Irish Church Quarterly

Anglican Communion Offices and Comparative Liturgiology

Author(s): A. J. Maclean

Source: *The Irish Church Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Jul., 1908), pp. 182-198

Published by: [Irish Church Quarterly](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30066896>

Accessed: 18/06/2014 08:20

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Irish Church Quarterly is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Irish Church Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ANGLICAN COMMUNION OFFICES AND COMPARATIVE LITURGIOLOGY.

IN Liturgiology, as in every other branch of study, the comparative method is the only scientific process which the investigator can use when testing the forms before him. The value of a Communion Service or Liturgy (I use the word in its proper sense) can only be determined by comparing it with the liturgies of all ages of Christianity, and this process alone can teach us the rationale of our worship. Just as the only true philology is based on the comparative and historical method which, abandoning erroneous derivations obtained from sound and guess-work, traces words of one language into other languages and into previous forms of the same language, and thus arrives at their true origin, so must it be with the liturgical forms of worship by which we offer our prayers and praises to God. We must compare together the liturgies of East and West, of ancient and modern times, and so we shall obtain the best models for our own offices. We must carefully avoid the mistake of first making our theories as to Christian worship, and then trying to make the facts conform to them. The compilation of a liturgy in order to suit a doctrinal purpose is a fatal error. We must rather, by a process of comparative research find out the true meaning of our worship, and the best examples of liturgical forms, and then derive our theories from the result.

The object of this article is to investigate the central portion of the Communion Service (from the Offertory onwards) with reference to two points: (1) the order and rationale of the Service, and (2) the Invocation (Epiclesis) or Prayer for Divine Intervention. For this investigation the present generation is in a better position than its predecessors, by reason of the discoveries with regard to primitive worship made in our

own day. We have now, in addition to the well-known Great Liturgies of the various families (none of which go back beyond the fifth century), several "Church Orders," or manuals of Christian doctrine and worship which preceded the Great Liturgies. One of these manuals¹ has long been known, but most of them are new discoveries, or at least have newly been brought before the public. We have also the lately-found *Sarapion's Prayer Book*.² Some of these books give us full liturgical forms; of these we must especially notice the Communion Offices in *Sarapion*, in the *Ethiopic Church Order*,³ in the Church Order attached to the *Verona Fragments* of the old Didascalia,⁴ in the *Testament of our Lord*,⁵ and in the *Apostolic Constitutions*.⁶ All of these probably date from the fourth century. Of the fifth century Offices, we must notice particularly the *Liturgy of Addai and Mari*⁷ (East Syrian or Nestorian), because of its archaic features, and the Abyssinian *Anaphora of our Lord*,⁸ a later adaptation of the *Testament* liturgy. The other Great Liturgies are too well known to need mention; the Eastern ones may be studied in Mr. Brightman's admirable work. Of fourth century descriptions of the service we may notice St. Cyril of Jerusalem's famous *Catechetical Lectures*, the last few chapters of the *Arabic Didascalia*,⁹ and the *Pilgrimage of "Sylvia."*¹⁰

¹ *Apostolic Constitutions*, book viii.

² For the Greek text with Brightman's Notes, see *Journ. of Theol. Studies*, i., 88ff., 247ff. An English translation with notes is to be found in the *Early Church Classics* of S.P.C.K. (Bp. J. Wordsworth). Sarapion was Bishop of Thmuis. in the Nile Delta, and a great friend of St. Athanasius.

³ Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 180.

⁴ Ed. Hauler (Leipzig, 1890).

⁵ See an English translation and notes by Cooper and Maclean (T. and T. Clark, 1902).

⁶ An English translation in *Early Church Classics*, S.P.C.K., ed. Cresswell.

⁷ Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 247.

⁸ See Appendix to the *Testament of our Lord*, ed. Cooper and Maclean.

⁹ Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, p. 510.

¹⁰ The Latin may be seen in Duchesne's *Origines du Culte Chrétien* (Eng. tr., *Christian Worship*, S.P.C.K., p. 490).

With regard to the Church Orders, it may be remarked that they were in their nature experimental ; in some respects they may have used ill-advised expressions ; they were the precursors of, and were superseded by, the Great Liturgies which have remained in use. But it is a great advantage that we have them as they were composed, whereas the Great Liturgies, being in daily use, were liable to addition and change, and for this reason must be used with some caution in a historical investigation. The Church Orders, on the other hand, give unexceptionable evidence for the age when they were composed, even though their exact date may be disputed.

I.

THE ORDER AND RATIONALE OF THE SERVICE.

It may be said that one of the most certain results of modern liturgical research is that the idea underlying all ancient liturgies, Eastern and Western, is one and the same. We owe much to writers like Mgr. Duchesne for insisting on this truth.¹ It used to be commonly assumed that there were two irreconcilable types of liturgy, the Eastern and the Western, the latter making the *Hoc est corpus*, etc., the essential point of the service, the former the Invocation. But this is a mistake. It is now seen that, though there are differences of detail between the various liturgies, the rationale of them all is the same.

I pass over the introductory part of the Eucharistic Office as not germane to our present purpose. The highly interesting question, also, of the Prayer for the Church or Great Intercession, which (probably because it was crystallized into a liturgical form somewhat later than the rest) varies somewhat in position in the different liturgies, I do not now discuss, for want of space. But otherwise we may take the order of the

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 181 f.

Service in the earliest forms known to us to be as follows:—

(1) Offertory, Benediction, Sursum Corda.

(2) Eucharistic Thanksgiving, often with a Commemoration of the work of Creation of men and angels,¹ prompting the introduction of the Angelic Song or Sanctus,² and always with a Commemoration of the work of Redemption, almost always including the recital of our Lord's words and acts at the Last Supper.

(3) The Oblation, or offering to God of the bread and wine as a symbolical acknowledgment that all we have is His ; this usually takes up the words, " Do this in remembrance of me," and begins with such words as these: " Remembering therefore the death . . . we offer to thee these thy gifts of bread and wine."

(4) The Invocation (Epiclesis) or Prayer for Divine Intervention, which almost always takes the form of a prayer that the Holy Ghost may descend to the earthly altar to bless and sanctify the elements, but in the Roman Liturgy asks that the elements may be taken up to the heavenly altar—i.e., for consecration.

(5) [The Great Intercession for the Church.]

(6) The Lord's Prayer (not universal in the fourth century).

(7) Communion of clergy and people.

(8) Thanksgiving after reception.

I have remarked that the Eucharistic Thanksgiving " almost always " included the recital of our Lord's words and acts. But there are some instances to the contrary. The oldest East Syrian Litany (*Addai and Mari*) omits them altogether, as perhaps did that of Jerusalem in St. Cyril's time (A.D. 348), for he does not mention them in his description, but seems rather (though this is not certain) to exclude them;³ the fourth

¹ It is much to be wished that the reference to the Creation were reintroduced into our Office. It was restored by the Nonjurors in 1718, but was erroneously put *after* the Sanctus. For the connexion see *Cyr. Jer., Cat. Lect., xxiii. 6.*

² The Sanctus was not universal in the fourth century.

³ *Cat. Lect., xxiii., 6, 7.*

century *Testament of our Lord* and the fifth century *Anaphora of our Lord* (see above) omit the words over the Cup. Otherwise we find them in all liturgies; but St. Gregory the Great, at least, could hardly have thought that the recital was essential to the sacrament, for we read¹ that he made a change in the position of the Lord's Prayer in the Roman Liturgy because he believed that the Apostles had used that prayer alone to consecrate the Eucharist. The fact that he held this opinion (however erroneous that opinion might be) shows that he had no idea that the words *Hoc est corpus* and the rest were the essential formula of consecration.

The later liturgies introduced various ceremonies and greatly extended the service; but the general scheme given above was adhered to. There is, however, one very important difference of detail which must here be commented upon, the difference between the Roman "Invocation" and that in other liturgies. It is this which once led people to think that East and West were radically separated in their liturgical idea; they did not attach sufficient value to the fact that the Gallican rite (the peculiarity of which is that the central parts of the service vary according to day and season) usually agrees with the East in this respect. But as Mgr. Duchesne shows, there is no essential difference between the two forms of Invocation; in the Roman rite the consecration is looked on as effected by the Divine intervention; and it is not till the prayer for this intervention is said that the elements are called in the older Roman rite the body and blood of our Lord. There is indeed no real difference between the idea of the Holy Ghost coming down and that of the elements being taken up to heaven. As was many years ago

¹ *Ep.* ix. 12 (26): "We say the Lord's Prayer directly after the canon (*prece*) for the following reason, because it was the custom of the Apostles to consecrate the sacrificial oblation solely with this prayer; and it seemed to me extremely unsuitable to say over the oblation the canon (*prece*) which was composed by a learned man (*scholasticus*), and not to say over his body and blood the prayer handed down (*traditionem*) and composed by our Redeemer."

pointed out by a *Church Quarterly* reviewer,¹ these two ways of speaking of the Divine intervention are exactly parallel to the Pauline way of speaking at one and the same time of our being taken up to sit in heavenly places, and of the Holy Spirit coming down to dwell within us.²

But the Roman Liturgy has long been misunderstood. Confusion has arisen from two causes. (1) Immediately before the commemoration of redemption and the words of our Lord, there is a preparatory prayer (*Quam oblationem*) asking God to "vouchsafe to make this oblation blessed, established, valid, reasonable, and acceptable, that it may be to us (*nobis fiat*) the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord."³ These words came to be looked upon as the central petition for consecration instead of the prayer for Divine intervention (*Supra quae* and *Supplices te*), which corresponds to the Invocation of the Holy Spirit elsewhere. (2) The other cause of confusion was more serious. The mediaeval Western theologians desired to particularize the moment of consecration, and it was very commonly held in the West that consecration must take the form of a declaration. An exact parallel is found in the Ordination Services of the Western Church, into which at a late date the declaratory words "Receive the Holy Ghost" were introduced in addition to the prayer, and sometimes "Whose sins thou dost remit, etc.," whereas the ancient Church always ordained by a prayer only. So in the same way at the Eucharist the words "*Hoc est corpus*," etc., were commonly held to be the formula of consecration and to contain within themselves the whole Mass. Mediaeval ecclesiastics did not realize that our Lord used other

¹ January, 1890.

² Eph. ii. 5 f., vi. 12; Gal. iv. 6; cf., Eph. iii. 16 f.

³ A prayer of this nature is found in a fifth century work, the *De Sacramentis*, formerly ascribed to St. Ambrose. It runs: "Make to us this oblation established, valid, reasonable, acceptable, because it is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ" (iv. 5). The expression about the "figure" is common in antiquity.

words besides these. He *first* blessed and gave thanks;¹ *then* He gave the bread and wine to the disciples, saying, "This is my body," and the rest. We do not know what words He used in blessing. And the ancient Church, having (usually) recited our Lord's words and actions, and having made the offering of the elements to God, prayed for His intervention, knowing that He would answer the prayer; *then*, in communicating the people, it used a formula similar to that of our Lord, "This is the body of Christ," "This is the blood of Christ," or the like. Nor did the Roman rite differ from its sisters. When once we have discarded the mediaeval *Hoc est corpus* theory, all is plain in this much misunderstood Liturgy, from which the Sarum and modern English offices are derived. After the prefatory prayer already mentioned, the Commemoration of Redemption, the Oblation, the Petition for Divine Intervention, and the rest follow as before.²

We may now consider how the branches of the Anglican Communion have carried out these principles. It will be remembered that several Eucharistic Offices have been and are in use among us. Let us endeavour to compare them with ancient forms, with reference to the point now under discussion. Cranmer had some slight acquaintance with Eastern liturgies, and laid one of them at least, that known as St. Chrysostom's, under contribution. He saw that the absence of an express Invocation of the Holy Ghost in the Pre-Reformation English Office was a defect, and in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. he inserted one. But the Reformers had never quite shaken off their scholastic training, and still held to the idea that the *Hoc est corpus* was the true centre of gravity of the whole rite. Cranmer therefore made the preparatory prayer, *Quam oblationem*, into an express Invocation of the Holy Ghost (thus placing the Epiclesis in a position

¹ St. Mark xiv. 22 ff., εὐλογήσας . . . εἶπε; εὐχαριστήσας . . . εἶπεν.

² The Great Intercession is divided into two parts. But we are not here concerned with it.

which it had never had in any Liturgy), and then (after the Prayer for the Church, Commemoration of Redemption, and Oblation) shortened what was the real equivalent of the Epiclesis (*Supra quae* and *Supplices te*) into one brief phrase which did not ask for the Divine intervention. This is a fatal blot in this otherwise beautiful Liturgy. The same defect is seen in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, commonly associated with the name of Laud. But the defect was the outcome of an honest endeavour to restore a direct Invocation; and it was not the fault of those early liturgiologists if they had not at their command the materials which we possess for making a comparison. The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1552) was much more unhappy in its changes of the order of the prayers; it effected a complete dislocation of the parts of the service. We need not here consider the position given in it and in succeeding revisions to the Prayer for the Church; there is something (not, I think, much) to be said for its being made to follow the Offertory and to precede the *Sursum Corda*; but no defence is possible for the postponement of the Prayer of Oblation, which is made only optional and is placed after the Communion of the people; nor yet for the complete absence of any prayer after the Commemoration of Redemption for the Divine intervention. The Prayer of Consecration in the 1552 book and its successors to the present day abruptly ends where in all the ancient liturgies the real action is just beginning.¹

The remedy for defects is, not to shut our eyes blindly and to talk of our "incomparable Liturgy," but to *compare* it with ancient rites. This was first done to any good effect by the English and Scottish Nonjurors in the eighteenth century; and by them the real liturgical step in advance was taken. Many of them devoted themselves to a study of Eastern liturgies, and the result was first seen in the *Nonjurors' Office* of

¹ From 1552 to 1662 it did not end with "Amen."

1718.¹ Many other attempts were made in the years that followed, but the most important for our purpose are the *Scottish Communion Office* of 1764², which is now in use in the Episcopal Church in Scotland side by side with that of the English Prayer Book, and the *American Communion Office* of 1789,³ which is now exclusively used in our Church in the United States. In these two offices the position of the Great Intercession differs, but otherwise they agree in the order of the central part of the service: (1) Commemoration of Redemption, (2) Oblation, (3) Invocation of the Holy Ghost. That America followed the lead of the Scottish Church is due to the influence of its first bishop, Samuel Seabury, who was consecrated in Aberdeen by Scottish bishops on 14th November, 1784. The scholars of that day clearly saw that the order of the parts of the Service thus obtained was the true one; and this is made to us even more abundantly clear by the discovery of so many fourth century forms. The scheme given above, as deduced from the most ancient sources, is exactly that of the Scottish Communion Office in the present day.

To review briefly what has been said, the study of ancient forms shows us that there is no fixed form for consecrating the Eucharist, that we cannot say of any one moment of the action, "This is the moment of consecration"; that the whole action is the action of consecration; that all ancient liturgies agree in general outline, though they differ in detail; and that modern Christians will do well, in compiling their Offices, to fall into line with that general scheme. It is a happy thing if Christians of all ages of the Church, however much they may differ in the details of their worship, yet offer to Almighty God essentially the same liturgy.

¹ Given in Bishop Dowden's *Annotated Scottish Communion Office*, p. 293.

² *Ibid.*, p. 125.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

II.

WORDING OF THE INVOCATION OR EPICLESIS.

The question to which I now proceed is, What ought we to pray for in the Invocation? The answer, as before, is to be found by using the comparative method. All the Invocations of ancient and modern times take one of these forms: (1) a prayer for the Holy Ghost to descend that the communicants may be blessed (the *Implicit* form); (2) a prayer for the Holy Ghost to descend that the elements may become, or be made, or constituted, or be declared to be, the body and blood of our Lord, to the end that the communicants may be blessed (the *Explicit* form); (3) a prayer for the elements to be taken to the heavenly altar that the communicants may be blessed. The last is the Roman form, and does not mention the Holy Ghost (see above). It will probably be useful to give all the Invocations which have any claims to be earlier than the General Council of Ephesus, and then to summarize those of the Great Liturgies, before considering those of Anglican formularies.

1. IMPLICIT FORMS TO A.D. 431. (a) *The Ethiopic Church Order* and the *Verona Fragments* contain liturgies which are nearly identical, daughters of a common parent. As the two Invocations are almost the same in both it is probable that we have in effect that of the common original, and we thus can go one stage further back than these Orders themselves. The Invocation is:

We beseech thee that thou wouldest send thy Holy Spirit on the oblation of the holy [Eth. "this"] Church; give it unto all saints [Eth. "all them"] who partake, bringing them together into one [Eth. simply "together"] for [sanctification and for] fulfilling with the Holy Ghost,

(b) *The Testament of our Lord* has:—

We offer to thee this thanksgiving, Eternal Trinity, O Lord Jesus Christ, O Lord the Father . . . O Lord the Holy Ghost; we have brought this drink and this food of thy holiness (to thee). Cause that it may be to us not for

condemnation . . . but for the medicine and support of our spirit.¹

(c) St. Chrysostom's writings² (not the so-called *Liturgy of St. Chrysostom*, which is a good deal later), give us the form in his day at Antioch (*cir.* 390 A.D.). He says:—

The priest stands before the Table stretching forth his hands to heaven, calling the Holy Ghost to come and touch the oblations (τῶν προκειμένων), to the end that grace falling on the sacrifice may by it kindle the souls of all, etc.

(d) The East Syrian *Liturgy of the Apostles Addai and Mari*, the earliest of the "Great Liturgies," has:—

May thy Holy Spirit, O my Lord, come and rest upon this oblation of thy servants and may he bless it and hallow it and may it be to us, O my Lord, for pardon, etc.

2. EXPLICIT FORMS TO A.D. 431. (a) *Sarapion's Prayer Book* (*cir.* 350 A.D.) is perhaps the earliest extant liturgy which has an Invocation of the explicit form. In it, as in some other early Christian writings, there is a certain confusion between the Word of God and the Holy Spirit. May not this confusion have arisen from the fact that all that the Eternal Word does for us is done through the Spirit?³ Perhaps, before the controversy about the Holy Ghost arose in the middle of the fourth century, it seemed immaterial whether Christians prayed for the Word to come or for the Spirit to come. The Invocation runs thus:—

O God of truth, let thy holy Word come upon this bread that the bread may become (γένηται) body of the Word and upon this cup that the cup may become blood of the Truth; and make all who partake to receive a medicine of life. . . For we have invoked thee, the Uncreated, through the Only-begotten in [the] Holy Spirit.

¹ It is made probable by the derived Abyssinian *Anaphora of our Lord*, which has the same Epiclesis, but prefixes one of the explicit form in addition, that we should read: "We have brought this drink and this food to thy holiness." Another, less probable reading in the *Testament* is: "Bring this drink and this food of thy holiness (to us)."

² Quoted by Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. 474

³ St. John xvi. 14.

(b) St. Cyril of Jerusalem (A.D. 348) describes the Invocation thus:—

We call upon God who loveth mankind to send His Holy Spirit on the oblations that he may make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ ; for whatsoever the Holy Spirit hath touched is sanctified and changed.¹

(c) The Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (c. 375 A.D.), often erroneously called the Clementine Liturgy, has:—

We implore thee to look graciously upon these gifts lying before thee. . . and to send down upon this sacrifice thy Holy Spirit. . . that he may constitute (*ἀποφύνη*) this bread the body of thy Christ and this cup the blood of thy Christ, that they who partake thereof may be strengthened in godliness, etc.²

(d) The Abyssinian *Anaphora of our Lord* prefixes to the implicit Invocation given above the following additional form:—

We beseech thee to send the Holy Spirit and power upon this bread and upon this cup [that] he may make [it] the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, world without end.

(e) The Egyptian *Anaphora*³ found in a later part of the *Sahidic Ecclesiastical Canons* than the “Egyptian Church Order” is really only a description of the service. It is thought to be derived from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and, if so, may be dated c. 400 A.D. It says:—

Let the high priest pray over the oblation that the Holy Ghost may descend on it, making the bread the body of Christ and the cup the blood of Christ.

3. THE GREAT LITURGIES. The Invocations of these are all of the explicit form ; all pray for the Holy Spirit, and all express the purpose of the prayer, that the communicants may be blessed. I need only note the way in which they pray that the Divine intervention

¹ *Cat. Lect.*, xxiii., 7.

² *Apost. Const.*, viii., 12.

³ Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. 461.

may be effected. We may follow Brightman in dividing the Eastern liturgies into four families—Syrian, Egyptian, Persian (East Syrian or Nestorian), and Byzantine. In the Syrian rite, the *Greek St. James*¹ prays that the Holy Spirit “may make (ποιῇ) the bread the holy body of Christ and the cup the precious blood of Christ.” The Syriac St. James² is similar, but a little more diffuse. In the Egyptian rite the *Greek St. Mark*³ has: “That he may hallow and perfect [the loaves and cups] and make (ποιήσῃ) the bread the body and the cup the blood of the new covenant of . . . Jesus Christ”; and the Coptic St. Mark and St. Cyril⁴ is similar. In the Persian rite the Epiclesis of the oldest liturgy (*Addai and Mari*) has already been given; it is of the implicit form. The other two extant liturgies of this rite, erroneously attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius, have explicit Invocations. That of *Theodore*⁵ runs thus:

May there come upon us and upon this oblation the grace of the Holy Spirit; may he dwell and rest upon this bread and upon this cup, and may he bless and consecrate and seal them. . . . By the power of thy name may this bread become the holy body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and this cup the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. And whoso in true faith eateth of this bread and drinketh of this cup, may they be to him, O my Lord, for the pardon of debts, etc.

The *Anaphora of Nestorius*,⁶ on the other hand, has the active voice: “May he bless and consecrate it and make this bread and this cup to be, etc.”

The Byzantine rite prays that the Holy Ghost may come “on us” as well as on the oblation. *St. Basil*⁷ has “to bless and hallow and render (ἀναδείξαι) the bread the precious body of our Lord,” etc., while *St. Chrysostom*⁷ has: “make (ποιήσον) this bread the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 134.

² *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

⁵ See *The Lit. of . . . Addai and Mari, together with two additional liturgies*, S.P.C.K., 1893, p. 46.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

⁷ I quote the older form (ninth century). See Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. 329.

precious body of thy Christ, changing it (μεταβαλὼν) by thy Holy Spirit," and so for the cup. The Armenian Liturgy¹, also of the Byzantine rite, has the word "make."

4. INVOCATIONS IN ANGLICAN COMMUNION OFFICES.
We may now consider how those Anglican Offices which have direct Invocations of the Holy Ghost have followed the precedents of antiquity. The First Prayer Book of Edward VI. and the First Scottish Prayer Book have forms which may be exhibited thus:—

1549.

Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech thee; and with thy holy spirit and word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.

1637.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy word and holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son; so that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of the same his most precious body and blood.

The prayer in the present English Prayer Book which precedes the Words of our Lord is derived from the 1549 form by abbreviation; the portion which corresponds to the latter part of the 1637 form having been added in 1552.

The Nonjuror's Office of 1718 follows the majority of the Eastern forms in using the active voice "make" instead of "become" or "be":—

Send down thine Holy Spirit, the witness of the passion of our Lord Jesus,² upon this sacrifice, that he may make this bread the Body of thy Christ, and this cup the Blood

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 439.

² This phrase is derived from the *Apostolic Constitutions*, viii., 12.

of thy Christ : that they who are partakers thereof may be confirmed in godliness, etc.

The most important offices for our present purpose are the present Scottish and American Liturgies. They may be exhibited side by side :—

SCOTTISH (1764).

AMERICAN (1789).

We most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine that

they may become the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son.¹

we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.

And we earnestly desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ and through faith in his blood, we (and all thy whole Church) may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of his passion.

A Scottish bishop may perhaps be forgiven for thinking, as many eminent scholars have thought, that the Scottish Communion Office is the most beautiful liturgical production of the Anglican Church since the Reformation; and the increased study of liturgies and the discovery of ancient forms continue to justify the eighteenth century revisers. A little Church in the midst of much persecution produced a real gem in its Communion Office. Yet that does not mean that no improvement is possible in it. Criticisms, partly justifiable and partly the reverse, have been directed against both the Scottish and the American Invocations given above. The American form may, perhaps justly, be judged to be rather vague, in that it does not explicitly state the object of the prayer for the Holy Ghost, as do

¹ The Office of 1755, drawn up by a predecessor of my own in the See of Moray (Bp. W. Falconar, Primus, to whom the 1764 Office is largely due) has: "That they may be to us the body and blood . . . so that we, receiving them," etc., as the American Office. I quote from a contemporary MS. copy in my possession.

almost all other liturgies; though the edge of this criticism is a good deal taken off by the study of the "implicit" forms of Epiclesis set forth above. Against the Scottish form it has been justly urged that there is not *in the same sentence* as the prayer for the Holy Ghost a statement of the end desired—that the communicants may receive a blessing—as is the case in all other liturgies. The statement comes in the next sentence, but as that next sentence is now usually printed (in modern copies), not as a part of the Invocation, as it was printed in 1764, but as a separate paragraph, the Invocation sounds somewhat abrupt and bald. In 1889, when the Scottish Church was considering the revision of its Communion Office, the Bishops proposed to add a clause after "thy most dearly beloved Son," as follows:—"That so whosoever shall receive the same may be sanctified both in soul and body and preserved unto everlasting life." The revision has not yet been carried out, though it is now again being discussed; when the time comes for it, there can be no difficulty in adding such words (perhaps slightly amended) as were suggested in 1889. The other criticism, which is not so well founded, is to the word "become." The word itself has the best of precedents, and one of the very earliest forms of all (Sarapion's liturgy) uses it. But the idea which underlies the objection to the word is that it means (so it is thought) not only "to be something which it was not before," but "to cease to be what it was before," as in a fairy story when a man becomes an animal. This would, in the Eucharist, be Transubstantiation in its grossest form. But it is certain that such a meaning of "become" never occurred to the Fathers. They never dreamt, any more than St. Paul dreamt (1 Cor. xi. 26, 28) that the Eucharistic elements after consecration ceased to be bread and wine.¹ On the other hand, we

¹ For example, Justin Martyr says that the consecrated gifts are not "common bread and common wine" (*Apol.*, i., 66), words which would be impossible if the consecrated elements were not bread and wine at all.

all believe, if we accept our Lord's words, that the bread and wine are endued with certain properties which they had not before. And if so, it is hard to see any real objection to the word "become."

Yet, as the difficulty is honestly felt, it is well to see if it cannot be met. If the use of the active "make" or "constitute," as in the majority of liturgies, would be helpful, it would be easy to make the change. But perhaps the most fruitful suggestion is that of the *Church Quarterly* reviewer (Jan., 1890). All Christians, of whatever school of thought, aim at doing what our Lord did at the first Communion. We may differ as to what He really did then, but we all wish to follow His example. No one would wish to ask, in the Eucharist, for more than He intended. No one would wish to ask for less. If, then, we added to our Eucharistic prayer such a phrase as "according to the purpose of the institution of thy dear Son," or, "in such wise as he hath ordained," or similar words, we have the qualification with which all should be satisfied. What Jesus meant by His words and deeds at the first Eucharist, that *we* mean; what *He* did not mean, that *we* do not mean. Such an addition, therefore, even though it lacks ancient precedent, might meet the difficulty, such as it is, with all reasonable persons.

The perfecting of our liturgical worship is an object which all devout Christians must have at heart; and this is my excuse for bringing the subject forward at the present time.

A. J. MACLEAN.