

the usage of the Eastern Churches, to which the Church of Rome made no resistance, since their liturgies differed in nothing essential from her own. We know that when St. Polycarp was at Rome, Pope Anicetus allowed him the honor of celebrating the sacred mysteries in his Church.

Hilduin, abbe of Saint Denis, in his preface on the Areopagities, addressed to Louis le Debonnaire shortly after the death of Charlemagne in 814, speaks of some missals of the highest antiquity, and "almost consumed with age, which contained the order of the mass according to the Gallican rite such as was received with the faith in this western country, and always used, until the Roman rite, now in use, was adopted." They were, therefore, persuaded that the Gallic liturgy was as ancient as the faith, and that both were derived from the same source—the apostles and apostolic men.

The Greek and Syriac liturgy of Jerusalem is incontestably traced to St. James, first bishop of that first Church, where the apostles celebrated the mysteries together before their dispersion, and where St. James continued to celebrate them during the remainder of his episcopacy. The fathers of the general council in Trullo, in 692, cited it as coming certainly from the same apostle, and made use of it to refute the error of the Armenians, who at that time merely put wine in the chalice without water. It will be readily perceived how it may indifferently be called the liturgy of St. James or of Jerusalem. The Greeks and the Syrians of that town and the neighbouring countries have always regarded it as transmitted by St. James. They wrote it at first in Greek for their use, because that language was generally spoken in the great towns of the East in the fourth and fifth centuries, at which periods the liturgies began to be committed to writing. In the Greek it bears the name of St. James, as well as in the Syriac version afterwards made of it.

Firmilian, when at Jerusalem towards the commencement of the third century, observed some difference between the office there celebrated and the Roman office. He observes to St. Cyprian that the ceremonies at Jerusalem are exactly the same as those at Rome. He merely takes notice of the difference in the ceremonies; which supposes that in essentials he discovered no difference, whatever.

In the judgment of skilful critics, the liturgy which St. Cyril of Jerusalem explained to the newly baptised is exactly the same as that known under the name of St. James. We see nevertheless that since the apostles, time and even since the time of St. Cyril, it has undergone some change in the ceremonies and in the collects or prayers, some being lengthened and others shortened: a change very common to books in common use, and which circumstances failed not to occasion, even after they had been committed to writing. It is also very manifest, that, not having been, like the other liturgies written in the fifth century, there was added to the name of Jesus Christ the word *consubstantial*, and to that of the Blessed Virgin the title of Mother of God, defined at Ephesus. This proves, indeed, that it was not written before these general councils, since it was not cited by them as a proof; but it would hardly be the part of a judicious critic to conclude from this circumstance, that it did not exist before these additions, which were commanded by posterior decrees of the Church.

For more than eleven centuries has the Church of Constantinople made use of two liturgies, one under name of St. John Chrysostom the other under that of St. Basil. Neither one nor other of

these two bishops were the authors of these liturgies. The eloquent patriarch did not receive the glorious title of Chrysostom, till three centuries after his death. Before him, in his time, and long afterwards, the liturgy, which has since gone by his name, bore the name of the apostles. For the purpose of distinguishing it from so many others equally coming from the apostles, and to follow the custom which had been introduced in other parts, they gave it without doubt the name of this great patriarch. At the conclusion of the sixth century it had not as yet received his name. Our voucher for this is Leontius, a lawyer of Byzantium, who reproaches Nestorius in the following strain: "Another crime yet, which yields in no respect to the preceding one: he had the audacity, without regard to the liturgy of the apostles and to that of St. Basil, written in the same spirit, to model a new form of mass, different from that which our fathers had transmitted to the Churches. In this his new mass he covered the mysteries of the Eucharist with blasphemies rather than with prayers."

As to St. Basil, we know from St. Gregory Nazianzen, that he had composed prayers for the altar: and St. Basil himself, in his letter to the clergy of Neocessarea, speaks of those which he had made for the mass: he had intended them for his monastery: they accorded with those which were said in the churches, merely with the addition of certain prayers to the canon without changing or removing any part of it: they were much admired in the East: various churches accommodated them to the order of their liturgies, each after its own manner.

The Church of Alexandria was founded by St. Mark: we cannot doubt that this evangelist gave to his Church the order of the liturgy, which was followed by his successors and by the bishops under their jurisdiction. Cyril, who lived till 444, was occupier of the patriarchal see about the time when the liturgies were committed to writing, that is, about the council of Ephesus, in 431. It was at first written in Greek, which was spoken in Alexandria, in Coptic for the provinces, then, in the seventh age in Arabic, after the conquest of Egypt by Mahomet. Cyril had, after the example of many saints, composed prayers for the altar: the splendour he had thrown upon the Church caused his name to be put to the liturgy which was written, but this did not destroy the remembrance of its first apostolical origin. The ancient coptic authors declare that the liturgy of St. Mark was augmented by Cyril, *liturgia Marci quam perfecit Cyrillus*.

Fruentius and one of his cousins, both very young, were led into Ethiopia by a merchant of their parents, who had also entrusted to him the education of their children. The barbarians, having assassinated the merchant and his crew, found the two children studying under a tree, and preparing their lessons: they were moved with compassion and led them to the king, who, charmed with their appearance and compassionating their situation, kindly took them into his protection, and eventually made Fruentius his treasurer and secretary of state, and the other his cup-bearer. The king dying some years afterwards, Fruentius divided the affairs of the regency with the queen dowager, during the minority of her son. He employed his credit and influence in favour of the christian merchants who landed on those coasts. Obtaining, at last, from the young king permission to return with his relation to Tyre, his native country, he passed through Alexandria, of which Athanasius had just been elected the patriarch, made known to him the state of the christians in Ethiopia, and the happy dispositions manifested by the barbarians towards christianity, and besought him to send them a bishop. Athanasius after duly considering the matter, decided upon

sending them Fruentius himself. From being a laic, he was accordingly made bishop of all that country, where his preaching was crowned with wonderful success.

Who can doubt that, upon dismissing him for a distant country, Athanasius would provide him with what was necessary for the ministry and public worship, such as a copy of the Scriptures and of the liturgy, to supply the defect of his memory, till then unpractised in the administration of the sacraments, and that after his death leaving it to his Church, his successor might find it written at length? What very much strengthens this more than probable conjecture is, that M. de Ludolf has by his translation made us acquainted with an Ethiopian liturgy, in which there is mention made of only 318 fathers of Nice, to whom Athanasius was so much devoted.

Nestorius, patriarch of constantinople, condemned and deposed in the general council of Ephesus in 431, for teaching that there were two persons in Christ, and consequently denying the union of the Word with the human nature and the divine maternity of the B. Virgin, found many adherents in Syria, where these notions had long been in embryo since Paul of Samosata. The Nestorians carried their errors with christianity into the kingdoms of the Assyrians and Persians, from thence into the Indies, and even, in the seventh age, as far as China as has been discovered from an inscription found in 1625 in the town of Sigam-Fu, capital of the province of Xinsi, which inscription has been considered as authentic by the most learned antiquaries. It was engraved on a stone of twenty-nine columns, in Chinese characters, with some Syriac lines, and dated the year of the era of the Greeks or Seleucidæ, 1092, which corresponds with the year 780 or 781 of our era. From it we learn that the Gospel was preached in China by priests who came from Syria in the year 936. You may consult on this singularly curious monument father Kircher, in his *China Illustrata*, and the liturgies of Pere Lebrun, t. III, p. 374.

Now, the Nestorians have three liturgies, written in the Syriac language, the first entitled of the apostles, the second of Theodoré of Mopsuestia, the third of the Nestorians. The learned abbe Renaudot who has translated them, observes that the first is the ancient liturgy of the Churches of Syria before Nestorius: the second was to be the liturgy of the Church of Mopsuestia, in Cilicia, of which Theodoré, the friend and master of Nestorius, was bishop. The third was to be the liturgy of Constantinople, which Nestorius had followed in it, but into which he insinuated his errors. The analogy and confraternity of the words of institution between the liturgy of Constantinople and that of the Nestorians sufficiently proves that they were originally the same. We do not discover the error of the Nestorians in the two former.

According to the tradition of Lesser Armenia, the faith was announced to their ancestors by S. S. Thadeus and Bartholomew. We know that at the commencement of the third century there was found there a great number of christians: the attachment of the Armenians to their religion determined the emperor Maximinus, who renewed the persecutions in 235, to declare war upon them, although they were friendly to the Romans. In the following persecutions of Decius and Diocletian they had many martyrs.

Greater Armenia was converted at the commencement of the fourth age by St. Gregory the Illuminator, himself an Armenian, educated at Cesarea and ordained bishop by Leontius, who assisted at the council of Nice, and was succeeded in his See by St. Basil. "Shall the church no longer exist in the two Armenias, because you are not there?" said Opatius of Milevum to the Donatists. And Rufinus, the translator of Eusebius, after relating what we have said of Maximinus, adds in a