

## THE FREQUENCY OF MASS IN THE LATIN CHURCH CA. 400

DANIEL CALLAM, C.S.B.

*St. Thomas More College, University of Saskatchewan*

LITURGICAL RENEWAL and clerical celibacy are two contemporary topics that direct attention to the Church of the fourth century. The form of the Eucharist then, its frequency, the hour and place of celebration, and its influence on piety—each of these is advanced as a normative guide for the reform of the liturgy today. Among these, the frequency of Mass has become an essential part of a popular thesis about the first laws of clerical celibacy. The supposition is that the clergy of the Latin Church began to celebrate Mass every day at the end of the fourth century. By joining this to the conviction that ritual purity was everywhere observed, some scholars feel they have accounted for the legislation of absolute continence for married clerics in major orders: married clerics who abstained from sexual intercourse the day before the celebration of the Eucharist would automatically be bound to observe total continence if they said Mass every day.<sup>1</sup> The force of this simple argument depends completely upon the validity of each of its components: that clerics observed ritual purity; that daily Mass appeared precisely then; that this

<sup>1</sup> R. Gryson has been the most influential exponent of this view in his book *Les origines du célibat ecclésiastique du premier au septième siècle* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1970) and in several articles. Cf. also R. Kottje, "Das Aufkommen der täglichen Eucharistiefeyer in der Weltkirche und die Zölibatsforderung," *ZKG* 82 (1971) 218–28. What little evidence there is implies that cultic abstinence was normally for one day in paganism, with the exception of occasional festivals; cf. D. Callam, *The Origins of Clerical Celibacy* (unpublished thesis; Oxford, 1977) 16–34; E. Fehrle, *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1910) 155–60. There is little evidence that Christianity differed from paganism in this respect. Ambrosiaster, *Ad Timotheum prima* 3, 13 (CSEL 81/3, 269), mentions that the Levites of the OT purified themselves for several days before officiating, but he applies this only indirectly to the Christian priesthood. Ambrose, *De officiis* 1, 50, 249 (ed. J. G. Krabinger [Tübingen: Laupp, 1857] 118) cites the two- or three-day periods of continence found in the OT. But Ambrose, and others, did not try to establish or defend the principle of ritual purity; they merely used it as part of their demonstration that absolute continence is a Christian and a clerical ideal. The connection between daily Mass and continence has been viewed as so necessary that canon 33 of the Synod of Elvira—which imposes absolute continence on major clerics—is viewed as proof for daily Mass in Spain ca. 300; cf. H. Böhmer, "Die Entstehung des Zölibates," *Geschichtliche Studien Albert Hauck zum 70. Geburtstage* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1916) 12; P. P. Joannou, *La législation impériale et la christianisation de l'empire romain (311–476)* (Rome: Pont. Institut. Orient. Studiorum, 1972) 28.

was a universal practice in the West. Of these, I shall comment here only on the last two.<sup>2</sup>

It has occasionally been claimed that Mass began to be celebrated daily ca. 200.<sup>3</sup> This date is arrived at by assuming that every mention of the reception of the body of Christ is a reference to the celebration of the Eucharist; but so to assume is to ignore the ambiguous character of texts which could refer either to the celebration of Mass or to the private reception of Communion at home. A more discriminating approach suggests now that the late fourth century is the earliest date for a well-established daily Eucharist.<sup>4</sup> Because evidence is scanty, there is a temptation to generalize too readily. St. Cyprian speaks unmistakably of a daily Mass in the 250's, but his remarks do not necessarily demonstrate that it was a universal practice or one that continued. According to R. Kottje, it was probably exceptional and limited to Carthage. He bases this conclusion on the lack of references to daily Mass for a hundred years afterwards and from the historical circumstances which provide, in the Decian persecution, reason for frequent Eucharists at that time.<sup>5</sup> But the same sorts of arguments can be advanced against the opinion that daily Mass began to be a common practice at the end of the fourth century: the evidence is scattered, most of it coming from a single source—the ascetical movement—and, as we shall see, none of it is without ambiguity; furthermore, there are strong indications that Mass was not said daily and whole regions about whose liturgical practice we know next to nothing.

Similarly, it can be too quickly concluded that *cottidianus* means “each and every day.” Like its English equivalent, “daily,” *cottidianus* bears several shades of meaning: “every day,” “everyday” (commonplace), “usual,” “frequent,” “continual,” and even “weekday.”<sup>6</sup> Moreover, the development of the Church year, especially the feast of Easter in its

<sup>2</sup> Despite frequent references to ritual purity, no serious study has been made of its motivation, its significance, and its extent in Christianity. In another article, “Clerical Continence in the Fourth Century,” *TS* 41 (1980) 3–50, I have criticized the narrowness of the theory that derives absolute continence exclusively from the juxtaposition of daily Mass and ritual purity.

<sup>3</sup> Böhmer, “Die Entstehung” 11; cf. F. Probst, *Sakramente und Sakramentalien in den drei ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen: [no pub.] 1872) 234–35.

<sup>4</sup> Kottje, “Das Aufkommen” 220; cf. V. Monachino, *La cura pastorale a Milano, Cartagine e Roma nel secolo IV* (Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1947) 52–60, 192–93, 354–55; J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite 1* (2 vols., New York: Benziger, 1951) 247.

<sup>5</sup> Kottje, “Das Aufkommen” 218–28. H. Hammerich (“Der tägliche Empfang der Eucharistie im 3. Jahrhundert,” *ZKG* 84 [1973] 93–95) denies that daily Mass was exceptional for third-century Africa; but of course this does not necessarily imply that Mass was said every day throughout the West at that time.

<sup>6</sup> “cottidie,” “cottidianum,” *Thesaurus linguae latinae* 4 (Leipzig, 1900–) 1089–91. For *cottidie* used as “weekday,” cf. Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem* 2, 21 (CCL 1, 499); Paulinus,

preparation and continuation, gave occasion for more frequent liturgical celebrations. Hence, sometimes *cottidie* may best be translated as "every day during Holy Week or during Paschaltide." Instances of this use are found in sermons preached on the Lord's Prayer to the newly baptized. *Panem nostrum cottidianum da nobis hodie* was applied to the Eucharist which was received by the new Christians at daily Mass during the Easter season.<sup>7</sup> This sentence was by no means applied only to the Eucharist.<sup>8</sup>

These observations indicate that an examination of specific texts that speak about the frequency of Mass should be preceded by a study of the private reception of Communion and the general norms governing Christian worship.

#### THE PRIVATE RECEPTION OF COMMUNION

Evidence for extraliturgical Communion at any time is very slight, with the exception of viaticum. Before the fourth century the practice of private Communion in the home is attested to in the West only incident-

*Vita Ambrosii* 38 (PL 14, 40); Ambrose, *De institutione virginis* 4, 31 (PL 16, 312-13); Gregory I, *Epistolarum liber* 9 12 (PL 77, 956; *MGH Epistolae* 2, 59); *La règle du maître* 75 (SC 106, 312); H. A. Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1894) 242. Cf. A. Häussling (*Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeier* [Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1973] 258-62), who translates *missa cotidiana dominicalis* as usual Sunday Mass. Peter Chrysologus (*Sermo* 70 [PL 52, 400]) interprets *cottidie* as representing the continuous existence of heaven: "Sed quia ipse est panis qui de coelo descendit, petimus et precamur ut ipsum panem quo quotidie, id est, jugiter, sumus in aeternitate victuri; hodie, id est, in praesenti vita, de convivio altaris sancti ad virtutem corporis mentisque capiamus;" cf. also *Sermo* 71 (PL 52, 402).

<sup>7</sup> *Itinerarium Egeriae* 24, 1 and 7 (CCL 175, 67 and 69); cf. Monachino, *La cura pastorale* 52-60. Ambrose, *De sacramentis* 5, 4, 25-26 (SC 25<sup>bis</sup>, 132-34); Augustine, *Serm.* 56-59, 227 (PL 38, 377-402 and 1099), *Sermo de sancto pascha II* (ed. G. Morin, *Miscellanea Agostiniana* 1 [Rome: Tipografia Poliglotta Vaticana, 1930] 693); cf. J. P. Bouhot, "Une ancienne homélie catéchétique pour la tradition de l'oraison dominicale," in *Ecclesia orans: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Père Adalbert G. Hamman* (= *Augustinianum* 20:1-2 [1980]) 69-78; J. Schmitz, *Gottesdienst im altchristlichen Mailand* (Cologne: Hanstein, 1975) 228-29.

<sup>8</sup> Augustine demonstrates his awareness of various interpretations of this phrase in the Easter sermons (n. 7 above) and in *Ep.* 130 21 (CSEL 44, 63-64) and *De sermone domini in monte* 2, 7, 25-27 and 2, 10, 37 (CCL 35, 113-16 and 127). Hilary of Poitiers (*Fragmenta minora* B.III [CSEL 65, 231]) interprets *cottidianum* as inviting a daily prayer that Christ, the bread from heaven, dwell within the Christian. This does not exclude daily (private?) Communion, but Böhmer ("Die Entstehung" 12) is surely going beyond the evidence to conclude from this passage that Mass was said every day in Gaul ca. 360. J. P. Bock, *Die Brotbitte des Vaterunsers* (Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1911), is a study of various interpretations of the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer. Cf. also the collection of texts by F. J. Vivès, *Expositio in orationem dominicam iuxta traditionem patristicam et theologicam* (Rome: Typis Artificum a S. Josepho, 1903) 196-206; also H. Pètré, "Les leçons du *panem nostrum quotidianum*," *RSR* 40 (1951-52 [*Mélanges Jules Lebreton* 2]) 63-79, and Raymond Brown, "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," *TS* 22 (1961) 175-208, esp. 194-99.

tally,<sup>9</sup> and in the fourth century references are not more numerous. Some studies associate the private reception of Communion with the special needs of Christians during persecutions, so that it would have disappeared after 313 with the advent of more frequent public liturgies. This opinion is strengthened by the facts that in the fourth century the sacred species began to be reserved in church buildings and Christians tended to refrain from receiving Communion out of reverence for the Sacrament. But unmistakable references to private Communion in the fourth century support the opposing view that it may have continued into the fifth century.<sup>10</sup> Mention of a daily reception of the Lord's body will necessarily imply that the Eucharist was celebrated every day only if private Communion was no longer customary. Of course, nothing prevents the simultaneous existence of daily Mass and private Communion, and there could well have been a period of overlap in which the old custom of extraliturgical Communion continued after regular weekday Masses had become common.

A few incidents have been recorded which show that the laity had access to the consecrated species. St. Ambrose mentions an event involving consecrated bread taken on a journey. One of St. Augustine's associates, blind from birth, regained his sight while still a child after his mother had applied the consecrated Host to his eyes in the form of a poultice. Zeno of Verona, speaking of the difficulties which face the Christian wife of a pagan, uses a curious phrase which seems to indicate that the host could be taken home: *blasphemabitur deus arreptoque forsitan ipso sacrificio tuo tuum pectus obtundet. . .*<sup>11</sup> Parallels in pagan-

<sup>9</sup> Tertullian, *De oratione* 19 (CCL 1, 267-68), *Ad uxorem* 2, 5, 2 (CCL 1, 389); Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition* 32, 1-4 (ed. G. Dix [London: SPCK, 1937] 58-59); Cyprian, *De lapsis* 26 (CSEL 3/1, 256); Ps.-Cyprian (Novatian), *De spectaculis* 5, 5 (CSEL 3/3, 8); Damasus (Carmen 18 [PL 13, 392]) describes the death of the martyr Tarcisius, who was carrying *Christi sacramenta* at the time of his death. "He was therefore perhaps engaged in distributing the sacrament officially" (W. H. Freestone, *The Sacrament Reserved* [London: Alcuin Club, 1917] 19); cf. A. A. King, *Eucharistic Reservation in the Western Church* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1965) 4; O. Nussbaum, *Die Aufbewahrung der Eucharistie* (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1979) 37-55. Convenient collections of texts referring to the Eucharist can be found in P. Browe, *De frequenti communione in ecclesia occidentali usque ad annum c. 1000 documenta varia* (Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1932), and J. Solano, *Textos eucarísticos primitivos* (2 vols.; Madrid: BAC, 1952).

<sup>10</sup> Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite* 2, 359-61; King, *Reservation* 26-28; J. O. Cobham, "Sunday and Eucharist," *Studia liturgica* 2 (1963) 15-16; M. Righetti, *Manuale di storia liturgica* 3 (3rd ed.; Milan: Ancora, 1966) 554-56; G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (2nd ed.; Westminster: Dacre, 1945) 441.

<sup>11</sup> Ambrose, *De excessu fratris* 1, 43 (CSEL 73, 232-33). King (*Reservation* 23-25) presents later examples of hosts being taken on journeys which, in Ireland, continued into the 12th century. Freestone (*Sacrament Reserved* 55-56) thinks that this was peculiar to Irish monasticism. Augustine, *Opus imperfectum contra Julianum* 3, 1962 (CSEL 85/1, 467-68). Zeno of Verona, *Tractatus* 2 7 8, 15 (CCL 22, 175). The *eulogia* sent by Paulinus of Nola to

ism to the incidents in Ambrose and Zeno collected by F. X. Dölger imply that such practices were common among both Christians and pagans in the fourth century.<sup>12</sup> A desire for viaticum would also have encouraged the reservation of the Sacrament in private houses, especially as there was an almost superstitious wish to receive it *in articulo mortis*.<sup>13</sup>

Sure evidence for the frequent private reception of Communion is provided by St. Jerome. He makes a disparaging comment about its Roman form in *Epistola 49* (393):

I know it is the custom at Rome that the faithful always (*semper*) receive the body of Christ, which I neither censure nor endorse; "every man abounds in his own sense." But I appeal to the consciences of those persons who communicate on the same day after intercourse even though, in the words of Persius, they "cleanse off the night in a stream." Why do they not dare to go to the martyrs? Why do they not enter churches? Is Christ one thing in public and another at home? What is not allowable in church cannot be allowable at home.<sup>14</sup>

He refers incidentally in his commentary on Ezekiel to Jesus as our heavenly bread to be had *semper* in heaven and *cotidie* on earth, and in

Sulpicius Severus (*Ep. 5 21* [CSEL 29, 38–39]), to Alypius (*Ep. 3 6* [CSEL 29, 18]), printed with Augustine's letters as *Ep. 24* [CSEL 34, 78]), and by Augustine to Paulinus (*Ep. 31 9* [CSEL 54, 9]) may have been the consecrated bread, but it was more likely blessed bread. Cf. "eulia," *Thesaurus* 5, 1048; J. Bingham, *The Antiquities of the Christian Church* 15, 2, 5 and 17, 4, 8 (5 [London: William Straker, 1834] 210–11, 322). Although Innocent I (*Ep. 25 8*, ed. P. Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum* [Paris: Delatour et Coustelier, 1721; reprinted by Gregg: Farnborough, 1967] 861–62) excluded suburban priests from receiving part of the bread consecrated at the bishop's altar because their churches were too far away, this need not mean that the Eucharistic bread was never sent from one bishop to another. Cf. Dix, *Shape* 134; King, *Reservation*, 8–11, 13–15.

<sup>12</sup> F. J. Dölger, "Antike und christliche Weihbrotstempel?" *Antike und Christentum* 1 (1929) 5–12; id., "Die Eucharistie als Reiseschutz: Die Eucharistie in den Händen der Laien," *ibid.* 5 (1936) 232–47; A. Paredi, "La liturgia di Sant'Ambrogio," *Sant'Ambrogio nel XVI centenario della nascita* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1940) 93.

<sup>13</sup> *Vita Ambrosii* 47 (PL 14, 43): "... obtulit sancto Domini corpus: quo accepto ubi glutivit, emisit spiritum, bonum viaticum secum ferens." *Santa Melania Giuniore, Senatrice Romana* 68, ed. M. Rampolla del Tindaro (Rome: Tipografia Vaticana, 1905) 39: "Consuetudo autem est Romanis ut cum animae egrediuntur, communio Domini in ore sit." Both Melania (*Santa Melania* 66–67 [Rampolla 39]) and her uncle Volusianus (in the Greek life, *Vie de sainte Mélanie* 55 [SC 90, 236]) received Communion three times on their deathbeds, the third being at the moment of death. The practice of putting the consecrated host in the mouth of a corpse was forbidden by various synods: Hippo (393), Carthage III (397), Auxerre (583/603), Trullo (692); cf. King, *Reservation* 17–18. A good discussion of viaticum is provided by G. Grabka, "Christian Viaticum: A Study of Its Cultural Background," *Traditio* 9 (1953) 1–43. Cf. Nussbaum, *Aufbewahrung* 62–101.

<sup>14</sup> *Ep. 49 15* (CSEL 54, 377). Freestone (*Sacrament Reserved* 40, n. 2) observes: "*Semper* may mean every day, or more probably, from the context, under all circumstances; in any case, private reservation is implied."

*Epistola 71* (398) says that daily reception of the Eucharist was allowed in both Rome and Spain.<sup>15</sup> Jerome mentions daily Communion at Rome again in an explanation of the parable of the prodigal son:

The fatted calf which is immolated for the salvation of penitents is the Savior himself, whose flesh we eat daily (*cotidie*), whose blood we drink. . . . "And they began to feast." This banquet is celebrated daily (*cotidie*), the father receives back his son daily (*cotidie*); Christ is always (*semper*) being immolated for those who believe in him.<sup>16</sup>

The reception of the blood as well as of the body of Christ and the repeated *immolatur* may imply that this passage refers to daily Mass rather than to private Communion. At the risk of being more precise than Jerome, we may note that *cotidie* is applied here only to the reception of Communion. In fact, as we shall see later, there was no daily Eucharist at Rome in 383, when this was written. The *semper* modifying *immolatur* may constitute a reference to the continuous "liturgy" of heaven.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, there are a few, very slight, indications that during private Communion the faithful received the blood as well as the body of Christ.<sup>18</sup>

These considerations throw light on a passage from the Latin Life of St. Melania:

<sup>15</sup> *Commentarii in Hiezechielem* 6, 18, 5/9 (CCL 75, 239): "*Panem nostrum substantium (sive superuenturum) da nobis, ut quem postea semper accepturi sumus, in praesenti saeculo cotidie mereamur accipere.*" Cf. *Ep. 71* 6 (CSEL 55, 6–7). In this passage *cotidie* and *semper* mean that the Eucharist could be received on any day, fast or feast; the emphasis is not on receiving Communion each and every day. Jerome knew something about Spain; cf. *Epp. 69, 75, 76*. He may also have received information from Pope Damasus, who was *natione Spanus* (*Le Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne 1 [Paris: E. Thorin, 1886] 212); Jerome was secretary to Damasus from 382–84. J. Labourt (*Saint Jérôme: Lettres* [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1949] 123, n. 1) identifies *Ep. 22* 13 as another instance of the Roman custom of private Communion on the basis of *Epp. 69* and *71*.

<sup>16</sup> *Ep. 21* 26 and 27 (CSEL 54, 129).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. the use of *semper* in Jerome, *In Hiezech. 6, 18, 5/9*, quoted in n. 15 above. The heavenly liturgy is referred to in Ambrose, *De sacram. 4, 6, 27* (SC 25<sup>bis</sup>, 116); cf. Dix, *Shape* 304; Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* 2, 231.

<sup>18</sup> J. M. Ford ("A Note on Didache ix. and x," *Studia liturgica* 5 [1966] 55–56) suggests that the ceremony described in these chapters for reception of the Eucharistic cup and bread may refer to reception of the Sacrament reserved in the home. Jerome (*Ep. 125* 20 [CSEL 56, 141]) praises Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, for what seems to be the bringing of Communion under both species to the ill or as viaticum. Communion under both species was received daily in monasteries that followed the *Regula magistri*; cf. *La règle du maître*, ed. A. de Vogüé (SC 105, 106) 1, 63–64 and 2, 102–4. There may well have been a practice of softening the privately-reserved consecrated bread by dipping it into wine, which would have been consecrated by contact. Something of this sort seems referred to by Eusebius (*H.E. 6, 44* [PG 20, 632–33]). M. Andrieu (*Immixtio et consecratio* [Paris: A. Picard, 1924] 114–41; this book was originally published as a series of articles in *RevScRel* 2–4 [1922–24]) provides other, later examples. Cf. Eoin de Bhaldraithe, "Problems of the Monastic Conventual Mass," *Downside Review* 90 (1972) 181.

She never took bodily nourishment without first receiving in Communion the body of the Lord—which she would receive for the sure salvation of her soul—although (*quamquam*) the custom among the Romans is to communicate each day (*per singulos dies*). At first Peter, the most blessed of the apostles, when he exercised the office of bishop, and then the blessed Paul, who completed his life there, established this tradition.<sup>19</sup>

If Melania received Communion only before her meals, she may not have received Communion every day despite the fact (*quamquam*) that the Roman Church did. By the time of her sojourn in Africa (410–17), she had extended her fasts to such an extent that she ate only on Saturdays and Sundays,<sup>20</sup> that Saturday was a fast day in Rome shows that Melania's monastery in Jerusalem was not altogether Roman. As Mass was offered on Fridays and Sundays at her monastery, she may have received private Communion only on Saturdays.<sup>21</sup>

A reference to Melania in the Life of Peter the Iberian has generally been taken as proof that the "apostolic Roman custom" was a daily Mass celebrated on aliturgical days for Melania alone by her chaplain, Geronius, in the oratory of the monastery.<sup>22</sup> But this Life, which was composed in Greek about 500 and is extant only in a Syriac translation, must be reckoned as a remote witness to the Roman Church of the fourth century.

<sup>19</sup> *Santa Melania* 62 (Rampolla 36). The *vita* was written shortly after her death in 438. The relationship between the Latin and Greek versions is uncertain; cf. A. d'Alès, "Les deux vies de sainte Mélanie la Jeune," *AnBoll* 25 (1906) 401–50. H. Thurston ("The Editorial Labours of Cardinal Rampolla," *Month* 108 [1906] 510) is "inclined to believe that the author . . . wrote the Life in both languages, modifying his text at a later date in accordance with the audience he conceived himself to be addressing;" cf. *ibid.* 517, n. 2.

<sup>20</sup> *Vie de Mél.* 22 (SC 90, 174). Ambrose's sister Marcellina also fasted for days at a time; cf. *De virginibus* 3, 4, 15 (ed. I Cazzaniga [Turin: Paravia, 1948] 64).

<sup>21</sup> *Vie de Mél.* 48 (SC 90, 218). The Life clearly states that Mass was celebrated at Melania's monastery on Fridays and Sundays (*ibid.*) but not on Saturdays, contrary to the universal custom of the East. Socrates, *H.E.* 5, 22 (PG 67, 635); Sozomen, *H.E.* 8, 19 (PG 67, 1478); cf. John Cassian, *De institutis coenobiorum* 3, 2 (CSEL 17, 34); Augustine, *Ep.* 54 2 (CSEL 34, 160). Canon 49 of the Council of Laodicea (320) forbade the celebration of the Eucharist during Lent on any weekday other than Saturday (Mansi 2, 571); and in Jerusalem, at least, there was a vigil starting on Friday evening and finishing with the Saturday morning Mass (*Itinerarium Egeriae* 27, 7–8 [CCL 175, 74]). Vigils were an essential part of Melania's religious observance; cf. *Vie de Mél.* 5, 23, 42, 46 (SC 90, 134, 174, 208, 216). Perhaps what is described as a Friday Mass was a vigil service beginning Friday evening that was completed on Saturday morning with the Eucharist; afterwards Melania would have had her Saturday meal.

<sup>22</sup> R. Raabe, *Petrus der Iberer: Ein Charakterbild zur Kirchen- und Sittengeschichte des fünften Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1895) 31 (Syriac text), 36 (German translation): "... often on one day of the week—especially on Sunday—there were three assemblies for divine services: one on the holy mountain, one in that monastery for men, and one in that monastery for women. Then, on the other days he conducted daily private divine service for the blessed Melania, as was the custom of the Church of Rome" (my translation from

One might query the assertion that the daily service conducted for Melania was Mass, since the Syriac word used is a general term that includes any church service.<sup>23</sup> It has been assumed to refer to Mass because of its context. Gerontius is said often to have offered three services, especially on Sundays: one at the Church of Ascension and one at each of the monasteries under Melania. Then it is stated that, following the Roman custom, he offered a daily service for Melania alone. Even granted that the Sunday service would have been the Mass, as it surely was, the daily service need not necessarily have been a full Eucharistic celebration; for there would have been some ceremony in administering private Communion. And even if it is accepted that Gerontius celebrated Mass every day for Melania, it does not follow necessarily that this was a Roman custom. Melania had been in Africa and Egypt, and their observance would have influenced her own. As there was almost certainly daily Mass at Hippo,<sup>24</sup> Melania may have brought from Rome the daily, private reception of Communion and from Africa the placement of this in a full Eucharistic celebration. In this case it would simply have been assumed in the Life of Peter that Melania's well-known Roman origin accounted for anything that was not usual in the East.

But even if we assume that daily Mass was Roman, we must ask exactly what the Roman custom would have been. Was it daily Mass offered for ascetics in their private oratories? For this there is little evidence, especially as the liturgical life of the early ascetics centered on their local church and the martyrs' shrines. In fact, there was a long tradition in Western monasticism of not attending daily Mass, much less of having it in the oratory of the monastery.<sup>25</sup> It would be rash to imagine on the basis of this passage that every Roman priest, or that many of them,

---

the German). This is taken as proof of a daily Eucharist by E. Dekkers ("Liturgie et vie spirituelle aux premiers siècles," *La maison Dieu* 69 [1962] 31-32), J. Schümmer (*Die altchristliche Fastenpraxis mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schriften Tertullians* [Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1933] 117), Schmitz (*Gottesdienst* 248), and Jungmann (*Mass of the Roman Rite* 1, 214, n. 14).

<sup>23</sup> I have consulted P. Parvis, O.P., on the Syriac text.

<sup>24</sup> This will be discussed later.

<sup>25</sup> Communal reception of Communion *extra missam* in Italy and Gaul is well attested by documents of sixth-century monasticism; cf. A. de Vogüé, "Scholies sur la règle du maître," *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 44 (1968) 122-25. According to the *Regula magistri* 45 (SC 106, 208), the monks heard Mass in the local church on Sundays and (ibid. 21 [SC 106, 102-4; cf. SC 105, 63-64]) received Communion in the private oratory of the monastery on other days. The implication is that the monks were following the custom of the Church at that time. Regarding the provenance of the *Regula magistri*, de Vogüé (SC 105, 233) concludes that the RM was written in the first quarter of the sixth century in the environs of Rome, to the southeast, where the influence of the Eternal City made itself felt. Cf. id., "Problems of the Monastic Coenual Mass," *Downside Review* 87 (1969) 329; de Baldrathe, "Conventual Mass"; A. Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeyer* (Münster



celebrated a daily Eucharist. The setting is ascetical, and we must look there for a satisfactory account of the origins and extent of a frequent Eucharist. The adjective "apostolic" also merits attention. It is difficult to estimate the age of a custom described as "apostolic," but we may safely set its beginning at least a few decades before Melania's birth ca. 383. This is to postulate a daily Mass in Rome much earlier than other evidence would lead us to expect. On the other hand, the practice of private Communion was certainly old enough to merit the title "apostolic."

All in all, I am inclined to think that Melania did have Mass every day in her monastery, but that this was an African rather than a Roman custom.

A better indication of the Roman observance is provided by the monastery at Bethlehem founded by Jerome and Paula, who had come directly from Rome, prided themselves on their Roman Christianity, and remained in close contact with the Latin Church.<sup>26</sup> In Bethlehem, it seems, Mass was not said daily. *Epistola 108* (404) indicates that the ascetics attended Sunday Mass at the Basilica of the Nativity,<sup>27</sup> and the fact that, when the monastery was placed under interdict by John of Jerusalem during the Origenist controversy, Jerome's brother, Paulinian, was forcibly ordained to say Mass for the community suggests that ordinarily there was no Mass in the monastic buildings at Bethlehem. The "apostolic Roman custom" seems to have been daily private Communion. That it was extraliturgical is indicated by its being received before ordinary food,<sup>28</sup> a practice not limited to Rome. Rufinus' Latin version of *Historia monachorum*, which Melania would have known, records that certain Egyptian monks received Communion each day before eating.<sup>29</sup>

---

in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1973) 24. The *Regula Benedicti* allows for the offering of Mass in the oratory of the monastery but without specifying if Mass was said every day; cf. *La règle de saint Benoît* (SC 181, 104–6). Jungmann (*Mass of the Roman Rite* 1, 199, especially n. 18) has gathered instances of medieval religious priests merely communicating at a conventual Mass without having celebrated elsewhere; cf. R. Grégoire, "La communion des moines-prêtres à la messe d'après les coutumiers médiévaux," *Sacris erudiri* 18 (1967–68) 524–49; P. Browe, *Beiträge zur Sexualethik des Mittelalters* (Breslau: Müller und Seiffert, 1932) 111.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome* (London: Duckworth, 1975) 23, 141, 179–80.

<sup>27</sup> Section 20 (CSEL 55, 335); cf. *Vie de Mél.* (SC 90, 98, n. 2): "... le silence de tous les textes, à propos de ces offices comme au moment des querelles qui suivirent l'ordination de Paulinien, font supposer avec assez de vraisemblance qu'on n'y disait pas la Messe."

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Tertullian, *De oratione* 19 (CCL 1, 267–68); *Ad uxorem* 2 5, 2 (CCL 1, 389); Cyprian, *De lapsis* 26 (CSEL 3/1, 256); Ps.-Cyprian, *De spectaculis* 5, 5 (CSEL 3/1, 8).

<sup>29</sup> *Historia monachorum* 7 (PL 21, 418): "Consuetudo autem erat ei non prius corporalem cibum sumere, quam spiritalem Christi communionem acciperet. Quo accepto, post gratiarum actionem adhortari nos etiam ad reficiendum coepit." Rufinus was the cofounder of a

Jerome's own attitude towards the priesthood fits in with this interpretation. In *Epistola 14* (376–77) he states that the monastic and priestly vocations are radically separate, an attitude confirmed later in his *Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum* (396), where he claims to have accepted ordination on the condition that it would not interfere with his calling as a monk. Another document from the controversy with John confirms Jerome's attitude towards orders. Epiphanius of Salamis wrote a long letter defending his ordination of Jerome's brother, Paulinian. We have the letter only in Jerome's translation; according to it, Jerome and Vincent, both priests, had refused to celebrate Mass for the monastic community because of their "modesty and humility," even though there was no one else to do so.<sup>30</sup> It may even be that Jerome, from the time of his ordination and including his stay in Rome, did not say Mass at all, much less daily. While this is a little to the side of the question of daily Mass, it indicates that not all priests felt obliged to celebrate every day. At the same time, however, Jerome recognized that many ascetics were properly called to the priesthood, and he extolled the monastic life as a preparation for the reception of orders. But he meant nothing more in this than that a selection of ordinands from his ascetical friends was the best assurance that the requisite virtues would be present. This says nothing about the practice of monks, unordained or ordained, who remained in the monastery,<sup>31</sup> nor does it represent any radical change in Jerome's attitudes or actions. The conventions of friendship and grief as they were expressed in widely-read public letters precluded equally criticism of friends and praise of foes.

The Milanese liturgy of Ambrose is noteworthy on two counts: first, that we know something about it; and secondly, Milan was an important civil and ecclesiastical center which was to some extent influenced by the theology and practice of the Greek Church.<sup>32</sup>

Ambrose's *Sermon 8* on Psalm 118 (ca. 389) has been interpreted as indicating that there was evening Mass in Milan on full fast days, but it may well be a reference to private reception of Communion before the

double monastery in Jerusalem with Melania's grandmother, Melania the Elder. He returned to Italy in 397, nine years before Melania left Rome. For Melania's visits to Egypt, cf. *Vie de Mél.* 34, 37–39 (SC 90, 190–92 and 196–202).

<sup>30</sup> *Ep. 14 8* (CSEL 54, 55–56); *Liber contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum* 41 (PL 23, 393); *Ep. 51 1* (CSEL 54, 396).

<sup>31</sup> *Ep. 52 1* and 4 (CSEL 54, 413–14 and 421); *Ep. 125 8* and 20 (CSEL 56, 127); Siricius, *Ep. 1* 13, 17 (Coustant, 635–36); cf. P. Rousseau, *Ascetics, Authority, and the Church* (Oxford: Oxford Univ., 1978) 125–32. Rousseau exaggerates Jerome's change in attitude.

<sup>32</sup> P. Borella (*Il rito ambrosiano* [Brescia: Morcelliana, 1964] 79–92) describes Eastern elements in the Ambrosian liturgy but among these excludes the frequency of the Eucharist (id., "La comunione extra missam," *Ambrosius* 29 [1953] 85); cf. also E. Cattaneo, "Rito ambrosiano e liturgia orientale," *Ambrosius* 25 (1949) 138–61.

evening meal. In section 47 Ambrose comments on Moses' offering of the paschal lamb in sacrifice at evening. In section 48<sup>33</sup> he uses this to understand the Christian practice of ending a fast day with the "heavenly banquet" which provides protection from the dangers of night. Ambrose observes that on most days Communion is received at noon, at the celebration of the Eucharist. In contrast, on a fast day Communion is received in the evening (*non longe est finis diei*), a practice recommended by Ambrose because the enemy would not enter a chamber where Christ was present. It is the word *sacrificium* (*admonet etiam sacrificium vespertinum*) which has been taken as proof that Ambrose is referring to the celebration of Mass.<sup>34</sup> But the subject of *admonet* is Moses, who in describing the sacrificial Lamb of the OT also foretold the Christian Eucharist. Furthermore, the celebration of Mass is not necessarily indicated by *sacrificium*, a word used for the consecrated species and even for the unconsecrated bread and wine.<sup>35</sup> The contrast made by Ambrose, then, seems to be between the public liturgy at noon on most days and the reception of Communion before retiring, i.e., in the evening before the evening meal which ended the fast days and was the only meal taken. Supportive of this reading is the fact that there is little evidence for evening Mass in the early Church and into the fourth century. In fact, if my interpretation of this text is correct, there remains no univocal evidence that Mass was normally said in the evening; the instances commonly advanced are either clearly exceptional or inconclusive.<sup>36</sup> In short, there is no compelling reason for taking this sermon as an indi-

<sup>33</sup> *Expositio psalmi 118* 8, 47-48 (CSEL 62, 179-80).

<sup>34</sup> This sermon was preached towards evening on a full fast day at a service during which a pericope from the Book of Wisdom was read (cf. section 23 [CSEL 32, 164]); if, as I suggest, it was not Mass, it would have been Vespers.

<sup>35</sup> A. Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens* (Turnhout: CCL, 1954) 731-32; J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae latinitatis lexicon minus* (Leiden: Brill, 1976). These also show that *sacrificium* was used to indicate the daily offices of psalms and readings. In *De virginibus* 1, 7, 32 (Cazzaniga 16) Ambrose employs it to describe the life of consecrated virginity: "Virgo dei donum est, munus parentis, sacerdotium castitatis. Virgo matris hostia est, cuius cotidiano sacrificio vis divina placatur."

<sup>36</sup> E. Dekkers, "L'Eglise ancienne a-t-elle connu la messe du soir?" *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem L. Cuniberti Mohlberg* (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1948) 231-57; id., "La messe du soir à la fin de l'antiquité et au moyen âge," *Sacris erudiri* 7 (1955) 99-130. Without the support of the passage in Ambrose other bits of evidence lose much of their force, in particular *Itinerarium Egeriae* 27, 6 (CCL 175, 74) and Paulinus of Nola, *Carmen* 23 112 (CSEL 30, 198). In his second article Dekkers points out that, whatever it may have been, the Mass *ad horam nonam* on fast days does not seem to have been as universal or as rapidly widespread as one might ordinarily think. It is only during the Carolingian epoch that one sees it everywhere taken for granted (p. 109). One may safely ignore the thesis of K. Gamber (*Domus ecclesia* [Regensburg: Pustet, 1968]) that the agape in conjunction with the Eucharist continued into the fifth century in the region of Aquileia; it is severely criticized by H. Brackmann, "Die angeblichen eucharistischen Mahlzeiten des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts," *RQ* 65 (1970) 82-97.

cation of evening Mass. It becomes, then, evidence for the practice of private Communion before the only meal of the day on a fast day. The strongest argument against my reading of this passage is the fact that Ambrose nowhere gives a clear indication that private Communion was practiced in Milan; the episode referred to above—Ambrose's brother Satyrus encountering people carrying the consecrated bread with them on a ship—would not, of course, have taken place in Milan.

In *Epistola 54* (400) Augustine mentions daily reception of Communion:

There are other things, to be sure, which vary from place to place and from region to region. Thus it is that some people fast on Saturday, others do not; some receive the Lord's body and blood in Communion daily (*cotidie*), others receive it on certain days; in some places no day passes without the offering being made, in others it is only on Saturday and Sunday or, in yet others, only on Sunday; there is freedom in the observance of the entire category of such things, whatever sort you can come across.<sup>37</sup>

Although Augustine here seems to distinguish Communion from Mass, this passage is not proof of private Communion. The strongly-worded phrase *nullus dies praetermittitur* indicates that in some places there was a daily Mass, and hence the possibility of daily Communion at Mass. Later in this letter<sup>38</sup> Augustine discusses occasional and daily reception. Some wait for a fitting time to receive, and prepare for it by purification and continence. Others respond that only those barred from the altar as penitents should dare to omit the daily medication provided by the body of the Lord. The occasional reception would presumably have been on Sundays and feasts and therefore in a setting of public worship. Daily reception, on the other hand, could have been private sometimes. But the reference to the altar, which is more clearly expressed in other texts,<sup>39</sup> indicates that daily Communion is best placed at a Mass, at least in Hippo.

Additional information comes from Augustine's comments on the Lord's Prayer in *De sermone domini in monte*:

<sup>37</sup> *Ep. 54* 2, 2 (CSEL 34, 160).

<sup>38</sup> *Ep. 54* 3, 4 (CSEL 34, 162-63).

<sup>39</sup> *Tractatus in Iohannis evangelium* 26, 15 (CCL 36, 267): "Huius rei sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum in dominica mensa praeparatur, et de mensa dominica sumitur." *Sermo* 59 3, 6 (PL 38, 401): "... sive quotidianum panem illum intelligamus, quem accepturi estis de altari, bene petimus, ut det nobis eum." This sermon was preached to the newly baptized, who would have attended Mass every day during Eastertide. The reference to daily Communion in *De dono perseverantiae* 4, 7 (PL 45, 998) consists of a quotation from Cyprian used to demonstrate against the Pelagians that perseverance was something to be prayed for; daily reception is not the point of Augustine's use of the quotation, and hence it is not a primary witness for his own practice.

Daily bread . . . refers . . . also to the sacrament of the body of Christ which we daily (*cotidie*) receive. . . It would not be a question of the sacrament of the body of the Lord for the many people in the lands of the East who do not communicate at the Lord's Supper daily (*cotidie*), although this bread has been described as daily (*cotidianus*)!<sup>40</sup>

Nothing here requires in itself that Communion was received only at Mass, especially as, by implication, Augustine is contrasting the entire Latin Church to the Greek. Augustine knew at first hand the Churches of Milan, Rome, and Africa. This passage, then, seems to establish, at least for these three, the daily reception of Communion. The active religious life in Hippo, with its clerical and lay monasteries and its frequent assemblies in church, would have encouraged a public liturgy and frequent Communion.<sup>41</sup> A high Eucharistic piety, however, would encourage those who could not attend public worship to receive privately if this were the custom. The strongest argument in favor of a daily reception of Communion at a daily Mass—at least for Hippo—is the absence of a statement about the private reception of the Sacrament. This makes it likely that for Augustine frequent Communion was a function of frequent Mass. But elsewhere, where there is evidence against the daily celebration of Mass, one may expect that private Communion continued in use.<sup>42</sup>

The Councils of Saragossa (380) and Toledo (400) require that the Eucharist be consumed in church. Sometimes this is interpreted as prohibiting the removal of the Host from the church building, i.e., as opposed to the practice of private Communion. Both of these councils, however, were concerned with the Priscillianists, rigorists who seem to have taught that every Christian should be celibate or continent; they may have refused Communion from clerics who exercised the rights of

<sup>40</sup> *De sermone domini* 2, 7, 25–26 (CCL 35, 113–15). There was a variety in the Eastern Church's observance. Daily, private Communion is described as common among the people and monks of Egypt, and in particular of Alexandria: Basil of Caesarea, *Ep.* 93 (ed. Y. Courtonne [Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957] 203–4); cf. S. Schiwietz, *Das morgenländische Mönchtum* 1 (Mainz: Kirchheim, 1904) 316–21. Regarding Constantinople cf. John Chrysostom, *Homilia 24 in epistolam primam ad Corinthios* (PG 61, 205). John Moschus mentioned private reservation in *Pratum spirituale* 29–30 and 79 (PG 87/3, 2875–78 and 2935–38). Some Eastern Christians kept even a year's supply: John Rufus, *Plerophorion* 38 (ed. F. Nau [Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1912] 87–89). In 519 Bishop Dorotheus of Thessalonica, a Eutychian, distributed consecrated bread by the basket in expectation of persecution by the Catholics: *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*, ed. A. Thiel (Braunsberg: E. Peter, 1868; reprinted Hildesheim and New York: Georg Olms, 1974) 902.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. A. Zumkeller, *Das Mönchtum des heiligen Augustinus* (Würzburg: Augustinus, 1968) 91–99. One should note, however, that Italian and Gallic monasteries had private Communion during the sixth century; cf. n. 18 above.

<sup>42</sup> F. van der Meer, *Augustine the Bishop* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1961) 27.

marriage or whom they found lacking in austerity. Or it may be that the canons were directed against a refusal on the part of the Priscillianists to drink from the chalice. Abstention from even the Eucharistic wine was a Manichean principle that may have been adopted by the Priscillianists; this is to presume that the accusation of being Manichees made against them would have had some basis in fact.<sup>43</sup> The point here is not that the Host was removed but that some refused to communicate at Mass. However the elements designated for private reception may have been distributed, everyone at Mass was expected to receive Communion. Therefore no compelling reason exists for connecting these canons with the private reception of Communion.<sup>44</sup>

#### GENERAL LITURGICAL NORMS

##### *General Observations*

Before particular texts which mention daily Mass are discussed, the general shape of the Latin Church's liturgical and aliturgical celebrations must be examined. The Church calendar was at first very simple: the Resurrection was celebrated every Sunday, and Easter was commemorated annually. But by the end of the fourth century a more elaborate liturgy had evolved. The celebration of the paschal mystery had begun to re-enact liturgically the final week of Christ's life, and during the fifty days of the Easter season Mass was said daily. By this time, too, Christmas was observed and, in places where there was Eastern influence—such as Northern Italy, Gaul, and Spain—the Epiphany.<sup>45</sup> The

<sup>43</sup> Saragossa, can. 3: "Eucharistiae gratiam si quis probatur acceptam in ecclesia non sumpsisse, anathema sit in perpetuum." Toledo I, can. 14: "Si quis autem acceptam a sacerdote eucharistiam non sumpserit, velut sacrilegus propellatur" (Mansi 3, 634 and 1000). Cf. H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976) 23, 174. E. Maffei ("De la réservation eucharistique," *Les questions liturgiques et paroissiales* 26 [1941-42] 81) sees these canons as contributing to the gradual disappearance of private reservation.

<sup>44</sup> Regarding continence cf. Chadwick, *Priscillian* 29, 71, 77, 105-9. The Council of Gangra, ca. 345, can. 4 (Mansi 2, 1101), condemns Eustathians who refused to communicate from married priests. The canons of this Council were included in the earliest Latin collections of Greek councils; cf. *Ecclesiae occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima*, ed. C. H. Turner, 2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913) 145-214. Regarding the obligation to receive Communion at Mass, cf. Righetti, *Storia liturgica* 3, 563; Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* 2, 360-61; Bingham, *Antiquities* 15, 4, 13 (5, 330-32).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. B. Botte, *Les origines de la Noël et de l'Épiphanie* (Paris: Mont César, 1932). Additional evidence that Ambrose celebrated both December 25 and January 6 is provided by A. Mutzenbecher, "Der Festinhalt von Weihnachten und Epiphanie in den echten *Sermones des Maximus Taurinensis*," *Studia patristica* 5: TU 80 (1962) 114-16. H. Chadwick (*Priscillian* 16-17) suggests that "the feast on 25 December made its way into the Spanish calendar more slowly," but that January 6 was observed in the fourth century.

development of Lent as a period of intense preparation for baptism gave occasion for frequent, even daily, assemblies.<sup>46</sup> Insofar as these were initially only for catechumens, Mass was not a part of them. When the baptized began to observe Lent, the character of these synaxes would have gradually altered. At Rome the list of stational churches suggests that such gatherings were held only on Wednesdays and Fridays before 450, and *Epistola 25* (416) of Innocent I seems to indicate that Mass was not celebrated on Fridays or Saturdays.<sup>47</sup> If this were so, the Wednesday assemblies would also probably have been aliturgical. Ambrose (*De mysteriis*) mentions daily gatherings during Lent for the catechumens at which he commented on Genesis and the book of Proverbs.<sup>48</sup> Augustine witnesses to the public recitation of prayers in the church every day of the year, at morning and evening, though there was not always a sermon.<sup>49</sup> In his description of his mother's daily prayers he distinguishes the daily Mass (*nullum diem praetermittentis oblationem ad altare tuum*) from the twofold visits to the church (*bis in die, mane et vespere, ad ecclesiam tuam sine ulla intermissione venientis*). Although Augustine says he preached only on Saturdays and Sundays, there is evidence for more frequent sermons, by Augustine himself and others. Perhaps the twice-weekly sermons occurred at the Eucharist, with additional preaching at

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Ambrose, *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam* 8, 25 (CCL 14, 307): "Ergo per hos quinquaginta dies ieiunium nescit ecclesia sicut dominica, qua dominus resurrexit, et sunt omnes dies tamquam dominica." The conclusion that this implies a daily Mass, at least for Eastertide, is strengthened by quotations from Ambrose and others that will be considered later. Instances of the festal character of the Easter season may be found in Righetti, *Storia liturgica* 2, 294. See Dix, *Shape* 353-57; E. Yarnold, *The Awe-Inspiring Rites of Initiation* (Slough: St. Paul, 1972) 11-14. Cf. Council of Saragossa, can. 2 (Mansi 3, 634): "de quadragesimarum diebus, ab ecclesiis non desint."

<sup>47</sup> Aliturgical Lenten synaxes are discussed in G. Morin, "Liturgie et basiliques de Rome au milieu du VIIe siècle d'après les listes d'évangiles de Würzburg," *RBén* 28 (1911) 323-24; id., "Aliturgiques (jours)," *DACL* 1, 1218-20; M. B. de Soos, *Le mystère liturgique* (Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1958) 42-43; C. Callewaert, "La durée et le caractère du carême ancien," *Sacris erudiri* (Steenbrugge: St-Pieterabdij, 1940) 488-91; A. Chavasse, "Le carême romain et les scrutins prébaptismaux avant le IXe siècle," *RSR* 35 (1948) 328-29; J. A. Jungmann ("Die Quadragesima in den Forschungen von Antoine Chavasse," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 5 [1957] 84-95) severely criticizes Chavasse's research but notes on p. 87 that as early as the time of Leo the Great the Mondays of penitential seasons were observed liturgically, i.e., at least with a service of readings, while the celebration of the Eucharist can be asserted with certainty only from the sixth century. Innocent's *Ep.* 25 7 (Coustant 859) will be discussed below.

<sup>48</sup> *De mysteriis* 1, 1 (SC 25<sup>bis</sup>, 156).

<sup>49</sup> W. Roetzer, *Des heiligen Augustinus Schriften als liturgie-geschichtliche Quelle* (Munich: Hueber, 1930) 10-13; J. A. Jungmann, "Die vormonastische Morgenhore im gallisch-spanischen Raum des 6. Jahrhunderts," *ZKT* 78 (1956) 306-33.

the morning and evening prayers, which in Hippo would have been attended mainly by monks and nuns.<sup>50</sup>

Besides Sundays and the great festivals of Easter and Christmas, the anniversaries of martyrs were honored by liturgical celebration. All of these were public, led by the bishop surrounded by his clergy.<sup>51</sup> Commemorations of the martyrs were few, primarily of those with local significance. In the fourth century, however, some saints, especially those mentioned in the Bible, began to be honored in the major centers of Christendom. An enthusiasm for relics, which led to frequent translations and inventions of the remains of saints, helped the spread of their cults. Nevertheless, liturgical calendars demonstrate that few saints were honored in any given church. The accumulated observances of Sundays, the seasons for Easter and Christmas, and the commemoration of the martyrs would still have left many days of the year without any occasion for offering Mass.<sup>52</sup>

Other celebrations of the Eucharist were restricted to the small circle for whom the Mass was being celebrated. In the fourth century, Mass

<sup>50</sup> A. Zwinggi, "Der Wortgottesdienst bei Augustinus," *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 20 (1970) 92-113, 129-40. Augustine's reference to Monica occurs in *Conf.* 5, 9, 17 (CSEL 33, 104). Zeno of Verona, *Tractatus* 1 37 (2, 13) 3, 10 (CCL 22, 103), commenting on the parable of the Good Samaritan: "... in *stabulo*, id est in ecclesia, quo pecora divina succedunt, venerabili sacramento susceptum cotidianis praedicationum medicaminibus curat." Ambrose, *Ep.* 63 10, *Ep.* 64 1, and *Contra Auxentium* 26 (PL 16, 1192, 1219, and 1015); Augustine, *Confessiones* 5, 9, 17 (CSEL 33, 104); *De vera religione* 3, 5 (CCL 32, 191): "si haec cottidie leguntur in ecclesiis et a sacerdotibus exponuntur"; *In ps.* 66 3 (CCL 39, 860). Augustine's sermons are analyzed by G. G. Willis (London: SPCK, 1962), but his assumption that Mass was said every day and that the sermons were part of the Eucharistic liturgy does not seem to fit some of the sermons: cf. p. 7 n. 10 and p. 8 regarding *Tract. in Ioh.* Cf. also Schmitz, *Gottesdienst* 323, 341. There is no evidence for a regular use of *lectio continua*, day by day; cf. A. Zwinggi, "Die fortlaufende Schriftlesung im Gottesdienst bei Augustinus," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 12 (1970) 85-129.

<sup>51</sup> Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite* 1, 195-97. Innocent I (*Ep.* 25 8 [Coustant 860-61]) indicates that concelebration was the usual practice except for Sundays, when the pastoral needs of the people took precedence: "presbyteri, quia die ipsa propter plebem sibi creditam nobiscum convenire non possunt."

<sup>52</sup> Cf. W. H. Frere, *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy* 1: *The Kalendar* (Oxford: Oxford Univ., 1930); H. Achelis, *Die Martyrologien, ihre Geschichte und ihr Wert* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1900) 6-28; Dix, *Shape* 369-85. The text of the Philocalian Calendar edited by T. Mommsen is found in *Monumenta Germaniae historica: Auctores antiquissimi* 9/1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1892) 71-72. Other examples of early church calendars can be found in Dix, *Shape* 383-85; G. Morin, "L'Année liturgique à Aquilée," *RBén* 19 (1902) 1-12; C. Lambot, "Les sermons de saint Augustin pour les fêtes de martyrs," *AnBoll* 67 (1949) 249-66; Cf. also J. P. Kirsch, *Der stadtrömische christliche Festkalendar im Altertum* (Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1924); T. Klauser, "Ein Kirchenkalendar aus der römischen Titelkirche der heiligen Vier Gekrönten," *Scientia sacra: Theologische Festgabe zugeeignet Karl Joseph Kardinal Schulte* (Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1935) 11-40.



was said at burials and on memorial days, but these may have been entrusted to the priests in the suburban churches adjacent to the cemeteries, especially at Rome, where the old law from pagan times that prohibited burial inside the city was long respected.<sup>53</sup> Masses for the dead are an instance of what later came to be known as votive masses. The Gelasian Sacramentary contains a large number of Masses for special occasions: in bad weather, for peace, against unjust judges, for the sick. Some of these seem public in character, others more personal. As the earliest extant version of the sacramentary was written near Paris around 750 and the Roman material in it is to be dated about a century earlier, little information is provided about the liturgy of the fourth and fifth centuries.<sup>54</sup> It seems likely that these Masses would have come out of celebrations for a small group. I do not see any compelling reason for imagining that these would have taken place in private oratories. Although it is a common opinion that such oratories were numerous among wealthy fourth-century Christians, there is literary evidence for only one, that in the home of Melania the Younger.<sup>55</sup> Archeological investigations

<sup>53</sup> Innocent I, *Ep.* 25 8 (Coustant, 860–61); "Siricius," *Le liber pontificalis* 1, 216; G. G. Willis, *Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy* (London: SPCK, 1968) 7; Schmitz, *Gottesdienst* 251–52, 273–77. Regarding memorial Masses cf. E. Freistedt, *Altchristliche Totengedächtnistage und ihre Beziehung zum Jenseitsglauben und Totenkultus der Antike* (Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1928) 30–37, 47–52, 75–76; Jungmann, *Mass of the Roman Rite* 1, 217–19; Monachino, *La cura pastorale* 192; A. Paredi, "La liturgia di Sant' Ambrogio," *Sant' Ambrogio nel XVI centenario della nascita* (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1940) 148–50. Regarding burial outside the city walls, cf. Schmitz, *Gottesdienst* 285.

<sup>54</sup> H. A. J. Wegman, *Geschichte der Liturgie im Westen und Osten* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1979) 123–24. The individual character of some of the prayers and Masses is demonstrated by *Oratio ad missam pro sterilitate mulierum* or *Oratio pro eo qui prius barbam tondet*. Cf. A. Chavasse, *Le sacramentaire Gélisien* (Paris: Desclée, 1958) 460–61. The text of the sacramentary can be found in *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, ed. L. C. Mohlberg (Rome: Herder, 1960), and *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, ed. Wilson.

<sup>55</sup> *Vie de Mél.* 5 (SC 90, 134). From this passage and *Vita Ambrosii* 10 (PL 14, 30) it has been concluded that private oratories were common; cf. Schmitz, *Gottesdienst* 248. J. P. Kirsch, "I santuari domestici de martiri nei titoli romani ed altri simili santuari nelle chiese cristiane e nelle case private de fedeli," *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, ser. 3 (1923–24) 27–43. P. Testini ("L' Oratorio scoperto al 'Monte della Guistizia' presso la Porta Viminale a Roma," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana* 44 [1968] 248–51) describes oratories, but the examples he gives, with the exception of Melania's, are not necessarily private. That in the palace of Constantine would more likely have been a public place of worship for the court; at least, the tent-church which accompanied him on his campaigns is described as being used both by Constantine and the army. The references to Basil of Caesarea and the sister of Gregory of Nazianzus do not require private oratories. Only the reference from Gregory the Great mentions an episcopal oratory unambiguously, and its use for Mass was in exceptional circumstances. Country estates of Christians would have had chapels for their large households. Such would seem to be those mentioned by Augustine (*De vera religione* 3, 5 [CCL 32, 191]; cf. van der Meer, *Augustine* 27), canon 5 of Toledo I (Mansi 3, 999), and Sidonius Apollinaris (*Ep.* 8 4, 1 [PL 58, 592] and *Carmen*

have not produced any at all.<sup>56</sup> Evidence for house Masses is almost as scarce. In *Vita Ambrosii* Ambrose is said to have once celebrated Mass in the house of a wealthy Roman matron.<sup>57</sup> Other references suggest that in the West house Masses were rare and independent of the existence of any private oratory. The Council of Carthage allows them only with the permission of the bishop, and the two other instances known both occurred in extraordinary circumstances: Augustine mentions Mass said in a haunted house to exorcise the demon, and Paulinus of Nola had Mass said at his deathbed.<sup>58</sup>

Independent of Eucharistic observances but relevant to them was the development of the Christian fasts. The earliest were observed on Wednesdays and Fridays—stational days—on which no food was taken

---

22 218 [PL 54, 729]): Testini ("L'Oratorio scoperto" 249) says that they were in fact little rural family churches. John Chrysostom (*In Acta apostolorum homelia 18 4* [PL 60, 147]) directed every landowner to build a church on his estate. There probably were, in fact, oratories in the homes of wealthy and devout Christians; Jerome (*Ep. 39 1* [CSEL 54, 294]), e.g., implies that the noble ascetics would have had a special room to chant their psalms. But evidence for such oratories, and for their use as Eucharistic chapels, is slight and inferential.

<sup>56</sup> Although G. De Rossi in a widely quoted article ("Oratorio privato del secolo quarto scoperto nel monte della Giustizia presso le terme Diocleziane," *Bollettino di archeologia cristiana*, ser. 3, no. 1 [1876] 37–58) reports the discovery of such an oratory, it seems to have been a place of public worship, and probably fifth century; cf. Testini, "L'Oratorio scoperto" 250–51. The evidence assembled by Rampolla (*Vita Melaniae* 246–50) for the existence of private oratories is meager and inconclusive. Kirsch ("I santuari domestici") discusses mainly *domus ecclesiae*, which were places of public worship. His section on private oratories (pp. 41–43) is based on De Rossi's article and the life of Melania.

<sup>57</sup> N. 55 above.

<sup>58</sup> According to canon 9 of Carthage II (390; Mansi 3, 695), these Masses were common among the priests of certain districts in spite of their bishops' wishes. *De civitate dei* 22, 8 (CCL 48, 820). Uranius, "Epistola de obitu Paulini" 2, *Acta sanctorum Iunii* 5 (Paris: Victor Palme, 1867) 198. Melania heard Mass on her deathbed—on a Sunday, *Vie de Mel.* 66 (SC 90, 262–64). The question of private Masses is thoroughly examined by J. Wagner, *Altchristliche Eucharistiefeyer im kleinen Kreis* (unpublished thesis; Bonn, 1949). He has collected many texts which demonstrate or imply that Mass was offered in informal circumstances when pastoral needs demanded it: by missionaries, for the dead, during persecution by pagans or harassment by heretics. (Perhaps canon 9 of Carthage II reflects the desire of the bishops to control private Masses necessitated by difficulties with the Donatists.) Wagner connects some private Masses with the cult of the martyrs and suggests that a bishop or priest might have celebrated at a shrine built in a house or in a cemetery chapel on aliturgical days (p. 91). Aside from establishing that private Masses of this sort had existed here and there in the history of the Church, he does not present any compelling evidence for their frequent occurrence in the West at the end of the fourth century. Of course, these "private" Masses are not of the type without any congregation that were common later in the Latin Church; cf. O. Nussbaum, *Kloster, Priestermonch und Privatmesse* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1961); A. Häussling, "[Review of] Nussbaum, Privatmesse" *ZKT* 85 (1963) 75–83; id., "Ursprünge der Privatmesse," *Stimmen der Zeit* 175 (1965) 21–28.

until midafternoon. These stationary fasts came to be associated with the passion of Jesus, Wednesday commemorating his betrayal and Friday his death on the cross. Sunday remained, as it had been, the celebration of the Resurrection, so that each week was viewed as a Holy Week in miniature. The fast on Saturdays at Rome was naturally associated with the sojourn of Jesus in the tomb, and Innocent I explicitly links the fasting and aliturgical Fridays and Saturdays of the Roman Church with the events of Holy Week.

For it is certainly well known that on those two days [Friday and Saturday of Holy Week] the apostles were in mourning and also had hidden themselves for fear of the Jews. At any rate, there is no doubt that inasmuch as they fasted in commemoration of the two days, as the Church's tradition holds, sacraments are not celebrated at all on those two days. Certainly, too, this model is to be followed week by week for this reason, that the commemoration of that day [the Resurrection] is always (*semper*) to be celebrated.<sup>59</sup>

The incompatibility of fasting and Eucharist presented here as a principle governing public worship implies that synaxes held on fast days would have been aliturgical unless there is evidence to the contrary.<sup>60</sup>

Fridays in Lent were aliturgical in medieval Milan. There is no evidence that this was or was not so in Ambrose's time. The general view is that he celebrated Mass every day, including therefore these Fridays, but

<sup>59</sup> *Ep. 25 7* (Coustant 859). *Semper* here means throughout the year, as the continuation of the text indicates: "Quod si putant, semel atque uno sabbato jejunandum, ergo et Dominica, et sexta feria semel in Pascha erit utique celebranda. Si autem Dominici diei ac sextae feriae per singulas hebdomadas reparanda imago est, dementis est, bidui agere consuetudinem sabbato praetermisso." The topic of this paragraph is the justification of fasting on Saturdays, and Coustant suggests (859, n. d) that the phrase *isto biduo sacramenta penitus non celebrari* is a parenthetical remark, so that the *forma* of the next sentence refers only to the fast on Holy Saturday; similarly, e.g., Borella, *Il rito ambrosiano* 374. In fact, Innocent assumes that Mass was not celebrated on Fridays or Saturdays. The basis of his argument for the Saturday fast is the normative force of the apostolic precedent. If it was being ignored by celebrating Mass on Fridays or Saturdays, Innocent's argument falls to the ground. In fact, Mass was not celebrated in Rome on Saturdays; cf. Socrates, *H.E.* 5, 22 (PG 67, 636) and Sozomen, *H.E.* 7, 19 (PG 67, 1477).

<sup>60</sup> F. Zimmermann (*Die Abendmesse in Geschichte und Gegenwart* [Vienna: Mayer, 1914] 87) says that in all of these cases we recognize the principle that the Eucharist and a fast are kept apart so that the celebration of the Eucharist on a fast day is omitted altogether or delayed until evening, the end of the fast. The earliest known quadragesimal Mass on any Lenten feria occurred in the sixth century; cf. Jungmann, "Die Quadragesima" 87-88. Thursdays in Lent at the beginning of the eighth century were the last to be observed with a Eucharist: cf. *Le liber pontificalis* 1, 402. Bede (*Historia ecclesiastica* 4, 14: *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors [Oxford: Clarendon, 1969] 376-79) describes a three-day fast during which no Masses were celebrated.

that through Eastern influence aliturgical days were introduced later.<sup>61</sup> The question of daily Mass in Milan during the fourth century will be discussed below, especially with regard to the differences between Ambrose's personal observance and public cult. It is possible to argue, however, that there was no public liturgy on Friday, even in Ambrose's time, though the evidence is tenuous and hypothetical. Tertullian mentions the practice of prolonging Friday fasts until Saturday. If this is combined with the principle that fasting excludes a celebration of the Eucharist and the fact that in Milan Sundays and feast days were preceded by vigils, it may be that during Lent Saturdays—festive in Milan as in the East—would have been preceded by a vigil culminating in a Eucharist on Saturday morning.<sup>62</sup> In this way Communion would have been received immediately before the meal ending the fast.

Another relevant fourth-century custom was the fast before Communion.<sup>63</sup> When Mass was said on a fast day, the simultaneous effect of the two fasts sometimes seems to have been to delay the reception of Communion until the end of the fast. According to Ambrose, on most days Mass was celebrated at noon, which was the time of the *prandium*, the first meal of the Roman day. On full fast days Mass may have been postponed until the evening, so that the meal followed the celebration. But, as I have indicated above, Milan may have followed a different custom, one mentioned by Tertullian. Some Christians at Carthage were reluctant to attend morning Mass on stational days because they thought that receiving Communion would break their fast. Tertullian replied that the Host could be reserved at home until evening, so that the scrupulous would attend Mass and observe the complete fast.<sup>64</sup> Tertullian's remark

<sup>61</sup> E.g., Schmitz, *Gottesdienst* 238. According to O. Heimig ("Aliturgische Fastenferien in Mailand," *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 2 [1952] 54-60), all fast days were aliturgical in Milan until Carolingian times. Heimig's thesis is questioned but not refuted by, e.g., Schmitz (*Gottesdienst* 237, n. 26) and Righetti (*Storia liturgica* 2, 551).

<sup>62</sup> Tertullian, *De ieiunio* 14, 3 (CCL 2, 1273). According to Bingham (*Antiquities* 21, 3, 3 [7, 197]), Victorinus the martyr is another witness for extending the fast until the next morning. Righetti (*Storia liturgica* 2, 551) suggests that the Friday fast during Lent in Milan may have been continued until Saturday morning. Cf. also n. 21 above. Borella ("La comunione" 84-85) argues that Mass was said daily in Milan by Ambrose, and therefore also on Fridays in Lent. He would refute Heimig's argument that Fridays were aliturgical based on a study of lectionaries by invoking a *lectio continua* for the daily Masses. There is, however, no evidence for this practice in Milan; cf. A. Zwinggi, "Die forlaufende Schriftlesung" 86-87.

<sup>63</sup> R. Arbesmann, "Fasten," *RAC* 7, 483.

<sup>64</sup> Ambrose, *Exp. ps. 118* 8, 48 (CSEL 62, 180). The desire to receive Communion immediately before eating may account for Ambrose's celebrating Mass at noon most days, since breakfast (*jentaculum*) was usually omitted in antiquity; cf. also Ambrose, *De Joseph patriarcha* 10, 52 (CSEL 32/2, 108): "Tunc enim plus dies lucet, quando sacramenta celebramus." Cf. Schmitz, *Gottesdienst* 242-43. This seems to exclude the notion of a

has been taken as indicating that Mass was a necessary component of stationary days. In fact, the celebration of the Eucharist on a fast day had nothing to do with the fast, the two being in accidental juxtaposition.<sup>65</sup>

Risking generalization, we may say that in the early Church a sort of Eucharistic fast would have been observed because Mass was said in the morning, long before the first meal of the day. There would have been no Mass on fast days. When, for whatever reason, Mass began to be celebrated more often, some scrupulous Christians felt that the reception of Communion broke their fast and, on fast days, set the Host aside for private reception later (Tertullian). It may be that Mass came to be deferred until the end of the fast (Ambrose?), a practice in accord with the fourth-century observance of an obligatory fast before Communion. Some places (e.g., Rome) followed the old way by not celebrating on fast days, though aliturgical synaxes were held.

#### THE FREQUENCY OF THE EUCHARIST

##### *Rome and Spain*

Among texts which state that Mass was not celebrated every day, first place may be given to one written in Rome about 380 by Ambrosiaster: "For it is to be offered every week, and even if not every day (*quotidie*) nevertheless, in foreign places, twice a week."<sup>66</sup> The virtues St. Paul found it appropriate to require of deacons are being commented upon, and Ambrosiaster tries to establish the necessity of absolute continence for all clerics from their daily attendance in the churches. His argument, which is based upon the principle of cultic purity, would be compelling if Mass had been celebrated daily, but he admits that this is not the case. The implied contrast between Rome and foreign places suggests that there was regularly only one Mass a week in Rome. A. Chavasse, on different grounds (the lectionaries and stations), arrives at the same conclusion: in the fourth century at Rome there was regularly only the

semifast until noon. The single meal allowed on a fast day was taken in the evening. One would expect that if there were Mass said on a fast day, therefore, it would have been displaced till late afternoon, but we have seen that there is little unambiguous evidence for this until the sixth century; cf. n. 36 above.

<sup>65</sup> C. Mohrmann, "Statio," VC 7 (1953) 226-32, 241-43.

<sup>66</sup> "Omni enim hebdomada offerendum est, etiam si non quotidie, peregrinis in locis tamen vel bis in hebdomada" (*Ad Timotheum prima* 3, 13, 3 [CSEL 81/3, 269]). It is accepted that Ambrosiaster wrote during the pontificate of Damasus, 366-84; cf. CSEL 81/1, xv. In one of the three main manuscript traditions the text continues: "et de non sunt, qui prope quotidie baptizentur aegri." The addition of baptism to the obligations on the clerics indicates that Mass was not said often enough to require absolute continence from the principle of ritual purity. Exactly the same reasoning is found in the decretals of Pope Siricius which are considered below.

Sunday liturgy. He claims that in the fifth century non-Eucharistic synaxes were held on Wednesdays and Fridays during the whole year.<sup>67</sup>

In *Epistola 54* Augustine wrote that custom varied, with some places celebrating Mass daily, others only on Saturdays and Sundays, and elsewhere on Sundays alone.<sup>68</sup> The first of these, as we shall see, very likely refers to Africa; the second, to the Eastern Church generally (the *peregrinis in locis* of Ambrosiaster); the third, in the light of Ambrosiaster's remark, to Rome. This passage from Augustine reappears two hundred years later in *De ecclesiasticis officiis* of Isidore of Seville.<sup>69</sup> Augustine's authority may be sufficient reason for the citation, but the fact that Mass was not said every day at Arles in the sixth century supports the use of Isidore's statement as an argument against the opinion that Mass was said every day in the Western Church when he wrote.<sup>70</sup>

Two decretals of Pope Siricius (384-99) mention the demands of a daily ministry in a way that suggests that Mass was not offered every day.<sup>71</sup> Siricius wanted to enforce absolute continence on married clerics in major orders, but his argument, like that of Ambrosiaster, is weakened by the absence of a daily Eucharistic celebration. Siricius cited the daily demands of the ministry: "Because in ministry the ministers are occupied with daily (*quotidianis*) necessities . . . either (*aut*) he offers the Sacrifice or (*aut*) he is obliged to baptize."<sup>72</sup> The use of the disjunctive *aut . . . aut*

<sup>67</sup> A. Chavasse, "Temps de préparation à la Pâque d'après quelques livres liturgiques romains," *RSR* 37 (1950) 125-45; id., "Les fêtes de carême célébrées au temps de saint Léon le Grand," *Miscellanea liturgica in onore di S. Em. il cardinale G. Lercaro* 1 (Rome: Desclée, 1966) 551-57. Cf. n. 47 above.

<sup>68</sup> I have referred to this letter above; cf. nn. 37-38. *Ep. 54* was written in 400. Augustine had been in Rome in 383-84 and in 388.

<sup>69</sup> 1, 44, 2 (PL 83, 776-77). *Ibid.* 1, 18, 7 (PL 83, 754) indicates that, in Seville, at least, Communion and therefore presumably Mass was daily: "Dicunt aliqui, nisi aliquo intercedente peccato, Eucharistiam quotidie accipiendam; hunc enim panem dari quotidie nobis, iubente Domino, postulamus, dicentes: *Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie*. Quod quidem bene dicunt, si hoc cum religione et devotione et humilitate suscipunt."

<sup>70</sup> Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo 73* 1 (CCL 103, 306): "... quotiens aut in die dominico aut in aliis maioribus festivitibus missae fiunt." Canon 6 of the Council of Mâcon (585) reads: "Quaecumque reliquiae sacrificiorum post peractam missam in sacrario supersederint, quarta vel sexta feria innocentes ab illo cuius interest, ad ecclesiam adducantur, et indicto eis jejuniis, easdem reliquias conspersas vino percipiant" (Mansi 9, 952). This implies either that Mass was not said on Wednesdays and Fridays, or that it was said only on those days. The former seems the more likely.

<sup>71</sup> *Epp. 5* and *10* (Coustant 651-58, 685-700). The attribution of *Ep. 10* to Siricius has been questioned, and re-established; cf. Callam, "Clerical Continence" 36.

<sup>72</sup> *Ep. 5* 3 (Coustant 655-56). Similarly in *Ep. 10* 2, 5 (Coustant 689-90): "Primo in loco statutum est de episcopis, presbyteris, et diaconibus, quos sacrificiis divinis necesse est interesse, per quorum manus et gratia baptismatis traditur, et corpus Christi conficitur." In fact deacons were forbidden to baptize (*ibid.* 4, 10 [Coustant, 693]) and would not have taken part in the presbyteral liturgies of the suburban Roman churches mentioned by Innocent I (*Ep. 25* 8 [Coustant 816-62]).

implies that because Mass was not celebrated every day, the ritual aspect of the argument had to be bolstered by an additional ministerial obligation. The choice of baptism for this is somewhat forced, since the appointed times for baptism were Easter and Pentecost, as Siricius himself stated.<sup>73</sup> The administration of the sacrament at other times, like the celebration of Mass apart from Sundays and feasts, would have been exceptional: e.g., baptism for the ill, Masses for the dead. In larger Christian centers the latter might have resulted in a Mass being celebrated most days, but surely not by each bishop or every priest. There is additional information about daily Mass in the decretal of Siricius to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, in which the pope replied to a series of questions about church discipline. In section 10 he says: "In all things may we be pleasing to our God in the sacrifices which we offer daily (*quotidie*)."<sup>74</sup> This phrase seems to include both Rome and Spain and, as far as the wording is concerned, might describe all priests. But there are reasons for not taking *quotidie* to mean "each and every day." Ambrosiaster, *Ad Tim. prima*, Siricius' other decretals, and Innocent I, *Epistola 25*, which have already been referred to, suggest that Siricius was either using *quotidie* for "regularly" or applying it literally only to Spain. But even the situation in Spain implied by this letter is difficult to square with a universal daily celebration of Mass. Siricius, quoting Himerius, describes the Spanish clergy as procreating offspring with their wives or concubines well after their ordination (*post longa consecrationis suae tempora*) and as justifying themselves from the right of the OT priests to beget children.<sup>75</sup> If Mass were being said every day in Spain, the priests who had been begetting children clearly were not observing cultic abstinence. This would weaken a demand for absolute continence based exclusively on a ritual argument which depends in large measure on the combination of a daily celebration and the unquestioning observance of cultic purity. On the other hand, if it is assumed that Mass was not said every day, an argument based on cultic purity disappears altogether, and the remark *in his quae quotidie offerimus sacrificiis* would have to be interpreted in some other context, that of the ascetical movement for example.<sup>76</sup> The likelihood that ritual purity was observed and the existence of children of major clerics constitute a forceful argument against the existence of a universal practice of daily Mass in Spain before 384.

It may be that about this time some priests began celebrating Mass

<sup>73</sup> *Ep. 1 2, 3* (Coustant 626-28). Siricius, like Ambrosiaster (nn. 66, 72 above), recognized that baptism could be administered at any time in cases of necessity. These would have been frequent, particularly in cities. Cf. J. Jeremias, *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries* (London: SCM, 1960) 87.

<sup>74</sup> *Ep. 1 7, 10* (Coustant 631).

<sup>75</sup> *Ep. 1 7, 8* (Coustant 630).

<sup>76</sup> This is discussed in some detail in Callam, "Clerical Continence" 24-44.

every day. As we shall see later, the evidence indicates that this practice originated among clerical ascetics, so that a daily celebration would have been associated with the conviction that virginity and, specifically, continence in marriage were Christian ideals. Clerics outside of the ascetical movement would not have been saying daily Mass, and those who were married could have been observing ritual purity and still have had families. To require absolute continence of such clerics was to bring them into the ascetical movement, and more frequent Eucharists would have been part of their new spirituality. Daily Mass should not be viewed as a cause, but as an effect, of clerical continence. Fourth-century asceticism did not view virginity and continence as fortuitous side-products of celebrating, for one reason or another, the Eucharist each and every day. They were goods in themselves and indispensable to a clergy who were expected to be exemplars of the Christian life.<sup>77</sup> This hypothesis avoids the weakness of the popular opinion that clerical celibacy arose from the simple juxtaposition of daily Mass and ritual purity. In fact, this argument accepts as premises what should be demonstrated: that abruptly, around 380 and for unspecified reasons, daily Mass became the universal practice of the Latin Church; that its clerics unreflectingly observed ritual purity; and that bishops and the pope exerted themselves by synod and decretal primarily to make certain that clerics who participated in these daily Masses were ritually prepared to do so. What the sources actually indicate is that Mass was not said everywhere every day; that ritual purity is a subtle and complicated phenomenon involving fundamental religious instincts, the identity of the individual, the preservation of social order, and principles of hygiene; that the pope and the bishops were desirous of encouraging the new forms of Christian asceticism. Canon 5 of the First Council of Toledo (400) may seem to disprove this hypothesis.

If a priest or a deacon or a subdeacon or any cleric attached to a church be in a city or in a place where there is a church—a fort or a farm or a villa—and shall not have gone to the church for the daily sacrifice (*sacrificium quotidianum*), let him no longer be regarded as a cleric; that is, if after being rebuked he has refused to earn forgiveness from his bishop by satisfaction.<sup>78</sup>

Does this canon imply that Mass was offered daily in every church and that all clerics were obliged to attend? If the demands of cultic purity as described in Siricius' decretal to Himerius were in force, the inclusion

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Siricius, *Ep. 10* 2, 5 (Coustant 689); Ambrose, *De officiis* 2, 17, 86 (Krabinger 152). Many other examples could be cited, beginning with St. Paul (1 Cor 4:16; 11:1; Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:6). Paul Parvis, O.P. ("The Word Grows," *Clergy Review* 66 [1981] 243-44, 296-97, 322-24, 354-55), has provided a perceptive analysis of this and other aspects of the enforcement of clerical celibacy in the fourth century.

<sup>78</sup> Mansi 3, 999.



of all clerics is tantamount to requiring absolute continence from those in minor orders as well as those in major. Yet canon 1 of this Council, and Siricius himself, demand continence only of deacons and priests. It may be that Mass was said every day but that cultic abstinence was not observed, at least not by minor clerics, or that *quotidianus* here means "frequently" or "usually." The occasion of the Council supports the latter interpretation. The bishops had gathered to deal with the Priscillianists, who used to meet privately, and clergy who were part of the movement may have begun to avoid the public liturgies to attend these sectarian meetings instead. The canon would have been directed, then, to clerics who had started to desert the public weekday (*quotidianum*) liturgies in favor of private gatherings.<sup>79</sup> By canon 4 of the Council of Saragossa (380) daily attendance at church is required from December 17 until January 6, a time when the Priscillianists removed themselves from the community, as they did also during Lent. There is no indication that this daily celebration was the Eucharist, and the implication is that daily attendance was not required after or before this "Advent" period.<sup>80</sup>

In the early fifth century Pope Innocent I (402-17) issued several decretals that touch our topic. The sections on clerical continence are adapted from Siricius and exhibit the same ambiguity about the daily ministry: it is described in *Epistola 2* as the celebration of Mass or the administration of baptism.<sup>81</sup> *Epistola 25*, however, indicates that Mass was not celebrated in Rome on Fridays or Saturdays, and further that the Roman observance is to be the universal model. Socrates, in his *Historia ecclesiastica*, confirms that Mass was not said in Rome on Saturdays.<sup>82</sup> According to the *Liber pontificalis*, Thursdays in Lent remained aliturgical until the time of Gregory II (715-31).<sup>83</sup>

### Milan

St. Ambrose, *De officiis* 1, 50, indicates that, in general, the clergy of country districts did not celebrate daily. They justified saying Mass only

<sup>79</sup> Toledo I, can. 1 (Mansi 3, 998); regarding the Priscillianists cf. Saragossa, can. 2 and 4 (Mansi 4, 634).

<sup>80</sup> Ibid. These canons are directed against the Priscillians.

<sup>81</sup> *Ep.* 2 12 (Coustant 753); *Ep.* 6 1, 2 (Coustant 791).

<sup>82</sup> Innocent, *Ep.* 25 7 (Coustant 859-60). In sections 1-2 (Coustant 855-56) the Roman practice is presented as the model for the entire Western Church; cf. n. 59 above. The datum from Socrates (*H.E.* 5, 22 [PG 67, 636]) is confirmed by Sozomen (*H.E.* 7, 19 [PG 67, 1477]).

<sup>83</sup> *Le liber pontificalis* 1, 402. The celebration of Mass during Lent is discussed for later periods by M. Andrieu ("Les messes des jeudis de carême et les anciens sacramentaires," *RevScRel* 9 [1929] 343-75) and by B. Capelle ("Note sur le Lectionnaire romain de la messe avant S. Grégoire," *RHE* 34 [1938] 556-59). On the basis of his study of early lectionnaires Capelle concludes that before Gregory I (590-604) there was Mass every day but Thursday during Lent.

every few days by a certain *usus vetus* according to which intervals of several days separated the offering of sacrifice:

I have not overlooked this because in most rather remote places, when they were exercising the ministry or even the priesthood, they have, nevertheless, begotten children; and they defend themselves on the grounds of a long-standing custom by which the sacrifice was put off several days at a time. But even (*et tamen*) the people used to be purified for two or three days so that they might approach the sacrifice in a pure state, as we read in the Old Testament; they also would wash their garments. If there was such observance in the figure, how much more in the reality.<sup>84</sup>

The awkward phrase is *et id tamquam usu veteri defendunt, quando per intervalla dierum sacrificium deferebatur* ("and they defend themselves on the grounds of a long-standing custom by which the sacrifice was put off several days at a time"). This has been taken as a reference to the priests of the OT, whose sacerdotal obligations did not prevent them from being the fathers of families.<sup>85</sup> According to this reading, the passage would be of no significance in a discussion of daily Mass in Milan, but would demonstrate that priests in remote places celebrated only every few days. This view is not altogether implausible. It suits the overall context. Ambrose immediately counters this *usus vetus* with two examples from the OT. An argument which had invoked an OT observance would best be met with others from the same source. The imperfect tense is used to describe both the deferral of the sacrifice (*deferebatur*) and the OT examples (*castificabatur, accederet, lavabant*). Finally, the word *vetus* is, of course, part of the name of the OT. There is also external evidence in support of this interpretation. Siricius' *Epistola 1* indicates that the OT had been used by Spanish clerics to justify the procreation of children, and about this time Jovinian had used the OT (and NT) to deny any special value to virginity or continence.<sup>86</sup> Ambrose may have been addressing a similar situation. Apart from the fact that *vetus* alone was not much used for the OT, the difficulty in accepting this reading arises from the description of the *usus vetus* as *quando per intervalla dierum sacrificium deferebatur*. This corresponds to no practice of the OT, which prescribed daily sacrifices. It is hard to imagine Ambrose's

<sup>84</sup> *De officiis* 1, 50, 249 (Krabinger 118).

<sup>85</sup> Coustant 629, n. d; L. Thomassin, *Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'église* 1 (2nd ed.; Paris: F. Muget, 1679) 139; J. A. and A. Theiner, *Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit bei den christlichen Geistlichen und ihre Folgen* 1 (2nd ed.; Altenburg: H. A. Pierer, 1845) 264; L. Hödl, "Lex continentiae: A Study on the Problem of Celibacy," *Priesthood and Celibacy* (ed. J. Coppens et al. [Milan: Ancora, 1972]) 707-08.

<sup>86</sup> Siricius, *Ep. 1* 7, 8 (Coustant 630). Regarding Jovinian cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome* 183, and Callam, "Clerical Continence" 10.

making a mistake of this sort, or allowing it to pass without remark if it had been made by others, especially if they were using it to justify clerics begetting children.<sup>87</sup> Ambrosiaster and Siricius, who also mention OT sacrifices, did not base their argument on an interval between sacrifices during which the priests of the OT could have sexual relations with their wives, but on the belief that different courses of priests served in the temple for a certain period, after which they returned home and were free from the demands of cult. Hence the tours of duty of individual priests were not continuous, but sacrifices were.

R. Kottje interprets *usus vetus* as the "old custom" (*alter Brauch*), which had been formerly observed in Milan. He says that daily Mass was the practice in Milan by the time Ambrose wrote, but that the older custom was apparently still widespread in the country districts.<sup>88</sup> I think Kottje is wrong to distinguish Milan from the country districts on the basis of this passage. In fact, the passage from *De officiis* is grammatically more consistent if *usus vetus* is interpreted as "the old custom which until recently was observed in and around Milan." This would imply that daily Mass and absolute continence were universal in the entire district when Ambrose wrote. The bishops and other clerics who had begotten children are simply defending (*defendunt*) the former custom as right for its time. In context, however, this is a very unlikely interpretation. Ambrose is not discussing a matter from the past. His concern, as the opening sentence of section 249 shows, is to justify absolute continence

<sup>87</sup> When *vetus* refers to the OT, it seems to be almost always linked with *lex* or *testamentum*. In *De mysteriis* 3, 9 (SC 25<sup>bi</sup>, 160), however, Ambrose calls baptism *vetus mysterium* because it was foreshadowed in creation as described in Gen 1, and in *De virginibus* 1, 7, 34 (Cazzaniga 17) he refers to the women of the OT as *veteres*. Cf. Augustine, *Tract. in Ioh.* 65, 1 (CCL 36, 490). In Ambrosiaster, *Ad Timotheum prima* 3, 13, 4 (CSEL 81/3, 269), *vetus* is used for the priests of the OT: "... veteribus ideo concessus est, quia multo tempore in templo non videbantur." Daily sacrifices are mentioned in Exod 29:38-42; Num 28:3-8; 2 Kgs 16:15; Ezek 46:13-15; cf. Heb 7:27 and 10:11. The daily sacrifice of the temple was never invoked in discussions of continence of the clergy or the frequency of the celebration of Mass. Ambrose mentioned the daily sacrifice of Job for his family in a reference to frequent Communion, which may be also a reference to daily Mass (cf. below). Augustine was aware of the OT practice but made no application of it to the New Law: *Retractationes* 2, 81, 3 (CSEL 36, 192-93); *Quaestionum in Heptateuchum libri* 7 3, 82 (CSEL 28/2, 303-4); cf. *ibid.* 3, 13 (pp. 244-45).

<sup>88</sup> Kottje ("Das Aufkommen" 222) says that Ambrose characterizes the time when this custom began by the remark "the sacrifice was put off several days at a time." For Kottje, this observation is only comprehensible and significant if, in contrast to "that time," a daily presentation of the sacrifice was common at the time Ambrose was addressing the clergy of the Milanese Church. His interpretation of *usus vetus* is supported by a similar phrase in Ambrose's *De virginitate* (10, 56 [Cazzaniga 26]): "Consuetudo enim boni usum veteris pravitatis amisit." Cf. *ibid.* 10, 58 (Cazzaniga 27): "quasi oblita maculae veteris." Schmitz (*Gottesdienst* 234-35) accepts Kottje's conclusions.

from all major clerics, whatever their liturgical practice.<sup>89</sup> Hence he resorts to a rather forced exegesis of the OT to prove that, even on a ritual basis, the rights of marriage are denied to all deacons, priests, and bishops, whether or not Mass is said every day. His use of *vetus* and the words *et tamen* etc. lend a prestige to this custom which one suspects might not have been so readily bestowed if daily Mass had been the universal observance. Furthermore, this reading also implies that daily Mass appeared throughout the Milanese district with surprising rapidity—priests with families had apparently all begun to say Mass every day, and so to live in absolute continence with their wives, their families being the result of the recently surrendered custom of more occasional liturgies. This seems to place a strain on the conservatism which normally rules liturgical development and to exhibit a readiness to surrender the rights of marriage without parallel in the history of clerical celibacy. Finally, Ambrose makes no allusion to daily Mass, though it had more obvious OT precedent and would have effected and demonstrated the total continence he desired.

The grammar can accommodate an interpretation by which this ancient custom was still in effect in country places, as Kottje suggests. Once this is granted, however, the passage says nothing at all about the practice of the Milanese Church. The central section would be translated: “. . . they have families and defend this by a custom of long standing, viz., the sacrifice has [always] been presented every few days.”<sup>90</sup> According to this version, Ambrose is admitting that these clerics have families, but claims that they should be continent in marriage even though they do not celebrate daily. The practice of the Church in Milan is different, not in a daily Eucharist, of which nothing is said, but because its priests are absolutely continent. The overall impression formed is that Ambrose knew and respected this ancient usage in and around Milan and, if implications are to be extracted, may well have followed it himself.

Nevertheless, Ambrose does speak of a daily celebration. The earliest reference occurs in *De virginibus*:

I remember a girl . . . who was being urged to marry by her parents and relatives. She fled to the most holy altar. . . . “Can there be a better veil,” she said, “to cover me than the altar which sanctifies the veils themselves? This is the most

<sup>89</sup> *De officiis* 1, 50, 249 (Krabinger 118): “Inoffensum autem exhibendum et immaculatum ministerium, nec ullo coniugali coitu violandum cognoscitis, qui integri corpore, incorrupto pudore, alieni etiam ab ipso consortio coniugali, sacri ministerii gratiam recepistis.”

<sup>90</sup> Cf. M. Hammond, *Latin: A Historical and Linguistic Handbook* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ., 1976) 32: “As the term ‘imperfect’ suggests, the action may have begun in the past and still be continuing in the present.” For *quando* translated as “viz.,” cf. L. T. Phillips, *The Subordinate Temporal, Causal and Adversative Clauses in the Works of St. Ambrose* (Washington: Catholic Univ., 1937) 55.

fitting kind of bridal veil, on which Christ, the head of all, is daily (*cotidie*) consecrated."<sup>91</sup>

Although the circumstances of this remarkable incident are vague, it most likely occurred in Milan during Ambrose's episcopate. This is implied by his personal acquaintance with the young woman, the vividness of the scene, and his notorious zeal for consecrated virginity.<sup>92</sup> If *cotidie* here means "every day," Ambrose may have said Mass daily from the beginning of his episcopate in 374.<sup>93</sup> The sense of this passage does not require that *cotidie* be translated "each and every day." In the first place, it would be overly precise to take an incidental reference to daily Mass in an ill-defined context as a demonstration that all priests in Milan said Mass each and every day. Secondly, this passage narrowly read requires not that Ambrose said Mass every day but that Mass was offered daily at the altar to which the young woman fled. It is unlikely that this would have been so; the bishop, who normally presided over the Eucharist, celebrated at different churches in the city with his presbyterium in attendance.<sup>94</sup>

In *Epistola 20* (385) Ambrose quotes from a sermon delivered during the siege of the Portian Basilica on Wednesday and Thursday of Holy Week. The scriptural reading had been from the Book of Job. "The devil tempted holy Job through his possession, through his children, through bodily pain. . . . And he also wanted very much to snatch even you from me, my good children for whom I daily renew the sacrifice (*quotidie instauro sacrificium*)."<sup>95</sup> The precision and definiteness of this statement have inclined many to the opinion that Mass was said every day of the year in Milan. Although the chronology and liturgical details of *Epistola*

<sup>91</sup> *De virginibus* 1, 11, 65 (Cazzaniga 33). Borella ("La comunione" 85) and Schmitz (*Gottesdienst* 234) accept this passage as clear proof that Mass was said daily in Milan. The suggestion by the latter (*ibid.*) that Ambrose, *De viduis* 3, 17 (PL 16, 240), is an allusion to the Offertory procession of daily Mass may be rejected; the context better suits interpreting this section as describing the daily increase afforded to the Church by the conversion of sinners: "cui [Christ] quotidie de peccatoribus cibus, Ecclesiae cumulus congregatur."

<sup>92</sup> E.g., Ambrose, *De virginibus* 1, 10, 57-61 (Cazzaniga 30-31); *De virginitate* 3, 11; 5, 24-6, 28 (Cazzaniga 12-13).

<sup>93</sup> This possibility implies either that Ambrose was an innovator in the liturgy or that daily Mass was said in Milan or Rome before 374, when Ambrose became bishop. *De virginibus* was written in 377.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Ambrose, *Ep. 20* (PL 16, 994-1002); Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii* 18 (PL 14, 33); also Schmitz, *Gottesdienst* 284-87, 299-301; Häussling, "Ursprünge der Privatmesse" 22-25; Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite* 1, 196-99. A relevant discussion of Innocent I, *Ep. 25* 8, may be found in A. Chavasse, "Liturgie papale et liturgies presbytérales: Leurs zones d'exercice," *Mélanges Mgr. M. Andrieu* (Strasbourg: *RevScRel* 1956) 103-12.

<sup>95</sup> Section 15 (PL 16, 998).

20 are far from clear, Dudden construes them to suggest that public assemblies had probably been held every day during Holy Week, and these may be sufficient to account for the appearance of *quotidie* here.<sup>96</sup> The context of the passage suggests another possible reason for the choice of *quotidie*. Ambrose is comparing the onslaughts of the devil against Job to the troubles then experienced by the Church in Milan, and the *quotidie instauro sacrificium* could have been suggested by Job's daily sacrifices for his children; the word *sacrificium*, then, might not be a reference to Mass at all, but simply a continuation of the parallel between Job's active concern for his dependents and Ambrose's for his.<sup>97</sup>

Two other texts of Ambrose may be examined here: *Exameron* 5, 25 and *De patriarchis* 9, 38. The passage from *Exameron*, preached during Holy Week, states that the passion of Christ forgives our sins every day. Nothing is said as to how this forgiveness is accomplished. It may be at Mass but need not be. The reference in *Exameron* is best classified as inconclusive.<sup>98</sup> *De patriarchis*, which was perhaps preached at the end of Lent in 391, says that Christ, as priest, consecrates himself to be our bread every day. As Ambrose's theology stresses the action of Christ in the Eucharist, this is almost certainly a reference to the celebration of Mass.<sup>99</sup> Even aside from the usual difficulty in interpreting the force of *cotidie*, this statement need not imply that Ambrose himself or any

<sup>96</sup> This passage is invoked as evidence that Mass was said in Milan every day by, e.g., F. H. Dudden (*The Life and Times of St. Ambrose* 2 [2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon, 1935] 447), Kottje ("Das Aufkommen" 221-22), and Schmitz (*Gottesdienst* 234). Monachino (*La cura pastorale* 52-53) suggests that *quotidie* is used seasonally here. For the chronology of the Holy Week of 385, cf. Dudden, *Life and Times* 1, 270-79.

<sup>97</sup> Job's daily sacrifices are referred to in *De sacramentis* 5, 25 (SC 25<sup>bm</sup>, 132); cf. below.

<sup>98</sup> *Exameron* 5, 25, 90 (CSEL 32/1, 203). According to Schmitz (*Gottesdienst* 234), this sermon was delivered on Holy Thursday 387/90. The Lenten setting may explain the *cotidie*; Schmitz stresses the relationship in Ambrose's thought between the Eucharist and the forgiveness of sins that comes from the death of Christ.

<sup>99</sup> *De patriarchis* 9, 38 (CSEL 32/2, 146-47): "hunc panem dedit [Christ] apostolis, ut dividerent populo credentium, et hodieque dat nobis eum, quem ipse sacerdos cotidie consecrat suis verbis." Other passages which dwell upon Christ's action at Mass are *De sacramentis* 4, 4, 14 and 4, 5, 23 (SC 25<sup>bm</sup>, 108-10, 114), *De officiis* 1, 48, 239 (Krabinger 115), and *De mysteriis* 54 (SC 25<sup>bm</sup>, 188). These are discussed in R. Gryson, *Le prêtre selon saint Ambroise* (Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste, 1968) 271, and R. Johanny, *L'Eucharistie: Centre de l'histoire du salut chez saint Ambroise de Milan* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1968). But lest too much be made of this passage, two striking passages from *De virginibus* illustrate the freedom with which Ambrose used the terminology of daily sacrifice: "Virgo dei donum est, munus parentis, sacerdotium castitatis. Virgo matris hostia est, cuius cotidiano sacrificio vis divina placatur" (1, 7, 32 [Cazzaniga 16]); "Neque enim dubitaverim vobis [virgins] patere altaria, quarum mentes altaria dei confidenter dixerim, in quibus cotidie pro redemptione corporis Christus immolatur. . . . Beatae virgines, quae tam immortalis spiritalis gratia, ut horti floribus, ut templa religione, ut altaria sacerdote!" (2, 2, 18 [Cazzaniga 41-42]). It should also be remembered that we know very little about the ceremony that would have accompanied private Communion.

particular priest said Mass every day. Augustine's remark about his mother Monica, *Confessiones* 5, 9, 17, may be relevant here; he states that Monica, who was in Milan from 385–87, attended Mass every day without fail: *nullum diem praetermittentis oblationem ad altare tuum*.<sup>100</sup> The statement as it stands is unqualified and would include not only the stay at Cassiciacum but the years spent in Africa. Whatever may have been the practice apart from Milan, in this city it is possible that she could have attended Mass every day without Ambrose or any other priest celebrating a daily Eucharist. Mass was celebrated for a small group at funerals, apparently at the grave site. Ambrose mentions memorials for the dead on the seventh and fortieth days after death and on the yearly anniversary, but what form they took is uncertain. If Mass were part of these memorials, it could have been celebrated in the "parish" churches, near the cemeteries. The Christian population of Milan has been estimated to have been about 50,000 at the time of Ambrose. As a result, these memorials would have been celebrated frequently, perhaps daily, in one or other of the cemeteries, even if not every Christian was so honored.<sup>101</sup> The most obvious conclusion, however, is that Ambrose celebrated every day and that Monica, greatly devoted to him, attended this Mass. The absence of clear proof to the contrary implies that we should take his statements at face value. But to do so is to say nothing about a universal practice of a daily celebration by all priests in Milan or the surrounding region, much less throughout the Latin Church.

St. Ambrose's series of sermons *Expositio de psalmo 118* contains exhortations to receive Communion which are independent of any reference to the frequency of Mass. In *Sermo* 8 48, Ambrose encourages his hearers to communicate every time they attend Mass, despite the inconvenience of the fast.<sup>102</sup> *Sermo* 18 26–29 is part of an extended and elaborate comparison in which the perfection of the new dispensation is contrasted with that of the old or with the order of nature. The word *cotidie* occurs three times, in sections 26, 28, and 29. In the first of these the abundance of the heavenly banquet is compared to the difficulty with which food and drink are obtained from the earth, and nature's yearly harvest is set off against the daily provision of Christ, who is himself our divine food and drink. Ambrose continues by contrasting the inadequacy of the manna with that bread which is daily and perpetually available to all men (section 28): "Why do you seek, O Jew, that he grant unto you the bread which he bestows on everybody daily (*cotidie*), always (*sem-*

<sup>100</sup> CSEL 33, 104, iterated in 9, 13, 36 (*ibid.* 225).

<sup>101</sup> Regarding the possibility of Mass on memorial days, cf. n. 53 above. Schmitz (*Gottesdienst* 273–77) argues that the suburban basilicas were near the cemeteries, but acted as parish churches. He reports the population of Milan on p. 277. *Conf.* 9, 13, 36 (CSEL 33, 224–25) reveals that Monica desired that (memorial?) Masses be said for her.

<sup>102</sup> CSEL 62, 180.

per)?" In section 29 he considers the manifold activity of Moses during the Exodus, showing that Christ was the true source of Moses' power and then apostrophizing the Jews for believing in Moses who conducted them through the Red Sea, while rejecting Christ "who frees us daily (*cotidie*) from the waves of this world." A narrowly literal interpretation of *cotidie* here is clearly not called for, and, as the whole passage is written in a highly rhetorical style, it may be legitimate to read the *cotidie* of sections 26 and 28 as "continually" in contrast to the yearly harvest or the relatively brief period during which the Jews were fed with manna.<sup>103</sup> If *Expositio in psalmo 118* was, in fact, directed to the whole Christian community of Milan, a recommendation to daily Communion would be more likely than one to attend daily Mass, which would have been impossible or impractical for most.<sup>104</sup>

*De sacramentis* and *De mysteriis* are today both generally attributed to St. Ambrose,<sup>105</sup> the former representing the spoken words of Ambrose taken down in shorthand as they were delivered, the latter a version edited afterwards for publication. A doughty critic of the largely literary arguments in favor of Ambrose's authorship of *De sacramentis* is K. Gamber, who bases his argument primarily on the different liturgical settings of these two works.<sup>106</sup> A comparison of what each of them says about daily Communion and daily Mass supports Gamber's conclusion. *De sacramentis* has several references, not without ambiguity, to a daily Eucharist; *De mysteriis*, none. If the popular hypothesis about the relationship between these two is accepted, one must account for Ambrose's suppression of references to daily Mass and Communion when he prepared his sermons for publication.<sup>107</sup> One reason could be the fact that

<sup>103</sup> *Sermo 18* 26–29 (CSEL 62, 410–12). In *Ep. 64* 1 (PL 16, 1219) Ambrose also compares the manna to Communion: "Quaeris a me cur Dominus Deus manna pluerit populo patrum, et nunc non pluat. Si cognoscias, pluit, et quotidie pluit de coelo manna servientibus sibi. Et corporeum quidem illud manna hodie plerisque in locis invenitur. . . ." Schmitz (*Gottesdienst* 235) contends that the *quotidie pluit* demands a daily celebration, but on p. 237, discussing *Exp. ps. 118*, he allows for the possibility of daily private Communion, though again he thinks that the most obvious reading would be that Ambrose is referring to Communion at daily Mass. Schmitz's interpretation does not take enough into account a variety of Eucharistic practice that might have included daily Mass (Ambrose?) and daily Communion, especially where Mass was not celebrated every day.

<sup>104</sup> Dudden (*Saint Ambrose* 2, 691), following Palanque, infers that Ambrose preached these sermons on Sundays from May 389 until sometime in 390. But *Sermo 8* 48, at least, was preached on a weekday during Lent; in fact, Palanque's reasoning is highly hypothetical.

<sup>105</sup> B. Altaner and A. Stuiber, *Patrologie* (9th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 1978) 383.

<sup>106</sup> "Ist der Canon-Text von 'De sacramentis' in Mailand gebraucht worden?" *Ephemerides liturgicae* 79 (1965) 109–16; "Zur Liturgie des Ambrosius von Mailand," *ZKT* 88 (1977) 309–29.

<sup>107</sup> E.g., Jungmann (*Mass of the Roman Rite* 1, 52, n. 10): "According to Faller this work of Ambrose is a stenographic report of his preaching, which was not restricted by the laws of the *arcana*, in marked contrast to the *De Mysteriis*."



daily Mass was restricted to the city of Milan, but if Gamber is correct in his attribution of *De sacramentis* to Niceta of Remesiana, this work represents a separate witness to the practice in fifth-century Gaul. In Book 5 of *De sacramentis* frequent Communion is recommended to the newly-baptized during Easter week. This is part of an exposition of the phrase *panem nostrum quotidianum* from the Lord's Prayer. The author contrasts the daily reception of this bread with the practice of the East, where Communion was received only once a year.<sup>108</sup> The word *cotidie* is the thread which holds together his appeal for frequent Communion. It may refer to private Communion or to the opportunity afforded for daily Mass during the Easter season,<sup>109</sup> although in this passage a distinction is hinted at between Communion and the celebration of Mass. The author mentions the "daily" (*cotidie*) sacrifice of Job, which foreshadowed that new sacrifice which, "howsoever often" (*quotiescumque*) it is offered, announces the resurrection of the Lord. Then he mentions again the need of a "daily" (*cotidie*) reception of the bread of life. Similarly, in 4, 6, 28, the sacrifice is effective "as often as" (*quotiescumque*) Christ's blood is shed, which we ought to receive "frequently" (*semper*).<sup>110</sup> In describing the effects of Communion, *De mysteriis* mentions manna as the daily nourishment of the Jews in the wilderness, but without saying anything about the frequency of the reception of Communion.<sup>111</sup>

The practice of the Church in Aquileia, a city within the sphere of influence of Milan,<sup>112</sup> may reveal something about that of the Milanese Church. Chromatius, who was bishop of Aquileia from 387–407, in his

<sup>108</sup> *De sacramentis* 5, 4, 25 (SC 25<sup>ba</sup>, 132–34). Cf. Pétré, "Les leçons" 69–71.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. Monachino, *La cura pastorale* 53, 60. Reference to daily Mass during paschaltide can be found in Augustine, *Ep.* 98 9 (CSEL 34, 530); cf. Tertullian, *De corona* 3, 4, *De idolatria* 14, 7 (CCL 2, 1043 and 1115). This text from *De sacramentis*, with *ibid.* 4, 6, 28 (SC 25<sup>ba</sup>, 116–18), is taken as proof of daily Mass by Johanny (*L'Eucharistie* 78–79), Kottje ("Das Aufkommen" 221–22—though he recognizes that the two passages speak only of the reception of Communion), and Schmitz (*Gottesdienst* 236, 237). Schmitz's principle—that all the admonitions Ambrose enunciated in his baptismal catechesis were meant for the entire life and behavior of the baptized—seems unnecessarily all-inclusive, especially when invoked for attendance at daily Mass.

<sup>110</sup> SC 25<sup>ba</sup>, 116–18.

<sup>111</sup> *De mysteriis* 8, 48 (SC 25<sup>ba</sup>, 182): "Revera mirabile est quod manna deus pluerit patribus et quotidiano caeli pascebantur alimento. Unde dictum est: *Panem angelorum manducavit homo*. Sed tamen panem illum qui manducaverunt omnes in deserto *mortui sunt*; ista autem esca quam accipis iste *panis vivus qui descendit de caelo*, vitae aeternae substantiam subministrat et quicumque hunc manducaverit *non morietur in aeternum*, est enim corpus Christi."

<sup>112</sup> Bouhot, "Une ancienne homélie catéchétique" 71; K. Gamber, "Die älteste abendländische Evangelien-Perikopenliste," *MTZ* 13 (1962) 181; G. Morin, "L'Année liturgique à Aquilée antérieurement à l'époque carolingienne d'après le Code Rehdigeranus," *RBén* 19 (1902) 1–12. At the Council of Aquileia in 381, "Valerian, Bishop of Aquileia, was the nominal president, but it was Ambrose who really directed the business" (Dudden, *Saint Ambrose* 1, 200).

exposition of the Lord's Prayer interprets *panem nostrum cotidianum* as daily Communion.<sup>113</sup> In a Christmas sermon he identifies the crib with the altar "at which we gather daily (*cotidie*) that we may there partake of the body of Christ, the food of salvation."<sup>114</sup> The association of the altar with the reception of the body of Christ suggests that daily Communion occurred at Mass. *Cotidie*—if it is taken to mean "each and every day"—might mean "daily during the Christmas season," a parallel to Monachino's interpretation of *cotidie* as "daily in Lent or Paschaltide." The Christmas cycle—consisting of Christmas, Epiphany, and the subsidiary feasts of Stephen, John the Evangelist (or the apostles), and the Holy Innocents—was just beginning to be observed. Ambrose seems to have celebrated the two major feasts<sup>115</sup> and perhaps also that in honor of Stephen. The earliest lectionary list from Aquileia, which dates from the fourth century, contains the additional feasts of the Holy Innocents and all the apostles. It also indicates that Mass was not said every day of the year.<sup>116</sup> There is not much reason to think that Mass was celebrated publicly in Aquileia every day of the year.

### *Africa*

The forms of public prayer at Hippo when Augustine was bishop have already been described.<sup>117</sup> Vespers consisted of psalms and other readings

<sup>113</sup> "Hoc autem spiritaliter nobis praeceptum esse debemus advertere, ut panem cotidianum petamus, id est, panem illum caelestem et spiritalem, quem cotidie ad medelam animae et spem aeternae salutis accipimus. . . . Et hunc ergo panem cotidie postulare iubemur, id est ut praestante Domini misericordia cotidie panem corporis Domini accipere mereamur . . . semper orare debemus, ut hunc panem caelestem cotidie mereamur accipere ne aliquo interveniente peccato a corpore Domini separemur" (*Tractus in evangelium Matthaei* 14, 5, 3–4 [CCL 9, 432–34]). Cf. *Praefatio orationis dominicae* (CCL 9, 446; SC 164, 226 and 225 n. 1). The same combination of daily Communion and a prayer for worthiness is found in *De sacramentis* 5, 25 (SC 25<sup>bis</sup>, 132). Cf. Pétré, "Les leçons" 69–71.

<sup>114</sup> *Sermo* 32 3 (SC 164, 164).

<sup>115</sup> Righetti, *Storia liturgica* 2, 536–42. H. Frank, "La celebrazione della festa Natalis Salvatoris ed Epifania in Milano ai tempi de S. Ambrogio," *Scuola cattolica* 62 (1934) 683–95. C. Marcora (*Il santorale ambrosiano: Ricerche sulla formazione dagli inizi al sec. IX* [Milan: (no pub.), 1953] 149–52) suggests that a feast in honor of John the Evangelist on December 27 may have been celebrated in the time of Ambrose. In Hippo Augustine observed Stephen (December 26) and on December 27 a feast in honor of John the Baptist and St. James. There is no evidence that he celebrated a feast in honor of the Holy Innocents, but January 1 was celebrated as the Octave of Christmas and January 6 as the Epiphany; cf. G. G. Willis, *Lectionary* 22 and 59–61.

<sup>116</sup> Gamber ("Die älteste Perikopenliste" 201) finds evidence that the Gospel lists at Aquileia originated in the fourth century from the fact that only those days are beginning to become "liturgical" that were already at that time civil holidays: Sundays, the weeks before and after Easter, Christmas and the days following, and New Year's. Cf. Morin, "L'Année liturgique à Aquilée."

<sup>117</sup> Van der Meer, *Augustine* 277–346; Willis, *Lectionary*; Roetzer, *Des heiligen Augustinus Schriften* 12; Zumkeller, *Das Mönchtum* 91–99; Zwinggi, "Die fortlaufende Schriftlesung" and "Der Wortgottesdienst bei Augustinus."

from the Bible—which, according to van der Meer,<sup>118</sup> would have been commented on by Augustine—but selections from the Gospels seem not to have been used.<sup>119</sup> The devout attended the morning and evening services in the major basilica each day—the two daily visits of Monica to church.<sup>120</sup> As Mass was said in the morning, it may be expected to have formed part of the morning service, but usually without a sermon on weekdays for lack of time. *Sermo 5*<sup>121</sup> and other instances of Augustine's preaching at a weekday Mass were exceptional, for special occasions, such as the vigil of the Ascension, when he announced his determination to halt the unsuitable observance of feasts in honor of the dead (*laetitiae*).<sup>122</sup>

Granted Augustine's statement that there were places in which Mass was celebrated every day, we must include Hippo among them. It is not impossible that a daily celebration of Mass had continued in Africa from the time of Cyprian; this would account for Augustine's unqualified remark that Monica had never let a day pass without attending Mass. In *Epistola 98* Augustine takes it for granted that there is daily Mass in Cataquas, a neighboring town, and the same assumption is found elsewhere.<sup>123</sup> In some of these the force of *cotidie* and *sacrificium* may be questioned, but their accumulated effect and the lack of any clear reference to private Communion make it virtually certain that daily Mass was the practice of Augustine and even of the African Church. Do Augustine's remarks apply beyond Africa? As we have seen, he says vaguely in *Epistola 54*<sup>124</sup> that observance varied from place to place, and in *De sermone domini in monte*<sup>125</sup> he mentions that many Eastern

<sup>118</sup> *Augustine* 345; cf. Zwinggi, "Die fortlaufende Schriftlesung" 107. On certain days Augustine mentions preaching twice: the feasts of St. Cyprian (*Misc. Agust. 1, 133*), St. John the Baptist (*Misc. Agust. 1, 227*), and, almost certainly, the Ascension (*Ep. 29 3* [CSEL 34/1, 115]).

<sup>119</sup> *Sermo 125 1* (*Misc. Agust. 1, 353*): "Nam si legatur quando sabbatum non est, aut quando dominicus non est, sermo de illa non redditur;" *Sermo 128 6* (PL 38, 716). Cf. Zwinggi, "Der Wortgottesdienst bei Augustinus" 94, 130; "Die fortlaufende Schriftlesung" 102, 107–15.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. n. 100 above.

<sup>121</sup> *Serm. 2.5 3* (*Misc. Agust. 1, 250–51*). As it is on a Gospel text (Mt 13:24–30), it would probably have been delivered at a morning service.

<sup>122</sup> *Ep. 29 2* (CSEL 34/1, 114–15). He once completed on a Monday the sermon he had begun the Sunday before (*Misc. Agust. 1, 356*).

<sup>123</sup> *Ep. 98 9* (CSEL 34/2, 530–31); cf. *De civ. dei* 10, 20 (CCL 47, 294); *Enn. in pss.* 75, 15 (CCL 39, 1047); *Serm. 17 5* (PL 38, 127); *Serm. 112 4, 4* (PL 38, 1413); *Serm. 2 11 8* and *10* (*Misc. Agust. 1, 260* and *261*). The references in *Sermones 56–59* and *227* (PL 38, 377–402 and 1099–1101) are to daily Mass and Communion in paschaltide.

<sup>124</sup> N. 27 above. The significant passage from *Ep. 54* is quoted in the text. Cf. also n. 39 above.

<sup>125</sup> 7, 26 (CCL 35, 114–15).

Christians did not receive Communion daily. In this section of his commentary he points out a problem with a Eucharistic interpretation of *panem nostrum cotidianum* for the East, where many do not receive daily, but also for his own audience, who would have to avoid the Lord's Prayer after having received Communion or to put Mass off until the end of the day. There is nothing in his comments that requires that all African Christians would have received Communion every day or that there was daily Mass throughout the entire Latin Church at that time.

### Gaul

The writings of John Cassian, generally later than 420, present a peculiar problem. They are clearly inspired by Egyptian monasticism adapted to the needs of his monks at Marseilles. Therefore the liturgical practices mentioned are, in origin, Egyptian. On the other hand, as Cassian considered them relevant for his monks, he would have selected or altered the original data to accord with the practices of his monastery. Whether of Egypt or Gaul, nothing in either the *Conlationes* or the *De institutis* requires the celebration of a daily Mass. Though daily Communion is mentioned, there are other references that imply a weekly Communion, on Sundays.<sup>126</sup> O. Chadwick avoids invoking private reception to resolve these conflicting pieces of information on the grounds that a chapel was within easy reach. Nevertheless, he also seems to disfavor the theory of a daily Mass. It is likely that Cassian's monks received Communion at the Sunday community Mass, and some also received privately on aliturgical days.<sup>127</sup>

### CONCLUSION

There is little evidence that there was daily Mass in Gaul even during the sixth century, although Cassian's monks may have received Communion privately every day.<sup>128</sup> In Rome, only Siricius mentions Mass every day, a witness called into question by the fact that there was no daily celebration during the episcopates of his predecessor Damasus and one of his near successors, Innocent I. The first reference to daily Mass

<sup>126</sup> Regarding daily Communion cf. *Instit.* 6, 8 (CSEL 17, 120); *Conlationes* 7, 30; 9, 21; 14, 8 (CSEL 13, 208, 269, 405). Regarding weekly Communion cf. *Instit.* 3, 2 (CSEL 17, 34) and *Conl.* 23, 21 (CSEL 13, 670-71).

<sup>127</sup> O. Chadwick, *John Cassian* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1968) 69. Vogüé ("Problems" 329) observes: "... one hears nothing of daily Mass before the seventh century, when it appears sporadically in Gaul. The earlier texts which speak of daily Communion refer to a Communion rite *extra Missam*."

<sup>128</sup> H. G. Beck, *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-East France during the Sixth Century* (Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1950) 130-33; id., "A Note on the Frequency of Mass in Sixth-Century France," *AER* 120 (1949) 480-85. Cf. Gennadius of Marseilles, *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum* 22 (Solano, *Textos eucarísticos* 2, 535): "Cotidie eucharistiae communionem percipere nec laudo nec vitupero: omnibus tamen dominicis diebus communicandum hor-  
tor."

in Rome, apart from Siricius', is found in the correspondence of Gregory I (590–604).<sup>129</sup> According to Jerome, the private reception of Communion was common in Rome. No statement by Ambrose that Mass was celebrated daily in Milan is altogether unambiguous, but the cumulative effect of many references to daily Mass and Communion persuades one that at least Ambrose said Mass most days and that the practice of private Communion may have continued there. The practice in Aquileia was likely very much the same as that of Milan; Ambrose's influence can be expected to have made itself felt throughout northern Italy. Augustine knew and approved of the custom of daily Mass, and the evidence for this custom existing in Africa is very strong. Siricius' *Epistola 1* and Canon 5 of Toledo I are not necessarily proof of daily Mass throughout Spain; Jerome mentions the practice of daily private Communion in Spain.

An interesting parallel to the evidence for daily Mass considered here can be drawn from what is known about the East. That Mass was celebrated daily in Palestine is affirmed by Eusebius of Caesarea; in Alexandria, by Cyril of Alexandria; and in Antioch and Constantinople, by John Chrysostom. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and John Chrysostom refer to daily Communion. Basil of Caesarea mentions that he does not say Mass every day, but recommends daily Communion and reports that it is common in Alexandria and among the monks of Egypt. The *Historia Lausiaca* says that some monks communicated daily. There is also much evidence that Mass was not said every day, and it has been suggested that "daily" may mean "frequently" or be restricted to paschaltide.<sup>130</sup> Nevertheless, the evidence for daily Mass in the Eastern Church is not negligible, but even more than for the West it has not been the subject of any comprehensive study.

Our ignorance of antiquity is an effective check on our inclination to generalize. But what evidence there is points to Ambrose's having begun the practice of daily Mass, in Milan. His authority would have been

<sup>129</sup> *Epistolarum liber 8*, 29 (PL 77, 930–31; *MGH: Epistolae 1*, 28–29). Cf. J. Barker, *Sacrificial Priesthood* (Westminster: Dacre, 1941) 26. Häussling ("Ursprünge der Privatmesse" 25–26) suggests that private Mass was unusual even in the time of Gregory I. M. B. de Soos (*Le mystère liturgique* [Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorff, 1958] 43–45, 50, 91, 125) discusses aliturgical synaxes in Rome under Leo the Great and the relationship between feasts, fasts, and the celebration of Mass.

<sup>130</sup> This information comes from H. Chadwick, "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy" *JTS* n.s. 2 (1951) 155, n. 2; E. Dublanchy, "Communion fréquent," *DTC* 3, 516–19; G. Rauschen, *Eucharistie und Bussakrament in den ersten sechs Jahrhunderten der Kirche* (2nd ed.; Herder: Freiburg im Breisgau, 1910; reprint Amsterdam: Rodopinv, 1971) 134–35; A. Bludau, *Die Pilgerreise der Aetheria* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1927) 53–54; F. van de Paverd, *Zur Geschichte der Messliturgie in Antiocheia und Konstantinopel gegen Ende des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Rome: Pont. Institut. Orient. Studiorum, 1970) 78–79, 422–24.

sufficient to recommend the practice throughout the cities of northern Italy, especially places like Aquileia and Vercelli, where monasticism was well established. Rome would have had its own tradition; Ambrose's saying Mass in a private house on one of his visits to Rome may have been the result of his practice of saying Mass daily and the older Roman custom of having Mass only once a week. Augustine, abetted by the example of Ambrose, would have followed at Hippo the universal African custom of daily Mass. But Rome (ever suspicious of novelty), Gaul, and perhaps Spain did not adopt the practice for several centuries.

I believe the origin of a daily celebration of Mass was the custom in the early Church of receiving Communion privately at home. This custom continued in the fourth century, but not as a universal practice. For several reasons—the sheer number of converts would have been as important as any—Christians generally began to stay back from receiving Communion even at Mass, so that it was only among the devout (from the fourth century on these became identified more and more with the ascetics) that the custom continued. It assumed two forms, corresponding to the two forms of monasticism in the West, lay and clerical. The liturgical life of unordained ascetics was centered on the local church. On days with no public worship, there would have been a ceremony of private Communion in the “monastery,” a practice which, we have seen, continued well into the medieval period.<sup>131</sup> But when the center of the monastic group was a bishop (e.g., Ambrose, Eusebius of Vercelli, Martin of Tours, Chromatius of Aquileia, Paulinus of Nola, Augustine—an altogether impressive list), the ceremonies of daily Communion would have tended quite naturally towards a full celebration of the Eucharist. Furthermore, the monk-bishop would have affected his clergy by his conviction that they should adopt an ascetical piety, especially daily Mass and celibacy. Many bishops and priests, of course, would not have shared this piety or possessed the openness to change needed for daily Mass and celibacy to become established throughout the West. The gradual adoption, often under duress, of these and other monastic observances by the clergy and *mutatis mutandis* the laity of the Latin Church represents the triumph of a monastic spirituality which embodied and developed what were even then traditional practices of Christianity: fasting, retirement, vigils and other forms of prayer, celibacy, and daily Communion. In manifold, ever-developing, sometimes bizarre forms, this spirituality retained its vigor in the Latin Church until our own day. If it is now to be abandoned, we are called upon to create a spirituality that is equally profound, adaptable, and respectful of the traditions of Catholicism.

<sup>131</sup> C. Vogel (“Une mutation culturelle inexplicée: Le passage de l’Eucharistie communautaire à la messe privée,” *Revue des sciences religieuses de l’Université de Strasbourg* 54 [1980] 237) shows that daily Mass was not recommended as a daily exercise until ca. 750.