

Clemens Leonhard

Morning *salutationes* and the Decline of Sympotic Eucharists in the Third Century

Abstract: In late antiquity and the middle ages, many expositors compare the liturgy of the Eucharist (or the mass/the Divine Liturgy) with the accounts of Jesus' Last supper claiming continuity and identity for a tradition in whose early phases diversity and change were abound. This essay departs from five issues regarding aspects of change between the early Christian sympotic celebrations of the Eucharist and the state of affairs in the middle ages: first, the quantity and quality of food to be consumed; second, the combined (as against separate) blessing or consecration of bread and wine; third, the timing of the celebration in the afternoon and evening versus the early morning; fourth, its compulsory combination with a liturgy of the word that is, moreover, performed preceding the Eucharist and not following the meal as it would be customary in ancient Greece and Rome; fifth, the later reservation of the presidency to clerics of the church. At least these five aspects of change in Eucharistic celebrations can be explained with recourse to the Roman custom of patrons receiving their clients almost every morning in the framework of the morning *salutatio*. Thus, it is indicated how the churches of Carthage moved from Eucharistic celebrations in the style of dinner parties and communal meals towards distributions of gifts to clients at a meeting with their bishop as patron of the church. This thesis explains why the loss of prandial Eucharists began long before Constantine. It explains when and why Christian churches in the Roman Empire abandoned a celebration that lent itself to the spontaneous interpretation as a mimetic celebration of the Last Supper thus creating the need to emphasize—eventually as part of the ritual itself in the form of the recitation of institution narratives—that the Eucharist is still the same, although it lost most of its mimetic allusions to its alleged pattern in the first century. The gradual adoption of the social institution of the morning *salutatio* also explains the parallel existence of different forms of Eucharistic celebrations: Its adoption and adaptation is an answer to the growth of the churches in certain places which could remain unimportant for others.

DOI 10.1515/zac-2014-0021

Clemens Leonhard: Seminar für Liturgiewissenschaft, Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Robert-Koch-Straße 40; 48149 Münster; E-mail: clemens.leonhard@uni-muenster.de

From Antique Symposia and Eucharistic Meals to the Early Medieval Mass

By the middle ages, the celebration of the Eucharist preceded by a liturgy of the word had become a public celebration *sui generis*. Although many public rituals were performed, the medieval mass was not an ecclesiastical version of an otherwise profane ritual. Recent studies of the Eucharist in the Early Church confirm, however, that Jewish and Christian adaptations notwithstanding, the first celebrations of Eucharists were understood and interpreted as communal meals both for internal and external purposes.¹ Yet, the medieval mass is anything but a remnant of an antique *symposium*. Traces of its basic shape emerge in the third century,² although its typical precursors are attested from the fourth century on. Almost all specimens of the main prayer of this ritual include a reference to Jesus' Last Supper as its narrative of institution. This prayer claims that the celebration is a more or less mimetic performance as fulfillment of Jesus' commandment to do in his remembrance what he did. For the medieval observer, this is not astonishing, because the narratives of institution in the New Testament do not tell many details about the shape of the celebration.³ Similar to the early remarks on the

1 Cf. recently Konrad Vössing, "Das 'Herrenmahl' und 1 Cor 11 im Kontext antiker Gemeinschaftsmähler," *JbAC* 54 (2011): 41–72; and the seminal studies by Matthias Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft: Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern* (Texte und Arbeiten zum Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 13; Tübingen: Francke, 1996) and Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003) and others as well as the summary in Benedikt Eckhardt and Clemens Leonhard, "Mahl 5," *RAC* 23 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 2010): 1012–1105. Thus, *Didache* 9–10 (ed. Klaus Wengst, *Didache [Apostellehre], Barnabasbrief, Zweiter Klemensbrief, Schrift an Diognet* [Schriften des Urchristentums 2; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1984], 78–83; cf. Kurt Niederwimmer, ed., *Die Didache* [Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 1; Ergänzungsreihe zum Kritisch-Exegetischen Kommentar über das Neue Testament 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989], 174–175) calls a sequence of pre- and post-prandial blessings that frame a substantial meal: "Eucharist" (*Didache* 9,1 [78 W.]). For Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 39,14–21 (CChr.SL 1, 152,60–153,100 Dekkers; CSEL 69, 94,58–95,98 Hoppe), Christians celebrate meals which belong to the basic category of Roman festive communal meals although they surpass the Roman customs in their frugality and the preservation of decorum and piety.

2 Cf. Harald Buchinger, "Early Eucharist in transition? A fresh look at Origen," in *Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship: New Insights into its History and Interaction* (ed. Albert Gerhards and Clemens Leonhard; Jewish and Christian Perspectives 15; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 207–227 studies Origen's churches and the earliest attestations of a liturgy of the word.

3 In his exposition of the mass, Amalarius Fortunatus, *Liber Officialis* 3,24,8 (ed. Ioanne M. Hanssens, *Amalari episcopi opera liturgica omnia, Tomus 2: Liber Officialis* [Studi e Testi 139; Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1948], 339,25–30) claims that the celebration of the

shape of the celebrations of the Eucharist, the traditions about Jesus' last meal describe it in terms of Greco-Roman *symposia*. At least part of the changes in this ritual must, therefore, be sought in the third century.

Based on results of recent research, especially Andrew McGowan's seminal studies, the following essay inquires into the prerequisites for the transition from the celebration of *symposia* towards the later structure of the mass. Any explanation of this transition must at least address the following points where Eucharistic *symposia* differ from the later mass.

First, the quantity and quality of the food that is served differs considerably. Putting aside "ascetic Eucharists" (according to McGowan's terminology) and anti-meals that deliberately change aspects of food and drink which may be consumed, participants in meals of the early church ate other foods and more of it than medieval Christians. On the one hand, it is plausible that the idea of the holiness of this food increased in importance over the centuries and caused thus a reduction of the quantities used in order to minimize the risk of deliberate or accidental misuse. Yet, even the first extra-Biblical texts about the Eucharist combine serious eating with a strong emphasis on the holiness of the food.⁴ Ideas about a sacred character of the food were thus no reason not to eat much of it. At some point, Christian groups replaced communal banquets with the mere distribution of small quantities of consecrated food. The reasons for this development are at stake here.

Second, the combined consecration and distribution of bread and wine does not imitate the descriptions of the Last Supper in the Gospels.⁵ For Paul (1 Cor 11:23–26), it is clear that the ritual manipulation and the distribution of bread and wine were separated by the consumption of a meal as he mentions the blessing

Eucharist imitates its ancient model meticulously. Amalar wants to identify each of the priest's acts during the Eucharist with a similar concept as the "sevenfold shape" of the Last Supper; cf. note 39. He does not admit the existence of structural differences between the narratives about the Last Supper and the performance of the medieval *Canon Romanus*. His explanations affirm continuity and consistence.

⁴ Cf. *Didache* 9–10 (78–83 W.).

⁵ Contrary to Amalar, Martin Luther observes that the basic structure of the medieval Eucharist does not fit to the descriptions of the Last Supper. He suggests a change of the performance of the ritual: "Es dunckt mich aber, das es dem abendmal gemes sey, so man flux auff die consecration des brods das sacrament reyche und gebe, ehe man den kilch segenet. Denn so reden beide Lucas und Paulus: Desselben gleychen den kilch, nach dem sie gessen hatten etce." (Martin Luther, *Schriften des Jahres 1526* [D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe Abteilung 1,19; Weimar: Böhlau, 1897], 99).

of the cup “after the meal,” μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι.⁶ Sophisticated and never attested intermediate steps of developments must be imagined between a symptotic celebration (that begins with a blessing of bread including wine in some cases⁷ followed by its distribution and which ends with a blessing over wine also followed by its distribution) and the medieval state of affairs where bread and wine are blessed in one ritual act which is followed by their distribution. Thus it must be asked, when and how the manipulation, distribution, and consumption of bread and wine developed from acts that were typically separated by the meal into the later single act of consecration followed by their distribution without any trace of a meal.

Third, clubs or private persons celebrate dinners in the late afternoons and in the evenings. Cyprian presupposes Eucharistic celebrations in the early morning. Moreover, he suggests that Eucharists could be celebrated in prison with small groups and without the detection of the guards.⁸ None of these celebrations were *symposia*. Yet they prefigure the later standard of Eucharistic celebrations that are not bound to a certain time of the day and which do not require a dining room. It must be asked, why the groups that Cyprian mentions accepted such performances as Eucharists, especially when their members knew both how to celebrate a banquet and that they should actually imitate Jesus’ Last Supper in some way.

Fourth, it is evident for the Middle Ages that the celebration of the mass is always preceded by a liturgy of the word containing the proclamation of biblical texts, sometimes followed by a short exposition and prayer. In symptotic celebrations, one would debate philosophical questions or affairs of one’s group during the drinking party after the meal.⁹ A reconstruction of the early history of the Eucharist must account for what resembles a complete inversion of the sequence of the customary elements of *symposia*. Modern explanations include anachronistic references to Jewish synagogue services and undocumented assumptions about

6 The question of Justin’s Eucharist is briefly taken up below. Konrad Vössing, “Herrenmahl” (see note 1), 46–51, 67 explains μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι and Paul’s remarks on the Lord’s Supper in the context of late antique meal customs of voluntary associations. He is summarizing former (aporetic) explanations, many of which just try to reconstruct the meal of 1 Cor 11 in terms of the medieval customs to celebrate the Eucharist.

7 Cf. however Paul Bradshaw’s observations referred to in note 39.

8 Cyprian, *Epistula* 5,2,2 (CChr.SL 3b, 28,23–32 Diercks; CSEL 3,2, 479,13–21 Hartel); cf. Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (An Alcuin Club Publication; Oxford: University Press, 2004), 113. Bradshaw remarks: “What still remains something of a mystery, however, is why either of these traditions should eventually have moved the Eucharist from Saturday evening to Sunday morning at all.” (72). The following recourse to the morning *salutatio* answers this question.

9 Vössing, “Herrenmahl” (see note 1), 67–68; Klinghardt, *Gemeinschaftsmahl* (see note 1), § 13, especially 347–363; Smith, *Symposium* (see note 1), e.g. 200.

the impact of rabbinic liturgy upon the development of the mass.¹⁰ If early Christianity did not just reverse well-established customs like the normal sequence of eating and talking at formal dinners, one must look for other social institutions as patterns for the Christian Eucharist.

Fifth, in rabbinic Judaism, every eater is responsible for the recitation of blessings, although these blessings may be recited by one person on behalf of the group.¹¹ In Christianity, the presider of a mass must be a member of a certain rank of the church's hierarchy. Many reasons can be adduced for this rule that is adhered to in many churches until today. The earliest texts do not, however, put much emphasis on this question. In Cyprian's time, the Eucharists of a heretical woman who acted as presider of such celebrations and who performed baptisms still shows that the qualities of the presider were less important than the question whether or not he or she belonged to the right group.¹² An explanation of the transition from sympotic contexts towards the later status quo in many churches must also account for the emphasis on the status of the person who can lead services and distribute consecrated food.

These developments can be explained by the assumption that the basic pattern of the Greco-Roman *symposium*, which resembled Jesus' Last Supper, is not the precursor of the medieval mass. Formal banquets continued to be celebrated by Christians. Yet leaders of the third century North African church decided to distribute consecrated food within the framework of another social institution: the Roman morning *salutatio*. With some qualifications (to be mentioned below), the assumption that Christian performances of the Eucharist were set in the context of

10 Cf. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (see note 8), 69–72 for a brief summary of the formerly widespread theses. Thus, Hans B. Meyer, *Eucharistie: Geschichte, Theologie, Pastoral: Mit einem Beitrag von Irmgard Pahl* (Gottesdienst der Kirche, Handbuch der Liturgiewissenschaft 4; Regensburg: Pustet, 1989), 116–119 refers to two groups of theses about the origins of the liturgy of the word. First, it could have been inspired by Jewish meal customs, e.g. the recitation of the Haggadah (of Pesach) and early Christian customs to remember and proclaim Christ during Christian meals. Second, early Christianity might have taken over a form of Jewish synagogue service and appended the Eucharist to it. Meyer rejects the second group of theses. Regarding the first group, he does not raise the point that a sympotic structure would normally make people eat first and debate afterwards.

11 Cf. for the rabbinic traditions of creating norms and explanations with regard to the pre-prandial blessings, Clemens Leonhard, "Blessings over Wine and Bread in Judaism and Christian Eucharistic Prayers: Two Independent Traditions," in *Jewish and Christian Liturgy and Worship: New Insights into its History and Interaction* (ed. Albert Gerhards and Clemens Leonhard; Jewish and Christian Perspectives 15; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 309–326.

12 Firmilian to Cyprian, *Epistula* 75,10,5–75,11,1 (CChr.SL 3c, 592,238–593,256 Diercks; CSEL 3,2, 817,28–818,18 Hartel); cf. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (see note 8), 114.

Roman *salutationes matutinales* explains the transition from sympotic Eucharists towards the medieval state of affairs.

The Morning *Salutatio*

Walking through the main streets of ancient Pompeii or Herculaneum in the early morning, passersby could watch groups of people waiting outside of certain houses, some of them sitting on stone benches next to the entrance. Two hours later, these groups were gone. The stone benches on which they were sitting continued to indicate for everyone where important people were residing. The benches can still be seen today.¹³ They are typically located near houses. There are no benches outside of the restaurants in the same streets. The stone benches may bear witness to the morning *salutationes* where clients of wealthy and influential people used to assemble in the early morning. They were waiting there to be admitted into certain parts of their patron's house.

In the Roman system of patronage, influential and wealthy persons met their clients almost every day. Typically, the visitors would belong to lower strata of the local society than those whom they visited. Patrons could spend much more than one hour each day in these meetings.¹⁴ Sometimes, clients lined up for a long time before dawn in front of an illustrious patron's house. They could also rush from one morning *salutatio* to the next, in order to meet two important people on the same morning.¹⁵ Patrons could also have their duties, for example a business

13 Cf. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 12. Jens-A. Dickmann, *Domus Frequentata: Anspruchsvolles Wohnen im pompejanischen Stadthaus, Textband 1* (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften: Kommission zur Erforschung des Antiken Städtewesens: Studien zur Antiken Stadt 4,1; München: Pfeil, 1999) does not discuss the possible use of the benches. Yet, he presupposes that *salutationes* belonged to the Pompeians' daily life for some time: 41, 98, 103, 283 (note 119), 311–312. Within a sample of 30 Pompeian houses, nine had fixed seating installations near the entrance; Penelope M. Allison, *Pompeian Households: An Analysis of Material Culture* (Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Monograph 42; Los Angeles: University of California, 2004), 65. Fabian Goldbeck, *Salutationes: Die Morgenbegrüßungen in Rom in der Republik und der frühen Kaiserzeit* (KLIO: Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte: Beihefte N.S. 16; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2010), 154 and 148 (note 3) rejects this interpretation of the benches.

14 Cf. Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13), chapter 2.2, and August Hug, "Salutatio," in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 2,2 (vol. 1A.2; Stuttgart: Metzler, 1920), 2060–2072 for a rich collection of references and bits of interpretation.

15 Cf. Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13), 97–98 for daily multiple visits.

meeting of the Senate. They could also regard it as necessary or useful to meet someone else in the other's house.¹⁶ In that case, clients waited in vain.

Patrons could distribute presents (*sportulae*) in cash or in kind to their clients at this occasion. In Roman aristocracy, the custom to distribute presents to clients became more important from the beginning of the empire onwards. While such presents could be substantial and supplement a poor person's income, they would not amount to a veritable welfare system, although this could be regarded as an ideal (or rather a myth).¹⁷

Patronage created a loose bond between people of different status. The daily performance of a ritualized reestablishment of this bond supported its stability. Nevertheless, its ritualization also left the participants in the dark about the true motives behind the respective others' actions. The fact that some clients were entitled to receive presents as well as the ritualization of the *salutationes* as meetings between "friends" (*amici* in a very broad sense) created different classes of clients and sometimes required the restriction of the number of clients or even a selection of persons to be admitted to meeting the patron. Roman patrons of higher rank could have servants (*nomenclatores*) who were specialized in knowing the names of the clients of their employer and in identifying their faces in the crowd. With their help, the patron could greet each client with his name. *Nomenclatores* could even use books¹⁸ in order to keep track of who was to be counted among the clients and friends and who was not.

Few sources indicate that the patrons regarded this institution as burdensome, while some describe the requirement (*officium*) for the clients to appear

¹⁶ E.g. Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13); 64 (note 5), 73, 75–76.

¹⁷ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae* 2,9–11 (ed. Karl Jacoby, *Dionysi Halicarnasensis Antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt* 1 [Leipzig: Teubner, 1995], 166,7–170,4; trans. Earnest Cary, *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus* [Loeb Classical Library 319; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948], 336–345), especially 2,9,2 (166,19–24 J.) and 2,9,3 (167,4–8 J.), saying that plebeians could choose their patrons and every plebeian should belong to a patron; and Plutarch, *Vitae parallelae, Romulus* 13 (BSGRT *Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae* 1,1, 49–50, especially 50,17–31 Ziegler; trans. Bernadotte Perrin, *Plutarch's Lives* [Loeb Classical Library 46; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959], 122–127) mentioning that Romulus instituted patronage in order to create social peace, harmony, and welfare in ancient Rome; Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, "Patronage in Roman society: from republic to empire," in *Patronage in Ancient Society* (ed. idem; London: Routledge, 1989), 63–87, especially 66; Koenraad Verboven, *The Economy of Friends: Economic Aspects of Amicitia and Patronage in the Late Republic* (Collection Latomus 269; Tournai: Éditions Latomus, 2002), 60; Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13), 51 (note 3), 238.

¹⁸ Cf. Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13), 101.

every morning at their patron's door as a form of drudgery.¹⁹ Clients could use the opportunity to ask a favor of the patron. In rare cases, they could hope to be invited to a veritable meal at the patrons' house,²⁰ which did not, however, guarantee that they would be served the same choice food as their superiors. The morning *salutatio* was not related in any way to the celebration of a *symposium* in the evening. Some sources imply that the gift of a *sportula* could be regarded as a substitution for an invitation to a formal dinner.²¹ Needless to say, writers complain about instances where they were only given a *sportula* instead of being invited to a luxurious meal within the high society.

The role of the patrons in Christian groups and vis-à-vis the organization of a hierarchically ordered church has been studied extensively. Patrons are also mentioned in the context of communal meals in the *Traditio Apostolica*.²² Many sources indicate that patrons had a significant impact on church life. They show that the actual roles of the patrons hardly differed from comparable institutions in the surrounding Roman culture. The texts try to cope with problems of the display of honor, hierarchy, and power that emerge in the wake of the patrons' tampering with affairs of a Christian club or congregation. While the *Traditio Apostolica* tries to preserve the manifestation of the patron's honor at communal banquets, the *Syriac Didascalia* seeks to limit the patrons' power to a minimum and to transfer their prerogatives and social functions to the office of the bishop. At the same time, the *Didascalia* tries not to endanger the flow of the patrons' money into the coffers of the church.²³

Those texts do not discuss an institution that can be presupposed on the basis of the practice of the surrounding culture: the patrons' or the bishops' reception of his clients—the members of his church—in the morning *salutationes*. The spread of the basic element of the institution of patronage beyond the city of Rome is well attested. Yet, morning *salutationes* are hardly mentioned for the provinces. Furthermore, the most explicit sources reflect the Roman aristocracy in the late

19 The satirists, especially Martial, provide ample evidence: Richard P. Saller, "Martial on patronage and literature," *The Classical Quarterly* 33 (1983): 246–257 for the assessment of Martial's satires as sources for historical reconstruction.

20 Wallace-Hadrill, "Patronage in Roman society" (see note 17), 73.

21 Verboven, *Economy of Friends* (see note 17), 95; Duncan Cloud, "The client-patron relationship: emblem and reality in Juvenal's first book," in *Patronage in Ancient Society* (ed. Andrew Wallace-Hadrill; London: Routledge, 1989), 205–218, especially 213–214; Charles A. Bobertz, "The role of patron in the *Cena Dominica* of Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*," *JThS* 44 (1993): 170–184, especially 175.

22 Cf. Bobertz, "The role of patron" (see note 21).

23 Georg Schöllgen, *Die Anfänge der Professionalisierung des Klerus und das kirchliche Amt in der syrischen Didaskalie* (JbAC Ergänzungsbande 26; Münster: Aschendorff, 1998).

Republic and the time of the first emperors. It is not, therefore, obvious that this practice was transferred to other parts of the empire and may be used as a social background for the reconstruction of Christian rituals. Fabian Goldbeck doubts that *salutationes* played any role outside of Rome allowing for temporal visits of Roman aristocrats in other places of Italy; such as Cicero in Cumae.²⁴ Yet, Richard P. Saller devoted a long chapter of his book *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* to the phenomenon of patronage in North Africa based on epigraphic material.²⁵ As the Romans in North Africa used Roman technical terminology for social statuses, it stands to reason that they also emulated the typical practice of their role models. In addition, the architecture of houses outside of the city of Rome allowed their owners to act as Roman patrons. It is true that the mere layout of Pompeian or North African houses does not imply that Pompeian or North African patrons must also have received throngs of clients each morning. However, remarks in literary sources supplement the interpretation of archeological remains.

Regarding North Africa, Apuleius of Madaura mentions crowds of visitors who would expect a newlywed couple to distribute *sportulae*—perhaps during a morning *salutatio* on the next day.²⁶ Cyprian is more explicit:

You see, forsooth, you see that man distinguished by his brilliant dress, glittering, as he thinks, in his purple. Yet with what baseness has he purchased this glitter! What contempts of the proud has he had first to submit to! What haughty thresholds has he, as an early courtier, besieged! How many scornful footsteps of arrogant great men has he had to precede, thronged in the crowd of clients, that by and by a similar procession might attend and precede him with salutations,—a train waiting not upon his person, but upon his power!²⁷

²⁴ Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13), 60 (note 1), 88–90 especially about Cicero.

²⁵ Richard P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 145–204. The concept of patronage is applied to the case of Cyprian by Charles A. Bobertz, *Cyprian of Carthage as Patron: A Social Historical Study of the Role of Bishop in the Ancient Christian Community of North Africa* (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1988 [Microfiche]).

²⁶ Apuleius, *Apologia* 88,1–8 (ed. Harold E. Butler and Arthur S. Owen, *Apulei Apologia* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914], n.p.), cf. Shelley Hales, *The Roman House and Social Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 171. The text only speaks about the expectation of the crowd to receive *sportulae* after the wedding and not that these *sportulae* were handed out in a morning *salutatio* in a technical sense. Cyprian also mentions *sportulae*; cf. Bobertz, *Cyprian of Carthage as Patron* (see note 25), 67–68 who does not link their distribution with the morning *salutatio*. Saller, *Personal Patronage* (see note 25), 129 points to Cassius Dio, *Historiae Romanae* 76 [77],5,3–4 (ed. Ursulus P. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum Quae Supersunt* 3 [Berlin: Weidmann, 1901; repr., 1955], 360,12–22; trans. Earnest Cary, *Dio's Roman History in Nine Volumes* [Loeb Classical Library 177 (= *Roman History* 9); London: Heinemann, 1955], 246–249) as the latest (205 C.E.) unambiguous reference to the continuation of the *salutationes* into the third century.

²⁷ *Quippe illum vides, qui amictu clariore conspicuus fulgere sibi videtur in purpura: quibus hoc sordibus emit, ut fulgeat, quos adrogantium fastus prius pertulit, quas superbas fores matutinus*

Cyprian shows that someone who aspired to increase his power was required to invest his time as *matutinus saluator* visiting at least one important patron every day. Cyprian remarks how such a person would eventually waste his money in order to buy the hypocritical sympathy of the crowd. He wants to show off in the same way as his former patrons.²⁸ Thus, Cyprian knew very well how this kind of fragile and only temporary status of power was acquired and maintained and that the morning *salutatio* played a decisive role in it.

Barbara Borg's and Christian Witschel's observations corroborate the assumption that the morning *salutationes* and similar forms of the public display of power relationships influenced the social behavior and ritualized acts of Christians.²⁹ They interpret the changes in the style and quality of public inscriptions as well as in the use and re-use of statues especially in the third century as traces of the emergence of profoundly different habits of representation. Roman elites of Cyprian's time shifted to the display of their power by means of public performances of different kinds rather than by the establishment of monuments.

Thus, Cyprian could have referred to a form of Roman aristocratic behavior and its consequences for the interaction between groups of different status in the society of his town. He mentions the morning *salutatio* as part and parcel of the normal processes of the distribution of power. Therefore, he does not seem to invent the scene in the text quoted above as a literary cliché without foundation

saluator obsedit, quot tumentium contumeliosa vestigia stipatus in clientium cuneos ante praecessit, ut ipsum etiam salutatum comes postmodum pompa praecederet, obnoxia non homini sed potestati! Cyprian, *Ad Donatum* 11 (CChr.SL 3a, 10,232–238 Simonetti; CSEL 3,1, 13,2–8 Hartel; trans. Ernest Wallis, "Cyprian," in *Hippolytus, Cyprian, Caius, Novatian, Appendix* [ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe; *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, vol. 5; New York: Scribner's Sons, 1919], [267–600] 270). Cf. Allen Brent, *Cyprian and Roman Cartage* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 71; Bobertz, *Cyprian of Carthage as Patron* (see note 25), 18–19 and especially 80–87: "Cyprian was thus creating a rhetorical picture with which he and Donatus, as members of the elite upper stratum of society, could reasonably identify." (83).

28 The paradoxical situations were noted by authors before Cyprian; cf. for a general assessment Aloys Winterling, "Freundschaft und Klientel im kaiserzeitlichen Rom," *Historia* 57 (2008): 298–316 and Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13), 239.

29 Barbara E. Borg and Christian Witschel, "Veränderungen im Repräsentationsverhalten der römischen Eliten während des 3. Jhs. n. Chr.," in *Inchriftliche Denkmäler als Medien der Selbstdarstellung in der römischen Welt* (ed. Géza Alföldy and Silvio Panciera; Heidelberg Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien 36; Stuttgart: Steiner, 2001), 47–120 and Barbara E. Borg, "Bilder für die Ewigkeit oder glanzvoller Auftritt? Zum Repräsentationsverhalten der stadtrömischen Eliten im dritten Jahrhundert nach Christus," in *Statuen in der Spätantike* (ed. Franz A. Bauer and Christian Witschel; Spätantike, Frühes Christentum, Byzanz, Series B: Studien und Perspektiven 23; Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2007), 43–77.

in his everyday experience. Cyprian's own access to power in Carthage also functioned within the system of patronage. Using his personal estate as a charitable fund quickly made a bishop out of him as a neophyte.³⁰ For both Cyprian and his supporters, his acts of generosity made the members of the church naturally dependent upon him and himself the logical patron and hence the bishop of the *plebs* of the church.³¹ Thus, the distribution of his estate did not make him a member of the poor but their patron.

Morning *salutationes* and the Eucharist

The recourse to the institution of morning *salutatio* helps to explain the five developments that were referred to at the beginning of this essay. In the first instance, it sheds new light upon Tertullian's reference to the distribution of food in *De Corona* written a few decades before Cyprian's time as a bishop:

We take also, in congregations before daybreak, and from the hand of none but the presidents, the sacrament of the Eucharist, which the Lord both commanded to be eaten at meal-times, and enjoined to be taken by all alike.³²

30 Cyprian's years as bishop and patron of the church of Carthage have been studied by Bobertz, *Cyprian of Carthage as Patron* (see note 25). Brent, *Cyprian* (see note 27), 69–75 also emphasizes the indebtedness of Cyprian's church to the Roman ways of life and political ethos, especially the ways of patronage. Cyprian fought against the notion that advancement in the ecclesiastical hierarchy is granted to confessors—i.e. achieved by surviving one's public confession of adherence to the church. Patrons emerge in the church—as elsewhere—by establishing normal networks between themselves and their clients, for example by means of money. The church emulated institutions of the Roman society. In a similar way as voluntary associations took the Roman state as a model for certain magistrates within the *collegium* (as observed frequently; regarding the present context e.g. Bobertz, *Cyprian of Carthage as Patron* [see note 25], 36–37), the Christian church established itself as a state *en miniature* when it expanded beyond the confines of the social format of small groups. Pontius, *Vita Cypriani* 5, no. 1486 (PL 3:1545C) might point to a morning *salutatio* after the description of Cyprian's election: *Obsederat fores domus copiosa fraternitas, et per omnes aditus sollicita charitas circuibat*—“A crowded fraternity was besieging the doors of the house, and throughout all the avenues of access an anxious love was circulating” (Wallis, “Cyprian,” [see note 27], 269). Cf. Bobertz, *Cyprian of Carthage as Patron* (see note 25), 120–121. The situation is not identified explicitly as a morning *salutatio*.

31 Verboven, *Economy of Friends* (see note 17), 54 observes that a favor which one received without any chance to repay it would make the receiver automatically a client of the giver. He could only support the public manifestation of the giver's honor by his visits.

32 Tertullian, *De Corona* 3,3 (CChr.SL 2, 1043,19–22 Kroymann; CSEL 70, 158,19–22 Kroymann; trans. Sydney Thelwall, “IV. The Chaplet, or De Corona,” in *Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian* [ed. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe; The Ante-Nicene

Tertullian mentions this as a typical example for an established Christian custom without any foundation in the Bible. While Tertullian's situation may have differed from Cyprian's, the Roman custom of the morning *salutatio* may also shed light on this remark. Thus, the bishop acts as a patron whose congregation visits him in the morning. Tertullian remarks that the *eucharistiae sacramentum* is received by the congregation *nec de aliorum manu quam praesidentium*—from the hand of none but the presidents.³³ In contrast, Justin, who does not allude to this social institution, mentions the deacons' distribution of *apophoreta* to members of his association who did not participate in the weekly meeting.³⁴ Apparently, Tertullian emphasizes the role and status of the distributor in this passage. The members of Tertullian's church do not receive eucharistized food at a dinner. It is also not brought to them by the bishop's servants. It is handed out to them by the church's president—the patron—in person.

Tertullian admits, moreover, that Jesus instituted the Eucharist to be held *in tempore victus*,³⁵ because it befits a worthy host to invite his guests to a dinner party in the afternoon or in the evening. Tertullian's brief remark reveals his acute awareness of the inconsistency between the times of Jesus' Last Supper and the distribution of eucharistized food in the church. In spite of the inappropriate timing of these *antelucanis coetibus*, Tertullian emphasizes that the essential elements of a Eucharist are no less (*etiam*) present there than in the sympotic vespertine Eucharists. The fact that the mimetic link to the institution narratives and—perhaps no less important—the social link to the bishop's symposium is broken, requires Tertullian's apologies.

Fathers: Translations of Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325, vol. 3; New York: Scribner's Sons, 1918], [93–104] 94): *Eucharistiae sacramentum, et in tempore victus et omnibus mandatum a domino, etiam antelucanis coetibus nec de aliorum manu quam praesidentium sumimus*. The plural of *praesidentes* refers, apparently, to the general, ecclesiastical phenomenon, and does not imply that more than one presider played a role in each instance. It corresponds to the plural of *coetus* in this context—one at a time.

33 Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13), 175 (note 2) discusses the question of *sportulae* that were distributed before the clients entered the house (according to Martial and Juvenal). If this should reflect a possible variant of the procedure, Tertullian could have emphasized that the Christians receive their portions from the patron himself and not from a servant.

34 Iustinus Martyr, *Apologia* 1,67,5 (PTS 38, 129,11–17 Marcovich; OECT *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*, 260,1–6 Minns/Parvis): the διάδοσις and the μετάληψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων are “sent through the διάκονοι”—not distributed by the “presider/president” (προεσιτώς; 65,3 [126,8 M.; 252,9 M./P.] and 67,4 [129,10 M., 258,8 M./P.]).

35 Cyprian refers to the same difference using similar terms, *Epistula* 63,16,1 (CChr.SL 3c, 412,294–296 Diercks; CSEL 3,2, 714,7–9 Hartel): . . . *quod etsi mane aqua sola offerri uidetur, tamen cum ad cenandum uenimus, mixtum calicem offerimus?*

Cyprian's *Epistula* 63 that deals with questions of the Eucharist reflects the same situation. Cyprian remarks that morning celebrations became necessary because of the large number of believers that assemble to receive bread and wine: "But when we sup, we cannot call the people together to our banquet, so as to celebrate the truth of the sacrament in the presence of all the brotherhood."³⁶ The Eucharist in Cyprian's ecclesiastical group could not be celebrated in one place at one time any more, if it was performed as a formal banquet. Furthermore, the church continued to include people of different social status and hence people who would never meet at the same dinner parties in an urban center like Carthage. For this situation, the Roman society had developed an institution which provided a framework for personal communication of these people other than the symposium: the morning *salutatio*. Cyprian thus describes himself playing the role of the patron who meets his clients (almost) every morning. McGowan suggests that early churches (e.g. Tertullian's church) distributed *apophoreta* from a preceding sympotic Eucharist to the faithful. This developed later into an independent celebration of the Eucharist that was appended to a pre-existing morning liturgy. That pre-existing morning liturgy can now be identified quite precisely as a plausible adaptation of a widespread custom: the bishop's meeting with his clients on the occasion of his morning *salutatio*.³⁷

These observations answer the questions posed in the first chapter above. Thus it was asked, why Christian groups replaced communal banquets with the mere distribution of small quantities of consecrated food and why bread and wine were blessed in a single act followed by their distribution without any trace of a meal in between or afterwards. In the context of his morning *salutatio*, the bishop

36 Cyprian, *Epistula* 63,16,1 (412,296–298 D.; 714,9–11 H.; trans. Wallis, "Cyprian," [see note 27], 363): *Sed cum cenamus, ad convivium nostrum plebem convocare non possumus, ut sacramenti veritatem fraternitate omni praesente celebremus*. Cf. Brent, *Cyprian* (see note 27), 71 and Andrew McGowan, "Rethinking Agape and Eucharist in early North African Christianity," *Studia Liturgica* 34 (2004): 165–176, especially 173.

37 Plinius Minor, *Epistula* 10,96,7 (SCBO C. *Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum Libri Decem*, 339 Mynors; trans. Betty Radice, *Pliny: Letters, Books 8–10: Panegyricus* [Loeb Classical Library 59; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969], 288–289) understands Christianity in terms of a type of associations (*hetaeriae*). He mentions that "they had met regularly before dawn on a fixed day to chant verses alternately among themselves in honour of Christ as if to a god. . . . After this ceremony it had been their custom to disperse and reassemble later to take food of an ordinary, harmless kind"—*quod essent soliti stato die ante lucem convenire carmen que Christo quasi deo dicere secum invicem . . . quibus peractis morem sibi discedendi fuisse rursus que coeundi ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innocuum*. Pliny's information about Christianity is too sparse to warrant reconstruct liturgical performances on the basis of his text. Klaus Thraede, "Noch einmal: Plinius d. J. und die Christen," *ZNW* 95 (2004): 102–128 shows that Pliny's details are unreliable.

could combine the distribution of *sportulae* of sacred food to the Christians with the church's care for—and display of interest in—its less affluent members. (As a Christian specialty in comparison to the Roman practice, Cyprian could have distributed consecrated food to members of the church regardless of their social status.) The basic provision would have been what became the later standard; some wine and bread, perhaps also some money as well as the promise to intervene on somebody's behalf in a problematic situation. For the distribution itself, the clients lined up once and received what they were entitled to receive from the bishop himself. For a Roman observer, it would have been a strange performance to make people line up twice in order to receive food and drink separately. The Eucharist was not any more bound to the framework of a meal.

In the wake of Tertullian's brief remark, Cyprian bends over backwards to legitimize this practice. He even abandons the coherence of his text in his desperate and pointless apology for the structure of that morning celebration as a performed *mimesis* recalling Jesus' Last Supper.³⁸ In his letter, he rebukes his adversaries who are used to drink water in their Eucharistic celebrations. Thus, he refers to Jesus' consumption of wine as the normative model for all subsequent Eucharistic celebrations. As a consequence, he must claim that the fact that Jesus celebrated the Last Supper in the evening is just not normative and requires an allegorical explanation. Like Tertullian, Cyprian acknowledges that the standard Eucharist of his time is not a meal any more. Like Tertullian, he is well aware that the church of Carthage has broken a mimetic tradition—a case of discontinuity that requires apologies. Third century Carthage thus recreates the Eucharist as a performance centered upon the bishop, who distributed small quantities of bread and wine (together) to a group of people lining up for their reception.

The morning *salutatio* explains thus why concepts like a “sevenfold shape” of Jesus' Last Supper could not exert any influence on the practical performance of the ritual after the third century, even if it should reflect meal customs of certain churches before that time.³⁹ At the same time, it shows why descriptions of the

³⁸ Cyprian, *Epistula* 63,16,2 (412,298–413,307 D.; 714,11–20 H.).

³⁹ See note 3. Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945), chapters 4–5, especially 48–50 dates “the four-action scheme” to the first century which would have been established “before the first three gospels or 1 Cor began to circulate with authority” (49). He observes that its emergence “must be connected in some way with the severance of the eucharist proper from its original connection with a meal” (50). Paul F. Bradshaw, “Did the early Eucharist ever have a sevenfold shape?,” *Heythrop Journal* 43 (2002): 73–78 argues in favor of the reconstruction of a more variegated situation in the early apostolic church assuming that a sevenfold scheme of the Eucharist was never normative. This paper claims that the morning *salutatio* stands at the pivotal point of a transition from sympotic celebrations to other forms of the

shape of the Last Supper continued to disturb attempts to legitimize liturgical rubrics with New Testament texts.

It had been asked above as a third question, why the members of (Tertullian's and) Cyprian's churches accepted the time frame of the Eucharist as a performance in the early morning. Regarding the preferred time of the celebration of the Eucharist and the mass of the middle ages, the framework of the morning *salutatio* explains why Christians assembled early in the day. It also suggests that such a meeting could take considerable time and would involve most of the members of the local church—perhaps including people who would meet again that day on the occasion of a real banquet. Cyprian's church accepted this time frame because it was just normal to meet in the morning.

The idea that the essentials of a banquet could be transferred to a morning *salutatio* was also not new, as a *sportula* could be given instead of an invitation to a meal. However, the celebrations of the morning Eucharists became compact and independent from time and place. Eventually, they could also be transferred to a performance in prison—the Eucharist as a ritual, not only as food. Of course, Christians did not hold morning *salutationes* in prison cells, but the performance of the Eucharist as a morning *salutatio* broke the ties of the Eucharist to the temporal, spatial, and social constraints of a sympotic dinner party.

Neither Cyprian nor Tertullian mention the weekday of the meetings which they hint at. These meetings were probably performed on Sundays as well as on other days of the week.⁴⁰ The morning *salutatio* does not answer the question whether Tertullian and Cyprian would have celebrated banquets on Saturday afternoons or on Sunday afternoons. The adoption and adaptation of the morning *salutatio* makes exactly this question irrelevant. The Eucharist was not any more tied to a certain day in the week.

In the morning *salutatio*, the Christian clients would have been interested in the reception of *sportulae*, although they could also consume bread and wine or water on the spot. Cyprian suggests that wine or water would have been drunk in the morning assemblies.⁴¹ The consumption was not, however, regarded as

Eucharist. The details of the earlier celebrations depended upon different local customs. Some of those earlier variants were just no longer feasible within the framework of the morning *salutatio*.

⁴⁰ Cyprian mentions the daily drinking of Christ's blood; cf. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (see note 8), 112 referring to Cyprian, *Epistula* 58,1,2 (320,21–22 D.; 657,3–4 H.) and the daily consumption of bread in *De Dominica Oratione* 18 (CChr.SL 3a, 101,331–333 Diercks; CSEL 3,1, 280,10–12 Hartel): *hunc autem panem dari nobis cotidie postulamus* [in the Lord's Prayer] . . . *et eucharistiam eius cotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus*; cf. Verboven, *Economy of Friends* (see note 17), 96–97 for the daily provision of *sportulae* and Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13), 107–108 for daily *salutationes* in Rome.

⁴¹ Cyprian, *Epistula* 63,15 (411,283–412,293 D.; 713,18–714,6 H.).

essential part of the celebration. Tertullian remarks that one could postpone the consumption until the end of one's fast on the same day.⁴² Already for Tertullian, the time frame, social context, and the way to perform morning *salutationes* were considered to override the custom to consume bread and wine together at these celebrations. The reception of something, not its consumption was the core issue at a *salutatio*. It facilitated the ruling that one could easily keep the ecclesiastical *sportula* until the end of one's day of fasting.

In addition, Tertullian refers to the consumption of Eucharistic bread by the pagan husband's Christian wife at home and during the night. Cyprian tells the story of a woman who opened a container of Eucharistic bread with unclean/unworthy hands when "fire flared up from it and prevented her touching it."⁴³ These two cases may be interpreted as references to a daily but private consumption of Eucharistic bread. These two stories support the thesis of ecclesiastical morning *salutationes*. On the one hand, both cases involve women, who attended the public *salutationes* much less frequently than men and would, therefore, typically store and consume Eucharistic bread at home.⁴⁴ Yet, Tertullian's ruling on the preservation and consumption of Eucharistic bread on fast days suggests, that Christians—at least in third century Carthage—had become accustomed to the separation of the reception and the consumption of Eucharistic bread and wine.

The fourth question posed above is not answered as easily as the first three. For, the structure of the morning *salutatio* does not explain how, when, and why it became a rule that the celebration of the Eucharist must be preceded by a liturgy of the word. The Roman morning *salutatio* was not an occasion where the patron would have addressed the crowd of clients as a group. On the contrary, patrons were eager to split this group into individuals according to status and social proximity. Yet it must be borne in mind that the adoption of the morning *salutatio* obliterated the sequence of a meal followed by the drinking party (where

⁴² Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (see note 8), 100–101 refers to Tertullian, *De Oratone* 19 (CChr. SL 1, 267–268 Diercks; CSEL 20, 192,5–11 Reifferscheid/Wissowa). Cf. Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem* 2,5,3 (CChr. SL 1, 389,17–19 Kroymann; CSEL 70, 118,17–19 Kroymann) for the consumption at night.

⁴³ Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (see note 8), 100 referring to Cyprian, *De Lapsis* 26 (CChr. SL 3, 235,508–510 Bévenot; CSEL 3,1, 256,6–9 Hartel): *et cum quaedam arcam suam in quo Domini sanctum fuit manibus immundis* [Hartel; Bévenot: *indignis*] *temptasset aperire, igne inde surgente deterrita est ne auderet adtingere*.

⁴⁴ Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13), 84–87 observes that there is not a single certain attestation for the period that he is studying (late Republic to early Empire) that women participated in the morning *salutationes* as visitors. Women, slaves, and children would hardly ever have taken part in a *salutatio* in the city of Rome; Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* (see note 13), 73–74, but cf. note 4. Freedmen could be found among the *salutatores* (Goldbeck, *Morgenbegrüßungen* [see note 13], 82–84.).

the group of guests would debate matters of concern to theology and church life) as a normative pattern for the Eucharist. It opened the path for new developments. Thus, bishops could have begun to engage in prayer and short rhetorical performances addressing the whole crowd before distributing bread and wine to each of them. He would have been compelled to do so in advance, because there would not have been anybody left in the atrium of his house in order to listen to him after the distribution.

In addition, it is more plausible that the churches expanded the morning *salutatio* with catechetical elements (at its beginning) than that they should have changed the normal sequence of elements in banquets. Dinner parties continued to fulfill their social functions. There was no incentive to change them. Some of the functions that they could not fulfill any more were just taken over by the morning *salutatio*. As suggested e.g. by Paul Bradshaw, the institution narratives were added to prayers and statements with a didactic purpose in mind.⁴⁵ The morning *salutationes* provide a formidable background for that development. As remarked above, both Tertullian and Cyprian tried to defend the legitimacy of the new shape of the celebration vis-à-vis the shape of the Last Supper.⁴⁶ It stands to reason that it became customary to emphasize that the new form of celebration is a worthy successor of the Last Supper as its alleged ancestor. The less their Eucharists resembled the Last Supper by their mere performance as banquets, the more bishops felt the need to affirming identity where the differences abounded. In the wake of Tertullian's and Cyprian's ministry in Carthage, churches did not reverse the structure of formal dinners and they did not append dinner parties to liturgies of the word, let alone to rabbinic Sabbath morning prayers. Their presidents added communal performances before the distribution of bread and wine. In later centuries, the recitation of institution narratives during the celebration began to emphasize that the performance of the rituals remained the same although they hardly resemble anything that Jesus could have done or suggested for imitation.

In this context, a brief comment on Justin Martyr's remarks about the celebration of the Eucharist is required, although a thorough treatment of the Eucharist according to his *First Apology* cannot be included in the framework of this paper.⁴⁷ Justin's group celebrates a kind of Eucharist whose shape seems to prefigure the medieval mass closely although it does not imitate the shorter institution narratives of Mark 14:22–25 and Matt 26:26–29 which suggest that bread and wine are

⁴⁵ Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (see note 8), 11–18, 135.

⁴⁶ Cyprian, *Epistula* 63,17,1 (413,308–313 D.; 714,21–715,1 H.) does not say explicitly that someone recites an institution narrative, although Jesus' Passion is mentioned. Cyprian refers to the imitation of Jesus' manipulation of the chalice by the church and refers to these acts as *sacrificia*.

⁴⁷ Iustinus Martyr, *1 Apologia* 65–67 (125,1–130,30 M.; 252,3–262,2 M./P.).

blessed and distributed separately. On Sundays, Justin's group listens to certain scriptures that are expounded by the president. After this, the Eucharistic food and drink are brought to the president. He prays and gives thanks. They are distributed to the present people and sent to the absent members of the group.

The parallels between Justin's description of the Eucharist and the morning *salutationes* are striking. The resemblance between Justin and Cyprian is based on the fact that both refer to a form of Eucharist that is not any more embedded in the performance of a sympotic dinner. Yet with regard to the reasons for these similarities, the difference between Justin and Cyprian could not be overemphasized. In the case of Cyprian, the church embraced Roman customs (of the morning *salutatio*) and Tertullian describes the meals of the church in order to claim a place for Christianity within the Roman Empire.⁴⁸ Against that, the shape of Justin's Eucharist is based on the celebration of the conscious rejection of Roman customs. Both approaches must hence apologize for their deviations from the shape of the Last Supper. They refer to its institution narratives in order to affirm its legitimacy and identity.⁴⁹

Justin's combination of the prayer and thanksgiving over bread and cup can be explained on the background of two aspects of the character of his group: first, with regard to their adherence to a branch of Christianity that held "Ascetic Eucharists" and second, with regard to their self-understanding as a group of philosophers. The first point was prominently raised by Adolf von Harnack and recently revisited by McGowan, who adds further evidence.⁵⁰ It is assumed here, that Justin's community belonged to a significant movement whose adherents refused to drink wine (and eat meat). Their practice was not based on asceticism as avoidance of alcohol. These people practiced the rejection of the Roman cuisine of sacrifice that included meat and wine in its typical ways of performance. Thus, the Eucharistic rituals of Justin's group required the abstention from wine. However, such a group lost the most important ingredient of the Greco-Roman post-prandial performance: the manipulation of wine. Thus, their fulfillment of

48 Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 39,21 (153,99–100 D.; 95,97–98 H.): *non est factio dicenda, sed curia*. In the preceding paragraphs, he compares the Christian meals with famous festivals all over the Roman Empire.

49 Justin refers to the institution narrative in *1 Apologia* 66,3 (128,11–16 M.; 256,10–14 M./P.).

50 Andrew McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals* (Oxford Early Christian Studies; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999). McGowan's position has recently been rejected by Gerard Rouwhorst, "L'usage et le non-usage du vin," in *Rites de Communion: Conférences Saint-Serge: LV^e semaine d'études liturgiques, Paris, 23–26 juin 2008* (ed. André Lossky and Manlio Sodi; Monumenta Studia Instrumenta Liturgica 59; Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2010), 229–241 and Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (OECT; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 11, 253, 255 (note 7).

Jesus' commandment to "do this in my remembrance" collapses into a prayer over bread accompanied by the biblical "cup" that is not, however, treated as it should be in the case of a decent Roman—but pagan—symposium.

Second, Justin also speaks about bread not mentioning a satisfying meal. The meeting of this group is concerned with philosophy: reading of certain scriptures and listening to the teacher's ethical explanations of the texts rather than eating.⁵¹ Justin's group performs (and invites the Roman emperor to observe this performance by reading Justin's *Apology*) an extremely frugal meal as part and parcel of their generally virtuous—i.e. philosophical—behavior. It steers a middle course between the total rejection of the sympotic and sacrificial customs of Rome and their vocation to imitate Jesus' (quite sympotic) Last Supper. Thus, Justin's Eucharist is neither a survival nor a repristination of a New Testament kind of Last Supper nor the first appearance of the medieval mass. Its special shape is the consequence of the political, religious, and prandial preferences of Justin's community. It emerged together with the Aquarians' way of organizing their Eucharistic celebrations and vanished with their disappearance. To sum up, Justin and the (non-Aquarian) churches of Carthage converge in their celebration of non-sympotic Eucharists. They do so for highly different reasons. Cyprian is aware of that other movement and rejects it fiercely.

Recalling the fifth point above, the transition from sympotic Eucharists towards the medieval situation with regard to the clerical status of the person who is regarded as capable of the leading of services and the distribution of consecrated food must be explained. The morning *salutatio* fits to an ecclesiological approach that supports a centralized structure of the church with a powerful person at its top and the frequent manifestation of this structure in public life. The church of

⁵¹ Without any necessary connection between these two texts, the presider of the meeting of Philo's *Therapeutae* likewise gives a speech before the meal; Philo, *De Vita Contemplativa* 75–82 (ed. Leopold Cohn and Siegfried Reiter, *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt* 6 [Berlin: Reimer, 1915], 66,1–69,12; trans. Francis H. Colson, *Philo* [Loeb Classical Library 363 (= Philo 9); London: Heinemann, 1954], 158–165). Just like Philo's description of (allegedly) typically pagan meal customs that precede the description of the meal of the *Therapeutae*, the details of the life of this community show that the community as well as its meals are literary fiction; cf. Martin Ebner, "Mahl und Gruppenidentität: Philos Schrift *De Vita Contemplativa* als Paradigma," in *Herrenmahl und Gruppenidentität* (ed. idem; *Quaestiones Disputatae* 221; Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 64–90. As an ideal, their sympotic behavior resembles, nevertheless, Justin's description of his congregation as another group of Pythagorean philosophers, who consume water and bread (occasionally seasoned with hyssop in the case of the *Therapeutae*) only, organize their meetings according to the Bible, and celebrate Pythagorean number symbolisms in their yearly cycle of festivals. As Justin's group, the description of the *Therapeutae* represents—in gross hyperbole—the ideal form of philosophic life that implies the total rejection of the mores and customs of the surrounding society.

Carthage decided not to break up large assemblies of Christians into small groups of diners that would eat in different rooms within one larger building or even entrust the celebration of the Eucharist to such groups all over the city.⁵² Cyprian wanted the church to unite frequently. He was not interested in the enactment of sympotic equality—a fragile concept that was anyway rather upheld by utopian philosophers than by aristocratic hosts.

The patron stood at the center of the morning *salutatio*. Against the social reality, the *Syriac Didascalia* tries hard to conceptualize the bishop as the true and only patron of the church by concentrating all financial authority in his hands and making him the only one responsible for the distribution of church funds to those in need and to the magistrates of the church.⁵³ Morning *salutationes* offer the bishop the opportunity to assume and play the patron's role in the church. Apparently, this worked well in the case of Cyprian, who spent his wealth in order to play this role properly. In other cases, it may not have functioned as smoothly as in this one. Charles A. Bobertz refers to the ongoing conflicts between powerful families in Rome and ecclesiastical magistrates until the time when these two groups converged.⁵⁴ The Eucharist/morning *salutatio* provided the stage to decide that question in ecclesiastical terms.

The Roman morning *salutatio* required the personal presence of the people who were involved in this social process. The concept did not work well with proxies. Thus, Cyprian's letters from his exile often imply the problem that he could no longer function directly within this important system of communication with the members of the church.⁵⁵ The system of morning *salutationes* binds

⁵² Brent, *Cyprian* (see note 27), 109–116 discusses the philosophical background of Cyprian's interest in the manifestation of the church as undivided.

⁵³ This was also Cyprian's concern according to Bobertz, *Cyprian of Carthage as Patron* (see note 25), 65–66 (especially note 31) and 70–71; Cyprianus, *Epistula* 5 (27,1–28,32 D.; 478,10–479,21 H.); 7 (38,1–39,21 D.; 484,20–485,17 H.); 13 (71,1–78,110 D.; 504,14–509,3 H.); 34 (167,1–170,57 D.; 568,11–571,5 H.); especially 41,2 (197,25–198,50 D.; 588,8–589,15 H.), also referring to the *Syriac Didascalia*. The morning *salutatio* gains thus further plausibility as a setting of the bishop's distribution of *sportulae* to the Christians. First, the transfer of all funds to the bishop as the sole distributor is designed to exclude other wealthy patrons from establishing their own power-base within the church. Second, in a large morning *salutatio*, the distribution of money and/or food to a crowd of Christians is much more left to the bishop's discretion than the allotment of food at a symposium which is clearly visible to the whole group of diners. It is a process that can hardly be controlled or even monitored by a third party.

⁵⁴ Bobertz, "The role of patron" (see note 21).

⁵⁵ Cf. Bobertz, *Cyprian of Carthage as Patron* (see note 25), chapters 4 and 5 (especially 147, 188 [note 22], 209 [note 50], 210–211, and 155–157 and 216 for the public reading of his letter), who does not refer to the morning *salutatio*. Bobertz assumes that gifts were distributed at "banquets and other gatherings" [emphasis C.L.], 203.

the functions of church officials to their personal presence. It also corroborates McGowan's characterization of Cyprian's church as a "state religion-in-waiting."⁵⁶

The morning *salutatio* could integrate further structures which were rather associated with procedures in voluntary associations. Recalling the *nomenclatores* mentioned above, it would not have been a strange requirement for clients to be registered in church books in order to be admitted to the reception of the Eucharist. The Romans also used recommendations for the admission of new members into the inner circle of clients of a certain patron. Some rituals and structures that are associated with the creation of an elaborate catechumenate fit into this framework. It can be imagined that a new client was admitted to the group after the *nomenclator* checked his credentials, spoke with his sponsor,⁵⁷ and wrote his name into the book of the church.

Other elements of the ritual of the medieval mass also appear here for the first time *in nuce*. Thus, the transition from reclining to standing as the typical posture during the performance of the Eucharist reflects the abandonment of the sympotic flair and the adoption of other social models for this ritual. The morning *salutatio* impacted the shape of the social interaction between wealthy and powerful men and the crowds of their clients on the rituals of the churches. While acclamations could also play an important role in the ritualized communication in voluntary associations, the ancient introductory dialogue of the Eucharistic prayer is more plausibly inspired by the increasing importance of public acclamations⁵⁸ of the emperor or the sponsor of races, gladiatorial combats, or spectacles than by ritualized elements of dinner parties. Standing is not the typical posture of the diner in front of his host, but of the client in his patron's atrium.

Roman houses were also adapted to the representational needs of their owners. In the third century, large rooms with apses come to be attested more frequently. The positioning of the patron in the apse of a large room underlines his magnificence during the visits of clients.⁵⁹ From this follows the opaque role of the precursors of the later altars in both architecture and theological interpretation.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ McGowan, *Ascetic Eucharists* (see note 50), 213.

⁵⁷ Cf. Verboven, *Economy of Friends* (see note 17), 114–115.

⁵⁸ Cf. Borg and Witschel, "Veränderungen im Repräsentationsverhalten" (see note 29), 101–104.

⁵⁹ Cf. Borg and Witschel, "Veränderungen im Repräsentationsverhalten" (see note 29), 113–114 also emphasize the increased importance and ritualization of meetings between patron and clients in the third century.

⁶⁰ For Eusebius, the altar of the Church of Tyre represents the innermost part of the heavenly Temple, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 10,4,68 (GCS N.F. 6,2, 882,1–9 Schwartz/Mommsen/Winkelman). According to Theodore of Mopsuestia, it evokes the notion of the bier on which Jesus' body is placed after his death, *Homilia catechetica* 15,26 (ed. Raymond Tonneau and Robert Devreesse, *Les homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste: Reproduction phototypique du ms. Mingana*

The morning *salutatio* neither requires a table, because it is no meal, nor an altar, because it is no sacrifice. Patrons may have had a place where they stored the gifts to be received by their clients. This piece of furniture could not challenge the person of the patron of his right to occupy the center of the performance. Of course, lavish banquets continued to be held by the wealthy and influential members of the society and the church. For the history of the medieval mass, it is significant that the ritual of the mass continued to enact the ceremonial and increasingly formalized meeting of a patron with a crowd of clients⁶¹ and abandoned the pattern of a meal. The adoption of the morning *salutatio* for ecclesiastical meetings in North Africa is a plausible point of departure for these developments.

The adoption of the morning *salutatio* in the third century also points to the further development of the Eucharist. Its shape and social function lent itself to the adaptation and integration of elements of imperial ceremonial and the display of power relations within the society in large scales. Furthermore, the control over the shape of the performance and the contents of texts recited during it remained in the hands of few presidents (bishops and presbyters), who also acted as the main interpreters of this celebration. These are probably the most important reasons why the pattern of the morning *salutatio* eventually won out over the smaller and—all display of affluence notwithstanding—more egalitarian sympotic Eucharists.

Summary

The texts of the medieval mass refer to Jesus' Last Supper as its antecedent, model, and source of dignity and legitimation. Based on a reconstruction of the Last Supper according to the New Testament as a formal meal and the observation of the shape of the combination of a liturgy of the word with the celebration of the Eucharist, one can look for the missing link between these two highly different clusters of ritualized acts. This essay suggests considering the Roman morning *salutatio* as a background for this transition. Accordingly, Christians as clients would meet with their bishop as their patron most of the days of each week early in the morning. They could ask for his advice or help and would receive alms or support from the funds of the church. This would especially be the occasion where the bishop distributed eucharistized bread and wine. The reception of such

Syr. 561, *Selly Oak Colleges' Library, Birmingham* [Studi e Testi 145; Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1949], 504–507 = ms. fol. 127r-v).

61 Cf. Borg, "Bilder für die Ewigkeit" (see note 29), 63–68.

a *sportula* replaced the respective believers' participation in a sympotic Eucharist. This meeting of the bishop with the members of his church was enlarged with the performance of other ritual elements until it became a celebration *sui generis* in the early middle ages.

Article Note: The core of this paper has been written during my stay at the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin in 2011/2012. I am deeply grateful for the generosity of this institution and the support of its staff. During our time at the Wissenschaftskolleg, Franz Alto Bauer offered important bits of advice to my theses and invited me to a presentation at the Ludwig Maximilians-Universität München. A draft of this paper was also discussed in the workgroup dealing with "Problems in the Early History of the Liturgy" of the North American Academy of Liturgy. The current version profited from the insights and comments of its members.