

ESSAYS ON HIPPOLYTUS

Geoffrey Cuming's text of Hippolytus 'Apostolic Tradition' was published in December 1976 as *Hippolytus: A Text for Students* (Liturgical Study No. 8). It has passed into widespread use as the standard text, not only for its relative cheapness, but also for its clarity, common sense and judicious scholarship. This new Study of *Essays* is planned to relate closely to the earlier *Text*, and the page-numbering runs on from the *Text* as an expression of this. The *Essays* bring together three leading Anglican scholars, each making a new contribution in his own specialist field, and each penetrating further into the significance of the dilemmas posed by that most infuriating but fascinating of early texts—the 'Apostolic Tradition' of Hippolytus of Rome.

GROVE LITURGICAL STUDIES

This series of weighty studies appears quarterly, replacing in each third month the slighter 'Grove Booklets on Ministry and Worship'. Price 75p (90p in 1979).

- 1 **SACRAMENTAL INITIATION COMPLETE IN BAPTISM**
by E. C. Whitaker
- 2 **LANGUAGE LITURGY AND MEANING** by A. C. Thiselton
- 3 **SHRINES FOR THE SAINTS: How Parish Churches Evolved**
- 4 **CENTRES FOR THE SERVANTS: Parish Plant Updated**
Both by Kenneth White
- 5 **ANAMNESIS IN THE EUCHARIST** by David Gregg
- 6 **THE LITURGY AND MUSIC: A Study of the Use of the Hymn in Two Liturgical Traditions**
by Robin A. Leaver
- 7 **WHAT DID CRANMER THINK HE WAS DOING?**
by Colin Buchanan
- 8 **HIPPOLYTUS: A text for students with translation, notes and commentary** by Geoffrey J. Cuming
- 9 **LAY PRESIDENCY AT THE EUCHARIST?**
Edited by Trevor Lloyd
- 10 **GREGORY DIX—TWENTY-FIVE YEARS ON**
by Kenneth Stevenson
- 11 **USING THE BIBLE IN WORSHIP**
Edited by Christopher Byworth
- 12 **WORSHIP IN THE NEW TESTAMENT—(i)**
- 13 **WORSHIP IN THE NEW TESTAMENT—(ii)**
Both by C. F. D. Moule
- 14 **THE END OF THE OFFERTORY**
by Colin Buchanan
- 15 **ESSAYS ON HIPPOLYTUS**
Edited by Geoffrey Cuming
- 16 **LITURGY AND SYMBOLISM**
by Nicholas Sagovsky (December 1978)

For details of other Grove Books publications send for catalogue

ISSN 0306 0608

ISBN 0 905422 41 4

GROVE BOOKS

BRAMCOTE NOTTS. (0602-251114)

Grove Liturgical Study No. 15

ESSAYS

ON

HIPPOLYTUS

Edited by
GEOFFREY J. CUMING

15

Essays
on
Hippolytus

by
Paul Bradshaw
Charles Whitaker
and
Geoffrey Cuming (Editor)

GROVE BOOKS
BRAMCOTE NOTTS.

CONTENTS

	Page
Ordination (Paul Bradshaw)	33
The Eucharist (Geoffrey Cuming)	39
Baptism (Charles Whitaker)	52
Other Acts of Worship (Paul Bradshaw)	61

Copyright Paul Bradshaw, Geoffrey Cuming and Charles Whitaker 1978

FOREWORD

These essays form a companion study to *Hippolytus: A Text for Students* (Grove Liturgical Studies no. 8, 1976). Page numbers without further identification refer to that booklet, and the writers of these essays have assumed that the reader will have a copy of it handy. References to 'Bibliography' should be followed up on page 32 in that Study. The order of essays in this Study derives from the order in which the material appears in the text of *Hippolytus*. The page numbers here run on from the end of the earlier Study.

ABBREVIATIONS

- A** Arabic version
AC *Apostolic Constitutions*
AT *Apostolic Tradition*
CH *Canons of Hippolytus*
DBL *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* (See page 51, note 1)
E Ethiopic version
GEL *Gelasian Sacramentary*
JTS *Journal of Theological Studies*
L Latin version
S Sahidic Coptic version
SP *Studia Patristica*
TD *Testamentum Domini*

THE CONTRIBUTORS

- Paul Bradshaw** is Course Director of the St. Albans Diocese Ministerial Training Scheme, and Vicar of Flamstead, Herts. He is author of *The Anglican Ordinal* (S.P.C.K./Alcuin, 1971).
- Charles Whitaker** is Vicar of Plumpton, Penrith, Cumbria, and a member of the Church of England Liturgical Commission. He is editor of *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* (S.P.C.K., 1970) and of *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer* (Mayhew-McCrimmon (but now distributed by S.P.C.K.)/Alcuin, 1974), and is an honorary Canon of Carlisle.
- Geoffrey Cuming** is a tutor at Ripon College, Cuddesdon, Oxford, and Lecturer at King's College, London. He is a member of the Church of England Liturgical Commission. He is editor of *The Durham Book* (Oxford, 1961—now available from Alcuin Club), author of *A History of Anglican Liturgy* (MoaMillan, 1969), and joint editor of *The Prayers of the Eucharist* (Collins, 1975). He is Canon Theologian of Leicester Cathedral.

First Impression September 1978

ISSN 0306 0608

ISBN 0 905422 41 4

1. ORDINATION

The Rite

In the Latin text of **AT** the 'rubrics' for the ordination of bishops, presbyters, and deacons exhibit divergences from the other extant versions and contain a number of peculiar features, some more marked than others, which seem to suggest that in the course of its transmission from the original form of the document a certain measure of augmentation and modification may have taken place, so that it may no longer represent exactly what Hippolytus originally wrote. Thus in the opening sentence of the bishop's rite the expression 'by all the people' is attested by **L**, **AC**, and **TD**, while **S**, **A**, and **E** have 'from all the people'. It is usual to prefer the Latin text as more reliable, but this reading creates a strangely repetitious situation in which all the people appear first to choose the candidate and then, quite unnecessarily, to have to confirm their own nomination ('when he has been named and accepted by all . . .'). The reading 'from all the people' avoids this difficulty and was strongly advocated by E. C. Ratcliff, so that the candidate would be nominated from among the laity—deacons and presbyters being ineligible at this stage of history since each office was conferred for life and there could be no movement to a higher order—and then this nomination would be subjected to the approval of the whole body.¹ This certainly seems to have been the procedure adopted at Rome c. A.D. 96: 'Men, therefore, who were appointed by the Apostles, or subsequently by other eminent men, with the approval of the whole Church . . .² When however bishops came to be chosen from deacons or presbyters, 'from all the people' would have been no longer accurate, and though faithfully retained by **SAE**, it would have been emended by the others to 'by' in order to harmonize with current procedure, whereas it seems impossible to imagine that an original reading of 'by' could have been deliberately emended in the reverse direction.

The same would appear to be true of the expression 'as we appointed above', which is included in this first sentence by **SAE** and **AC**, though not by the other witnesses. It is hard to believe that such a meaningless statement would have crept into the text as a secondary addition, but quite natural that it should have been omitted by those who could not understand its significance. Ratcliff suggested that it referred to the author's treatise *Peri Charismaton*, 'Concerning Spiritual Gifts', which now only survives in fragmentary form, but which originally preceded this section and contained among other things directions for the nomination procedure.³ A parallel expression is attested by all the sources in the section concerning deacons: 'And when a deacon is ordained, let him be chosen according to what was said above . . .'

A. F. Walls has also pointed out that the statement in the rite for bishops that 'the presbytery shall stand by and be still' is a curious feature—rubrics usually direct action, not enforce inactivity—as is the double

¹ Bibliography 13.

² 1 Clement, 44.3. For the forms of election practised in the third century, see K. Richter, 'Zum Ritus der Bischofsordination in der "Apostolischen Ueberlieferung" Hippolytus von Rom unter davon abhängigen Schriften', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 17 (1975) pp. 10-14.

³ Ratcliff, *loc. cit.*

imposition of hands which seems to be envisaged, first by all the bishops before the people pray and secondly by one bishop alone while he says the ordination prayer', something otherwise completely unknown in early ordination rites which prescribe only one imposition of hands by all the bishops present while the ordination prayer is said. Some scholars, however, would understand the supposed second laying on of hands merely as a continuation of the first, while others would accept the double imposition of hands as a primitive feature which did not survive in later practice and would interpret its significance in various ways², and Matthew Black would even link it with 1 Tim. 4:14 and 2 Tim. 1:6, where both a collective and an individual laying on of hands apparently refer to one ordination.³

On the other hand both these peculiarities to which Walls has drawn attention may possibly be resolved if one accepts another claim of Ratcliff's, that 'discernible between the lines of the several versions of *Apostolic Tradition* there are signs which can be taken as indicating that, in its original form, the direction instructed the presbyters to conduct the proceedings.⁴ An examination of the versions reveals that there are certainly some interesting divergences in their mention of bishops. While **L** has 'let the people assemble together with the presbytery and those bishops who are present on the Lord's day', **SAE** have 'deacons' in place of 'those bishops who are present', and the reference to bishops is somewhat clumsily inserted into the next sentence ('when all bishops give consent who lay hands . . .'), whereas in **L** it is not explicitly stated who are to lay hands on the candidate, and it has to be presumed to be the bishops, since presbyters are excluded in the next clause. On the other hand, **CH** does not refer to the presence of bishops at all until the final sentence where it suddenly, and rather oddly, says that 'they choose one of the bishops and presbyters; he lays his hand . . .'. Finally, one may observe that all mention of bishops is lacking in all the versions from the eucharist which follows the ordination: the new bishop concelebrates with his presbyters, and other bishops apparently fade into the background. Out of this confusion the following is proposed as a possible reconstruction of the original text, along the lines suggested by Ratcliff:

'Let him be ordained bishop who has been chosen from all the people as we appointed above; and when he has been named and accepted by all, let the people assemble together with the presbytery (and the deacons?) on the Lord's day. When all give consent, the presbyters shall lay hands on him and all keep silence, praying in their hearts for the descent of the Spirit, of whom one, having been asked by all, laying his hand on him who is being ordained bishop, shall pray, saying thus:

This has a number of advantages over the commonly accepted text: the strange direction that the presbyters are to do nothing disappears and they

¹ Bibliography, 20 pp. 159-60. **TD** supplies a prayer for the first imposition of hands, while **AC** and **CH** omit it entirely.

² See Richter, pp. 15-19.

³ M. Black, 'The Doctrine of the Ministry', *Expository Times* 63 (1952) pp. 114-5. But cf. the explanation of 1 Tim. 4. 14 in D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (1956) pp. 244-6.

⁴ Ratcliff, p. 269.

become the explicit subject of the imposition of hands; the problem of a double imposition of hands is obviated, the ordination prayer being more clearly a continuation of the corporate laying on of hands, as in later practice; and the Latin *ex quibus* can now be translated in its literal sense as 'of whom' and not with the unusual meaning 'after which', for although Botte thought that it probably represented an original Greek *aph' hon* used as a temporal conjunction¹, it was only understood in this sense by **TD** and was entirely omitted by **SAE**, probably because it was no longer intelligible in the version of the text underlying that tradition.

However, not only does this reconstruction remove peculiarities from the text, but it provides an explanation as to how they and the various textual differences between the versions subsequently arose. When such a text was inherited by a community in which bishops were now involved in the ordination of other bishops, there would have been a tendency to make changes in order to bring it into line with current practice. Thus mention of the presence of bishops was effected in different ways by the different textual traditions, **L** inserting the words 'and those bishops who are present' after 'together with the presbytery' (in place of 'and the deacons', if that is not itself a secondary addition), while the source underlying **SAE** preferred not to disturb this phrase but adopted the rather more clumsy insertion of the word 'bishops' into the next sentence and linked it directly with the laying on of hands. The now anachronistic word 'presbyters' in this next sentence was not simply omitted but moved by all the versions into a new clause and supplied with a verb indicating that they had no active part in the ordination, **SAE** merely directing them to 'stand', **L** being more emphatic. This left the laying on of hands without an explicit subject in **L**, and the subsequent 'all shall keep silence' appears to have been understood by all the versions as referring to the whole congregation rather than to the presbyterate. Finally, all the versions inserted explicit reference to the fact that it was one of the bishops present who was to say the prayer, **SAE** dropping the now redundant 'of whom', though **L** retained it and **TD** interpreted it as the equivalent of 'afterwards', while **CH** attempted to keep the original sense by referring to 'one of the bishops and presbyters'.

In the ordination of a presbyter, although there is some textual divergence, **SAE** reading 'and let him pray over him according to the manner which we said before about the bishops' in place of the second half of the sentence in **L**, all the authorities are nevertheless agreed on the general sense, that the same prayer is to be used for a presbyter as for a bishop, and then all quite contrarily go on to provide the text of a different one, except for **CH** which is apparently unable to make sense of this seeming contradiction and omits the prayer entirely, directing that the same prayer is to be used as at an episcopal ordination but with the omission of the word 'bishop'. In 1915 C. H. Turner put forward the suggestion² that what had really been intended in **AT** was that at the ordination of a presbyter the first part of the prayer for the ordination of a bishop should be used but when the second part, which contained petitions specific to the bishop, was reached it

¹ B. Botte, *La Tradition Apostolique de saint Hippolyte* (Munster 1963) p. 7, n. 1.

² C. H. Turner, 'The Ordination of a Presbyter in the Church Order of Hippolytus', *JTS* 16 (1915) pp. 542-7.

should be replaced by the prayer for presbyters which then followed. This solution was adopted by W. H. Frere and by Gregory Dix in his edition of the text¹, and has recently been supported by Douglas Powell², but it has been rejected by Botte in his edition³, by Ratcliff⁴, and by Walls, who pointed out that this 'though apparently simple, involves no small subtlety of thought in the users of Hippolytus's manual.'⁵ No alternative solution to the apparent contradiction has so far, however, been advanced.

On the other hand, if the reconstruction of the original text for the ordination of a bishop proposed above is accepted, one possibility does emerge, and that is that the words 'and he shall say' were absent from the original version of the presbyter's ordination, so that it would have then directed that the same procedure was to be adopted at the laying on of hands as in the case of a bishop, all the presbyters joining in. When presbyters ceased to lay hands on a candidate for the episcopate, this direction became untrue and so it was understood as referring in some way to the prayer rather than to the imposition of hands and emended accordingly, **L** by inserting *et dicat, SAE* by recasting the end of the sentence.

The whole of the section on the diaconate has generally been accepted by scholars as authentic, but it exhibits a very confused air, it is badly written and repetitious, and **SAE** differs considerably at many points from the text of **L**. If it had been written by one person, he might have been expected to have made his point much more briefly and concisely. Frere suggested that the earliest text probably contained no more than some brief directions analogous to those in the preceding sections' and consisted of just the first sentence, and possibly also the second.⁶ However, this second sentence is partly repetitive of the first, and the denial to the deacon of a share in the *sacerdotium*, 'priesthood', as well as a place in the 'counsel of the clergy'⁷, belongs more to the fourth-century understanding of the ministry than it does to the second and third centuries. This much is admitted by Douglas Powell, but he would nevertheless hold the whole passage as original.⁸ We may conjecture that only the first sentence is an authentic part of **AT** and that the rest grew by stages in the fourth century as successive redactors sought to clarify the relationship between the three orders, a subject of intense debate at that period. Even this sentence is a little clumsily expressed, the phrase 'in the same way as we also directed above' being intended really to refer to the general rite of ordination and not to the fact that it was the bishop alone who was to perform the imposition of hands.⁹

The Prayers

As with the 'rubrics' it has been generally accepted by scholars that the reconstructed text of the prayers reproduces substantially what Hippolytus wrote. Ratcliff, however, claimed that 'the bishop's ordination prayer has undergone considerable revision so as to be conformed to the standards and usage of the fourth century'¹⁰, and more recently E. Segelberg has

1 W. H. Frere, 'Early Forms of Ordination', in H. B. Swete (ed), *Essays on the early history of the Church and the Ministry* (1918) pp.283-4; Dix pp.80-1.

2 D. Powell, 'Ordo Presbyterii', *JTS* 26 (1975) p.310. 3 p.21, n.1.

4 in a review of Botte's edition in *JTS* 15 (1964) p.406. 5 Walls, p.159.

6 Frere, pp.285-6.

7 Cumming translates 'clergy' here as 'presbyterate'.

8 Powell, pp.308-11.

10 Ratcliff, p.270, n.13.

attempted to discern an original text beneath what he regards as later strata in all three prayers, though admitting that one of these layers might well be the redaction by Hippolytus of traditional liturgical material and not necessarily a post-Hippolytean interpolation.¹ Although his reconstruction is perhaps not entirely convincing, it does rightly encourage caution in treating the received text as authentic, and any significant passages regarded as secondary by Segelberg are noted below.

In these prayers the nature of all three offices is defined by the use of typology drawn from the Old Testament. This is not simply incidental: it witnesses to a belief in the fundamental continuity of God's work through history, the promise of the new covenant in the old and the fulfilment of the old covenant in the new. Thus in the opening address of the bishop's prayer we find references to God's work from the beginning in appointing princes and priests and not leaving his sanctuary without a ministry. Yet this should not lead us to the conclusion that the orders of the Christian ministry were seen as the exact counterparts of their predecessors, but rather 'what these earlier institutions were for the Old Covenant in its relation to Christ, the Christian ministries are, by analogy, for the New Covenant'², and in two of the three prayers the Old Testament typology is fused with, and hence modified by, an image drawn from the New Testament. Thus the bishop's office is understood to succeed both to that of the high priest and to that of the apostles, so that God is asked to bestow the functions of both the high priest and the New Testament apostles.³

This succession is seen as being accomplished by a fresh outpouring of the Holy Spirit at each ordination ('now pour forth that power which is from you, of the princely Spirit which you gave to your beloved Son Jesus Christ, which he gave to your holy apostles'⁴) and not by its transmission from one person to another: 'if the author of *Apostolic Tradition* thought about apostolic succession, he did not think of it as a "sacramental succession" or in terms of chain or series. He thought of the bishop as succeeding, by an immediate appointment of the Lord, to an apostolic vacancy, and so to an immediate apostolic relationship with the Lord, as Matthias had done.'⁵ Thus the laying on of hands signifies acceptance and incorporation rather than transmission of power.

The bishop's prayer also confirms that the involvement of the whole Church in the selection of candidates for ordination which is mentioned in the 'rubrics' of the rites does not point to some notion of the ideal of democracy in early Christianity or of the right of the congregation to choose for itself those who were to be its ministers, since the choice was thought of as coming ultimately 'from above' rather than 'from below': the real

1 Bibliography, 17.

2 J. M. R. Tillard, *What Priesthood has the Ministry?* (Grove Booklet on Ministry and Worship No. 13, 1973) p.27.

3 Though Segelberg (pp.400-1) would hold that the reference to apostles is a secondary, but possibly Hippolytean, redaction.

4 Botte (p.9, n.4), Dix (pp.4-5), and Frere (p.280, n.2) all agree that this is the original form of the text, demonstrated by **L** and confirmed by **E**, **AC**, and **TD**, while the *Epitome* and **CH** have emended it to 'which you granted through your beloved Son Jesus Christ to your holy apostles' to avoid any implication of subordinationism, but cf. Segelberg, p.399, and Walls, p.161, n.4.

5 Ratcliff, p.269. See Bibliography 7, p.200.

election was always God's, even though it was mediated through the Church. The words from Acts 1.24 at the election of Matthias are echoed in the prayer in **AT**, though Segelberg believes that only the reference to God's election of the candidate and not the allusion to the Acts prayer is original here¹: 'You who know the hearts of all, bestow upon this your servant, whom you have chosen for the episcopate . . . The same concept is also found in the prayer for deacons ('give the holy Spirit . . . to this your servant whom you have chosen to serve your Church'), and is reflected in later Eastern and Western rites of ordination.

The presbyter's office is defined by the use of the analogy of the seventy elders appointed by Moses to govern the people (Num. 11.16f.). Some scholars would see in this the understanding of the presbyterate as deriving from and participating in the episcopate, just as the elders received the spirit which had originally been given to Moses²; but as David Power has argued³, the parallel between Moses and the bishop is nowhere made explicit, and there is no good reason to believe that it is implied—the parallel is between the elders and the Christian presbyterate—and the 'counsel' and 'help' which the presbyter is said to give are not spoken of as directed towards the bishop who is not mentioned in the prayer, but towards the people. Indeed Dix expressed the opinion that the substance of the prayer might be older than the monarchical episcopate and go back to the earliest Jewish-Christian synagogues governed by a college of presbyters.⁴ The collegiate nature of the order is implied in the prayer, not only by the use of the collective term 'presbyterate' but also by the final petition, which is clearly spoken on behalf of a corporate body which already possesses the grace being sought for the individual ordinand: 'And now, Lord, grant the spirit of your grace to be preserved unfaillingly in us, and make us worthy to minister to you . . . Segelberg, however, argues that the change to the first person plural here is an indication that this section of the prayer is not original, although it might already have been incorporated by the time of Hippolytus, and he refers to Dix's comment that the 'quasi-agreement of the versions suggests that something has been altered in **L**, but it seems hopeless to restore it.'⁵

The model for the deacon is not St Stephen nor the Seven in Acts 6, as it is in many later rites, but the service of Christ himself, as it is also in Ignatius of Antioch (*Magnesiens* 6; *Trallians* 3), to which is added an Old Testament allusion in a reference to his liturgical ministry as the equivalent to that of the Levite ('to present in your holy of holies that which is offered to you by your appointed high-priest'). In the light of the fact already mentioned above (p.33), that offices were conferred for life in the early Church and that there was no movement from one order to another, it is probable that the phrase 'he may attain the rank of a higher order' in **E** is a later adaptation of the text made when the situation had changed, and the original text is that preserved in **TD**: 'he may be worthy of this high and exalted rank.'⁶

¹ Segelberg, p.39.

² See for example B. Botte, 'Holy Orders in the Ordination Prayers', in *The Sacrament of Orders* (1962) p.7; J. Lecuyer, 'Episcopat et Presbyterat dans les écrits d'Hippolyte de Rome', *Recherches de science religieuse* 41 (1953) pp.42-3.

³ David N. Power, *Ministers of Christ and his Church* (1969) pp.33-6.

⁴ Bibliography, 7.

⁵ Segelberg, pp.403-4; see Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, p.14.

⁶ See Dix *Apostolic Tradition*, p.18; Ratcliff, p.270, n.15; Segelberg, p.405.

2. THE EUCHARIST

The Rite

AT gives two descriptions of the eucharist, set in different contexts, one following the consecration of a bishop, the other after a baptism. By putting the two together, a picture of the rite is obtained which can be confirmed and supplemented by the accounts given by Justin Martyr and various references in Tertullian.

Justin, describing the Roman rite some fifty or sixty years before **AT**, also places the services in two contexts; in his case, one after a baptism, the other an ordinary Sunday morning.¹ In the latter account the service begins with readings from the records of the apostles or the writings of the prophets. In another eucharistic passage² he also mentions 'hymnoi', probably meaning Old Testament psalms. There follows a discourse by the president (compare the instruction given by the teacher in **AT**, ch. 18). When there is a baptism, it apparently takes the place of the readings and sermon, and the eucharist begins with the newly-baptized joining in the common prayers. These prayers of the faithful, as they were called later, were reserved to those who had been baptized (**AT**, p.21). According to Justin, they are said by all standing, and prayer is offered 'earnestly for ourselves, and for him who has been enlightened, and for all others everywhere'. The catechumens prayed 'by themselves, separated from the faithful' (**AT**, ch. 18).

Tertullian, writing in Carthage c. 210, says 'the Scriptures are read, psalms are sung, sermons are preached, prayers are offered'³, which exactly fits Justin's evidence. There was a strong affinity between Rome and North Africa in matters of liturgy. In another work, written in 198, Tertullian lists some of the contents of the prayers: the emperors, their long life and secure reign, their armies, the senate and people, and the peace of the world.⁴

Both **AT**'s accounts include the kiss of peace (pp.10, 21), and this is confirmed by Justin and Tertullian.⁵ All three authors regard the kiss as the climax of the prayers; Tertullian indeed calls it 'the seal of prayer'. The kiss is often referred to in the New Testament Epistles, always towards the end of a letter, and usually in conjunction with two other phrases, 'The God of peace be with you all', and 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you', in varying forms. This strongly suggests that the three together formed the normal conclusion of a *synaxis* or meeting for worship.⁶ Only the kiss has survived in **AT**, though the other phrases are still found in later liturgies. It also was forbidden to catechumens, 'for their kiss is not yet holy' (**AT**, ch. 18).

The eucharist proper begins with the deacons bringing up the offerings which the people have brought (p.18, lines 5-7), normally of bread and wine, though on occasion they might include oil, cheese, and olives (chs. 5 and 6). Although the word used in **L** is *offero*, the action is still purely

¹ *Apology*, 65, 67.

² *Apology*, 13.2.

³ *De Anima*, 9.

⁴ *Apologeticum*, 30; cf. 39.

⁵ *De Oratione*, 18.

⁶ G. J. Cuming, 'Service-endings in the Epistles', in *New Testament Studies* 22 (1975) pp.110-3.

functional, and has not the theological implications of the later offertory. **AC** makes this clear by using *prosgo* ('bring to') here and *prosphero* ('offer') in the anamnesis. Dix¹ tried to distinguish between the meanings of the different tenses of *prosphero*, but this is probably over-subtle.

The bishop lays his hands on the offering 'with all the presbytery'. This looks like an early example of concelebration, anticipating the Roman Canon's phrase 'those who stand around'. But **AC** could make nothing of it, and suppresses any mention of hand-laying. Instead, it reads 'praying silently with the presbyters', an idea which seems to be derived from ch. 2 'they shall lay hands on him; and the presbytery shall stand by and be still'. The bishop then begins the Thanksgiving, which is discussed in detail below (pp. 41-51).

When the Thanksgiving is finished, the bishop breaks the bread (p. 21, line 17) and distributes it to the communicants, with the words 'The bread of heaven in Christ Jesus' and they answer 'Amen'. The cup is normally administered by presbyters, though deacons may administer if there are not enough presbyters present. In Justin, deacons administer both bread and wine as the normal practice², still being regarded as the bishop's liturgical assistants. So also in Cyprian, at any rate for the cup.³

At a baptismal eucharist there are three cups: water, milk and honey, and wine, which represent washing, the promised land, and the blood of Christ respectively. **AT** is confused in its account of the administration of these cups.

'They who receive shall taste of each thrice, he who gives it saying:

In God the Father almighty.

And he who receives shall say:

Amen.

And in the Lord Jesus Christ.

And in the holy Spirit and the holy Church.'

It is not clear in the Latin whether 'thrice' goes with 'they who receive it shall taste of each (thrice)' or with 'he who gives it saying (thrice)'. The natural sense of the passage would seem to be:

'they who receive shall taste of all three cups, he who gives to each one saying . . .

each cup being associated with one person of the Trinity. But this is stretching the Latin rather far, and it may be that the full trinitarian formula was used with each cup. **S, A, E, CH, AC**, and **TD** all solve the problem by omitting the cup of water, perhaps because of its use in Gnostic eucharists; in consequence, they all also omit the word 'thrice'. **S** and **E** have three cups, wine, milk, and honey; **CH** has two, milk and honey, and wine; **AC** and **TD** have one cup, of wine; **A** is hopelessly confused. It looks as though the cup of milk and honey continued to be in use in Egypt, but not in Syria; and this is supported by Tertullian⁴ and Clement of Alexandria.⁵ In the oriental sources the words of administration are changed accordingly to 'This is the blood of (our Lord Jesus) Christ', thus losing the

1 *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 111.

2 *Apology*, 65.5.

3 *De lapsis*, 25.

4 *De corona*, 3 (A.D. 211).

5 *Paedagogus*, 1.6.

echo of the baptismal formula which is present in the original words. Both milk and honey, and water were still being administered to the newly-baptized in Rome c. 500: a blessing for both is provided in the Leonine Sacramentary (*Veronese*)¹; and Ambrose also appears to have used milk and honey at Milan.²

The bishop is to explain the meaning of these symbols 'to those who receive' (**L**), 'to those who are being baptized' (**A, E**), or 'to those who are going to be baptized' (**S**). In the fourth century such instruction was usually delayed until after baptism and first communion. **S** envisages it being given before baptism, **A** and **E** after; **L** is non-committal (it is not even certain whether 'receive' refers to baptism or communion).

After the service, each one shall hasten to do good works and to please God, and to conduct himself rightly' (p. 22). This sequel is also stressed in Justin:

'that we may be deemed worthy to be found good citizens in our actions, and guardians of the commandments . . .

and the wealthy who desire give what they wish . . . and (the president) takes care of all those who are in need.'³

Justin adds that the deacons take the bread and wine to those who are absent. The faithful also took the sacrament to their own homes for communion during the week (chs. 37 and 38). The eucharist was received fasting (ch. 36).

The Thanksgiving

The eucharistic prayer of **AT** must not be regarded as being in any sense the official text of the thanksgiving to be used at the Sunday eucharist in Rome c. 200, though some writers have tended to give this impression. It is meant to be the sort of prayer that a bishop with due respect for tradition might compose for his own ordination. **AT** deals with this point in ch. 9 (p. 14), for which the Latin text is unfortunately lacking. According to **S**, 'the bishop shall give thanks according to what we said above. It is not at all necessary for him to utter the same words that we said above, as though reciting them from memory . . . but let each pray according to his ability.'

He should pray 'at length' if he can; but a short prayer is acceptable, so long as it is orthodox.

There are clear echoes here of Justin's accounts: 'the president . . . offers prayers and thanksgivings according to his ability' and 'gives thanks at some length'.⁴ Irenaeus⁵ and Hippolytus⁶ himself speak of heretics 'stretching out the word of invocation to excessive length (*epi pleon*)'. The practice of the bishop composing his own prayers is confirmed by Origen⁷,

1 E. C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* (1970 ed.), pp. 153, 154; cf. the letter of John the Deacon to Senarius, *ibid.*, pp. 157, 158.

2 *De Sacramentis*, 5.15-17.

3 *Apology*, 65.1; 67.6, 7.

4 *Apology*, 67.5; 65.3.

5 *Adversus Haereses*, 1.7.2.

6 *Philosophoumena*, 6.39.

7 *Conversation with Heracleides* (c. 246), quoted in R. P. C. Hanson, 'The liberty of the Bishop to improvise prayer in the Eucharist', in *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961) pp. 173-6.

who notes that he is expected 'to remain within the conventions' (*emmenene in tais synthekais*). In Hippolytus' case these would probably include the subjects of thanksgiving mentioned by Justin:

'praise and glory to the Father of all in the name of the Son and of the holy Spirit, and . . . that we have been deemed worthy of these things from him.'

In the *Dialogue with Trypho*² Justin gives the purposes for which the eucharist was handed down to us. A tabular comparison reveals several points of contact with AT's thanksgiving.

Justin	AT
'for the remembrance of the suffering which he suffered for those who are cleansed in their souls from all wickedness of men (<i>in baptism</i>); so that we might give thanks to God both for creating the world with all things that are in it for the sake of man, and for freeing us from the evil in which we were born, and for accomplishing a complete destruction of the principalities and powers through him who suffered according to his will.'	'remembering his death . . . when he should suffer . . . those who have believed in you (<i>in baptism</i>) . . . we render thanks to you, O God . . . through whom you made all things that he might release from suffering . . . that he might destroy death and break the bonds of the devil . . . fulfilling your will . . .'

Other 'conventions' may have included the institution narrative and its complement, the anamnesis ('Remembering therefore . . .') and a doxology. The presence at this date of an epiclesis (invocation of the holy Spirit) is a matter of argument (see below, p.49). The Sanctus seems not to have been adopted at Rome until c. 450³, and the intercessions which later form part of the Canon were still in Hippolytus' time made earlier in the service. Although Justin uses the word 'offer', he applies it to prayers, not to the elements; an offering of the bread and the cup may, however, have become a 'convention' by the time of AT.

The practice of free composition of the eucharistic prayer was dying out by the end of the fourth century, and CH, AC, and TD are sufficiently embarrassed by the idea to omit the paragraph altogether. A and E keep it in, but simply omit 'not at all', so that it reads, 'it is necessary for him to utter the same words . . . (1)'.¹

The text of the Thanksgiving is given in full by L and E, which agree together, apart from one or two minor details. S, A, and CH give only the introductory dialogue AC and TD both make full use of AT's text, while expanding it in different ways for their own purposes. With the help of AC, it is possible to restore an almost complete Greek text, though individual details must remain conjectural. The language of the Thanksgiving has

¹ *Apology*, 65.3.

² *Dialogue*, 41.1.

³ L. Chavoutier, 'Un Libellus Pseudo-Ambrosien sur le Saint-Esprit', in *Sacris Erudiri* 11 (1960) pp.180-91.

been analysed in great detail in a masterly article by R. H. Connolly¹, and here it will be necessary to deal only with selected points.

1. Introductory dialogue.
2. Thanksgiving to God for the work of Jesus Christ.
3. Institution narrative.
4. Anamnesis.
5. Epiclesis.
6. Doxology.

1. Introductory dialogue

AT's form is almost identical with that of the Roman Canon, the only difference being the addition there of 'our God' after 'Let us give thanks to the Lord'. In Jewish practice this difference indicates a gathering of a hundred persons rather than one of ten. The similarity between the two rites at this point is the more remarkable in view of the large number of variations found in the East. In the first couplet, the original Egyptian version (CH Liturgy of St. Mark) was 'The Lord be with all', which S and E conflate with L to produce 'with you all'. Elsewhere (AC, TD, Liturgy of St. James) versions of 'the Grace' (2 Cor. 13.13) take the place of 'The Lord be with you'. 'The Grace' was one of the three phrases referred to above in connection with the kiss of peace, which it normally follows in the Epistles. In the liturgy it may have survived from New Testament times, or equally may be a conscious return to New Testament practice. The response, 'And with your spirit', is the same everywhere. Cyprian and Cyril of Jerusalem do not mention this couplet, nor does Augustine (except in a sermon of doubtful authenticity²), and it may be that in their areas the dialogue began with 'Lift up your hearts'.

Literally translated, the second couplet begins 'Hearts up!' In Egypt (CH, S, St. Mark) this was glossed as 'Up with your hearts'; AC substitutes 'our mind'; and at Jerusalem (St. James) the two are conflated to 'Let us lift up our mind and our hearts'. There are no significant variants in the response, nor in either member of the third couplet.

2. Thanksgiving to God for the work of Jesus Christ

The Thanksgiving proper is directed to God 'through your beloved child Jesus Christ', which is equivalent to Justin's 'in the name of the Son'; but, unlike Justin, AT does not add 'and the holy Spirit'. The first sentence is a mixture of words which appear to come from early liturgical formulae, and others which are due to Hippolytus himself. The opening words of the prayer may well already have become stylized, or were in process of becoming so. It is in this section of the Thanksgiving that 'the bishop's liberty of improvising' normally finds its most free expression, and here it is marked by doctrinal emphases and phraseology characteristic of, or even peculiar to, Hippolytus; the present passage is full of phrases which are also found in Hippolytus' own writings.

The word translated 'child' is *puer*, representing the Greek *pais*. Both these words can mean 'servant' as well as 'child' (compare the French *garçon* or the Anglo-Indian 'boy'). The word's appearances in Acts³ may have been

¹ Bibliography, 5.

² *Serm. Inedit.* 6.

³ 3.13, 26; 4.25, 27, 34.

suggested by its use in primitive liturgical formulae. In the whole of early Christian literature it only occurs eleven times, often with 'beloved', as in **AT**, and always in a context of prayer (Didache, 1 Clement, Barnabas, Martyrdom of Polycarp).¹ It reappears in **AC** in a passage omitted from the later manuscripts as heretical. The opening sentence continues: 'you sent Christ to us as saviour and redeemer'. The last two nouns do not appear in combination anywhere in the New Testament, though each is found combined with 'sent' (*apostalken*).² They occur together in Origen³ and Eusebius⁴, while the prayer of *prothesis* in the Liturgy of St. Basil has the whole phrase.⁵ It seems probable that here again is part of an early liturgical formula. The double occurrence of the word 'womb' may also be a sign that Hippolytus is combining his own words with an existing form. 'In the last times' is a characteristic phrase of his, and so is the concept of the Son as 'angel'; but the latter is also frequent in Justin⁶, so may well be part of the early 'conventions'.

The reasons for giving thanks are contained in a series of relative clauses whose antecedent is Jesus Christ. A departure from Justin's 'programme' is immediately evident: instead of thanking God for his work of creation, the thanksgiving proceeds directly to redemption. When creation is mentioned, it is only in a single subordinate clause embedded in other christological statements: 'through whom you made all things' (**E** adds, 'by your will', instead of 'in whom you were well pleased'). The reliability of Justin's emphasis on creation is borne out by several anaphoras (St. Mark, St. James, **AC**, and several Gallican prefaces) and by the Jerusalem *Catecheses*.⁷ In all of these God the Father is praised for creating all things, and examples are given. **AC** retains **AT**'s phrase just quoted, but elaborates the details to very great length. Since **AC** uses **AT** as part of its framework, E. C. Ratcliffe suggested that **AT** may originally have had a thanksgiving for creation which was removed in a fourth-century revision. If so, phrases may survive in **AC**, but they are not now identifiable.

But **AT** is not the only instance of extreme brevity on the subject of creation: the anaphora of SS. Addai and Mari, generally believed to contain primitive elements, has only this to say: 'He created the world through his grace and its inhabitants through his kindness'. Among later liturgies, that of St. Basil contains only the phrase: 'through whom also you made the ages', and the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom has only: 'you brought us out of non-existence into existence', while the Roman Canon is devoid of any reference to creation at all until the doxology at the end of the Canon. It is therefore by no means impossible that **AT** should have lacked a thanksgiving for creation from the start. It is one of the points in which **AT** is Roman and Byzantine rather than Egyptian or Syrian in character.

1 J. Jeremias, in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, s.v. *país*, D.II.2.c.

2 1 John 4.14; Acts 7.35.

3 Fragment 101 in *Lamentationes*, 4.6.

4 *Quaestiones ad Stephanum*, 10.1.

5 F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p.309, line 12 (also St. James, p.41, line 28).

6 References in R. H. Connolly (Bibliography, 5) p.356.

7 R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming (ed), *Prayers of the Eucharist*, pp.43, 52, 56, 67, 92.

8 Bibliography, 12, pp.125-6; reprinted in *Liturgical Studies* (1976) pp.27-8; cf. *JTS* n.s. 14 (1963) p.522.

The thanksgiving for redemption deals with the subject in three stages: the pre-existence of Christ, his incarnation, and his passion, a framework which anticipates the Nicene Creed. The first two lines, however, deal with the incarnation before the pre-existence, which strengthens the suggestion made above that the opening may already have become stereotyped. The phrase 'inseparable Word' is uncommon in liturgy, but common in doctrinal writing about the relationship of the Father and the Son, so that it is probably to be attributed to Hippolytus' own contribution. Also characteristic of Hippolytus is the belief that 'the pre-incarnation Logos was not yet "perfect Son" of God' until he was 'manifested' as such. Likewise, the statement that Jesus was 'born of the holy Spirit and the Virgin' is found previously only in Irenaeus. It is possible that by 'holy Spirit' Hippolytus means the Logos himself. On the other hand, the image of Christ stretching out his hands on the cross is common in the early Fathers.¹

3. The Institution Narrative

The first half of this section continues the sequence of thought of the preceding section, its subject being Christ's descent into hell, which follows on naturally after the reference to the crucifixion; but grammatically it is welded into the institution narrative, which begins at the words 'And when he was betrayed' (cf. 1 Cor. 11.23). What follows, 'with its series of short rhetorical "and" -clauses is entirely characteristic of Hippolytus'.² The passage closely resembles one in Irenaeus' *Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching*:

'And he broke the bonds of our fetters; and his light appeared and made the darkness of the prison disappear, and hallowed our birth and destroyed death, loosing those fetters in which we were enchained and manifested the resurrection.'³

Hippolytus often shows the influence of Irenaeus, and here it is unmistakable. The phrase 'fix a term' has caused difficulty to commentators: Connolly explains it as meaning 'for the detention of souls in Hades, by appointing a time for the resurrection'; Dix renders 'establish the limit (probably of hell)'; and Botte 'fix the rule (?of faith)', though in a footnote he asks whether, in the context, it might not be preferable to accept Dix's rendering.

The natural way to take the purpose clauses ('that he might . . .') is that all these actions were to be the consequences of Christ's 'voluntary suffering', but Dix⁴ argues that they were to be the consequence of the institution of the eucharist. This is just possible syntactically, though very strained, but seems much less probable theologically.

Most liturgies preface the institution narrative with the phrase 'When he was betrayed', but many either substitute 'he handed himself over' or add 'to voluntary death', in an attempt to make Jesus fully master of the situation. In Italy, however, both Ambrose and the Roman Canon substitute 'before he suffered'; here **AT** is closer to Eastern tradition than to later Western.

1 Bibliography, 5, pp. 357-9.

2 *Ibid.*, p.361.

3 *Demonstration*, ch. 38.

4 *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p.166.

It is normal for the institution narrative in any liturgy to be composed of elements taken from the different accounts in the New Testament, and **AT** is no exception. Most of its narrative is taken from matter common to Mark and Matthew, or to Paul and Luke. It is slightly more developed than the forms quoted by Justin¹ and Irenaeus², as the following table shows. (Both Justin and Irenaeus quote the narrative in indirect speech; in the table the original direct speech has been restored.³)

<p><i>Justin</i></p> <p>Taking bread, and giving thanks, he said, 'Do this for my remembrance. This is my body'.</p> <p>Likewise also taking the cup and giving thanks, he said, 'This is my blood'.</p> <p>(above)</p>	<p><i>Irenaeus</i></p> <p>He took bread and gave thanks saying, 'This is my body'.</p> <p>Likewise also the cup</p> <p>'my blood of the new covenant ...'</p>	<p>AT</p> <p>Taking bread, giving thanks to you, he said, (below) 'Take, eat; this is my body, which shall be broken for you'.</p> <p>Likewise also the cup, saying, 'This is my blood, which is shed for you.</p> <p>When you do this you make my remembrance'.</p>
---	---	---

The same rudimentary form appears in all three, but **AT** adds two phrases, initiating a process of elaboration which later liturgies carried to extremes. **AT's** form does not mention the breaking of the bread, and giving to the disciples, the (new) covenant, or forgiveness of sins. The word 'broken', absent from the best manuscripts may represent *'klomenon'* in the *textus receptus*, or *'thruptomenon'* in **AC** and Codex Bezae. The future tense, 'shall be broken' (*frangetur*), is still found in Ambrose⁴, who also echoes **AT** in having the indicative mood, 'you make my remembrance', rather than the imperative, though, unlike **AT**, he puts this in the future (*facietis* rather than *facitis*).

4. The Anamnesis

This section of **AT's** Thanksgiving is reproduced more faithfully than any other by **AC**; it also has points of verbal contact with Ambrose's rite and the Roman Canon, to an extent not found elsewhere in the prayer, as in the table which follows.

1 *Apology*, 66.3.
 2 *Adversus Haereses*, IV.29.5.
 3 See further E. C. Ratcliff, 'The Eucharistic Institution Narrative of Justin Martyr's First Apology', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 22 (1971) pp.97-102; reprinted in *Liturgical Studies* (1976) pp.41-8.
 4 *De Sacramentis*, IV.21.26.

<p>AT</p> <p>Remembering Therefore (<i>igitur</i>) his death and resurrection, we offer to you</p> <p>the bread</p> <p>and the cup,</p> <p>giving you thanks because (E. through him) you have deemed us worthy to stand before you and minister to you.</p>	<p>AC</p> <p>Remembering therefore (<i>toimun</i>) his suffering and death, and resurrection from the dead ... we offer to you</p> <p>this bread</p> <p>and this cup,</p> <p>giving you thanks through him: that you have deemed us worthy to stand before you and serve you as priests.</p>	<p>Ambrose</p> <p>Remembering therefore (<i>ergo</i>) his most glorious passion and resurrection from the dead ... we offer to you</p> <p>this holy bread</p> <p>and this cup of eternal life ...</p> <p>majesty ... the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation ...</p>	<p><i>Roman Canon</i></p> <p>Remembering therefore (<i>unde</i>) the blessed passion ... his resurrection from the dead ... we offer to your excellent</p>
---	---	---	--

The basic words 'Remembering therefore his death and resurrection, we offer to you this bread and this cup', are found in all anaphoras of the Antiochene type. St. Mark, however, and other Egyptian anaphoras use the word 'proclaiming', from 1 Corinthians 11.26, which they have quoted at the end of the institution narrative. Here **AT** is closer to the Syrian tradition than to the Alexandrian. But the Syrian tradition may itself be derived from **AT**. **AC** has, curiously, another anamnesis in a quite unparalleled place, *before* the institution narrative, which may be the original; and **AT's** anamnesis may have been inserted into **AC** at the place which by then had become conventional. The simplicity of **AT** is a strong indication of its early date: all fourth-century anaphoras add at least the ascension and the second coming; some are more elaborate still.

The three Latin texts each use a different word for 'therefore', which may point to a widespread 'convention' rather than a verbal dependence. On the other hand, the Roman Canon has already used the word '*igitur*' twice, and may simply be avoiding inelegant repetition.

The words 'stand before you and minister to you' are taken from Daniel 7.10, and in Eastern liturgies commonly appear in the passage which introduces the Sanctus, which led Ratcliff¹ to conjecture that the Thanksgiving of **AT** originally concluded with the Sanctus. Acceptable as this position for the Sanctus may be on theological and psychological grounds, historical evidence for it is virtually non-existent. Ratcliff is on firmer ground in maintaining that '*ministrare*' in **L** represents the Greek *leitourgein* (minister) in the original text, as in Daniel, rather than **AC's** word '*hierateuere*', which over-accentuates the priestly nature of this ministry. **AC**,

1 Bibliography, 12.

however, is supported by **E** and **TD**, who both refer to performing a priestly ministry; and as Louis Bouyer¹ points out, 'to perform priestly functions' is a natural prayer for the newly-ordained bishop.

5. The Epiclesis

This section of the Thanksgiving has caused far more discussion than any other. There are two problems at issue; first, how to translate the Latin; and secondly, whether the passage is a later interpolation. The two problems are interrelated, and the solution of either may depend on the position taken in regard to the other.

The difficulties of translating the epiclesis are notorious. The Latin text, as it stands, is lacking in clarity, to say the least.² 'Gathering into one' (*'congregans in unum'*) has no object. **TD** supplies 'that all may be united to you', which is surely wrong. The phrase goes back to John 11.52, 'to gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad', which is picked up in *Didache*, 9.4.³

'As this broken bread was scattered . . . and when brought together became one, so let your Church be brought together . . .'

Here, and later in Sarapion, this prayer forms part of that said over the bread; but in the *Deir Balyzeh papyrus*⁴, an anaphora which possibly dates from the fourth-century, and has much in common with the anaphora of St. Mark, there is a consecratory epiclesis before the institution narrative, followed by the *Didache* prayer. The anaphora then ends with the petition for the power of the holy Spirit and strengthening and increase of faith. It seems highly probable that the author was familiar with **AT**.

It is, then, the Church that is gathered together, and the object of 'gathering' must be supplied from the preceding phrase, to read:

'Send your holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church, that, gathering it into one . . .'

This seems less strained than supplying the object from the subsequent words 'all who partake': 'that, gathering them into one, you would grant to all who partake . . .'. It also explains why 'gathering them into one' comes before 'you would grant', which is otherwise very awkward. **AC** omits the words altogether.

The next problem of translation is whether '*qui percipiunt sanctis*' means 'the holy people who partake' or 'those who partake of the holy things'. There can have been no ambiguity in the Greek, which would require '*hagiois*' in the first case and '*hagion*' in the second. **AC** inserts the phrase 'to show this bread to be the body of your Christ and this cup the blood of your Christ', and then goes on 'that those who partake of it (*autou*) may be strengthened . . .', omitting any reference to 'holy' at all. This is surely decisive in favour of translating '*sanctis*' as 'the holy things' (*hagion*).

The sentence then takes the form:

'That you would grant to all who partake of the holy things . . . for filling with holy Spirit and strengthening the faith in truth.'

¹ Bibliography, 1, p.179.

² 'L'épîclèse de l'anaphore d'Hippolyte', in *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947) pp.241-51.

³ C. F. D. Moule, 'A Note on *Didache* ix.4', in *JTS* n.s.6 (1955) pp.240-3.

⁴ R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cumming, *Prayers of the Eucharist*, p.40.

How is the gap to be filled to make a coherent sentence? Botte suggests supplying 'to partake', implied by 'who partake'. C. C. Richardson¹ relates 'for filling . . . closely to 'who partake', and takes 'grant' as governing the following clause, 'that we may praise you . . .'. He would then translate as follows:

'That you would grant to all (us) saints, who communicate with a view to being filled with holy Spirit and having our faith confirmed in the truth, that we may praise thee . . .'

(For the use of *hina* after 'grant', he compares Mark 10.26 and Revelation 9.8.) Emended to 'grant to all (us) who communicate in the holy things with a view . . .', this translation is preferable to Dix's rendering quoted below, as also is that of Botte.

We turn to the question of authenticity. Dix's treatment of the passage starts from his theory that '*outside Syria* the use of the Eucharistic epiclesis of the Spirit cannot anywhere be traced back further than c. A.D. 375' (i.e. **AC**); though he finds some traces of the theology of the epiclesis in Syrian documents of the third century.³ He therefore deletes the first clause of the petition and reads:

'We pray thee that thou wouldest give to all the saints who partake to be united to thee that they may be fulfilled with the Holy Spirit . . .'

This agrees with **TD**, which likewise has no mention of the holy Spirit at this point and reads:

'Grant then that all those who partake and receive of your holy things, may be united to you, that they may be filled with the holy Spirit . . .'

Dix accepts the omission of the epiclesis, because he regards **TD** as having used 'an outstandingly good' text of **AT**; but as his chief piece of evidence for his belief is this very omission, he is using a circular argument (and the rest of his evidence is singularly unconvincing).⁴ **TD**'s omission can be explained in another way.

But is an epiclesis unthinkable in an anaphora written c. 215? **AT**'s petition does not ask specifically for a change in the elements, but only that they may be the means of filling the communicants with holy Spirit and strengthening their faith. This congregational type of epiclesis, which concentrates on the worshippers rather than the elements, is certainly earlier than the consecratory type, which is first found in the Jerusalem *Catecheses*.⁵ Richardson⁶ made the point that if the presence of an epiclesis in **AT** is due to a fourth-century interpolator, he would surely have introduced a reference to the transformation of the bread and the cup, as **AC** did (see above).

The lack of any such petition for transformation is in line with the language **AT** uses to describe the bread and wine over which thanks have been given. It refers to them as the 'symbol' (*exemplum*), 'antitype', or 'likeness' of the body and blood of Christ, but never speaks of their actually being or having

¹ Bibliography, 15.

² *The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus* (1937), p.79.

³ 'The Origins of the Epiclesis', in *Theology* 28 (1934) pp.125-37, 187-202.

⁴ *The Apostolic Tradition*, pp.lxvii, lvi.

⁵ Cyril, *Catecheses Mystagogicae*, 5.7; the date may be anywhere between 350 and 400.

⁶ Bibliography, 14.

become such, even in the words of administration (see p.40). Here **AT** is apparently more primitive than Justin,¹ who is quite ready to write:

'We have been taught that the food over which thanks have been given . . . is the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus.'

'We have been taught' implies that the identification was not new in Justin's day. So too Irenaeus²:

'The mixed cup and the created bread receive the Word of God and become eucharist, the body and blood of Christ.'

AT is supported by Tertullian³, who uses 'figure' and 'representing' (*representat*) and Cyprian⁴ ('show forth', *ostenditur*). In fact, this kind of language lasted into the fourth century. Sarapion speaks of the 'likeness', Ambrose of the 'figure', and the liturgy of St. Basil of the 'antitypes'. Thus the presence of a *non-consecratory* epiiclesis raises no problems.

In any case, at the time that Hippolytus was writing, the doctrine of the holy Spirit had not been formulated with the precision which it acquired in the fourth century. Dix himself collected some of the evidence in an important article which was published in 1934⁵, in which he writes:

'[Justin] takes it for granted that the words *pneuma hagion*, "Holy Spirit" mean *the Logos*, and he applies *this* theology to the Eucharist.' (Dix's italics)

He then quotes other Fathers from Irenaeus (the passage quoted above) to Ambrose to show that this is no 'isolated freak of language'. They include Hippolytus himself:

'For he was Word, he was spirit, he was power.'

'For what was begotten of the Father but the spirit, that is to say, the Word.'⁶

Two centuries after Justin, Sarapion can still write:

'Let your holy Word come on this bread, that the bread may become body of the Word.'⁷

If, then, Hippolytus does not draw the same distinctions between the Word and the Spirit that the fourth-century writers do, once again, no problems are raised by accepting a third-century dating for the epiiclesis of **AT**.

6. The Doxology

Hanssens⁸, after examining some 1,791 early doxologies, came to the conclusion that this doxology and the others in **AT** conform to a type which can be shown to have originated in Alexandria in the first century and to have been generally adopted from Origen onwards. His arguments appear convincing, though it would be difficult to refute them without re-examining the huge mass of material. Certainly there is no affinity between **AT**'s doxology and that of the Roman Canon.

AT includes seven doxologies, which have a common framework with minor variations among themselves and among the versions. Some

1 *Apology*, 66.2.

2 *Adversus Haereses*, 5.2.3.

3 *Adversus Marcionem*, 3.19; 1.14.

4 *Ep.* 63.2.

5 See note 3 on p.49.

6 *Contra Noetum*, 4.16.

7 R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming (ed.), *Prayers of the Eucharist*, p.35.

8 *La Liturgie d'Hippolyte* 1 (1959 and 1965), pp.343-70; 2 (1970) pp.167-259.

doxologies in **L** have the peculiarity of including the words 'to Father and Son' before 'with the holy Spirit'. But glory is being ascribed 'through your child Jesus Christ', so that a renewed mention of the Son is most infelicitous. **E** and **TD** both omit the intrusive words. **L** may have imported them into the Thanksgiving from the doxology in ch. 6, where they make sense. The phrase 'in the holy Church' is not found in the two standard forms extracted by Hanssens from his material. It was added, he suggests, either under the influence of Ephesians 3.21, or to conform to the doxology to the baptismal creed.¹ On the other hand, the doxology of the Thanksgiving in **AT** lacks an almost invariable element in the great mass of doxologies: the word 'power' after 'glory' (cf. Revelation 1.6 etc.). The word does appear, however, in the doxologies of the ordination prayers of chapters 3, 7, and 8. The closest parallel in other liturgies to the eucharistic doxology of **L** is probably that of Sarapion:

'Through your only begotten Jesus Christ are glory and might to you in holy Spirit, now and to all the ages of ages.'²

Special offerings

At the end of the Thanksgiving **L** appends two short blessings, one to be used 'over oil; the other over cheese and olives (chs. 5 and 6). They are to be used 'when individuals make special offerings. Sarapion also has a separate 'blessing of olives and waters': and the Gregorian Sacramentary (eighth century) has a blessing of chrism on Maundy Thursday³ which has phrases in common with both of these blessings. Eric Segelberg has shown that similar prayers appear in a wide variety of rites.⁴ In the Leonine Sacramentary (sixth century) there is a 'blessing of water and milk and honey' at Pentecost which echoes **AT**'s second blessing ('unite your servants . . . to the holy Spirit, as this milk and honey was united . . .'). But the similarity of language is not strong enough to suggest more than a widespread tradition from which both **AT** and the sacramentaries have drawn. The second blessing is followed by a doxology to be used 'in every blessing', which suggests that they were to follow the anaphora, not form part of it. In the sacramentaries the blessings are to be inserted into the Canon before the doxology.

The reference to 'cheese' remains mysterious, particularly in combination with olives, and none of the oriental versions contain this chapter. The blessing consists of two unconnected sentences, either of which could stand on its own; and it may well be that they were really meant to be two separate blessings (the title of the chapter is conjectural, being indecipherable in the manuscript). Hanssens⁵ has collected a number of references to a Montanist sect called 'Artotyrites' ('Bread-and-cheesers'), but it is most unlikely that Hippolytus would countenance any practice associated with Montanism. Hanssens also points out that Perpetua in her vision was given cheese to eat; but since it also contained 'something sweet', the reference may be to milk and honey.

1 *Ibid.*, 1, p.368; cf. Hippolytus, *Contra Noetum*, in Connolly, *Bibliography*, 5, p.369.

2 R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming (ed.), *Prayers of the Eucharist*, p.36.

3 *Ibid.*, p.109.

4 *The Benedictio Olei in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, in *Oriens Christianus* 48 (1964) pp.268-81.

5 *La Liturgie d'Hippolyte*, 1, p.423.

3. BAPTISM

Of those who will receive baptism

The titles of the two chapters (20 and 21) with which we are concerned do not employ any compendious expression such as 'Christian Initiation' to announce their subject. The one word 'baptism' is used to cover everything. This may suggest either that the washing in water in the name of the Trinity was regarded as the important part of the rite, and the ceremonies which followed it as of less importance and not worth specifying, or that the word 'baptism' was used to cover the whole performance only for lack of any more precise terminology. It is impossible to affirm with confidence that one of these interpretations is correct and the other wrong. What we can say with certainty is that by the end of the second century baptism in the western Church normally included anointing and the imposition of the bishop's hand, and was followed by the eucharist. All this is presented as one coherent rite, not only in **AT**, but with varying details by Tertullian¹, Cyprian, and Ambrose, and subsequent witnesses to western practice.

Whether Justin Martyr, whose evidence is that of a generation earlier than **AT**, was also acquainted with the same procedure is uncertain. In his *First Apology* he describes a rite which begins with baptism and ends with the eucharist, but in this particular work he mentions no other ceremonies between the two. However, the attempt has been made, notably by A. H. Couratin², to show from other works by Justin that he was acquainted with a rite of anointing after baptism. It would therefore be a mistake to assume too confidently, and merely because he does not happen to mention them in the *First Apology*, that post-baptismal ceremonies were unknown to Justin. The wisest conclusion we can draw from his works is that they do not provide us with sufficient evidence to be certain of all the details of the baptismal rites of his day.

AT testifies to a period when the postulant for baptism passed through two stages before he could be baptized. In later centuries his admission as a catechumen was marked by a signing with the cross and in some places also with the first administration of exorcized salt³; but in **AT** the admission is concerned primarily with discerning between suitable and unsuitable candidates. It took place privately 'before all the people arrive', and was apparently the business of the 'teachers', possibly in their own classroom. From this time forward they received instruction. They would attend the 'mass of the catechumens', but were not allowed to associate themselves with the prayers of the faithful or the kiss of peace, still less with the eucharist itself.

The time came when suitable catechumens were 'chosen' to proceed to the second stage of their preparation, which lasted for a few weeks before baptism. At Rome such people were known as *electi*, that is 'chosen': in other parts of the west they were known as *competentes*. When the

1 E. C. Whitaker, *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* (S.P.C.K., London, 2nd ed. 1970), cited below as *DBL*, pp. 7-10. Future references in this essay to *Didache*, Justin, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Ambrose may be checked in *DBL*, but are not mentioned in the footnotes.

2 Justin Martyr and Confirmation—A Note', in *Theology* 55 (1952) pp. 258-60.

3 *DBL*, pp. 99, 109f, 160, 169f.

BAPTISM

choice had been made, and their sponsors had given an assurance that they had conducted themselves as became Christians, the *electi* were allowed to 'hear the gospel'. The meaning of this statement is not clear, and **CH**¹ interprets it to mean that a passage of the gospels was read to the *electi*. But that is not what we read in **AT**. More than two centuries later, a Gallican council² declared that catechumens should be 'allowed to hear the gospel'. The implication of this seems to be that there had previously been a time when they were not allowed to hear the gospels read, and possibly therefore that the permission in **AT** for the *electi* to hear the gospel was the first step in their admission to the privileges of the faithful. Today we may think it strange if the instruction of Christians was able to proceed without a knowledge of the gospels, but the possibility that the postulant for baptism did not hear the gospels until a late stage in his preparation is supported by the evidence of the developed rite in the Gelasian Sacramentary³, in which the Exposition of the Gospels to the Elect is one of the impressive features of the ceremony known as the Opening of the Ears.

The time which elapsed between the occasion when the *electi* were singled out from the ranks of the catechumens and the occasion when they were baptized was not long. **AT** is not specific about it, but **GEL**⁴ indicates that the *electi* were chosen on or about the third Sunday in Lent, with baptism four weeks later at Easter. During this period the candidates were exorcized each day. Again, **AT** does not tell us who performed this duty, but a letter written by pope Cornelius in the year 251 provides a list of the various orders which made up his staff and includes 54 exorcists. Although **AT** makes no specific mention of exorcists in the chapters relating to ordination, it does refer to people with gifts of healing, and healing was closely associated with exorcism. A few days before baptism, the final exorcism was performed by the bishop himself, and it appears from **AT** that this exorcism would enable the bishop to determine which candidates were to be deemed free from demonic possession, and which were to be 'put aside' because they were not yet free. This judgment was the purpose of the ceremonies which at a later date were known as the 'scrutinies'. Ambrose⁵ said that in the scrutinies 'search was made lest some uncleanness might cling to the body of any one of you'; and in a sermon delivered after a scrutiny Augustine said 'we have now ascertained that you are free from unclean spirits'. Little is known of what happened at the scrutinies, and we may wonder how it was possible to learn who was free from unclean spirits and who was not. The best accounts available of a scrutiny are to be found in the sermons of Augustine of Hippo and Quodvultdeus, bishop of Carthage.⁶ It is probable that the scrutiny in the early third century was not as elaborate as that which they describe. But in some form or other the candidate seems to have been subjected to an ordeal at the episcopal exorcism, and some were able to survive it and some were not.

1 *DBL*, p. 88.

2 *DBL*, p. 228.

3 *DBL*, p. 172. This is a sixth century document, referred to hereafter as 'GEL'.

4 *DBL*, p. 166.

5 R. H. Connolly, *The Explanatio Symboli ad Initandos* (Cambridge, 1952) p. 19.

6 *DBL*, pp. 102, 106f; see also 122f, 149; for a full account, see E. C. Whitaker, *The Baptismal Liturgy* (London, 1965) p. 42.

As the time for baptism approached, the timetable in **AT** becomes more precise. The baptism is to take place early on Sunday morning, and the observances of the previous three days are laid down. It is not possible to say with certainty that the Sunday in question was Easter Day. Tertullian appeared to regard Easter as the most suitable day for baptism but recognized that it might properly take place at other seasons. Nevertheless it does not seem likely that the lengthy business of preparation and the solemn performance of the sacrament as they are described in **AT** could take place very often: it seems probable that by this date or very soon afterwards the custom of the western Church became stabilized by which baptism was normally reserved to Easter.

On Thursday the candidates bathed, on Friday they fasted. The *Didache* suggests a fast on 'one or two days' before baptism. Justin and Tertullian are less precise but agree that baptism was preceded by fasting, and this was probably the origin of the Lenten fast. However, the pleasures of the bath were not consistent with fasting, so if the candidates had been fasting for any length of time they would certainly need to bathe if they were to be suitably clean for the baptismal bath.

On the Saturday before baptism the candidates were gathered together for the last time in the presence of the bishop. As they knelt, the bishop laid his hand on them, exorcised them, breathed on their faces, and then signed them with the cross on the forehead, ears, and nose. Some centuries later, **GEL** describes a similar gathering which took place early on the Saturday morning.¹ The bishop laid a hand on the heads of the candidates and exorcized them. Then he touched their ears and noses with spittle and said 'Effeta, that is, Be opened, unto the odour of sweetness. But thou, O devil, take flight, for the judgment of God has drawn near'. If we are right in supposing that the gathering described in **GEL** is a lineal descendant of that described in **AT**, then we must notice a development in the ceremony in which the bishop signed the ears and nose of the candidates. In **GEL** the formula *Effeta* (i.e. *Ephphatha*) and the use of spittle indicate that this ceremony had come to be understood as a liturgical performance of our Lord's action when he healed a deaf-mute², although the reference to the nose rather than the mouth shows that the copy was not exact. **AT** however makes no reference to the use of spittle but says only that the bishop signed the candidates; and the places which he signed were not only the mouth and nose but also the forehead. An important Roman document which lies between **AT** and **GEL** is the letter to Senarius written by John the Deacon about the year 500. According to this letter³, the ears and nose were touched with oil, and John explains with some precision that the purpose of the ceremony was to close the ears and nose of the candidate to the sensuous pleasures of the world and the devil. This interpretation, which was followed in the *Tractates on Baptism* written by pseudo-Maximus in Turin⁴ about the year 550, makes it clear that John the Deacon

1 *DBL*, p.183.

2 Mark 7.31f.

3 *DBL*, p.156.

4 Migne, *Patrologia Latina* 57, col. 772, 774; see also Dom B. Capelle, 'Les *Tractatus de Baptismo* attribués à Saint Maxime de Turin', in *Revue Bénédictine* 45 (1933), p.108f.

was not acquainted with the formula 'Effeta, that is, Be opened', or with the notion that the ceremony was performed in imitation of the healing of the deaf-mute. He saw it rather as the completion of the exorcism which preceded it. And that appears to be the meaning of the ceremony as it is described in **AT**.

The rites of Milan as described by Ambrose supply the earliest evidence for the interpretation of the Saturday morning ceremony in the light of the gospel story. Ambrose describes the occasion as 'the opening', and says that the bishop touched the ears and nose of the candidates saying 'Effeta, that is, Be opened'. He does not mention the use of oil or spittle or any other substance, but in view of his reference to the 'bonus odor' conveyed in the *Effeta*, it seems likely that the touching of the ears and nose was done with oil. No doubt this interpretation of the rite and the adjustments which it called for made their way from Milan to Rome eventually, but at some date later than that of John the Deacon.

In the programme set out in **AT**, the candidates were baptized in the early hours of Sunday morning. We learn that they spent the previous night in vigil, during which they were 'to be read to and instructed'. The language of **AT** does not suggest that this was an occasion attended by the faithful. However, the Easter vigil was among the customary observances of the Church and had probably been so from its earliest days, when the celebration of the Jewish Passover gave way to the celebration of the Passover as the Church, taught by St. Paul, had come to understand it. The *Homily on the Pascha* written by Melito of Sardis² was itself a declaration of the Christian meaning of the Passover designed for the occasion, and its reading had been preceded by the reading of the Exodus narrative. The reading and homily together made up a central part of the vigil observance, and it seems probable that this is the event to which **AT** refers and which the candidates for baptism attended. The homily and reading combined with the eucharistic celebration of our Lord's passion and resurrection to illuminate the meaning of baptism by reference to its Old Testament types, to present the theme that 'Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us', and to show that in baptism the candidate identified himself with Christ in his death and resurrection.

Of the Conferring of Holy Baptism

Up to this point we have been concerned with the preparation of the candidates for baptism. **AT** turns now to the actual performance of the sacrament and matters closely associated with it. Our first problem is to know where these things took place. Dom Gregory Dix was probably right when he said that 'it is doubtful if in Hippolytus' day, there were as yet any public buildings set aside in Rome for Christian worship'³; and since the word *ecclesia* can mean either the assembly of the faithful or the building in which they assembled, he went on to conclude that when the word

1 See Dom C. Lambot, *North Italian Services of the 11th century*, HBS 67 (1931) p.xxii, n.4; xxiii. For a different opinion, see E. J. Yarnold, 'The Ceremonies of Initiation in the *De Sacramentis* and *De Mysteriis* of St. Ambrose', in *SP* 10 10(70) p.455.

2 See F. L. Cross, *The Early Christian Fathers* (London, 1960) pp.103ff. Melito died c. 190.

3 *The Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus*, p.IV.

ecclesia appears in **AT** it must refer to the assembly and not the building. At every point therefore where Cuming's text (following Botte) uses the word 'church', Dix reads 'assembly'. However this may be, c. 21 give us some clue about where baptism took place. As we read these chapters, it is difficult to avoid the impression that everything, from the exorcism on Saturday onwards, took place on the same premises. They included an area in which there was a tank or bath of water, preferably flowing water. In the same complex there was also a room capable of holding the assembly of the faithful. This seems to match exactly with Dix's description of the house of a Roman nobleman of the period.¹ Basic to its lay-out were a covered forecourt with a large tank of water in the centre, and beyond this the *tablinum*, which was both the family shrine and the main reception room. Dix himself draws attention to the suitability of such a complex for the performance of baptism and the eucharist, and this seems to be the kind of premises which **AT** has in view; and it does not seem impossible that, when **AT** was written, the room where the faithful assembled for worship had already come to be known as 'the church'.

Like the *Didache*, **AT** shows a preference for running water but is prepared to accept any water if necessary. Tertullian is the earliest witness to a prayer for the consecration of the water, and Cyprian also explains that the water is efficacious because it has been purified and sanctified by the priest first'. Both writers suggest that the purpose of the prayer is that the water should be imbued with the holy Spirit, and it is possible that this seemed the more necessary as the use of moving water in open places gave way to the use of still water in a building.² There is much evidence that originally baptism was administered in rivers and lakes and in the sea. However, even when it came to be administered in specially prepared baths or tanks, it did not follow that the water was not running water. It might still have been flowing into the tank, or pouring in from above it; and that is the situation which **AT** seems to envisage or to prefer when it was possible.

AT seems to assume that baptism will take place by immersion. Although the *Didache* appears to allow affusion when water was scarce, and Cyprian attests the practice of affusion in cases of clinical baptism, immersion seems to have been the normal practice, at least so far as the size of the baptismal tanks would allow. In Jewish proselyte-baptism, total nudity was a necessary part of the immersion ritual, so that nothing stood between the body and the water. This requirement was so rigorously applied that a woman's hair had to be loosed and freed from knots and her jewellery removed. Whatever the reason for this in Judaism, R. J. Z. Werblowsky⁴ maintains that when we find the same customs attested in **AT**, it was in order that the body, which had already been exorcized and freed from demons, should then be perfectly exposed to the renewing influence of the water.

¹ *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p.22f.

² See J. D. C. Fisher, 'The Consecration of Water in the Early Rite of Baptism', in *SP 2* (1957), pp.41-46.

³ J. G. Davies, *The Architectural Setting of Baptism* (London, 1962) p.25f.

⁴ 'On the Baptismal Rite according to St. Hippolytus', in *SP 2* (1957), pp.93-105.

Like Tertullian, **AT** attests the practice of infant baptism, and also the practice whereby parents or sponsors spoke for the children. From at least this date the Church almost invariably proceeded on the assumption that infants may be credited with the answers made by their sponsors. Since the Reformation, however, this assumption has been called in question, and the modern Roman Catholic rite of Infant Baptism has abandoned it.

After the prayer over the water, prayers were said over the 'oil of exorcism' and the 'oil of thanksgiving'. These oils were for immediate use, at the final exorcism before baptism and the two anointings after it. In Cyprian's time the blessing of the oils took place at the eucharist, and in course of time the custom became universal by which this was done on Maundy Thursday.

The passage in **AT** which we may identify as the Renunciation is made up of three items which do not appear together as a coherent group elsewhere. Taken together, the words of renunciation, the anointing, and the words 'Let every spirit depart far from you', comprise the final exorcismal act to release the candidate from the possession of evil spirits before the holy Spirit took possession of him in the waters of baptism. The anointing survived in the western rite, but before the renunciation, and is attested by Ambrose, **GEL**, and many other western witnesses. In **AT** its apotropaic purpose is made clear by the context, and Ambrose described it as the anointing of 'Christ's athlete' in the battle with the devil.

The renunciation in **AT** is cast in the form of a direct address to the devil, 'I renounce you, Satan...'; and a form of this kind is preserved by a number of eastern witnesses, and survives unexpectedly in the works of Hildephonus of Toledo' (died, c.667). The vigour of this direct approach is somewhat weakened in the form 'I renounce Satan...' in other eastern sources², and weakened still more in the interrogatory form which came to characterize the western rite.³

There can be no doubt that at the administration of baptism the original text of **AT** provided three questions each followed by an immersion. Such is the procedure attested by **TD, CH**,⁴ and the fragment we possess of **L**. The text of **SAE** at this point, as Cuming explains, is evidently an interpolation which suppresses the original scheme.⁵ The resemblance of the three questions to the Apostles' Creed is obvious, and it is probable that

¹ *DBL*, pp.28, 37, 62, 89, 93, 114.

² *DBL*, pp.32, 47, 70, 77.

³ *DBL*, p.183.

⁴ *DBL*, p.89.

⁵ It is important at this point to recognize that the passages in Dix's text which are printed in roman type represent his attempt to reconstruct the original text of **AT**, while passages printed in italics are those which he considers to be later embellishments and not likely to have formed part of the original. It would be a mistake however to assume that Dix is invariably correct. By contrast, Cuming's text, following that of Botte, provides the undoubted manuscript text of **L** where it is available and of **S** (or others) where it is not, and leaves the business of reconstructing the original to the footnotes.

this creed originated in interrogatory form in this baptismal context. It is to such a scheme of questions and immersions that Tertullian probably refers when he says 'When we have entered the water, we make profession of the Christian faith in the words of its rule', and again 'We are thrice immersed, while we answer interrogations rather more extensive than our Lord has prescribed in the gospel'. Ambrose also testifies to a similar scheme, but his questions are different and shorter, as are the questions in **GEL**. Western rites show some variety in the text of these questions, of which the important feature is that they relate to the three Persons of the Trinity.

Notably absent from **AT** is the familiar form 'I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Spirit'. This is no accident. This form belonged to the baptismal practice of the oriental Church from the earliest times, but was not adopted in the west until later.¹ The earliest evidence for its use outside Syria is in **CH** (Egypt: c. 336), and it does not appear to have reached Rome until early in the eighth century. Until then the form of words which declared the Trinitarian character of Christian baptism was the triple interrogation about the Trinity.

According to the Latin text the candidate was baptized 'once', 'again', and 'a third time'. This is absurd: he was immersed three times, but baptized only once. This absurdity arises from the weakness of the Latin translation. The original Greek text must have read 'baptizein', of which the primary meaning is 'to immerse', and to translate it with *baptizare* was a mistake.

Dix has suggested that the Latin *baptizetur* (he shall be baptized) may mean 'he shall baptize himself', and that baptism was performed by self-immersion. Of course there is a sense in which the candidate did immerse himself, since he could not be immersed by another without his co-operation.² But the account of the first immersion shows that the real minister of baptism was the deacon who laid his hand on his head to immerse him.

The baptismal rite of **AT** as we have observed it so far is identical with that described by Ambrose and Tertullian. Tertullian gives us a short but precise account in the words 'When on the point of coming to the water we then and there . . . affirm that we renounce the devil . . . After this we are thrice immersed, while we answer interrogations rather more extensive than our Lord prescribed in the gospel'. Ambrose described a similar procedure with more detail, and all three witnesses thus testify to a rite which consisted first of a renunciation which took place before baptism and then a triple immersion accompanied by a triple interrogation on the faith. This was the characteristic pattern of the western baptismal rite. The eastern pattern was different.³ The triple immersion was not accompanied

¹ See E. C. Whitaker, 'The History of the Baptismal Formula', in *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 16 (1965), pp. 1-12.

² *DBL*, p. 49.

³ Typical examples in *DBL*, pp. 32, 37, 47, 53, 57. Cyril of Jerusalem is not typical, because he introduces western features into the eastern pattern.

by interrogations but by the form 'I baptize you (or, *M*, is baptized) in the name of the Father . . . The renunciation of the devil was followed by a correlative act of adherence to Christ; and to suit their action to the words candidates were turned to face west to the 'region of sensible darkness' for the renunciation, and east for the adherence to Christ. The two parts of the single rite were known as the *apotaxis* (renunciation) and *syntaxis* (adherence). Later versions of **AT**, that is to say **CH** and **TD**, attested both an *apotaxis* and a *syntaxis*, but Botte is certainly correct in saying that while the renunciation is an original part of **AT**, the original text did not include an act of adherence: for it is more probable that a *syntaxis* was introduced into **CH** and **TD** in conformity with the eastern pattern than that it was suppressed in **S**.

In the subsequent history of the Latin west, the familiar form 'I baptize you . . .' was introduced by degrees, and the triple interrogation therefore came to be detached from its close association with the triple immersion. In some cases, particularly in the later Gallican rite¹, it was combined with part of the preparation for baptism. But this was not always the case. In the Roman rite, the renunciation and the questions on the faith remained as separate matters, and as late as the Roman Catholic Ritual of 1964 the renunciation took place outside the baptistery and the questions on the faith inside.²

The post-baptismal ceremonies described in **AT** have parallels in Tertullian, Cyprian and Ambrose, though not, as we have seen, in Justin. On the other hand they have no parallel at all in the early Syrian rite. Both Tertullian and Cyprian suggest that the post-baptismal ceremonies of the African rite consisted of an anointing, an imposition of the hand, and a signing with the cross. They seem to agree that the anointing imparts 'the grace of Christ', making them 'christi' or members of the royal priesthood, while the imposition of the hand conveys the holy Spirit. Ambrose testifies to an anointing by the bishop after baptism, but gives no clear explanation of its meaning. Then, after the *pedilavium*, comes the 'spiritual seal'. This certainly included a prayer for the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit, and it may have been accompanied by an anointing, an imposition of the hand, the sign of the cross, one or more. Ambrose associates it with the gift of the Spirit.³

The closest parallel to the more complex post-baptismal rites of **AT** is found in **GEL**.⁴ In particular the use of two anointings, first by a priest and later by the bishop, is a constant and distinctive feature of the Roman rite. The words used in **AT** to accompany the anointings do little to explain them. The prayer associated with the imposition of the hand has been a matter of controversy. As it stands in **L**, the prayer assumes that the candidate has already received the Spirit in baptism and now asks for the sending of

¹ And consequently in the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1662. For the Gallican rite, see *DBL*, pp. 245f.

² See P. J. Jagger, *Christian Initiation, 1552-1969* (Alcuin/S.P.C.K., London, 1970), p. 228.

³ For a careful examination of post-baptismal ceremonies, see J. D. C. Fisher, *Christian Initiation: Baptism in the Medieval West* (Alcuin/S.P.C.K., London, 1965); and L. L. Mitchell, *Baptismal Anointing* (Alcuin/S.P.C.K. London, 1966).

⁴ *DBL*, p. 188.

Christ's grace upon them. But Botte has argued persuasively that the original text of **L** read 'count them worthy to be filled with your holy Spirit, and send on them your grace'. This would set **AT** in line with Tertullian and Cyprian, and also with **TD** and **CH**, in associating the gift of the Spirit with the imposition of the hand. In *The Seal of the Spirit* G. W. H. Lampe originally claimed that there is no reason to question the correctness of the text of **L**, but in the second edition of the same work (1967, p. xvii) he says 'I should not now wish to lay so much emphasis on the possibility of an important discrepancy between the Latin and the oriental versions.'

It is not likely that the bishop repeated the prayer in full for each candidate. Did he then lay his hand separately on each candidate after saying the prayer, or did he extend it once over all of them as he said the prayer? **GEL** poses the same problem. Tertullian conveys a hint that he may have extended his hand over them when he says 'Flesh is overshadowed (*adumbratur*) by the imposition of the hand', and certainly the sixteenth-century Roman Ritual provided that the bishop said the prayer 'with his hand extended towards them'.

The first anointing took place when the candidate came up from the water. The rest took place when they had all gone into church. The prayers of the faithful and the kiss of peace then led into the eucharist, as with Justin. Before receiving the cup of the eucharist, the newly-baptized received a cup of water and then a cup of milk and honey. The latter is attested by Tertullian, the third council of Carthage², the Leonine Sacramentary, and John the Deacon, who offers several interpretations of it. The Leonine Sacramentary includes a blessing of the water, milk, and honey, and this prayer provides some explanation of the cup of water. Jungmann suggests that the milk and honey are a survival of the meal from which the eucharist has been detached.³

Our survey shows plainly that the baptismal rite of **AT** is not an oriental rite, but suggests many points of contact with Africa and Egypt and especially with Rome. A. Salles⁴ has argued that since the genius of the Roman Church was its conservatism, the differences between **AT** and **GEL** are too great to allow the hypothesis that **AT** is Roman. But this ignores the fact that the accounts of baptism in John the Deacon and **GEL**, though not much separated in time, are themselves not easy to reconcile; and also it ignores the immense and significant changes which overtook the Church in Rome. These include the change from Greek to Latin for the liturgical language, the process by which infant baptism became the normal practice rather than adult baptism, and the erection of purpose-built churches. If we are right in thinking that the baptismal rite of **AT** is Roman, it is not surprising if there are some substantial differences from **GEL**: the points of similarity are also very striking.

1 J. D. C. Fisher, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

2 *DBL*, pp. 222, 153, 157f.

3 *The Mass of the Roman Rite* (New York, 1950), 1, p. 15.

4 'La Tradition apostolique, est-elle un témoin de la liturgie romaine?', in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 148 (1955), pp. 181-213.

4. OTHER ACTS OF WORSHIP

1. Times of Prayer

It is generally agreed that at one time there were two versions of **AT** in circulation, the shorter lacking 39-41 and so having only the brief reference to morning prayer and instruction in 35, which is duplicated and expanded in 41. Unless both versions are held to have stemmed from the pen of Hippolytus—and it is hard to conceive of him writing two such very different endings¹—one is forced to ask which of them is the original. As a general rule one would expect a shorter liturgical text to be the earlier and a longer version to be an expansion. If this is true in this case, then we learn very little about the times of daily prayer in the period of Hippolytus from it. On the other hand most of the practices mentioned in the longer text are otherwise attested as having existed in the second and third centuries, so that it is possible that this could have been written in Hippolytus' day, though that is not to say that it has not undergone some degree of subsequent expansion and elaboration. Attempts to reconstruct the original text here are made more difficult by the fact that there is a gap in the manuscript of **L** at this point and part of this section is missing from it.

Prayer in the morning, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, in the evening and at midnight are spoken of in the West at this period by both Tertullian² and Cyprian³, as well as by **AT**. Prayer at cockcrow, however, is unknown elsewhere at such an early date, and when it does make its first appearance in some fourth century monastic rules, it is as an alternative to midnight prayer and not as an additional time as it is here. Therefore at least this element is very probably a later addition to the document, for it seems unlikely that this hour of prayer constituted a part of the regular daily pattern at Rome at the beginning of the third century but failed to be adopted elsewhere for such a long time. Similarly the explanations given in **AT** for the adoption of the third and sixth hours as times of prayer are not ones generally advanced in the literature of this period: Tertullian and Cyprian both think of the giving of the Spirit as the scriptural precedent for the practice of prayer at the third hour, and not of the Marcan timing of the crucifixion nor of the offering of the shewbread, and of the prayer of Peter on the housetop⁴ for the sixth hour, although Cyprian does mention the passion in relation to prayer at the ninth hour; and Tertullian⁵ associates it with the observance of the ninth hour on station days, but not directly with the daily times of prayer, referring instead to Peter and John going up to the Temple at the ninth hour in Acts 3.1. On the other hand, the justification for prayer at midnight has been thought to contain certain primitive indications: Jean Danielou has argued that the expression 'the elders who gave us this tradition' refers back to Jewish Christianity⁶, and Henry

1 See A. F. Walls, *Bibliography*, 20, p. 158.

2 *De Oratione*, 24, 25; *Ad Uxorem*, 2.5.

3 *De Orat. Domin.*, 34-36.

4 Acts 10.9.

5 *De Ieternis*, 10.

6 J. Danielou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (1964) p. 342; see also pp. 45-52.

Chadwick has concluded from a comparison with the Testament of Adam that 'behind the tradition of the elders preserved by the Apostolic Tradition there probably lies an originally Jewish tradition.'¹

2. Daily Instruction

The daily assemblies for instruction and prayer described in chs. 35, 39, and 41 are clearly something different from the services of the word on station days mentioned by Tertullian (see above) and later authors, for the gatherings in **AT** take place in the morning and not at 3 p.m. and apparently are not restricted to specific days of the week. They should be considered in the light of what is said about the instruction of catechumens in chs. 15-19. It is often assumed that such instruction was given by the bishop in the first part of the Sunday eucharist, but that does not appear to be what is in mind in **AT**: the 'teachers' may be clerics or laymen, and it is they and not the bishop who lay hands on the candidates and dismiss them. Because the faithful are also said to be present on these occasions—they are required to separate from the unbaptized at the end of the instruction for their own prayers and the peace—it seems likely that the gatherings are to be identified with those described in 35, 39, and 41, where again the teacher is apparently not the bishop, who does not seem to have been involved at all, probably because this was an assembly occasioned by pastoral needs and not a fixed liturgical rite over which he had to preside. This institution was not restricted to Rome at this period, as Origen's sermons provide evidence for the existence of a similar daily assembly for the instruction of both catechumens and the faithful in the East²; and it can be found surviving in the fourth century: Egeria tells of the presence of the faithful as well as the baptismal candidates at the bishop's *catechesis* in Jerusalem.³

3. The Agape

Chs. 24 and 25 occur in full only in **E** and are placed in that manuscript after 29, an order which Dix accepted in his edition,⁴ but as there was no place for them in **L** at this point, he was forced to conclude that this section was an eastern interpolation into the text, though 'not necessarily much, if at all, later in date than Hippolytus' genuine work.'⁵ Subsequently, however, it has been argued both by Botte in his edition⁶ and by Chadwick⁷ that the passage is genuine, but displaced by **E** from an original position after 23, where there is a lacuna in the Latin manuscript. It is possible that the change in order was made by the tradition underlying **E** so that the sequence of the Agape might harmonize with that followed in the community through which the text was transmitted, for we know from Tertullian⁸ that at least in North Africa the lighting of the lamp and the singing of

¹ Henry Chadwick, 'Prayer at Midnight', in *Epektasis: Melanges Patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou* (Paris 1972) pp.47-9.

² *Hom. in Gen.*, 10.2, 3; *Hom. in Jes. Nav.*, 4.1.

³ *Travels*, 46.1, 2; 47.2.

⁴ See Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, p.83.

⁵ Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p.86.

⁶ pp. xxxi, xxxii.

⁷ Dix-Chadwick, p. j.

⁸ *Apologeticum*, 39.

psalms came after, and not before, the meal itself. It is also possible that in the process some of the details of the description of the lighting of the lamp and the psalm-singing have been altered and expanded in **E**, the most obvious point of suspicion being the phrase 'they shall rise then after supper and pray'¹, although the whole of what follows exhibits such confusion that it is difficult to be sure what the original said. The use of the Alleluia psalms at this period is, however, attested by Tertullian: 'the more conscientious in prayer are accustomed to append to their prayers Alleluia and such manner of psalms, so that those who are present may respond with the endings of them'.² One may also suspect that the statement in 26, that each person gives thanks over his own cup, has been added to the text to harmonize with the current practice known to the redactor, since it contradicts the thanksgiving over the common cup described at the end of 25, and this suspicion is encouraged by the clear difference in the grammatical construction of **L** as it reappears at this point, and by the statement that the catechumens are to offer a cup each for himself: this would have much greater point if the faithful on the contrary shared in the common cup denied to them.

¹ See Botte's edition, p.65, n.1.

² *De Oratione*, 27.