offices it contains. According to Schulting, these were kept in the library of the Friars Preachers at Cologne.

[margin: Theodore Lascaris II, Greek emperor.]

(1255). Theodore Lascaris II, Greek emperor, composed a canon or hymn in honor of the Blessed Virgin, found in the book the Greeks call the Parakletike.

[margin: Gregory Bar-Hebraeus, primate of the East.]

(1260). Gregory Bar-Hebraeus, primate of the East for the sect of the Jacobites, is the author of an anaphora found in Renaudot's collection, and of an abridgment of the Liturgy of Saint James.

[margin: Hugh of Saint-Cher, a Dominican, cardinal.]

(1260). Hugh of Saint-Cher, a Dominican, cardinal, and author of the Concordance of the Bible, also worked on the Liturgy. He composed a book under the title Speculum sacerdotum et Ecclesiæ, de Symbolo et Officio missæ.

[margin: Latinus Frangipani, a Dominican, cardinal.]

(1270). Latinus Frangipani, a Dominican, cardinal, and nephew of Pope Nicholas III, is said to be the author of the sequence for the dead, Dies iræ ("Day of wrath"), and of several others in honor of the Blessed Virgin.

[margin: Saint Thomas Aquinas, angelic Doctor.]

(1270). Saint Thomas Aquinas, the angelic Doctor, besides the Office of the Blessed Sacrament, wrote a book entitled Expositio missæ.

[margin: Guibert of Tournay, a Franciscan.]

(1270). Guibert of Tournay, a Franciscan, left a most interesting work under the title De officio Episcopi et Ecclesiæ cæremoniis. It is dedicated to William, bishop of Orléans.

(p. 341)

[margin: Érard de Lésignes, cardinal, bishop of Auxerre.]

(1270). Érard de Lésignes, cardinal and bishop of Auxerre, went to Rome and heard such beautiful responsories from the history of Noah and Abraham, for the weeks of Sexagesima and Quinquagesima, that he introduced them into his Church.

[margin: Sancho, infante of Aragon, archbishop of Toledo.]

(1270). Sancho, infante of Aragon and archbishop of Toledo, composed litanies and hymns in honor of the Blessed Virgin.

[margin: Saint Bonaventure, seraphic Doctor.]

(1272). Saint Bonaventure, the seraphic Doctor, is the author of an Exposition of the Mass and an Office of the Passion of Jesus Christ. The Office of Saint Francis has also been attributed to him.

[margin: Peckham, a Franciscan, archbishop of Canterbury.]

(1280). Peckham, a Franciscan and archbishop of Canterbury, left two liturgical treatises, one entitled De Ratione diei Dominicæ, the other Speculum Ecclesiæ de Missa.

[margin: William Durand, a Dominican, bishop of Mende.]

[margin: He gives the Middle Ages' last word on the mystical interpretation of divine worship.]

(1290). William Durand, a Dominican and bishop of Mende, composed the famous Rationale divinorum Officiorum. In this work he explains the whole of the liturgy with the help of earlier authors, adding his own observations. This book may be considered the Middle Ages' last word on the mystical interpretation of divine worship. If it is so forgotten today, this must be attributed solely to that sad indifference to religious forms which had chilled our forefathers, to such a degree that in eighteenth-century France the entire ancient liturgy could be overthrown and a new one substituted without stirring the people. The Offices Durand expounds are no longer those celebrated in our churches. This will somewhat embarrass our modern antiquarians who, having happened upon Durand in the dust of libraries, try to use him to explain the worship of former times. If any of them should one day read these lines, we would take the liberty of telling him that Durand, who can be of such great help in interpreting *(p. 342)* the myths (as they say) of Catholicism in the Middle Ages, is merely the compiler of opinions expressed by earlier liturgical writers, from the age of the Fathers of the Church onward. In the part of his work that is his own, moreover, it is not always safe to take his explanations as expressing the spirit of the Church. His book is indeed a Summa; but everything in it must be judged in relation to the traditions of antiquity. In a word, Durand's Rationale is a monument that liturgical scholarship could, after all, do without. For this learning originates in the earliest traditions of Christianity, from which it has come down to us by word of mouth, fully alive, without needing secular scholarship to restore it. France's condition as regards the Liturgy is only an isolated and passing phenomenon, or so we hope at least. For while Durand, if he returned to life today, would understand nothing of the Liturgy of Mende, his own Church, or of Lyon, Paris, and so forth, he could at least cross our country's borders and find throughout the West those holy formulas he commented on with such love.

[margin: His book is the first printed with metal type.]

To the glory of liturgical scholarship, and of William Durand in particular, we must say that the Rationale divinorum Officiorum was the first book printed with metal type: a preference that amply shows the respect in which it was held. It appeared at Mainz in 1459. On the last page of this edition one reads the following words:

"This present volume of the Rationale of the Divine Offices, adorned with beautiful capitals and distinguished by rubrication, has thus been fashioned by the ingenious invention of printing and forming characters, without writing with a pen, and has been diligently completed for devotion to God by Johann Fust, a citizen of Mainz, and Peter Gernzheim, a cleric of the same diocese, in the year of the Lord *(p. 343)* one thousand four hundred fifty-nine. On the sixth day of October."

From this inscription, which we have preserved with all its incorrectness, one sees how the memories of liturgical scholarship are joined to one of humanity's greatest and most glorious undertakings.

[margin: Ignatius V, patriarch of the Jacobites.]

(1293). Ignatius V, patriarch of the Jacobites, composed an anaphora included in Renaudot's collection.

[margin: Ebedjesu, metropolitan of Soba.]

(1296). Ebedjesu, metropolitan of Soba for the sect of the Nestorians, left a book entitled Margaritæ de veritate fidei, in which he treats many questions of liturgy.

[margin: Engelbert, a Benedictine abbot in Styria.]

(1297). Engelbert, a Benedictine abbot in Styria, wrote an explanation of the seven great antiphons.

[margin: John the Deacon, canon of the Lateran Basilica.]

(1297). John the Deacon, a canon of the Lateran Basilica, dedicated to Pope Alexander IV an interesting book entitled De Sanctis Sanctorum, in which he discusses the liturgical antiquities of this mother and mistress of the Churches.

[margin: Peter, cantor and chancellor of the Church of Chartres.]

(1300). Peter, cantor and chancellor of the Church of Chartres, left a treatise under the title Speculum Ecclesiæ, sive Manuale mysteriorum Ecclesiæ.

[margin: Conclusions.]

We shall conclude this chapter with the following observations:

In the thirteenth century, as in every other, the Liturgy was the expression of the Church. The new religious Orders she brought forth exerted their influence on the Liturgy as the principal sphere of ecclesiastical institutions: the universal breviary was Franciscan; the new solemnity of the Blessed Sacrament received part of its grandeur from the hand of a Dominican.

This age of theological synthesis also produced Durand's liturgical synthesis.

The ancient deposit of the Liturgy remained intact in all its parts. Even after the Franciscan correction one could still say that the Church of the West knew *(p. 344)* no other liturgical forms in substance than those Saint Gregory the Great had brought together, and that Charlemagne and Saint Gregory VII had finished establishing in the Latin Church.

Ecclesiastical chant made progress corresponding to the beauty, nobility, and harmony of the architectural lines of this most brilliant century of Western Christendom.

---

[1] Regula S. P. Francisci, ch. III.

[2] Et istud Officium breviatum secuti sunt fratres minores. Inde est, quod breviaria eorum, et libros Officii intitulant secundum consuetudinem Romanæ curiæ; But they took no care to receive and observe the customs of the other churches of the city of Rome. (De Canonum observantia. Proposition XXII, p. 313.)

[3] Annales Minorum. Under the year 1244, and year 37 of the Order.

[4] Because, as I have learned beyond doubt, some brothers presume sometimes to alter the Divine Office in its text, but especially to vary it in its chant—the Office which under our Rule we must celebrate according to the order of the Holy Roman Church—etc., I have deemed it necessary by these letters to enjoin that, beyond that alone which the Missal ordinal and the Breviary, revised with pious care by Brother Haymo of holy memory, our predecessor, confirmed by the Apostolic See, and subsequently also approved by the general chapter, are known to contain, you in no way permit anything whatsoever in chant or text, under the pretext of any feast or devotion, in hymns or responsories.... to be altered in choir..... (Wading. Annales Minorum. Under the year 1249.)

[5] There is some exaggeration here; for we find in no other historian that the Friars Minor altered the Missal, whose integrity is clearly demonstrated by the manuscripts.

[6] Fecit (Nicolaus) in ecclesiis urbis amoveri Antiphonarios, Gradualia, Missalia et alios libros Officii antiquos quinquaginta, et mandavit, ut de cetero ecclesiæ urbis uterentur libris, et Breviariis fratrum minorum, quorum regulam etiam confirmavit; unde hodie in Roma omnes libri sunt novi et franciscani. (Radulphus. Ibid., p. 314.)

[7] Liturgia Domenicana spiegata in tutte le sue parti, by Fra Luigi Vincenzo Cassitto. Vol. I, p. 11.

[8] Grancolas. Commentaire historique sur le Bréviaire Romain. Vol. I, p. 93.

[9] Johannes de Johanne, De Divinis Siculorum Officiis. Chs. V, VIII, X, XII and following.

[10] Paciaudi, De Cultu S. Joannis Baptistæ, p. 413.

[11] Grancolas, Commentaire historique sur le Bréviaire romain, vol. I, p. 64.

[12] Quam devote ibidem se habuerit, quam solemniter et gloriose fecerit celebrari vesperas, matutinas, missam, et cetera, quæ ad solemnitatem tam celebrem pertinebant, testes esse possunt, qui affuerunt, de quibus nonnulli attestari veraciter, sive edere potuerunt, quod postquam Filius Dei in eodem loco de gloriosa Virgine carnem assumpsit, nunquam tam solemne, tamque devotum Officium fuerit ibi factum. (S. Ludovici vita per Gaufridum de Bello loco, ch. IV.)

[13] Roderic. Toletan. De Rebus Hispan.

[14] Roger. P. 753.

[15] Thomas de Walsingham, vol. II, p. 67.

[16] Benedict XIV, De festis D. N. J. C., bk. I, ch. XIII.

Chapter XIII. Decline of the Liturgy and Chant during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Need for Reform. — Leo X. Clement VII. Paul III. — Ferreri and Quignonez. — Burchard and Paris de Grassi. — Liturgical Writers of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries

(p. 345)

[margin: Causes of the Liturgy's decline in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.]

It was difficult for the Liturgy to remain entirely pure after the Franciscan correction. The Apostolic See had not obliged the Churches to receive the books thus reformed; their adoption in several places had been entirely optional. Moreover, where they were adopted, many old usages were retained, further increasing the confusion, while ardent devotion daily burdened the calendar with new saints and Offices of varying correctness.

[margin: Corruption arising from manuscript copies.]

Although the ancient body of the Roman Liturgy always remained—as one may verify by leafing through the books still preserved—it is easy to imagine the anarchy of detail that must have prevailed in the usages of different dioceses. Without printing to multiply uniform copies, one was reduced to the dangerous process of manuscript copying and had to endure all its inaccuracies. These copies were corrupted not only by their makers' ignorance or carelessness; they also accumulated a host of crude and even superstitious additions, as may be seen *(p. 346)* from the ordinances of councils, which frequently complain of such abuses during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

[margin: The Liturgy ceases to be the living rule of the Christian people.]

These additions consisted chiefly of apocryphal stories, unknown to earlier centuries and sometimes even rejected by them, introduced into lessons, hymns, or antiphons; barbarous formulas inserted to please a crude people; votive Masses displacing the ordinary Masses, with superstitious circumstances attached to their number or the rite to be observed; and blessings unknown to all antiquity, slipped into ecclesiastical books by mere private individuals. In a word, instead of being the living rule, the teaching, the supreme law of the Christian people, the Liturgy had fallen into the service of popular passions. Certain fictions, perfectly at home in the mystery plays performed by the law clerks of the Basoche, had too often invaded the books of the altar and choir. To grasp the full extent of these abuses, one need only recall the composure with which the clergy surrendered cathedrals to the strange farces of the Feast of the Ass and the Feast of Fools. One can then imagine how greatly such familiarity with the most sacred things of divine worship compromised the purity of the Liturgy.

[margin: Assessment of this period.]

In the last century it was fashionable to vilify the Middle Ages as an age of barbarism. Today, most happily, the fashion seems to be to exalt the centuries called Catholic centuries. Certainly this movement marks great progress. But further study will show that the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, undoubtedly far superior to those that have followed them down to our own time—as we heartily agree—also had their miseries. If, then, we point out in them the many grave evils of ignorance and *(p. 347)* superstition, we speak as did the Councils and Doctors of those heroic times. Yet by the very nature of the reproaches we address to those centuries, we already place them infinitely above the centuries degraded by rationalism and materialist doctrines.

[margin: The encroachments of new liturgical forms damage the work of earlier centuries,]

The ancient deposit of the Liturgy thus faced great dangers amid this ferment of ill-informed zeal, which daily produced chivalric devotions everywhere. The Liturgy, like the Christian faith, belongs to every century. All have professed it; all have adorned it with a few flowers. It would not have been just for the ancient body of material developed by men such as Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory the Great to be entirely covered by the excrescences of two or three privileged centuries. Unjustly robbing earlier ages of their glory, these centuries would deprive later ones of the honor and consolation of writing their own page in the book of the prayers of the Church and, through her, of the human race. The feast and Office of the Blessed Sacrament are the sole liturgical work the Church wished to preserve from this thirteenth century, otherwise so fruitful in every kind of pious inspiration. Certainly it is a great glory for this century to have endowed the Christian people with so sublime an institution. One would be tempted to regard it as the completion of the liturgical year, did one not also know that the Bridegroom never ceases to reveal new secrets to the bride.

[margin: and threaten the work of unity accomplished by the Roman Pontiffs and Christian princes.]

Another grave danger had arisen from liturgical anarchy, besides the one just discussed. The work of unity accomplished by Charlemagne and the Roman Pontiffs, while safeguarding the purity of the faith, consolidated a single nationality in the West. This was the great good that Spain's warrior and lawgiver kings, in agreement with Saint Gregory VII, had wished to secure for their peoples by embracing the Roman Liturgy. But if this Liturgy, abandoned to human whims, *(p. 348)* came to be fragmented not only by nations but by dioceses and churches, what became of the fruit of so many efforts to detach peoples from their ancient usages, if they fell back into a condition worse than the first? Sooner or later prayer ceased to be common to the various European races, the expression of faith deteriorated, and faith itself was threatened. We shall see later what measures Rome took to restore unity and the success that crowned them.

[margin: The Liturgy shares the vicissitudes of the Papacy.]

Moreover, in undergoing degradation in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the Liturgy shared, as always, the fate of the Church herself. The abasement of the Papacy after Boniface VIII, the Popes' residence at Avignon, the Great Schism, and the saturnalia of Constance and Basel more than sufficiently explain the disorders that furnished a pretext for the undertakings of the so-called Reformation. We rank the decline of the Liturgy among the misfortunes then to be deplored. Accordingly, we shall see the holy Council of Trent concerned with the need for reform in this matter as in others. But we must not anticipate what remains to be said: we have not yet pointed out all the abuses introduced into the forms of worship in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

[margin: Simultaneous decline of religious architecture.]

Religious architecture alone, especially during the fifteenth century and part of the sixteenth, would furnish grave grounds for complaint. This art, so pure, inspired, and divine in the thirteenth century, soon prostituted itself to the point of producing ignoble caricatures of holy things, not only on exterior galleries but even on the capitals and woodwork of the sanctuary. Indecent images of clerics and monks defiled the surroundings of those niches where the age of Saint Louis had placed the serene and pure images of the Blessed and of the Queen of Angels. Rabelais is no more cynical, no more shamefully contemptuous of the *(p. 349)* Christian priesthood than certain architects and sculptors of the period we are recounting. Add to this the confusion, strangeness, and caprice of ornamentation, opening the door to pagan forms and to such incongruous mixtures of the most carnal mythological symbols with the mystical emblems of our worship. Here we merely indicate the general features. But one must understand that, if paganism revived in the arts in the sixteenth century, its place had long been prepared by the frivolity and extreme license into which medieval art had already plunged. Let us understand this well: there were two peoples in our Catholic centuries, as there are today; only the children of God were stronger than the children of men.

[margin: Decline of ecclesiastical chant following the introduction of discant.]

Ecclesiastical chant not only changed at this time; it nearly perished forever. Gone were the days when the Gregorian repertory remained intact while pieces, few or many but always religious in character, were added to celebrate certain local solemnities more fully or increase the majesty of universal feasts. These pieces drew on the ancient modes or at least redeemed their departures from established rules by original and sometimes sublime beauties. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries saw discant—the name given to singing in parts over the Gregorian melody—absorb and entirely obliterate, beneath strange and capricious inflections, all the majesty and unction of the ancient pieces. The venerable phrase of the chant, too often already altered by bad taste and the unfaithfulness of copyists, succumbed to the efforts of a hundred secular musicians who sought only novelty and opportunities to display their talent for harmonies and variations. This does not mean that we blame the judicious use of harmonies over plainchant, nor that we absolutely *(p. 350)* reject all ornate chant merely because it is not sung in unison. Indeed, with Abbé Lebœuf, we believe that the earliest origin of discant, now called counterpoint or chant sur le livre (singing over the book), should be traced to the Roman cantors who came to France in Charlemagne's time[1]. But the Holy Spirit had not chosen Saint Gregory as the mouthpiece of Catholic melodies in vain. His work, a sublime and inspired reminiscence of ancient music, was to accompany the Church until the end of time. It therefore became necessary for the great voice of the Apostolic See to be heard and for a solemn condemnation to be pronounced against innovators who wished to give human, earthly expression to the heavenly sighs of Christ's Church. To complete the promulgation of the judgment, it had to be inserted into the body of canon law, where it forever condemns not only the scandals of the fourteenth century but, with still greater reason, those that even today profane so many churches in France and elsewhere. Here are John XXII's words in his famous Bull Docta sanctorum, issued in 1322 and placed at the beginning of the third book of the Extravagantes Communes, under the title de Vita et Honestate clericorum.

[margin: Pope John XXII condemns innovations in chant in the Bull Docta sanctorum.]

"The learned authority of the holy Fathers has decreed that, in the Offices of divine praise rendered as an act of the service that is due, everyone's mind should be watchful, speech should not falter, and the modest gravity of those singing psalms should chant with peaceful modulation. For in their mouth a sweet sound resounded. Indeed, a wholly sweet sound resounds in the mouth of those singing psalms when they receive God in their heart as they speak in words, and through their singing kindle *(p. 351)* devotion to him. For this reason the singing of psalms is prescribed in the churches of God: to stir the devotion of the faithful. To this end the night and day Office and the celebrations of Mass are continually sung for clergy and people in a sober manner and with clearly distinguished steps, so that this very distinctness may please them and this sobriety delight them. But certain disciples of a new school, intent on measuring time, devote themselves to new notes. They prefer to invent their own melodies rather than sing the ancient ones. Ecclesiastical pieces are sung in semibreves and minims and hammered with little notes. For they break up melodies with hockets, make them wanton with discants, and sometimes cram them with tripla and vernacular motets. Thus they sometimes despise the foundations of the Antiphonary and Gradual and are ignorant of what they build upon. They do not know the modes, which they fail to distinguish and indeed confuse: for their multitude of notes obscures the modest ascents and measured descents of plainchant by which the modes themselves are distinguished from one another. They run without resting; they intoxicate the ears without healing them. Their gestures imitate what they sing, thereby scorning the devotion that should be sought and displaying the lasciviousness that should be avoided. For Boethius himself does not speak in vain: "A lascivious mind either delights in more lascivious modes or, by hearing them often, is softened and broken." We and our Brothers therefore perceived long ago that this needed correction. We hasten to banish it, indeed to cast it out altogether and expel it more effectively from that same Church of God. Accordingly, *(p. 352)* on the counsel of these same Brothers, we strictly command that no one henceforth presume to attempt such things, or anything similar, in the said Offices, especially the canonical Hours or when the solemn celebrations of Mass take place. Anyone who acts otherwise shall, by authority of this canon, be punished with suspension from

office for eight days. For non-exempt persons, this shall be imposed by the ordinaries of the places where these acts were committed, or by their delegates; for exempt persons, by their own superiors or prelates, to whom the correction and punishment of such or similar faults and excesses otherwise belongs, or by their delegates. Yet we do not thereby intend to forbid the occasional use, especially on feast days or solemnities, at Masses and in the aforesaid divine Offices, of certain melodious consonances over simple ecclesiastical chant—for example, octaves, fifths, fourths, and the like. This must, however, be done so that the chant itself remains wholly intact with no resulting change in the good moral character of the music, especially since such consonances soothe the ear, stir devotion, and prevent the minds of those singing psalms to God from growing torpid[2]."

[margin: He nevertheless permits harmonies that respect the integrity of the chant.]

[margin: The Papacy's wise discernment concerning the art of music.]

Thus in every age, at Avignon as at Rome, the Papacy taught the world with that admirable precision which reconciles the inviolability of Catholic principles with true progress in art. She firmly maintains the dignity and gravity of chant; yet she does not proscribe, and even encourages, holy and melodious music that raises the soul to God without distracting it, that enhances rather than stifles the ancient, sacred rhythm which *(p. 353)* every generation has repeated. Later we shall see the further efforts of the Roman Pontiffs to improve music at the time of the great Catholic reform.

[margin: Unsuccessful attempts at reform.]

[margin: The efforts of Julius II and Leo X.]

As is well known, this Catholic reform was preceded by several unsuccessful attempts, which nevertheless attested to the unease felt on every side. The audacious ordinances of Constance and Basel for the reform of the Church in her Head and members, as people then said, met with the resistance they deserved from the Roman Pontiffs. Eugene IV, Nicholas V, and Pius II will forever be blessed for disregarding the insolent fulminations launched in their time against the Chair of Saint Peter. Yet the successors of these immortal Pontiffs declined from their virtue. After Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, and Alexander VI, Julius II and Leo X undertook the work of reform, although they were not of the race of men through whom Israel was to be saved. The Fifth Lateran Council and its accompanying bulls are a monument to this zeal, which lacked only perseverance to produce lasting fruit.

[margin: An exclusive concern for classical form frustrates the first attempts at liturgical reform.]

The Liturgy then seemed a natural object of attention for the apostolic reformers. But the misfortune of those times was that the full extent of the wound to be healed went unrecognized. Immature judgment thus led to concern almost exclusively with outward form, which was indeed defective. Yet it was an ill-chosen moment to decide what form was best, when Rome was under the influence of that secular literature born of too exclusive a study of the Greek and Latin classics. The first thought of correcting the Liturgy came to Leo X when the Roman court was filled with poets and prose writers whose taste could not bear the barbarism *(p. 354)* of ecclesiastical Latin. One called the Christians' God Numen (divinity), and the Virgin Mary Alma Parens (nurturing mother); another recited his Hours in Greek or Hebrew; yet another had stopped reading Saint Paul's Epistles for fear of compromising the purity of his taste. Thus the Liturgy's principal defect was thought to be its incorrect style. Without considering the rights that antiquity confers on sacred formulas, or that respect for this venerable antiquity simply required pruning ill-judged additions and interpolations, people in this age of poetry thought the first and foremost object of reform should be the hymnal. But would you like to know how they went about it? In every age the genius of Catholicism has been to improve, complete, and reform. The violent destruction of usages followed for centuries and the sudden substitution of entirely new forms for the old are without precedent in its annals. Yet this is what would have happened had Providence allowed Leo X's plan to succeed. This Pontiff ordered Zacharias Ferreri of Vicenza, bishop of Guarda, to compose a collection of hymns for all the year's feasts in a style worthy of sixteenth-century

literature. The prelate devoted all his care to the work; but Leo X, carried off by death, could not himself enjoy the fruit of Ferreri's labors. The work appeared only under Clement VII, Leo X's successor and, like him, a great admirer of ingenious antiquity.

[margin: Leo X orders Zacharias Ferreri, bishop of Guarda, to compose a new hymnal.]

[margin: This work is published at Rome in 1525 under Clement VII.]

In 1525 the long-awaited collection appeared at Rome. It bore this magnificent title, which we transcribe in full because the work has become rare:

New Ecclesiastical Hymns by Zacharias Ferreri of Vicenza, Bishop of Guarda, according to the true standard of meter and Latinity, approved by the Most Blessed Father Clement VII, Supreme Pontiff, so that anyone may use them in divine worship, and published in the new type of Ludovico *(p. 355)* of Vicenza and Lautitius of Perugia. A holy and necessary work.

Breviarium Ecclesiasticum ab eodem Zacharia longe brevius et facilius redditum et ab omni errore purgatum prope diem exibit.

At the end of the volume, one reads: This divine work was printed at Rome, in the premises of Ludovico of Vicenza and Lautitius of Perugia, not without a privilege. On the Kalends of February, 1525.

[margin: Ferreri's hymns, modeled on Horace's odes, have nothing in common with the works of the Catholic Church's poets, yet surpass those of the hymnographers of eighteenth-century French breviaries.]

The work itself perfectly answers so ostentatious an announcement. Its hymns are such as one had every right to expect from the age and the author. Everything in them is new. The mysteries of the Savior's birth, Passion, and Resurrection; those of Pentecost and the Blessed Sacrament; the feasts of the Blessed Virgin and the saints—in a word, everything is splendidly celebrated in odes that have nothing in common, in form or expression, with the ancient hymns of Saint Ambrose, Prudentius, and the other poets of the Catholic Church. Yet with the most incredible naïveté they contain every image and allusion to pagan beliefs and usages that one might find in Horace. We shall cite just one example: recounting Saint Gregory's election to the papacy, Ferreri naïvely says that the flamens chose him as Supreme Pontiff. In fairness, however, several of these hymns must also be called simple and beautiful: for example, that for the Apostles, Gaudete, mundi principes (Rejoice, princes of the world), and that in honor of the Blessed Virgin, O noctis illustratio (O light of the night). In many others, figures drawn from Holy Scripture and recollections borrowed from Catholic traditions about the saints, their deeds, and their attributes lend these compositions a certain charm, despite a form too slavishly imitated from works of pagan literature. In a word, such as they are, *(p. 356)* these hymns are certainly preferable to most of those adorning the modern breviaries of France. At bottom they spring from a strong and pure inspiration still recognizable through the mask of classical diction. Above all, they were approved by the Holy See, which, although it later revoked this approval, would at least never have granted it had these hymns not contained pure doctrine.

By a brief of December 11, 1525, Clement VII approved Ferreri's hymns. Here are the Pontiff's remarkable words:

[margin: Clement VII's approval of Ferreri's hymns.]

"Ferreri has recently composed and carefully examined ecclesiastical hymns for the splendor of divine worship, suitable for the various feast days of Almighty God, of Mary ever Virgin, and of many saints, and for the whole course of the year and its seasons. These hymns have true meters, clear meanings, and clear Latinity, and are intended for his own spiritual consolation and that of the Christian faithful, especially learned priests. He has gathered them into one volume and, after they were praised by many learned men, including some of our Brothers the cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, has dedicated and offered them to Us and the Apostolic See. Mindful that it is written in Holy Scripture that the fruit of good labors is glorious, and wishing that so much effort should not have been spent in vain, but should come to light, be publicly

published, and be used for the common benefit and spiritual advantage of all, especially learned Christians: of our own motion and certain knowledge, by the tenor of these presents and by apostolic authority, We grant and command that anyone, even a priest, may read these same hymns and use them even in divine worship[3]."

(p. 357) Thus this measure, unprecedented until then, allowed every ecclesiastic to use privately a liturgical form that was not universal. The choice of prayers to recite was left, at least to some extent, to each person's will: a private remedy was applied to public evils. This was therefore yet another palliative that reformed nothing and cried out all the more loudly for the great and sound reform of the Council of Trent and the Pontiffs who so vigorously interpreted and applied its decrees.

[margin: Ferreri announces the publication of an abridged, expurgated breviary.]

Readers will have noticed on Ferreri's Hymnal title page the announcement of an Ecclesiastical Breviary prepared by the same Zacharias, advertised as appearing shortly, made much shorter and easier and purged of every error. Indeed, a new collection of hymns was insufficient if the substance of the Office itself needed reform. Yet one must admit that it is a strange idea to single out, as its chief recommendation, the brevity of the expurgated breviary intended to replace the old one. The length of the prayers of divine service cannot be ranked among abuses on the same footing as the interpolations of apocryphal facts that may have *(p. 358)* crept in. But such was the general spirit during the first half of the sixteenth century. People sensed that something needed to be done; to discover what, they groped about, searching far away for what lay close at hand. Saint Pius V acted otherwise.

[margin: Clement VII entrusts this project to Francis Quignonez, Cardinal of the Holy Cross.]

[margin: Paul III approves the new breviary in 1535.]

Ferreri died before he could publish his abridged breviary. Clement VII entrusted the project to Cardinal Francis Quignonez, known as the Cardinal of the Holy Cross because he held the title of Holy Cross in Jerusalem. This Franciscan prelate, formerly general of his Order, worked actively to fulfill the mission. At last, in 1535, he was able to present his work to Paul III, Clement VII's successor. With this Pope's approval, Quignonez's breviary appeared at Rome under the title Breviarium Romanum ex sacra potissimum Scriptura et probatis sanctorum historiis collectum et concinnatum (Roman Breviary, Compiled and Arranged Chiefly from Holy Scripture and Approved Histories of the Saints). To help the reader judge this work, we shall translate here part of the dedicatory epistle to Paul III that the cardinal placed at the beginning of his breviary.

[margin: In his dedicatory epistle to the Pope, Quignonez explains the plan of his work.]

Quignonez first sets out the reasons why the Church has made recitation of the canonical Office a duty for clerics. He recognizes three. The first rests on their special consecration, which binds them to God's service; the second, on their need for help against the devil's temptations.

"Third," he says, "those who will also be teachers of religion should be instructed by daily reading of Holy Scripture and ecclesiastical histories and, as Paul says, hold fast to the true message as taught, so that they may be able both to exhort with sound doctrine and to refute opponents. Indeed, anyone who carefully considers the manner of praying handed down long ago by our forebears will clearly recognize that they took all these matters into account. Yet it has happened, I do not know how, through human negligence, *(p. 359)* that people have gradually departed from those most holy institutions of the ancient Fathers. First, the books of Holy Scripture appointed to be read at fixed times of the year are passed over by those praying almost as soon as they are begun. Examples are Genesis, begun at Septuagesima, and Isaiah, begun in Advent: we barely read a chapter of either. In the same way we taste the other books of the Old Testament rather than read them. The same happens with the Gospel and the rest of the Scripture of the New Testament. Other material has taken their place, comparable to them neither in usefulness nor in gravity, and is repeated daily with movement of the tongue rather than attention of the mind. Moreover, most of the psalms assigned to the

several days of the week have been set aside; a certain few are repeated almost throughout the year. The histories of the saints that are read are so crudely written, and with such careless judgment, that they seem to possess neither authority nor gravity. Added to this is so confused an arrangement and so difficult a manner of praying that sometimes little less effort is spent finding what to read than reading it once found. Having observed these things, Clement VII, Supreme Pontiff of happy memory, understood that his office required him to provide for the welfare of other Christians and especially of the clergy, whose ministry he used in governing the flock entrusted to him. He encouraged me and charged me, with all the care and diligence I could apply, to arrange the prayers of the Hours so that, once the difficulties and wasted effort I have mentioned were removed, clerics might be drawn to prayer by still greater convenience. I most willingly accepted this charge, *(p. 360)* also wishing to serve the public good to the best of my ability. I therefore enlisted some prudent members of my household, versed in Holy Scripture and canon law and learned in Greek and Latin. I made every effort to complete the work conveniently and for the public benefit, chiefly as follows.

[margin: Criticism of the old breviary.]

[margin: Arrangement of the new breviary.]

With antiphons, short chapters, responsories, many hymns, and other things of this kind that hindered the reading of Holy Scripture omitted, the breviary consists of psalms, Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testaments, and histories of the saints. We selected these histories from approved and weighty Greek and Latin authors, taking care to adorn them with a somewhat more cultivated style, but without artificial embellishment. Those hymns that seemed to possess the greatest authority and gravity have also been retained. The psalms are distributed so that, preserving the institution of the ancient Fathers as far as was possible, all are read each week of the year, three at each Hour. The length of one is balanced by the brevity of another, so that the daily labor of reading is nearly equal throughout the week and likewise throughout the year. …

Because of the variability of Eastertide and the other feasts called movable, we could not avoid rules altogether. The former breviary was so full of them that a human lifetime scarcely sufficed to master their system. But we have established rules so few and clear that anyone can readily understand them. …

[margin: Advantages of this manner of praying.]

This manner of praying has three very great advantages. First, those praying also acquire knowledge of both Testaments. Second, it is *(p. 361)* very expeditious, owing to the utmost simplicity of its arrangement and a certain brevity. Third, the histories of the saints contain nothing that offends serious and learned ears as before. …

[margin: Holy Scripture will be read almost in its entirety each year.]

The difference, then, between the breviary we have used until now and this one is that, although the ancient Fathers wished almost all Holy Scripture to be read each year, in the former one barely reads a tiny portion, tasting the books piecemeal. In this one, by contrast, a large and principal part of the Old Testament is read each year, and the whole New Testament except part of the Apocalypse, as we have said. The Epistles and Acts of the Apostles are even repeated. …

[margin: The new breviary is both shorter and more convenient.]

Although our aim was to provide for the convenience of those praying rather than for brevity, we have nonetheless, we hope, achieved both. Individual Lessons are longer in this breviary, but there are only three. In the former, with the Office of the Blessed Virgin added, there are twelve, with as many versicles and responsories. Although some psalms in this one are longer, in the other far more are read each day, if you count the repeated psalms as well as the many different ones. …

Our arrangement contributes considerably to saving time and easing labor. The same arrangement of the Lessons also helps: the first and second are disposed in a simple and unchanging order throughout the year, whether a feast occurs or not. The difference between the Office of a feast, a Sunday, and a ferial day consists in changing the invitatory, the hymns at Matins and Vespers, the third Lesson, and the prayer; the rest has the same form in both cases[4]."

(p. 362)

[margin: This reform, which sacrificed the Liturgy's entire past, was disastrous.]

Such were Quignonez's intentions; such had been the aim of Leo X, Clement VII, and Paul III: to reform the Office by abridging it and, to avoid attacking the outward usages of the Liturgy, to introduce a distinction between the Office celebrated in choir and the Office recited privately. Through some variety in the prayers and readings, by avoiding repetitions as far as possible and removing everything connected with the assembly of the faithful as having no further meaning in private recitation, they thought to revive the clergy's taste for prayer. They failed to see that this was at the expense of Tradition; that the ancient deposit of liturgical prayers, once altered, would soon perish; that this form of Office, unknown to every Christian century, would soon enter the churches to the great scandal of the peoples; in a word, that a reform to which the Liturgy's entire past was sacrificed was a disastrous reform.

[margin: Character of the approval given by the Supreme Pontiffs to Quignonez's work.]

If today we allow ourselves to judge so severely a work belonging to several Roman Pontiffs, since it was carried out under their inspiration, this certainly does not mean that we are not always resolved to accept as best everything that comes from the supreme Chair, upon which Peter lives and speaks forever in his successors. But this work received from the three Pontiffs just named only a private approval. It was never promulgated in the Church and was later, by the sovereign and formal act of one of the greatest and holiest Popes of recent times, solemnly disapproved and abolished for good.

The character of the Apostolic See's influence on the publication of Quignonez's breviary contrasts with everything witnessed in every century before or after. Rome seems to wish this form of Office to be adopted while fearing, on the other hand, to make it a *(p. 363)* law. One senses a transitional state that must last until the Pontiff designated by God to succeed men such as Leo, Gelasius, and Gregory in the work of the Liturgy appears and reforms divine worship in holiness, as the Church expresses it[5]. Meanwhile, Paul III explains his intentions concerning Quignonez's breviary in these terms:

[margin: Paul III permits this breviary's use for private recitation only to secular clergy who have obtained special permission.]

"Furthermore, We grant to all and each of the clerics and priests who wish to recite it, secular clergy alone[6], that they are in no way bound to recite the old Office now in use according to the usage of the Roman Curia or of another Church. They shall instead be deemed to have fulfilled their obligation of reciting the Office and canonical Hours just as if they had recited the old Office, provided that each obtains a special license for this from the Apostolic See. We command that this license be issued by signature alone, without any other expense[7]."

[margin: Quignonez's breviary is censured by the University of Paris at the Parlement's request.]

In 1535, the very year it appeared at Rome, Quignonez's breviary made its way into France, where it became the target of a vigorous and harshly argued attack by the doctors of the University of Paris. It had been *(p. 364)* referred to the Faculty by the Parlement of Paris. We shall quote some parts of the censure. It begins as follows:

[margin: The Faculty condemns the new breviary for rejecting many ancient prayers consecrated by tradition.]

"First, it must be noted that this breviary differs from and is at variance with all other breviaries, of whatever dioceses, even that of the Roman Church. All the others contain many holy and salutary things that lead the

faithful to piety and devotion, which this breviary lacks: the Hours of Blessed Mary, antiphons, responsories, short chapters, homilies or expositions by Catholic doctors on the Gospels and other Scriptures, the order and number of the psalms and the manner of reading them in church, and also the order of reading Holy Scripture at Matins according to the various seasons, hitherto observed by the Church. Since these most salutary institutions of the Church have been kept in the ecclesiastical Offices almost from the Church's beginnings until now, it is astonishing how the compiler of this new breviary rejects them all and decrees their rejection on the ground that, as he says, they contribute little either to piety or to knowledge of Holy Scripture. If that were true, antiphons, responsories, and the other things named above would certainly be of no use in the Church; all should be cut away as superfluous and useless. Yet this is erroneous and inconsistent with the piety that accords with doctrine.

[margin: The author prefers his opinion to the Fathers' decrees, the Church's common usage, and the most authentic]

[margin: histories.]

"This writer also seemed to show little sobriety of judgment, since he was not at all ashamed to prefer his own solitary opinion to the ancient decrees of the Fathers, the Church's common and approved usage, and authentic histories. Therefore, so that everyone may know how dangerous and intolerable the publication of this breviary *(p. 365)* is, it is worthwhile first to show that no one may depart from the Fathers' ancient ordinances and the Church's universal statutes that promote piety. Second, the Church's common and approved rite must be kept. Further, in the matters at issue the Church in no way differs from the writings of the doctors of the received faith. Finally, the evils resulting from the curious novelty of this breviary must be explained."

[margin: Such liberties are not permitted to Catholic doctors.]

The doctors then undertake, with the learning of their time, to prove these three propositions. They discuss in detail their various criticisms of Quignonez's breviary, explaining why all the particulars of the Office that he thought he could suppress were instituted. Finally, turning to the harmful consequences that may follow the adoption of this new liturgical form, they write:

"Moreover, such a change in the breviary seems dangerous. If such a change is accepted, it is to be feared that the missal and the Office of the Mass will be altered in the same way and many holy and salutary things removed, not for edification but for destruction.

[margin: Changing the breviary will inevitably bring a total upheaval of the Liturgy.]

"With equal ease the ceremonies and solemnities of the sacraments could also be removed, and other sacramentals, such as the consecrations of churches, altars, and chalices, the Church's chant, saints' feasts, holy water, and many other such things. This clearly shows what path this change and novelty in the breviary opens, and how dangerous its consequences are.

[margin: Danger of abandoning the whole Church's common usage to follow…]

"Moreover, no small danger threatens if, under the signature of an individual ecclesiastic, not a religious, they abandon the common usage hitherto observed in *(p. 366)* the Church, so that cathedral, collegiate, and parish churches accept this new breviary and leave the Church an Office received under a like signature. This would result in great scandal among the people and bring a danger of stirring up sedition. May God keep us from them[8]."

[margin: the authority of a mere individual.]

[margin: Quignonez presents his defense in the preface to a new edition of his breviary, published with slight corrections in 1536.]

This vigorous and so weightily reasoned critique struck both Quignonez and the authority that seemed to have put him forward. The cardinal alone made a show of noticing it. He introduced a few almost imperceptible changes into his work. But what must chiefly have disarmed the doctors was the telling tone of

simplicity with which he expressed himself the next year in the preface to his new edition of 1536. As in the first edition, he addresses Paul III and writes as follows[9]:

"I learned that most men of gravity and learning had so approved and welcomed the Roman Breviary recently compiled by us at the urging of Clement VII, Supreme Pontiff of happy memory (or rather restored to a fuller reading of Holy Scripture and to the ancient form of the holy Fathers and ancient councils), and published by your will, Most Holy Father, that they thought nothing in it should be changed. I also observed other serious and prudent men who, though strongly approving its plan, nevertheless said that something was lacking. Indeed, I never doubted that in so great a multitude there would be some, namely those who had grown old in a different rite of prayer, for whom our labor would not be equally welcome, believing that clerics must in no way *(p. 367)* depart from that long-established custom of prayer. Indeed, we had intended the breviary's first edition to be, not the promulgation of a law, but a kind of public deliberation. By putting forward our opinion, we would seek the judgments of many and follow the course that most prudent and serious men judged the most advantageous of all and most consonant with religion and piety. …

[margin: He naïvely admits that his breviary is a book like any other, subject to censure.]

"Accordingly, having compared the opinions of many, made known to us partly by word of mouth and partly in writing, and following the judgment of those who seemed to think most prudently of all, we willingly added some things, changed others, and carefully revised the whole, while retaining the breviary's general form. But such is the nature of things that nothing is so right, nothing introduced into human life and use with such good reason, that its novelty does not displease some. We therefore seem not to act rashly if, now that the breviary has been more carefully revised, we explain a little more fully the plan of our entire undertaking, which we previously set out only in summary[10]."

We see that Quignonez does not disdain to defend himself before the Faculty. One cannot help being struck by the naïveté with which he admits that his breviary is a book like any other, destined to undergo public criticism and subject to censure: in a word, an entirely human work that could have no life in the eternal Church. Its life lasted less than forty years; but meanwhile, *(p. 368)* the brevity of this form of Office seduced many people. The Sorbonne itself, with the levity of which its history offers so many instances, allowed an edition of the breviary against which it had thundered so loudly to be printed in Paris before its very eyes as early as 1539. Three other editions published in that capital can still be found, besides at least ten printed in Lyon, the last of them in 1557[11]. Many others appeared at Rome, Venice, and Antwerp. Consequently, copies of this famous breviary in various formats can still be found fairly easily today.

[margin: Despite the Sorbonne's censure, the new breviary is printed in Lyon and Paris.]

[margin: It slips into the choir of some Spanish cathedrals, to the people's great scandal.]

Had the reign of this strange Liturgy been long, it would have replaced the ancient form of the Roman Offices everywhere and broken the bond joining the centuries of antiquity to modern times. Indeed, this breviary had slipped from the benefice holder's study into the choir itself. In Spain alone, the cathedrals of Zaragoza, Tarragona, and Palencia had abandoned the ancient Office to introduce before the people a manner of prayer unknown to anyone. Disturbances had even arisen at Zaragoza over this, and the scandalized people deserted the cathedral church to go and hear the monks' Office. We learn this from a valuable manuscript document in the Vatican Library, noted by Montfaucon[12]. Arévalo published important fragments in his special dissertation on Quignonez's breviary[13]. It is a consultation by a Spanish doctor named John de Arze, written at Trent in 1551 while the council was in session, entitled De novo breviario Romano tollendo consultatio (Consultation on Abolishing the New Roman Breviary).

(p. 369)

[margin: Opposition to the new breviary despite the ease with which permission to use it is granted.]

Permission to use Quignonez's breviary was given very readily. According to John de Arze, this readiness had become so excessive that the sole clause of the indult, granted now not only at Rome but in the legations and nunciatures, was that the petitioner be able to use such a new breviary (ut possit tali novo breviario uti). Nevertheless, the consultation shows that several serious men resisted this laxity with all their strength, and that bishops vigorously opposed introducing this new form into public Offices. But the most impressive of all these expressions of disapproval was Saint Francis Xavier's. As his biographer Tursellini reports:

[margin: Example given by Saint Francis Xavier.]

"Indeed, the laxity of those times made his religious observance in this matter conspicuous. A new breviary of three Lessons, called the Holy Cross Breviary, had recently been published to lighten the burden of busy men. From the outset Francis had been permitted to use it because of his occupations. Yet, though weighed down by immense cares and business, he never wished to use the permission granted him. He always recited the old breviary of nine Lessons, which was considerably longer[14]."

Certainly the authority of the incomparable Apostle of the Indies carries great weight in this question. We gladly place it beside the no less holy and still weightier authority of Pius V and all his successors without exception. Moreover, Quignonez's work, besides the lamentable *(p. 370)* fruits we have described, would have produced, had it lasted, another still more lamentable. The abridged breviary begot an abridged missal, printed at Lyon in 1550, which contained many of the most audacious innovations[15]. Thus the desire to simplify clerics' private Office had given birth to a breviary that repudiated the ancient form of the divine Offices and severed the priest's communion with the prayers of the choir. Now, following a wholly natural course, men were led to disfigure the sacred book containing the rites of the Sacrifice. Its form, if kept pure and inviolate, carries such weight in proving against the sectarians the venerable antiquity of the mysteries of the altar.

[margin: The abridged breviary begets an abridged missal full of the most audacious innovations.]

[margin: Definitive publication of the body of rites and sacred observances called Rubrics.]

Before recounting the liturgical regeneration begun by the holy Council of Trent and accomplished by the great pontiffs who applied its decrees, we shall place here a major liturgical event that marked the close of the fifteenth and the opening of the sixteenth century. This was the definitive publication of the body of rites and sacred observances known as the Rubrics: an admirable body of laws, at once mysterious and rational, despised only by those who have lost the sense of faith or a taste for serious things. These laws, whose origin is lost in the mists of time, express the forms of Catholic worship; a complete commentary on them would require a general history of those forms. They appear in increasing detail in the series of Roman Ordines for the pope's chapel. But there was no collection treating them for the use of all priests and including the particulars omitted by the Roman Ordines, whose purpose is quite specific, and which *(p. 371)* had hitherto been entrusted to oral tradition. This work was undertaken and completed by John Burchard of Strasbourg, who held the important office of master of pontifical ceremonies in the chapel of Popes Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, and Alexander VI. He also left so important a diary of these three supreme pontiffs' private actions. His work was printed at Rome in 1502 under the title Ordo servandus per sacerdotem in celebratione Missæ[16]. Merati and Zaccaria indicate other editions after Burchard's death. He died as bishop of Città di Castello in 1503; these editions bear a different title from the first. Finally, missals with this appendix attached appeared as early as 1534, as Cardinal Bona attests.

[margin: John Burchard, master of pontifical ceremonies, compiles the rubrics of the Mass.]

[margin: The rubrics of the missal and pontifical are compiled in the same period.]

The breviary rubrics are so closely related to those of the Mass, and each so constantly presupposes the other, that they must be judged to have the same origin. Their beginnings are found in the Roman Ordines. Their definitive compilation, if not Burchard's work, must date from this illustrious master of ceremonies' time; he also issued those of the pontifical in 1485. The breviaries preceding Saint Pius V's present them in

approximately the form in which that holy pontiff promulgated them.

[margin: In three centuries of existence, the Congregation of Rites has never had to modify the text of laws of incomparable wisdom.]

We shall leave superficial minds to blaspheme what they do not know and ridicule this admirable summary of all liturgical traditions. We shall merely note here a fact unique in the history of legislation. For nearly three centuries a tribunal has existed at Rome under the name of the Congregation of Rites, to resolve all difficulties *(p. 372)* in applying or interpreting the rubrics of both the Roman missal and breviary. After more than six thousand printed consultations and replies, it is unheard of that the judges should have been obliged to depart from the text of the law in their decisions. Thus one of the Roman Church's institutions, which would seem the least weighty and serious, at least to those who do not know the great importance of the deposit of ritual traditions, can challenge in solidity and immutability the wisest provisions the most civilized societies have established in their forms of government.

[margin: Paris de Grassi, Burchard's successor as master of pontifical ceremonies, likewise helps save the Roman Church's liturgical tradition.]

After Burchard we shall mention his successor as master of pontifical ceremonies, Paris de Grassi, later bishop of Pesaro. Like Burchard, he left a famous diary containing the private events of the pontificates of Julius II and Leo X. He was worthy to receive and transmit to others the liturgical traditions Burchard himself had received from his predecessors. Without these two famous men, one closing the fifteenth-century annals of the papal chapel and the other reopening them in the sixteenth, Rome's entire liturgical past was in danger of perishing. The craving for innovations then troubled everyone. Quignonez, the mouthpiece of Clement VII and Paul III, saw in knowledge of the rules of divine worship only a source of useless toil, and in reciting the Office only a private reading of the Bible and a few psalms. Burchard and Paris de Grassi were the men needed to master this tendency. Though already dead when the famous Holy Cross Breviary appeared, their work, rooted moreover in the past, had acquired sufficient solidity to escape the liturgical anarchy we have recounted.

The reason for the success that thus attended the work of these *(p. 373)* two great masters of ceremonies, and saved it from destruction, lies in the seriousness they always brought to their duties. These seem minute to frivolous people, but are so weighty for the man of faith and so interesting to the antiquarian. A famous monument of this inviolable and even passionate fidelity to liturgical traditions, which is genius in a master of ceremonies, is Paris de Grassi's conduct when the book containing the Ceremonies of the Roman Church was published. This collection had been compiled by Augustine Patrizi, bishop of Pienza in Tuscany, on Innocent VIII's orders; but printing it had not been thought advisable. In 1510, under Leo X, Christopher Marcelli, bishop of Corfu, at a cardinal's instigation, took it upon himself to have it printed at Venice. It appeared there as Rituum ecclesiasticorum, sive sacrarum Cæremoniarum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ libri tres non ante impressi.

[margin: Clandestine publication of the papal ceremonial compiled by Augustine Patrizi, bishop of Pienza.]

Nothing could depict Paris de Grassi's indignation at this news. Printing this book could not be justified by public utility, since it concerned rites belonging exclusively, for the most part at least, to the pope's person. Moreover, exposing such august ceremonies to the scrutiny of the public and even heretics, forever stripping them of the mystery that had hitherto enveloped them, was an attack on their majesty. The office of prefect of pontifical ceremonies was thereby dishonored, exposed to criticism from anyone who had leafed through the book, and thus brought into real disrepute. Finally, and still more regrettably, this work, furtively handed to the printers, contained errors, misunderstandings, and alterations of the true liturgical tradition.

[margin: Paris de Grassi's indignation.]

Paris de Grassi laid the strongest complaints before Leo X in a curious memorandum that Dom Mabillon *(p. 374)* has preserved for us[17].

He asked the pope for nothing less than to have the recently printed book of ceremonies burned entirely, together with its false author, or at least to have the author himself corrected and punished.

Librum cæremoniarum nuper impressum omnino comburi simul cum falso auctore; aut saltem ipsum auctorem corrigi et castigari.

Leo X was more inclined to the latter course, as was only to be expected. Regrettable though it was, the affair died down of itself. How could one stop the various editions bound to follow the Venetian one, as indeed they did? For this book, imperfect as it is and fraudulent as its origin may be, is and ought to be sought by all who wish to gain any depth of knowledge of the Liturgy.

[margin: Paris de Grassi, author of the last Roman Ordo, one basis of the Roman ceremonial.]

Paris de Grassi left in manuscript the last of all the Roman Ordines, published by Dom Martène in volume III of his great work de Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus[18]. Like its predecessors, it formed a basis for the Roman ceremonial, which is simply the form of the papal chapel's usages adapted to the various cathedral and collegiate churches of the Christian world, as we shall explain elsewhere. It is time to turn to the bibliography of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century liturgical writers.

[margin: Fourteenth- and fifteenth-century liturgical writers. Blessed Jacopone.]

(1306). We shall head our list with Blessed James de Benedictis, better known as Jacopone, of the Order of Friars Minor, who died in 1306. The sequence Stabat Mater ("The Mother stood") and several others are attributed to him.

[margin: Hermann Grethus.]

(1307). Hermann Grethus, canon and scholaster of a German collegiate church, wrote de Notabilibus divini Officii Dominicarum et Festorum de tempore et de sanctis.

[margin: Cardinal Gaetan.]

(1310). James Gaetan, cardinal, composed an *(p. 375)* Ordinarium sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, a work of the greatest interest, forming the fourteenth Roman Ordo in Dom Mabillon's collection.

[margin: Nicholas of Treveth.]

(1312). Nicholas of Treveth, an English Dominican, wrote, among other things, eight books de Missa et ejus partibus and another book de Officio Missæ.

[margin: Thomas de Cabham.]

(1315). Thomas de Cabham, archbishop of Canterbury, wrote a summa de Ecclesiasticis Officiis and a book de Baptismo.

[margin: Timothy II, patriarch of the Nestorians.]

(1320). Timothy II, patriarch of the Nestorians, is the author of the seven-chapter work de Septem causis Sacramentorum ecclesiasticorum.

[margin: Nicephorus Callistus.]

(1333). Nicephorus Callistus, a monk of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, left hymns and other pieces for the ecclesiastical Offices.

[margin: Matthew Blastares.]

(1335). Matthew Blastares, a Greek monk, wrote a Catalogue of the Offices of the Great Church of Constantinople and a treatise de Appositione cocti frumenti in Officio pro mortuis.

[margin: Hermann of Schilde.]

(1340). Hermann of Schilde, an Augustinian hermit, wrote an Exposition of the Mass, a Manuale Sacerdotum, a treatise de Horis Canonicis, and another de Comparatione Missæ.

[margin: Nicholas Cabasilas.]

(1350). Nicholas Cabasilas, a Greek schismatic, left an Exposition of the Liturgy.

[margin: Blessed Charles of Blois, duke of Brittany, composer of liturgical pieces.]

(1350). Blessed Charles of Blois, duke of Brittany, imitated the religious princes discussed in earlier chapters. Besides attending every liturgical act with great zeal, he followed Charlemagne, King Robert, and Fulk of Anjou in composing several pieces of ecclesiastical chant. Among them is mentioned a sequence in Saint Yves's honor. He set its words to so melodious a chant that it was sung in various places in Brittany and even presented before the *(p. 376)* commissioners delegated to investigate the cause for his canonization.

[margin: Philotheus, metropolitan of Heraclea.]

(1362). Philotheus, archimandrite of Mount Athos and later metropolitan of Heraclea, left a formulary entitled Liturgia et Ordo instituendi Diaconum, and several hymns and parts of the Office for the Greeks' use.

[margin: Peter Amelius.]

(1370). Peter Amelius, an Augustinian, patriarch of Grado and Alexandria, left a book de Cæremoniis sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, forming the fifteenth Roman Ordo in Dom Mabillon's collection.

[margin: Philip de Maceriis, chancellor of the kingdom of Cyprus.]

(1370). Philip Macerius or de Maceriis, a Picard knight who became chancellor of the kingdom of Cyprus, composed the Office of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin under the name Philotheus Achillinus.

[margin: Arnold Terreni.]

(1373). Arnold Terreni, a canonist attached to the Church of Elne, wrote a treatise de Mysterio Missæ et Horis Canonicis.

[margin: Raymond of Capua.]

(1380). Raymond de Vineis, commonly called Raymond of Capua, composed an Office for the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin.

[margin: Ralph de Rivo, dean of Tongres.]

(1380). Ralph de Rivo, dean of the church of Tongres, left, besides his Calendarium Ecclesiasticum, a curious book entitled De Canonum observantia in ecclesiasticis Officiis.

[margin: Ignatius IV, patriarch of the Jacobites.]

(1400). John, also called Ananias, patriarch of the Jacobites under the name Ignatius IV, composed an anaphora found in the book of these heretics.

[margin: Henry of Langestein. Simeon, archbishop of Thessalonica.]

(1410). Henry of Langestein, a Carthusian, wrote a book de Horis canonicis.

(1410). Simeon, a monk and later archbishop of Thessalonica, a fanatical enemy of the Latins, left, besides a collection entitled Precationes sacræ, an important work under this title: Commentarius de Divino Templo, de ejus Ministris, de sacris eorum vestibus, de sacrosancta Mystagogia, sive missa, ad pios quosdam Cretenses.

(p. 377)

[margin: Peter d'Ailly.]

(1411). Peter d'Ailly, cardinal and bishop of Cambrai, famous in the ecclesiastical affairs of his time, published a Sacramentale.

[margin: Ignatius Behenam, patriarch of the Jacobites.]

(1420). Ignatius Behenam, patriarch of the Jacobites, composed an anaphora remarkable for the beauty of its style.

[margin: Nicholas Kempht.]

(1440). Nicholas Kempht, a Carthusian, wrote an Exposition of the Canon and the entire Mass.

[margin: Troilus Malvetius.]

(1446). Troilus Malvetius, a doctor of Bologna, left a book de Sanctorum Canonizatione.

[margin: Ferdinand of Córdoba.]

(1450). Ferdinand of Córdoba, subdeacon of the Roman Church, addressed to Cardinal Francis Piccolomini a treatise de Pontificii Pallii mysterio.

[margin: James Gil, author of the Office of the Transfiguration.]

(1456). James Gil, a Dominican and Master of the Sacred Palace, composed the Office of Our Lord's Transfiguration by order of Callistus III.

[margin: Cardinal John of Torquemada.]

(1460). John of Torquemada, a Dominican, Master of the Sacred Palace, cardinal, and bishop of Sabina, left a book entitled De Efficacia Aquæ Benedictæ.

[margin: George Codinus.]

(1460). George Codinus, surnamed Curopalates, published, after the Turks' capture of Constantinople, a book under this title: De Curiæ et Ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ officiis et officialibus.

[margin: Ange of Brunswick.]

(1471). Ange of Brunswick, a Saxon, wrote a book on the Canon of the Mass.

[margin: Michael Lochmayr.]

(1474). Michael Lochmayr, rector of the Academy of Vienna, compiled the Parochiale parochorum, containing many instructions like those in our modern rituals.

[margin: John of Dursten.]

(1475). John of Dursten, an Augustinian, wrote De Monocordo; de Modo bene cantandi; and de collectarum conclusionibus.

[margin: Gabriel Biel.]

(1480). Gabriel Biel, a doctor of the University of Tübingen, left an Exposition of the Canon of the Mass.

[margin: John Trithemius.]

(1483). John Trithemius, abbot of Saint Martin's at Spanheim *(p. 378)* and later of Saint James's at Würzburg, the great light of the Order of Saint Benedict in his century, was also a remarkable liturgical writer. Besides several sequences, he composed an Office in honor of Saint Anne and Saint Joachim, and several Masses for the Compassion of the Blessed Virgin, the Guardian Angel, Saint Peter, Saint Andrew, Saint John the Evangelist, Saint Mary Magdalene, Saint Martha, etc.

[margin: Jerome Savonarola.]

(1490). Jerome Savonarola, a Dominican, adds to his other claims to fame that of having treated liturgical matters with elevation and unction. He composed a treatise de Sacrificio Missæ et Mysteriis ejus, another de Mysterio Crucis, and an Office of the Holy Cross.

[margin: John of Lanshem.]

(1495). John of Lanshem, a German Augustinian, wrote a Speculum Missæ.

[margin: Nicholas de Alfentia. Balthazar of Leipzig.]

(1495). Nicholas de Alfentia, a Carmelite, composed a very extensive volume on the Ordinary of the Mass and the Canon.

(1497). Balthazar of Leipzig, a Cistercian abbot, is the author of an Exposition of the Canon of the Mass, printed at Leipzig in 1497.

[margin: Important conclusions for developing the true doctrine of the Liturgy. Principles that must govern every liturgical reform.]

As we close this chapter, we find many considerations to gather for the reader's instruction and the development of the true doctrine of the Liturgy.

1. A liturgical form improvised to satisfy alleged literary demands is not enduring.

2. To endure, liturgical reform must be carried out not by learned hands, but by pious hands invested with clearly competent authority.

3. In reforming the Liturgy, one must guard against the spirit of novelty, remedy whatever defects may have crept into the ancient forms, and not abolish them.

4. To abridge the Liturgy is not to reform it; *(p. 379)* its length is no fault in the eyes of those who must live by prayer.

5. Reading much Holy Scripture in the Office does not fulfill the whole obligation of priestly prayer, for reading is not praying.

[margin: Distinguishing the public Office from the private Office has no foundation.]

6. There is no foundation for distinguishing the public Office from the private Office, for there are not two prayers that are simultaneously the Church's official prayer. Just as a cleric legitimately absent from choir is deemed present there, so he must remain united to his brethren by reciting with them what they chant in union with him. His readings in a learned breviary isolate him from this common prayer.

[margin: Impropriety of any complaint of length.]

7. It is no evil that the rules of divine service should be numerous and complicated, so that the cleric may learn how diligently the Lord's work must be performed. Any satire on the Rubrics reveals a prejudiced or superficial man. The Church answers these new and soft theories by promulgating more emphatically than ever the whole body of her laws, so beautiful in their harmony and unity.

[margin: Consequences of this doctrine and the Holy Cross Breviary's history for the French liturgies of the eighteenth century.]

8. Finally, if conscience cannot hesitate between Saint Pius V, supreme pontiff solemnly restoring the ancient Office, and Quignonez, Cardinal of the Holy Cross, responsible editor of a new Office unknown to all the centuries, what choice must one make between the Catholic Church's Office and one or several Offices that a few obscure priests, suspect in the faith, some even struck by the Church's thunderbolts, might have improvised in their own names or, if one prefers, under patronage that must admittedly be ranked below that of Clement VII and Paul III? Is it not to be feared that the Sorbonne's judgment of 1535 has become applicable to them?

The continuation of this history will enable the reader to draw a conclusion.

(p. 380)

Notes to Chapter XIII

Note A

Docta sanctorum Patrum decrevit auctoritas, ut in divinæ laudis Officiis, quæ debitæ servitutis obsequio exhibentur, cunctorum mens vigilet, sermo non cespitet, et modesta psallentium gravitas placida modulatione

decantet. Nam in ore eorum dulcis resonabat sonus. Dulcis quippe omnino sonus in ore psallentium resonat, cum Deum corde suscipiunt, dum loquuntur verbis; in ipsum quoque cantibus devotionem accendunt: inde etenim in Ecclesiis Dei psalmodia cantanda præcipitur, ut fidelium devotio excitetur; in hoc nocturnum diurnumque Officium et Missarum celebritates assidue Clero ac populo sub maturo tenore, distinctaque gradatione cantantur, ut eadem distinctione collibeant, et maturitate delectent. Sed nonnulli novellæ scholæ discipuli, dum temporibus mensurandis invigilant, novis notis intendunt, fingere suas, quam antiquas cantare malunt; in semibreves et minimas Ecclesiastica cantantur, notulis percutiuntur; nam melodias hoquetis intersecant, discantibus lubricant, triplis et motetis vulgaribus nonnunquam inculcant, adeo ut interdum Antiphonarii et Gradualis fundamenta despiciant, ignorent super quo ædificant, tonos nesciant, quos non discernunt, imo confundunt; cum ex earum multitudine notarum ascensiones pudicæ, descensionesque temperatæ, plani cantus, quibus toni ipsi secernuntur, ad invicem obfuscuntur; currunt enim, et non quiescunt; aures inebriant, et non medentur; gestibus simulant quod depromunt, quibus devotio quærenda contemnitur, vitanda lascivia propalatur. Non enim inquit frustra ipse Boëtius, lascivus animus, vel lascivioribus delectatur modis, vel eosdem sæpe audiens emollitur, et frangitur. Hoc ideo dudum nos, et Fratres nostri correctione indigere percepimus, hoc relegare, imo prorsus abjicere, et ab eadem Ecclesia Dei profligare efficacius properamus. Quocirca de ipsorum Fratrum consilio districte præcipimus, ut nullus deinceps talia, vel his similia in dictis Officiis, præsertim Horis Canonicis, vel cum Missarum solemnia celebrantur, attentare præsumat. Si quis vero contra fecerit, per Ordinarios locorum ubi ista commissa fuerint, vel deputandos ab eis in non exemptis, in exemptis vero per præpositos seu prælatos suos, ad quos alias correctio, et punitio culparum, et excessuum hujusmodi, vel similium pertinere dignoscitur, vel deputandos ab eisdem, per suspensionem ab Officio per octo dies, auctoritate hujus Canonis, puniatur. Per hoc autem non intendimus prohibere, quin interdum diebus festis præcipue, sive solemnibus in Missis, et præfatis divinis Officiis aliquæ consonantiæ, quæ melodiam sapiunt, *(p. 381)* puta octavæ, quintæ, quartæ, et hujusmodi supra cantum Ecclesiasticum simplicem proferantur: sic tamen, ut ipsius cantus integritas illibata ermaneat, et nihil ex hoc de bene morata musica immutetur, maxime cum hujusmodi consonantiæ auditum demulceant, devotionem provocent, et psallentium Deo animos torpere non sinant.

Done and given, etc.

(Extravagant. Commun., book III, title I.)

Note B

Preface by Francis Quignonez, cardinal priest of the title of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, to the recently compiled breviary, addressed to the Most Holy Father and our Lord Paul III, Supreme Pontiff.

As I reflect, Most Holy Father, and recall the beginnings of the ancient institution requiring clerics in sacred orders or holding ecclesiastical benefices to read daily through the prayers of the Hours, which we also call canonical, it generally seems to me that three reasons in all were considered. The first is this. While other men in each city attend to their own affairs or are occupied with governing the commonwealth, clerics, so called, as Jerome testifies, because they belong to the Lord’s portion, and maintained from ecclesiastical goods, have this chief duty imposed on them by divine and human laws: to strive by every means to secure God’s favor for the people entrusted to them, who have been their benefactors. This is accomplished not only by sacrifices but also by prayers proceeding from a pious heart. James testifies to this when he urges us to pray, saying, “Pray for one another, that you may be saved; for the continual supplication of a just man has great power.” The second reason is that those who ought to be examples of virtue and holiness to the rest of the people, by speaking to God in continual prayer, may be less exposed to the devil, the tempter, if he finds them occupied, as Jerome says. Repeatedly drawn away from thoughts of transitory things, they may grow accustomed to contemplating divine things.

Tertia, ut Religionis quoque futuri magistri quotidiana sacræ Scripturæ, et ecclesiasticarum historiarum lectione erudiantur, complectanturque, ut Paulus ait, eum, qui secundum doctrinam est, fidelem sermonem, et potentes sint exhortari in doctrina sana, et eos, qui contradicunt, arguere. Et profecto si quis modum precandi olim a majoribus traditum diligenter consideret, horum omnium ab ipsis habitam esse rationem manifesto deprehendet. Sed factum est nescio quo pacto hominum negligentia, ut paulatim a sanctissimis illis veterum Patrum institutis discederetur. Nam primum libri sacræ Scripturæ, qui statis anni temporibus erant perlegendi, vix dum incœpti a precantibus prætermittuntur. Ut exemplo esse possunt liber Genesis, qui incipitur in Septuagesima, et liber Isaiæ, qui in Adventu, quorum vix singula capitula perlegimus, ac eodem modo cetera Veteris Testamenti volumina degustamus magis quam legimus: nec secus accidit in Evangelio, et reliquam Scripturam Novi Testamenti, quorum in loco successerunt alia, nec utilitate cum his, nec gravitate *(p. 382)* comparanda, quæ quotidie agitatione linguæ magis quam intentione mentis inculcantur. Deinde Psalmorum plerisque, qui singulis hebdomadæ diebus erant destinati, rejectis, pauci quidam toto fere anno repetuntur. Tum historiæ Sanctorum tam inculte, et tam negligenti judicio scriptæ leguntur, ut nec auctoritatem habere videantur nec gravitatem. Accedit tam perplexus ordo, tamque difficilis precandi ratio, ut interdum paulo minor opera in inquirendo ponatur, quam cum inveneris, in legendo. Quibus rebus animadversis, felicis recordationis Clemens VII, Pontifex maximus, cum intelligeret officii sui esse, cum aliorum Christianorum commoditatibus prospicere, tum imprimis Clericorum, quibus ministris uteretur in commisso sibi grege administrando, me hortatus est, negotiumque dedit, ut quantum cura et diligentia niti possem, preces horarias ea ratione disponerem, ut sublatis, quas dixi, difficultatibus, et dispendiis, clerici majoribus etiam commodis ad precandum allicerentur. Quam ego provinciam libentissime suscepi, simul ut bono publico pro mea virili parte servirem. Adhibitis igitur quibusdam meorum domesticorum prudentibus hominibus sacrarum litterarum, et Pontificii juris doctrina præditis, eisdemque græce, et latine eruditis, dedi operam quam maxime potui, ut commode ac ex utilitate publica rem conficerem in hunc maxime modum. Omissis antiphonis, capitulis, et responsoriis, ac multis hymnis, ceterisque id genus rebus Scripturæ sacræ lectionem impedientibus, Breviarium constat ex Psalmis, et Scriptura sacra Veteris et Novi Testamenti, et Sanctorum historiis, quas ex probatis, et gravibus auctoribus græcis et latinis decerpsimus, easdemque stylo paulo quidem cultiore, non tamen fucato, exornare curavimus. Relicti sunt etiam ex hymnis, qui plurimum omnium habere visi sunt auctoritatis, et gravitatis. Psalmi sunt ita distributi, retento, quatenus licuit, veterum Patrum instituto, ut omnes perlegantur singulis hebdomadis anni, terni singuli horis, unius longitudine cum alterius brevitate sic compensata, ut labor legendi diurnus par propemodum sit tota hebdomada, et perinde toto anno.

As for the rest of Holy Scripture, all the most useful and weighty books of the Old Testament are read through. Nothing of the New is omitted except the Apocalypse, of which only the beginning is read. Indeed, Paul's Epistles, together with the Catholic Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles, are repeated. Of the three Lessons read every day throughout the year, the first is from the Old Testament; the second is from the New, which is thus completed in its entirety, except, as we said, part of the Apocalypse; and the third is from the history of the saint whose feast is being celebrated. If there is no such feast, the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles are repeated in the third Lesson, in the order indicated in the Calendar.

Propter inconstantiam temporis Paschalis, et aliorum festorum, quæ mobilia dicuntur, fieri non potuit, ut regulas omnino vitaremus, quarum tam plenum erat prius Breviarium, ut vix ætas hominis ad earum rationem perdiscendam sufficeret, sed nos tam raras, et perspicuas regulas disposuimus, ut eas cuivis facile sit intelligere.

(p. 383) The daily Office of the Blessed Virgin is not read. Instead, she is commemorated daily at Vespers and Matins, and on every Saturday the whole Office is devoted to that same Virgin, unless a feast occurs.

Habet hæc precandi ratio tres maximas commoditates. Primam, quod precantibus simul acquiritur utriusque Testamenti peritia. Secundam, quod res est expeditissima, propter summam ordinis simplicitatem, et

nonnullam brevitatem. Tertiam, quod historiæ Sanctorum nihil habent, ut prius, quod graves, et doctas aures offendat.

This is the order and manner of prayer.

At Matins

The Our Father with the Sign of the Cross; I confess to God, etc.; O Lord, my lips, etc.; Deus, in adjutorium ("O God, to assistance"), etc. Then follows the invitatory appropriate to the season or feast. The psalm Come, let us rejoice, etc. The invitatory is repeated only at its end, not in the middle. Then the appointed hymn. After this, three psalms are read without an antiphon, followed by three Lessons, each beginning with a blessing and ending with But you, O Lord, etc. The blessing before the first Lesson, from the Old Testament, is God the almighty Father, etc.; before the second, from the New, God's Only Begotten, etc. The third Lesson is either from the saints' histories, when it is a feast day, preceded by the blessing Whose feast we celebrate, etc.; or it repeats the Epistles or Acts of the Apostles, preceded by the blessing The grace of the Holy Spirit, etc. On Saturdays when we assign the Office to the Blessed Virgin, the blessing is Through the Virgin Mother, etc. After the third Lesson, You are God: we praise you. In Advent and Lent this is replaced by the psalm Have mercy on me, except on saints' feasts, when You are God: we praise you is said even then.

At Lauds

Deus, in adjutorium; then three psalms with the canticle Benedictus ("Blessed"), which is never to be omitted on any day. O Lord, hear, etc. The appropriate prayer. Finally, unless the whole Office is devoted to the Blessed Virgin, she is commemorated, as are the Apostles and all Saints. Let us bless the Lord and The souls of the faithful, etc.

At Prime

The Our Father with the Sign of the Cross. Deus, in adjutorium. The customary hymn. Three psalms; on Sundays the creed Quicumque vult ("Whoever wishes") is added, and on other days the creed I believe in God. O Lord, hear. The customary prayer. Let us bless the Lord and The souls of the faithful. Terce, Sext, and None follow the same manner, except for the creeds; the prayer said at Lauds is used.

At Vespers

The Our Father with the Sign of the Cross. Deus, in adjutorium. The hymn. Three psalms. The canticle Magnificat ("Magnifies"), which is never omitted on any day. The prayer and commemorations as at Matins.

(p. 384)

At Compline

Turn us, O God. Deus, in adjutorium ("O God, to assistance"). The hymn Te lucis ("You … of light"). Three psalms with the canticle Nunc dimittis ("Now you dismiss"), also said every day. The prayer Visit. Hail, Queen. The prayer Almighty, everlasting God. All the foregoing is explained more fully on the first Sunday of Advent.

Discrimen igitur inter illud, quo hactenus usi sumus, et hoc Breviarium est, quod in illo, quanquam veteribus Patribus placuisset, totam fere sacram Scripturam legi singulis annis, tamen vix una particula legitur carptim libros degustando. In hoc autem legitur singulis annis magna, et præcipua pars Veteris Testamenti, et totum Novum præter partem Apocalypsis, ut diximus, Epistolis et Actis Apostolorum etiam repetitis.

As for the Psalter, in that breviary a certain few psalms are repeated very often, while most are not read even once throughout the year. In this one all are read every week without tedium: three psalms are assigned to each Hour, and none is repeated in the same week. Moreover, in the former breviary many histories of the

saints are read in so crude a style, and with so little discrimination in the choice of material and so little gravity, that readers sometimes regard them with contempt and derision. Nothing of this kind has been left in this one. Everything is more polished and weightier, drawn from ecclesiastical history and approved, serious authors.

Finally, in the former there was utter confusion owing to the number and complexity of the rules, the transfer of feasts, and the various laborious and not very dignified repeated recitations and repetitions of commemorations, versicles, responsories, antiphons, and similar things. These contributed little either to piety or to knowledge of Holy Scripture. In this one all such impediments are removed. We are chiefly occupied with continuous reading of Holy Scripture and serious histories of the saints, with a few clear rules supplied.

Thus anyone who attends carefully and considers the Fathers' ancient purpose and institution will plainly understand that this breviary is not so much a new invention as a restoration of the old breviary to a more convenient and polished form, with certain things removed that had crept in during the intervening time without judgment or gravity.

Porro quanquam non fuit nobis propositum brevitati, sed commoditati precantium consulere, utrumque tamen, ut speramus, consecuti sumus. Nam licet lectiones singulæ longiores sint in hoc Breviario, sunt tamen tres duntaxat, cum in priore adjuncto Officio beatæ Virginis sint duodecim cum totidem versiculis, et responsoriis, et licet quidam Psalmi in hoc sint longiores, in illo tamen singulis diebus leguntur multo plures, si repetitos numeres tamque diversos.

Moreover, in the former there is great complexity and length in the Office both of the ferial day and of Sunday. In this one there is no difference, or very little, among the days of the whole year: its length does not depend on whether the Office is of a Sunday, a ferial day, or a feast. In the former the psalms must be sought here and there, turning pages with difficulty, delay, and tedium. In this one they are arranged by the days and Hours of the whole week.

Qui noster ordo non parum *(p. 385)* facit ad temporis brevitatem, et laboris levamen. Adjuvat et idem ordo lectionum; nam prima et secunda simplici et immutabili ordine dispositæ sunt in totum annum, sive festum incidat, sive non. Diversitas enim Officii festi, dominicæ, et ferialis diei consistit in mutatione invitatorii, et hymnorum ad Matutinum, et Vesperam, et tertiæ lectionis, et orationis, cetera sunt ejusdem rationis utrobique.

If anyone finds it laborious in this breviary to read almost everything from the book, whereas in the other many things learned through frequent repetition are recited from memory, let him set against this labor the knowledge of Holy Scripture that thus increases day by day, and the attention of mind that God requires above all else in those who pray. Those reading must necessarily have more of this attention than those reciting from memory. He will then judge this labor not only fruitful but also salutary. You have, Most Holy Father, the rationale of our undertaking and the plan of the breviary. It remains that, if you do not disapprove of it, as we hope, you yourself also favor our enterprise and the labor undertaken for the common benefit. Farewell.

Note C

Reasons and grounds for which it seems to the University of Paris that the recently published and promulgated breviary should not be accepted.

In primis advertendum est, quod dictum Breviarium discrepat et dissonum est aliis omnibus Breviariis quarumcumque diœceseon, etiam Romanæ Ecclesiæ; cum alia omnia Breviaria pleraque sancta et salutaria ad pietatem et devotionem fideles inducentia contineant quæ istud Breviarium non habet; cujus generis sunt Horæ Beatæ Mariæ, antiphonæ, responsoria, capitula, homiliæ, sive expositiones catholicorum Doctorum

super Evangeliis et aliis Scripturis, ordo et numerus Psalmorum, et modus legendi illos in Ecclesia, nec non et ordo legendi sacras Scripturas in Matutinis, juxta varietatem temporum ab Ecclesia hactenus observatus. Cum autem hæc usque adeo salutaria Ecclesiæ instituta in Ecclesiasticis Officiis a primordiis ferme Ecclesiæ, ad hæc usque tempora servata fuerint, mirum quonam pacto is qui hoc novum Breviarium condidit, hæc omnia rejiciat et rejicienda decernat, tamquam, ut inquit, nec ad pietatem, nec ad cognitionem sacræ Scripturæ magnopere conducant. Quod si verum esset, nulla utique esset antiphonarum, responsoriorum, et reliquorum prænominatorum in Ecclesia utilitas, forentque hæc omnia ut superflua et inutilia resecanda. Quod tamen erroneum est, nec ei quæ secundum doctrinam est, pietati consentaneum. Parum quoque sobrie sapere visus est hujusmodi scriptor, dum suam unius sententiam antiquis Patrum decretis, communi et approbato usui Ecclesiæ et authenticis historiis minime erubuit præferre. Proinde ut quam periculosa sit nec ferenda hujusmodi Breviarii editio, cognoscant omnes, operæ pretium in primis est ostendere, quod a veteribus Patrum ordinationibus et Catholicis *(p. 386)* Ecclesiæ statutis ad pietatem conferentibus nemini liceat discedere. Deinde quod servandus sit communis et probatus Ecclesiæ ritus. Ad hæc, in his de quibus agitur, nequaquam a receptæ Fidei Doctorum scriptis Ecclesia dissideat. Denique mala, quæ ex hac curiosa hujusmodi Breviarii novitate sequuntur, explicanda sunt … Cæterum periculosa videtur talis Breviarii mutatio. Nam timendum est, si talis mutatio suscipiatur, ne eadem ratione immutetur Missale et Officium Missæ, et multa ex eo sancta et salutaria detrahantur, non in ædificationem, sed in destructionem. Eadem quoque facilitate auferri possent cæremoniæ et solemnitates Sacramentorum, et alia sacramentalia, cujusmodi sunt consecrationes ecclesiarum, altarium, calicum, cantus Ecclesiæ, festa Sanctorum, aqua benedicta, et alia id genus multa. Ex quo clare apparet quali via, et quam periculosa sequantur ex ista mutatione Breviarii et novitate. Periculum insuper imminet non mediocre, si sub signatura particularis hominis ecclesiastici, non religiosi, communem usum Ecclesiæ hactenus observatum relinquant, ut accipiant hoc novum Breviarium ecclesiæ Cathedrales, Collegiales et Parochiales, consimili signatura receptum Officium relinquant Ecclesiæ, id quod in magnum scandali populi cederet, et periculum immineret inducendi seditionem, a quibus Deus nos avertat.

(D'Argentré, Collectio Judiciorum, vol. II, pp. 12-126.)

Note D

Preface by Francis Quignonez, cardinal priest of the title of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, to the breviary recently compiled and revised anew, addressed to the Most Holy Father and our Lord Paul III, Supreme Pontiff.

Breviarium Romanum nuper a nobis felic. recor. Clementis VII Pontif. Max. hortatu confectum, ac potius in ampliorem sacrarum Scripturarum lectionem ad veterem Sanctorum Patrum, et Conciliorum antiquorum formam revocatum, tuaque voluntate, Sanctissime Pater, aditum, graves plerosque ac doctos viros ita probasse et recepisse intellexi, ut nihil in eo mutandum existimarent. Alios item animadverti graves etiam et prudentes homines, qui ejus rationem magnopere probantes, nonnihil tamen in eo desiderari adfirmarent. Illud vero numquam dubitavi, fore in tanta multitudine nonnullos, ex iis videlicet, qui in diverso precandi ritu consenuissent, quibus labor ille noster non esset perinde gratus, existimantibus ab inveterata illa consuetudine precandi nulla ratione clericis esse discedendum. Imo vero nobis primam editionem Breviarii non tanquam promulgationem legis esse placuerat, sed quasi publicam quamdam deliberationem, ut sic, proposita nostra sententia, judicia multorum exquireremus, et quod omnium commodissimum et religioni ac pietati convenientissimum plerisque prudentibus gravibusque viris esset visum, sequeremur... Itaque multorum sententiis collatis, quæ nobis partim vocibus, partim scriptis innotuerunt, judicium eorum *(p. 387)* secuti qui omnium prudentissime sentire visi sunt, libenter quædam addidimus, alia mutavimus, et omnia diligenter recognovimus, retenta tamen summa forma Breviarii. Sed quoniam sic fert natura rerum, ut nihil sit tam rectum, nihil tanta ratione in vitam usumque hominum inductum, cujus novitas non sit aliquibus ingrata, non temere facturi esse videmur, si rationem totius instituti nostri a nobis prius summatim redditam,

nunc adcuratius recognito Breviario, paulo latius explicabimus.

---

[1] Traité historique du Chant ecclésiastique, p. 73.

[2] See Note A.

[3] Cum nuper pro divini cultus splendore hymnos ecclesiasticos variis omnipotentis Dei, et Mariæ semper virginis, et plurium sanctorum diebus festis, ac totius anni circulo, et tempori congruentes veris metris, sensibus, ac latinitate perspicuos pro suo, et fidelium Christianorum, peritorumque præcipue sacerdotum solatio spirituali texuerit (Ferrerius), et excusserit, eosque uno volumine congestos, et a plerisque viris doctis, etiam nonnullis ex fratribus nostris S. R. E. cardinalibus celebratos, Nobis et Apostolicæ Sedi dicaverit, et obtulerit; Nos animo tenentes in sacro eloquio scriptum esse bonorum laborum gloriosum esse fructum, cupientesque tot studia frustra non esse impensa, sed pro communi omnium præcipue peritorum Christianorum fruge ac spirituali utilitate in lucem et publicam editionem prodire et in usum esse, motu proprio et ex certa nostra scientia, ut quilibet etiam sacerdos eosdem hymnos etiam in divinis legere, et eis uti possit, tenore præsentium, auctoritate Apostolica concedimus, et mandamus. (This brief is found at the beginning of Ferreri's collection of hymns.)

[4] See Note B.

[5] O God, who deigned to choose blessed Pius, the Supreme Pontiff, to crush the Church's enemies and to restore divine worship, etc. (Brev. Rom., May 5.)

[6] We see that Rome feared weakening the militia of the religious Orders by permitting it to use this abridged Office, and also unsettling the ancient traditions preserved in the cloisters better than anywhere else.

[7] Et insuper omnibus et singulis clericis, et presbyteris duntaxat secularibus, qui illud recitare voluerint, concedimus, ut ad veteris Officii secundum usum Romanæ curiæ, vel alterius Ecclesiæ, quod nunc in usu habetur, recitationem minime teneantur, sed recitationi officii et horarum canonicarum, perinde ac si vetus officium recitassent, satisfecisse censeantur, dummodo singuli specialem super hoc licentiam a sede Apostolica obtineant, quam per solam signaturam absque alia impensa expediri mandamus. (This brief, attached to the first edition of Quignonez's Breviary in 1535, bears this superscription: "To our beloved sons Thomas and Benedict Juncta, Antonio Blado, and Antonio Salamanca, printers of books at Rome.")

[8] See Note C.

[9] Like the first, the preface to this second edition is addressed to Paul III.

[10] See Note D.

[11] Zaccaria, Biblioth. Ritualis, vol. I, p. 113. Arévalo, Hymnodia Hispanica, Appendix II, p. 391.

[12] Biblioth. Bibliothecarum MSS., vol. I, p. 122.

[13] Hymnodia Hispan., at the end, Appendix II, pp. 423ff.

[14] Insignem vero ejus in hoc genere religionem fecit illorum licentia temporum. Nuper novum ternarum lectionum Breviarium (sanctæ Crucis dicebatur) ad occupatorum hominum levamen editum erat; ejusque usus Francisco propter occupationes ab initio concessus. Ille tamen quamvis ingentibus curis negotiisque distentus, nunquam permissa uti voluit licentia; vetusque Breviarium novenarum lectionum haud paulo longius perpetuo recitavit. (Tursellini, Vita S. Francisci Xaverii, lib. VI, cap. v.)

[15] Arévalo, ibid., 424.

[16] Merati, Annotat. in Gavantum, vol. I, p. 4. Zaccaria, Biblioth. Ritualis, vol. I, p. 58.

[17] Musæum Italicum, vol. II, Appendix, p. 587 ff.

[18] Vol. III, ch. xxxiv, p. 607 ff.

Chapter XIV. On Antiliturgical Heresy and the Protestant Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, Considered in Its Relation to the Liturgy

(p. 388)

[margin: The Liturgy necessarily exposed to heresy's attacks.]

[margin: The Eastern sects preserve traditional notions together with a sense of faith.]

The Liturgy is too excellent a thing in the Church to have escaped the attacks of heresy. Yet just as the Eastern sects, which otherwise tore the Creed apart in so many ways, did not directly attack the very notion of the Church's authority, neither has the rationalist systematically assailed the forms of worship in that homeland of mysteries. Divided by violent dissensions, the Eastern sects have joined to Christianity, some a disguised pantheism, others the very principle of dualism. Above all, however, they need to believe and to be Christian; their Liturgy fully expresses their condition. Blasphemies concerning the Incarnation of the Word dishonor certain formulas, but this disorder does not prevent traditional liturgical notions from surviving in

those formulas and their accompanying rites. Indeed, however disfigured, faith has been fruitful almost down to our own day among these men who believe wrongly yet wish to believe. Since the year 1000 alone, the Jacobites and Nestorians have produced more liturgical formulas—anaphoras, for example—than the Melkite Greeks, whose books have gained nothing since their separation from the Roman Church, apart from certain collections *(p. 389)* of hymns composed by all sorts of persons and added to the Office books. Yet this last kind of prayer does not belong to the substance of the Liturgy as do the anaphoras, blessings, etc., composed by modern Jacobites and Nestorians, whose text or description we find in Renaudot's work on the Eastern liturgies or in Assemani's Oriental Library. The reader would nevertheless be mistaken to think we offer this extreme abundance as evidence of progress. Antiquity and immutability are the foremost qualities of the formulas of the altar. Still, this fruitfulness is at least a sign of life, and one cannot help recognizing that the ecclesiastical style of these anaphoras, even the most recent, conforms perfectly to that consecrated by the centuries. As for traditions concerning rites and ceremonies, the Eastern sects have preserved them all with rare fidelity. If superstitious circumstances are sometimes mingled with them, they at least attest an original foundation of faith, just as among us the progressive decline of outward practices betrays a hidden rationalism making its effects felt.

[margin: Liturgical inspiration remains fruitful among these heretics.]

[margin: In schism the Greek Church preserves the forms of its Catholic Liturgy, but remains sterile.]

The Greek Church has generally preserved with great care, if not the genius, at least the forms of the Liturgy. We have explained elsewhere how God predestined it, at least for a time, to bear irrefutable witness to the purity of Latin traditions through the immobility of its ancient usages. That is why Cyril Lucaris failed so shamefully in his plan to initiate the Eastern Church into the doctrines of Western rationalism. Yet the disputatious and punctilious spirit of Mark of Ephesus has remained within the Greek Church and will bear its natural fruits as soon as that Church is called to merge into our European societies. The Greek Church must infallibly pass through Protestantism before *(p. 390)* returning to unity, and there are many reasons to believe that the revolution has already taken place in the hearts of its pontiffs. Under such conditions, the Liturgy, the official form of an official belief, will remain stable or vary as the sovereign pleases. Thus no liturgical heresy is possible where the Creed is already undermined, where only a corpse of Christianity remains, still given a few movements by springs or galvanism, until, falling into rotting shreds, it becomes as incapable of receiving external impulses as it has long been of feeling the touches of life.

[margin: Antiliturgical heresy, the enemy of the forms of worship, can ferment only within the true Church.]

[margin: In the eighth century the iconoclasts first represent this heresy in the East; it develops chiefly in the West.]

[margin: Roman Christianity's own vitality and the character of Western nations favor this tendency.]

It is therefore only within the true Church that antiliturgical heresy, the enemy of the forms of worship, must ferment. Only where there is something to destroy will the genius of destruction seek to infiltrate this deadly poison. The East suffered its attacks only once, but violently, in the days of unity. In the eighth century a furious sect arose which, under pretext of freeing the spirit from the yoke of form, smashed, tore apart, and burned the symbols of the Christian's faith and love. Blood flowed in defense of the image of the Son of God, as it had flowed four centuries earlier for the true God's triumph over idols. But Western Christendom was destined to see organized within itself the longest and most stubborn war, still continuing, against the whole body of liturgical acts. Two things help keep the Western Churches in this state of trial: first, as we have just said, the vitality proper to Roman Christianity, the only Christianity worthy of the name and therefore the one against which all the powers of error must turn; second, the material cast of Western peoples' rational outlook. Lacking both the flexibility of the Greek mind and *(p. 391)* Eastern mysticism, they know only how to deny in matters of belief, to cast away whatever restrains or humbles them. For this twofold reason they are incapable, unlike the Semitic peoples, of following the same heresy for long centuries. That is why, among us, apart from certain isolated instances, heresy has always proceeded solely

by negation and destruction. As we shall see, this is the tendency of all the efforts of the immense antiliturgist sect.

[margin: Antiliturgical heresy in the West begins with Vigilantius in the fourth century.]

Its known starting point is Vigilantius, that Gaul immortalized by Saint Jerome's eloquent sarcasms. He declaims against ceremonial pomp, crudely insults its symbolism, blasphemes the relics of the saints, and attacks both the celibacy of sacred ministers and the continence of virgins—all to preserve Christianity's purity. As we see, this is quite advanced for a fourth-century Gaul. The East, which produced only iconoclastic heresy of this kind, at least spared, though inconsistently, liturgical rites and usages not directly connected with holy images.

[margin: Berengarius's eleventh-century blasphemies against Eucharistic dogma signal rationalism's insurrection against Christian worship among Western nations.]

After Vigilantius, the West rested for several centuries. But when the barbarian races, introduced to civilization by the Church, had grown somewhat familiar with intellectual labor, individuals arose, followed by sects, crudely denying what they did not understand and asserting that no reality existed where the senses had no immediate grasp. The Sacramentarian heresy, forever impossible in the East, began in the eleventh century in the West, in France, with Archdeacon Berengarius's blasphemies. The Church rose universally against so monstrous a doctrine. Yet one had to foresee that rationalism, once unleashed against the most august act of Christian worship, would not stop there. The mystery of *(p. 392)* the real presence of the divine Word under the Eucharistic symbols was to become the target of every attack. God had to be removed from man, and to attack this cardinal dogma more surely, every avenue of the Liturgy leading, so to speak, to the Eucharistic mystery had to be closed.

[margin: Terrible unleashing of Satan after the year 1000.]

Berengarius had merely given a signal. His attack was to be reinforced in his own century and those following, and would bring upon Catholicism the longest and most dreadful assault it had ever endured. Everything therefore began after the year 1000: Perhaps this was, says Bossuet, the time of that terrible unleashing of Satan described in the Apocalypse, after a thousand years, which may signify extreme disorders: a thousand years after the strong man armed, that is, the victorious demon, was bound by Jesus Christ coming into the world[1].

[margin: Manichaean heresy reappears in the West, still hostile to outward forms of worship, as in the days of Leo, Gelasius, and Augustine.]

Hell stirred the foulest dregs of its mire, and while rationalism was awakening, Satan had cast upon the West, as a diabolical reinforcement, the impure seed the East had felt with horror within itself from the beginning: that sect Saint Paul calls the mystery of iniquity, the Manichaean heresy. We know how, under the false name of gnosis, it had defiled Christianity's first centuries; how perfidiously it had, at various times, concealed itself within the Church, allowing its followers to pray and even receive Communion with Catholics, and penetrating into Rome itself, where the keen eye of a Saint Leo and a Saint Gelasius was needed to discover it. This abominable sect, given over under pretext of spiritualism to every infamy of the flesh, secretly blasphemed the holiest practices of outward worship as crude and excessively material. One may see what Saint *(p. 393)* Augustine tells us in his book against Faustus the Manichaean, who called the veneration of saints and their relics idolatry.

[margin: By the ninth century it reappears in Armenia in the Paulician sect.]

The Eastern emperors had pursued this infamous sect with the severest decrees, without being able to extinguish it. We find it again in ninth-century Armenia under a leader named Paul, whence these heretics were called Paulicians in the East. They became powerful enough there to wage wars against the emperors of Constantinople. Peter of Sicily, sent to them by Basil the Macedonian to negotiate an exchange of prisoners, had the opportunity to learn about them and wrote a book on their errors.

[margin: Bossuet's portrait of these sectarians, following Peter of Sicily, shows the traits of antiliturgist heresy.]

"He identifies these heretics," says Bossuet, "by their distinctive characteristics, their two principles, their contempt for the Old Testament, their prodigious skill in hiding themselves whenever they wished, and the other marks we have seen. But he notes two or three that must not be forgotten: their particular aversion to images of the cross, a natural consequence of their error, since they rejected the Passion and death of the Son of God; their contempt for the Blessed Virgin, whom they did not regard as the Mother of Jesus Christ, since he had no human flesh; and above all their aversion to the Eucharist[2]. They also said that Catholics honored the saints as divinities, and that this was why the laity were prevented from reading Holy Scripture, lest they discover several similar errors[3]."

As we see, this was already antiliturgist heresy fully formed. All it lacked was populations *(p. 394)* disposed to welcome it. To reach Europe, the sect passed through Bulgaria, where it struck deep roots; hence its adherents were called Bulgarians in the West. In 1017, under King Robert, several were discovered at Orléans; shortly afterward, others in Languedoc, then Italy, where they called themselves Cathars, meaning pure; finally, deep into Germany. Their infamous word had eaten away beneath the surface like a canker[4], and their doctrine remained the same, founded on belief in the two principles and hatred of everything outward in worship, reinforced by all the Gnostic abominations. Extremely secretive, they mingled with the orthodox within the Church, ready for every kind of perjury rather than betray themselves once they had resolved not to speak. They were already very powerful in twelfth-century southern France, and there can be no doubt that Peter of Bruis and Henry, whose doctrines were opposed by Saint Bernard and Peter the Venerable, were their two principal leaders. In 1160 we see them pass into England, where they were called Poplicans or Publicans. In France they are called Albigensians because of their power in one of our provinces; those most deeply initiated into the sect's disgusting mysteries are called Patarins. We know with what zeal the Catholic populations of the Middle Ages threw themselves against these sectarians. The Church believed it could proclaim a crusade against them, and a war of extermination began, in which all the great figures of Church and State took part directly or indirectly. Albigensian doctrine was stifled, at least in its outward predominance. It remained covertly as the seed of all the errors that were to erupt in the sixteenth century, and the doctrines of its monstrous *(p. 395)* mysticism persisted down to our own day in the Quietist heresy, perhaps a more dangerous enemy of true liturgical doctrine than pure rationalism itself.

[margin: Quietism.]

[margin: The crusade preached against the Albigensians checks Manichaeism's expansion; the heresy remains hidden as a seed of sixteenth-century errors, especially]

[margin: Manichaeans reach the West through Bulgaria; as Cathars, Publicans, Albigensians, and Patarins, they infest Germany, Italy, England, and especially southern France.]

[margin: In the twelfth century the Waldensian sect, a new form of antiliturgist heresy, boldly undermines the entire edifice of Catholic worship.]

A new branch of the sect, less mystical and therefore better suited to Western customs, was sprouting at Lyon from the same trunk of Manichaeism imported from the East, just when the first branch faced violent destruction. In 1160, at Lyon, the merchant Peter Waldo was forming the sect of turbulent fanatics known as the Poor of Lyon, but chiefly as Waldensians, after their founder. One could then foresee an alliance between the sect's spirit and that of which Berengarius had been the first spokesman among us. Soon freed of Manichaean opinions, unpopular among us, they preach chiefly the reform of the Church and, to effect it, boldly undermine the whole edifice of her worship. First, for them there is no longer a priesthood: every layman is a priest; a priest in mortal sin no longer consecrates, and consequently there is no certainty of the Eucharist; clerics cannot own earthly goods; churches, holy Chrism, the veneration of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, and prayer for the dead must be abhorred. Everything must be referred to Holy Scripture, etc. The Waldensians find the Church's morality scandalously lax and even parade a rigor of conduct contrasting with the Albigensians' excesses.

[margin: In the fourteenth century Wycliffe teaches the same doctrines in England.]

But France was not the only scene of this violent reaction against form in Catholicism. At the end of the fourteenth century, Wycliffe arose in England, uttering almost all the Waldensians' blasphemies. Yet, since every system of religious error needs some direct or indirect support from pantheism to have any coherence, and since Gnostic mysticism *(p. 396)* could not suit the masses among us, as we have observed, Wycliffe devised a support for his dissolving doctrines in a system of fatalism rooted in an immutable will of God in which all creatures' wills were absorbed.

[margin: In Germany John Hus prepares an immense revolt against the Roman Church.]

About the same time, John Hus was teaching his doctrines in Germany and preparing that immense revolt which would separate whole nations from Roman communion for centuries. He too laid great stress on exaggerated consequences of the dogma of predestination. Turning to practice, he humbled the priesthood before laicism, preached the reading of Holy Scripture at Tradition's expense, and openly defied sovereign authority in liturgical matters by demanding use of the chalice in Communion for the laity.

[margin: Luther arrives with Calvin and Zwingli to free man from the twofold servitude of teaching and liturgical authority.]

[margin: Socinus marks error's final limit; antiliturgist heresy stops at him.]

Finally came Luther, who said nothing his predecessors had not already said, but claimed to free man at once from the mind's servitude to teaching authority and the body's servitude to liturgical authority. Calvin and Zwingli followed him, dragging Socinus after them; his pure naturalism was the immediate consequence of doctrines prepared over so many centuries. But all liturgical error stops at Socinus: the Liturgy, progressively reduced, does not reach him. Now, to convey the ravages of the antiliturgist sect, we have thought it necessary to summarize the course of Christianity's alleged reformers over the past three centuries and present the whole of their acts and doctrine concerning the purification of divine worship. No spectacle is more instructive or better suited to explain Protestantism's rapid spread. We shall see the work of a diabolical wisdom acting with sure aim and bound infallibly to produce vast results.

(p. 397)

[margin: Summary of these alleged reformers' doctrine on divine worship and the traits of antiliturgical heresy.]

[margin: 1. Hatred of tradition in the formulas of divine worship.]

[margin: Luther's rule for the reformed Mass.]

1. The first characteristic of antiliturgical heresy is hatred of Tradition in the formulas of divine worship. This distinctive trait is undeniable in all the heretics we have named, from Vigilantius to Calvin, and its reason is easily explained. Every sectarian wishing to introduce a new doctrine inevitably encounters the Liturgy, which is tradition at its highest power. He cannot rest until he has silenced that voice and torn apart those pages enshrining the faith of past centuries. Indeed, how did Lutheranism, Calvinism, and Anglicanism establish and maintain themselves among the masses? Nothing was needed but to replace the old books and formulas with new ones, and all was accomplished. Nothing hampered the new teachers anymore; they could preach at their ease: the peoples' faith was now defenseless. Luther grasped this doctrine with a sagacity worthy of our Jansenists when, early in his innovations, while he still felt obliged to retain some outward forms of Latin worship, he laid down the following rule for the reformed Mass: "We approve and retain the Introits for Sundays and the feasts of Jesus Christ, namely Easter, Pentecost, and Christmas. We would gladly prefer the complete psalms from which these Introits are drawn, as was formerly done; but we are willing to conform to present usage. We do not even blame those who wish to retain the Introits of the Apostles, the Virgin, and the other Saints, WHEN THESE THREE INTROITS ARE DRAWN FROM THE PSALMS AND OTHER PARTS OF SCRIPTURE[5]." He had too great a horror of the sacred canticles composed by the Church herself for the public expression *(p. 398)* of her faith. He felt too keenly in them the vigor of the Tradition he wished to banish. Acknowledging the Church's right to mingle her voice with

Scripture's oracles in the sacred assemblies would expose him to hearing millions of mouths anathematize his new dogmas. Hence, hatred for everything in the Liturgy not drawn exclusively from Holy Scripture.

[margin: 2. Suppression of formulas in ecclesiastical style, replaced by Scripture readings too often chosen with infernal art to inculcate error.]

[margin: Why recent heretics prefer Holy Scripture to ecclesiastical definitions, and the liberties they take with the sacred books.]

2. Indeed, the antiliturgist sect's second principle is to replace formulas in ecclesiastical style with readings from Holy Scripture. It gains two advantages: first, silencing the voice of Tradition, which it always fears; second, a means of spreading and supporting its dogmas by negation or affirmation. By negation: through skillful selection, passing over texts expressing the doctrine opposed to the errors it wishes to establish. By affirmation: highlighting truncated passages which, showing only one side of the truth, conceal the other from ordinary people. For many centuries it has been known that all heretics prefer Holy Scripture to ecclesiastical definitions for no other reason than the ease with which they can make God's word say whatever they wish, letting it appear or stopping it as suits their purpose. Elsewhere we shall see what the Jansenists have done in this regard, obliged by their system to keep an outward bond with the Church. As for Protestants, they have reduced almost the entire Liturgy to Scripture reading, accompanied by discourses interpreting it through reason. The choice and determination of the canonical books have finally fallen to the reformer's whim. In the last resort, he decides not merely the meaning of God's word, but whether it is God's word at all. Thus Martin Luther finds that, within his system of pantheism, the uselessness of works and the sufficiency *(p. 399)* of faith are dogmas to be established. He will therefore declare Saint James's Epistle an epistle of straw, and not a canonical epistle, solely because it teaches the necessity of works for salvation. In every age and every form it will be the same: no ecclesiastical formulas; Scripture alone, but interpreted, but selected, but presented by whoever profits from innovation. The snare is dangerous for the simple, and only much later does one realize one has been deceived, and that God's word, that two-edged sword, as the Apostle calls it, has inflicted great wounds because it was wielded by the sons of perdition.

[margin: 3. Introduction of new formulas that help sustain error.]

3. The heretics' third principle concerning liturgical reform comes after they have expelled ecclesiastical formulas and proclaimed the absolute necessity of using only scriptural words in divine service. Seeing then that Scripture does not always bend, as they would wish, to all their desires, their third principle, we say, is to fabricate and introduce various formulas, full of perfidy, by which the peoples are chained still more firmly to error, and the whole edifice of impious reform will be consolidated for centuries.

[margin: 4. Heretics' habitual contradiction of their own principles.]

4. One should not be surprised at the contradiction heresy thus displays in its works, knowing that the fourth principle—or, if one prefers, the fourth necessity imposed on sectarians by the very nature of their rebellious state—is habitual contradiction of their own principles. It must be so for their confusion on that great day which comes sooner or later, when God exposes their nakedness before the peoples they have seduced, and also because consistency does not lie within man's power; truth alone can be consistent. Thus all sectarians, without exception, begin by asserting the *(p. 400)* rights of antiquity. They wish to free Christianity from everything false and unworthy of God that human error and passions have mingled with it. They want nothing but what is primitive and claim to take up the Christian institution at its cradle. To this end they prune, erase, and cut away; everything falls beneath their blows. When one expects divine worship to reappear in its original purity, one finds oneself encumbered with new formulas dating only from yesterday, indisputably human, since their author is still alive. Every sect undergoes this necessity. We have seen it among Monophysites and Nestorians; we find it in every Protestant branch. Their affectation of preaching antiquity has merely enabled them to batter down the whole past. Then, facing the peoples they have seduced, they have sworn that all was well, that papist excrescences had disappeared, that divine worship had returned to its primitive holiness. Let us note another characteristic of heretics' alteration of the Liturgy. In

their rage for innovation they do not merely prune formulas in ecclesiastical style, which they stigmatize as human words; they condemn even the readings and prayers the Church has borrowed from Scripture. They change and substitute, refusing to pray with the Church, thus excommunicating themselves, and also fearing the least particle of the orthodoxy that guided the choice of these passages.

[margin: The innovators suppress formulas in ecclesiastical style and also change everything the Church has borrowed from Holy Scripture.]

[margin: 5. Removal of everything in divine worship that expresses mysteries.]

5. Since the sectarians undertake liturgical reform for the same purpose as the reform of dogma, of which it is the consequence, it follows that, just as Protestants separated themselves from unity in order to believe less, they were led to cut from worship every ceremony and every formula that *(p. 401)* expresses mysteries. They branded as superstition and idolatry everything that did not seem purely rational to them, thus restricting the expressions of faith and blocking, by doubt and even denial, every path opening onto the supernatural world. Thus no more sacraments except Baptism, until Socinianism comes to free its adherents even from that; no more sacramentals, blessings, images, saints' relics, processions, pilgrimages, etc. No longer an altar, but merely a table; no longer sacrifice, as in every religion, but only a supper; no longer a church, but only a temple, as among the Greeks and Romans; no religious architecture, since there are no mysteries; no Christian painting or sculpture, since there is no religion accessible to the senses; finally, no poetry in worship which neither love nor faith renders fruitful.

[margin: 6. Total extinction of the spirit of prayer called unction in Catholicism.]

6. Suppressing mysterious things in Protestant liturgy was bound infallibly to produce the total extinction of that spirit of prayer called unction in Catholicism. A rebellious heart has no love, and a loveless heart can at most produce tolerable expressions of respect or fear, with the Pharisee's proud coldness: such is Protestant liturgy. One senses that the person reciting it congratulates himself on not belonging to those papist Christians who bring God down to their level through the familiarity of their commonplace language.

[margin: 7. Proscription of the veneration of the Blessed Virgin and the saints.]

7. Dealing nobly with God, Protestant liturgy has no need of created intermediaries. It would consider invoking the Blessed Virgin's intercession or the saints' protection a failure in the respect due to the Supreme Being. It excludes all that papist idolatry which asks of a creature what ought to be asked of God alone; it clears the calendar of all those names of men which *(p. 402)* the Roman Church so rashly inscribes beside God's name. It especially abhors the names of monks and other figures of later times appearing beside the revered names of the Apostles chosen by Jesus Christ, through whom was founded that primitive Church which alone was pure in faith and free from every superstition in worship and every laxity in morals.

[margin: 8. Demand for the vernacular in divine service.]

8. Since one of liturgical reform's chief ends is the abolition of mystical acts and formulas, its authors necessarily had to demand the use of the vernacular in divine service. This is therefore one of the most important points in the sectarians' eyes. Worship is not something secret, they say; the people must understand what they sing. Hatred of Latin is innate in the hearts of all Rome's enemies. They see in it the bond uniting Catholics throughout the world, orthodoxy's arsenal against every subtlety of the sectarian spirit, the papacy's most powerful weapon. The rebellious spirit impelling them to entrust universal prayer to the idiom of each people, province, and century has, moreover, borne its fruits. Every day the Reformed can see that Catholic peoples, despite their Latin prayers, better appreciate and more zealously fulfill the duties of worship than Protestant peoples. At every hour of the day divine service takes place in Catholic churches. The faithful person attending leaves his mother tongue at the threshold. Apart from the times of preaching, he hears only mysterious accents, which fall silent even at the most solemn moment, the Canon of the Mass. Yet this mystery so charms him that he does not envy the Protestant's lot, although the latter's ear hears only sounds whose meaning it understands. While the Reformed temple gathers its purist Christians *(p. 403)* with

great difficulty once a week, the papist Church constantly sees her many altars besieged by her devout children. Each day they tear themselves from their work to hear those mysterious words which must be from God, since they nourish faith and soothe sorrows. Let us admit it: Protestantism's declaration of war on the sacred language was a masterstroke. If it could destroy that language, its triumph would be far advanced. Exposed to profane eyes like a dishonored virgin, the Liturgy has from that moment lost its sacred character. The people will soon find it hardly worth interrupting their work or pleasures to hear speech like that of the public square. Strip the French Church of its radical declamations and diatribes against the clergy's alleged venality, and see whether the people will long listen to the so-called primate of the Gauls crying, The Lord be with you, and others replying, And with your spirit. We shall treat the liturgical language separately elsewhere.

[margin: 9. Freedom from the practices of papist liturgy, and reduction of public and private prayer.]

9. In removing from the Liturgy the mystery that humbles reason, Protestantism was careful not to forget the practical consequence: freedom from the fatigue and constraint imposed on the body by the practices of papist liturgy. First, no fasting or abstinence; no genuflection in prayer; for the temple's minister, no daily Offices to perform, not even canonical prayers to recite in the Church's name. Such is one of the chief forms of the great Protestant emancipation: reducing the amount of public and private prayer. Events soon showed that faith and charity, nourished by prayer, had died out in the Reformation, whereas among Catholics they continually nourish every act of devotion to God and men, made fruitful by the ineffable *(p. 404)* resources of liturgical prayer offered by the secular and regular clergy, with whom the community of the faithful unites.

[margin: 10. Hatred of papal power common to all dissident sects.]

10. Needing a rule to discern which papist institutions might be most hostile to its principle, Protestantism had to dig into the foundations of the Catholic edifice and find the foundation stone supporting everything. Instinct immediately disclosed the dogma irreconcilable with every innovation: papal power. When Luther wrote on his banner, Hatred for Rome and her laws, he merely promulgated once more the great principle of every branch of the antiliturgist sect. Hence worship and ceremonies had to be abolished wholesale as Rome's idolatry; Latin, the Divine Office, the calendar, the breviary—all abominations of the great whore of Babylon. The Roman Pontiff weighs upon reason through his dogmas and upon the senses through his ritual practices. One must therefore proclaim his dogmas nothing but blasphemy and error, and his liturgical observances merely a means of securing more firmly a usurped and tyrannical dominion. Thus, in its emancipated litanies, the Lutheran Church continues unaffectedly to sing: From the murderous fury, calumny, rage, and ferocity of the Turk and the Pope, deliver us, Lord[6]. Here we should recall Joseph de Maistre's admirable reflections in his book du Pape. With such sagacity and depth he shows that, despite the discordances that should isolate the separated sects from one another, they all unite in one quality: being non-Roman. Imagine any innovation, whether in dogma or in *(p. 405)* discipline, and see whether one can undertake it without incurring, willingly or unwillingly, the designation non-Roman—or, if one lacks boldness, less Roman, if you prefer. It remains to ask what kind of peace a Catholic could find in the first, or even the second, of these two situations.

[margin: 11. A vast Presbyterianism follows immediately from suppressing the Sovereign Pontificate.]

11. To establish its reign forever, antiliturgist heresy needed to destroy all priesthood in Christianity, in fact and in principle. It sensed that wherever there is a pontiff, there is an altar, and wherever an altar, a sacrifice, and consequently a mysterious ceremonial. Having abolished the status of the Supreme Pontiff, it therefore had to annihilate the bishop's character, from whom proceeds the mystical laying on of hands perpetuating the sacred hierarchy. Hence a vast Presbyterianism, the immediate consequence of suppressing the Sovereign Pontificate. There is no longer any priest properly so called: how could mere election, without consecration, make a man sacred? Luther's and Calvin's reform will therefore recognize only ministers of God—or of

men, as one pleases. But one cannot stop there. Chosen and installed by laymen, wearing in the temple the robe of a kind of bastard magistracy, the minister is merely a layman invested with incidental functions. Protestantism thus contains only laymen. This had to be so, since there is no longer a Liturgy; just as there is no longer a Liturgy because there are only laymen.

[margin: 12. The whole hierarchy summed up in the prince, now Supreme Pontiff.]

12. Finally—and this is the lowest depth of brutish degradation—since the priesthood no longer exists and the hierarchy is dead, the prince, the only possible authority among laymen, will proclaim himself head of Religion. We shall see the proudest reformers, after shaking off Rome's spiritual yoke, recognize the temporal sovereign as supreme pontiff and include power over the Liturgy among the prerogatives of *(p. 406)* sovereignty. There will therefore be dogma, morality, sacraments, worship, Christianity, only insofar as the prince pleases, since absolute power devolves upon him over the Liturgy, through which all these things find expression and application in the community of the faithful. Yet this is the Reformation's fundamental axiom, both in practice and in Protestant teachers' writings. This final trait completes the picture and enables the reader to judge the nature of that alleged emancipation, accomplished with such violence against the papacy, only to make way afterward, necessarily, for a dominion destructive of Christianity's very nature. At first, admittedly, the antiliturgist sect did not habitually flatter the powerful in this way. Albigensians, Waldensians, Wycliffites, and Hussites all taught that one must resist and even attack princes and magistrates in a state of sin, claiming a prince forfeited his right as soon as he was no longer in grace with God. These sectarians, fearing the sword of Catholic princes, bishops of external affairs, had everything to gain by undermining their authority. But once sovereigns joined the revolt against the Church and wished to make religion a national affair, an instrument of government, the Liturgy, like dogma, confined to one country's boundaries, naturally fell within that country's highest authority. The reformers could not help feeling deep gratitude toward those lending their powerful arm to establish and maintain their theories. This preference for the temporal over the spiritual in religion certainly contains an entire apostasy; but self-preservation itself is at stake. One must not merely be consistent; one must live. That is why Luther, who broke so publicly with the pontiff of

(p. 407) Rome as the abettor of all Babylon's abominations, does not himself blush to declare the theological legitimacy of a double marriage for the landgrave of Hesse. It is also why Abbé Grégoire finds in his principles a way both to associate himself with the vote for Louis XVI's death in the Convention and to champion Louis XIV and Joseph II against the Roman Pontiffs.

Such are the chief maxims of the antiliturgist sect. We have certainly exaggerated nothing; we have merely gathered the doctrine professed a hundred times in the writings of Luther, Calvin, the Magdeburg Centuriators, Hospinian, Chemnitz, etc. These books are easily consulted—or rather, the work issuing from them lies before everyone's eyes. We thought it useful to bring its principal traits to light. There is always profit in knowing error; direct instruction is sometimes less advantageous and less easy. It is now for the Catholic logician to draw the contradictory proposition.

---

[1] Histoire des Variations, book XI, § 17.

[2] Histoire des Variations, book XI, § 14.

[3] Ibid.

[4] 2 Tim. 2:17.

[5] Lebrun, Explication de la Messe, vol. IV, p. 13.

[6] Lutherisches Gesangbuch. Leipzig. P. 667.

Chapter XV. Catholic Reform of the Liturgy. — Paul IV. Pius IV. — Council of Trent. Saint Pius V. Roman Breviary. Roman Missal. — Introduction of the

Reformed Liturgy in Italy, Spain, France, and the Rest of the West. — Palestrina. — Sixtus V. Congregation of Rites. — Gregory XIII. Calendar Reform. Roman Martyrology. — Clement VIII. Roman Pontifical. Roman Ceremonial. — Sixteenth-Century Liturgical Writers

(p. 408)

[margin: Clement VII commissions Saint Cajetan and John]

[margin: Peter Caraffa to contribute to a new breviary.]

The sixteenth century, in which true liturgical doctrine had suffered such harsh attacks and which had witnessed Ferreri's and Quignonez's ill-advised reforms, was nevertheless to see a true, solid, and legitimate reform accomplished. But it was reserved to the Roman Pontiffs to undertake and complete it themselves. As always, the regular clergy was to have an influence on so important a work; yet this time it was no longer the Franciscans. The insufficient action of the mendicant orders had been joined by the zeal of a new branch sprouting from the great tree of the religious state, called the Clerks Regular. The oldest of this militia, the Theatines, founded by Saint Cajetan of Thiene, attached their name to the first attempt at liturgical reform that can be taken seriously and prepared the great result later obtained by Saint Pius V. Clement VII, who had charged Quignonez with work on a new breviary, *(p. 409)* had given the same commission to Saint Cajetan and John Peter Caraffa, one of Cajetan's earliest associates, who later became pope under the name Paul IV. The Brief conferring this mark of high apostolic confidence still exists in the Theatine annals[1], dated January 21, 1529. Quignonez's breviary was preferred, doubtless because it was shorter and more elegantly arranged. The Theatines' work, partly due to Caraffa, then bishop of Chieti, recommended itself only by preserving ancient and venerable usages, purging apocryphal histories, correcting rubrics, and replacing homilies drawn from heterodox authors such as Origen, Eusebius of Emesa, etc., with genuine readings from the holy Fathers[2]. Caraffa loved antiquity too greatly and was too grave not to disdain Quignonez's work. He therefore followed Saint Francis Xavier's example and showed, even openly, his contempt for the cardinal's breviary[3]. He ascended Saint Peter's chair in 1555. One of his first concerns was to declare that permission to use this abridged liturgy would no longer be granted, although he did not yet judge it expedient to withdraw faculties previously obtained for its use. He then resumed work eagerly on his reformed breviary. Wishing to accomplish himself so important a work, so worthy of a pope, he was diverted by the many grave cares of the supreme dignity and could not bring the breviary to a state fit for promulgation. He *(p. 410)* died in 1559, after four years of an energetic pontificate which he had begun having already reached his seventy-ninth year.

[margin: As Paul IV, Caraffa refuses future permission to use Quignonez's abridged liturgy and continues work on the breviary.]

[margin: Paul IV refuses to resume the Council of Trent and wishes the Church's reform to proceed through the Supreme Pontiffs' direct action.]

After Paul IV's death, his successor Pius IV devoted all his care to continuing the council opened at Trent under Paul III in 1545 and since suspended several times. Ardent in his zeal for the Apostolic See's rights, Paul IV had refused to consent to the resumption of the council's work. He was persuaded that the Roman Pontiff's authority, exercised firmly and perseveringly, sufficed to accomplish the Church's reform. Paul IV was indeed worthy of conceiving such a hope. Yet divine Providence planned that, to accommodate the century's ideas and pretensions more closely, a council, hampered in a thousand ways by temporal powers and nationalities, should have the largest part in Catholic reform. It should also be added that this assembly was fortunate to find itself directed by legates devoted to the Apostolic See, whose instructions they received and transmitted. A succession of great pontiffs—Saint Pius V, Gregory XIII, Sixtus V, Clement VIII, Gregory XV—proved ready to apply Trent's canons with that unyielding vigor which, since that great epoch, has brought their spirit and maxims into every Catholic institution.

[margin: In God's design, liturgical reform was to be the proper work of a successor of the Gelasiuses and Gregories.]

Paul IV had thought liturgical reform could take place only at Rome, as the proper work of a Roman Pontiff, a successor of the Gelasiuses and Gregories. As we shall see, Pius IV did all he could to have this reform accomplished at Trent. But the Church's divine Author, who established Rome as the metropolis of ecclesiastical government and its Church as the mother of all the faithful, knew how to bring matters to their proper outcome, and the reformed Liturgy was finally published *(p. 411)* by the Supreme Pontiff's authority in that capital of Catholicism. Before recounting this great event, we must give some details about the council's dispositions concerning liturgical reform.

[margin: Plan for liturgical reform drawn up by the Council of Cologne in 1536.]

In the preceding chapter we discussed the needs imperiously demanding the Church's pastors' attention in the grave matter of divine worship. As early as 1536 a council was held at Cologne whose very expressive canons are of the greatest importance for characterizing the elements then stirring within the Church. It was assembled by the famous Archbishop Hermann, who later had the misfortune to embrace Lutheranism. This circumstance more than sufficiently explains the extreme freedom with which that period's discipline is sometimes characterized in the council's acts. On the Liturgy, the sixth and eleventh canons of part two articulate a plan for reform. They affirm that the breviary contains histories devoid of authority and gravity—a wholly legitimate complaint in itself—but boldly express the wish to suppress even authentic histories and replace them with mere readings from Holy Scripture[4]. As for the missal, the Fathers rightly reprove several innovations introduced into it which offended the respect due to the most august of mysteries[5]. The claim made here concerning *(p. 412)* Holy Scripture as the Liturgy's sole material had already been expressed in Germany in the articles of reform proposed by the emperor to the Council of Basel[6].

[margin: Complaints against Quignonez's breviary and requests for liturgical reform presented to the Council of Trent.]

During the Council of Trent's first period, the Fathers had no leisure to attend to the Liturgy. Yet, as we saw above, formal complaints had already been lodged against Quignonez's breviary. When the council was temporarily suspended, further requests concerning the Liturgy appeared in a plan of reform drawn up by Charles V at Augsburg. It asks that the form of the Church's prayers be brought back to the institutions of the ancient Fathers, and that devout and learned men be charged with purging breviaries of everything apocryphal and less consonant with the purity of divine worship[7]. When the council resumed under Pius IV, a memorandum given to the Cardinal of Lorraine, traveling to Trent in 1562, contained the injunction from the king and the kingdom's Estates General that he urge the council Fathers strongly to purify divine service, remove superstitions, and revise prayers and ceremonies[8]. All these facts, which attest ever more clearly the urgency of liturgical reform *(p. 413)* and the zeal Catholic peoples still showed in the sixteenth century for matters of divine worship, also reveal the full gravity of the situation the council was to face amid all these claims, among which one could not help discerning certain more or less suspect inspirations.

[margin: Pius IV sends the council Fathers the work of Paul IV, inspired by Gregorian thought.]

[margin: The council entrusts reform of the whole Liturgy to the Roman Pontiff, despite some prelates' opposition.]

Pius IV, who always displayed such sure tact and such sound understanding of the Church's true needs in directing the council through his legates, sent the Fathers Paul IV's work. He wished to enable them to accomplish the much-desired liturgical reform with full regard for canonical propriety. This marked out the safest course: that great Pope's sole purpose in his reform had been to bring the breviary closer to the Gregorian sources and free it from the arbitrary or unseemly additions made to it in recent centuries. Occupied with the grave matters filling its eighteenth through twenty-fifth sessions, the council reached 1563 before its commission for breviary reform had found sufficient leisure to finish its work. Two views seemed to divide the assembly: some wanted perfect liturgical unity throughout the Church; others upheld the dioceses' particular rites. Deciding so important a matter, together with the delay inevitably involved in revising the whole Liturgy in detail, would require much time: not only the breviary but also the missal was

at issue. Yet it was urgent to bring the council to an end. To avoid further delays, the legates proposed entrusting liturgical reform to the Roman Pontiff. This was approved in the twenty-fifth session[9]. Some prelates did indeed *(p. 414)* express opposition. The bishop of Lérida, among others, delivered a long speech arguing that the council had far greater resources for treating so important a subject than Rome could have, since Rome lacked an equally exact knowledge of the usages of different countries. This claim was not heeded, nor should it have been, if any conclusion at all was desired. The task was not to provide a new Liturgy, but simply to purify the Western Church's Liturgy and restore its ancient form. That Liturgy was Rome's; its sources were at Rome. The Catholic Church's capital was therefore the only place where liturgical revision could be accomplished. Had Trent sought to restore unity by combining all the usages scattered through the West's dioceses, it would merely have produced a monstrous, incoherent whole. Unity would have been restored only by gratuitously affronting every local claim, kindling war between churches whose usages were preferred and those that thought their customs had fallen into contempt.

[margin: By entrusting liturgical reform to the Roman Pontiff, the council again proclaims the whole Western Church's need to follow Rome's Liturgy.]

[margin: Pius IV summons the council's liturgical commission to Rome. Saint Pius V]

[margin: increases the number of commissioners and urges their work forward.]

By entrusting reform of the breviary and missal to the Roman Pontiff, the council thus did no more than proclaim once again the whole Western Church's need to follow the Liturgy of the mother and teacher Church. Paul IV's manuscripts were brought back to Rome, together with all the materials prepared along the same lines by the council's commissioners. Pius IV also summoned those commissioners to his presence and joined several learned men of Rome to them. Death overtook him, however, and his successor Saint Pius V took this great work in hand, adding further commissioners to hasten its completion[10].

(p. 415)

[margin: Names of some of the commissioners.]

Despite all our research, we have so far been unable to discover the names of every member of this important commission. Merati names only Cardinal Bernardin Scotti and Thomas Goldwell, bishop of St. Asaph, both of the Theatine order, which deserves the greater part of the honor for the sixteenth century's liturgical revision[11]. Zaccaria agrees with Lagomarsini that an important part in this work should also be attributed to Cardinal William Sirlet and the learned Julius Poggio[12].

[margin: Principles governing the revision of Saint Pius V's breviary.]

[margin: Bring the Liturgy closer to ancient sources; reject the distinction between a public and a private Office.]

We shall briefly set out the principles governing the revision of Saint Pius V's breviary. First, Paul IV's fundamental idea, shared by his Theatine brethren and adopted by Trent and Pius IV, was diametrically opposed to Quignonez's. No liturgical reform was needed except to bring it closer to its ancient sources, rejecting the distinction between an Office recited privately and a public Office. The oldest manuscripts therefore had to be consulted, restoring their order and arrangement in the psalter, the distribution of the books of Scripture, the responsories, antiphons, and hymns. In this way the Church remained true to herself.

[margin: Restraint in admitting feasts of new saints.]

As for feasts of new saints, the revisers thought they should admit them very sparingly, not from a systematic preference for the ferial Office, but to avoid usurping the place of later ages. They therefore retained a certain number of Offices honoring saints admitted to the calendar since Saint Gregory. Care was taken, however, that these Offices, ordinarily reduced to the readings of the second nocturn, should no longer have hymns or antiphons *(p. 416)* of their own, to prevent the overcrowding that ill-regulated zeal would inevitably have produced sooner or later. The Propers of the various Churches were to supply what the general breviary did not contain.

The number of saints' feasts being greatly reduced, the revisers could assign about two hundred days a year to the ferial Office. This removed Quignonez's objection that the breviary of his day deprived clerics of the weekly recitation of the psalter.

[margin: Saint Gregory VII's canon on distributing Scripture restored; readings chosen to give a complete view of the sacred books.]

Saint Gregory VII's canon on the distribution of Holy Scripture in the Matins readings was restored to force. The only books for which no place was found were Paralipomenon, Esdras, and Baruch. Yet the passages were chosen with such taste and precision that, taken together, they may be said to offer as complete a view of Holy Scripture as Quignonez's breviary itself. Its preface does indeed promise an annual reading of the Bible; that promise, however, is not fulfilled.

[margin: Discernment in choosing homilies and other passages from the holy Fathers.]

The homilies and other passages from the holy Fathers are generally chosen with exceptional discernment. If some come from books modern criticism has recognized as apocryphal, we must remember that this science was then only beginning, and the great, accurate editions we enjoy today did not exist. An impartial man would not dare reproach Baronius and Bellarmine for blemishes of this kind in their immortal writings.

[margin: Revision of the content and style of the saints' historical accounts.]

The saints' historical accounts appear purged of all the apocryphal events whose presence had been regrettable. If severe critics today still find fault with the Roman breviary from the standpoint of historical *(p. 417)* criticism, we refer them to Benedict XIV's treatment of the subject[13], until the course of this work brings us to examine the value of that criticism. As for the style of these accounts, variations admittedly occur because some old ones were thought worth retaining; most, however, are written with both elegance and conformity to liturgical style. Among the latter we would especially mention those of the holy Doctors, usually attributable to Sirlet and Poggio.

[margin: The rubrics retained almost without change.]

Some corrections could be made to the breviary's rubrics, but on the whole they remained as they were. In Chapter XIII we set out the Church's principles on this matter and showed how greatly they differ from Quignonez's maxims.

[margin: Nothing more consonant with antiquity than the reformed breviary, according even to Doctor Grancolas.]

Such was the reformed breviary. Its responsories, antiphons, and other formulas not discussed here in detail likewise conformed to the ancient Gregorian books, especially the Antiphonary or Responsorial published by Blessed Tommasi. Nothing purer or more consonant with antiquity could therefore be seen. This leads Doctor Grancolas, despite his prejudices, to say: "If in the ninth century the Roman breviary deserved such applause and preference over those of all other churches, it appeared with greater splendor after Pope Pius V had it revised. Indeed, since then all particular churches may be said to have adopted it so thoroughly that those which did not take it under the name Roman Breviary inserted almost all of it into their own, accommodating it to their rite[14]." In this last respect, admittedly, things have changed somewhat in *(p. 418)* France since 1727, when Grancolas was writing his book.

[margin: Saint Pius V issues the bull Quod a nobis promulgating the breviary.]

When everything was finished, Saint Pius V issued the bull promulgating the breviary. It begins with the words Quod a nobis. Here is its translation.

"Pius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, for a perpetual memorial.

[margin: Reasons making breviary reform necessary.]

"As Our pastoral office requires, We devote Our care to ensuring that all carry out the decrees of the sacred Council of Trent, as far as can be done with God's help. We recognize the need for still greater effort when

the practices to be introduced concern above all God's glory and the duty owed by ecclesiastical persons. Foremost among such matters We count the sacred prayers, praises, and thanksgivings owed to God which the Roman Breviary contains. This form of the Divine Office, once piously and wisely established by the Supreme Pontiffs, especially Gelasius I and Gregory I, and reformed by Gregory VII, had with time departed from its ancient institution. It therefore seemed necessary to restore it to conformity with the original rule of prayer. Some had disfigured the old Breviary's excellent arrangement by mutilating it in many places; others by altering it with uncertain and extraneous material. Many, attracted by the appearance of a more convenient Office, took refuge in the brevity of the new Breviary composed by Francis Quignonez, cardinal-priest of the title of Holy Cross in Jerusalem. Moreover, that corrupt custom had gradually crept into the provinces whereby bishops, in churches which from the beginning had shared with the others the old Roman practice of saying and chanting the canonical Hours, each compiled a private breviary, and by Offices utterly unlike one another and peculiar, so to speak, *(p. 419)* to each bishopric, rent that communion of offering prayers and praises to the one God in one and the same form. Hence the disturbance of divine worship in so many places; hence the clergy's utter ignorance of ecclesiastical ceremonies and rites, so that innumerable ministers of churches performed their duties unbecomingly, to the great offense of the devout.

[margin: Breviary revision, begun by Paul IV and then entrusted to Trent, was referred by that assembly to the Supreme Pontiff.]

"Paul IV, of happy memory, deeply distressed by this diversity of prayer, resolved to correct it. Having provided that no further permission for the new Breviary should be granted, he undertook to restore the whole manner of saying and chanting the canonical Hours to its ancient custom and institution.

"But he died before completing what he had so excellently begun. When Pius IV, of pious memory, reconvened the Council of Trent after its various interruptions, the Fathers, in the salutary reform established by that council, considered restoring the Breviary according to Pope Paul's plan. Everything he had collected and prepared for this sacred work was therefore sent by the aforesaid Pope Pius to the council Fathers at Trent. There the council charged certain learned and devout men to add care for the Breviary to their other concerns. As the council's conclusion approached, its decree referred the whole matter to the Roman Pontiff's authority and judgment. Summoning to Rome the very Fathers chosen for this task, and adding suitable men from the City to their number, he desired the work to be completed.

"But when he too had gone the way of *(p. 420)* all flesh, We, raised by divine clemency's disposition, though undeserving, to the summit of the Apostolate, pressed this sacred work forward with the help of further experts. By God's great kindness toward Us—for so We understand it—We saw this Roman Breviary completed. More than once We learned its method of arrangement from those charged with the task. We understood that in preparing it they had not departed from the ancient breviaries of Rome's distinguished churches and Our Vatican Library, had also followed several weighty writers on this subject, and finally, while removing extraneous and uncertain material, had omitted nothing of the ancient Divine Office's proper substance. We approved the work and ordered it printed at Rome and, once printed, disseminated.

[margin: Saint Pius V personally supervised this great undertaking.]

[margin: Abolition of Quignonez's breviary and all other breviaries without two hundred years' lawful possession.]

"Therefore, that this divine work may achieve its effect in practice, by the authority of these presents We first suppress and abolish the new Breviary issued by the aforesaid Cardinal Francis and permitted by this See in any church, monastery, convent, order, military order, or place of men or women, even exempt, whether from its first foundation or otherwise.

"We also abolish all other breviaries, whether older, protected by any privilege whatsoever, or circulated by bishops in their dioceses. We forbid every use of them in all the world's churches, monasteries, convents, military orders, orders, and places of men or women, even exempt, where the Divine Office is otherwise customarily or obligatorily said according to the Roman Church's rite, except those whose use of other

established breviaries is shown to derive from a first *(p. 421)* foundation approved by the Apostolic See, or from a custom, where that custom or the foundation itself goes back more than two hundred years. While We do not take away their ancient right to say and chant their own Office, We permit them, should they prefer this Breviary of Ours now published, to say and chant it in choir, provided the bishop and the entire chapter consent.

[margin: All churches, without exception, may use the new breviary if the bishop and chapter consent.]

[margin: Revocation of contrary permissions, customs, and statutes.]

"We entirely revoke all apostolic and other permissions, customs, and statutes, even secured by oath, apostolic confirmation, or other guarantee; also privileges, licenses, and indults to pray and chant, in choir or outside it, according to the custom and rite of the breviaries thus suppressed. This applies to grants, approvals, and renewals, for any reason, to the aforesaid churches, monasteries, convents, military orders, orders, and places; to the Holy Roman Church's cardinals, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, abbots, and other prelates of churches; and to all other ecclesiastical persons, secular and regular, of either sex. Whatever their wording, decrees, or reinforcing clauses, We will that all these henceforth have no force or effect.

[margin: The Roman breviary's form of Office prescribed everywhere, in choir and outside it, under the penalties of canonical law.]

"Having thus forbidden everyone any other usage, We command that this Breviary of Ours and form of prayer and chant be observed in all the world's churches, monasteries, orders, and places, even exempt, where the Office must or customarily does follow the aforesaid Roman Church's custom and rite, saving the foundation or custom exceeding the aforesaid two hundred years. We decree that this Breviary is never to be changed, wholly or partly, or anything added to it or removed from it; and that all who, by law or custom, must say or chant *(p. 422)* the canonical Hours according to that Church's custom and rite are henceforth bound in perpetuity to say and chant those Hours, day and night, according to this Roman Breviary's prescription and arrangement, under the penalties established by canonical sanctions for those who do not say the Divine Office daily. None upon whom this duty of saying and chanting is necessarily imposed can fulfill it except by this form alone.

"We therefore command every patriarch, archbishop, bishop, abbot, and other prelate of churches to introduce this Breviary in his aforesaid churches, monasteries, convents, orders, military orders, dioceses, and places, abandoning all the others thus suppressed and abolished, even those privately established by themselves. They, and all other priests and clerics, secular and regular, of either sex, as well as members of military orders and exempt persons, upon whom the duty of saying and chanting the Office is in any way imposed as aforesaid, are to see that they say and chant according to this Breviary's form, in choir and outside it[15]."

[margin: Saint Pius V removes the obligation of the Offices of the Blessed Virgin and the Dead, the Penitential and Gradual Psalms; indulgences for devotional recitation.]

[margin: Deadlines for adopting the new]

[margin: breviary.]

The holy Pontiff next declares the obligation extinguished of reciting on certain days the Offices of the Blessed Virgin and the Dead, the Penitential Psalms, and the Gradual Psalms. His aim is to give the clergy greater zeal for reciting the reformed breviary, and he proclaims indulgences for those who henceforth devoutly continue these practices. He announces that the obligation to follow the reformed breviary will take full effect after one month for those present at the Roman court; after three months for those outside Rome but on this side of the mountains; and after six months for those *(p. 423)* beyond them, at least as soon as they can obtain a copy. Finally, to preserve this breviary in all its purity, it is stated that it may nowhere be printed without permission from the Apostolic See or its delegated commissary. The rest of the bull contains the ordinary chancery clauses and ends with these words:

"Given at Rome, at Saint Peter's, in the year of the Lord's Incarnation 1568, on the seventh day before the Ides of July, in the third year of Our Pontificate."

[margin: Judiciousness and effectiveness of the breviary reform.]

Such was the first act of liturgical reform at Rome. We shall soon recount how Saint Pius V's measures were applied in the West's various churches. The reader has doubtless noticed the bull's clauses. It abolishes Quignonez's breviary generally and establishes everywhere the form of Office contained in the Roman Breviary, without binding churches possessing a particular breviary for two hundred years. It nevertheless leaves them free to adopt the new breviary after certain formalities. Rome could have applied no remedy at once more effective and more judicious to the great evil of liturgical anarchy. We shall show how all the Western churches understood this and made it their duty to enter into the intentions of the Roman Pontiff and Trent.

[margin: Promulgation of the missal by Quo primum tempore in 1570.]

An equally important part of the reformed Liturgy still awaited publication: the breviary could not be useful without a similarly revised missal conforming to it. The Roman commission had attended to both simultaneously. Two years after the breviary's publication, in 1570, Saint Pius V could promulgate the new missal. It was accompanied by the following constitution, beginning Quo primum tempore.

"Pius, bishop, servant of the servants of God, for a perpetual memorial.

(p. 424)

[margin: After revising the breviary as Trent desired, the Pope had to revise the missal, for one rite of Mass and one manner of psalmody.]

"From the time We were raised to the summit of the Apostolate, We gladly applied Our mind and strength, directing all Our thoughts to preserving the purity of ecclesiastical worship. With every effort, and with God's own help, We strove to prepare and accomplish what served that end. Among the other decrees of the sacred Council of Trent, We had to determine the publication and revision of the sacred books, catechism, missal, and breviary. With God's favor, We had already published the catechism for the people's instruction and revised the breviary for rendering God His due praises. It now seemed altogether necessary to consider without delay what remained in this matter: publishing the missal so that it might correspond to the breviary, as is fitting and proper (since it is most fitting that God's Church have one manner of psalmody and one rite for celebrating Mass).

[margin: Method used in carrying out this work.]

"We therefore judged that this task should be entrusted to chosen learned men. They diligently collated everything with the oldest codices of Our Vatican library and with other corrected, uncorrupted codices gathered from every quarter. They also consulted the writings of ancient, approved authors who left records of the sacred ordering of these rites. Thus they restored the missal itself to the ancient norm and rite of the holy Fathers. After its review and revision with mature consideration, We ordered it printed and published at Rome as soon as possible, so that all might reap the fruits of this undertaking and labor: that priests might understand what prayers to use and what rites and ceremonies they must henceforth retain in celebrating Masses. So that *(p. 425)* everyone everywhere may embrace and observe what the holy Roman Church, mother and teacher of the other Churches, has handed down, We ordain that henceforth, for all future time in perpetuity, Mass shall not be sung or recited otherwise than according to Our published missal in the following churches or chapels throughout the Christian world: patriarchal, cathedral, collegiate, and parochial; secular or regular, of any order or monastery of men or women, even military orders, including those without cure of souls, where conventual Mass is customarily or obligatorily celebrated aloud with a choir, or in a low voice, according to the Roman Church's rite. This applies even if those churches, however exempt, possess an Apostolic See indult, custom, privilege, oath, apostolic confirmation, or any other

faculties. An exception is made where another manner of celebrating Mass has been continuously observed from the first foundation approved by the Apostolic See, or from a custom, that custom or foundation being more than two hundred years old. We in no way remove that established manner or custom of celebrating. Yet if they prefer this missal We have now published, We permit them, with the consent of the bishop or prelate and the entire chapter, to celebrate Masses according to it, notwithstanding anything to the contrary. In all the other aforesaid churches, We remove the use of their missals, rejecting them wholly and entirely.

[margin: Mass to follow this missal in all churches without a particular usage kept for at least two hundred years by original foundation or lawful possession.]

[margin: Nothing in the missal to be changed.]

"By this constitution of Ours, to remain in force perpetually, We establish and ordain, under pain of Our displeasure, that nothing is ever to be added to, taken from, or changed in this newly published missal of Ours. We command and strictly enjoin each and every patriarch and administrator of the aforesaid churches, and all other persons of any ecclesiastical *(p. 426)* dignity—even cardinals of the holy Roman Church, or those of any other rank or preeminence—by virtue of holy obedience, to sing and read Mass according to the rite, manner, and norm We now prescribe through this missal. Henceforth they must wholly omit and utterly reject all other manners and rites hitherto customarily observed from other missals, however ancient. They must not presume to add other ceremonies or recite other prayers in celebrating Mass than those contained in this missal. By apostolic authority and the tenor of these presents, We also grant and permit in perpetuity that they may henceforth follow this very missal entirely in singing or reciting Mass in any churches whatsoever, without any scruple of conscience or incurring any penalties, sentences, or censures, and may freely and lawfully use it. Nor shall prelates, administrators, canons, chaplains, or other priests, however designated, secular or regular of any order, be bound to celebrate Mass otherwise than We have established, or be forced or compelled by anyone to change this missal[16]."

[margin: Full freedom to use this missal in any church whatsoever.]

The rest of the bull concerns the manner of promulgation, the same as for the breviary, and the precautions to observe in printing. After the usual chancery formulas, we read these words:

"Given at Rome, at Saint Peter's, in the year of the Lord's Incarnation one thousand five hundred and seventy, the day before the Ides of July, in the fifth year of Our pontificate."

[margin: Joy at the appearance of the reformed breviary and missal.]

The appearance of a reformed breviary and missal caused great joy throughout the Church. Complaints about the disorder that had prevailed in the Liturgy had been heard everywhere; here was seen an effective *(p. 427)* remedy. Saint Pius V's missal drew exclusively from antiquity's purest sources. His breviary, freed of all needless accretions, admittedly no longer flattered diocesan or national pride; yet almost everything in it was also found in local breviaries. Dioceses covered by the bull's exception could still choose either to adopt the reformed breviary outright or to revise their own—a very easy task—with this excellent model. By suppressing Quignonez's breviary in perpetuity, Saint Pius V had destroyed the influence it might exercise through its greater brevity. For churches covered by the exception, the question thus became which course to take: adopt the reformed breviary outright, printing a separate supplementary Proper containing those precious local traditions of which Rome was never the enemy; or reprint the breviary under its diocesan title, combining the local rite's distinctive features with the entire reformed breviary in a single compilation. The whole question therefore came down more or less to how much could be spent on printing. Greater economy alone led many dioceses to adopt the Roman books outright.

[margin: Freedom the Holy See left churches regarding adoption of this Liturgy.]

[margin: Alone among Rome's churches, the Vatican basilica adopts the new books with modifications.]

All Rome immediately adopted the new books. The Lateran basilica itself hastened to introduce a breviary that was no longer merely that of the papal chapel, or of the Friars Minor, but the breviary of the Catholic Church. The Vatican basilica—which, according to Abelard, had cared less about ancient usages in the twelfth century than the Lateran church—alone adopted the new breviary with a modification. It was confirmed *(p. 428)* in its right to keep using the ancient Italic psalter. Otherwise its breviary is simply the current Roman one, with the Offices of holy popes and other saints whose bodies rest in the basilica or its treasury.

[margin: The various religious orders in relation to Saint Pius V's reform.]

Speaking of Rome, it is natural to discuss the religious orders whose common homeland it is. The monastic orders, covered by the exception not merely for two centuries but for nearly a thousand years, kept the ancient form of their Office. The mendicant orders, except the Dominicans and Carmelites, who kept their Romano-Parisian breviary, revised their books according to Saint Pius V's Office. This was simply the purified breviary of the Friars Minor; the latter, however, continued to incorporate their Proper into it. The orders of clerks regular followed the new books without exception. The Theatines had powerfully influenced this reform. The Jesuits, by their great patriarch's will, were always to keep the form of Office observed by the Roman Church. Other religious families of the same kind were led to imitate them by the very nature of their constitution as cosmopolitan bodies. Finally, the orders of canons regular everywhere soon embraced the reformed Liturgy, except the Premonstratensians, whose Office, as we have said, mixed Roman and Parisian elements. Nuns generally followed the books proper to the various monastic or other orders to which they were attached. Those whose institutes stood alone adopted Saint Pius V's breviary, never varying thereafter.

[margin: Saint Charles Borromeo safeguards his Church's prerogatives and the Holy See's rights at Milan.]

The Church of Milan was then governed by Saint Charles Borromeo. We have already seen this illustrious cardinal's great zeal in maintaining the venerable Ambrosian Liturgy. He showed no less exact obedience to the Supreme Pontiff's wishes by securing the *(p. 429)* introduction of Saint Pius V's books into all churches of his city, diocese, and metropolitan province bound by law or custom to follow the Roman Office. His life shows how uprightly he safeguarded both his Church's prerogatives and the Apostolic See's rights. His province's bishops were eager to imitate him. At the second Council of Milan, held in 1569, we find a decree in which the prelates of the province's sixteen churches expressly declare that clerics must recite the canonical Hours in the form of Saint Pius V's published Roman Breviary, on pain of failing to fulfill the divine Office's precept—unless they belong to churches whose ancient custom places them under the bull's exception[17]. The holy archbishop himself issued an edition of the Ambrosian missal in 1570 and of the breviary in 1588. These have been faithfully reproduced down to our day, with no changes beyond revising some hymns and adding a number of saints' feasts.

[margin: Saint Pius V's work consists in simple corrections, rather than introducing an unknown, new Liturgy.]

Concerning the province of Milan, we shall make an observation for which occasion will arise more than once again. Its purpose is to show from the facts themselves that the Liturgy published by Saint Pius V was *(p. 430)* no new Liturgy, but simply a restoration and revision of the ancient Roman Liturgy already established throughout the West. A canon of the sixth Council of Milan, speaking of choir books, urges the bishops to ensure their revision according to the newly published breviary[18]. Saint Pius V had therefore made simple changes, mere modifications; he had introduced no unknown Liturgy. Unity of worship had thus always existed, despite the errors that had crept into ecclesiastical books.

[margin: Milan alone had a Liturgy of its own.]

The Church of Milan alone, not only in Italy but in the West, had a Liturgy of its own, apart from the few Spanish churches where the Mozarabic Liturgy survived by privilege. All the churches covered by Saint Pius V's bull's exception had simply mixed the Roman Liturgy with some local usages and given the resulting

whole a particular Church's title. This observation applies even to the Church of Aquileia's rite, the most venerable of Italy's mixed rites in the sixteenth century. It was known as the Patriarchine Rite, a name derived from the dignity of the Church of Aquileia, which used it in divine offices.

[margin: How Aquileia's Patriarchine Rite died out after the introduction of Saint Pius V's books.]

Soon after publication of Saint Pius V's bull, the patriarchal church, lacking breviaries of its rite and somewhat reluctant to incur the cost of reprinting them, asked the Holy See's permission to use the Roman breviary outside choir only until the Patriarchine breviary could conveniently be reprinted. The Roman Congregation, *(p. 431)* consulted on this matter, granted the necessary dispensation in the most honorable terms.

In a letter addressed on September 10, 1589, to Paul Bisanti, the patriarch's suffragan, it says: "It is a holy and fitting thing to preserve that Church's rite, so ancient and approved, and for all to conform to it in the Office. The chapter shall therefore procure breviaries of that rite. This it can conveniently do, since it was recently printed at Como. If this cannot be done otherwise, let His Lordship the Patriarch arrange for it to be printed at his own expense within two years. Meanwhile, it shall be lawful to say the Roman Office, but outside choir only[19]."

This printing of the Patriarchine breviary, however, did not take place. Once introduced at Aquileia, Saint Pius V's books took such deep root that ten years later no trace of the old rite remained, even in the patriarchal church. Finally, in 1596, this liturgical revolution having been accomplished, Patriarch Francis Barbaro took express measures at a provincial council held at Udine to establish the pure Roman Liturgy permanently in all the patriarchate's churches[20].

[margin: Como follows this rite until Clement VIII's pontificate.]

The Church of Como, under Aquileia's patriarchal jurisdiction although situated in the duchy of Milan, kept Aquileia's rite until the pontificate of Clement VIII. He obliged it to adopt the Roman rite, judging it unfitting for a Church enclosed within the Milanese territory to follow an alien Office already abolished *(p. 432)* even in the places where it had originated[21]. As early as 1579, Como's diocesan synod had declared that clerics unable to obtain the diocesan books could use Saint Pius V's breviary and missal. The records still survive of an apostolic visitation made to this diocese that same year by John Francis Bonomo, bishop of Vercelli, commissioned by Gregory XIII. The prelate expressly recognizes Como's right to keep its particular rite, though he exhorts the canons to abandon their old rite for the Roman one.

Of the Patriarchine missals he says that they are very few and in manuscript, that they differ in almost no other respect from the Roman missal[22]. He concludes that it will therefore be very easy to pass to the exclusive use of Saint Pius V's books.

Father Lebrun, from whom we borrow these details, says that Como cathedral's archives preserve a manuscript of Aquileia's breviary entitled Breviarium Patriarchinum nuncupatum secundum usum Ecclesiæ Comensis correctum, et auctoritate Apostolica probatum [The so-called Patriarchine Breviary, revised according to the use of the Church of Como and approved by apostolic authority]. At the volume's end is Cardinal Sirlet's attestation, dated October 21, 1583, certifying Gregory XIII's approval of this breviary. We have just explained why Clement VIII judged it proper to abolish it.

[margin: Gentleness of Rome's measures in applying the ordinances for]

[margin: liturgical reform.]

This history of the destruction of Aquileia's ancient rite allows us to observe how gently, indeed how favorably, Rome treated ancient *(p. 433)* usages in applying the ordinances for liturgical reform. It would be vain to view the matter from another standpoint and set the sixteenth-century Popes' indulgence against Saint Hadrian I's and Saint Gregory VII's vigorous ordinances establishing the Roman rite throughout the West.

Everything is explained once we recognize that these two great Popes' work had not ceased to exist. Apart from variations introduced by certain local usages and errors that advancing criticism was sooner or later to remove, the whole West praised God in one and the same Liturgy. Rome's keen desire was undoubtedly to see every nation completely united with her in public prayer. Yet Saint Pius V's bulls had already won over almost all the Churches, and each year saw others join the first in the unity of one breviary and one missal.

[margin: This conduct agreed with Saint Hadrian I's and Saint Gregory VII's vigorous establishment of the Roman rite in France and Spain.]

[margin: All Italy, except Ambrosian territory, adopts Saint Pius V's books before the sixteenth century's end.]

All Italy, indeed, successively conformed to the Holy See's intentions. Sicily's churches, for example, which had a particular breviary, yielded early. By the sixteenth century's end, throughout the peninsula outside Ambrosian territory, all churches were united in the most exact observance of Saint Pius V's promulgated liturgical usages. Yet the greatest freedom had been given to all whose breviaries and missals were more than two hundred years old when the bull appeared. The rights of cathedrals, and even of collegiate and other churches with comparable possession, had been recognized[23]. None of this prevented the principle *(p. 434)* of unity from extending its applications. After all, it was just that all Italy, a land of obedience, including its neighboring islands, should first and most fully exemplify complete conformity not only to the Apostolic See's laws but even to its mere wishes. There lies Italy's strength, her only life: may she always understand it!

[margin: Spain and all its New World dominions sacrifice their particular usages to accept the Roman reform at Philip II's urging.]

The Spanish peninsula too submitted early in absolute obedience to Saint Pius V's bulls. Not that the Catholic kingdom's prelates had then lost every trace of that rebellious spirit we have seen in the historian Rodrigo of Toledo. Their boldness at Trent had caused astonishment, and was certainly no less than that of our most daring prelates. Yet love of unity and zeal for the faith still took precedence in their eyes over national susceptibilities. The bishop of Lérida's motion at the council had not prevented the Fathers from entrusting liturgical revision wholly to the Roman Pontiff. Nor did opposition from some Spanish cathedrals stop the uniform establishment of Saint Pius V's breviary and missal. Perhaps we should regret the complete loss of some particular breviaries, those of Toledo and Seville, for example. It would have been interesting to see how remnants of the ancient Gothic rite sometimes still blended with the Roman forms imposed by Saint Gregory VII. Philip II's powerful will weighed with its full force in the adoption of the reformed Roman usages. This prince has been harshly judged; yet no impartial man can deny him ardent, conscientious zeal for the Catholic faith. Through him the new books were not only *(p. 435)* introduced into Spain, but spread into the vast colonies attached to that powerful mother country.

[margin: Respecting the Church's freedom, Philip II humbly asks Saint Pius V to be named in the Canon after the Pope and bishop throughout his dominions.]

In accordance with the maxims of Catholic public law, Saint Pius V had not judged it proper to place the prayer for the king in the Canon of the Mass. It belonged to the Apostolic See to determine which princes in communion with it were truly invested with the right to command Christians. Spain's king, despite his title of Catholic King, had not been excepted. Philip II, that proud monarch, did not disdain to petition Saint Pius V for the insertion of the words "for our king" (Pro rege nostro) after the prayer for the Pope and bishop in missals intended for Spain's churches. The Pontiff granted his request[24]. Remembering Philip II's colossal power, we must acknowledge that on this occasion he offered one of the greatest examples of respect for religious freedom ever given by a sovereign. If we added that, absolute tyrant though he was, Philip II willingly allowed his theologians to teach and preach the doctrine that sovereign power can be forfeited—the Supreme Pontiff's and the Church's right to correct and even depose princes who abuse their authority—perhaps that observation alone would enable some sensible people to understand that, although cursed by Reformation writers and by self-styled wits among eighteenth-century historians, the Demon of the

South was not entirely devoid of the morality and disinterestedness peoples desire, but do not always hope to find, in their sovereigns.

A few pages hence, we shall see another government *(p. 436)* in a similar situation. Then we shall judge which, the French or the Spanish, better understood religious freedom in the sixteenth century.

[margin: The Holy See also permits petitions for all the Catholic kingdom's needs to be added to the Mass prayers.]

Philip also obtained the Holy See's permission for all priests in his dominions to append to the Mass prayers, even on the greatest solemnities, a series of petitions found in Spanish missals. They express all the Catholic kingdom's needs with vigor and simplicity. This concession, unique in the annals of the Liturgy, also proves Rome's great love for a Church that long remained so firmly faithful to her[25].

[margin: Many Offices proper to Spain granted.]

Finally, at the head of the Proper of Saints published as a supplement to the Roman Breviary for Spain's churches, there is a brief of Gregory XIII. It grants those churches permission to celebrate the feasts of many saints dear to Spain, as compensation for the general extinction of all that country's diocesan breviaries. Dated December 30, 1573, the brief was issued at Philip II's request. The collection to which it serves as a preface contains the noble, patriotic Office of Saint James, the Catholic kingdom's patron, and the no less interesting Office of the Triumph of the Holy Cross, on July 16, anniversary of the famous victory of Las Navas de Tolosa.

[margin: Portugal, then]

[margin: subject to Philip II, adopts the reformed Liturgy and introduces it into its colonies.]

Portugal introduced, with the same fidelity as Spain, *(p. 437)* the books of the reformed Liturgy, and immediately brought them into its colonies in the East and West Indies. Philip II's will then resounded throughout the peninsula. Yet we can identify at least one exception to acceptance of the purely Roman breviary. Zaccaria notes a breviary bearing Braga's diocesan title, dated 1634, in that Church whose see the famous Dom Bartholomew of the Martyrs occupied at the time of Trent. We do not know whether Saint Pius V's books have since been introduced there. We even have reason to doubt it, knowing with certainty that several places in Portugal still retain, even at Mass, usages wholly distinct from the Roman missal's. Nevertheless, if this Braga breviary still exists, it can only be the Roman one with some particular features and a Proper incorporated under the same title.

[margin: The Church of Braga keeps its diocesan usages.]

[margin: France's liturgical anarchy is recent; Saint Pius V's bull was implemented here, often at the cost of venerable, lawful usages.]

Turning now to France, the Western country whose present liturgical usages differ most from Rome's, we must examine whether this difference is ancient and predates Saint Pius V's bull. Unfortunately, what we must say of this Church contrasts with our account of all the others. When the bull was published, France's churches had a Liturgy formed from the Roman Liturgy introduced by Charlemagne and the particular usages they had added to it. This whole brought them honor in all Europe's eyes, and the bull's terms allowed them lawfully to preserve it. Yet today those same churches contain nothing recalling that ancient glory of our country. Still less do we find the Roman books of Saint Pius V's reform. Would the Church of France, returning *(p. 438)* to her cradle, have dared, despite Charlemagne's prohibition and that of Popes Stephen and Hadrian, to restore the ancient Gallican Liturgy of men like Hilary and Gregory of Tours? Alas, no! What is sung in our churches today bears even less relation to the Gallican rite—of which we have spoken honorably elsewhere—than that rite would bear to the Roman Liturgy itself. Everything came from the brains of certain men, some of whom are still alive. Before recounting this lamentable history, in which we shall see every principle the Church had accepted in liturgical matters in all preceding centuries trampled underfoot, we have a very different picture to offer our readers: the Church of France working with the

Apostolic See to consolidate liturgical unity within herself. We must answer with weighty, incontestable facts those who have dared maintain that Saint Pius V's bull had not been received in France.

[margin: Paris University maintains vigorous liturgical orthodoxy, rejects innovators' assertions about Saint Magdalene and Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, and denounces innovations in Soissons's breviary in 1529.]

First we shall remind our readers of the University of Paris's vigorous orthodoxy in liturgical doctrine when it censured Quignonez's breviary. It had already shown similar zeal in branding Lefèvre d'Étaples's bold assertions about Saint Mary Magdalene and Erasmus's about Saint Dionysius the Areopagite—questions of the highest importance to liturgical tradition. It also watched over the various editions of diocesan breviaries, vigorously denouncing every attempted innovation by which restless minds might seek to alter the deposit of the ancient Liturgy. Thus in 1529 it denounced to Soissons cathedral's chapter the innovations slipped into a new edition of that Church's breviary.

The Sorbonne says: "From examining these breviaries we have established with certainty that they contain many *(p. 439)* extraneous things alien to the Church's common usage. This can readily bring an odious and pernicious schism into the Gallican Church unless promptly remedied. Were this to happen, your otherwise glorious name would be branded with a stain that many centuries could scarcely efface. It is therefore your task to resist so great an evil before it spreads further[26]."

[margin: Censure of an Orléans breviary edition in 1548.]

The doctors express their principles concerning the Liturgy's inviolability more precisely in a formal censure, dated 1548, of an edition of the Orléans breviary. Among their characteristic criticisms of this book are these:

"In addition, many Matins readings are removed from saints' feasts, wholly or in part, so that nine-reading feasts sometimes become three-reading feasts, and three-reading feasts become simple commemorations. Even where this change is not made, some Matins readings are generally removed from the feasts themselves or their octaves. They are removed, I say, sometimes wholly, sometimes by cuts, now at a reading's beginning. Thus the word "Blessed" or "Most Blessed" (Beatus, Beatissimus) is cut out, though it used to precede saints' proper names at the beginning of their historical accounts, to God's praise and their own. Cuts are sometimes made in the middle, sometimes at the end. In these and many other places some miracles of the saints are removed, sometimes merits of works, sometimes invocations of saints, as can be seen from the second folio of the winter part to the second, and in many other places. Certain things are also struck out which seemed particularly apt to confirm belief in the sacrament of the Eucharist, as is clear from the histories of the blessed Gregory, Benedict, Ambrose, and Mary of Egypt. Many other things most conducive to Christ's true religion have been removed: fasts, mortification of the flesh, foundations of holy churches and their endowments. This is evident in the feasts of Saints Anthony, Louis, Genevieve, and many others. If any saints had proper hymns, proper antiphons, or other suffrages in their festal Offices, these are generally cut away and reference to the Common prescribed. The same is sometimes done in the readings. This can be observed not only in other feasts but even in those *(p. 440)* proper to the Church of Orléans. Hence we must fear that Christians' devotion to the saints—more deeply stirred when they read or heard recounted those saints' particular merits and virtues—may at last diminish or wholly perish. Thus so many great changes and omissions have been made, especially of things conducive to building up faith and morals and destroying the heresies flourishing in this our truly lamentable age. This new alteration of the aforesaid Breviary seems imprudent, rash, and scandalous, and not free of suspicion of favoring heretics[27]."

[margin: France's councils acknowledge the duty to submit to Saint Pius V's bull and proclaim the reformed books' superiority to those of the kingdom.]

Such was the University of Paris's sixteenth-century opinion of liturgical innovations. The whole Church of France held the same principles when the reformed breviary and missal appeared. She immediately recognized these books' superiority to those used in the kingdom. Since she then still had the right to

assemble in provincial councils, these holy gatherings, while firmly demanding execution of the sacred Council of Trent's decrees, proclaimed the necessity of submitting to Saint Pius V's bull.

[margin: Rouen's council of 1581 orders all bishops of the province to revise their liturgical books according to Pius V's constitutions.]

The first was held at Rouen in 1581 by Archbishop Charles de Bourbon, attended by the bishops of Bayeux, Séez, Évreux, and Lisieux, and the representatives of the chapters of Avranches and Coutances, among others. In chapter two, De cultu divino in genere [On divine worship in general], the council urges the bishops to examine breviaries, missals, manuals, and other ecclesiastical books most carefully, lest they contain anything contrary to Catholic doctrine or the saints' true histories, anything akin to sorcery, or anything departing from ecclesiastical discipline and holiness of conduct. The bishops are to arrange the printing and revision *(p. 441)* of the liturgical books according to diocesan usage, yet in accordance with the constitutions of Pius V, of holy memory, concerning the Roman breviary and missal, restored and published by decree of the sacred Council of Trent. The council then recalls the Holy See's prohibition of any further use of Quignonez's breviary, etc.[28].

[margin: Study of Norman breviaries of this period shows the bishops' fidelity to this injunction.]

Here we see that, although the bishops do not adopt the Roman books outright, they only confirm more explicitly the obligation to submit to the bulls promulgating them: they require reprinted diocesan usages to apply the form of Office published by those bulls. This is evident in the rare surviving copies of Norman breviaries printed at the sixteenth century's end and during the seventeenth. We have handled those of Bayeux, Lisieux, Évreux, and Avranches. Their titles read Breviarium Bajocense, Lexoviense, etc. [Breviary of Bayeux, of Lisieux, etc.]; ad Romani formam [in the form of the Roman Breviary] or ex decreto concilii Tridentini [by decree of the Council of Trent]. Apart from each diocese's particular saints, the responsory at First Vespers, the ninth Matins responsory, the priestly versicle, and other features mostly enumerated in chapter X, they *(p. 442)* are entirely in conformity with the current Roman Breviary. We can therefore say that liturgical unity was restored in the sixteenth century in the ecclesiastical province of Rouen. Let us pass to that of Reims.

[margin: The council of Reims in 1583 proclaims the obligation to correct liturgical books according to the Roman Church's use.]

This metropolitan see's council was held at Reims itself in 1583 by Archbishop Louis, Cardinal de Guise. The assembly included the bishops of Soissons, Laon, Beauvais, Châlons-sur-Marne, Noyon, and Amiens, and the procurators of the bishops and chapters of Boulogne and Senlis. In the chapter De breviario, missali et agendis [On the breviary, missal, and ritual books], the Fathers decree:

"Furthermore, since all rites and forms of prayer are contained in the breviary, missal, and ritual books or manual, we exhort our province's bishops, with at least two canons, one chosen by the bishop and the other by the chapter, diligently to inspect and examine these books and similar ones, such as books of Hours, lest they contain anything contrary to Catholic doctrine and the true histories of the saints, akin to superstitions, or in any way undermining ecclesiastical discipline and upright morals. Where they find breviaries or missals ill-arranged and less consonant with piety, let them see that these are reformed and published as soon as possible and in the closest possible conformity to the Roman Church's use, in accordance with Pius V's constitution, at the diocese's expense[29]."

The obligation to observe this constitution is recalled again in an express regulation entitled De Cultu divino [On divine worship].

[margin: Faithful obedience]

[margin: of the province's Churches.]

The books of Reims's province dating from before the *(p. 443)* eighteenth century attest how faithfully this regulation was observed. Examples are those of Amiens and Noyon. They bear at their beginning the clause we noted in the Norman books, and substantiate it by their agreement with Saint Pius V's books.

[margin: The council of Bordeaux in 1583 decrees outright adoption of the Roman books.]

In that same year, 1583, we find the council of Bordeaux, held by Archbishop Antoine Prévost de Sansac, attended by the bishops of Agen, Angoulême, Poitiers, Saintes, Sarlat, and Bazas, although the last belonged to Auch's province. It decreed outright adoption of Saint Pius V's breviary and missal because diocesan books were very scarce and correcting and reprinting them would take too long and be too difficult. The council orders their exclusive use, publicly and privately, to be established everywhere before the First Sunday of Advent of that same year, 1583[30].

(p. 444)

[margin: Economy often determines adoption of the Roman books. The bishops of Tours's province, assembled in 1583, proclaim the obligation in France to obey Saint Pius V's liturgical constitutions.]

This clearly went further than the councils of Rouen and Reims, which had at least preserved the diocesan titles of breviaries and missals. In many places, however, trouble and expense alone were to bring about outright introduction of the Roman books, as we have already seen for the Church of Aquileia.

The provincial council of Tours was also held in 1583, presided over by Simon de Maillé, archbishop of Tours. Present were the bishops of Angers, Nantes, Saint-Pol de Léon, Saint-Brieuc, Rennes, Quimper, Dol, and Vannes; the procurators of the bishops of Le Mans and Saint-Malo; and those of Tréguier's chapter, its see being vacant. The Fathers also addressed liturgical reform. Unity in this matter was as precious to them as it could have been to the bishops of the council of Vannes in 461, discussed in chapter VI. Yet this was no longer unity confined to an ecclesiastical province's boundaries. It was the vast, Catholic unity that the Roman Pontiffs had since established, with so much care, in the whole West's Liturgy. The bishops at Tours have no doubt that Saint Pius V's constitution must be observed everywhere, although nowhere up to that point is there the slightest trace of this bull's promulgation in France, still less of its acceptance, whether in council or otherwise. We shall even soon see the Crown's law officers attacking this constitution's authority in several places and opposing measures for its application.

The bishops at Tours therefore declare the ordinaries' obligation to see that missals, breviaries, graduals, and other books necessary for divine worship, of which almost all Churches are deprived, are accurately amended according to the *(p. 445)* norm prescribed by the Apostolic See and the constitution of Pius V, of holy memory, and are printed within a year at the expense of those bound to bear it by the province's custom[31].

[margin: All Brittany adopts the Roman usages.]

[margin: Tours, Le Mans, and Angers correct their diocesan books ad Romani formam [in the Roman form].]

The dioceses of Tours's province executed this decree differently. All Brittany, a land of obedience, embraced the Roman books, retaining of its ancient usages only a Proper of Saints for each diocese. The Churches of Tours, Le Mans, and Angers reprinted their missals and breviaries under diocesan titles, adding ad Romani formam [in the form of the Roman books]. The episcopal letters prefacing successive editions published until the change of Liturgy show that these three dioceses believed themselves bound to follow Rome's Offices, both by the Council of Trent's decree and Saint Pius V's bull, and by the canon of Tours's council of 1583. We lack space for these important pastoral letters. Anyone can consult them at the beginning of copies of these three dioceses' breviaries still found in public libraries and even in several private hands.

[margin: The council of Bourges in 1584 orders liturgical reform for all the province's churches.]

The province of Bourges held its council in 1584, presided over by Archbishop Renauld de Beaulne. Present were the bishops of Saint-Flour, Cahors, and Limoges; procurators of the bishops of Rodez, Tulle, Albi,

Mende, and Vabres; and those of the chapters of Clermont and Castres, the see being vacant. Title I, canon 10, enjoins the bishops to have missals, breviaries, and other liturgical books reprinted and *(p. 446)* corrected as needed. The Fathers add these words, clearly showing their conviction that the liturgical reform accomplished at Rome concerned the entire West:

"If any Churches have hitherto used the old Roman Office, let them be compelled to receive the one recently reformed by decree of the Council of Trent[32]."

[margin: Bourges and Limoges correct their diocesan books; the other Churches adopt the Roman books without alteration.]

Certainly, nothing more explicit could be desired. In Bourges's province, as in Tours's, Churches differed in applying liturgical reform. The primatial Church and that of Limoges, among others, printed their breviaries almost immediately after the council under diocesan titles, with the clause already mentioned. Saint-Flour, Cahors, Rodez, Castres, etc., adopted the Roman books without alteration and printed the diocesan Proper separately.

[margin: The council of Aix's decree of 1585 prescribes the Roman books for all the province's Churches.]

The following year, 1585, Alexandre Canigiani, archbishop of Aix, held his provincial council, attended by the bishops of Apt, Gap, Riez, and Sisteron, and the bishop of Fréjus's procurator. It issued this decree:

"This holy synod desires that all this province's ecclesiastics, united with one voice, both in churches and privately, honor the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Considering that the constitution of Pope Pius V, of happy memory, forbids those who abandon their own Office to adopt any but the Roman one, and that the other cathedral Churches cannot conform to the metropolitan Church's Office, this synod therefore enacts, prescribes, and commands all concerned, under pain of excommunication and another penalty at the bishop's discretion, to introduce without fail in every church of this province the use of the Roman breviary and missal restored and published by decree of the sacred Council *(p. 447)* of Trent, within the period between now and the beginning of January of the next year, 1586."

[margin: Further proof of the almost literal conformity of diocesan liturgies with the Roman one.]

The Fathers add that this measure seems preferable to reprinting particular breviaries, which would cost too much. They end their decree with words that once again demonstrate—if repetition has not already made this observation commonplace—the almost literal conformity of these French diocesan liturgies with the Roman one, both ancient and reformed:

"And lest the books held by both the metropolitan and the other cathedral Churches remain useless to them, to these same Churches' great detriment, it has been decided that they be adapted and revised according to the Roman use, at the expense of the entire clergy of each diocese[33]."

[margin: The council of Toulouse in 1590 prescribes adoption of the Roman books throughout the province.]

The council of Toulouse in 1590, presided over by Archbishop François, Cardinal de Joyeuse, was no less categorical than Aix's in its decree on the Divine Office. Present were the bishops of Saint-Papoul, Rieux, and Lavaur, *(p. 448)* and the procurators of the bishops of Lombez, Pamiers, Mirepoix, and Montauban. The canon is brief: "But that Christians may be in greater agreement with one another, let the canonical Hours be recited both privately and publicly according to the Roman breviary's prescription[34]."

[margin: The archbishop of Narbonne holds the last French provincial council for liturgical reform in 1609.]

[margin: This assembly frames its decree in a new form and claims to receive and promulgate Saint Pius V's bulls.]

The last French council we find adhering to Saint Pius V's liturgical reform is Narbonne's, held in 1609 by Archbishop Louis de Vervins. Present were the bishops of Carcassonne, Agde, Saint-Pons, Nîmes, Uzès, Aleth, and Montpellier, and procurators of the bishops of Béziers and Lodève. Its decree, which we do not translate so as not to weary the reader, who can read it in note[35], is distinctive: the bishops expressly say that they receive Saint Pius V's bull, wish it received throughout the province, and declare it sufficiently

promulgated by publication of their present decree, notifying and making known to those acting against it the penalties it has laid down. This language clearly differs greatly from that of the seven sixteenth-century councils cited. Nevertheless, the council Fathers' claim only makes the province's Churches more gravely bound to recognize a constitution's authority when it has been authentically received and approved.

The eight provincial councils whose liturgical ordinances we have just *(p. 449)* reported have led us to survey almost the whole Church of France. Without assembling in council, the other provinces took similar measures for liturgical reform. Lyon retained the substance of its Office, a mixture of Roman and Gallican. Several Churches of this metropolitan province renewed and corrected their old books; we cannot name them precisely today. Langres, at least, adopted the Roman books without alteration. Sens merely purified its old books with the help of Saint Pius V's. Paris, Meaux, and Chartres followed its example. We can affirm nothing about the other Churches of Sens's province.

[margin: Lyon, Sens, Vienne, and most of their suffragan Churches correct their old breviaries.]

[margin: The provinces of Auch, Avignon, and Embrun adopt the Roman books.]

Auch adopted the reformed Roman Liturgy outright, and the rest of the province followed. Avignon and Embrun, with their Churches, did likewise. The same holds for most dioceses of Vienne's province. The metropolitan Church itself, however, kept the old breviary without even issuing a corrected edition.

Turning to dioceses subsequently incorporated into French territory, we find Cambrai adopting the Roman books without alteration, Arras correcting its books, and Saint-Omer using only the Roman Liturgy. In the same ecclesiastical province, Tournai and Namur also adopted the Roman books.

[margin: The council of Mechelen in 1607 prescribes the same rules for liturgical reform as the French councils.]

To say a passing word about Belgium, we mention the council of Mechelen in 1607. Its prelates established the same rules for liturgical reform as the French bishops in the councils cited above. The bishops participating in this assembly under the archbishop's presidency were those of Ghent, 's-Hertogenbosch, Roermond, Bruges, Antwerp, and Ypres.

Thus liturgical unity was restored in France, and so strikingly that there is *(p. 450)* no example of any other papal constitution being recognized as binding there by so many councils as Saint Pius V's on the Roman Breviary. In their obedience to the Holy See, these councils even exceeded the limits it had set. More than a third of our Churches possessed a breviary, Roman in substance, certainly, but corrected and reformed by diocesan authority more than two hundred years earlier. Nevertheless, the bishops judged that unity could not be too perfect. Recognizing the new breviary's superior composition, they had no difficulty: most adopted it outright; the others printed it almost entirely under a diocesan title. Throughout France we know scarcely any but Lyon that kept its old breviary, and even it borrowed some improvements from the new Roman one.

[margin: The French councils recognize Saint Pius V's liturgical-reform bull as binding and even exceed its limits in their obedience.]

[margin: Introduction of the reformed Roman books into the king's chapel in 1583.]

Another event important for France's liturgical unity was the introduction of the reformed Roman books into the king's chapel in Paris and those of the other royal castles. This pious innovation took place by Henry III's order in 1583[36]. At the request of the Jesuits, to whom the Catholic Church was so indebted from the sixteenth century onward, this prince had authorized printing the Roman Breviary in 1580, despite obstacles raised by the Parlement of Paris[37].

[margin: This liturgical reform arouses the Parlement of Paris's hatred of the Holy See.]

Indeed, this body's hatred of everything coming from Rome had already been aroused by the appearance of a body of Liturgy imposed on the Churches by the Holy See. The councils' agreement in enforcing Saint Pius V's bull had not gone unnoticed. Perhaps a formal notification by the Crown's law officers is *(p. 451)* the

best explanation of the clause by which the council of Narbonne, already held in the seventeenth century, thought it necessary to declare that it formally received this constitution. Be that as it may, around 1580 the Parlement of Paris gave a signal example of that religious oppression no other country has known better than ours.

[margin: The Parlement of Paris orders insertion of the prayer for the king into the Roman Missal's Canon of the Mass.]

Recall that Saint Pius V's Missal did not include in the Canon the words Pro rege nostro [for our king]. We have recounted Philip II's conduct: respecting religious authority, he refused to use royal power to wring prayers from Spain's clergy. Now consider what happened in France. The Parlement, always jealous of the king's rights when it came to oppressing the Church, indignantly observed the king's name absent from the Roman Missal. Yet, faithful to its plan to nationalize the Church, it carefully refrained from advising the sovereign to petition the Holy See for the same favor Philip II had not disdained to request. By its lay, material authority, lacking jurisdiction in this matter, it forbade all printers in the kingdom in 1580 to publish the Roman Missal without adding Pro rege nostro N. [for our king N.]. No one has since dared infringe this regulation[38]. Time, and still more the Apostolic See's condescension, may have legitimized these words' use in the Canon of the Mass. Nevertheless, this usage originated in an encroachment by secular power. This also proves clearly enough that in that much-despised, or rather poorly known, Spain, the Crown understood freedom of conscience better than in France, where that freedom has developed only in favor of heretics.

This ill temper of the parlements toward the Roman books already seems to foreshadow the reaction *(p. 452)* that would one day take place in France against the ancient principles of the Liturgy. For, we must admit, the magistrates did not feel alone in this opposition. A party was quietly forming among the clergy, and hatred of Rome was already fermenting in more than one heart. The Sorbonne gave a highly significant demonstration of this in 1583. Pierre de Gondy, bishop of Paris, considered introducing the Roman books into his cathedral, as the king himself had just introduced them into his chapel. The chapter of Notre-Dame opposed the prelate's intention, maintaining, with good grounds, that the Paris Breviary and Missal came within the exception provided by the bull; that a rite renowned throughout France and almost all the world's other Churches should not be abolished. It resolved simply to have the Parisian books corrected by the commissioners already appointed for this purpose[39]. The commission therefore continued its work, but with such zeal for the reformed Roman usages that it incorporated almost the whole of Saint Pius V's Breviary[40].

[margin: Stopped by this opposition, Bishop Pierre de Gondy has a commission revise his Church's breviary, making it almost entirely conform to the Roman one.]

[margin: The chapter of Notre-Dame in Paris refuses to adopt the Roman Liturgy.]

[margin: A party ready to support the Parlement's struggle against Rome forms among the clergy.]

Moreover, we have just seen that, in believing the Church of Paris came within the bull's exception, the chapter acknowledged this constitution's force. Paris must therefore be numbered among the Churches participating in Saint Pius V's liturgical reform. As for the canons' refusal to adopt the Roman books without alteration, we are far from blaming it. It was only right that this Romano-French Liturgy, enriched by Robert the Pious, Fulbert, and Maurice de Sully, adopted by several religious orders, and reaching even the Churches of Jerusalem, Rhodes, and Sicily, should remain standing as one of our national *(p. 453)* glories. Already abolished in most French cathedrals by the introduction of the Roman books, it should at least have been preserved in Paris. Rome herself had prepared for its preservation through the bull's clauses. If this beautiful, poetic form of Catholic worship no longer exists today, let us call to account the modern Parisians who, a hundred years later, delighted in overthrowing the ancient, noble edifice their fathers had defended so lovingly, rather than the Apostolic See.

[margin: The chapter of Paris consults the Sorbonne on the plan to adopt the Roman books.]

Unfortunately, as we just said, a party was forming that would in due course attack Rome's liturgical work even within diocesan books. The Sorbonne harbored such men. History has preserved the scandalous opinion

that this Faculty—or rather, some of its members—gave against the proposed adoption of the Roman books when consulted by the chapter of Paris. The reader will find this strange document below[41]; here we select only its principal features.

[margin: Scandalous reply of some doctors.]

After some platitudes on the great good of variety, as though unity were not desirable too, the doctors reveal their true thought:

"This greatly diminishes the authority of bishops and dioceses. Its proponents are not straightforward, devout, or spiritual men, but crafty, worldly operators who seek their worldly advantage from anything, by any means. The other bishops have power of governance and regulation in their dioceses, as the Roman bishop has in his; this would be undermined in large part. This is against the Gallican Church's liberty. If she submits to the Roman Church in this general and most important profession, what remains but that, as a consequence, she will often submit in every other matter of governance? For the accessory follows the *(p. 454)* principal. There is no more reason for all priests everywhere to say one breviary than for all the laity to offer only one prayer to God, most good and most great. What results but an increase—I do not say of Roman religion, but of Roman pride and ambition? Let the Gallic cock's crest not yield to the Roman brow: this concerns crafty pride, not religion. Here the bishops in their dioceses, if they understand what they are, have power to determine the form of prayer, as the Pope has in the Roman diocese and Church (for this is what the word Pontifex [high priest] means and signifies: Hebrews, chapters V and IX); otherwise they would become the Pope's chaplains."

[margin: The Sorbonne itself protests in 1603 against this opinion stamped with hatred of Rome.]

That is certainly frankness! The whole document is in the same taste. The doctors chiefly invoke the impropriety of abandoning veneration of the diocesan saints by adopting the Roman calendar. This difficulty is not serious: everyone knows that all dioceses using the Roman books without alteration may append to the breviary a Proper of local saints as complete as desired. Moreover, in a case argued before the Parlement in 1603, to be discussed elsewhere, the Crown's advocate Servin inserted this Sorbonne act in his pleading. The Faculty protested both its insertion and the act itself. It must therefore be regarded, as we said, simply as a manifestation of a spirit of revolt in a few individuals, rather than the opinion of all this body's members. We shall soon see the terrible conflagration kindled by this spark, briefly hidden beneath the ashes. Let us finish our account of sixteenth-century liturgical reform in the Latin Church.

[margin: Liturgical reform in Franche-Comté and Switzerland.]

The dioceses near France on the German side—those of Franche-Comté and Switzerland, for example—reformed their Liturgy after the Roman one, *(p. 455)* according to their particular character. Besançon kept the diocesan title at the head of its books, which retained many distinctive usages. Zaccaria lists a Chur missal dated 1589. Today all Switzerland, except Lausanne, follows the Roman books without alteration.

[margin: Several German Churches correct their books; the others, with those of Austria, Hungary, and Poland, adopt the Roman books without alteration.]

Libraries contain breviaries of Cologne[42], Trier, Mainz, Constance, Würzburg, Worms, Speyer, and others, printed in the late sixteenth century and reformed after Saint Pius V's. Today several of these Churches use the Roman books without alteration, as do all Austria, Hungary, Poland, Tyrol, and other lands that adopted the reformed books immediately.

[margin: England takes no part in the Holy See's reform; its five national Liturgies had already perished through persecution.]

England had already separated from Roman communion when the Apostolic See undertook to restore liturgical unity, and so could not participate. Burnet and de Larrey, historians of the Anglican Reformation cited by Father Lebrun[43], tell us that before England's defection the kingdom had five principal Liturgies, all

forms of the Roman: Salisbury's, used in the southern provinces under the name Sarum, of which an edition, as also of its breviary, was printed in Paris in 1556; York's, used in the northern provinces; Hereford's, adopted in southern Wales; Bangor's, for northern Wales; and finally Lincoln's, for the diocese of that name.

It is time to return to Rome, the center of liturgical reform, and consider further the great works *(p. 456)* accomplished for this purpose by the Roman Pontiffs. The state of ecclesiastical chant and music demanded all their care. We have seen how greatly this part of the Liturgy suffered from the spirit of innovation in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The reader has not forgotten John XXII's famous bull Docta Sanctorum. Despite these praiseworthy efforts, the evil grew as discipline slackened. In most churches, Gregorian chant had almost completely disappeared. Wholly profane music—noisy, tangled, crammed with worldly reminiscences, and taking no account of the words' meaning—had invaded the most august basilicas. The human voice seemed merely an instrument for producing more or less skillful sounds.

[margin: Increasing decline of ecclesiastical chant and sacred music.]

[margin: The Council of Trent prohibits all lascivious music in churches and orders ecclesiastical chant to be studied in seminaries.]

Such abuses could not escape the Council of Trent's solicitude. In 1562, in the congregations preparing the decree on the sacrifice of the Mass, a proposal was made to ban music altogether during celebration of the holy mysteries. Most Fathers, especially the Spaniards, defended it as fostering piety when the character of the singing and its words inspired devotion and the words' meaning could be understood. In its twenty-second session, therefore, the council confined itself to prohibiting all music containing anything lascivious and impure, whether on the organ or in singing proper[44]. A few months later, in its twenty-third session, the holy assembly, providing for the clergy's reform, decreed the foundation of seminaries and included ecclesiastical chant among the subjects to be taught to young clerics.

(p. 457)

[margin: Provincial councils and bishops are charged with reforming church chant and music.]

The next year, 1563, Cardinals Morone and Navagero, recently sent by Pius IV to preside over the council, resolved to call the Fathers' attention again to continuing abuses. They had a prohibition on overly soft music in churches inserted in the reform articles prepared for the twenty-fourth session. Emperor Ferdinand, informed of these articles, feared that this wording might be understood as a formal ban on polyphonic singing, which often aroused devotion. In deference to the emperor, the legates withdrew their proposed wording. At the session of November 11, 1563, the decree reforming cathedral chapters referred to provincial councils everything concerning celebration of the Divine Office, particularly the proper manner of singing or modulating. These assemblies were to establish rules suited to each region's benefit and usages. Until the councils met, each bishop was invited to provide for these needs with two canons, one of his choice and the other designated by the chapter[45].

[margin: The congregation of cardinals instituted by Pius IV to enforce Trent's decrees undertakes the reform of church music in Rome.]

Having given Trent's reform decrees the force of law by his approval, Pius IV established a congregation of eight cardinals on August 2, 1564, to ensure their exact observance. In its very first year it *(p. 458)* concerned itself with correcting chant and music in Rome, especially in the papal chapel, which was to set an example of regular observance for all the Churches of the City and the world. This reform was all the more important because music increasingly tended to usurp Gregorian chant's place in the capital of the Christian world. The congregation entrusted this matter particularly to Cardinals Vitellozzo Vitellozzi and Charles Borromeo. It asked them to enforce the council's decrees by banning lascivious airs and also to require greater clarity in the words of Masses, which could not be understood when sung in part music.

[margin: Cardinals Vitellozzi and Borromeo confer with the papal chapel's singers on the congregation's behalf.]

At the two cardinals' request, the body of singers of the papal chapel appointed eight members to confer with them. Vitellozzi and Charles Borromeo wanted Masses intermingled with words foreign to the Liturgy or composed on profane airs to be banned henceforth, together with motets whose words private individuals had capriciously invented. The singers raised no difficulty here. Asked whether the words sung by the choir in part music could always be easily understood, however, they answered that this was not always possible. The cardinals insisted, citing pieces performed in the papal chapel as models, particularly the Good Friday Reproaches composed by the master Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina. Formerly a papal singer, he had been excluded under Paul IV because he was married and was then choirmaster of the Liberian Basilica. After several conferences, they agreed to commission this illustrious composer to write a Mass whose theme, meter, and melodies contained nothing lascivious or worldly, and in which, despite its *(p. 459)* harmony and fugues, every word and the meaning of every phrase could be easily understood. The cardinals promised that, if Palestrina met these requirements, music would remain permitted in churches. They did not conceal that, if he failed, they would have to take whatever measures seemed appropriate on their colleagues' advice.

[margin: Music, threatened with banishment from the sanctuary, is saved by a Mass Palestrina composes and has performed before the council congregation's cardinals.]

Cardinal Borromeo, archpriest of the Liberian Basilica, undertook to give the instructions himself to Palestrina, who was subject to him as his church's choirmaster. To save sacred music and prevent an overly severe decision that would have deprived the Liturgy of one of its most powerful means of action, Providence had prepared in Rome itself this man of profoundly liturgical genius, whose resources matched his mission. Palestrina began work with the liveliest, most fervent ardor. He felt that sacred music faced life or death. The custom was to head each new musical composition with a title made as piquant and sometimes even bizarre as possible. In the simplicity of his faith, Palestrina headed his manuscript with Illumina oculos meos, "Give light to my eyes," wishing this humble prayer alone to designate his work. Helped by the Holy Spirit, whose aid he had invoked, the illustrious master composed three Masses in a few days, meeting the conditions laid down. On April 28, 1563, a day forever memorable in sacred music's annals, the papal chapel's singers performed them before the eight cardinals, interpreters of the Council of Trent, assembled at Vitellozzi's house. All the members of this tribunal, about to pronounce on sacred music's fate, were princes of the Church renowned for learning, *(p. 460)* experience, and gravity of morals. Among them were two austere reformers around whose brows the halo of sanctity already shone: Michele Ghislieri, later Saint Pius V, and Charles Borromeo. Their judgment of Palestrina's three Masses was unanimous. All three fulfilled the program set for the illustrious composer, but they especially admired the third for its simplicity, unction, and richness. Nothing could surpass the precision and clarity with which the text's meaning was expressed. The cause was won. The cardinals concluded that music would not be banished from churches, provided that musicians, for their part, henceforth sang only compositions worthy of the sanctuary.

[margin: After hearing Palestrina's masterpiece, Pius IV declares it impossible to suppress sacred music.]

On the cardinals' report, Pope Pius IV wished to hear Palestrina's masterpiece himself. It was sung before him on June 19, 1563, in the Sistine Chapel. The Sacred College had gathered around the Supreme Pontiff to thank God for the alliance happily concluded between the Holy See and Switzerland's Catholic cantons. The holy Cardinal Borromeo celebrated Mass. Palestrina's music, performed by the incomparable voices of the papal singers, enraptured everyone present. At the ceremony's end, the Pope said that after this Mass of Palestrina's, music could no longer be attacked; it should be moderated in use, rather than suppressed. In gratitude he created for the illustrious master the office of composer to the papal chapel. Jealousy sought to deprive him of it after Pius IV's death, but Saint Pius V, and later Gregory XIII, Sixtus V, and Clement VIII, preserved this well-earned reward for him. He enjoyed it until his death in 1594. Even during his lifetime, his admirers' enthusiasm had hailed him *(p. 461)* as Prince of Sacred Music, a title no one has yet been able to dispute.

[margin: Palestrina names his masterpiece the Pope Marcellus Mass.]

[margin: Error resulting from this name.]

Two years after his triumph, the illustrious master dedicated a collection of his compositions to Philip II, king of Spain, including the Mass that had won sacred music's cause. In gratitude to Pope Marcellus II, his former benefactor while still a cardinal, Palestrina placed that pontiff's name at the head of his masterpiece, wishing it henceforth to be called the Pope Marcellus Mass. Posterity obeyed the great composer's wish. Yet, misled by a title whose origin it soon forgot, it came to believe that Marcellus II was the pontiff who had considered banishing music from the Church, and that Palestrina had disarmed him by letting him hear this Mass of wholly divine harmony[46].

[margin: Provincial councils undertake the reform of ecclesiastical chant.]

The provincial councils held to implement the ecumenical assembly of Trent's decrees did not neglect their duty to oversee church music. They spoke forcefully against the abuses that had crept in, protested expressly against worldly melodies all too commonly used, and issued regulations against those who buried the words' meaning beneath the din of voices. "Let bishops take care that the meaning is not buried in unruly noise." These are the words of the council of Toledo in 1566.

[margin: Reform of the calendar by Gregory XIII in 1582.]

After securing the purity of the missal and breviary and saving the Church's traditions concerning sacred music, *(p. 462)* the Roman Pontiffs faced a great undertaking, both liturgical and social, that called for their solicitude. The calendar, the foundation of the Liturgy as of human dealings with one another, had fallen into complete disorder. Its reform belonged to the Roman Pontiffs: from the Church's beginnings we see them charged with communicating to the Churches the date of Easter, the Christian year's center, and this date was becoming increasingly uncertain. The Council of Trent had addressed this grave matter but ultimately referred its examination and judgment to the Pope. It was a great spectacle, moreover, to see Europe—or rather the whole civilized world—still asking Rome in the sixteenth century for the lost key to the science of reckoning time. Gregory XIII had the glory of rendering this service to humanity. He gathered every available source of knowledge and formed a commission of the most celebrated astronomers. Among them, two especially influenced the results: Cardinal Sirlet and the German Jesuit Christopher Clavius. An Italian physician, Louis Lilio, although already dead when this great undertaking was concluded, perhaps played the chief part through a special memorandum he left, indicating the easiest and surest method of making the desired correction. Gregory XIII also consulted learned foreign astronomers, including the French nobleman François de Foix de Candale. Having gathered all the information needed for an informed, legitimate reform, he announced it to the Church and formally established it by the bull Inter gravissimas, dated VI days before the Kalends of March, 1582[47]. The course of this work will lead us elsewhere *(p. 463)* to discuss the calendar and the nature of its reforms at length. Here it is enough to recall that all Catholic states immediately adopted the Gregorian calendar. Protestant nations delayed accepting this service to society for varying lengths of time because it came from a pope. Nevertheless, they finally yielded—England only in the last century. Today, in Europe, Russia alone still holds to the Old Style, and this so that all may see clearly this historical truth: schism is still more hateful and blind than heresy itself. Even the Arians were better for Christian Africa than the Donatists.

[margin: Principal scholars consulted by the Supreme Pontiff.]

[margin: Protestant nations long refuse the Gregorian calendar, which Russia and the other schismatic states still reject today.]

[margin: Publication of the Roman Martyrology by Gregory XIII in 1584.]

Gregory XIII soon undertook a work closely connected with calendar reform: publication of the Roman Martyrology. It had already been printed several times in Italy, especially in Rome, but needed correction. The Pope appointed a commission consisting of Caesar Baronius, Silvio Antoniano, Robert Bellarmine, Louis de Torrès, archbishop of Monreale, John Baptist Bandini, canon of Saint Peter's, Michel Ghisleri, a Theatine, and Barthélemi Gavanti. The commission successively issued three editions. The first two proving

faulty, as Baronius himself attests[48], only the third was presented to the whole Church by Gregory XIII. The promulgation brief, dated January 14, 1584, obliges all patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, abbots, and other superiors of churches, monasteries, convents, or orders, whether secular or regular, to conform to it in the Office in choir. Saints customarily celebrated in certain churches or localities are not to be *(p. 464)* inserted into the body of the Roman Martyrology. Their names are to be written in a separate book and then placed in the position and order prescribed by that martyrology's rules[49].

[margin: Sixtus V institutes the Sacred Congregation of Rites in 1588.]

Publication of the breviary, missal, calendar, and martyrology had admittedly not yet met all the Liturgy's needs. The pontifical, ceremonial, and ritual still required reform. Yet measures to preserve the purity of Rome's newly established rules were no less important. The idea of a special tribunal to settle all difficulties and answer all consultations concerning sacred rites belongs to Sixtus V. In his famous bull Immensa, dated XI days before the Kalends of February, 1588, establishing fifteen congregations of cardinals to handle ecclesiastical affairs and the internal government of the Roman State, he erects a special one entitled Congregation of Sacred Rites. Here are Sixtus V's remarkable words establishing it:

[margin: The bull establishing this tribunal defines its responsibilities.]

"Now, since the sacred rites and ceremonies that the Church, taught by the Holy Spirit, uses according to apostolic tradition and discipline in administering the sacraments, the Divine Offices, and all veneration of God and the saints, contain much instruction for the Christian people and an affirmation of the true faith, commend the majesty of sacred things, and lift the faithful's minds to meditation of the *(p. 465)* highest things and also kindle them with devotion's fire, desiring to increase the piety of the Church's children and divine worship still further by preserving and restoring these sacred rites and ceremonies, We have likewise chosen five cardinals. Their particular charge shall be to ensure that ancient sacred rites are diligently observed by everyone everywhere, in all the Churches of the City and the world, even in Our papal chapel, in Masses, Divine Offices, the administration of the sacraments, and all other matters pertaining to divine worship. Let ceremonies fallen into disuse be restored, and those corrupted be reformed. Let them reform and correct books concerning sacred rites and ceremonies, especially the Pontifical, Ritual, and Ceremonial, as needed; examine the Divine Offices of patron saints and grant them after first consulting Us. Let them also diligently attend to the canonization of saints and celebration of feast days, so that everything is done properly and rightly, according to the Fathers' tradition. Let them give thought and diligent care to ensuring that kings and princes, their ambassadors, and other persons, including ecclesiastics, coming to the City and Roman Curia are honorably received according to ancestral custom, in keeping with the Apostolic See's dignity and kindness. Let them hear disputes over precedence in processions or elsewhere, and other difficulties arising concerning these sacred rites and ceremonies, and settle and resolve them by summary procedure[50]."

(p. 466)

[margin: The number of this congregation's cardinals is raised to twenty-four. Clement VIII publishes the Roman Pontifical in 1596.]

Since Sixtus V, the number of cardinals belonging to the Congregation of Rites has been raised to twenty-four. Elsewhere we shall explain this tribunal's responsibilities and its procedure in cases concerning sacred rites in greater detail.

Clement VIII, who became Pope in 1592 and whose glorious pontificate lasted until 1605, continued liturgical reform with tireless zeal. He first attended to the Pontifical. This book, indispensable for exercising episcopal functions, had been printed several times in Italy and France but contained various errors. Removing them and restoring unity in such important rites could belong only to the Roman Pontiff. In his brief Ex quo in Ecclesia Dei of February 10, 1596, Clement VIII announces to the Church his correction of the Roman Pontifical, following his glorious predecessor Saint Pius V's work on the Roman Breviary and

Missal. He says he assembled a commission of men most versed in pontifical rites, who based their reform on the oldest manuscripts from Rome's churches and the Vatican and other libraries. Accordingly, he suppresses all other pontificals in use anywhere and commands all patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, abbots, and other prelates to receive and use this reformed pontifical;

"decreeing that the aforesaid Pontifical must never be altered, in whole or in part, nor anything added to it or at all removed from it; that all who must exercise pontifical functions, or otherwise perform or execute the things contained in the said Pontifical, are bound to do so according to this Pontifical's prescriptions and manner; and that no one *(p. 467)* charged with exercising and performing these things can fulfill his duty unless he observes the forms contained in this very Pontifical[51]."

[margin: In 1600 the same pontiff publishes the reformed Ceremonial of Bishops.]

Four years later, in 1600, the same pontiff published the reformed Ceremonial of Bishops by the brief Cum novissime of July 14.

"Since We recently commanded," he says, "that the Pontifical, formerly faulty and corrupt, be corrected and restored by pious, learned men, then published for the common use and convenience of bishops and other prelates of churches, and observed by everyone throughout the universal Church, it seemed worthwhile [to reform] the Ceremonial of Bishops, very useful and necessary for all churches, especially metropolitan, cathedral, and collegiate churches, in which [are contained] the rites and ceremonies for celebrating Masses, Vespers, and other Divine Offices, and for other ecclesiastical functions and acts to be observed therein by these bishops and other lesser prelates, etc.[52]."

Clement VIII then says that the commissioners charged *(p. 468)* with reforming the ceremonial strove to bring it into harmony with the Pontifical. In his brief on the Pontifical, the Pope had noted that its revisers removed everything better placed in the Ceremonial. These two sources of liturgical knowledge thus stand in perfect correspondence. Having sanctioned the obligation of everyone concerned to conform to this Ceremonial in all things, and abrogated all older ceremonials wherever they differ from the new one, Clement VIII sets the deadline for the absolute obligation to use this book: two months for those present at the Roman court, eight months for those on this side of the mountains, and twelve for those beyond them.

[margin: The reformed Pontifical and Ceremonial are adopted throughout the Western Churches, except some in France.]

If we now examine how Clement VIII's Pontifical and Ceremonial were promulgated, we find both received throughout the Western Churches, except for some French Churches that thought fit to give themselves a pontifical, and a far greater number that did not consider themselves bound to accept the ceremonial. God knows, too, the disorder in many of our cathedrals, where pontifical functions follow rules no one has ever seen written down, and which in any case flagrantly contradict the wise, precise, harmonious rubrics of the Ceremonial promulgated by Clement VIII and his successors. Be that as it may, the decorum of episcopal dignity has gained nothing from this refusal to admit the Roman Ceremonial. No diocesan ceremonial treats this most sacred and eminent dignity with greater respect than the Roman one, and there are many in which one *(p. 469)* is entitled to complain of the opposite. The reader will judge as this work proceeds.

[margin: Clement VIII revises the Roman Breviary in 1602 and imposes rules on printers to preserve the corrected text in subsequent editions.]

Clement VIII undertook another great work of liturgical reform: revision of the breviary. Numerous errors and alterations had crept into many copies through printers' negligence or private individuals' indiscretion. The Pope appointed a commission to restore the text's purity. After issuing a corrected copy from the Vatican presses, he established very severe monetary penalties for printers in the Ecclesiastical State, and excommunication for those elsewhere, should they dare print the Roman Breviary without express permission from the inquisitors, or from local ordinaries where the tribunal of the Holy Office did not exist. This was done by the apostolic letters Cum in Ecclesia of May 10, 1602. The brief then sets out the

formalities inquisitors and ordinaries must observe before granting permission. They are most carefully to compare both the breviary to be reproduced and the copy coming from the press with a copy published by Clement VIII. They shall permit no addition or removal. The permission itself must attest this comparison and complete agreement, and a copy of the permission must be printed at the beginning or end of every copy. The penalties incurred ipso facto [by the fact itself] for infringing any of these injunctions are: for inquisitors, deprivation of office and perpetual incapacity to return to it; for ordinaries, suspension a divinis [from divine functions] and prohibition of entry into the church; and for their vicars, besides excommunication, perpetual deprivation of their offices and benefices[53].

(p. 470)

[margin: On July 7, 1604, Clement VIII publishes a corrected Roman Missal, gravely altered since Saint Pius V.]

Two years later, on July 7, 1604, the same pontiff issued a new brief, Cum sanctissimum, for revision of the missal. This book had already suffered even more alterations than the breviary. Among other things, Clement VIII complains that many introits, graduals, and offertories of the greatest antiquity in the Church, being drawn from the ancient Vulgate, had been indiscreetly corrected according to Saint Jerome's biblical version; that several Epistles and Gospels had been thrown into confusion; in short, that various changes had been introduced without authority or discernment. He then says he entrusted the missal's review and correction to a commission of the most learned cardinals and other skilled men. Where necessary, they restored the old reading on the authority of the most reliable copies, and also made various improvements, especially to the rubrics, expanding and clarifying them in several places. The Pope then charges inquisitors and bishops to guard the purity of copies printed within their jurisdictions, establishing for violations the same penalties for these inquisitors and bishops, and for the printers themselves, as those laid down in the brief cited above for the breviary's new edition[54]. In a special part of this work we shall examine how Clement VIII's wishes are observed in France. His two constitutions cannot be unknown there: they appear, complete or abridged, at the beginning of all Roman missals and breviaries published during the last two centuries, in Paris and the kingdom's other cities alike.

(p. 471)

[margin: Commissioners engaged in this revision.]

Such were Clement VIII's labors for liturgical reform, worthy of this great pontiff and his predecessors. According to Merati[55], the commission mentioned in the apostolic letters just cited comprised Cardinals Caesar Baronius, Silvio Antoniano, and Robert Bellarmine, joined by Louis de Torrès, archbishop of Monreale and later a cardinal; John Baptist Bandini, canon of Saint Peter's; Michel Ghisleri, a Theatine; and the illustrious Milanese Barthélemi Gavanti, of the Clerics Regular of Saint Paul. Surely no more imposing names could have been assembled, nor the sacred rites entrusted to men more distinguished for learning and piety.

[margin: Sixteenth-century liturgical authors.]

We shall now list the sixteenth-century authors who treated the Liturgy.

[margin: Jacques Wimpheling, priest of Speyer.]

(1501). Jacques Wimpheling, a priest of Speyer's diocese, composed an Office of the Blessed Virgin's Compassion at his bishop's request, and dedicated to that prelate a poem, De Laudibus et Cæremoniis Ecclesiæ [On the praises and ceremonies of the Church]. He also left a treatise on the authors of hymns and sequences.

[margin: Josse Clichtoüe, doctor of Paris.]

(1516). Josse Clichtoüe, a doctor of Paris, wrote the excellent liturgical commentary well known as Elucidatorium ecclesiasticum [Ecclesiastical elucidation], explaining hymns, canticles, the Canon of the

Mass and other ecclesiastical prayers, and finally sequences. This precious work can still be found fairly easily today, although not reprinted for more than two centuries. Many liturgical questions are treated in his Anti-Lutherus [Against Luther] and his other writings against the Reformation, all remarkable for their time.

[margin: Albert Castellani, Dominican.]

(1520). Albert Castellani, a Venetian of the Order of Friars *(p. 472)* Preachers, prepared and dedicated to Leo X the book entitled Sacerdotale [Priests' manual]; he also supervised the edition of the Roman Pontifical published in Venice in 1520.

[margin: Erasmus of Rotterdam.]

(1526). Erasmus of Rotterdam, so well known for the unhappy influence of his half-Protestant ideas on part of Catholic Europe, must nevertheless be included among the sixteenth-century liturgists. He left hymns in honor of the Blessed Virgin, some of which were inserted into the Breviary of Besançon during his lifetime.

[margin: Peter Ciruelo, canon of Salamanca. Gabriel of Ancona, sacristan of the papal chapel.]

(1528). Peter Ciruelo, a canon of Salamanca's cathedral, left a work entitled Expositio libri Missalis peregregia.

(1529). Gabriel of Ancona, an Augustinian and sacristan of the papal chapel, composed three treatises that remain in manuscript: 1. De Ritu et Cæremoniis in Capella Pontificia; 2. Acta in adventu et coronatione Caroli V in civitate Bononiæ; 3. Acta quædam cæremonialia ab anno 1508, cum supplemento usque ad annum 1550.

[margin: George Wicelius.]

(1532). George Wicelius, first a Lutheran and then reunited with the Catholic Church, left two writings on our subject: 1. Defensio Liturgiæ ecclesiasticæ; 2. Liturgica Exercitamenta christianæ pietatis. In the latter he translates several Eastern Liturgies.

[margin: Francis Titelman, Friar Minor.]

(1540). Francis Titelman, of the Order of Friars Minor, composed, among other works: 1. Expositio mysteriorum Missæ et sacri Canonis; 2. Expositio officii de sacrosancta Trinitate.

[margin: John Cochlaeus, canon of Breslau.]

(1540). John Cochlaeus, an illustrious Catholic doctor, canon of Breslau, and tireless defender of the Catholic faith against the sixteenth-century reformers, countered Luther's treatise against the Mass with an edition of Innocent III's books de Mysteriis Missæ and Saint Isidore's de Officiis ecclesiasticis. He also compiled *(p. 473)* the earliest known collection of liturgical authors. It appeared in Mainz in 1549 under the title Speculum antiquæ devotionis circa Missam et omnem alium cultum Dei, ex antiquis, et antea nunquam evulgatis per typographos auctoribus, a Joanne Cochlæo laboriose collectum. It comprises nine authors, namely:

[margin: First collection of liturgical authors.]

1. Amalarius of Trier, de Officio missæ; 2. Walafrid Strabo, de Exordiis et Incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum; 3. Saint Basil, de Missa Græcorum; 4. Expositio missæ brevis, from ancient manuscripts; 5. Saint Peter Damian, Liber qui dicitur Dominus vobiscum [the book called "The Lord be with you"]; 6. Honorius of Autun, Gemma animæ; 7. The Micrologus; 8. Peter the Venerable, Nucleus de sacrificio missæ; 9. Liber de vita S. Bonifacii, Martyris.

[margin: Laurent Massorilli, Friar Minor.]

(1547). Laurent Massorilli, of the Order of Friars Minor, published a collection of sacred hymns in four books. Arévalo judges these hymns not unworthy of the century that produced them.

[margin: Gentien Hervet.]

(1550). Gentien Hervet, a learned French man of letters who attended the Council of Trent and died a canon of Reims, translated into Latin, besides many works of the holy Fathers, the Liturgies of Saint John Chrysostom and Saint Basil, Saint Maximus's Mystagogy, and Nicholas Cabasilas's Exposition of the Liturgy.

[margin: Matthias Illyricus.]

(1557). Matthias Francowitz, better known by his literary name Flaccus Illyricus, one of the Magdeburg Centuriators, had the famous Latin Mass printed at Strasbourg. It still bears this scholar's name and has attracted so much attention from Catholic and Protestant critics. We shall discuss it elsewhere.

[margin: George Cassander,]

(1558). George Cassander, a Flemish doctor, opposed *(p. 474)* the innovations of the Reformation with zeal, although he may rightly be reproached for some overly bold propositions. He published a learned work entitled Liturgica de Ritu et Ordine Dominicæ Cœnæ celebrandæ e variis scriptoribus. It collects passages from ecclesiastical authors on every part of the Mass, followed by the Roman Ordo, the only one then known. Cassander also published a hymn collection like Clichtoüe's and another collection of the prayers called collects.

[margin: a Flemish doctor.]

[margin: Marc-Antoine Muret, humanist.]

(1560). Marc-Antoine Muret, the celebrated humanist, belongs among the liturgists through his hymns, several of which have been admitted into the modern breviaries of French dioceses.

[margin: President Duranti.]

(1560). Jean-Étienne Duranti, president of the Parlement of Toulouse, whose tragic end everyone knows, published under his own name the celebrated De Ritibus Ecclesiæ catholicæ, the latest edition of which appeared at Lyon in 1675. Several authors dispute Duranti's authorship and attribute the work to Pierre d'Anès, bishop of Lavaur.

[margin: Claude de Sainctes, bishop of Évreux. Wolfgang Lasius, German philologist, publishes the second collection of liturgical authors.]

(1560). Claude de Sainctes, bishop of Évreux, translated the Liturgies of Saint James and Saint Basil into Latin.

(1560). Wolfgang Lasius, a learned German philologist, published what must count as the second liturgical collection. It appeared at Antwerp in 1560 as De Veteris Ecclesiæ ritibus ac cæremoniis. Less extensive than Cochlaeus's, it contains the following pieces:

1. A letter from Charlemagne to Alcuin, de Cæremoniis ecclesiasticis; 2. Alcuin's reply to this letter; 3. Hildebert's poem, de Mysterio missæ. 4. An anonymous fragment, de Ritibus et Cæremoniis Ecclesiæ Romanæ a Nativitate Domini per hyemem; *(p. 475)* 5. Rabanus Maurus, de Virtutibus et vitiis.

[margin: Antoine Democharès.]

(1562). Antoine de Mouchy, rector of the University of Paris, known as Democharès, published a large, rather indigestible treatise on the sacrifice of the Mass, directed against the Sacramentarians.

[margin: Melchior Hittorp, dean of Saint Cunibert in Cologne, publishes the most celebrated collection of liturgical authors.]

(1568). Melchior Hittorp, dean of the collegiate church of Saint Cunibert in Cologne, published the third and most celebrated liturgical collection. It comprises twelve authors and is entitled De Catholicæ Ecclesiæ divinis officiis ac ministeriis, varii vetustiorum aliquot Ecclesiæ Patrum ac scriptorum libri. Cologne, 1568.

It contains the following books:

1. The Roman Ordo; 2. Saint Isidore of Seville, de Ecclesiasticis Officiis; 3. Pseudo-Alcuin, de Officiis divinis; 4. Amalarius Fortunatus, de Divinis Officiis, and de Ordine Antiphonarii; 5. Rabanus Maurus, de Institutione clericorum; 6. Walafrid Strabo, de Exordiis et Incrementis rerum ecclesiasticarum; 7. Berno of Reichenau, de Quibusdam Rebus ad missæ officium pertinentibus; 8. The Micrologus, de Ecclesiasticis Observationibus; 9. Saint Ivo of Chartres, twenty-one sermons de Ecclesiasticis Sacramentis, ac Officiis, et Præcipuis per annum Festis; 10. Hildebert, de Mysterio missæ; 11. Ralph of Tongres, de Observantia canonum; 12. An anonymous author, Missæ Expositio brevis.

Hittorp's collection has had several editions, each reproduced with additions, as we shall soon see.

[margin: John Molanus, doctor of Louvain.]

(1568). John Molanus, a doctor of Louvain, published an edition of Usuard's Martyrology with additions from the Roman Martyrology and those of the Churches of Lower *(p. 476)* Germany. He also added Wandelberg's Martyrology and completed the whole with an excellent preface in twenty-three chapters. He likewise wrote de Picturis et Imaginibus sacris and a short work on the Agnus Dei [blessed wax medallions].

[margin: John Maldonat, of the Society of Jesus.]

(1569). John Maldonat, an illustrious professor of the Society of Jesus, adds to his other claims to glory that of distinguished liturgist. We may judge this from his excellent de Cæremoniis, so highly esteemed by Richard Simon, and finally published by Zaccaria in 1781 in volume III of the Bibliotheca ritualis.

[margin: Jean du Tillet, bishop of Meaux.]

(1570). Jean du Tillet, bishop first of Saint-Brieuc and then of Meaux, left a French treatise, de l'Antiquité et de la Solennité de la messe [On the antiquity and solemnity of the Mass].

[margin: James Pamelius, bishop of Saint-Omer.]

(1571). James Pamelius, bishop of Saint-Omer, rendered some of the greatest services to liturgical scholarship by publishing his important collection Liturgica latinorum. It includes the ancient books of the Roman, Ambrosian, Gothic, and other Churches.

[margin: Jerome Maggi, Milanese engineer.]

(1571). Jerome Maggi, a Milanese, first a magistrate and then a military engineer, was captured by the Turks at the siege of Famagusta and composed an interesting treatise on bells during his captivity.

[margin: Onofrio Panvinio, Augustinian.]

(1572). Onofrio Panvinio, an Augustinian and one of the sixteenth century's greatest experts in ecclesiastical antiquities, left several liturgical works. We shall cite: 1. The interesting de Urbis Romæ stationibus, usually printed after Platina's lives of the popes; 2. de Ritu sepeliendi mortuos apud veteres christianos, et de eorum cœmeteriis; 3. de Baptismate Paschali, origine et ritu consecrandi Agnos Dei; 4. de præcipuis urbis Romæ sanctioribusque Basilicis, quas Septem Ecclesias vulgo vocant; 5. de Episcopalibus Titulis et Diaconiis Cardinalium. Panvinio also prepared a collection of ancient rituals that was *(p. 477)* never published; Dom Mabillon published its preface in volume II of the Museum Italicum.

[margin: Nicholas Aurificus, Carmelite.]

(1572). Nicholas Aurificus, a Carmelite, issued a new edition of Cochlaeus's Speculum at Venice that year. He removed the Mass of Saint Basil and the Book on the Life of Saint Boniface, replacing them with the short works of Berno and Hildebert from Hittorp's collection. He then added Burchard's Ordo missæ and a work of his own, De Antiquitate, Veritate et Cæremoniis missæ.

[margin: Peter Galesini, apostolic protonotary.]

(1577). Peter Galesini, an apostolic protonotary who flourished at Rome under Gregory XIII and Sixtus V, worked to elucidate and correct the Roman Martyrology, refining its style and adding a historical notice to

each saint’s name.

[margin: Gabriel Severus, archbishop of Philadelphia.]

(1578). Gabriel Severus, archbishop of Philadelphia, whom the Venetian Senate had entrusted with the care of Greeks settled in the republic’s territory, composed de Septem Ecclesiæ Sacramentis. Father Morin extracted from it the short work de Sancto sacerdotii Sacramento.

[margin: Joseph Stevano, Italian bishop.]

(1580). Joseph-Valentin Stevano, an Italian bishop, left two short liturgical works: 1. De Adoratione et Osculatione pedum Romani pontificis, et Levatione seu Portatione ejusdem; 2. De Ritu tenendi frænum et staphades summis pontificibus ab imperatoribus.

[margin: Maximus Margunius, bishop of Cythera.]

(1584). Maximus Margunius, bishop of Cythera, is known for translating and publishing the Synaxaria and the Menologion in vernacular Greek.

[margin: Marcantonio Colonna, archbishop of Salerno.]

(1586). Marcantonio Marsilio Colonna, archbishop of Salerno, wrote the excellent Hydragiologia, sive de Aqua benedicta [Hydragiology, or On holy water].

[margin: Vincent Bonardi,]

(1586). Vincent Bonardi, a Dominican and bishop of Saint *(p. 478)* Cyriaca, wrote a volume on the Agnus Dei, entitled Discorso intorno l’antichità, e origine, modo di fare, benedire, batezzare, e distribuere i sacri Agnus Dei.

[margin: Dominican and bishop. Francis Panigarola, bishop of Chrysopolis. Rudolf Hospinian, Protestant scholar.]

(1587). Francis Panigarola, bishop of Chrysopolis, left an interesting volume entitled De Stationum veteri instituto a Xisto V. P. M. revocato.

(1587). Rudolf Hospinian, a Protestant scholar, composed two large liturgical works filled with learning that makes one regret he did not devote it to a better cause. The first is De Templis, hoc est de Origine, Progressu, Usu et Abusu templorum, ac omnino rerum omnium ad templa pertinentium, libri quinque. The second is Festa christianorum, hoc est de Origine, Progressu, Cæremoniis et Ritibus festorum dierum christianorum libri tres.

[margin: Marc-Antoine Mazzaroni.]

(1588). Marc-Antoine Mazzaroni wrote de Tribus Coronis pontificis Romani, nec non de Osculo sanctissimorum pedum ejus.

[margin: Gilbert Génébrard, monk of Cluny and archbishop of Aix.]

(1590). Gilbert Génébrard, a monk of Cluny and archbishop of Aix, one of the most learned men of his time, translated, among other Greek books and authors, the Liturgy of the Presanctified, the Menologion, and Symeon of Thessalonica’s treatise on the Church’s Seven Mysteries. He also composed a short French work, Liturgie apostolique [Apostolic Liturgy].

[margin: Augustine Fivizzani, sacristan of the Apostolic Palace. George Ferrari, new editor of Hittorp’s collection.]

(1592). Augustine Fivizzani, sacristan of the Apostolic Palace, left a specialized work de Ritu sanctissimæ Crucis Romano pontifici præferendæ.

(1592). George Ferrari issued an edition of Hittorp’s collection at Rome that year. He added the books of Saint Peter Damian, Peter the Venerable, and Honorius of Autun, already included in Cochlaeus’s Speculum, and also Rupert of Deutz’s de Divinis Officiis, together with the Speculum de Mysteriis *(p. 479)* Ecclesiæ [Mirror of the mysteries of the Church], and the other short works attributed to Hugh of Saint Victor.

[margin: Angelo Rocca, sacristan of the papal chapel.]

(1593). Angelo Rocca, bishop of Tagaste and sacristan of the papal chapel, treated many liturgical questions in specialized works collected in the two precious volumes Thesaurus pontificiarum sacrarumque antiquitatum, nec non rituum, praxium et cæremoniarum. Among them are: De Sacrosancto Christi Corpore Romanis pontificibus iter conficientibus præferendo; — De sacra summi pontificis Communione, missam solemniter celebrantis; — Commentarius de campanis; — de Tiaræ pontificiæ quam regnum mundi vulgo appellant, Origine, Significatu et Usu; — de Salutatione sacerdotis in missa et in divinis officiis, nec non de ministri vel chori Responsione; — de Precatione qua lectiones in matutino prævenimus, nec non de fine quo eas claudimus; — Feria quidnam sit, et cur dies ab ecclesiasticis viris feriarum nominibus in Ecclesia nuncupentur; — de Origine et Institutione benedictionis candelarum, vel cereorum in festivitate Purificationis B. M. V.; — Unde cineres super caput spargendi usus originem habeat et quæ sibi velint?; — Aurea rosa, ensis et pileus, quæ regibus ac magnatibus a summo Pontifice benedicta in donum mittuntur, quid sibi velint? etc. Rocca also worked on correcting the Gregorian Sacramentary included in Saint Gregory's Works, printed at Rome in 1593 and also published separately with notes in the same city in 1596. We also owe him an edition of Samarini's Sacerdotal, a kind of ritual that we shall discuss elsewhere.

[margin: Francis Ferrario.]

(1594). Zaccaria names Francis Ferrario as the author of a book on the consecration of churches, printed at Cremona.

[margin: Cornelius Schulting,]

(1599). Cornelius Schulting, dean of the Faculty of Cologne, *(p. 480)* and a canon of Saint Andrew's in that city, left several works of remarkable learning for their time. One is Bibliotheca ecclesiastica, seu commentaria sacra de expositione et illustratione Missalis et Breviarii. Cologne, 1599, four folio volumes. Despite its many imperfections, it must be considered the first attempted liturgical library. Zaccaria drew much information from it for his own that he would not have found elsewhere.

[margin: dean of Cologne's Faculty of Theology, author of the first liturgical library.]

[margin: Cardinals Robert Bellarmine and Silvio Antoniano.]

(1602). In this year of Clement VIII's edition of the Roman Breviary, we place among the liturgists the two cardinals Robert Bellarmine and Silvio Antoniano, both members, as we have related, of the papal commission revising the breviary. Each supplied a composition of his own to make good an omission that marred Saint Pius V's breviary. That pontiff had assigned no special hymn for the Common of Holy Women. Antoniano composed the one we sing today: Fortem virili pectore [Strong with a manly heart]. As one was likewise lacking for Saint Mary Magdalene's Office, Bellarmine supplied the hymn beginning Pater superni luminis [Father of heavenly light].

[margin: The magnificent spectacle of the Church reforming]

[margin: herself during the sixteenth century.]

Here ends the history of the Liturgy in this sixteenth century, which, despite its storms and scandals, must be counted among those the Church of Jesus Christ has passed through most gloriously. Indeed, its history remains to be written. Anyone even slightly versed in religious scholarship can regard Ranke's much-vaunted work, with its omissions, prejudices, and outright errors, only as a source of information on certain points: useful only to those who already command the whole field of that age's ecclesiastical events, and very dangerous to others. What matters above all is to see the reform of *(p. 481)* the Church, renewing her own youth like an eagle's[56]. What marvelous and mighty works the Roman Pontiffs accomplish, from Pius V to Clement VIII! What energetic, intelligent government created those institutions on which Catholicism's entire outward form rests today! Pius IV publishes the rules of the Index of Prohibited Books and the celebrated profession of faith that maintains orthodoxy within the Church. Saint Pius V promulgates

the breviary, the missal, and that admirable synthesis of Catholic dogma called the Roman Catechism. Gregory XIII reforms the calendar, publishes the martyrology, and revises Gratian's Decretum. Sixtus V issues the corrected Vulgate and erects the Roman congregations. Clement VIII publishes the pontifical and ceremonial and safeguards the purity of the breviary and missal for succeeding centuries.

[margin: All the popes' efforts at this time aim to strengthen unity.]

[margin: Liturgical unity achieved especially in France.]

These are some of the sixteenth-century popes' efforts to reform the Church. All these great measures return to unity as their sole desired goal: indeed, unity saved Catholicism in the sixteenth century, as always. But this unity then needed to be developed to its ultimate consequences. So important a form as the Liturgy could therefore no longer remain apart from the great principle of Gregory VII, Charlemagne, and Saint Innocent I. The whole Church felt this, and France, leading the other provinces of the Catholic world, hastened to support the Apostolic See's aims. As in the world's earliest days, the earth had one language and the same words[57]. Today that unity is broken, that harmony shattered. While the rest of the world still prays with Rome, France has rent this *(p. 482)* communion, so moving, so sacred[58]. When will this liturgical unity be reborn, prepared so carefully by the Supreme Pontiffs to safeguard dogma and ecclesiastical liberty? When shall we say, with the Fathers of the Council of Vannes in 461: Since we hold one faith, let us also keep one rule for the Divine Offices[59]? We are no longer asked, as in Pepin's and Charlemagne's time, to renounce rites established here by the founders of our Churches. Scarcely more than a century ago we shared one prayer with the Roman Church: why should we not return to it? We appeal to those who have followed these feeble pages: does the Church not desire unity in the Liturgy as in everything else? Can our doctrine on this point differ from the Apostolic See's, expressed by Clement VIII in these beautiful words:

[margin: The unhappy rupture of this unity in succeeding centuries; how important its restoration would be.]

"Since, in the Catholic Church established by Christ our Lord under one head, His Vicar on earth, unity and conformity in matters concerning God's glory and the proper duties of ecclesiastical persons must always be preserved, above all this communion in offering prayers to the one God in one and the same form, contained in the Roman Breviary, must be perpetually retained, so that God may always be praised and invoked by Christ's faithful, in the Church spread throughout the world, in one and the same order of prayer and psalmody[60]."

Such is the Church's desire; what would be contrary to it is therefore not the Church's desire. Let us pray that the God of *(p. 483)* peace and unity may order all things in his strength and gentleness; that unity of prayer may be restored in our homeland, and the Supreme Shepherd's prayer may be the sheep's prayer, as his faith and doctrine are already their faith and doctrine.

(p. 484)

Notes to Chapter XV

Note A

Pius Episcopus, Servus Servorum Dei,

Ad Perpetuam Rei Memoriam.

Quod a nobis postulat ratio pastoralis Officii, in eam curam incumbimus, ut omnes, quantum Deo adjutore fieri poterit, sacri Tridentini concilii decreta exequantur, ac multo id etiam impensius faciendum intelligimus, cum ea quæ in mores inducenda sunt, maxime Dei gloriam, ac debitum ecclesiasticarum personarum officium complectuntur. Quo in genere existimamus in primis numerandas esse sacras preces, laudes, et gratias Deo persolvendas, quæ Romano breviario continentur. Quæ divini Officii formula, pie olim, ac sapienter a summis Pontificibus, præsertim Gelasio, ac Gregorio primis constituta, a Gregorio autem septimo

reformata, cum diuturnitate temporis ab antiqua institutione deflexisset, necessaria visa res est, quæ ad pristinam orandi regulam conformata revocaretur. Alii enim præclaram veteris Breviarii constitutionem, multis locis mutilatam, alii incertis et advenis quibusdam commutatam deformarunt. Plurimi, specie Officii commodioris allecti, ad brevitatem novi Breviarii a Francisco Quignonio tit. S. Crucis in Hierusalem presbytero card. compositi confugerunt. Quin etiam in provincias paulatim irrepserat prava illa consuetudo, ut Episcopi in Ecclesiis, quæ ab initio communiter cum cæteris veteri Romano more Horas canonicas dicere ac psallere consuevissent, privatum sibi quisque breviarium conficerent, et illam communionem uni Deo, una et eadem formula, preces et laudes adhibendi, dissimillimo inter se, ac pene cujusque episcopatus proprio Officio discerperent. Hinc illa tam multis in locis divini cultus perturbatio; hinc summa in Clero ignoratio cæremoniarum, ac rituum ecclesiasticorum, ut innumerabiles Ecclesiarum ministri in suo munere indecore, non sine magna piorum offensione, versarentur.

Hanc nimirum orandi varietatem gravissime ferens fel. rec. Paulus Papa IV, emendare constituerat; itaque provisione adhibita, ne ulla in posterum novi Breviarii licentia permitteretur, totam rationem dicendi, ac psallendi Horas canonicas, ad pristinum morem et institutum redigendam suscepit.

Sed eo, postea nondum iis quæ egregie inchoaverat perfectis, de vita decedente, cum a piæ memoriæ Pio Papa IV Tridentinum concilium, antea varie intermissum, revocatum esset. Patres in illa salutarii refor- *(p. 485)* matione ab eodem Concilio constituta, Breviarium ex ipsius Pauli Papæ ratione restituere cogitarunt. Itaque quidquid ab eo in sacro opere collectum, elaboratumque fuerat, Concilii Patribus Tridentum a prædicto Pio Papa missum est; ubi cum doctis quibusdam, et piis viris a Concilio datum esset negotium, ut ad reliquam cogitationem, Breviarii quoque curam adjungerent, instante jam conclusione Concilii, tota res ad auctoritatem judiciumque Romani pontificis ex decreto ejusdem Concilii relata est; qui illis ipsis Patribus ad id munus delectis, Romam vocatis, nonnullisque in Urbe idoneis viris ad eum numerum adjunctis, rem perficiendam voluit. Verum eo etiam in viam universæ carnis ingresso, Nos, ita divina disponente clementia, licet immerito, ad Apostolatus apicem assumpti, cum sacrum opus, adhibitis etiam ad illud aliis peritis viris, maxime urgeremus, magna in nos Dei benignitate (sic enim accipimus), Romanum hoc breviarium vidimus absolutum. Cujus ratione dispositionis ab illis ipsis, qui negotio præpositi fuerant, non semel cognita, cum intelligeremus, eos in rei confectione ab antiquis Breviarii nobilium Urbis Ecclesiarum, ac nostræ Vaticanæ bibliothecæ non decessisse, gravesque præterea aliquot eo in genere scriptores secutos esse, ac denique remotis iis, quæ aliena et incerta essent, de propria summa veteris divini Officii nihil omisisse; opus probavimus, et Romæ imprimi, impressumque divulgari jussimus. Itaque, ut divini hujus operis effectus re ipsa consequatur, auctoritate præsentium tollimus in primis, et abolemus Breviarium novum a Francisco cardinale prædicto editum, et in quacumque ecclesia, monasterio, conventu, ordine, militia, et loco virorum et mulierum, etiam exempto, tam a primæva institutione, quam aliter ab hac Sede permissum.

Ac etiam abolemus quæcumque alia breviaria vel antiquiora, vel quovis privilegio munita, vel ab episcopis in suis diœcesibus pervulgata, omnemque illorum usum de omnibus orbis ecclesiis, monasteriis, conventibus, militiis, ordinibus, et locis virorum ac mulierum etiam exemptis, in quibus alias Officium divinum Romanæ ecclesiæ ritu dici consuevit, aut debet; illis tamen exceptis, quæ ab ipsa prima institutione a Sede apostolica approbata, vel consuetudine, quæ vel ipsa institutio ducentos annos antecedebat, aliis certis breviariis usa fuisse constiterit: quibus, ut inveteratum illud jus dicendi, et psallendi suum Officium non adimimus, sic eisdem si forte hoc nostrum, quod modo pervulgatum est, magis placeat, dummodo episcopus, et universum Capitulum in eo consentiant, ut id in choro dicere, et psallere possint, permittimus.

Omnes vero, et quascumque apostolicas, et alias permissiones, ac consuetudines et statuta, etiam juramento, confirmatione apostolica, vel alia firmitate munita, nec non privilegia, licentias et indulta precandi et psallendi, tam in choro quam extra illum, more et ritu breviariorum sic suppressorum, prædictis ecclesiis, monasteriis, conventibus, militiis, ordinibus et locis, nec non S. R. E. cardinalibus, patriarchis, archie- *(p. 486)* piscopis, episcopis, abbatibus, et aliis ecclesiarum prælatis, cæterisque omnibus et singulis personis

ecclesiasticis, sæcularibus et regularibus utriusque sexus, quacumque causa concessa, approbata, et innovata, quibuscumque concepta formulis, ac decretis et clausulis roborata, omnino revocamus; volumusque illa omnia vim et effectum de cætero non habere.

Omni itaque alio usu, quibuslibet, ut dictum est, interdicto, hoc nostrum Breviarium, ac precandi, psallendique formulam, in omnibus universi orbis ecclesiis, monasteriis, ordinibus, et locis etiam exemptis, in quibus Officium ex more, et ritu dictæ Romanæ ecclesiæ dici debet, aut consuevit, salva prædicta institutione, vel consuetudine prædictos ducentos annos superante, præcipimus observari. Statuentes Breviarium ipsum nullo unquam tempore, vel in totum, vel ex parte mutandum, vel ei aliquid addendum, vel omnino detrahendum esse; ac quoscumque, qui Horas canonicas ex more et ritu ipsius Romanæ ecclesiæ, jure vel consuetudine dicere, vel psallere debent, propositis pœnis per canonicas sanctiones constitutis, in eos qui divinum Officium quotidie non dixerint, ad dicendum et psallendum posthac in perpetuum Horas ipsas diurnas et nocturnas ex hujus Romani breviarii præscripto et ratione omnino teneri, neminemque ex iis, quibus hoc dicendi psallendique munus necessario impositum est, nisi hac sola formula satisfacere posse.

Jubemus igitur omnes, et singulos patriarchas, archiepiscopos, episcopos, abbates, et cæteros ecclesiarum prælatos, ut omissis quæ sic suppressimus, et abolevimus, cæteris omnibus etiam privatim per eos constitutis, Breviarium hoc in suis quisque ecclesiis, monasteriis, conventibus, ordinibus, militiis, diœcesibus, et locis prædictis introducant; et tam ipsi, quam cæteri omnes presbyteri, et clerici, sæculares et regulares utriusque sexus, nec non milites, et exempti, quibus Officium dicendi, et psallendi quomodocumque, sicut prædicitur, injunctum est, ut ex hujus nostri Breviarii formula, tam in choro quam extra illum, dicere et psallere procurent.

As for what the Rubrics of this Office of Ours prescribe concerning the days on which the Office of the Blessed Mary ever Virgin and of the Dead, and likewise the Seven Penitential Psalms and the Gradual Psalms, ought to be said and chanted: in consideration of the various affairs of this life and the occupations of many, We have judged that the danger of sin should be removed from that prescription. Yet, mindful of the duty of pastoral care, We earnestly exhort all in the Lord to go beyond Our relaxation, as far as possible, by their own devotion and diligence, and to strive through these prayers, suffrages, and praises also to provide for their own salvation and that of others. To stir the will and zeal of the faithful still further to this salutary practice, trusting in the mercy of almighty God and the authority of His blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, We remit one hundred days of the penance imposed on them each time they say the Office of the Blessed Mary or of the Dead on the very days specified in the Rubrics; but to those who say the Seven Psalms or *(p. 487)* the Gradual Psalms, fifty days. We grant this without prejudice to the holy custom of those churches in which the Little Office of the Blessed Mary ever Virgin was customarily said in choir, so that in those churches the same praiseworthy and holy custom of celebrating the aforesaid Office in the usual manner is to be preserved.

Furthermore, so that these present letters may become more fully known to all, We order their publication at the doors of the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles in the City and of the Apostolic Chancery, and at the edge of the Campo de' Fiori, with a copy posted there in the customary manner. We will and decree by apostolic authority that, after such publication, those present in the Roman Curia shall be bound to pray and chant according to this breviary's rite, both in choir and outside it, immediately after one month has elapsed; the others on this side of the mountains, after three months; and those beyond them, wherever they live, after six months, or as soon as copies of this breviary become available to them for purchase. Copies of these letters bearing a public notary's signature and the seal of an ecclesiastical prelate or of that Curia, or even copies printed at Rome in the volumes themselves without that or any other supporting authentication, shall everywhere command the same credence as these present letters themselves if exhibited or shown.

But so that the breviary itself may everywhere remain inviolate and uncorrupted, We forbid its being printed, offered, or received anywhere in the whole world without express permission from Us or from a special

apostolic commissioner to be appointed for this purpose in each kingdom and province of the Christian world. Whoever prints, offers, or receives it otherwise, We bind by that very fact with the sentence of excommunication.

Therefore, let no one whatsoever infringe this instrument of Our removal, abolition, permission, revocation, order, precept, statute, concession, mandate, decree, relaxation, exhortation, prohibition, imposition of censure, and will, or rashly presume to contravene it.

If anyone, etc.

Dat. Romæ, apud S. Petrum, anno Incarnationis Dominicæ 1568, septimo Id. Julii, Pontificatus nostri anno tertio.

Note B

Pius Episcopus, Servus Servorum Dei,

Ad Perpetuam Rei Memoriam.

Quo primum tempore ad Apostolatus apicem assumpti fuimus, ad ea libenter animum, viresque nostras intendimus, et cogitationes omnes direximus, quæ ad ecclesiasticum purum retinendum cultum pertine- *(p. 488)* rent, eaque parare, et Deo ipso adjuvante, omni adhibito studio, efficere contendimus.

Cumque inter alia sacri Tridentini concilii decreta, nobis statuendum esset de sacris libris, catechismo, missali et breviario, edendis atque emendandis, edito jam, Deo ipso annuente, ad populi eruditionem, catechismo, et ad debitas Deo persolvendas laudes breviario, castigato, omnino ut breviario missale responderet, ut congruum est, et conveniens (cum unum in Ecclesia Dei psallendi modum, unum Missæ celebrandæ ritum esse maxime deceat), necesse jam videbatur, ut quod reliquum in hac parte esset, de ipso nempe missali edendo, quam primum cogitaremus.

Quare eruditis delectis viris onus hoc demandandum duximus, qui quidem diligenter collatis omnibus cum vetustissimis nostræ Vaticanæ bibliothecæ, aliisque undique conquisitis, emendatis, atque incorruptis codicibus, nec non veterum consultis ac probatorum auctorum scriptis, qui de sacro eorumdem Rituum instituto monumenta nobis reliquerunt, ad pristinam missale ipsum Sanctorum Patrum normam ac ritum restituerunt. Quod recognitum jam, et castigatum mature adhibita consideratione, ut ex hoc instituto, cœptoque labore fructus omnes percipiant, Romæ quam primum imprimi, atque impressum edi mandavimus, nempe ut sacerdotes intelligant, quibus precibus uti, quos ritus, quasve cæremonias in missarum celebratione retinere posthac debeant. Ut autem a sacrosancta Romana ecclesia, cæterarum ecclesiarum matre et magistra tradita ubique amplectantur omnes et observent, ne in posterum perpetuis futuris temporibus in omnibus christiani orbis provinciarum patriarchalibus, cathedralibus, collegiatis, et parochialibus, sæcularibus et quorumvis ordinum et monasteriorum, tam virorum quam mulierum, etiam militiarum regularibus, ac sine cura ecclesiis, vel capellis, in quibus missa conventualis alta voce cum choro, aut demissa celebrari juxta Romanæ ecclesiæ ritum consuevit, vel debet, alias quam juxta Missalis a nobis editi formulam, decantetur aut recitetur, etiamsi eædem Ecclesiæ quovis modo exemptæ apostolicæ Sedis indulto, consuetudine, privilegio, etiam juramento, confirmatione apostolica, vel aliis quibusvis facultatibus munitæ sint, nisi ab ipsa prima institutione a Sede apostolica approbata, vel consuetudine, quæ vel ipsa institutio super ducentos annos missarum celebrandarum in eisdem ecclesiis assidue observata sit, a quibus, ut præfatam celebrandi constitutionem vel consuetudinem nequaquam auferimus, sic si Missale hoc, quod nunc in lucem edi curavimus, iisdem magis placeret, de episcopi vel prælati, capitulique universi consensu, ut quibusvis non obstantibus, juxta illud missas celebrare possint permittimus, ex aliis vero omnibus ecclesiis præfatis eorumdem missalium usum tollendo, illaque penitus et omnino rejiciendo.

Ac huic Missali nostro nuper edito, nihil unquam addendum, detrahendum, aut immutandum esse decernendo, sub indignationis nostræ pœna, *(p. 489)* hac nostra perpetuo valitura constitutione statuimus et ordinamus. Mandantes, ac districte omnibus et singulis ecclesiarum prædictarum patriarchis, et administratoribus, aliisque personis quacumque ecclesiastica dignitate fulgentibus, etiamsi sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ cardinales, aut cujusvis alterius gradus et præeminentiæ fuerint, illis in virtute sanctæ obedientiæ præcipientes, ut cæteris omnibus rationibus et ritibus ex aliis missalibus quantumvis vetustis hactenus observari consuetis, in posterum penitus omissis, ac plane rejectis, missam juxta ritum, modum, ac normam, quæ per Missale hoc a nobis nunc traditur, decantent ac legant, neque in missæ celebratione alias cæremonias vel preces, quam quæ hoc Missali continentur, addere vel recitare præsumant. Atque ut hoc ipsum Missale in missa decantanda aut recitanda in quibusvis ecclesiis absque ullo conscientiæ scrupulo, aut aliquarum pœnarum, sententiarum et censurarum incursu posthac omnino sequantur, eoque libere et licite uti possint et valeant, auctoritate apostolica, tenore præsentium, etiam perpetuo concedimus et indulgemus. Neve præsules, administratores, canonici, capellani, et alii quocumque nomine nuncupati presbyteri, sæculares, aut cujusvis ordinis regulares, ad missam aliter quam a Nobis statutum est, celebrandam teneantur; neque ad Missale hoc immutandum a quolibet cogi et compelli.

We likewise establish and declare that these present letters may never be revoked or modified, but shall always remain firm and valid in their force.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, apostolic constitutions and ordinances, general or particular constitutions and ordinances issued in provincial and synodal councils, the usage of the aforesaid churches established by very long and immemorial prescription, though not for more than two hundred years, and any contrary statutes and customs whatsoever.

We will and decree by the same authority that, after publication of this constitution and missal of Ours, priests present in the Roman Curia shall be bound to sing or read Mass according to it after one month; those on this side of the mountains, after three months; and those dwelling beyond the mountains, after six months, or as soon as this missal is made available to them.

So that it may everywhere be preserved uncorrupted and purged of mistakes and errors, by apostolic authority and the tenor of these presents We likewise forbid all printers living in Our dominions and those of the holy Roman Church, whether mediately or immediately subject, under pain of forfeiture of the books and one hundred gold ducats, to be applied by that very fact to the Apostolic Camera; and other printers anywhere in the world, under pain of automatic excommunication and other penalties at Our discretion, to dare or presume in any way to print, offer, or receive it without [permission] from Us or a special apostolic commissioner to be appointed by Us in those regions, and unless full assurance has first been given that this commissioner has collated the printer's copy of the missal, from which the standard for printing other copies is to be taken, with the missal printed in the City in the *(p. 490)* large edition, and that it agrees with that missal and differs from it in no respect whatsoever.

But because it would be difficult to convey these present letters to every place in the Christian world and bring them promptly to everyone's knowledge, We order their customary publication and posting at the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, the Apostolic Chancery, and the edge of the Campo de' Fiori. We command that copies of these same letters, even printed copies, signed by a public notary and bearing the seal of a person holding ecclesiastical dignity, be given everywhere among all peoples and places the very same unquestioned credence as these present letters would receive if shown or exhibited.

Therefore, let no one, etc.

Datum Romæ, apud Sanctum Petrum, anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo quingentesimo septuagesimo, pridie Idus Julii, Pont. nostri anno quinto.

Note C

The dean and Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris, to the venerable men and lords, the dean and canons of the Church of Soissons, greetings: Honored sirs, in recent days We have learned that certain breviaries recently printed under Reginald Chaudière's direction have been given to the clerics of your diocese, in quibus pleraque extranea et a communi Ecclesiæ usu aliena contineri nobis ex eorum inspectione certo constitit. Quod profecto odiosum schisma et perniciosum in ecclesiam Gallicanam (ni celerius occurratur), facile potest inducere. Quod si contingeret vestro nomini alias glorioso nota inureretur quæ vix sæculis multis posset aboleri; vestrum itaque erit tanto malo priusquam latius serpat, obsistere.

May the Lord preserve your venerable body as it labors for the Church's welfare. Given in Our congregation specially convened for this purpose at the College of the Sorbonne, on Saturday, July 24, in the year of the Lord 1529. (D'Argentré, Collectio judiciorum, vol. II, p. 77.)

Note D

In the year of the Lord 1548, on the first day of the month of March.... The title of the new Orléans Breviary is suspect and erroneous, and what was expunged from the old one is neither vain nor useless nor offensive to pious and learned ears. The Christian reader will easily recognize this from what follows. First, the prayers customarily said after Lauds, Vespers, and the other Hours are removed from the aforesaid old breviary on certain weekdays on which the ferial Office [dieta] is said. On other weekdays on which the ferial Office is said, such prayers are indeed said after Lauds and Vespers, but are removed from the other places, *(p. 491)* fol. 52. From the prayers to be said during Lent, however, the Penitential Psalms formerly said after the psalm Miserere [Have mercy] are removed.

Insuper subtrahuntur a Sanctorum festis multæ lectiones matutinarum, vel omnino, vel ex parte. Ita ut e festis novem lectionum aliquando festa trium lectionum fiant, et e festis trium lectionum fiant festa simplicis memoriæ. Ubi autem prædicta festorum mutatio non fit, nihilominus tolluntur plerumque lectiones aliquot matutinarum, vel ex ipsis festis, vel ex octavis eorumdem. Tolluntur, inquam, modo integræ, modo in parte concisæ, fitque concisio nunc in principio lectionis. Unde vocabulum istud, Beatus, vel Beatissimus præciditur. Quod tamen in exordio Legendæ Sanctorum, ad Dei laudem et ipsorum laudem propriis nominibus anteponi consueverat. Aliquando concisio fit in medio, aliquando in fine; in quibus et aliis plerisque locis nonnulla auferuntur Sanctorum miracula, quandoque operum merita, nonnumquam Sanctorum invocationes, ut videre est a secundo folio partis hyemalis usque ad secundum, et in plerisque aliis locis. Ad hæc nonnulla expunguntur quæ maxime facere videbantur ad Sacramentum Eucharistiæ, Confirmationem, ut perspicuum est ex historiis BB. Gregorii, Benedicti, Ambrosii, et Mariæ Ægyptiacæ. Multa sunt et alia subtracta, quæ ad veram Christi religionem plurimum conducebant, ut sunt jejunia, carnis maceratio, sanctorum Templorum fundationes et dotationes eorum. Hæc patent in festis SS. Antonii, Ludovici, Genovefæ, et aliorum multorum. Item si qui Sancti in Officiis suarum festivitatum habebant proprios hymnos, proprias antiphonas, aliave suffragia, illis plerumque resecatis, ad Commune recurrendum esse annotatur. Quod similiter nonnunquam fit in lectionibus. Id autem fieri deprehendere licet non tantum in aliis, verum etiam in eis festivitatibus, quæ Aurelianensis ecclesiæ peculiares sunt. Quare timendum est, ne christianorum devotio erga Sanctos, quibus magis afficiebatur, quando peculiaria eorum merita et virtutes seu legebat, seu recenseri audiebat, tandem imminuatur, vel prorsus depereat. Quapropter tot et tantæ mutationes, ac subtractiones factæ sunt, et præsertim earum rerum, quæ ad fidei et morum ædificationem et ad hæresium destructionem, hac nostra tempestate certo deploranda vigentium, conducebant. Videtur dicti Breviarii nova ista mutatio imprudens, temeraria, et scandalosa, neque carens suspicione favendi hæreticis.

But if there are any vain and useless things in the old breviary, as the compilers of the new one say, let them show and produce them, and the Faculty will pass judgment on them.

Given in Our general congregation held under oath at Saint-Mathurin, on the first day of March 1548. (D'Argentré, ibid., p. 160.)

Note E

Wednesday, May 2, 1583.

Since, because copies of the Parisian breviary and missal were scarce, it had previously been discussed repeatedly that both should be reprinted, *(p. 492)* and the need of the churches of the diocese of Paris, becoming more pressing over the past two years, had been reported to this chapter on behalf of the reverend lord bishop of Paris, several men preeminent in learning and piety had been duly chosen to provide for the restoration and reform reasonably desired in this matter. They applied such diligence to it that the first part of the breviary is almost finished, and the rest would have advanced further had the work not been delayed, with many desiring the Roman use restored by decree of the most holy Council of Trent, and with certain other causes intervening.

All this was laid before this chapter by the said reverend lord bishop of Paris in the provident and wise discharge of his pastoral care, and the advice of the lords dean and chapter was sought. At length, on a specified day of a special meeting customarily summoned for this purpose, they considered first the antiquity of the Parisian breviary and missal, whose use is permitted under the decretal concerning the latest Roman use; then the ceremonies and rite in which the Church of Paris has hitherto excelled the other churches of France, indeed those of almost the whole Christian world, and is held in the greatest admiration by all who see and hear, not without glory to God; and finally many other considerations. Members were appointed on behalf of the lords dean and chapter to report their deliberation to the said reverend lord and ask him, for these reasons, to continue the old use in his church.

In his absence, this deliberation was communicated to his vicar general, and all other matters requiring consideration and examination in this affair were weighed. The lords dean and chapter judged it more fitting to retain the Parisian breviary and missal in the Church of Paris itself and have them printed, after both had first been duly purged and restored by the gentlemen already appointed for this purpose. So that this might be done sooner and without hindrance, the delegated precentor and Le Prévost were to urge those gentlemen, with all proper earnestness, to bring the restoration they had recently begun, highly to be praised by all, to a corresponding conclusion, earnestly desired again and again. (Preuves des Libertés de l'Église gallicane, vol. II, p. 1140.)

Note F

God, most good and most great, has always delighted in and made use of variety, as is evident in creation itself, in which He took pleasure in diversity. Here His powerful and wise providence is manifest in the concord and harmony of diverse and contrary things.

This conflicts with reason and with faith working through charity. For lower reason must agree with eternal reason, which from the beginning placed diversity in the constitution of the universe, so that there might be a discordant concord; so that we might also be stirred more strongly to virtue when more examples of it are set before us; and so that God might be praised more in the multitude and variety of His wonders. This would diminish the glory of God, most good and most great, the veneration of the saints, and Christians' edification through examples.

Hoc valde minuit episcoporum et diœceseon auctoritatem.

(p. 493) Qui hoc promovent non sunt viri simplices, et devoti, seu spiritales, sed astuti, politici, qui ex re qualibet, quolibet modo rem suam mundanam conantur facere.

The Queen stood at the Bridegroom's right hand, clothed in variety.

As every novelty is suspect, so a great change of this kind cannot occur without great harm.

This would encourage disobedience and laxity among cantors and servants of the Church, since all churches would have one and the same Office.

What expenses would be required? Country people could not help their parish priests celebrate the Office, yet this is especially necessary in villages.

The Holy Spirit made them speak of the mighty acts of God in every tongue (Acts, 11). This is an argument for diversity in the Church's Office, as is seen in the universe and in the members of the human body.

The holy Fathers of old surpassed us in wisdom, prudence, virtue, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. For just reasons they allowed and established distinct breviaries for distinct dioceses. Let Gaul, then, admire her Marcellus while Rome admires her Sylvester.

Such a change would help and delight heretics, as though the Catholic Fathers had been in error or ignorance in so great a matter. This would scandalize devout Catholics, who might thereby come to doubt the very faith and religion whose accustomed profession they saw so altered. What benefit does this bring?

Reliqui episcopi habent potestatem politiæ et ordinationis in suis diœcesibus, ut Romanus in sua: hoc autem bona ex parte convelleretur.

Why adopt the Roman Breviary, which we have seen changed and abandoned three times within a few years? When another pope succeeds, perhaps a new breviary will have to be awaited.

Hoc est contra libertatem ecclesiæ Gallicanæ, quæ si Romanæ in hac professione generali et maxima se submittat, quid restat nisi quod etiam ex consequenti sæpe submittet in reliqua omni politia? Nam accessorium sequitur principale.

Each church and province has always enjoyed its own rites, according to the saying:

"If you are at Rome, live by Roman custom; If you are elsewhere, live as they do there.

Village churches often do not follow their cathedral's regulations, and cathedrals would follow the Breviary of the Roman Church.

The greedy and ever ambitious Romans thus arrange to profit from printing, as we see has already been done through many privileges concerning this matter.

Let correction be made, yet very prudently, and without fussiness or scrupulosity *(p. 494)* to excess, if anything in the diocesan breviaries needs correction; but let them not be abandoned.

As a result, preachers and parish priests would not teach the people so readily, being unfamiliar with the accounts of many particular saints more celebrated and known in particular places.

Where God, most good and most great, has given saints, there He also wishes the faithful people to invoke Him through them, just as He wished to be petitioned by the children of Israel through their fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Let the breviaries of the individual dioceses therefore be retained.

If the veneration of particular saints, so vast and almost countless in number, were cast aside, the Church would not be helped by them in the same way. For when petitioned and praised, they intercede and help. Hence the Church, through the Holy Spirit, ordained that they be celebrated in their own particular places.

While the Church was still in its infancy, gathering into one body with the spirit of teaching fervent, each person brought his particular devotion (I Cor., 14). How much more, then, when they were dispersed throughout the world, did each parish, or at least diocese, retain its own devotion and form of prayer, always in good order? Here the earth nourishes trees and seeds bearing diverse fruits.

Non major est ratio quod omnes sacerdotes ubique dicant unum breviarium, quam quod omnes laici unam tantum orationem Deo Opt. Max. offerant.

God, most good and most great, who wishes to be acknowledged by tithes and firstfruits, no more wishes such offerings to be made to Him from what grows in each province—for not every land produces everything—than He desires to be worshiped and praised for the wonders He has bestowed and worked through the individual saints proper to each particular province.

Quid inde provenit, nisi Romanæ, non dico religionis, sed superbiæ et ambitionis auctio? Non cedat crista Gallica Romano supercilio, non enim hic de religione, sed de superbia astuta agitur.

For where are the decrees of ecumenical councils observed less than at Rome? Is this not lording it over the clergy rather than building up the Church? Antiquity said that the world is greater than the City; here, however, the City tries to embrace the world and subject it to herself.

Here a snake lies hidden in the grass in this most suspicious, crafty, and evil age. Here, then, appear those who change times and laws (Daniel, VIII). Christ warns (Matt., XXIV) that only the one who perseveres to the end will be saved. Perseverance, however, is not obstinacy in profane novelty, but the religious continuation of antiquity.

Let no shameful and harmful spiritual wound be admitted for the sake of avoiding temporal expenses.

In the Church triumphant in heaven—according to whose model and likeness all things on earth ought to be done—as there are various forms of hearts, orders, and ranks, so too there are diverse forms of praises and crowns.

We do not think it free from impiety to bury on earth the memory of those *(p. 495)* whose names are written in the book of life and glorious in heaven. Yet this would happen if the particular breviaries of particular dioceses were removed. For it is not enough to retain them in writing unless they are also honorably commemorated in the churches.

This is neither the Council’s wish nor the Pope’s intention, but that of the Pope’s flatterers, who serve their own interests to the detriment of religion’s fullness.

If the Roman Breviary is accepted, either a good part of it will be lost, or the countless [forms] of particular devotion for celebrating individual saints omitted from that breviary. Founders will be abandoned, and so will the Offices to which the particular churches are bound, with the gravest injustice. Let monks retain their own breviary, and let the hierarchical pastors fittingly use theirs.

Of those who pursue this, some fear the expense, others flatter and hope for gain, while still others secretly and craftily intend to diminish the worship and splendor of the Catholic profession and to disturb the Catholic Church.

This proposal overturns ecclesiastical customs and traditions, to religion’s great detriment. That cannot happen without scandal to Catholics and elation among heretics, who will boast that such a change on our part proves previous error and ignorance in the profession of the Catholic religion, drawing the same conclusion about its conviction and doctrine. Such a change, therefore, especially at this time, would be imprudent and most dangerous.

Hic episcopi in suis diœcesibus, si intelligunt quod sunt, habent potestatem orationis modum constituendi, sicut Papa in Romana diœcesi et ecclesia (hoc enim sonat et significat vocabulum Pontifex, Hebr. cap. V, et IX); alioqui fierent Papæ capellani.

(Preuves des Libertés de l’Église gallicane. Ibid.)

Note G

Jam vero, cum sacri ritus et cæremoniæ, quibus Ecclesia a Spiritu Sancto edocta ex apostolica traditione, et disciplina utitur, in sacramentorum administratione, divinis officiis, omnique Dei, et Sanctorum veneratione, magnam christiani populi eruditionem, veræque fidei protestationem contineant, rerum sacrarum majestatem commendant, fidelium mentes ad rerum altissimarum meditationem sustollant, et devotionis etiam igne inflamment, cupientes filiorum Ecclesiæ pietatem et divinum cultum sacris ritibus, et cæremoniis conservandis, instaurandisque magis augere; quinque itidem cardinales delegimus, quibus hæc præcipue cura incumbere debeat, ut veteres ritus sacri ubivis locorum, in omnibus Urbis, orbisque ecclesiis, etiam in capella nostra pontificia, in missis, divinis officiis, sacramentorum administratione, cæterisque ad divinum cultum pertinentibus, a quibusvis personis diligenter obser- *(p. 496)* ventur, cæremoniæ si exoleverint, restituantur, si depravatæ fuerint, reformentur, libros de sacris ritibus, et cæremoniis, imprimis Pontificale, Rituale, Cæremoniale, prout opus fuerit, reforment et emendent, officia divina de sanctis Patronis examinent et nobis prius consultis, concedant. Diligentem quoque curam adhibeant circa Sanctorum canonizationem, festorumque dierum celebritatem, ut omnia rite, et recte, et ex Patrum traditione fiant, et ut reges et principes, eorumque oratores, aliæque personæ, etiam ecclesiasticæ, ad Urbem, curiamque Romanam venientes, pro Sedis apostolicæ dignitate ac benignitate honorifice more majorum excipiantur, cogitationem suscipiant, seduloque provideant: controversias de præcedentia in processionibus, aut alibi, cæterasque in hujusmodi sacris ritibus et cæremoniis incidentes difficultates cognoscant, summarie terminent et componant.

(Bullarium Romanum, vol. II, Luxembourg ed., p. 669.)

Note H

So that its use may be preserved in all parts of the Christian world for all future time, We decree that this same breviary may be printed in Our beloved City only in that same printing house and nowhere else. Outside the City, however, We permit its printing according to the exemplar now issued in the said printing house, and in no other way, on this condition: any printers wishing to print it may do so, provided they have first requested and obtained written permission from Our beloved sons the inquisitors of heretical depravity where these exist, or, where they do not, from the local ordinaries.

Otherwise, if they presume henceforth to print the said breviary in any form without such permission, or booksellers presume to sell it, printers and booksellers outside Our Ecclesiastical State shall incur automatic excommunication, from which they may be absolved only by the Roman Pontiff, except when at the point of death. Those residing in the beloved City or the rest of the Ecclesiastical State shall, by the fact itself and without further declaration, incur without remission a penalty of five hundred gold ducats of the Camera and forfeiture of the books and all printing type, to be applied to the aforesaid Camera.

Nonetheless, We perpetually forbid and prohibit, everywhere among all peoples and places, under the same penalties, the use of those breviaries henceforth printed or sold by them without such permission.

Before granting such permission, the inquisitors or local ordinaries themselves shall most diligently compare the breviaries to be printed by those printers, and again after printing, with this breviary revised by Our authority and now printed. They shall permit nothing to be added or removed, and shall attest in their own hand, in the original permission itself, that comparison has been made and that the texts agree in every respect. A copy of this permission shall always be printed at the beginning or end of each breviary. If they act otherwise, *(p. 497)* the inquisitors shall, by the fact itself and without further declaration, as stated above, incur deprivation of their offices and incapacity to obtain those or other offices in the future; bishops and local ordinaries, suspension a divinis [from sacred functions] and an interdict forbidding entry into a church; and their vicars, likewise deprivation of their offices and benefices, incapacity to obtain those or others in the future, and, in addition, excommunication.

(Bullarium Romanum, vol. III, p. 140.)

[1] Silos, Hist. Theatin., book III. In Bolland., vol. II, August 7, p. 251.

[2] Vita e gesti di Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, cioè di Paolo IV Pontefice Massimo, compiled by Father Dom Antonio Caracciolo. Manuscript of 1633, cited by Arévalo, Hymnodia Hispanica, p. 302 ff.

[3] Ibid.

[4] For, since the most holy Fathers once ordained that only the sacred Scriptures should be read in the Church, we do not know through what negligence other things, in no way comparable with them, took their place; meanwhile, histories of the saints have been written so crudely and with such negligent judgment that they seem to possess neither authority nor gravity. With God's guidance, therefore, and the counsel of our chapter, theologians, and other devout men, we shall consider the reform of breviaries. (Conc. Labb., vol. XIV, p. 504.)

[5] Special themes for Masses, recently invented beyond the institutions of the ancients, also displeased the Fathers, because so great a mystery ought not to be handled according to any individual's fancy. For our part, it would be permissible to omit the unlearned sequences recently introduced into missals by a sort of blind judgment. We shall therefore seem to have done something worthwhile if we see to the revision of missals as well as breviaries, so that, once only what is superfluous and what might seem to have been introduced somewhat superstitiously has been cut away, only what accords with the Church's dignity and ancient institutions may remain. (Ibid.)

[6] Breviaries and missals are to be purged; everything not drawn from the divine Scriptures is to be cut away, and the tedious length of psalms and prayers reduced through selection. Article XII. (See Grandcolas, Commentaire hist. sur le Brév. Rom., vol. I, p. 20.)

[7] The breviary is to be brought back to the form of prayers and supplications transmitted and prescribed by the Church's ancient Fathers and rulers; moreover, apocryphal material and things contributing little to pure worship are to be cut from breviaries. (See Benedict XIV, De Canonizatione Sanctorum, book IV, part II, ch. 13.)

[8] Fleury, Histoire ecclés., Continuation, vol. XXXIII, p. 14.

[9] Council of Trent, session XXV, Decree on the Index of Books and on the Catechism, Breviary, and Missal.

[10] Benedict XIV. Ibid.

[11] Merati, vol. III, Venetian edition, p. 15.

[12] Zaccaria, Bibliotheca Ritualis, vol. I, p. 116.

[13] De Canonizatione SS., book IV, part II, ch. XIII.

[14] Commentaire historique sur le Bréviaire romain, vol. I, p. 11.

[15] See Note A.

[16] See Note B.

[17] Each bishop is to ensure in his own diocese that the divine offices due at each canonical Hour are celebrated and performed, publicly in church and privately by every priest or cleric of lower order obliged to perform them, according to the prescribed form of the recently published Roman breviary. Excepted are churches where ancient custom provides another rite and manner, as safeguarded in the Supreme Pontiff Pius V's letters issued for this purpose. If any act otherwise, since they will not fulfill their obligation of the canonical Hours—as expressly laid down in those same papal letters—the bishops are to punish them with the penalties established by Leo X in the Lateran Council and by the preceding provincial synod against clerics who omit the canonical Hours. (Labb., vol. XV, p. 351.)

[18] Each bishop is to ensure in his diocese that the books formerly notated with particular antiphonal melodies, but not yet revised according to the recently published breviary, are carefully revised as soon as possible and brought into conformity with the new edition of the breviary. (Labb., vol. XV, p. 730.)

[19] E cosa santa e conveniente, che si serva il rito di quella chiesa tanto antico, et approvato, e tutti si confrontino nell' officio stesso. Pero il capitolo si provvederà di breviarii di quel rito: il che potrà fare commodamente, sendo poco fa stampato in Como. Et quando non si possi far altrimenti, monsignor Patriarca procuri, che à sue spese tra due anni sia stampato: e intanto sia lecito extra chorum solamente dir l'Officio Romano. (Madrisius, in Appendice II ad Opera S. Paulini Patriarch. Aquil.)

[20] Zaccaria, Biblioth. ritual., vol. I, p. liij.

[21] Ughelli, Italia sacra, vol. V, p. 235.

[22] Since very few missals of the Patriarchine Rite have been found, and these in manuscript, quæ præterea a missali Romano nulla ferme alia re differunt, except in the order of certain Sundays and the date of the Most Holy Trinity's feast, which has been transferred to another time, we therefore observe Masses celebrated widely according to the Roman rite, and also, by very many priests at their discretion, according to the old missal's arrangement. The latest edition has shown that the latter contained much needing revision. (Lebrun, Explication de la Messe, vol. II, p. 227.)

[23] At Rome, in the library of the Jesuits' professed house, we saw a copy of the particular breviary of Saint Barbara's collegiate-abbatial church at Mantua, printed at that church's expense, and approved by Gregory XIII, although differing in many places from Saint Pius V's breviary.

[24] Gavanti, Thesaurus sacrorum Rituum, vol. I, quarto, p. 286.

[25] This is the prayer appended under the same conclusion, not only to the Collect but also to the Secret and Postcommunion: "And guard Your servants N. our Pope, N. our bishop, N. our king, the queen and prince with the royal offspring, the people entrusted to

him, and his army, from every adversity. Grant peace and safety in our times, and drive all wickedness from Your Church. May the peoples of pagans and heretics be crushed by the power of Your right hand. Be pleased in Your mercy to free Christian captives held in the Saracens' power, and to give and preserve the fruits of the earth."

[26] See Note C.

[27] See Note D.

[28] Therefore we exhort our province's bishops diligently to inspect and examine their dioceses' books of Hours, breviaries, missals, ritual books or parish priests' manuals, and other ecclesiastical books and ceremonies, lest they contain anything contrary to Catholic doctrine or the saints' true histories, anything akin to sorcery, or anything that does not foster ecclesiastical discipline and pious conduct. They are to have the books printed after revision as far as possible, retaining diocesan usage, juxta tamen constitutiones sanctæ memoriæ Pii V super breviario Romano et Missali, ex decreto sacrosancti concilii Tridentini restituto et edito. They must ensure that all monasteries, parishes, and other churches, and all candidates for sacred orders, have the books necessary for the divine Office. Those ordained must know that they are bound to the breviary and wholly forbidden the Roman breviary of three daily readings compiled by the Cardinal of the Holy Cross and abolished by the sacred Apostolic See. (Labb., vol. XV, p. 824.)

[29] Porro quoniam omnes ritus, formulæque precandi breviario, missali, et agendis seu manuali continentur, hortamur episcopos nostræ provinciæ, ut adhibitis saltem duobus canonicis, quorum unus ab Episcopo, alter a capitulo eligatur, diligenter inspiciant et examinent hujusmodi libros, illisque similes, sicut preculas horarias, ne quid contineant contrarium doctrinæ catholicæ, et veris historiis sanctorum, aut superstitionibus affine, aut quod aliqua ratione disciplinam ecclesiasticam, morumque probitatem labefactet: atque ubi indigesta minusque pietati consona breviaria vel missalia repererint, curent quamprimum, et quam proxime fieri poterit, ad usum Ecclesiæ Romanæ, juxta constitutionem Pii V, reformari, et in lucem emitti, impensis diœcesis. (Labb., vol. XV, p. 888.)

[30] Since there is great and total diversity among the Divine Offices and their rites and ceremonies in almost every diocese of this province, and no less a shortage of the books we call breviaries, missals, manuals, or baptismal books, necessity now demands printing a large number of such books. Moreover, since even the best things grow old with age or become obsolete through grime and neglect, many things have crept into these books requiring review and perhaps amendment, which would nevertheless take too long and be too difficult. For these and other reasons, it seemed to us that one very easy remedy could meet so many difficulties if—suppressing, as we now do, Cardinal Quignon's so-called three-reading Breviary and all the others—we decreed, as by these presents we decree, that henceforth the breviaries, missals, and manuals restored and renewed for the Roman Church's use by decree of the Council of Trent, and published by order of the Supreme Pontiff Pius V, be received both privately and publicly, at the latest before Advent of the next year, 1583, by all in this province bound by office to administer the sacraments and devote themselves to divine worship, prayer, and the celebration of Masses. These alone are to be used everywhere and by everyone. (Labb., vol. XV, p. 948.)

[31] We admonish bishops to arrange for the following: missalia, breviaria, gradualia, aliosque libros ad divinum cultum necessarios, quibus fere omnes Ecclesiæ sunt destitutæ, ut exacte emendentur, ad normam a Sede apostolica et constitutione sanctæ memoriæ Pii quinti præscriptam, et intra annum eorum qui ex consuetudine provinciæ ad id tenentur impensis, imprimantur. (Labb., vol. XV, p. 1021.)

[32] Si quæ Ecclesiæ hactenus usæ sunt veteri officio Romano, nuper reformatum ex concilii Tridentini decreto recipere cogantur. (Labb., vol. XV, p. 1071.)

[33] Cupiens hæc sancta Synodus, ut omnes ecclesiastici hujus provinciæ, unanimes, uno ore tam in ecclesiis, quam privatim honorificent Deum ac Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi; et attendens quod ex constitutione felicis recordationis Pii Papæ quinti prohibitum est proprio officio relicto, aliud quam Romanum assumere: ideo cum aliæ Cathedrales Ecclesiæ officio metropolitanæ conformari non possint: statuit hæc Synodus, et omnibus ad quos spectat præcipit et mandat, sub pœna excommunicationis, ac alia arbitratu Episcopi, ut usum breviarii Romani et missalis ex decreto sacro sancti concilii Tridentini restituti et editi in omnibus hujus provinciæ ecclesiis intra illud tempus, quod hinc ad principium mensis januarii anni proximi 1586, interjectum est, omnino introducant. For this seemed more fitting than for each diocese to retain its own Office, especially since the missals, breviaries, diurnals, graduals, antiphonals, and other such books for the use of each diocese in this province are now almost all torn, indeed entirely worn out, scarcely to be found, and cannot be reprinted without great expense; et ne libri, quos tam metropolitana, quam aliæ cathedrales Ecclesiæ habent, illis inutiles remaneant, magno earumdem ecclesiarum præjudicio, placuit illos ad usum Romanum aptari et reconcinnari, impensis totius cleri uniuscujusque diœcesis. (Labb., vol. XV, p. 1134.)

[34] Sed ut major Christianorum sit inter se consensio, horæ canonicæ, tum privatim, tum publice, ex breviarii Romani præscripto recitentur. (Labb., vol. XV, p. 1388.)

[35] Therefore, that there may be unity in all things in the Church, which is one, we prescribe and command that all ecclesiastics—of the metropolitan, cathedral, collegiate, and other churches—recite the Office in choirs and chant it in churches according to the rite, order, manner, and form prescribed by Pope Pius V, of happy memory, in his bull on reforming the breviary: quam nos recipimus, et in tota provincia recipi volumus, et præsentis nostri decreti publicatione sufficienter promulgatam declaramus: contra eamdem agentes, pœnas per ipsam latas eis indicimus et significamus. (Labb., vol. XV, p. 1616.)

[36] The Parisian use was nevertheless retained at Paris's Sainte-Chapelle until Ash Wednesday 1610.

[37] Grancolas, Commentaire historique du Bréviaire romain, p. 28.

[38] Grancolas, ibid., p. 30.

[39] See Note E.

[40] Grancolas, ibid., p. 65.

[41] See Note F.

[42] The diocese of Liège, formerly in Cologne's province, long kept a distinctive breviary. Today it is subject to the Roman use, apart from certain rites of its own.

[43] Explication de la Messe, vol. IV, p. 50.

[44] Let bishops keep from churches those kinds of music in which anything lascivious or impure is mingled, whether through the organ or singing. (Council of Trent, session XXII, Decretum de observandis et evitandis in celebratione missæ [Decree on things to be observed and avoided in celebrating Mass].)

[45] As for other matters concerning the proper conduct of the Divine Offices, the appropriate manner of singing or modulating in them, fixed rules for assembling and remaining in choir, everything necessary concerning all the Church's ministers, and matters of this kind, the provincial synod shall prescribe a definite form for each, according to each province's benefit and customs. Meanwhile the bishop, with no fewer than two canons, one chosen by him and the other by the chapter, may provide in these matters as seems expedient. (Council of Trent, session XXIV, chapter XII.)

[46] This false tradition, related even by Benedict XIV (Bullarium, vol. III, constitution De Ecclesiarum cultu, § 3), by Adami (Osservazioni per ben regolare il coro dei cantori della capella pontificia, historical preface, p. 11), and by a hundred authors, was discussed with great care by Abbé Baini, director of the papal chapel, in his interesting, learned work on Palestrina: Memorie storico-critiche della vita et delle opere di Giovanni Pier-Luigi da Palestrina, detto il Principe della musica. Rome, 1828, vol. I, pp. 74–294.

[47] Bullarium Romanum, Luxembourg edition, vol. II, p. 448.

[48] Preface to the Roman Martyrology, chapter VIII.

[49] We therefore command all patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, abbots, and all other superiors of churches, monasteries, convents, or orders, whether secular or regular, to use only this Our Martyrology in performing the Divine Office in choir, setting aside every [other] martyrology, with nothing added, changed, or removed. If they have other saints customarily celebrated in their churches or localities, let them not insert them in this book, but keep them listed separately and assign them the place and order laid down in the rules given here.

[50] See Note G.

[51] Statuentes Pontificale prædictum nullo unquam tempore, in toto, vel in parte mutandum, vel ei aliquid addendum, aut omnino detrahendum esse, ac quoscumque, qui pontificalia munera exercere, vel alias quæ in dicto Pontificali continentur facere, aut exequi debent, ad ea peragenda, et præstanda, ex hujus Pontificalis præscripto, et ratione teneri, neminemque ex iis, quibus ea exercendi, et faciendi munus impositum est, nisi formulis, quæ hoc ipso Pontificali continentur, servatis satisfacere posse. (Bullarium Romanum, vol. III, p. 59.)

[52] Cum novissime Pontificale antea mendosum et corruptum, a piis et eruditis viris emendari et restitui, et demum ad episcoporum, et aliorum ecclesiarum prælatorum communem usum et commoditatem divulgari, et in universali Ecclesia ab omnibus observari mandaverimus, operæ pretium visum fuit, Ceremoniale episcoporum omnibus ecclesiis præcipue autem metropolitanis, cathedralibus, et collegiatis, perutile ac necessarium, in quo ritus et cæremoniæ celebrandi missas, vesperas et alia divina officia, ac in aliis Ecclesiæ functionibus et actibus ab eisdem episcopis ac aliis prælatis inferioribus in eisdem observandæ, etc. (Id., ibid., p. 110.)

[53] See Note H.

[54] Bullarium Romanum, Luxembourg edition, vol. III, p. 174.

[55] Thesaurus Sacrorum Rituum, vol. III, 4°; p. 22.

[56] Ps. CII, 5.

[57] Erat terra labii unius et sermonum eorumdem. (Gen. XI, 1.)

[58] Communionem discerperent [rent communion]. See below, the bull Quod a nobis.

[59] Above, p. 125.

[60] Cum in ecclesia catholica, a Christo D. N., sub uno capite, ejus in terris Vicario, instituta, unio et earum rerum quæ ad Dei gloriam et debitum ecclesiasticarum personarum Officium spectant, conformatio semper conservanda sit; tum præcipue illa communio uni Deo, una et eadem formula, preces adhibendi, quæ Romano breviario continetur, perpetuo retinenda est, ut Deus, in Ecclesia per universum orbem diffusa, uno et eodem orandi et psallendi ordine, a Christi fidelibus semper laudetur et invocetur. (Clemens VIII, Bulla Cum in Ecclesia, §1.)

Chapter XVI. Liturgy in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century. Zeal of the French Episcopate for the Roman Liturgy. Reaction of the Secular Power. — The Roman Pontiffs' Work on the Liturgy. Paul V. Roman Ritual. Roman Breviary. Monastic Breviary. — Urban VIII. Correction of the Hymns. — Liturgical Authors of This Period

(p. 498)

[margin: The Church of France, rejoicing in the blessing of liturgical unity, strives to perpetuate it.]

Liturgical unity thus now reigned in the West. Half a century was to pass before anyone dared undermine it. No less faithful to this unity than the other churches, the Church of France, which had so vigorously carried out the provisions of Saint Pius V's bull in her various provincial councils, peacefully enjoyed so great a blessing and worked zealously to perpetuate it.

[margin: In 1605 the assembly of the clergy grants a subsidy for printing the books of the Roman Liturgy.]

For this reason, at the assembly of the clergy of 1605–1606, the archbishop of Embrun, though well aware that a considerable number of churches had received the reformed breviary only to combine it with diocesan uses, urged that all churches should be uniform in celebrating divine service, and that the Roman Office should be received everywhere[1]. He added that a printer had been found who offered to print all the necessary books, on the sole condition that the assembly advance him one thousand écus[2].

(p. 499) The prelates accepted this proposal, and a contract was made between the clergy and the printer in question on May 8, 1606, as may be seen in the proceedings of the assembly of 1612[3]. We also read there that the bishop of Chartres and the clergy's agents were requested and charged to arrange distribution, to the provinces and dioceses needing them, of all the books of the Roman use previously printed[4].

[margin: Beneficial effects of this measure for liturgical unity.]

This measure led several dioceses that had not yet abandoned their particular breviaries to adopt the Roman Breviary in its purity. It also benefited churches determined to retain the diocesan rite, since that rite was itself simply the reformed Roman rite combined with the Office of local saints and certain ancient particular uses. By this measure of the assembly of 1605, the Roman Liturgy was thus, so to speak, proclaimed the Liturgy of the Church of France in general—a truth already apparent from the canons of the various sixteenth-century councils cited in the preceding chapter.

[margin: Charles Miron, bishop of Angers, wishes to introduce the Roman Liturgy into the Church of the Trinity in his episcopal city.]

An event, at first unnoticed but soon famous, seemed at the very beginning of the seventeenth century to foreshadow the assaults one day to be made on the Roman Liturgy in France. At the request of several clerics of the Church of the Trinity in Angers, whose chapter was united to the illustrious Abbey of Ronceray, Charles Miron, bishop of Angers, issued two ordinances, dated October 26, 1599 and March 26, 1600. They suppressed the Angevin Breviary in that church and enjoined the exclusive use henceforth of the Roman Breviary reformed by Saint Pius V. The objections raised by the *(p. 500)* majority of the chapter were firmly rejected by the episcopal judge. Arrest orders and even imprisonment followed against several of the recalcitrants; it is even alleged that the Angevin books used in the Church of the Trinity were burned by the bishop's order.

[margin: The abbess of Ronceray and the canons of the Trinity appeal to the Parlement of Paris.]

Matters having been driven to this extremity, the abbess and nuns of Ronceray, together with the canons and chaplains of their Church of the Trinity, appealed on grounds of abuse of ecclesiastical authority to the Parlement of Paris. Advocate General Servin, an audacious man well known for his aversion to the Church's freedom, warmly championed the Angevin Breviary against that of Rome and secured a judgment that became famous. By it the court

"orders that the customary divine service in the Church of the Trinity shall continue; and has forbidden and forbids the said bishop to innovate in any respect in the conduct and celebration of divine service in the churches of his diocese without the King's authority; and his ecclesiastical prosecutor and judge to exercise any court, jurisdiction, or cognizance except that assigned to them by the ordinances.

[margin: The Parlement's judgment quashes the bishop's ordinances and forbids him to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction.]

To receive further prohibitions and answer whatever submissions the said procurator general may choose to bring against them, they shall be summoned to appear in person in a month's time; and until they have appeared, the court forbids them to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

It condemns the respondents to pay the costs of the appeals and damages for the imprisonments and their consequences; orders that any appellants still held prisoner shall be released; and commissions the King's procurator general to investigate the facts concerning the burned books of the said Church of the Trinity and the scandalous words uttered in public sermons, so that, once this is done and reported, appropriate orders may be made. As for the remainder *(p. 501)* of his requests, the said court will deliberate in council. Done in Parlement, on the 27th day of February 1603[5]."

[margin: Hatred of Rome, shared by all French jurists, shows through this judgment.]

Now, if we examine the motives on which the magistrates could base so scandalous a judgment, we shall find that it was inspired, at least in large part, by hatred of Rome, a sentiment innate in the souls of French jurists since—and even before—Philip the Fair. This hatred dictated the Sorbonne's famous conclusions against receiving the Roman Breviary in 1583, in Pierre de Gondy's time: a strange but most precious document[6], whose preservation we owe to that same Advocate General Servin. To heighten the scandal still further, he saw fit to insert it into his argument against the bishop of Angers. We have said that the Sorbonne protested against the publicity given to this document, which, it maintained, should be regarded only as the work of a few private individuals. But the time had come for the evil seed to sprout and the weeds to choke the good grain in the householder's field.

[margin: The Parlement also wishes to confer sovereign power over the Liturgy on the secular ruler.]

Besides this hatred of everything coming from Rome, the distinctive spirit of the parlements, another tendency must be noted in the judgment just cited: the desire to confer sovereign power over the Liturgy on the secular ruler. This is the twelfth characteristic of the antiliturgical heresy. We shall see it develop in France and finally enter the lawbooks used by the clergy. On reflection, we shall see how wonderfully Advocate Servin's two maxims fit together. First, halt Rome's direct influence over the Liturgy: for the Liturgy is an exalted teaching addressed to the people, which must not be left to the Pope in a land of liberty such as France. Then, supervise, *(p. 502)* by sovereign authority, the clergy in so important a matter as public prayer, so that they cannot take a step without feeling their dependence in this regard.

[margin: Persecution of the Church necessarily follows such claims, vainly disguised as zeal for defending ancient uses.]

We are well aware that on this point, as on every other, the secular power claimed to intervene only as guardian of ancient uses. But nothing now prevents us from calling persecution of the Church any secular policy that seeks to compel her either to retain a form she judges it fitting to abandon or to adopt another toward which her own impulse does not lead her.

[margin: The 1605 assembly vainly seeks to quash the 1603 judgment, which becomes a foundation of the Gallican liberties.]

The assembly of the clergy of 1605 viewed with indignation the Parlement's assault on the sacred right of the Liturgy. It resolved to beg the king to quash the judgment and everything done to enforce it, asking also that it be erased from the registers and that Servin be forbidden henceforth to plead in any Church case. The assembly even appointed deputies to pursue its annulment[7], yet we find no evidence that the judgment was ever revoked. Indeed, it became famous in every book treating French ecclesiastical law as one of the first foundations of that maxim of our liberties which declares that French bishops can do nothing concerning the Liturgy in their own dioceses without the king's permission.

[margin: The assembly itself exposes its flank to lay encroachment by ordering mention]

[margin: of the king inserted into the Roman Missal's Canon.]

Moreover, even while asserting the Church's imprescriptible rights, the assembly of 1605 itself exposed its flank to encroachment by the lay power. It will be recalled that when Saint Pius V's Missal was published,

the Parlement forbade its printing in France unless these words were added to the Canon of the Mass: Et rege nostro N. [and our king N.]. This irregular undertaking should not have *(p. 503)* been sanctioned, at least, by ecclesiastical authority. The clergy's duty in this case was to appeal to Rome, which would readily have granted France what Spain had already obtained. Instead, before concluding its business, the assembly's prelates ordered on April 24, 1606 that the first sheet of the Roman Missal printed at Bordeaux the previous year be revised, and that mention of the king be inserted in the new printing after that of the pope and bishop[8]. Thus the very assembly that denied the king's officers the right to intervene against changes a bishop introduced into his diocese's general Liturgy accepted the initiative of a secular court in a matter touching the very wording of the Liturgy's principal monument, the Canon of the Mass.

True, the clergy intended in this affair to act only in its own name and independently of the precedents established by the magistrates. Yet, from the moment it failed to seek support beyond the kingdom's borders—at Rome, in a word—it was considered defeated. Another page could now be added to the history of those shameful servitudes which their very authors derisively called the LIBERTIES OF THE GALLICAN CHURCH. The parlements, indeed, did not fail to do so, and thereafter we encounter numerous applications of their famous principle: That the king has a special right over matters of divine worship.

[margin: In 1606 the bishop and chapter of Poitiers seek a declaration of the king's will before adopting the Roman books.]

We find, in fact, letters patent of Henry IV dated July 27 of that same year 1606. Twenty years after the Council of Bordeaux discussed in the preceding chapter, he deigns to approve its canon adopting the Roman books throughout the province, without thereby establishing a precedent *(p. 504)* for the other resolutions that may have been passed in the said assembly and provincial council of Bordeaux. These letters patent were occasioned by the request made to His Majesty by the bishop and chapter of Poitiers. The misfortunes of the times had until then prevented them from carrying out the Council of Bordeaux's canon; now at last they could fulfill this duty. Before proceeding further, they had thought it expedient to obtain a declaration of His Majesty's will and intention on the matter, so that neither in general nor in particular should there be any ground or occasion for future complaint concerning its execution[9].

[margin: This step explicitly acknowledged the lay power's competence in liturgical matters.]

How far matters had already gone in so few years! The seventeenth century had scarcely opened, and ecclesiastical authority—the very authority that had proceeded so frankly and so extensively to reform the Liturgy in the councils of Rouen, Reims, Bordeaux, Aix, Bourges, Tours, Toulouse, and Narbonne—already dared not put its own resolutions into practice without securing the king's approval! The assembly had indeed protested against the outrage done to the bishop of Angers; yet scarcely a few months had passed before positive acts acknowledged the lay power's competence in liturgical matters!

[margin: The Parlement of Paris permits the Roman Breviary at Saint-Maixme in Chinon, again asserting royal authority over the Liturgy.]

In the important collection entitled Preuves des libertés de l'Église gallicane, we also read a judgment of the Parlement of Paris, delivered on Advocate General Servin's submissions and dated August 9, 1611, concerning the introduction of the reformed Roman Breviary into the collegiate Church of Saint-Maixme in Chinon[10]. It declares that in matters concerning the Liturgy, "the King's authority must intervene to lay down the rule, without which no innovation may be made in ecclesiastical *(p. 505)* governance. Accordingly, given the parties' wish to settle the matter lawfully, the court permits the Roman Breviary, which (it is agreed) is the most thoroughly purged of all, to be followed in the collegiate Church of Saint-Maixme in Chinon, on condition that the Offices of the saints especially venerated in that church be added."

Then come these curious words: This is the course to follow in such circumstances. Had the bishop of Angers chosen it when he wished to introduce the Roman Breviary into a church of his diocese, the great controversy litigated on the subject would have been brought swiftly to an end. Instead, since that bishop would not appeal to the king in this regard, the court disapproved what he had done on his own initiative and,

by its judgment of February 27, 1603, forbade him to innovate in any respect in the conduct and celebration of divine service without royal authority.

The collection we cite then gives letters patent of Louis XIII dated July 9, 1611, granting the aforesaid permission to the chapter of Saint-Maixme in Chinon in terms similar to those of the judgment just quoted.

These details suffice to show how far the true principles concerning the Liturgy were already being corrupted in France, and how dependence on secular power in this matter was beginning to take root. In chapter XIV we identified this as one of the traits constituting the system destructive of the Liturgy. No Catholic, we believe, will dispute either the fact or its application.

These, however, are the beginning of labor pains.

Hæc autem initia sunt dolorum.

[margin: Character of the first half of the seventeenth century in France.]

Before unfolding the sad picture of the liturgical revolution that soon followed, we shall at least say that this first half of the seventeenth century, despite the all too fruitful errors *(p. 506)* we have just recounted, was a final period of freedom for the Church of France. In those years that passed all too quickly, in 1614, Cardinal Du Perron, speaking for the clergy, vindicated with such eloquence and dignity Christendom's ancient public law, which the Third Estate's blind undertakings threatened with complete destruction. Later, in 1625, the assembly of the clergy still professed the doctrine of the Supreme Pontiff's infallibility[11]. Indeed, in 1653 an assembly of the clergy expressly declared that judgments delivered by the Supreme Pontiffs to establish the rule of faith, in response to the bishops' consultation—whether they state their own judgment in the records of their report or omit it, as they please—rest on authority that is DIVINE AS WELL AS SUPREME throughout the whole Church[12].

[margin: This period is the Church of France's last age of freedom and fidelity to Roman doctrines.]

We love to dwell on these pure traditions of the Church of France. Soon enough, the course of events will draw us into lamentable accounts; let us therefore delay them a little longer and also show that, to prove faithful once more *(p. 507)* to the doctrines of the Roman Church, the Gallican Church today need only look back a few years into her memories.

[margin: Rome completes the reform of divine worship by publishing the ritual.]

While the Liturgy in France faced attacks still more threatening for the future than harsh in the present, Rome was completing the great work of reforming divine worship. The breviary, missal, martyrology, pontifical, and ceremonial had already appeared. One no less important book remained to be published: the ritual.

[margin: Early attempts by the Dominican Castellani, Canon Samarini, and Cardinal Sanctorio.]

Paul V, whose pontificate in several respects continued that of the admirable Clement VIII, undertook to finish this important work. As early as 1537, the Dominican Albert Castellani had brought out at Rome the book entitled Sacerdotale, seu liber sacerdotalis collectus, Leonis X auctoritate approbatus. This collection, chiefly containing the details needed for administering the sacraments, had been approved by Leo X, at least as a trial, but was not published until the pontificate of Pius IV, who refrained from making any judgment upon it. It nevertheless spread, and several more or less faithful editions were produced outside Rome.

In the same century, Samarini, a canon of Saint John Lateran, undertook a similar compilation, drawing heavily on Castellani's work. It appeared at Venice in 1579 under the title Sacerdotale, sive sacerdotum Thesaurus ad consuetudinem sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, aliarumque ecclesiarum collectus, juxta Tridentini concilii sanctiones, etc. The celebrated prelate Rocca issued an enlarged edition of this collection.

Finally, Cardinal Sanctorio compiled a third ritual in the last years of the sixteenth century. This rather substantial ritual earned Paul V's praise in the very brief in which he declared it suppressed. It bears the

following title, which Benedict XIV proves was added afterward: Rituale sacramentorum Roma- *(p. 508)* num, Gregorii XIII Pont. Max. jussu editum. Romæ, 1584. It does indeed appear established that only under Paul V's pontificate was the printing of Sanctorio's ritual contemplated, several years after the cardinal's death[13].

[margin: Until this period, the ritual did not form a separate book.]

These various attempts by private individuals clearly show that until then the ritual had not formed a separate liturgical book. The formulas it contains today were found either in missals or in breviaries. But Saint Pius V's Breviary and Missal no longer contained such details, apart from the blessings; moreover, the pontifical included only rites for the use of bishops. A special book meeting the clergy's needs therefore had to be published.

Paul V undertook and completed this work. The brief publishing the Roman Ritual appeared on June 17, 1614, and begins with the words Apostolicæ Sedi. The pope first recalls Saint Pius V's and Clement VIII's work for liturgical reform, then adds:

[margin: Paul V promulgates the Roman Ritual in 1614 by the brief Apostolicæ Sedi.]

"With these matters thus settled, it remained for the sacred and authentic rites of the Catholic Church, to be observed by those with the care of souls in administering the sacraments and performing other ecclesiastical functions, to be collected in a single volume and published by the Apostolic See's authority. Amid so many rituals, they could then carry out their ministries according to this volume's prescriptions, as to a public and authenticated standard, and walk together without stumbling under one faithful guidance. This undertaking had indeed been considered long ago. Once the work of publishing the general councils in Greek and Latin, accomplished by divine grace, ceased to delay it, We *(p. 509)* judged it Our duty to press it forward diligently. To conduct the matter properly and in order, as was fitting, We entrusted it to certain of Our venerable brethren, cardinals of the Holy Roman Church distinguished for piety, learning, and prudence. With scholars' advice, they consulted various rituals, especially ancient ones and those in circulation, above all the very comprehensive work compiled through long study, great diligence, and labor by Julius Antonius of blessed memory, known as the Cardinal of Santa Severina, a man of exceptional zeal for piety and of learning. After mature consideration of everything, with divine clemency's favor they at last prepared a Ritual with the brevity required.

[margin: Paul V exhorts the prelates to adopt the new ritual, but does not command them to do so.]

"Seeing in it the Catholic Church's received and approved rites arranged in their proper order, We judged that it should fittingly be published for the public good of God's Church under the name Roman Ritual. Therefore, We exhort in the Lord Our venerable brethren the patriarchs, archbishops, and bishops, and Our beloved sons their vicars, as well as abbots, all parish priests wherever they are, and others whom it concerns, henceforth, as children of the Roman Church, to use in sacred functions the Ritual established by the authority of that Church, mother and teacher of all. In a matter of such importance, let them observe inviolably what the Catholic Church and the ancient usage she approves have established.

"Given at Rome, at Saint Mary Major, under the Fisherman's Ring, on June 17, 1614, in the tenth year of Our pontificate[14]."

(p. 510)

[margin: The Holy See did not wish to destroy by force the many local sacramental customs that Trent had acknowledged without censuring.]

The tenor of this brief shows that the Roman Ritual was published no less solemnly than the breviary, missal, ceremonial, and pontifical. Yet we must note that, unlike Saint Pius V's bulls and Clement VIII's briefs, Paul V's brief contains no express command to use the Roman Ritual to the exclusion of every other. The Pontiff confines himself to a simple but urgent exhortation. This difference arose from the extreme diversity that had

persisted in the West in the ceremonies accompanying the administration of the sacraments. Violently destroying local customs in this matter would have caused both scandal among the people and murmuring among the clergy. Remarkably, the Council of Trent itself had recognized this variety in principle as both a fact and a right. Thus, in session twenty-four, chapter one On Reform, the Fathers say that the parish priest, having questioned the spouses and received their mutual consent, will pronounce these words: Ego vos in matrimonium conjungo [I join you in matrimony], etc.; or use other words according to the received rite of each province[15]. Several similar passages from the same council could be cited.

[margin: Paul V's Ritual, adopted throughout]

[margin: almost all the West, also serves as a model for correcting the particular rituals some churches retain.]

Thus in every age the Roman Church has known how to make suitable accommodations to govern the Lord's inheritance with strength and gentleness. Nevertheless, what was bound to happen did happen: Paul V's Ritual was soon adopted in most Western churches. Dioceses that retained the substance of their usages adopted at least the formulas for administering *(p. 511)* the sacraments, the blessings, etc. This book's publication completed the liturgical reform. The Supreme Pontiffs of subsequent ages nevertheless saw fit to make certain improvements or additions to the books their predecessors had approved. We shall record these as the course of the years brings them before us.

[margin: Paul V reforms the monastic Liturgy.]

[margin: Variety of liturgical usages in the Order of Saint Benedict.]

Paul V also gave his name to a liturgical work of secondary importance, it is true, yet one that must have its place in this book: the publication of the monastic breviary. We showed in chapter VIII that the West's monastic orders and congregations possess a particular form of Divine Office founded on the Rule of Saint Benedict. Saint Pius V's bull suppressing all breviaries introduced within the preceding two hundred years could not affect an arrangement of the Office dating back a thousand years. The monks therefore continued to follow their usages. These differed, however, in several respects from country to country, and even among orders or congregations in the same country. Thus Cluny's customs differed from Monte Cassino's; Cistercian usages were very unlike those of the Camaldolese; abbeys on the Rhine or Danube departed in several points from the forms used in Spain and Portugal. Nothing here should have surprised or scandalized anyone. A body as extensive as the Western Church, without a center and divided into many branches, drawing its own life not only from the various reforms that had modified it but also from the customs of the lands where it had spread, could no more than the Church herself have retained a uniform discipline in all its liturgical customs. There were therefore several monastic breviaries when Saint *(p. 512)* Pius V's bull was published, and they had no more to fear from that constitution than did the Ambrosian, Lyonnais, or Parisian breviaries.

[margin: Publication in 1612 of a monastic breviary based on Saint Pius V's reformed Breviary.]

[margin: Paul V exhorts all orders serving]

[margin: under the Rule of Saint Benedict to receive this breviary.]

On the other hand, Saint Pius V's reformed Breviary was undeniably far superior to all those then existing in the Church. Once the monks in turn considered reforming their own breviaries, they could draw on no purer source. Moreover, considering only the easiest means of reforming a monastic breviary, it is clear that much expense was saved and the undertaking greatly facilitated by bringing the Benedictine Liturgy into unity and eliminating each order's or congregation's particular usages. This plan, whose advantages counterbalance its drawbacks, was conceived and executed by the various Benedictine congregations' procurators general resident in Rome. While retaining the monastic Office's general form, they sought to fit almost all of Saint Pius V's Breviary into its framework and submitted this new work for the Supreme Pontiff's approval. Many ancient and venerable traditions of the order had been sacrificed. The psalter, whose weekly recitation the Rule of Saint Benedict so strictly requires, was interrupted on every feast of a saint. At that time, however,

such feasts were far fewer than today and still allowed this inviolable law to be fulfilled most weeks. Paul V approved the work by a brief of October 1, 1612. Yet he would not oblige all orders serving under the Benedictine Rule to reject other breviaries and use exclusively the one the procurators general had just compiled. He confined himself to exhorting in the Lord all the same order's religious to receive unanimously the breviary and choir books reformed as stated above[16], *(p. 513)* and, to move the Benedictines more effectively to adopt them, he attached to recitation of the new Monastic Breviary the same indulgences with which Saint Pius V had encouraged use of the Roman Breviary[17].

[margin: Almost all the West's monastic congregations comply with the Supreme Pontiff's wish.]

In Italy, and generally in foreign countries, orders and congregations living under the Rule of Saint Benedict adopted Paul V's Breviary. Besides drawing closer in many respects to the reformed Office, they could obtain books easily and avoid the great expense that reprinting particular usages always entailed for each congregation. Nevertheless, the entire Cistercian Order refused to change its books, in which, as we have said, the Gregorian element was mingled with the Parisian. In France the congregations of Saint-Vannes and Saint-Maur accepted the new breviary, but rather in fact than in law: their constitutions expressly declared that they did not intend to receive the new saints' Offices continually added to it[18]. In Spain the congregation of Tarragona likewise retained its old books. Valladolid waited until 1621 before adopting the new ones, but, like Saint-Vannes and Saint-Maur, retained its practice of determining its own calendar. We shall discuss Cluny in the next chapter.

Four years after the publication of the Monastic Breviary *(p. 514)* of Paul V, a judgment and declaration issued from the Congregation of Rites. This tribunal judged and declared that all monks and nuns serving under the Rule of Saint Benedict may and must use the Benedictine Breviary recently published by command of Our Most Holy Lord Pope Paul V for all religious serving under the Rule of Holy Father Benedict, notwithstanding that some exempt religious had previously used the Roman or another breviary[19].

[margin: The Congregation of Rites' declaration concerning Paul V's Monastic Breviary.]

[margin: Some monastic congregations retain their old breviaries, all of which, in any case, derive from Gregorian sources.]

Yet this declaration's authority did not prevail so far as to abolish the monastic breviaries that had survived. It was judged not to be preceptive, since otherwise it would have contradicted Paul V's brief, issued only four years earlier, in which the pontiff merely exhorts the monks to adopt the breviary compiled by the procurators general. In Rome itself, the Cistercian Order in particular continued for a long time to use only the Cistercian Breviary for the Divine Office. Toward the end of the same century, Cardinal Bona, in his fine treatise de Divina Psalmodia, printed at Rome, devoted a whole chapter to detailing with satisfaction the Cistercian Breviary's advantages over Paul V's monastic one.

For that matter, all these monastic breviaries differed from one another only in details of secondary interest. All arranged the Offices according to the Rule of Saint Benedict. In all, most antiphons, responsories, and hymns conformed to Saint Gregory's ancient responsorial books, and consequently to Saint Pius V's Breviary. The rest, as in diocesan breviaries, was borrowed from local customs, but above all from the Romano-French use, whose influence had *(p. 515)* spread so far. As for the missal, we have already noted that the monks knew no other than the Roman Church's, to which they added certain particular usages. The Monastic Missal also published by Paul V spread to the same extent as his breviary.

[margin: Paul V publishes the Monastic Missal.]

[margin: Urban VIII appoints commissioners to revise the breviary.]

Urban VIII, who succeeded Paul V after Gregory XV's all too short pontificate, undertook a revision of the breviary; none had been made since Clement VIII. He appointed the following commissioners: Cardinal Louis Gaetan; Tegrime Tegrimi, bishop of Assisi and secretary of the Congregation of Rites; Fortunato Scacchi, sacristan of the papal chapel; Nicolas Riccardi, Master of the Sacred Palace; Jerome Lanni,

referendary of both Signaturas; Hilarion Rancati, abbot of Holy Cross in Jerusalem; James Vulponi of the Oratory of Saint Philip Neri; Bartholomew Gavanti of the Clerics Regular of Saint Paul; Terence Alciati of Milan, a consultor of the Congregation of Rites, as were several of those already named; and finally the famous annalist of the Friars Minor, Luke Wading[20].

[margin: Promulgation in 1631 and nature of this revision, the last the breviary underwent.]

The commission's work consisted chiefly in checking the holy Fathers' homilies against their originals and replacing some of the old ones with others that seemed better suited. The rubrics were also clarified, and the Psalms' punctuation for chanting was settled. This revision, published by a brief of January 25, 1631, beginning Divinam psalmodiam[21], is the last to have been made. Urban VIII's successors may have added Offices to the breviary, but it bears at its head only the names of Saint Pius V, Clement VIII, and Urban VIII.

(p. 516)

[margin: Urban VIII, shocked by the breviary hymns' faults, commissions four Jesuits to correct them according to classical poetry's rules.]

Urban VIII's revision attracted attention for more than the reforms just discussed: an even more important feature distinguished it. Most hymns had been revised and brought into conformity with the rules of verse at Urban VIII's command. This pope, who loved literature and successfully cultivated Latin poetry, could not tolerate the numerous faults in most of the breviary's hymns. He regretted, as he says in his brief, that the holy Fathers had sketched their hymns rather than perfected them; the decorum of divine service seemed to him imperatively to demand reform in this respect. The talent he had shown in composing the hymns he placed in the breviary, which we shall discuss below, made him very capable of this difficult undertaking. Nevertheless, he did not see fit to undertake it himself. He entrusted it to four Jesuits: Matthias Sarbiewski, Fabian Strada, Tarquin Galluzzi, and Jerome Petrucci, who corrected more than nine hundred and fifty faults of prosody.

[margin: Divergent judgments on their work.]

As was inevitable, these four commissioners' work has been judged very differently. Some, such as Fathers Théophile Raynaud[22], Charles Guyet[23], and Faustino Arévalo[24], etc., defended their confreres' work—and rightly, it seems to us. Others treated the revisers of the Roman hymns very harshly: Father Louis Cavalli, a Franciscan penitentiary at Saint John Lateran, in a book of observations written expressly on the subject; Jean-Baptiste Thiers, in his satire on the Cluny Breviary; and Henri Valois, cited by Merati. If, after all these authors, we may state our own opinion, we shall first say that it was *(p. 517)* a very difficult task to correct another's verses—verses whose meaning and words everyone knew by heart. The revisers were asked to preserve each line's meter and meaning and retain the substance of its expressions—in a word, its distinctive color. In our judgment, they fulfilled this task as well as it could be fulfilled. There are doubtless a few places where they sacrificed too much to classical purity. For the most part, however, the original unction remained while the expression became at once more precise and clearer. We reproach them only for changing the meter of the hymn of Saint Michael, Tibi, Christe, splendor Patris [To you, Christ, splendor of the Father], and of the hymns for a church's dedication, Urbs Jerusalem beata [Blessed city Jerusalem] and Angularis fundamentum [Cornerstone … foundation].

[margin: The revisers fulfilled their difficult task as well as it could be fulfilled.]

[margin: Opposition encountered by the revised hymns.]

[margin: They are nevertheless adopted by all Western churches except those of France and Saint Peter's Basilica.]

Whatever our personal opinion, there is no denying that adopting the revised hymns provoked great opposition. Its chief causes were the ever formidable difficulty of uprooting routine, the impossibility of correcting old choir books without spoiling them, and, finally, the unmusical construction of a number of verses. Cavalli reports a saying on this subject that is no more just for having become famous. A Belgian,

otherwise a pious and learned man, said of the revised hymns: accessit latinitas et recessit pietas [Latinity came in, and piety went out]. The Roman cantors also claimed that the revisers knew the Muses better than music. It proved impossible to establish use of the revised hymns in Saint Peter's Basilica. They spread rapidly, however, through the other churches of Rome, Italy, and indeed Christendom, except in France. Those of our dioceses that followed the pure Roman use generally preferred to retain the old ones. Few French editions of the breviary before 1789 contain the *(p. 518)* revised hymns; even then, they are usually relegated to an appendix at the end. By contrast, almost all editions published in the last twelve or fifteen years reproduce only the revised hymns.

[margin: All religious orders bound to the Roman Breviary receive the new hymns, but the monks and Carthusians retain the old ones.]

Among religious orders, those bound to the Roman Breviary adopted the new hymns, except, however, the Franciscans of the French provinces. The monastic orders and congregations kept the old ones. After various changes, the congregation of Saint-Maur alone finally adopted Urban VIII's revision definitively. Even today, in Rome itself, the Benedictines of Monte Cassino, the Cistercians, the Carthusians, etc., sing the old hymns. These have also remained in use in the Dominican Breviary.

[margin: Last revision of the missal, carried out by Urban VIII in 1634.]

Having revised the breviary, Urban VIII undertook the revision of the missal, considering these two books, the foundation of the Liturgy, as wings which the priest, like the cherubim of the ancient mystical tabernacle, unfolds each day toward the world's true propitiatory[25]. The same commission established to revise the breviary attended to the missal. Several corrections and clarifications were made to the rubrics, and the text of Scripture, corrupted in places, was restored to its purity. This revision of the missal is also the last. For this reason, like the breviary, its title has since borne Urban VIII's name alongside those of Saint Pius V *(p. 519)* and Clement VIII. The brief of publication is dated September 2, 1634, and begins Si quid est in rebus humanis. We do not include it in this chapter's notes because it is of less interest than the brief concerning the revision of the breviary and correction of the hymns. Finally, Urban VIII published a new edition of the pontifical, with some changes and improvements, and promulgated it as henceforth obligatory by a brief of June 17, 1644, beginning Quamvis alias.

[margin: Expansion of the Roman Breviary through the addition of Offices of several saints.]

[margin: Each addition is a new sign of the Church's life and a consolation for her sons.]

We shall not end this liturgical history of the first half of the seventeenth century without discussing the Roman Breviary's expansion during that period through the addition of Offices of several saints whom the sovereign Pontiffs proposed for the Church's veneration. It is right that this bride of Christ should celebrate her children's triumphs, whatever century they belonged to. She should not blush to place in her calendar the sons she nourished in a fruitful old age[26], beside the firstfruits of her motherhood. In the seventeenth century, France had not yet turned a deaf ear to the supreme Pastor's voice, which resounds in God's churches under each pontificate, commanding that henceforth a particular day of the year be consecrated to a servant of God's memory. Beneath his hut of reeds, deep in the caves that conceal him, the missionary whose only consolation is his breviary learns this great news. He feels strengthened by this new sign of life from the Mother of Christians. He joins all the churches: France's alone will not repeat the new canticle with him.

When revising the breviary, Clement VIII, following Gregory XIII and Sixtus V, had added to Saint Pius V's *(p. 520)* calendar several new saints. By various decrees he had first established the Offices of Saint Romuald, abbot of Camaldoli, and Saint Stanislaus, bishop of Kraków and martyr, both of semidouble rank. He had raised to greater double rank the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin, the two feasts of Saint Peter's Chair, at Rome and Antioch, and Saint Peter in Chains. The feast of Saint John Gualbert, abbot of Vallombrosa, had been established as a simple, and that of Saint Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna and martyr, raised from simple to semidouble. Having joined the veneration of the illustrious martyr Flavia Domitilla to

that of Saints Nereus and Achilleus, Clement VIII had also raised their previously simple feast by one rank. In return, however, doubtless to safeguard Sunday's rights more fully, he had lowered from double to semidouble the feasts of Saint Francis of Paola, Saint Peter the Martyr, Saint Anthony of Padua, and Saint Nicholas of Tolentino.

[margin: Clement VIII institutes the feasts of Saint Romuald and Saint Stanislaus of Kraków, and changes the rank of several others.]

[margin: Paul V institutes the feasts of Saint Casimir, Saint Norbert, Saint Charles Borromeo, the Stigmata of Saint Francis, the holy Guardian Angels, and Saint Ubald.]

[margin: Urban VIII's zeal in this respect surpasses that of all the other pontiffs of this period.]

Paul V established the Offices of Saint Casimir, a Polish prince, and Saint Norbert, founder of the Premonstratensians, as semidoubles. He approved the same rank, but optionally, for the feasts of Saint Charles Borromeo and the Stigmata of Saint Francis; and double rank, likewise optionally, for the Office of the holy Guardian Angels. The same pontiff also instituted the feast of Saint Ubald, bishop of Gubbio, but as a simple. Finally, Paul V restored to Saint Francis of Paola the double rank Clement VIII had removed. But no pope of this period surpassed Urban VIII in zeal for instituting new Offices. He established a double feast of Saint Hyacinth, a Polish Dominican, and obligatory semidoubles for Saint Bibiana, virgin and martyr; Saint Hermenegild, martyr; Saint Catherine of Siena, virgin; Saint Eustace and *(p. 521)* his companions, martyrs; finally, Saint Martina, virgin and martyr. Urban VIII also approved optional semidoubles for Saint Philip Neri, founder of Rome's Oratory; Saint Alexius, confessor; Saint Henry II, emperor; Saint Teresa, virgin and reformer of Carmel; and Saint Elizabeth, queen of Portugal, whose hymns and entire Office he composed himself. Innocent X, Urban VIII's successor, established the feast of Saint Frances, a Roman widow, as a double, and those of Saint Ignatius of Loyola, Saint Teresa, and Saint Charles Borromeo as obligatory semidoubles. This pontiff also established Saint Clare's Office, but only as an optional semidouble.

[margin: Innocent X institutes the feasts of Saint Frances of Rome and Saint Clare.]

[margin: Most of these feasts are semidoubles, the sovereign Pontiffs still being concerned to preserve Sunday's Office.]

Such was the expansion of the Roman Breviary, and of the missal at the same time, up to the middle of the seventeenth century. We should note that most of these feasts are semidoubles, to preserve Sunday's Office. As we advance through the liturgical history of the last two centuries, we shall see a gradual revolution in the opposite direction, and the weekly recitation of the psalter lose some of its importance. Elsewhere we shall have occasion to express our opinion of this serious liturgical change.

[margin: Liturgical authors of the first half of the seventeenth century.]

Let us now give a bibliography of liturgical writers who flourished in the first half of the seventeenth century.

[margin: Victorius Scialak, Maronite monk.]

First we shall place Victorius Scialak, a Maronite monk born in Mount Lebanon, who lived in Rome at the beginning of the seventeenth century and taught Eastern languages there. He translated from Arabic into Latin the Liturgies attributed to Saint Basil, Saint Gregory of Nyssa, and Saint Cyril of Alexandria. This collection was printed at Augsburg in 1604.

[margin: John de Angelis, Observant Franciscan.]

(1604). John de Angelis, an Observant Friar Minor, published a Spanish work printed at Madrid under the title Tratado de los sacratissimos mysterios de la Misa.

(p. 522)

[margin: Andrew Hove, professor at Douai.]

(1605). Andrew Hoïus, or Hove, professor of Greek at Douai, wrote a book entitled Antiquitatum liturgicarum arcana concionatoribus et pastoribus uberrimum promptuarium, sacerdotibus serium exercitium, religiosis meditationum speculum, nobilibus spiritualis venatio, laicis litteratis sancta devotio, omnia ex diversis auctoribus tribus tomis comprehensa. Douai, octavo. In fairness, we must say that the book's execution does not quite fulfill such magnificent promises.

[margin: John Palantieri, bishop of Cedonia.]

(1606). John Paul Palantieri, a Franciscan and bishop of Cedonia, left an explanation of the ecclesiastical hymns, printed at Bologna in 1606.

[margin: John Gretser, Jesuit.]

(1606). The celebrated Jesuit John Gretser, one of the Reformation's most valiant opponents, whose voluminous works form one of Catholic scholarship's largest repositories, left several interesting liturgical treatises. We shall mention especially: 1. De Sacris Peregrinationibus, libri IV; 2. De Ecclesiasticis Processionibus, libri II; 3. Podoniptron seu Pedilavium, hoc est, de more lavandi pedes peregrinorum et hospitum, with an addition to the book on pilgrimages; 4. De Funere christiano, libri III; 5. De Festis, libri II. He later supplemented this last work with a special treatment of the worship and feast of the Blessed Sacrament. 6. De Benedictionibus, libri duo, et tertius de maledictionibus; 7. De sancta Cruce, a work no less fruitful for liturgical scholarship than for Christian antiquity generally. We omit many other shorter works included with these books in the fine seventeen-volume folio edition of Gretser's works, published at Ingolstadt in 1734.

[margin: Nicolas Serrarius, Jesuit.]

(1607). Nicolas Serrarius, a Jesuit from Lorraine, wrote two books entitled le Litaneutique ou des Litanies, *(p. 523)* the first treating the antiquity and usefulness of litanies, the second the invocation of the saints. He also composed a treatise on Processions, likewise divided into two books. Both these learned and interesting works are found in the collection of Serrarius's shorter works, printed at Mainz in 1611, folio.

[margin: John Baptist de Rubeis.]

(1608). John Baptist de Rubeis published at Piacenza a book entitled Rationale divinorum officiorum. Despite our other researches, we know the author and his book only from Zaccaria's brief mention.

[margin: New edition of Hittorp's liturgical collection.]

(1610). In this year, the Parisian publishers of Margarin de la Bigne's Bibliotheca veterum Patrum issued a supplementary tenth volume containing a new and better edition of Hittorp's liturgical collection. This edition, nineteen years later than Ferrari's Roman edition of the late sixteenth century, is the last of all. It is also the most correct, especially for Honorius of Autun's work entitled Gemma animæ.

[margin: Andrew Duval, doctor of the Sorbonne.]

(1610). Andrew Duval, a doctor and professor of the Sorbonne, so well known for his forthright orthodoxy, published in 1610 a work Ellies Dupin mentions under the title Observations sur quelques livres de l'Église de Lyon.

[margin: Claude Villette, canon of Saint-Marcel in Paris.]

(1611). Claude Villette, a canon of Saint-Marcel in Paris, left a work entitled Les raisons de l'office, et cérémonies qui se font en l'Église catholique, apostolique et romaine. Ensemble les raisons des cérémonies du sacre de nos rois de France, et des douze marques uniques de leur royauté céleste, par-dessus tous les rois du monde. Drawing its teaching from medieval liturgical writers, this book is very interesting and has had several editions, both quarto and duodecimo.

[margin: John Chapeauville, doctor of Louvain.]

(1612). John Chapeauville, a doctor of Louvain, wrote the following work, reprinted several *(p. 524)* times: Tractatus de necessitate et modo ministrandi sacramenta tempore pestis (Mainz, 1612, octavo). At the end of his second volume on the history of the bishops of Liège is a historical treatise de prima et vera Origine festivitatis SS. Corporis et Sanguinis Christi.

[margin: Augustine de Herrera, Jesuit.]

(1613). Augustine de Herrera, a Spanish Jesuit, left two important works printed at Seville in the national language. The first is entitled Del Origen, y progreso en la Iglesia catholica de los ritos, y ceremonias, que se usan en el santo sacrificio de la Misa (1613, quarto); the second, Origen, y progreso del oficio divin, y de sus observancias catholicas, desde el siglo primero de la Iglesia al presente (1644, quarto).

[margin: John Baptist de Glano, Augustinian.]

(1613). John Baptist de Glano, an Augustinian religious and doctor of Paris, wrote, according to Ellies Dupin, a book entitled Des Cérémonies des principales Églises de l'Europe.

[margin: Joseph Visconti, custodian of the Ambrosian Library.]

(1615). Joseph Visconti, known in the republic of letters by his Latinized name Vicecomes, was one of the custodians of the Ambrosian Library, founded at Milan by the illustrious Cardinal Frederic Borromeo. Under the title Observationes ecclesiasticæ he wrote four volumes, now rare but deservedly celebrated (Milan, 1615, 1618, 1620, 1626, quarto). The first treats the rites of Baptism; the second, those of Confirmation; the third, the ceremonies of Mass; and the fourth, what must be prepared to celebrate this sacrifice properly.

[margin: John Baptist Scortia, Jesuit.]

(1616). John Baptist Scortia, a Genoese Jesuit, published four books de Sacrosancto missæ sacrificio, printed at Lyon in 1616, quarto, which attest their author's remarkable learning.

[margin: Peter Halloix, Jesuit.]

(1617). Among his many writings, Peter Halloix, a learned Flemish Jesuit, left a liturgical work entitled Triumphus sacer sanctorum, sive de *(p. 525)* cæremoniis in reliquiarum sanctorum translationibus usurpatis. "Antwerp" (octavo).

[margin: Martin de Alcazar, Hieronymite.]

(1618). Martin de Alcazar, a Hieronymite, wrote Kalendarium romanum perpetuum ex Breviario et Missali Clementis VIII authoritate recognitis, cum festis quæ generaliter in Hispaniam celebrantur, in quo ordo recitandi officium divinum et missas celebrandi dilucide exponitur (Madrid, quarto). This work appears to be the first of its kind and preceded Gavanti's Ordo perpetuus by several years.

[margin: Gaspar Loartes.]

(1619). Gaspar Loartes wrote a book printed at Cologne entitled De Sacris Peregrinationibus, Reliquiis et Divitiis (1619, quarto). We know this author and his book only through Ellies Dupin and Zaccaria.

[margin: Cardinal Frederic Borromeo, archbishop of Milan.]

(1619). Cardinal Frederic Borromeo, archbishop of Milan and nephew of Saint Charles, besides the Cæremoniale Ambrosianum, by which he completed his Church's Liturgy, wrote a folio book printed at Milan in 1632 entitled De Concionante Episcopo. It gives a learned treatment of the liturgical ceremonial that should accompany a bishop proclaiming God's word to his people.

[margin: Francis Ferrari, prefect of the Ambrosian Library.]

(1621). Francis Bernardin Ferrari, prefect of the Ambrosian Library, left a work in three books on a subject similar to Cardinal Frederic Borromeo's, entitled De Ritu sacrarum ecclesiæ veteris concionum, quarto. This remarkable book has been reprinted several times. We also have seven books by the same Ferrari on a liturgical subject, de Veterum Acclamationibus et Plausu (1627, quarto). He treats acclamations both in

ecclesiastical assemblies and in secular gatherings.

[margin: Michael Lonigo.]

(1623). Michael Lonigo, whose status we do not know but who seems to have served as a master of ceremonies, wrote an interesting book entitled Dell'uso *(p. 526)* delle vesti de' signori cardinali, tanto nelle chiese di Roma, quanto fuori. Venice, octavo, 1623.

[margin: Gabriel de l'Aubespine, bishop of Orléans.]

(1623). Gabriel de l'Aubespine, bishop of Orléans and a man of great learning, rendered good service to the Liturgy with his de Veteribus Ecclesiæ Ritibus, printed at Paris, quarto, in 1623; and another book in French, entitled Ancienne police de l'Église sur l'administration de l'eucharistie et sur les circonstances de la messe. Paris, octavo, 1629.

[margin: Fortunato Scacchi, sacristan of the papal chapel and bishop of Porphyre.]

(1625). Fortunato Scacchi, an Augustinian religious, was bishop of Porphyre and sacristan of the papal chapel. He wrote a fine work on sacred oils and anointings, published at Rome in 1625, quarto, and reprinted in folio at Amsterdam in the seventeenth century. Its title is Sacrorum Elæochrismatum myrothecia tria. We shall not discuss Scacchi's unfinished work on the canonization of saints, or several treatises on that subject by other authors, because they deal almost exclusively with procedural details and discussion, giving very little space to liturgical matters. Benedict XIV's work is altogether different.

[margin: Mutio, Capuchin.]

(1626). Mutio, an Italian Capuchin, published at Rome in 1612 a work entitled Tractatus de significatis sacrosancti sacrificii missæ, and another in 1626 entitled Declaratio de divinis officiis et de cæremoniis quæ fiunt in exequiis defunctorum.

[margin: Bartholomew Gavanti, Barnabite.]

(1628). Bartholomew Gavanti of Milan, of the congregation of Clerics Regular of Saint Paul, also called Barnabites, left a name forever famous in the annals of the Liturgy. We have seen how Clement VIII and Urban VIII called him to the commissions they formed, thirty years apart, to revise the breviary and missal. In 1632, the archbishop of Milan appointed him alone to make the necessary changes, additions, and corrections *(p. 527)* in that great Church's ceremonial. His reputation as a liturgist reached Germany and France. Cardinal d'Arach, archbishop of Prague, overwhelmed him with requests to come regulate his diocese's ceremonies. Urban VIII refused Gavanti permission to leave Rome. In a brief to the celebrated liturgist, the pope explained his refusal: "I reply that you are engaged, by Our authority and for the benefit of the universal Church, in revising the Roman Breviary." Father Boudier, a learned Benedictine liturgist, came to Rome as many as six times to confer with Gavanti. Finally, several French bishops in turn urged him to cross the Alps and work on an edition of the pontifical for the churches of their kingdom. He died in 1638. His principal liturgical works are:

1. Thesaurus sacrorum rituum, sive Commentaria in rubricas Missalis et Breviarii. This book is too well known to require a lengthy account of its merit. We shall discuss Merati's edition later.

2. Octavarium romanum. We shall soon have occasion to discuss this book.

3. Ordo perpetuus recitandi officium divinum.

[margin: Louis Cressol, Jesuit.]

(1629). Louis Cressol, a French Jesuit, left a book full of liturgical learning entitled Mystagogus, de Sacrorum hominum disciplina (Paris, folio).

[margin: John Filesac, doctor of the Sorbonne.]

(1630). John Filesac, a doctor of the Sorbonne, dean of that faculty, and parish priest of Saint-Jean-en-Grève, was remarkable for his profound sacred and secular learning. His various writings contain many interesting details on certain liturgical questions. They were gathered into two collections: Opera varia (Paris, 1614, two volumes, octavo), and Opera selecta (Paris, 1621, three volumes, quarto). The latter includes, among others, these dissertations: De Cære- *(p. 528)* moniis; de Sanctorum festis diebus; Sanctorum imaginum radiatum caput; Baptismi lux et candor; Funus vespertinum; de Cantu Ecclesiæ, etc.

[margin: Anaclet Secchi, Barnabite.]

(1634). Anaclet Secchi, a Barnabite, wrote a valuable and often reprinted work on ecclesiastical chant entitled Hymnodia ecclesiastica. Among other editions, it was printed at Antwerp in 1634, octavo. It has since been translated into Italian.

[margin: Peter Arcudius, Greek priest.]

(1634). Peter Arcudius, a learned Greek priest, left a very celebrated work comparing Greek and Latin Liturgy in administering the sacraments. It is entitled De Concordia Ecclesiæ occidentalis et orientalis in septem Sacramentorum administratione. The first Paris editions are those of 1619 and 1625, quarto.

[margin: Simon Barbosa, Portuguese.]

(1635). Simon Vaz Barbosa, a Portuguese doctor of Coimbra and brother of the celebrated canonist of that name, wrote a book printed at Lyon, octavo, in 1635, entitled Tractatus de dignitate, origine, et significatis mysteriosis ecclesiasticorum graduum, officii divini, vestium sacerdotalium et pontificalium, atque verborum, cæremoniarum et aliarum rerum pertinentium ad sanctissimum Missæ sacrificium.

[margin: Mark Diaz, Observant Franciscan.]

(1637). Mark Diaz, a Portuguese Observant Franciscan, published at Rome in 1637 an Ordo perpetuus recitandi officii divini.

[margin: Joseph of Saint Mary, Carthusian.]

(1637). Joseph of Saint Mary, a Spanish Carthusian, published at Seville in 1637 a quarto work entitled Sacros ritos y ceremonias baptismales; and another in the same format in 1642, entitled Triunfo del agua bendita. He seems also to have worked on exorcisms.

[margin: Dominic Giacobazzi.]

(1638). Dominic Giacobazzi, called Jacobatius in Latin, wrote the famous treatise de Conciliis, included in Labbe’s edition of the Councils. This important work gives all necessary details on the liturgical forms to be used at councils.

(p. 529)

[margin: James Éveillon, canon of Angers.]

(1641). James Éveillon, a canon of Saint-Maurice in Angers, was commissioned around 1620 by his bishop, William Fouquet, to revise the diocese’s breviary and ritual. He published two esteemed liturgical works. The first is De Processionibus ecclesiasticis liber (Paris, octavo, 1641); the second, De Recta psallendi ratione (La Flèche, quarto, 1646).

[margin: John Garcia, Franciscan.]

(1641). John Garcia, a Spanish Franciscan, published at Lima in 1641 a work entitled Explicacion de los misterios de la misa, y de sus ceremonias.

[margin: James Lobbetius.]

(1641). James Lobbetius of Liège wrote a quarto volume printed in that city, entitled De Religioso templorum cultu.

[margin: Dom Hugh Ménard, Benedictine of Saint-Maur.]

(1642). Dom Hugh Ménard, who so gloriously heads the imposing list of scholars of the congregation of Saint-Maur, was a liturgist of the first rank. It will suffice to mention his edition of Saint Gregory's Sacramentary, published at Paris in 1642, quarto, with the excellent notes he supplied. As is known, Dom Denys de Sainte-Marthe thought he could do no better than include his former confrere's entire work in his fine edition of Saint Gregory the Great's works.

[margin: Isaac Habert, bishop of Vabres.]

(1643). Isaac Habert, a doctor of the Sorbonne, canon of Paris, and later bishop of Vabres, published in this year an edition of the Archieraticon, or Pontifical of the Greek Church. He also belongs among seventeenth-century liturgical writers because of several hymns remarkable for their unction and fluency, adopted in most modern French breviaries.

[margin: Andrew du Saussay, bishop of Toul.]

(1646). Andrew du Saussay, bishop of Toul, left three interesting works on sacred vesture. The first, on episcopal vestments, is entitled Panoplia episcopalis, seu de sacro episcoporum ornatu. Libri VII (Paris, 1646, folio). The second, on clerical dress, is entitled Panoplia clericalis, seu de clericorum tonsura *(p. 530)* et habitu. Libri XV (Paris, 1649, folio). The third concerns the priest's sacred vestments, under the title Panoplia sacerdotalis, seu de venerando sacerdotum habitu. Libri XIV (Paris, 1653, folio). Du Saussay also wrote a book on ecclesiastical chant, published at Toul, octavo, in 1657, entitled Divina doxologia, seu sacra glorificandi Deum in hymnis et canticis methodus; and another entitled De sacro ritu præferendi crucem majoribus prælatis ecclesiæ libellus (1628, octavo).

[margin: James Goar, Dominican.]

(1647). James Goar, a Dominican, made himself forever famous in the annals of the Liturgy through his edition of the Greek Eucologion, with a Latin translation and learned notes. It was printed at Paris in 1647, folio.

[margin: Leo Allatius.]

(1648). Leo Allacci, Latin Allatius, one of the seventeenth century's most learned Italian men of letters, was born of Greek parents. He served as Vatican librarian and left many works intended to acquaint readers with the Liturgy of the modern Greeks. Among others, we shall mention the dissertations de Dominicis et hebdomadibus recentiorum Græcorum; de Missa præsanctificatorum; and de communione orientalium sub specie unica, appended to the excellent treatise de Ecclesiæ occidentalis et orientalis perpetua consensione (Paris, 1648, quarto). Allacci also left a treatise de Libris ecclesiasticis Græcorum (Cologne, 1645, octavo); another, de Templis Græcorum recentioribus, de Narthece Ecclesiæ veteris et de Græcorum quorumdam ordinationibus (Cologne, 1645, octavo), etc.

[margin: Michael Bauldry, Benedictine.]

(1646). Michael Bauldry, a Benedictine of the old observance and grand prior of Maillezais, gained deserved renown in France and abroad through his excellent Manuale sacrarum cæremoniarum juxta ritum sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, in quo omnia quæ ad usum omnium cathedralium, collegiatarum, parochialium, sæcularium et *(p. 531)* regularium ecclesiarum pertinent, accuratissime tractantur (Paris, 1646, quarto). The work of a single private individual, this book has had six editions. The practice it sets out with admirable clarity has been adopted by all subsequent writers on Roman ceremonies. At the request of that illustrious body's superiors, Bauldry also compiled the Ceremonial of the congregation of Saint-Maur, incorporating much of his Manual, adapted to cloistered usages, and bringing the work to great perfection.

[margin: Mark Paul Leo.]

(1649). We know Mark Paul Leo only through Zaccaria, who praises highly a book this author published at Rome in 1649 under the title De auctoritate et usu pallii pontificii.

[margin: Conclusions.]

We shall end this chapter with the following observations:

1. During the first half of the seventeenth century, the universal Church rested in liturgical unity.

2. The Church of France began to feel the first blows of a reaction against the Liturgy's freedom. This reaction arose from the influence of the secular magistracy.

3. While protesting in vain against the magistracy's encroachments, the Assembly of 1605 gave the first example of an attack upon Saint Pius V's Missal.

4. Rome continued to determine the general forms of the Liturgy with imposing solemnity, and the whole West showed itself attentive and docile to her prescriptions.

(p. 532)

Notes to Chapter XVI

Note A

Pope Paul V,

For Perpetual Remembrance.

Placed over the Apostolic See through the abundance of divine grace, without any supporting merits of Our own, We understand that it is Our concern to watch over God's whole household with such attention that increasingly suitable means are provided day by day, so that, as the Apostle admonishes, everything in it may be done decently and according to order. This applies especially to the administration of the sacraments of God's Church, in which Our office strictly binds Us to ensure the religious observance of the rites and ceremonies established by apostolic traditions and the decrees of the holy Fathers. Therefore, Pope Pius V of happy memory, Our predecessor, mindful of this office, then his and now Ours, judged in his pastoral foresight that the Roman breviary should first be published, and then the missal, both prepared with great study and diligence. His purpose was to restore the observance of sacred rites in the most holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the Divine Office; and, at the same time, that the Catholic Church, gathered in the unity of faith under one visible head, the Roman Pontiff, successor of blessed Peter, might maintain one order of psalmody and prayer, as far as possible in the Lord. Following his footsteps in the same spirit of wisdom, Pope Clement VIII of like memory, also Our predecessor, not only gave bishops and lesser prelates of the Church a carefully restored Pontifical, but also regulated many other ceremonies in cathedral and lesser churches by promulgating a Ceremonial.

His ita constitutis, restabat, ut uno etiam volumine comprehensi, sacri et sinceri catholicæ Ecclesiæ ritus, qui in sacramentorum administratione, aliisque ecclesiasticis functionibus servari debent, ab iis qui curam animarum gerunt apostolicæ Sedis auctoritate prodirent, ad cujus voluminis præscriptum, in tanta ritualium multitudine, sua illi ministeria tanquam ad publicam et obsignatam normam peragerent, unoque ac fideli ductu inoffenso pede ambularent cum consensu. Quod quidem jampridem agitatum negotium, postquam generalium Conciliorum græce latineque divina gratia editorum opus morari desivit, sollicite urgere nostri muneris esse existimavimus. Ut autem recte et ordine, ut par erat, res ageretur, nonnullis ex Venerabilibus Fratribus nostris S. R. E. Cardinalibus, pietate, doctrina et prudentia præstantibus, eam demandavimus, qui cum consilio eruditorum virorum, variisque præsertim antiquis et quæ circumferuntur, Ritualibus consultis, eoque in primis, quod vir *(p. 533)* singulari pietatis zelo, et doctrinæ bonæ memoriæ Julius Antonius S. R. E. Card. S. Severinæ nuncupatus, longo studio, multaque industria et labore plenissimum composuerat, rebusque omnibus mature consideratis, demum divina aspirante clementia, quanta oportuit brevitate, Rituale confecerunt. In quo cum receptos et approbatos catholicæ Ecclesiæ ritus suo ordine digestos conspexerimus, illud sub nomine ritualis Romani merito edendum publico Ecclesiæ Dei bono judicavimus. Quapropter

hortamur in Domino Venerabiles Fratres Patriarchas, Archiepiscopos, et Episcopos, et dilectos Filios eorum Vicarios, necnon Abbates, Parochos universos, ubique locorum existentes, et alios, ad quos spectat, ut in posterum tanquam ecclesiæ Romanæ filii, ejusdem Ecclesiæ omnium matris et magistræ auctoritate constituto rituali in sacris functionibus utantur, et in re tanti momenti, quæ catholica Ecclesia, et ab ea probatus usus antiquitatis statuit, inviolate observent.

Datum Romæ apud S. Mariam Majorem, sub Annulo Piscatoris, die 17 Junii M DC XIV. Pontificatus Nostri anno X.

Note B Pope Paul V, for Future Remembrance.

By virtue of the office of apostolic service imposed upon Us from above, We gladly attend to measures meeting the pious desires of the monks of the order of Saint Benedict, who shine with a singular splendor in God's Church, as We see in the Lord to be conducive to salvation. We have learned that Our beloved sons, the procurators general of monks serving under Saint Benedict's Rule, appointed to reform their order's Breviary and other ecclesiastical choir books, have, after long and many labors, reformed these books. By this reform they have ensured that the order's religious will henceforth recite the canonical Hours with a uniform rite and offer the sacrifice of praise to the Most High in concord, whereas they previously celebrated different Offices. We greatly commend this praiseworthy undertaking, and omnes ejusdem ordinis religiosos ad Breviarium, et libros chorales, ut præfertur, reformatos, unanimiter recipiendos, in Domino hortantes, desire to advance this work as far as We can in the Lord, so that a more correct and faithful edition of the Breviary and those books may be produced, etc. Moreover, We wish to provide that these religious may be moved all the more readily to receive unanimously the Breviary and choir books reformed as stated above, the more they find themselves refreshed also by spiritual gifts. By the aforementioned authority and terms, We grant each and every one of these religious that, by reciting this Breviary thus reformed, they may obtain the same privileges, graces, indulgences, and remissions of sins which *(p. 534)* Pope Pius V of happy memory, Our predecessor, granted to those reciting the Roman breviary. Notwithstanding Our provision against granting indulgences by analogy, other apostolic constitutions and ordinances, any statutes and customs, even those strengthened by oath, apostolic confirmation, or any other guarantee, and privileges, indults, and apostolic letters contrary to the foregoing, however granted, confirmed, or renewed, and anything else to the contrary. We will that copies of these presents, even those printed in the books themselves, signed by a public notary and authenticated with the seal of a person holding ecclesiastical dignity, be accorded precisely the same credence as these presents would receive if exhibited or shown.

Given at Rome, at Saint Mark's, under the Fisherman's Ring, on October 1, 1612, in the eighth year of Our pontificate.

Note C Pope Urban VIII, for Perpetual Remembrance.

Divine Psalmody, in which the bride consoles herself in this exile for her absence from the heavenly bridegroom, should have neither wrinkle nor spot. Since it is the daughter of the Hymnody continually sung before the throne of God and the Lamb, it should, to resemble that Hymnody more closely, contain as far as possible nothing that could draw away and distract the psalmists' minds from their fitting attention to God and divine things. Such distractions occur when thoughts or words are sometimes less aptly and harmoniously arranged than a work of service and ministry so great and so exalted would require. These reasons once moved the supreme Pontiffs, Our predecessors of happy memory: Pius V to bind the Roman breviary, then wandering amid uncertain rules, to a definite, fixed method of prayer; and Clement VIII to restore its original beauty after the passage of time and printers' carelessness had corrupted it. We too were drawn to the same undertaking, both by Our concern for sacred things, which We consider the first and best part of Our office, and by the judgments and wishes of pious and learned men. They complained that it contained many things which, whether they had fallen from the original splendor of their institution or had

been begun rather than perfected by others, certainly required Our finishing hand. We therefore applied Ourselves diligently to this matter. At Our command, several learned and wise men devoted serious attention to it; their diligence and study have completed a work We hope will please all and bring honor to God and holy Church. For its hymns (with few exceptions), composed not in meter but in prose or even in rhythm, have, either through the use of more correct copies *(p. 535)* or through certain changes, been brought back, where possible, to the rules of verse and Latinity; where this was impossible, they have been composed anew, preserving the same meaning as far as permitted. The punctuation of the Vulgate edition has been restored in the Psalms and Canticles; asterisks have been added for the singers' convenience, for which the punctuation itself had sometimes been changed. The Fathers' Sermons and Homilies have been collated with several printed editions and old manuscripts, with many omissions supplied and many readings emended and corrected. The Saints' Histories have been revised from ancient and approved authors. With some things removed and others added, the rubrics have been explained more clearly and conveniently. Finally, everything has been arranged and polished with diligent accuracy through great and lengthy labor, bringing what was desired to its wished-for conclusion.

Since so great and exact a labor by learned men requires printers' fidelity if it is not to come entirely to nothing, We have entrusted Our beloved son Andrew Brogiotto, prefect of Our Apostolic Printing House, with preparing the first publication of this Breviary. All who subsequently print the Roman breviary must follow this exemplar. Outside the City, no one may henceforth print or publish it without written permission from the inquisitors of heretical depravity, where these exist, or otherwise from the local ordinaries. Any printer who prints, or bookseller who sells, the Roman breviary in any form contrary to that prescribed shall, outside Our ecclesiastical dominion, incur automatic excommunication, from which only the Roman Pontiff may absolve him, except at the point of death. Those residing in the beloved City and the rest of the Ecclesiastical State shall, without further declaration, incur without remission a fine of five hundred in gold to the Treasury and forfeiture of all their books and printing types to that same Treasury. Moreover, Breviaries printed or published without that permission shall by that very fact be deemed prohibited.

The inquisitors and local ordinaries must not grant this permission until they have diligently compared the Breviary, both before and after printing, with this exemplar published by Our authority, and ascertained that nothing has been added or removed. In the permission itself, a printed copy of which must always be included at the end or beginning of each Breviary, they must attest in their own handwriting that this collation has been completed and that the two Breviaries conform. The penalties are: for inquisitors, deprivation of their offices and ineligibility to obtain those or other offices thereafter; for local ordinaries, suspension from divine functions and an interdict against entering a church; for their vicars, deprivation of their offices and benefices, ineligibility to obtain those or others thereafter, and excommunication incurred without further declaration. We intend and will that the same prohibitions and penalties cover everything derived from the Roman breviary, in part or in whole: Missals, Diurnals, Little Offices of the Blessed Virgin, Offices of Holy Week, and other such books, which henceforth must not be *(p. 536)* printed until they, and each one of them, have first been printed in that printing house by the same Andrew, so that they may agree entirely with the Breviary published at Our command. We enjoin Our nuncios everywhere to watch diligently over this matter and ensure that everything is carried out according to this expression of Our will. Nevertheless, We do not wish these letters to prohibit Breviaries and the other aforesaid books already printed. To protect everyone from loss, in Our apostolic kindness We permit and allow printers and booksellers to sell them, and churches, clerics, and others to retain and use them. Notwithstanding any licenses, indults, and privileges to print Breviaries hitherto granted to any printers by Us or Our predecessors the Roman Pontiffs, which We expressly revoke by these presents and will to be revoked; or any general or particular constitutions and ordinances contrary to the foregoing, however issued, confirmed, or approved. From all these, even if special, specific, and express mention of them and their entire wording were required, We specially and expressly derogate for this occasion alone, treating their wording as expressed in these

presents, and notwithstanding anything else to the contrary. We will that copies of these Our letters, even those printed in the Breviaries themselves, or signed by a public notary and authenticated with the seal of a person holding ecclesiastical dignity, receive precisely the same credence as these presents would receive if exhibited or shown.

Given at Rome, at Saint Peter's, under the Fisherman's Ring, on January 25, 1631, in the eighth year of Our pontificate.

End of the Notes to Chapter Sixteen.

---

[1] Procès-verbaux des Assemblées générales du clergé, vol. I, p. 767.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Procès-verbaux des Assemblées générales du clergé, vol. II, p. 43.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Preuves des libertés de l'Église gallicane, vol. II, p. 1144.

[6] See above, ch. XV, p. 453, and supporting documents, Note F, pp. 492–495.

[7] Procès-verbaux du clergé, vol. I, p. 733 ff.

[8] Procès-verbaux du clergé, vol. I, p. 767.

[9] Preuves des libertés de l'Église gallicane, vol. II, p. 1144.

[10] Ibid., p. 1146.

[11] Address of the General Assembly of the Clergy of France of 1625 to the Archbishops and Bishops of This Kingdom.

[12] For the Catholic Church clearly understood, not only from Christ our Lord's promise to Peter, but also from the acts of earlier pontiffs and from the anathematisms issued shortly beforehand by Damasus against Apollinarius and Macedonius, who had not yet been condemned by any ecumenical council, that judicia pro sancienda regula fidei a summis Pontificibus lata, super episcoporum consultatione (sive suam in actis relationis sententiam ponant, sive omittant, prout illis collibuerit) divina æque ac summa per universam Ecclesiam authoritate niti: to which all Christians are bound by duty to render the submission of their very minds as well. We too, imbued with that conviction and faith, duly reverencing the present authority of the Roman Church, which is in force in the Supreme Pontiff Innocent X, shall ensure that the constitution drawn up by Your Beatitude at the prompting of the divine Majesty and delivered to us by the most illustrious bishop of Athens, the apostolic nuncio, is promulgated in our churches and dioceses; and we shall insist on its enforcement among the faithful people. (D'Argentré, Collect. Judiciorum, vol. III, p. 276.)

[13] Benedict XIV, Epist. ad Cardinal. Guadagnium, §18.

[14] See Note A.

[15] The parish priest, having questioned the man and woman and ascertained their mutual consent, is either to say: I join you in matrimony, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; vel aliis utatur verbis, juxta receptum uniuscujusque provinciæ ritum. (Council of Trent, session XXIV, On Reform, ch.1.)

[16] We, highly commending this praiseworthy plan, and omnes ejusdem Ordinis religiosos ad breviarium et libros chorales, ut præfertur reformatos unanimiter recipiendos in Domino hortantes, and desiring, as far as We can in the Lord, to advance this work, etc.

[17] See Note B.

[18] Apart from the saints' feasts that Our Most Holy Lord Pope Urban VIII has added to the Roman Breviary's calendar, no one is to introduce other feasts without consulting the general chapter. (Declar. Cong. S. Mauri, on ch.XIV of the Rule of Our Holy Father Benedict.) No one, without consulting the general chapter, is to introduce feasts other than those printed in the calendar or prescribed in the diocese. (Declar. Cong. SS. Vitoni et Hydulphi, on the same chapter.) VOL.1 / 33

[19] The Sacred Congregation of Rites judged and declared omnes monachos et moniales qui et quæ militant sub regula S. Benedicti, posse et debere uti breviario Benedictino nuper de mandato SS. D. N. Pauli V papæ edito pro omnibus religiosis qui militant sub regula S. Patris Benedicti: nonobstante quod aliqui exempti in præteritum usi fuerint Romano, vel alio breviario. And it so declared on January 24, in the year of the Lord 1616.

[20] Merati on Gavanti, Thesaur. Sacr. Rituum, vol.III, 4°, p.22.

[21] See Note C.

[22] Théophile Raynaud, Opera, vol.XI, Minutalia sacra, p.12.

[23] Hortologia sacra, book III, ch.V, question 2.

[24] Hymnodia Hispanica, De Hymnis ecclesiast., §28.

[25] Therefore, just as We recently ordered the breviary reformed for the splendor of the Divine Office, so, following its example, We have at last ordered the missal corrected to adorn the Divine Sacrifice; and since these quasi alas quas sacerdos, instar cherubim prisci mystici tabernaculi, quotidie pandit ad verum mundi propitiatorium, ought to be perfectly paired and uniform, etc. (Brief of September

2, 1634.)

[26] They shall still increase in senecta uberi. (Psalm XCI,15.)