

7. The Theory of the Liturgy: Encyclopaedias, and *The Mass*

If the Eastern churches were a lifelong passion for Fortescue so similarly were ‘liturgics’, the study of liturgical worship and the passion to celebrate it well. In this chapter I consider him not so much as practitioner — that will be the subject of the chapter that follows — but as theoretician, which must mean as *theologian-cum-historian of the rites*.

If not exactly easy (some of the subject-matter is inordinately complex), it was at any rate convenient for Fortescue to take on the writing of a series of articles on liturgical subjects for the great Anglo-American *Catholic Encyclopaedia* which began production in 1907, with multiple collaborators and an imprimatur from the archbishop of New York. According to its editors, the *Encyclopaedia* aimed to ‘give its readers full and authoritative information on the entire cycle of Catholic interests, action and doctrine’.¹ The request to Fortescue was timely because he was at the time planning a book on the early history of the Mass.² Naturally there would be overlap. The editors of the *Encyclopaedia* wanted general articles on the nature of liturgy and rite. They also wanted particular articles on the Roman Liturgy, and notably on the various ‘moments’ in the liturgical action, from the preparatory prayers ‘at the foot of the altar’ to the Last Gospel, which follows the dismissal and blessing. These will be considered in connexion with Fortescue’s handbook on the Mass of the Roman rite. Here we must consider first his wider view of the Liturgy and his contributions to the study of its Eastern Christian forms.

The Liturgy at large

Fortescue draws on the Septuagint text of the Old Testament and, within the New Testament, the Gospel of Luke and the Letter to the Hebrews, in order to support his claim that, in Christian usage, the term ‘liturgy’ always meant ‘the official public service of the Church’, corresponding to

1 C.G. Herbermann et al. (ed.), *The Catholic Encyclopaedia I* (London: Caxton, and New York: Robert Appleton, 1907), p.v.

2 The invitation evidently came through the good offices of Herbert Thurston, S.J.: Westminster Diocesan Archives, Series 20, Box 22, Letter to Herbert Thurston of 20 June, 1906.

‘the official service of the Temple in the Old Law’.³ He points out that, as a consequence of the development of idiom, there can be some confusion nonetheless. ‘Liturgy’ can be taken to denote ‘the whole complex of official services, all the rites, ceremonies, prayers, and sacraments of the Church, as opposed to private devotions’. And this is generally what is meant in the West. Alternatively, the word may be restricted, as is the case with Eastern Christians, to the ‘Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, which in our rite we call the Mass’.⁴

I note in this connexion the strength of Fortescue’s doctrine of the Eucharist as the ‘sacrifice of the Mass’, intimated most obviously in the introduction to the Fortescue Missal.

Each Mass contains the slaying of the Victim, not repeated here in the West after centuries, made once only long ago in Palestine, yet part of the sacrifice offered throughout the world each morning. All Masses are one sacrifice, including the death of the cross, continuing through all time the act of offering then begun. . . . Every time we hear Mass we look across that gulf of time, we are again before the cross, with his mother and St. John; we offer still that victim then slain, present here under the forms of bread and wine.⁵

This statement is so marked by the Eucharistic sensibility of a Tridentine Catholic that we feel a certain sense of surprise when Fortescue, in the article ‘Liturgy’, declares his preference for the Oriental nomenclature. Counselling the universal adoption of the Eastern linguistic practice, by which the Mass is ‘The Liturgy’ and other public acts of worship must find some different name, Fortescue sees no reason why Latin Christians cannot simply describe the celebration of the Hours, for instance, as ‘official’ or ‘canonical’ rather than ‘liturgical’ prayer.

‘The Liturgy’ was Fortescue’s preferred name for the Mass, though when addressing a Catholic readership he retained as normative the familiar term; by the same token, he was willing to give the liturgy of the Hours some less prestigious label. The reform of the Roman rite, carried out within half a century of Fortescue’s death, did not follow this lead. It must be said that, had the Western Catholic Church taken Fortescue’s

3 ‘Liturgy’, *Catholic Encyclopaedia* IX (1910), pp. 306–313, and here at p. 306; the New Testament references are Luke 1:23, and Hebrews 8:6, the first of which concerns the last days of the Old Law and the second the fount of the Liturgy in the New.

4 ‘Liturgy’, art. cit., p. 306.

5 *The Roman Missal*, compiled by lawful authority from the *Missale Romanum*, with an introduction by Adrian Fortescue, D.D., (London: Burns and Oates, 1912), p. xiv.

advice, achieving an integrated approach to the worshipping day would be seriously handicapped. The Mass is the sun of each liturgical day, but around it, in a constellation, the planets of the other acts of divine worship always circle.

Fortescue's self-denying ordinance (the Liturgy is the Mass and that alone) meant that when he comes to speak about the origin and development of the Liturgy what he will actually describe is the origin and development of the ceremonial celebration of the Eucharist. His questions in this regard are: 'From what date was there a fixed and regulated service such as we can describe as a formal Liturgy? How far was this service uniform in various Churches? How far are we able to reconstruct its forms and arrangement?'⁶

Fortescue's approach does not diverge in any obvious fashion from the median position of scholars in his time. There was much fluidity, much variability, in the worship of the apostolic age, but there were also fixed reference points, both in the synagogue model for a liturgy of the Word (those writing on this subject after the work of the pioneering Methodist student of biblical worship-patterns Margaret Barker would have to note the absence of much 'Temple theology' in Fortescue's account)⁷ and in the memory of what the Lord himself did at the Board on the first Holy Thursday when he instituted this continuing sign of his Sacrifice. Two features — the Eucharistic agape and the 'spiritual exercises' of prophesying in the Holy Spirit — dropped out quickly (their presence in the anonymous late first century text called the *Didache* or 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' shows that the latter 'in some ways lies apart from the general development').⁸

By the time of the Apostolic Fathers, forms are becoming set. The bishop has a certain right to improvise but this can only have been extremely restricted since the deacon and people had to know how and when to make their responses or acclamations. Moreover, the themes to be covered were more or less constant since the content of the divine blessings under the new and everlasting Covenant was always the same. And the conservative instinct, ever powerful in religion, would have served as a barrier against constant change. Daughter churches, for instance, would imitate a mother. Fortescue will not go so far as to say that all liturgies, Eastern and Western, derive ultimately from a single apostolic prototype but he writes nonetheless, 'The mediaeval idea that all are derived from one parent rite is not so absurd, if we remember that the parent was not a written or stereotyped Liturgy, but rather 'a general *type* of service'.⁹ Here

6 'Liturgy', art. cit., p. 307.

7 M. Barker, *Temple Theology. An Introduction* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 2004).

8 'Liturgy', art. cit., p. 308.

9 Ibid.

Fortescue is coming close to the highly influential concept, put forward after his death by the Anglo-Catholic liturgical historian (and theologian) Dom Gregory Dix, that what is crucial in the origin and development of the Church's worship is the Liturgy's overall 'Shape' (typically, Dix kept the word in capitals), not, as was customarily thought by comparative liturgists, the detailed content of a Eucharistic Prayer.¹⁰

Comparing the account of the Mass in Justin's First Apology, the liturgical allusions in the First Letter of Clement of Rome and the liturgical rite laid out in the eighth book of the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions*, Fortescue thinks it is possible to construct that 'general type', at any rate up to a point. Here he intervenes in a controversy among, above all, German scholars. He follows the line of Paul Drews in the latter's *Untersuchungen über die sogenannte clementinische Liturgie*.¹¹ Drews had sought to locate and defend a germ of truth in the complex but over-systematising proposal of an earlier liturgical historian, Ferdinand Probst. Probst's attempt to demonstrate that the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* can be considered the universal primitive Liturgy of the Church Fortescue calls, in a memorable phrase, the 'monomania of a very learned man'.¹² For Fortescue, as for Drews, the Liturgy in the *Apostolic Constitutions* is a developed Syrian form of something much older and not absolutely tied to Syria at all.

Fortescue thought that the overall development of the liturgies resembled that of languages. A diversity arises, but then some particular strains within that diversity acquire a hegemony, and further, if regional, uniformities result. The key to the new regional uniformities is the emergence of the patriarchal centres, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch. 'As the other bishops accepted the jurisdiction of these three patriarchs, so did they imitate their services.'¹³ By a natural progression, then, Fortescue was led

10 G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1982 [1945]), p. 5. Dix stressed the way the 'Shape' was dictated by the fourfold nature of the Eucharistic action: the Offertory; the Prayer of Thanksgiving; the Fraction; the Communion. A more recent Anglican liturgiologist, Paul Bradshaw, has, however, set a question-mark against Dix's assumption that 'only what was common could be regarded as primitive': thus P.F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship. Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1992), p. 143.

11 P. Drews, *Untersuchungen über die sogenannte clementinische Liturgie* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1906).

12 'Liturgy', art. cit., p. 309. The two principal works by Probst were his *Liturgie der drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderte* (Tübingen: Laupp, 1870), and *Liturgie des vierten Jahrhunderts und deren Reform* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1893).

13 'Liturgy', art. cit., p. 310.

on to speak of the genesis of the principal liturgical families, Eastern and Western, on which he also provided more detailed accounts in essays for the *Encyclopaedia* on the great rites (and even some lesser ones).

The Eastern liturgies

Though the request for articles on the Eastern liturgies, and notably on the Byzantine Liturgy, was less germane to Fortescue's purposes in his forthcoming handbook, it too was grist to his mill. Like all the major historians of the early liturgies, he was aware that the Western and Eastern forms of Christian worship could not satisfactorily be studied in mutual isolation. And moreover, owing to his fascination with Orthodoxy, and its non-Byzantine estranged sisters, the (Nestorian) 'Church of the East' and the (Monophysite) non-Chalcedonian churches, he had an additional ground for wanting to take on the burden of the Oriental liturgical articles as well.

A yet further incentive was his conviction that the Catholic Church is not exclusively Roman or, more widely, Latin. She is made up of a number of ritual churches, of which the Latin church merely happens, for reasons of historical accident, to be the largest. As at the London Eucharistic Congress, it was important to him to show separated Western Christians that the Catholic Church was splendid in her internal variety, and this was manifested most persuasively in the diverse worshipping life of the 'Uniate' churches within her single communion.

Fortescue's first article for the *Encyclopaedia* was in fact on the Alexandrian (or, as he — or possibly his editors — preferred, 'Alexandrine') Liturgy. It gives us a good idea of his chosen approach. Though the forms of worship used for some centuries by the 'orthodox Melchites' as well as enduringly by Copts and Ethiopians would be of more interest to the Church historian or, for that matter, to the contemporary student of Christianity in Egypt and the Horn of Africa, he thought it desirable to begin with a speculative archaeological construction of the primitive (Greek) liturgy of Alexandria, the 'old use of the Church of Alexandria as it existed before the Monophysite schism and the Council of Chalcedon'.¹⁴ It meant identifying what was common to these various (presumed) daughter rites and synthesizing it with occasional allusions in other relevant texts — such as, in this particular case, Athanasius of Alexandria's writings. This was very much in the manner of the comparative liturgists of Fortescue's day and later, though his version seems idiosyncratic in that it includes among the sources for pertinent allusions the *de Hierarchia ecclesiastica* of the Pseudo-Denys, whom he regards as a fourth (rather than sixth) century figure and not Syrian (as generally claimed) but Egyptian.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 303. Fortescue was not consistent in his spelling of the word 'Melkite'/'Melchite'. Outside of citations, I prefer to use here the first of these.

Firmer ground is reached with the Greek Liturgy of St Mark — eventually abandoned by the (highly minoritarian) Orthodox in Alexandria in favour of the worshipping template found at Constantinople. Here there is a *textus receptus* (reproduced in the *Liturgies Eastern and Western* of Fortescue's Oxford contact F.E. Brightman), largely based on a thirteenth century manuscript in the Vatican Library. Though this rite has undergone Byzantine influence, Fortescue draws attention to its most distinctive feature: the 'Supplication' (for 'various causes and people') which in all other liturgical traditions follows the Sanctus comes before it in what 'we' (i.e. Latins) would call the Preface of the Mass.

The Alexandrine Preface then is very long; interwoven into it are a series of prayers for the Church, the Emperor, the sick, the fruits of the earth, and so on. Again the priest prays God to "draw up the waters of the river [Nile] to their right measure"; he remembers various classes of Saints, especially St. Mark, says the first part of the Hail Mary, and then goes on aloud: "especially our all-holy, immaculate, and glorious Lady Mary, Mother of God and ever Virgin". The deacon here reads the diptychs of the dead; the priest continues his supplication for the patriarch, the bishop, and all the living; the deacon calls out to the people to stand and then to look towards the east; and so at last comes the Sanctus: "the many-eyed Cherubim and the six-winged Seraphim".¹⁵

This peculiarity emboldens Fortescue to float the hypothesis that in all the liturgies of the Church it was originally the case that the deacon began to read out the supplications as soon as the priest started the Preface. This would explain why in some places (Alexandria) those supplications precede the Consecration; in others (Antioch) they follow it; in yet others (Rome) they come partly before and partly after. Fortescue finds the anaphora of the Greek Liturgy of St Mark to bear some obvious resemblances to the Roman Canon. Following the much-admired Louis Duchesne, it is 'with this Egyptian Liturgy that ours is generally supposed to have had a common source'.¹⁶

He ends by describing much more briefly the Coptic and Ethiopic liturgies. After the schism, the former added three anaphora (dedicated to St Cyril, St Gregory Nazianzen, and St Basil) in the Coptic tongue, the latter 'ten or fifteen' in the ancient predecessor of Amharic, though the most commonly used Eucharistic Prayer is a Ge'ez translation of the Coptic Anaphora of St Cyril. Again, the Vatican Library is the best place to look for manuscripts, but Fortescue can also tell the reader how to get hold of the

15 Ibid., p. 304.

16 Ibid., p. 305.

texts used by Uniates in his own day: *Missale Coptice et Arabice* printed at Rome in 1736 for the Catholic Copts, and, for the Uniates a 1548 *Missale cum benedictione incensi, cerae, etc* (containing the *Ordo communis* and the *Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles* i.e. the Coptic St Cyril) for the Catholic Ethiopians. In reality, the latter were only just emerging, in their small numbers, from a Roman-rite regime based on the unavailability of printed liturgical texts suited to their needs. Fortescue wondered aloud whether among the Greek Orthodox in Egypt the current ‘strongly anti-Phanariote’ patriarch might not one day try to resume use of the Greek Liturgy of St Mark as a gesture of independence from Constantinople.

The other great family of Eastern liturgies took its name from the Syrian metropolis, Antioch. Fortescue’s view of the origins and development of the Antiochene Liturgy turns on his account of the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions*, or more precisely, of the eighth and last book in that collection. The *Apostolic Constitutions* purport to be the work of St Clement of Rome, who died soon after the end of the first century. That they are a genuine Clementine product is hardly credible. On Fortescue’s analysis: the first six books are a modified version of the early third century *Didascalia Apostolorum*, the seventh book is a variant on the *Didache*, or ‘Teaching of the Twelve Apostles’ (which, he thinks, could well be a first century work). But the eighth book, aside from 85 ‘Apostolic Canons’, is a ‘complete liturgy’,¹⁷ which Fortescue ascribes to a Syrian Christian, living in Antioch or near it, around the year 400. He thinks it the form of worship used at the anonymous compiler’s time in the church of Antioch, but with modifications whose character is discernible from the changes he had made to the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (Fortescue draws a connexion here to the pseudonymous letters added at some point to the little epistolary bundle left, at the start of the second century, by St Ignatius of Antioch).

This of course is all grist to the antiquarians’ mill. Of more import to the reader interested in how later Christians worshipped is Fortescue’s claim that the liturgy of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is ‘obviously built up on the same lines as all the Syrian ones’:¹⁸ he means, up to the present day. Its structure consists of

the Mass of the Catechumens and their dismissal; the litany; the Anaphora beginning with the words “Right and just” and interrupted by the Sanctus; the words of Institution; Anamnesis, Epiklesis and Supplication for all kinds of people at that place; the Elevation with the words “Holy things to the holy”; the Communion distributed by the bishop and deacon (the deacon having the chalice); and then the final prayer

17 ‘Antiochene Liturgy’, *ibid.*, pp. 571-574, and here at p. 571.

18 *Ibid.*

and dismissal — this order is characteristic of all the Syrian and Palestinian uses, and is followed in the derived Byzantine liturgies.¹⁹

That there is no mention of the name of the Mother of God Fortescue takes to be a sign of the antiquity of this rite (before the Council of Ephesus, 431, when Mary's status as *Theotokos* was formally confirmed); he can find no explanation for its omission of the Our Father which the *Didache* had enjoined to be prayed thrice daily.

The main features of the text whose provenance and content Fortescue has been discussing are reproduced in more elaborate form in the Greek Liturgy of St James used throughout Syria and Palestine, including at Jerusalem. The elaboration concerns chiefly the *Prothesis* or preparation of the Gifts prior to the Liturgy of the Word, and the way in which the entry of the sacred ministers for the reading of the Scriptures and the carrying of the Gifts from the *Prothesis* to the altar became solemn processions. The oldest extant manuscript of the Greek Liturgy of St James, so Fortescue tells us in passing, dates from the tenth century, and was formerly the property of the Greek monastery in the Sicilian city of Messina, in whose University library it could still be found. That is a flickering shadow of the 'Italo-Greek' church, once so glorious, whose fate he had described in *The Uniate Eastern Churches*.

The principal features of the Antiochene rite are likewise continued in its successor after the Monophysite schism, viz. the Syriac Liturgy of St James, used with variations by both Syrian Jacobites and their Uniate brethren, whether Syrian Catholic or Maronite. Fortescue is able to refer readers to Brightman's *Liturgies Eastern and Western* to get an idea of the basic development from the *Apostolic Constitutions* through the Greek to the Syriac Liturgy of St James. But the Jacobites went on to add — apart from the famous clause 'Holy Immortal One who wast crucified for us', stigmatized by the Orthodox (rightly or otherwise) as unacceptably Monophysite — a large number of supplementary Anaphoras (Fortescue can count sixty-four), ascribed to various saints and Monophysite bishops, as well as a shortened version of the Anaphora of St James. We read that the 'complete Jacobite texts are not published',²⁰ while an 1843 Roman *Missale syriacum iuxta ritum antiochenum Syrorum* has been superseded by liturgical books now published for Syrian Uniates at Beirut. That was the kind of information Fortescue's 1907 travels, with their Beirut base, would have enabled him to acquire with ease.

19 Ibid., p. 572. The 'Anamnesis' is when the celebrant makes memorial of the death and subsequent exaltation of Christ, the 'Epiklesis' when, on this basis, he asks for the coming of the Holy Spirit onto the Gifts or the people, or both, so that the sacrifice may be fruitful.

20 Ibid., p. 574.

The Orthodox of the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem long ago abandoned their own use for that of Constantinople, 'one result of the extreme centralization towards Constantinople that followed the Arab conquests of Egypt, Palestine, and Syria',²¹ though on the island of Zakynthos (better known to British visitors to Corfu by its Italian name of 'Zante'), the Greek Liturgy of St James has remained in use on one day of the year, 23 October, the feast of James the 'brother of God'. The text, so Fortescue tells us, was published locally in 1886. He reports that the patriarch Damianos I of Jerusalem revived the ancient Liturgy of his see in 1900 for use on 31 December, while commissioning an improved edition for the future.

Granted the inevitable stylistic constraints of encyclopaedias, Fortescue's account of the rite of Constantinople itself — the Byzantine Liturgy — has a detectible note of ardour, at any rate once we have got beyond the archaeological introduction. Though, historically, the Byzantine was 'not one of the original parent-rites',²² Fortescue's love for it is palpable — though doubtless saying so is affected by awareness of the huge effort he made to arrange for its celebration in Westminster Cathedral during the Eucharistic Congress, as well as at Letchworth, and his own hankerings after transfer to the Melkite rite, the church of the Byzantine Liturgy in Arab dress.

He rehearses the pre-history as he sees it. An early form of the Greek Liturgy of St James was re-arranged and abbreviated by St Basil for the use of the church of Caesarea, the metropolitan church of Cappadocia. Though Constantinople was outside the exarchate of Caesarea, Basil's fame and the convenience of his reform may have meant this rite was in use in the capital before Chrysostom arrived from Antioch. As to Chrysostom: '[t]he Tradition of his Church says that during the time of his patriarchate he composed from the Basilian Liturgy a shorter form that is the one still in common use throughout the Orthodox Church'.²³ Though Fortescue writes 'still in common use', he makes it plain that much water has flowed under the bridge, for to reconstruct the worship Chrysostom knew we must take away from the present forms the preparation of the Offerings at the Liturgy's start, the Little and Great Entrances, and the Creed. (We find these rites in a transitional stage en route to their current form in a manuscript of the Barberini Library from c. 800: it is reproduced in the volumes of Fortescue's Oxford contact Brightman.) And as to the story of the Byzantine Office, Fortescue regards it as inherited from the Antiochene method of keeping the canonical Hours, with such great poets as Romanos

21 Ibid., p. 573.

22 'Constantinople, The Rite of', art. cit., p. 312.

23 Ibid., p. 313.

the Melodist, Cosmas the Melodist, John Damascene and Theodore of Studion intercalating a rich succession of ‘canons’ — by which term is meant ‘unmetrical hymns’.²⁴

After dealing with the topics of language, calendar, and service-books, Fortescue turns to investigate the altar, vestments and sacred vessels of the Byzantine rite as well as its music. He remarks on the latter: ‘In Russia and lately, to some extent, in the metropolitan church of Athens they sing figured music in parts of a very stately and beautiful kind. It is probably the most beautiful and suitable church music in the world’.²⁵ But all this is only a preamble to Fortescue’s describing the *déroulement* of the rite, confining himself to the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, since, as he says, the older Liturgy of St Basil, apart from its restriction to a smaller number of feasts and vigils, differs only in a certain quantity of prayers. Modern Orthodox service-books sanctioned Fortescue’s *modus operandi* by printing Chrysostom’s Liturgy first and then the variant prayers of the Basilian rite (and those for the ‘Liturgy of the Presanctified’ ascribed, by a curious legend, to St Gregory the Great, who was the pope’s envoy in Byzantium for six years in the 570’s).

The ‘first rubric’ requires that the celebrant must be reconciled to all, his heart kept free from evil thoughts and his body fasting from midnight. At the time appointed, generally this is after None, he arrives in church with the deacon, says the preparatory prayers, kisses the icons and goes into the *diakonikon* (the equivalent of a Western sacristy, but fully joined to the body of the church on the south side) so as to vest. This may be as good a place as any to mention the serious study Fortescue put into the topic of iconophilia (and of the enemies of the icons, the Iconoclasts).²⁶ While conceding that among some Christians in the early centuries there was anxiety about the possible *entrée* images might offer to idolatrous attitudes,²⁷ Fortescue thinks the first Christians nevertheless developed a sacred art as soon as the conditions of their material culture allowed. ‘They accepted the art of the time and used it, as well as a poor and persecuted community could, to express their religious ideas.’²⁸

24 Ibid., p. 315.

25 Ibid., p. 316.

26 ‘Images, veneration of’, *The Catholic Encyclopaedia* VII (1910), pp. 664–672; ‘Iconoclasm’, *ibid.*, pp. 620–625.

27 ‘Iconoclasm’, *art. cit.*, p. 620. It should be noted that, somewhat confusingly, Fortescue wrote a further article, not substantially different from this, under the same title (‘Iconoclasm’), for J. Hastings, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, VII (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1913), pp. 78–81.

28 ‘Images, veneration of’, *art. cit.*, p. 665.

The tradition of actually venerating images (by kissing, prostration, lights, incense and so forth) arose, for Fortescue, from ‘decent reverence’,²⁹ the conventions for which just happened to be more dramatic in the East than in the West. The honour to which the Second Council of Nicaea, the Seventh Ecumenical Council, in 787, gave the name ‘relative’ worship, since it passes through the image to its prototype, ‘will be expressed in signs denoted by custom and etiquette’.³⁰ And this is the worship (‘a general word denoting some more or less high degree of reverence and honour, an acknowledgement of worth, like the German *Verehrung*’),³¹ with which celebrant and deacon in the Byzantine Liturgy, ‘are constantly told to pay reverence to the holy icons’.³²

The first part of the Liturgy, the *Proskomidê* or preparation of the gifts now begins at the credence table (the *prothesis*). Using the holy lance the celebrant cuts out from five leavened rounds of bread portions marked with the initials of *Iêsous Christos, Nika* (‘Jesus Christ, victory’), with the acclamation ‘The Lamb of God is sacrificed’, while other portions (‘prosphora’) are set aside in honour of the Mother of God and the saints, and for the bishop and others for whom he wishes to pray. All this is accompanied, explains Fortescue, by many prayers and much incensing. When finished, the celebrating clergy go to the altar, kiss the Gospel-book, and the deacon announces ‘It is time to sacrifice to the Lord!’. That is the signal for the Litanies to begin as the deacon leaves the sanctuary through the north door and, standing before the Royal Doors (Fortescue has already explained their iconography) prays for all sorts and conditions of men. This is in turn the prelude for the ‘Little Entrance’, the deacon bearing the book of the Gospels, with acolytes carrying candles. Troparia (short hymns) are sung while the celebrant prays and a reader prepares to read the epistle. After a gradual, the deacon sings the Gospel and more prayers follow.

Once the catechumens (usually notional) have been dismissed, there comes the ‘Great Entrance’ whose drama is well brought out in Fortescue’s account.

The deacon covers his shoulders with the great veil and takes the diskos (paten) with the bread; the thurible hangs from his hand; the celebrant follows with the chalice. Acolytes go in front and form a solemn procession. Meanwhile the choir sings the Cherubic Hymn (*Kheroubikos hymnos*): “Let us, who mystically represent the Cherubim, and who sing to the Life-giving Trinity

29 Ibid., p. 669.

30 Ibid., p. 671.

31 Ibid., p. 670.

32 Ibid.

the thrice holy hymn, put away all earthly cares so as to receive the King of all things (here the procession comes out through the north door) escorted by the army of angels. Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia.”

The procession goes meanwhile all round the church and enters the sanctuary by the royal doors.³³

In the substantial essay on the hymn he wrote for the prestigious *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* (it is owing to his quartet of articles for this multi-volume work that I refer in the title of this chapter to ‘Encyclopaedias’ in the plural), Fortescue was inclined to agree with John Mason Neale that the *Cherubikon* was the ‘least beautiful of the four liturgical hymns of the Byzantine rite’. But he thought the prayer the celebrant recited by way of accompaniment to it quite extraordinarily fine.³⁴ Praising the elaborately melismatic Greek music for the hymn, Fortescue finds the entire ceremony ‘curious’ in its anticipation of the Eucharistic consecration (in the *Dictionnaire* essay he noted the protest entered by Eutychius of Constantinople, in a homily of 582, against its, evidently recent, introduction).³⁵ Yet he also found this portion of the rite extremely moving. Now it is — or rather, after a few more prayers, and the deacon’s cry, ‘The doors, the doors!’ — that the Anaphora, the Eucharistic Prayer, actually begins.

Consonant with the Orthodox insistence that the Words of Institution do not consecrate, the Euchologion to which Fortescue had access, published in Venice ‘at the sign of the Phoenix’ (he had already been told as a student in Rome visiting the Greek College that the Venice editions of the Orthodox service-books were the best), includes a rubric warning the sacred ministers not to make a reverence at this point but to wait until the Epiklesis, the prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit. The Byzantine Uniates, on the other hand, ‘make a profound reverence after each form’.³⁶ With the Orthodox, the deep prostration is reserved for after the Epiklesis which is also when ‘the deacon waves the ripidion (fan) over the Blessed

33 ‘Constantinople, Rite of’, art. cit., p. 317.

34 ‘Chérubicon’, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* III/1 (Paris: Letouzey, 1913), cols. 1281–1286, and here at col. 1282.

35 *Ibid.*, col. 1283. Fortescue notes the continuance of a controversy about it, among Greeks as well as Latin observers. For Germanus of Constantinople (in office 715–730), the procession, after all, signifies the entry of the saints and angels accompanying Christ as he draws near to accomplish his sacrifice, and the hymn makes sense in that context, *ibid.*, cols. 1283–1284. Less piously: it is simply one of numerous examples of liturgical anticipation, ‘to be found in all the rites’, *ibid.* col. 1285.

36 ‘Constantinople, Rite of’, art. cit., p. 317..

Sacrament. This ceremony, now interpreted mystically as a symbol of adoring angels, was certainly once a practical precaution. They have no pall over the chalice and there is a danger of flies.³⁷

Now comes the memorial of the saints and the diptychs of the dead and the living, whereupon, after a blessing of the people, the deacon re-emerges to stand before the iconostasis for a further litany asking for spiritual and temporal favours which climaxes in the Lord's Prayer. The curtains over the royal doors are drawn back, the Gifts are shown to the people, a Communion hymn is sung and the distribution of Holy Communion begins. Fortescue draws attention to the beauty of the prayers made in preparation for receiving (especially the one that opens, 'I believe, Lord, and I confess'). There is some discussion, he says, as to whether the *prospora*, particles of bread that have lain on the *diskos* since the preparation, have been consecrated. The Orthodox say no, Uniates yes. Fortescue comments sensibly that it depends on the intention of the celebrant concerned. The ceremony ends with the distribution of unconsecrated bread from the table of prothesis as 'antidoron', a substitute for communion for those who have not received.

Fortescue does not omit to describe the Byzantine office, and the way the Orthodox celebrate the remaining sacraments and sacramentals, though for a fuller account of these than that given in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia* he refers readers to *The Orthodox Eastern Church*. A major essay on the collections of odes in the Byzantine office appeared in the Cabrol *Dictionnaire* under the title 'Canon dans le rite byzantin'.³⁸

The variety of Liturgies in union with Rome

Fortescue's concept of catholicity made him understandably concerned about the fate of the Eastern liturgies as practised by Oriental Catholics. He also felt an obligation to answer the question why the Roman rite in the course of its mediaeval and modern history had supplanted such a variety of Western liturgical usage beyond the City. He was sensitive to the charge — whether made by Orthodox, Anglicans, or simply by liturgical historians — that Rome tended to de-nature the Eastern rites through imposing its own preferences as well as eliminating other liturgical usages from its own patriarchate. Addressing the general issue of rites in the Catholic Church, he opined that 'supposing uniformity in essentials and in faith, the authority of the Church has never insisted on uniformity of rite; Rome has never resented the fact that other people have their own

37 *Ibid.*, p. 318.

38 'Canon dans le rite byzantin', *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* II/2 (Paris: Letouzey, 1910), cols. 1905–1910.

expression of the same truths'.³⁹ That being so, he needed to explain why the Gallican rite had virtually vanished from the high mediaeval West; why the Holy See had intervened to modify the liturgical books of the Uniate churches; and why the later mediaeval usages, such as in England the Use of Sarum, had gone the way of all flesh.

Fortescue's line on the Gallican rites (within which he includes the Mozarabic) is that their disappearance was not the result of Roman fiat from above but of a groundswell of opinion from below, especially in the Frankish north. Led by the Carolingian emperors and their bishops, it flowed from a desire for a certain homogeneity of rite combined with admiration for the see of the apostles Peter and Paul. 'In the history of the substitution of the Roman Rite for the Gallican the popes appear as spectators, except perhaps in Spain and much later in Milan'.⁴⁰ He inferred from the general principle 'rite follows patriarchate' that a Romanization of the other Western liturgies would have happened in the natural course of things anyway – but somewhat spoils the neatness of his plan by conceding that in places where people really cared for their ancient liturgies, such as Milan and Toledo, they have kept them anyway. He would probably have been surprised to find that, in the wake of the Second Vatican Council, the Mozarabic Liturgy may now be celebrated not just in the cathedral of Toledo but anywhere in Spain.

He is more exercised about the Uniate question since, as he cites Duchesne in remarking, changes made by Roman correctors to the Oriental liturgies have sometimes smacked more of zeal than of knowledge.⁴¹ The extent of the damage, says Fortescue, has been exaggerated. 'Despite the general prejudice that Uniat rites are mere mutilated hybrids, the strongest impression from the study of them is how little has been changed.'⁴² There was never any question of possible false doctrine in the Byzantine Liturgy, so it was never tampered with in any way whatsoever. If the Ruthenians have elected to add the Filioque to the recitation of the Creed that was their choice uninfluenced or at any rate undetermined by Rome.⁴³

39 'Rites', *Catholic Encyclopaedia* XIII (1912), pp. 64–72, and here at p. 64.

40 *Ibid.*, p. 65.

41 L. Duchesne, *Les origines du Culte chrétien* (Paris: Fontemoing, 1898, 2nd edition), p. 69.

42 'Rites', art. cit., p. 65.

43 Fortescue was inclined to exculpate Rome from the charge of insisting on the inclusion of the Filioque in the profession of the Creed by Eastern Christians; but in fact from time to time pressure was exerted to this end if there was dubiety as to acceptance of the doctrine which underlies the credal insertion, or anxiety about the giving of scandal as candidly explained by Pope Benedict