CHAPTER VIII

BEHIND THE LOCAL TRADITIONS

THE reader has now seen something of the evidence for a great diversity in the local traditions of the eucharistic prayer during a period which may be roughly defined as from about A.D. 200 to 400. Had the last chapter included even a summary analysis of other prayers, such as the Eastern liturgies of *S. Basil* (from Asia Minor) and *S. Mark* (from Alexandria) or the Roman canon, all of which contain a good deal of older material overlaid by fifth and sixth century revision, the impression of a great early diversity in eucharistic prayers would have been strengthened, and the range of ideas found in them would have been extended. We have also seen how towards the close of the fourth century, as a result of continual local revisions and mutual borrowings, eucharistic prayers everywhere were beginning to shew a general structural similarity and even a partial identity of phrasing.

It will be one of the most important technical tasks of liturgical studies in the next ten years to pierce this later superficial uniformity and to recover the fragments of genuinely ancient local traditions beneath.[1] But this is a task which is only beginning to be attacked with properly scientific methods, and it would be out of the question to attempt here even a sketch of the problems which will have to be re-examined in detail by experts before we shall have reached the stage of solidly established conclusions. That would require a book in itself, and one of a much more technical character than this can claim.

Yet it seems necessary, even in a book for the general reader and at the present stage of research, to attempt to give some sort of answer to the main question: Can we hope to penetrate through this (fourth–fifth century) period of growing uniformity, and behind that through the period of the unordered growth of local traditions (in the third–fourth century) back to some sort of original uniformity? Can we hope to find in the primitive church, say in the second century, coherent universal principles which can guide our own ideas about liturgy? Was there anything, for instance, in what is vaguely called 'the early church' which might serve as a standard or model by which the perplexities of Prayer Book revision in twentieth century England might be lessened? That is the sort of question which the plain churchman or the practical bishop wants to put to the liturgical stu-

[1] The pioneer work in English along these lines is a small book by the present chancellor of Lincoln cathedral, Dr. J. H. Srawley, on *The Early History of the Liturgy* (Cambridge, 1913). It is unfortunately out of print, but is still sometimes available second-hand. This is still the best technical introduction to liturgical studies available in English.

dent, and to which (so it seems to me) he is entitled to expect a plain and practical answer—and to which (so it seems to him) he does not always get one. I hope I shall not seem to be trying to evade the question if I begin by pointing out the conditions in which such a plain and practical answer has to be framed at present, especially by an Anglican.

The Present State of the Question

The early evidence on the eucharist is both fragmentary and complicated. Not only its interpretation but its discovery is often a matter needing a very delicate discernment. The pre-Nicene church was a secret society, which deliberately intended to seclude knowledge of its liturgy from all but its own tested members. It is as a rule only by hints and allusions that liturgical matters are referred to by writers of the first three centuries in works which deal primarily with other aspects of the christian religion. (There are exceptions, like Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*, but these are few.) To those who frequented the christian rites such allusions were enough to illustrate the author's meaning; to others they would convey little or nothing—and the modern student is often among the 'others' for practical purposes. It is not surprising, though it is unfortunate, that for two centuries experts have interpreted this sort of evidence in different ways, and that different general theories have dictated two different types of answer to this main question which the plain christian wants to put. The two schools may be distinguished here as the 'traditionalist' and the 'critical'. Without going at all deeply into the controversy between them, it is necessary to say a little about their respective theories.

Beginning so far as modern times are concerned with the German scholar Probst about 1860, the traditionalists have for nearly three generations now been proclaiming to such of the public as take an interest in these things that a primitive standard type or model of the eucharistic prayer did exist, and that its form is not difficult to reconstruct. The attempt to demonstrate its existence and explain its meaning has preoccupied most of the more 'popular' literature (if that adjective is applicable to any of the productions of liturgists) on the subject for at least sixty years past. Some writers of this school have contended that there existed a 'lost *text*' of the eucharistic prayer, of apostolic or sub-apostolic origin, from which all the historic rites were developed by a process of expansion or perversion. The greater part of the traditionalists, however, impressed by the evidence for a general custom of more or less free phrasing of the eucharistic prayer by the celebrant, have sought rather to establish the idea that there was a normal or standard *outline* or framework of the prayer, to which all such prayers ought to conform, and to which, they argued, the majority of such prayers have conformed since very early times. This authentic model the earlier representatives of this school mostly found to be best represented

by the Byzantine or North Syrian type of prayer, whose earliest complete example is the eucharistic prayer of the liturgy in the *Apostolic Constitutions, Bk. viii.*, from the region of Antioch *c.* A.D. 375. More recently they have concentrated their attention on the eucharistic prayer of Hippolytus, which is now known to have been one of the sources used by the compiler of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

This theory is currently associated in England with the name of that very distinguished liturgical scholar the late Bishop Walter Frere, C.R., whose last book, *The Anaphora* (S.P.C.K., 1938), may be taken as its latest and most brilliant exposition. But the theory is in reality much older than Frere's rehabilitation of it, and far from being a peculiarly Anglican thesis. It was first put forward in a fully developed form by the French liturgist Pierre Le Brun in his *Explication de la Messe* in 1726, but in essentials it goes much further back. It is, for instance, the basis of the anti-protestant polemics of the first editor of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the Spanish Jesuit Francisco Torres in the sixteenth century. In a naïve form it can be traced back into the roots of the middle ages, to the Carolingian liturgists of Gaul in the ninth and tenth centuries.[1]

In modern times it has attracted the support of three outstanding representatives of German scholarship in three successive generations: Probst (Roman Catholic), Paul Drews (Lutheran), and Dr. Anton Baumstark (Roman Catholic), besides a large number of lesser names not only of the German but also of the French and Italian liturgical schools (*e.g.* Dom Cagin). In Anglican liturgical study this has been the dominant theory at least since the compilation of the second Scottish Prayer Book in 1764. Its influence here may be traced chiefly to the work of Bishop Thomas Rattray, whose essay on *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem* was published in the year after his death, 1744. It is sometimes said that this was the theory generally held by the English Caroline divines of the seventeenth century, but this is true only with such qualification as to be virtually untrue.[2] The fact is that the Carolines, like the Non-Jurors after them, took only an unscientific interest in the early *history* of the liturgy, and did not advance to the stage of producing serious theories about that, though they had plenty to say about its theology.

Whether its influence in England began in the seventeenth or the eighteenth century, the traditionalist theory has long enjoyed here two great practical advantages for its propagation. As the established and dominant theory, it has affected nearly all the elementary manuals and text-books, so that every fresh exposition of it could always appeal to that

[1] It is surprising how many theories which pass for 'modern' in the liturgical schools have their source in these very interesting, ingenious and systematic liturgical writers of the dark ages. Their only drawback is that they knew so little and said so much about the practice of the primitive church.

[2] *Cf. e.g.* the evidence collected by Brightman, *Church Quarterly Review*, civ. July 1927, *pp.* 242 *sq.*

general background of liturgical knowledge which most of the clergy had picked up in the course of their professional training. And in itself it offers a clear and attractive theory which anyone interested can grasp without much difficulty, and which can be illustrated effectively by much of the evidence from the fourth and fifth centuries.

Over against the traditional school, however, there stands not so much a 'school' as a long succession of some of the greatest names in the history of liturgical scholarship—Tommasi in the seventeenth century, Forbes of Burntisland and Ceriani in the nineteenth, Brightman, Armitage Robinson and Lietzmann in the twentieth, and above all, Edmund Bishop (perhaps the greatest of all liturgists)—all of whom have either explicitly rejected the traditional theory as seriously misleading, or at least based their own studies on a quite different understanding of the evidence. Some of them (*e.g.* Bishop and Ceriani) had hinted at the possibility of a radical dualism in liturgical origins. In our own day Lietzmann has boldly developed this into the idea that there were from the first two quite different types of liturgy in the church, different not only in form but in essential meaning, which he would derive respectively from the Pauline and the judaising churches of the apostolic age. The critical school (if such they can be called) have differed considerably among themselves in their positive statements,[1] but they at least agreed in this, in rejecting both the form and the basis of the traditional theory of a single primitive type of prayer. They all emphasised the signs of a very great variety in the outline of the eucharistic prayer before about A.D. 350.

Unfortunately, excepting Lietzmann, every one of these names is that of a writer who was very much a 'scholar's scholar'. Their most important contributions on this particular subject are mostly, either like those of Tommasi and Forbes, incidental statements found in works on other aspects of liturgy which are now unprocurable even at second-hand, or else printed as articles buried away in back numbers of theological periodicals which are not very commonly available.[2] And just because their criticisms of the accepted theory are based chiefly on the earlier evidence which is particularly difficult and complicated to handle, their work as a rule shows little consideration for the wayfaring man. The scholar's caution and perception of *nuances*, his wariness of the over-simplification of complex questions, his distrust of short-cuts to results, are all qualities necessary for the pursuit of truth. But they do not make for easy reading, and these writers suffer from all these virtues. It is possible to detect in them a sense (eminently reason-

[1] *Cf. e.g.* Brightman's criticisms of Armitage Robinson; *Theology*, ix. (July 1924) *pp.* 33 *sqq.*

[2] The most accessible in English are an article by Armitage Robinson in *Theology*, viii. (Feb. 1924), *pp.* 89 *sq.*, and an appendix by Edmund Bishop to Dom R. H. Connolly's edition of *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Cambridge (*Texts and Studies*, viii. 1), 1909, *pp.* 126 *sqq.* Both are outstanding pieces of scholarship; the latter in particular is magisterial. But neither is at all easy reading for the uninitiated.

able in the state of the evidence until just the last few years) that the main questions of eucharistic origins were by no means ripe for positive solution; and they do not as a rule give more than hints of where they believe the true solutions to lie. The only attempt at a general exposition of a 'critical' thesis which has ever been made, Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl* (Bonn, 1926), fully justified this caution. It is spoiled, for all its brilliance, by not a few extravagances.

It is not surprising, I think, that confronted on the one hand by a long-established theory which is attractive and lucid in itself, and which can account for an impressive selection of what passes for 'ancient' evidence (though it is almost entirely post-Nicene); and on the other hand by what seemed to be a recondite and chiefly negative criticism, the bulk of what might be called 'interested but not expert' opinion in Anglican clerical circles should have tended for many years past to accept the traditionalist thesis without much hesitation. Such outright rejection of it as there has been was derived from attachment to present Anglican liturgical practice, or from post-Tridentine doctrinal sympathies among a certain section of 'Anglo-catholics', much more than from reasons of history or technical liturgical study. The results of this state of affairs became obvious and practical in 1927–28.

We are not here concerned at all with the question whether the proposed new Anglican canon drawn up then was or was not desirable in itself, but simply with the fact that it was the product of a particular technical theory about the early history of the liturgy which had been in debate among scholars for two centuries before 1928, and which at the least had been shewn to be open to serious historical criticism. This does not seem to have been clearly understood by the majority of the bishops when they put forward their proposals, and not at all by the church at large when these were being considered. It was soon obvious that the criticisms of this element in them made by scholars of the calibre of Armitage Robinson and Brightman greatly surprised and disconcerted men like Bishop Headlam of Gloucester, who were lending intelligent support to the proposals, but who on technical questions of liturgy could speak only as amateurs, as was plain from their replies.

Yet the constructive weakness of the critical school of liturgists was illustrated once more in this, that though they made many incidental suggestions for the practical improvement of the proposed rite, they produced no easily understood criticism of its form or general justification for their own ideas, and no alternative scheme as a whole. In the event their criticisms were ignored by authority as 'unhelpful'—a verdict which had in it a certain rough-and-ready justice, but little wisdom, as the issue proved.

This same attitude of surprise tinged with resentment was noticeable in these same interested but inexpert circles ten years later, at the very cool reception accorded to Frere's book on *The Anaphora* by the reviewers

(mostly competent liturgical scholars) almost without exception in the learned periodicals of all countries. It was inevitable from the form in which Frere had cast his book that discussion in England should reawaken some of the polemics about 1928. It was quite unnecessarily unfortunate that camp-followers on both sides tried to involve a matter of pure scholarship in questions of personalities and ecclesiastical politics. But apart from the small groups which acted in this way, there was a large body of thoughtful Anglican opinion which was genuinely puzzled that such a book should be received by scholars as *The Anaphora* undoubtedly was, with a virtually unanimous rejection of its main thesis, accompanied by respectful compliments on the manner of its presentation.

Frere himself, as his last letter to me shewed, was by no means unprepared for this reception. He was quite aware that with the advance of knowledge and method in the last twenty years the historical difficulties which confront the traditional theory of a single original type of eucharistic prayer had grown more and more formidable, and that he was probably the last living scholar of the first rank to maintain it in anything like its traditional form.[1] The truth is that the book is a skilful rearguard action, an attempt to recast the traditional theory in such a way that it should still be tenable in face of the growing critical difficulties. It is proper to say that, in the judgment of most of those qualified to pass an opinion, his attempt in the particular form in which he made it must be held to have failed; though it was well worth making and in some things has pointed the way to a truer solution. But in view of the way in which the whole matter has sometimes been handled it seems right to insist here that it is only incidentally connected with the name of Bishop Frere or the proposals of 1927–28,[2] and not at all with doctrinal or ecclesiastical allegiance. It is part of a technical debate among liturgical scholars which had been proceeding at intervals for some two centuries before 1928, though in the opinion of most competent scholars it is now in sight of a conclusion. The theory which Frere embraced originated with the Roman Catholics Torres and Le Brun, and has numbered among its modern defenders Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Anglicans just as indifferently as it has numbered them among its critics.

It will have been worth while reflecting a little at length on this episode if it makes clear the difficulty at the present moment of giving 'plain and practical' answers about the primitive eucharistic prayer, of the kind which I for one believe that liturgical science ought to be able to give. The traditional theory did give such an answer, but there is good reason to fear

[1] Even the veteran Dr. Baumstark has modified his support of it considerably of late years.

[2] The actual form of the *epiklesis*-clause in these proposals, on which discussion has centred, was not of Frere's making at all. It was composed by a well-known 'evangelical' bishop, and Frere, though he accepted and defended it publicly for reasons of policy, was prepared in private to criticise its wording somewhat strongly.

that it was a very misleading answer. On the other hand, the critical school, while it has made good its thesis of a great diversity in pre-Nicene eucharistic prayers and overthrown the traditional theory that the Syrian type of eucharistic prayer represents the original universal type, has found nothing very coherent to put in its place as a plain and practical guide for the modern church. Yet to say, as some scholars have implied of late, that we cannot rightly look to the primitive church for such guidance, because it had not itself achieved any intelligible principles in liturgy, would be, I believe, to consent to a mere reaction against the traditional theory which is not warranted by the evidence. And it would rob the science of liturgy not only of all practical value to the church, but of its chief interest in the eyes of all but a few specialists who might continue to make it their hobby.

Yet if the question continues to be put in the way in which the traditional theory has for so long encouraged the ecclesiastical public to put it, 'Can we find in the primitive church a model or standard for a modern eucharistic prayer?'—the answer of the liturgists will be, 'Certainly not, if what we are required to pursue be any form of the mediaeval or modern myth of a single apostolic or sub-apostolic *text* of the prayer'. Such a text never existed, and it is hard to see any complete scheme of a common arrangement in the immense variety of the early material, as this is now slowly coming to light. Yet the pre-Nicene church was quite well aware of what it supposed itself to be doing when it celebrated the eucharist. It should be quite possible to discover and interpret its liturgical principles truly, if only we look for the kind of principle which was then recognised, not those which the fourth and fifth century fathers in their very different situation, or the Byzantines and the mediaeval Latin church, or Tudor and Stuart statesmen, successively elaborated for themselves. Whether pre-Nicene liturgical principles, if we can discover them, will be of much use to us in our very different circumstances is a matter which might require further consideration when we find out what they were.

For the liturgical scholar the technical question resolves itself into this: Does that great variety which has been discerned in the eucharistic prayers of the early fourth century, and which seems to increase as we penetrate back into the third, does that go back all the way to a beginning in the apostolic age in a sort of liturgical anarchy? Or is there some element of truth in the discredited traditional theory of an original uniformity, by which we may find general principles which will interpret the apparent confusion of these prayers? This book has been written partly in order to shew that there is.

The Primitive Nucleus of the Prayer

What was fixed and immutable everywhere in the second century was the outline or Shape of the Liturgy, what was *done*. What our Lord insti-

tuted was not a 'service', something said, but an action, something done—or rather the continuance of a traditional jewish action, but with a new meaning, to which he attached a consequence. The new meaning was that henceforward this action was to be done 'for the *anamnesis* of Me'; the consequence was that 'This is My Body' and 'This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood'. Apart from these statements, the formulae which Jesus had used at the last supper, the jewish grace before and after meals, had referred exclusively to the *old* meaning. Beyond these brief statements, both the new meaning of the action and the words in which to express it were left to the church to find for itself, and there was nothing to suggest that this was a process to be completed by the first christian generation.

We have seen that the church in reflecting upon this legacy from her Lord was soon led to disencumber this jewish action from everything in its traditional jewish setting which could obscure its new christian meaning, and so to form the rite of the eucharist apart from the supper. The universal scheme of this, that 'four-action shape' in which the prayer formed the second item, went back to the end of the first century, perhaps to the last years of the apostolic generation itself. From the uniformity of this outline everywhere and the early identity of the dialogue introducing the prayer, one would infer that the new form of the rite, together with its new name of 'the eucharist', spread all over christendom in the last quarter of the first century from a single centre, which—if we must try to locate it—is most likely to have been Rome.

What would form the chief content of 'the' prayer, which originally afforded the only possibility of giving verbal expression to the meaning of the rite as a whole?

First, the name 'eucharist', '*thanksgiving*', governed the whole rite from beginning to end. Secondly, this expressed the *old* meaning with which our Lord Himself had 'done this' at the last supper. Thirdly, this was something carried over from the very roots of the eucharist in the *chabûrah* supper into its new christian shape, by the retention of the dialogue of host and guests ('Let us *give thanks* unto the Lord our God') as well as by the derivation of the eucharistic prayer from the jewish *berakah* (='thanksgiving'). Fourthly, this jewish *berakah* itself, traditional at the last supper and the primitive Jerusalem eucharist when this was still celebrated as the beginning and end of a meal, contained elements which looked beyond that mere thanksgiving for food which would soon come to seem quite inadequate as the fulness of the new christian meaning began to be understood.

When we look back at this *berakah* (*p.* 53) and place beside it the consensus of the second century evidence as to the contents of the christian prayer, we can perhaps see a parallel of thought which does not seem to me to be either fanciful or accidental, though others must judge for themselves.

Its first paragraph opens with the usual formula of address to God in such blessings: 'Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God' etc. Besides the specific 'thanksgiving' for the meal (which would be irrelevant to the 'four-action shape' of the eucharist) it contains a 'blessing' or 'glorifying of the Name' of the kind obligatory in all jewish blessings.

It is, however, the second paragraph which is of most importance to us now.

Jewish grace	*Justin and Hippolytus*
1. Thanksgiving 'because Thou didst give as an heritage unto our fathers a desirable good and ample land.'	1. Thanksgiving 'for the creation of the world with all that is therein for man's sake.' (Justin, *Dialogue*, 41.)
2. Thanksgiving for redemption from Egypt and deliverance from the house of bondage.	2. Thanksgiving for redemption from 'the iniquity wherein we were born' (Justin, *ibid.*) 'release from sufferings . . . rend the bonds of the devil.' (Hippolytus, *c*, *d*, *e*.)
3. Thanksgiving for 'Thy Covenant . . . Thy Law . . . the life, grace and loving-kindness which Thou hast bestowed upon us.'	3. Thanksgiving for the New Covenant: 'that we have been made worthy of these things by Him' (Justin, *Ap.*, I. 65); 'procuring for Thee an holy people' (to replace the old Israel). (Hippolytus, *d*.)
4. Thanksgiving for 'the food wherewith Thou dost continually feed us.'	4. 'Taking bread and giving thanks said: "Take, eat; This is My Body . . ." '
5. The paragraph concludes 'For all this, O Lord our God, we thank and bless Thee; blessed be Thy Name by the mouth of all living continually and for ever'—a second glorifying of the Name.	5. Besides the opening address and 'Naming' of God (as Father and Son and Holy Ghost in most liturgies) we have already seen the importance of the concluding 'glorifying of the Name' in all rites, stated by Hippolytus to be obligatory. (*Ap. Trad.*, vi. 4.)

It is quite open to anyone to say that the parallels here are both too vague and too subtle to be anything but accidental. Yet if a prayer had been handed down in a tradition by a process of more or less free reproduction extempore Sunday by Sunday for a century through a long line of celebrants, the most that could be expected to maintain itself would be a series of themes in a certain connection. And this particular series of themes, apparently in approximately the same order, is found as matter of the eucharistic prayer at Rome in Justin *c.* A.D. 155 and in Hippolytus fifty

years later. The same themes, in approximately the same order, are found too in other traditions, *e.g.* at Antioch and Edessa; though we cannot in these other cases prove that they were in use in the second century, as we can at Rome. Such a widespread use suggests a very early diffusion. And some explanation is required for the fact that the allusion to the last supper in most rites[1] is curiously placed, coming out of its historical order, *after* the thanksgiving for redemption by the passion.

Despite certain difficulties,[2] it does seem that those who believe that there was an original authoritative outline of the prayer could make out (by a comparison of traditions) an overwhelmingly strong case for regarding this series of 'Thanksgivings' as the original opening of the prayer (after the preliminary 'Naming' of God), especially if its derivation from the second paragraph of the *berakah* be admitted. The traditional school have tended for some reason to ignore this series of 'Thanksgivings'.[3] But I will venture to prophesy that this will eventually prove to be their fortress, which the critics will be unable to capture.

The connection—if such there be—between the jewish and christian thanksgiving is one of ideas and form only, not of phrasing. The *berakah* has been entirely re-written in terms of the New Covenant. It concentrates in a remarkable way on the work and Person of our Lord, even where, as by Hippolytus, it is addressed to the Father and not to the Son, as in *Addai and Mari*. The series is, in fact, in itself an *anamnesis* of Him, as our Lord had ordained.

On the other hand, if this 'Thanksgiving series' (following the preliminary 'Naming' of God) formed the original opening of the prayer, it was from quite an early date—let us say vaguely the late third or fourth century—not the only form such an opening could take. An opening sequence of 'Thanksgivings' does not appear at all in the only extant examples of the old Egyptian tradition, *viz.*, Sarapion, and the authentic text of the liturgy of *S. Mark* as found in the Strassburg papyrus (fourth-fifth century).

[1] The exceptions are Cyril at Jerusalem, Sarapion in Egypt and the present Roman canon. Each of these is essentially a fourth century representative of its own tradition. It can be shown that in the case of Syria and Rome Cyril and the canon are independent 'modernisations' of their respective traditions in this particular matter by that very 'go-ahead' period; and that old Syrian and Roman tradition did place the mention of the last supper after that of redemption (*cf.* Hippolytus and *Addai and Mari*). It cannot be shewn, but it is likely, that Sarapion represents the same process at work in Egypt.

[2] One of these is the 'Thanksgiving for Creation'. It might be possible to argue from the whole of the evidence as now known that this is a later addition, originating in the long disputes at Rome over the Gnostic doctrine that creation was in itself evil and not an act of the goodness of God, a doctrine which this 'Thanksgiving' as found in Justin and Hippolytus seems intended to challenge. But these controversies might have led only to a change or increase of emphasis on this point in the Roman prayer, not to the insertion *de novo* of the idea itself into the scheme everywhere.

[3] They are passed over by Frere in three lines in *The Anaphora*, p. 25.

As this text has not hitherto been given, but will now be necessary to the argument, we may say that a collation of this papyrus, where it is legible, with the mediaeval Greek and Coptic texts of *S. Mark* reveals the following as having been the opening of the Alexandrian prayer in the later fourth century:

(1) *Address:* 'It is truly meet and right, holy and fitting and expedient for nor souls, O Living God, Master, Lord God the Father almighty, to praise Thee, to hymn Thee, to bless (*eulogein*) Thee, to confess Thee night and day,
(2) *Creation*: 'Thee, the creator of heaven and all that is therein, the earth and all that is on earth, the seas and rivers and all that is in them; Who didst create man according to Thine own image and likeness. Thou didst make all things by Thy Wisdom, Thy true Light, Thy Son our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ:
(3[a]) *Preface* (1st half): Through Whom unto Thee with Him and with the Holy Ghost, we give thanks (*eucharistountes*) and offer the reasonable sacrifice of this bloodless worship, which all nations offer unto Thee from the rising up of the sun even unto its going down, from the north even unto the south; for great is Thy Name among all nations and in every place incense is offered unto Thy Holy Name, and a pure sacrifice, offering and oblation,

[*Here the intercessions are interpolated. The preface resumes:*]

(3[b]) *Preface* (2nd half): 'For Thou art far above all principality and power and rule and dominion and every name that is named . . .' [*and so through the rest of the preface to the sanctus, almost verbally as in Sarapion b*[1]; *cf. p.* 163].

There is here no sequence of the 'thanksgiving' themes. But it is conceivable that something of the sort once stood as the opening of this Egyptian tradition as well as of all others. *S. Mark* (2) looks like a survival of the 'creation theme' following the preliminary 'Naming' of God, even though it is cast rather in the form of a 'praising' for creation than a 'thanksgiving' for it (*cf.* Sarapion *a*[1] and *a*[2]). This latter word does not appear in *S. Mark* until we reach (3), and not at all in Sarapion till the end of the prayer (*i*). It looks as though this 'thanksgiving' (it is convenient to retain the word, even though it is not quite accurate in the case of *S. Mark*) for creation, which is rather pointless as it stands, was once followed by others for the incarnation, redemption, etc. on a scheme comparable to that of Hippolytus and *Addai and Mari*; and as though the later members of the series had been ousted by the preface and sanctus. But it is to be remembered that the preface and sanctus were already found in the Alexandrian rite *at some point* by the time of Origen *c.* A.D. 230, and that there is nothing to suggest that their use was then a recent innovation.

It is usual to regard the preface and sanctus as a peculiar development of the 'thanksgiving series' opening of the prayer. But the fact remains that it appears in practice not as a development of it but as an alternative to it, a sort of liturgical cuckoo, which ends by taking the place of the 'thanksgivings' whenever it is admitted into the prayer. Only in the prayers of the Antiochene type has a successful effort been made to fuse both forms, by prefixing the preface and sanctus (borrowed from Egypt *via* Jerusalem) to the old Antiochene 'thanksgiving series' (*cf. S. James, pp.* 188 *sq.*); and even there, if the wording of *S. James b, c, d,* be examined, it will be found that the prefixing of the sanctus has led to the elimination of the actual 'thanksgiving' form of the clauses. The word 'give thanks' has been replaced by the form 'Holy art Thou', etc. When the preface and sanctus were adopted by other churches, as at Jerusalem and at Rome, it displaced altogether in their rites that sequence of 'thanksgivings' which *Addai and Mari* and Hippolytus assure us was the pre-Nicene tradition of Syria and Rome alike, but of which Cyril at Jerusalem and the present Roman canon know nothing.

It seems probable when we look at *S. Mark* that something of the same sort happened in the first instance at Alexandria itself, where, so far as we know, the preface and sanctus originated. But there the first member of the old Alexandrian sequence of 'thanksgivings', that for creation, survived when the following 'thanksgivings' for the incarnation, redemption, etc. were eliminated in favour of the preface and sanctus. Perhaps that for creation survived in *S. Mark* chiefly through the difficulty of disentangling it from the 'Naming' of God in § 1. The opening of *S. Mark* (in §§ 1 and 2 taken together) constitutes a 'Naming' of God as Father and Son, to the exclusion of the Holy Ghost, of the type found as the opening of Hippolytus and Sarapion. But it would be difficult to extract the creation theme from the text of *S. Mark* as it stands, while leaving this 'Naming' as a coherent sentence. If we are right in supposing that a series of such thanksgivings once came between that for creation in *S. Mark* 2 and the preface and sanctus in 3, it would seem that the combination of preface and sanctus with the sequence of 'thanksgivings' differed at Alexandria from that found at Antioch. At Antioch in *S. James* the preface and sanctus come first. At Alexandria in *S. Mark* the preface and sanctus appear to have come *after* the sequence of 'thanksgivings'. I will hazard a suggestion as to why this should be so in a moment.

To revert now to the general question, Was there an original uniform type of eucharistic prayer? We have found something of which traces appear to be present in all the early traditions, *viz.*:—An opening address and 'Naming' of God, followed by a series of 'Thanksgivings' or 'Praisings' on a sequence of themes beginning with creation, incarnation and redemption. (We need not at this point try to decide exactly where this sequence ended, and whether it originally included a reference to the last supper or

not. The universal existence of such a sequence is sufficient for our immediate purpose.) But it is when we pass beyond the possible contents of this sequence of themes into the second half of the prayer that the difficulties in the way of establishing the existence of any original universal model of the prayer become really formidable.

The evidence we have already surveyed represents the traditions of the three leading pre-Nicene churches of Syria, Egypt and Rome, and includes all the most ancient evidence extant, except that to be derived from certain heretical gnostic writings. When one has eliminated from the second half of each of these prayers all that can safely be ascribed to later local developments and to borrowings, it is not easy to detect any single scheme upon which they all arrange their parts and ideas.

To take but one instance, though a cardinal one: Three ideas which Hippolytus keeps distinct and arranges in three successive statements (*fg*, *h*, *i*)—the recital of the institution, the *anamnesis* of 'His death and resurrection' and the offering of the bread and the cup—Sarapion in Egypt expresses inextricably entangled with one another in his section *d* (with no mention of the resurrection). *Addai and Mari* in Syria contains the first and the last, but in its earlier form, apparently, not the second. But it expresses them differently again, by the barest allusions, in connection with other ideas, in *g* and *i*. One can trace in the second half of all these prayers the recurrence of some ideas which are the same in substance, but differently handled and differently arranged. The one obvious point of arrangement in which they all agree in their second halves is that all end with a doxology or 'glorifying of the Name'.

Thus the later traditions of the prayer all show a similarity of arrangement in their first half, the 'Thanksgivings'. Especially impressive is the identity of the series of themes everywhere. But they shew great diversities of content and arrangement in their second half. The inference is that any original material common to them all covered only the first half and the concluding doxology.

Is it possible to conceive of a primitive type of eucharistic prayer which consisted simply of a 'Naming' of God, followed by a series of 'Thanksgivings' for the New Covenant and concluding with a 'glorifying of the Name'? It would be without much which later ages considered essential to such a prayer. But at all events one can see how it could be called '*the Thanksgiving*'. And after studying the themes of the 'Thanksgivings' as they are actually handled in the various traditions, one can see how they could be regarded precisely as 'the *anamnesis*', the solemn 're-calling' before God, of the work and Person of Jesus Christ. Finally, for my own part, I can see how such a prayer as a whole could be derived directly from that jewish *berakah* which was used at the last supper, and in the jewish apostolic church. Such an outline of the prayer could very well be a part of that fixed 'four-action shape' of the liturgy by which the *chabûrah* ritual was

so delicately adapted to the new christian form, and which took over amongst other things the very dialogue which immediately preceded and introduced the *berakah*.

This is all quite possible, but a little evidence is worth a great deal of plausible speculation. Can we find any examples of this type of primitive prayer? The two oldest prayers we have, Hippolytus and *Addai and Mari*, can both be dated in substantially their present form soon after A.D. 200, and these are both prayers which have a fully developed 'second half'. It will therefore be of little use seeking beyond the second century for an unexpanded prayer. Second century evidence is scanty and hard to interpret, but we can only examine once more our three traditions.

Let us look back at the Alexandrian liturgy of *S. Mark*, with (1) its 'Naming' of God; (2) thanksgiving for creation; (3) preface and sanctus. If—it has not been demonstrated and the reader must judge for himself of the probability of the hypothesis—but *if* in S. Mark a series of similar 'thanksgivings' for incarnation, redemption, etc., originally stood between the present thanksgiving for creation (2) and the preface (3)—then one begins to see the point! 'Through Whom unto Thee with Him and with the Holy Ghost'—but this is the normal introduction of a *concluding doxology, a 'glorifying' of the Name* (*cf.* Hippolytus *l*). 'For great is *Thy Name* among all nations, and in every place incense is offered unto *Thy holy Name* . . . For Thou art far above . . . every *name* that is *named* . . .' and so to a climax with the seraphim 'ever shouting and crying' as they '*hallow and glorify*' the dreadful holiness of the Name of God—'Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth; full is the heaven and earth of Thy glory!' And then did the people answer, 'As it was and is and shall be unto generations of generations and world without end. Amen'—as they still answered at the end of Sarapion's prayer out of immemorial tradition, though in his day an immense interpolation now divided the sanctus from their response, and his actual ending no longer invited the traditional reply?

We seem to have stumbled on the 'lost' doxology of the old Egyptian tradition (*cf. p.* 172), and a remarkable one it is. But its position carries with it the implication that what follows it, the bulk of the prayer as it now stands—precisely the equivalent in contents of the 'second half' of Hippolytus and *Addai and Mari*—is an addition to the original nucleus. I do not want to overpress the case, and I will put what appears to me to be the explanation in the form of questions, the answers to which can be weighed by the reader for himself.

In the original Alexandrian prayer was there a series of 'praisings' (on the same general scheme as the 'thanksgivings' in Hippolytus and other traditions) of which only the first for 'creation' now survives, followed by a 'glorifying of the Name' with a climax in the sanctus? Is the remainder of the prayer another example of the successive *appending* of new items in a

supplementary position between the original body of the prayer and the communion? (*Cf. S. James, pp.* 205 *sqq.*, the Lord's prayer in all rites, the *Agnus Dei* in the Roman rite, etc.) Is the 'telescoping' of the original nucleus (so that the 'praising for creation'—its original beginning—now comes immediately before the preface and sanctus—its original ending) a result of the gradual fusion of these supplements with the original *eucharistia*, and perhaps due to a desire to shorten a prayer becoming unwieldily long by successive additions? Is the strange abruptness which marks the transition from the sanctus to the rest of the prayer in Sarapion *c* (an abruptness found equally in the transition after the sanctus in *S. Mark*) explained by the fact that the rest of the prayer was not originally connected at all with the sanctus? (Are the awkward transitions from one section to another throughout the latter part of the prayer of Sarapion to be explained as the marks of successive additions which have never been properly fused together?) Does the phrase, 'We offer the reasonable sacrifice of this unbloody worship', coming where it does in *S. Mark* (3), explain the original application of the phrase, 'to Thee we *have* offered this living sacrifice, this unbloody oblation' (inserted by Sarapion *c* at a point *after* the sanctus) to the angelic worship, as already suggested on *p.* 166? Have we in *S. Mark* traces of an original *eucharistia* of 'praisings', preceded by a 'Naming' of God and ending with a glorifying and hallowing of the Name, as the *root* of the Egyptian liturgical tradition?

Let us now look at the earliest evidence about the contents of the Roman eucharistic prayer, that of Justin, *c.* A.D. 155. It is worth while studying his language carefully.

(*a*) 'The president . . . sends up praise and glory to the Father of all things through the Name of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and makes thanksgiving (*eucharistian*) at some length that we have been made worthy of these things by Him. And when he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving (*tas euchas kai tēn eucharistian*), all the laity present shout assent saying 'Amen'. . . . And when the president has eucharistised (*eucharistēsantos*) and the people have shouted assent . . .' (there follows the communion). (*Ap.*, I. 65.)

(*b*) 'For we do not take these as common bread or common drink. But as by the Word of God Jesus Christ our Saviour was made Flesh, and had Flesh and Blood for our salvation—so, we have been taught, by a word of prayer which comes from Him, the food which has been "eucharistised" . . . is the Flesh and Blood of that Jesus Who was made Flesh. For the apostles in the memoirs which came from them, called "gospels", have recorded that thus it was commanded them—that Jesus took bread and gave thanks and said, "Do this for the *anamnesis* of Me; this is My Body"; and likewise took the cup and gave thanks and said, "This is My Blood" ' (*ibid.* 66).

(*c*) 'The president sends up prayers together with thanksgivings (*euchas*

. . *eucharistias*) to the best of his powers, and the people applaud, saying .'Amen" ' (*ibid.* 67).

(*d*) . . . 'the bread of the eucharist, which Jesus Christ our Lord commanded to be offered for the *anamnesis* of the passion which He suffered on behalf of men for the cleansing of their souls from all iniquity; that we might at the same time give thanks to God for the creation of the world with all that is therein for man's sake, and for that He has delivered us from the wickedness wherein we were born, and overthrown the powers and principalities with a perfect overthrow by becoming subject to suffering according to His own counsel' (*Dialogue*, 41).

These are the only passages in Justin which appear to deal directly with the contents of the eucharistic prayer (though not the only ones dealing with eucharistic theology). (*a*) and (*c*) are obviously summaries of the briefest sort; (*b*) may or may not refer to something actually found in the prayer as Justin knew it, but the description of the account of the institution as a 'word' or ' "formula" of *prayer* which comes from' Jesus suggests that it had liturgical associations for Justin. (*d*) is not directly stated to refer to the actual contents of the prayer. But it expresses the meaning of the eucharist, which is what the prayer was intended to do; and it does so in terms so strikingly similar (for a summary) to those of the first part of Hippolytus' prayer that we need have no hesitation in taking it in this sense.

One might be tempted to infer from Justin's use of the phrase 'prayers and thanksgivings' in (*a*) and (*c*) that the eucharistic prayer as he knew it contained an element besides 'thanksgivings', something analogous to the second half of the prayer in Hippolytus. But in view of the order in which he places them, 'prayers' before 'thanksgivings', this can hardly be pressed. It might even be argued that in (*a*) the word *euchas* 'prayers' refers back to the intercessory 'prayers' (*euchas*) before the offertory, mentioned two lines before our quotation begins, where Justin had omitted to mention that the laity replied 'Amen' to these 'prayers', an omission which he is now repairing. But the expression a 'formula of prayer and thanksgiving' (*logōï euchēs kai eucharistias*) is found elsewhere in Justin (*e.g. Ap.*, I. 13) apparently as an elegant variation meaning quite vaguely 'a thanksgiving to God'. It seems unwise to assume that he had in mind any rigid distinction in using the two words. In (*a*) the phrase 'When he has finished the prayers and the thanksgiving' is repeated as 'When the president has eucharistised (given thanks)', not 'prayed and eucharistised'.

For the rest one cannot but be struck by the fact that the emphasis in describing the president's prayer is *entirely* on the element of 'thanksgiving'. It is possible to recognise in the beginning of (*a*), 'praise and glory to the Father of all things through the Name of the Son and the Holy Ghost', the opening Address and 'Naming' of God. At once after this comes 'he makes thanksgiving . . . and when he has finished . . . the

thanksgiving' the people answer, Amen. So far as the language here goes it would be difficult to say that it suggests any element between the 'thanksgiving' and the Amen.

It is quite true that we have already established (*p.* 159) that there is nothing in the contents of the second half of Hippolytus' prayer which would not have been accepted by Justin sixty years before him. But this is not necessarily quite the same thing as saying that it was all in the prayer in Justin's day. It was precisely ideas which were already believed and accepted about the eucharist which people would come to feel ought to be incorporated in the prayer which expressed the meaning of the eucharist. The expansion of the prayer may quite well have taken place in the generation between Justin and Hippolytus, a period about which we know very little, but in which the ideas about the eucharist which they have in common were presumably commonly held in the Roman church. Bating for the moment the question of the institution narrative, which requires separate discussion, all that we can safely say is that Justin's language is quite consistent with the idea that the Roman prayer in his day consisted only of an Address and 'Naming' of God followed by a series of 'Thanksgivings' for creation, redemption, etc., and nothing more. If his prayer contained other elements, he has not mentioned them.

As regards the Syrian tradition, we are hampered by a total lack of orthodox documents between Ignatius, *c.* A.D. 115, and the *Didascalia*, *c.* A.D. 250. From Syria we have the *Acts of Judas Thomas*, which were perhaps composed in the second century.[1] But if so, they have been heavily revised in the third–fourth century, and it is unfortunately the liturgical material which shews some of the clearest traces of revision. There is, however, a document of the same kind, the *Leucian Acts of John*, from Asia Minor, which M. R. James was prepared to affirm comes from 'not later than the middle of the second century'. We may cite a eucharistic prayer which this puts into the mouth of the apostle, as illustrating at an early stage the eucharistic tradition of Asia which in later times shews more affinities than any other with that of Syria, for which second century evidence is totally lacking.

(*a*) 'We glorify Thy Name, which converteth us from error and ruthless deceit:

'We glorify Thee Who hast shewn before our eyes that which we have seen:

'We bear witness to Thy loving-kindness which appeareth in divers ways:

'We praise Thy merciful Name, O Lord.

[1] The original date and language of this document have been much disputed. It is possible, even probable, that the original Syriac author of the second century would have passed for orthodox in his own surroundings, and that the gnostic flavour of the text is chiefly due to a later reviser.

(*b*) 'We give thanks to Thee, Who hast convicted them who are convicted of Thee:

'We give thanks to Thee, O Lord Jesu Christ, that we are persuaded of Thy grace which is unchanging:

'We give thanks to Thee, Who hadst need of our nature that should be saved:

'We give thanks to Thee that Thou hast given us this sure faith,

(*c*) 'For Thou art God alone, both now and ever.

'We Thy servants who are assembled with good intent and are gathered out of the world (*or* risen from death) give thanks unto Thee,

'O Holy One!'[1]

It would be very unwise to attempt any reconstruction of the content of the early Eastern eucharistic prayer from this gnostic farrago. But one can detect in most gnostic liturgical practice a steady retention of the orthodox forms while reinterpreting their meaning in gnostic terms and rewriting their formulae in gnostic jargon. Here I draw attention only to the form of this eucharistic prayer. It is addressed not to the Father but to the Son, as is that of *Addai and Mari*. It opens (*a*) with a 'glorifying of the Name'; it consists (*b*) of a body of four 'Thanksgivings', the number we found in the parallel between the *berakah* and the second century Roman evidence; and it ends (*c*) with the statement 'We give thanks unto Thee, O Holy One' (*hagie*), as there is reason to believe that the original Egyptian form ended with a 'thanksgiving' (*S. Mark* 3*a*) leading up to the 'hallowing' of the sanctus. It is fair to say that the same document contains elsewhere (§ 109) another eucharistic prayer in which this structure is less clearly apparent, though it seems at bottom the same.

But it appears safe on the evidence of the prayer above to assert at least that eucharistic prayers of the structure which we have been led to suppose existed in Egypt and at Rome in the early second century were not unknown in the Eastern churches also at that date.

The Second Half of the Prayer

We turn now to what is a more tangled matter, the arrangement of the 'second half' of the prayer as this is found in the various traditions. We are met at the outset by the question, where exactly does this second half begin? There is a broad distinction between the series of Thanksgivings and what follows, but where does the dividing line come? In all the traditions the 'second half' may be defined as lying between an allusion to the last supper (either a full institution narrative or a mere mention) and a concluding doxology. The latter is universal and traceable to the primitive nucleus. Is some reference to the last supper also traceable to this nucleus?

[1] *Acts of John*, E.T., 85; M. R. James, *Apocryphal New Testament*, *p.* 250.

It is difficult to say. On the one hand, such a reference is found in some form in all the traditions. The jewish *berakah* in its final thanksgiving for the earthly 'food wherewith Thou feedest us continually' contains something which might easily have suggested a thanksgiving for the heavenly food of the eucharist and its method of provision, as the last of the series of christian 'Thanksgivings'. Justin, too, in *Ap.* I. 66, with his formula or '"word" of *prayer* which comes from' Jesus Himself, suggests that something of the sort stood in the prayer as he knew it.

On the other hand, there are certain difficulties. In all the traditions the reference to the last supper is separated from the 'Thanksgiving' series by a sort of intervening clause or 'link' (Hippolytus *e*; Sarapion *c*; *Addai and Mari f*). And this link is not the same in any two of them, either in substance or expression. In each case the link itself does not seem at all closely related to the series of 'Thanksgivings'. Nor is the allusion to the last supper ever cast in the form of a 'Thanksgiving', but always of a statement. And in the one case where the original 'glorifying of the Name' closing the series of 'Thanksgivings' has survived in its primitive position (the Egyptian preface and sanctus) the allusion to the last supper comes *after* this.

This is of some significance. In later times, when the actual history is known to us of the process by which various supplementary items were appended from time to time to the body of the eucharistic prayer between this prayer and the communion, the order in which they are said represents as a rule the sequence in which they were adopted. This is true, *e.g.*, in the Roman rite. The *Agnus Dei* which was inserted *c.* A.D. 700 stands before the prayers for unity, etc., which are a still later insertion. We can never quite rule out the possibility of later rearrangement; *e.g.*, in the Roman rite S. Gregory *c.* A.D. 600 inserted the Lord's prayer *before* the *pax* which had been placed after the canon *c.* A.D. 400. But the presumption is generally that the earlier additions stand first and the later ones after them. The position of the institution narrative in the Egyptian tradition, both in Sarapion and *S. Mark*, is that it follows immediately upon the primitive conclusion (the sanctus) with a brief 'link' (Sarapion *c*) between them. This suggests that the institution narrative is originally an addition to the primitive prayer, though an early one, perhaps the very first[1] of all the various items which were appended in course of time to the primitive nucleus of the Egyptian prayer. From the mere position of the institution-

[1] I say 'perhaps' because the 'link' itself in Sarapion *c* has an interest of its own: 'Lord of powers, fill also this sacrifice with Thy power', coming immediately after the 'glorifying of the Name' in the sanctus. We must not forget that fragment of Theodotus (*c.* A.D. 160) cited by Clement of Alexandria: 'The bread is hallowed by the *power of the Name* of God . . . by this *power* it is transformed into *spiritual power*' (*Exc. ex Theod.* 82). The 'link' itself is thus apparently genuine second century material. It might represent the remains of an even earlier *stratum* of addition than the institution narrative which it now connects with the remains of the primitive Egyptian *eucharistia*.

reference in other traditions one might suspect that the same was true of them also.

But this can hardly be more than a suspicion, even in the case of the Egyptian prayers. One cannot exclude the possibility of a third century rearrangement of the Egyptian prayer when it had already received a certain number of items appended after the sanctus, a rearrangement by which an older reference to the last supper *before* the sanctus was transferred to a position after it (no doubt with some adaptation) in order to place it in a more central position.

For this much is certain. Whether the reference to the last supper belongs to the primitive nucleus or not, it is the centre or pivot of all the developed traditions of the prayer. It serves to cohere the *anamnesis* of the redemptive work of Christ in the opening series of 'Thanksgivings' with the more miscellaneous elements found in the 'second half' of the prayer. It is indeed from the reference to the last supper that the substance of this 'second half' grows in every case. In Hippolytus it contains that command to 'do this for the *anamnesis* of Me' which the 'second half' goes on to define: 'Doing therefore the *anamnesis* . . . we offer the bread and the cup', etc. In *Addai and Mari* it is the 'example', which in the Syrian gospel of Matthew contains the promise of that 'forgiveness of sins' for which the Syrian churches invariably prayed when they imitated that 'example' in their 'oblation' (*Addai and Mari i*). In Sarapion the church does what it does and its offering is what it is because of what our Lord did and said at the last supper: 'To Thee we have offered this bread, the likeness of the Body . . . This bread is the likeness of the holy Body *because* the Lord Jesus Christ . . . took bread . . . saying . . . "This is My Body" '.

As one reflects upon the great diversity in the 'second halves' of these three traditions there appears to be only one likeness of substance between them. Underneath their variety they are at bottom all of them independent attempts to do a single thing, to define the meaning of what the church does at the eucharist and relate it to what was done at the last supper. 'We *offer* to Thee the bread and the cup . . . and we pray Thee that Thou wouldest *grant to all who partake* to be made one, that they may be fulfilled with Holy Spirit for the confirmation of faith in truth' (Hippolytus). 'To Thee we have *offered* this bread. . . . We have *offered* also the cup . . . and *make all who partake* to receive a medicine of life, for the healing of every sickness and for strengthening of all advancement and virtue, not for condemnation . . .' (Sarapion). '. . . this *oblation* of Thy servants . . . *that it be to us* for the pardon of offences and the remission of sins and for the great hope of resurrection from the dead and for new life in the kingdom of heaven' (*Addai and Mari*). This is what the church does at the eucharist—*offers and communicates*; and it is this which the 'second half' of the prayer expresses and defines. It looks back to the offertory and expresses in words the meaning of that. It looks forward to the communion and prays for the

effects of that. The descriptions of the effect of communion are quite differently defined in the three prayers, as can be seen at a glance. The descriptions of the offertory differ verbally more than could have been expected, considering that all three prayers are describing an identical action, of a great simplicity. But essentially they are doing one and the same thing, stating the meaning of the offertory and the communion. It is the function of the prayer to state the meaning of the whole rite.

At this point it may be objected, 'But what about stating the meaning of the prayer itself and of the fraction?' Why state the meaning of only the first and last items of the 'four-action shape'? The fraction was treated primitively as what it had been at the last supper and in the *chabûrah* ritual, a mere preliminary to distribution, without any of the symbolic meanings which were seen in it by later times. And as for the prayer, it was itself the statement of the meaning of the whole rite. A 'statement of the meaning of the statement of the meaning' is the sort of refinement which seems to be decisively marked as secondary by mere definition.

Nevertheless the step was taken in course of time, as the churches slowly lost sight of the original principles upon which their rites were framed. And always the statement of the meaning of the prayer is placed between the statements of the meanings of the offertory and the communion. Let us look at two fourth century prayers, from the East and from the West. This time let us take for a change two that we have not hitherto used, those of *Apostolic Constitutions, Bk. viii*, from Syria, and the Milanese canon cited in *de Sacramentis* by S. Ambrose, both from the last quarter of the fourth century.

The Eastern prayer runs thus:

a. 'Making therefore the *anamnesis* of His passion and death and resurrection and ascension into the heavens, and His second coming that shall be, wherein He shall come to judge the quick and the dead and reward every man according to his works,

Meaning of the offertory

b. 'We offer unto Thee, our King and God, according to His command this bread and this cup giving thanks unto Thee through Him for that Thou hast made us worthy to stand before Thee and minister as priests to Thee;

Meaning of the prayer

c. 'And we beseech Thee that Thou wouldest favourably regard the gifts that lie before Thee, O God that lackest for nought, and be well pleased with them for the honour of Thy Christ, and send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice, the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that He (the Holy Ghost) may shew this bread to be the Body of Thy Christ and this cup to be the Blood of Thy Christ:

Meaning of communion

d. 'that they who partake of Him may be strengthened unto piety, may

receive the forgiveness of sins, may be delivered from the devil and his deceit, may be filled with Holy Spirit, may become worthy of Thy Christ, may receive eternal life, and that Thou mayest be reconciled unto them, O Lord Almighty.'

The Milanese prayer, which is either a 'first cousin' or more probably the direct ancestor of the present Roman canon, runs thus:

a. 'Therefore making the *anamnesis* of His most glorious passion and resurrection from the dead and ascension into heaven,

Meaning of the offertory

b. 'We offer to Thee this spotless offering, reasonable offering, unbloody offering, this holy bread and cup of eternal life:

Meaning of the prayer

c. 'And we ask and pray that Thou wouldest receive this oblation at Thine altar on high by the hands of Thine angels as Thou didst receive the offerings of Thy righteous servant Abel and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which the high-priest Melchizedek offered unto Thee:'

(At this point the quotation in *de Sacramentis* ends. But it is virtually certain that the prayer ended much as it ends in the present re-arranged Roman canon):

Meaning of communion

d. 'That as many of us as shall receive by this partaking of the altar the most holy Body and Blood of Thy Son may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace.'

These two prayers each express what is felt as the fundamental meaning of the eucharistic prayer, at the obvious point, between the meanings of the offertory and the communion. The meaning they see in the prayer is different. The Eastern concentrates on 'consecration', the Western on 'oblation'. This is typical of a difference which since the fourth century has gradually hardened into a difference of ethos between the Eastern and Western rites and theologies. But it is a mistake to suppose that in the fourth century this distinction had yet acquired a rigidly geographical basis. Mr. W. H. Codrington has recently drawn attention[1] to a whole group of Syrian and Egyptian prayers which contain a reference to the 'Western' idea of the offering at the heavenly altar at this point of the prayer. A reference to this same idea is found elsewhere in the rite in *Ap. Const., viii.* itself, and in the liturgies of *S. Basil*, *S. John Chrysostom* and *S. Mark*.[2] And we must not forget that Sarapion's prayer is headed 'Prayer of Oblation', even though when it comes to formulate its meaning

[1] *Journal of Theol. Studies*, xxxix. (April 1934), *pp.* 141 *sq.*

[2] In *S. Mark* it is now at the offertory, but there is reason to think this is not its original position.

(in e^1) it does so in terms of 'consecration' closely allied in thought to those of *Ap. Const., viii. c.* Similarly it would be easy to find later prayers from Spain and Gaul in the West which state the meaning of the prayer in the 'Eastern' way. I am not sure that *Ap. Const., viii. c.* itself, with its reference to 'being well pleased with the gifts that *lie before Thee*', is not at least feeling after the 'Roman' idea of the oblation at the heavenly altar; while the Roman canon in its turn contains in the *Quam oblationem* before the institution narrative a petition for consecration expressing the same fundamental idea as the petition in *Ap. Const., viii. c.*, though it is put in quite different theological terms.

Nevertheless, these fourth century statements of the fundamental meaning of the prayer are different. Each concentrates on an aspect of the matter which was clearly recognised from an early date. One has only to remember the phrase of Theodotus in Egypt, *c.* A.D. 160, already quoted: 'The bread is hallowed by the power of the Name of God, remaining the same in appearance as it was when it was taken . . . it is transformed into spiritual power',[1] to see the antiquity of the notion of 'consecration' as the chief meaning and purpose of the prayer. On the other hand, one has only to recall the phrase of Irenaeus in the same generation, 'For there is an altar in heaven, and thither are our prayers and oblations directed',[2] to be sure of the equal antiquity of the idea of the heavenly altar at which the eucharist is offered.

But there is another and, it seems, a more penetrating way of regarding this difference of interpretation. In emphasising the meaning of the prayer as 'consecration', is not the one type simply stating in another way the meaning of the *communion*? And does not the other emphasis on 'oblation' only state in another way the meaning of the *offertory*? In the last analysis the prayer has no separate meaning of its own in the rite to be stated at all. It is not in origin either a 'consecration prayer' (in our familiar phrase) or a 'prayer of oblation' (as Sarapion called it) but what it was from the beginning—the *eucharistic* prayer. It is what is 'done' at the eucharist, the eucharistic action as a whole, the Shape of the Liturgy, which contains the meaning of the rite. It is the function of the prayer to put this meaning into words.

A Critical Reconstruction of the Traditional Theory

It is time to draw the threads together. We can distinguish three main periods in the early history of the eucharistic prayer. Working backwards these are:

(1) A period in the later fourth and the early fifth centuries, when by a process of mutual borrowing and adaptation all the rites of the great sees

[1] *Ap.* Clement of Alexandria *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 82.
[2] *Adv. Haer.*, iv. 18. 6.

are evolving in the direction of a general uniformity of structure and content, and even to some extent of phrasing, in their eucharistic prayers. This is the period which is set up as a norm by the exponents of the traditional theory, who assume that it represents faithfully tendencies which had operated uninterruptedly from the beginning. It is in fact the period which was decisive for the final form of the historic rites. It is represented by such documents as the Roman canon in the West, and *S. James, Apostolic Constitutions, viii.*, and *S. Basil* in the East (and to some extent by Sarapion, though this is in most respects a document of the preceding period).

(2) Behind this is a period covering (? the last quarter of the second century and) the third and earlier part of the fourth centuries. It is marked by the growth of considerable variety in both structure and contents of the unco-ordinated local traditions of the prayer. This is the period upon which the 'critical' school of liturgists have fixed their attention. It is represented by such documents as Hippolytus and *Addai and Mari* (in approximately their present form) and in its later stages by Sarapion and Cyril of Jerusalem. A great deal of work yet remains to be done on the details of the various traditions in this period. But enough is already known for it to be certain that those scholars are right who reject the traditional assumption that the post-Nicene tendency towards uniformity merely developed a pre-Nicene 'standard type'; or that the Syro-Byzantine outline of the prayer is anything more than one among several amalgams which emerged in the fourth-fifth century. The later fourth century tendency to uniformity was thus a reversal of a third century tendency towards great local diversity. But the critical school in its turn has assumed that the growth of variety in the third century goes back in principle to the very beginning in the apostolic age—so much so that we find Lietzmann and his followers postulating that the eucharistic liturgy never had any single origin at all, but two (or even more) original different sources in the apostolic age.

(3) What now of the period behind this again, before the solid evidence of the earliest liturgical *texts* begins, in the second century and the latter part of the first, which we have been investigating?

The evidence is delicate and scanty, but we seem to have found indications in this period of two distinct *strata* in the prayer. (*a*) There are traces of an original stage when the prayer consisted simply of a 'Naming' of God, followed by a series of 'Thanksgivings' and ending with a 'hallowing' or 'glorifying of the Name'. This can be connected with the outline of the jewish 'Thanksgiving' which formed an invariable part of that *chabûrah* ritual out of which the 'four-action shape' of the eucharist was derived in the latter part of the first century. (*b*) A second *stratum* appears to arise out of the reference to the last supper (which may or may not have formed the last member of the original series of Thanksgivings in the first *stratum*). This second *stratum* states the meaning of what is done in the celebration

of the eucharist, and relates the present eucharistic action of the church to what was done at the last supper.

To me personally the most satisfying thing about the results at which we seem to have arrived is that at no stage of the argument does it require us to go beyond the known facts and the evidence as it stands. We require no silent revolutions accomplished by Antiochene gentile converts, no liturgical innovations by S. Paul, no pagan infiltrations from the mysteries, no inventions or misunderstandings of what happened at the last supper, to account for anything in eucharistic history. And there are no subsequent improbabilities or gaps in the evolution.

That the last supper was a *chabûrah* meeting seems to arise straight out of the New Testament evidence (and indeed from the facts of the case) when this is compared with the ordinary rabbinic regulations for the meetings of such *chabûrôth*. This appears to have been S. Paul's own understanding of it. The 'four-action shape' of the eucharist meets us as an universal fact in the second century. It arises quite naturally from the desire to mark off those particular elements in the *chabûrah* ritual to which our Lord had attached His new meaning, and to separate these from the remainder of the *chabûrah* rite, to which He had attached no special significance. S. Paul's difficulties at Corinth had foreshadowed the necessity of such a separation, at all events in the gentile churches, long before the end of the apostolic age. The 'four-action shape' does in fact detach just these elements from the *chabûrah* rite, leaving the remainder to continue as the *agape* or Lord's supper independently of the eucharist.

Among other constituents of the *chabûrah* ritual was the *berakah* or 'thanksgiving', preceded by a dialogue. Among the constituents of the eucharist was the *eucharistia* or 'thanksgiving', fulfilling the same function in the christian as in the jewish rite, and preceded by *the same* dialogue. Furthermore, there are traces of a very early stage at which the christian 'thanksgiving' in all traditions had the same outline as the jewish one, but with the contents rewritten in terms of that 'New Covenant' into which it was (according to the earliest tradition) the very purpose of our Lord to initiate His disciples by this rite. So far all is natural, almost inevitable.

Was a direct reference to the last supper included in this primitive *eucharistia*? It is impossible to decide. One can see very easily why and where it could be placed in the new christian rewriting of the *berakah*, and there are things in 1 Cor. xi. (*e.g.*, *v.* 23: 'that which I also delivered unto you') which would make its inclusion from the beginning entirely natural.

On the other hand one must remember the immense difference which the circulation of written gospels must have made to the way in which christians regarded the historical origin of their faith, and to the store they set by detailed allusions to it. It is extraordinarily difficult for us to think ourselves back behind this change that the written gospels made in the possibility, and therefore the expectation, of such references. But I think I

can understand how a gentile christian late in the first century, introduced to the eucharist for the first time after his baptism, would be content with a tradition that this rite as he found it had been instituted by Jesus, without expecting a detailed account of the institution to be incorporated into the prayer. More particularly would this be the case if his preparation for baptism had not included any biography of Jesus (before the gospels were written or circulating) and not much information about His life beyond the main facts of the crucifixion and resurrection, and some stories of miracles with a number of parables and teachings. (It is, I think, now generally agreed that the primitive preparation for baptism laid emphasis on the Messiahship of Jesus and His atonement, and on moral instructions about conduct, rather than on the history or even the teachings of Jesus in His earthly life.) As for the relation of the eucharist to the *chabûrah*, what gentile convert would understand or care very much about that? It is one of the decisive reasons for placing the formation of the 'four-action shape' of the eucharist (which so carefully preserves that relation) right back in the period when even the gentile churches still looked to jewish leaders, that only jews could have made the changes involved in jewish custom with such discrimination. And for a jewish christian the mere fact that he was now keeping the familiar *chabûrah* ritual with a new meaning, and perhaps with a *berakah* rewritten in terms of the New Covenant, would be in itself a sufficient reminder of what Jesus was traditionally alleged to have said and done at the last supper, with no need for a specific rehearsing of it. At the most such an allusion as that in *Addai and Mari*—'we have received by tradition the example that is from Thee'—would suggest itself in such circles.

But once the written gospels came into general circulation (*c.* A.D. 100-150) even before they were canonised, they would suggest the incorporation into the rite of the sort of account of the institution they contained. The same would be true of the older account in 1 Cor. xi. But one notices that though in later times most rites incorporate other details of S. Paul's wording, no known rite has the words of institution over the chalice in quite his primitive form, 'This cup is the New Covenant in My Blood'. It looks as though all the institution narratives have been *suggested* by the gospels, even though they fuse them with matter from S. Paul, and treat them in other ways with great independence. I do not see why the incorporation of the institution narrative (or its development from the sort of allusion found in *Addai and Mari*) should be much later than the period of the first general circulation of the gospels and their public reading in the church, quite early in the second century. This would account for Justin's description of the words of institution as a formula or 'word' of prayer (in *Ap.* I. 66) without difficulty, if it needs accounting for.

The process could hardly stop there, with the mere appending of the narrative to the old jewish model of the *eucharistia*. As the church became

more and more a purely gentile society and lost contact with its jewish origins and jewish habits of thought and ways of piety, the sense of the importance and sufficiency of the jewish model of the *berakah* must inevitably fade, and even the understanding of the jewish basis of the traditional form of the christian prayer. The idea of the *berakah*, the series of 'thanksgivings' for the work and Person of Jesus the Messiah as in itself an adequate *anamnesis* of Him before God, had certainly been lost by the churches of the third century, or they would not have overlaid and displaced this jewish nucleus of the prayer with other elements as they did. Once the historical reference to the last supper had been elaborated or introduced, it provided another focus or centre in the prayer. By its mere presence it suggested the need to relate what the church is *now* doing in the eucharist to this original authority for doing it; and the institution narrative itself contained all the material necessary. 'Do this for the *anamnesis* of Me'—'We do the *anamnesis* of His death and resurrection.' 'Take, eat'—we take and eat, in offertory and communion. There is supplementary matter besides, but that is the framework of the prayer in Hippolytus, our earliest dated text.

The new *anamnesis* in a sense duplicates matter found in the old Thanksgivings, but with a different emphasis. The old matter concentrates on the Person of Christ—it is an *anamnesis* of '*Him*'—and on the effects of redemption. The new *anamnesis* derived from the historical narrative of the institution concentrates on the particular events in history by which redemption was wrought—'His death and resurrection.' We have already noted that Hippolytus *e* (the introduction to the institution narrative) regards the eucharist as the present means by which these 'effects' of redemption are actually achieved in the individual soul. Thus the institution narrative has drawn to itself before it the essence of the old 'Thanksgivings', just as it furnishes the basis for the whole second half of the prayer. It has become the focus or pivot of the whole, linking the old and the new material. And very rightly, for it contains in itself all that our Lord had said as to the new meaning to be attached by his followers to 'doing this', the very pith of that meaning of the rite which it was the function of the prayer to state.

The development in other churches was not quite the same; there is, *e.g.*, no *anamnesis* in Sarapion, nor, I think, originally in *Addai and Mari*. But everywhere there is the manifest intention that the second half of the prayer should state the meaning of offertory and communion in relation to the last supper. Everywhere the second half of the prayer has its roots in the allusion to the last supper, even though it was the eucharistic action, the Shape of the Liturgy from offertory to communion, that provided the substance of this part of the prayer.

The question arises as to the date when this development of the institution narrative into the 'second half' of the prayer may be called an

accomplished fact. Where all opinions are bound to be tentative I can only put the matter as it seems to me. Hippolytus *c.* A.D. 215 is a *terminus ad quem*. More than one scholar has recently questioned whether the prayer as it now stands in the text of the *Apostolic Tradition* has not been interpolated since his day. On grounds of textual criticism I believe this suspicion to be true of one clause in Hippolytus *k*. But for the rest the textual tradition is astonishingly unanimous as to the substance in versions in Latin, Greek, Syriac and Ethiopic. And there is this further consideration: Hippolytus is a writer with a strongly marked personal style and vocabulary, who is much given to repeating little tags or catch-phrases of his own. Almost every clause in the prayer as it stands can be paralleled in style, vocabulary and even phrasing, some of them many times over, in other unquestioned works of his. And these parallels, some of which have been collected by Dom Connolly,[1] are found in all parts of the present text. The prayer as it stands may be taken as coming from his pen—more than that, as being of his composition. I mean by this, not that he is the inventor of this type of prayer, but that its phrasing and articulation bear unmistakable marks of his personal ideas.

In the circumstances in which the *Apostolic Tradition* was issued—as a conservative manifesto against contemporary innovations in the Roman church—we must attach a good deal of weight to Hippolytus' claim that he is setting down customs which had been traditional at Rome at least during his whole life-time, say from *c.* A.D. 175 or rather earlier. But this must not blind us to the fact that there are a number of phrases in the prayer which are distinctive of his own peculiar theology of the Trinity, and which the rest of the Roman church in his own lifetime might very well have refused to use. Yet the general form and structure of the prayer are very unlikely to have been unusual at Rome in his day. It would have stultified the whole purpose of his pamphlet in favour of the old ways if the first prayer he gave as an example was of a type unknown to the average Roman christian, or even one which his christian contemporaries would not recognise as like those in use there ever since they could remember. But that very 'tidyness' and closeness of articulation which distinguish his prayer from those of *Addai and Mari* and Sarapion are a sign that in the prayer of Hippolytus the material has been thoroughly fused and ordered by a single mind. It is the product, on strictly traditional lines, of a professional theologian. In *Addai and Mari* and Sarapion we have the much less orderly and coherent result of the gradual accumulations of tradition in local churches.

Nevertheless, Hippolytus supplies us with a lower limit which we can accept with some confidence. The eucharistic prayer at Rome had had some sort of 'second half' ever since he could remember—say since *c.* A.D. 175. If the evidence of Justin is to be taken at its face-value, the

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxxix. (Oct. 1938), *pp.* 350 *sq.*

Roman prayer had been expanded to include this only in the preceding quarter of a century. Development in some churches may have been less rapid, but it may well have been more so. Even in the second century the Roman church had deserved a reputation for conservatism.

The theory sketched here of the second century development of the prayer will probably seem to many impossibly radical. I can only plead against the traditionalists that the actual structure of the prayer in all traditions suggests that in its simplest form it contains two separate *strata*; that the 'Thanksgiving series' and the 'second half' spring from two different roots, serve two different purposes and are fused into a single prayer only by the allusion to the last supper. Even if I am wrong in supposing that the 'second half' is a later addition—and I have tried to shew that there is definite historical evidence to be discerned for thinking that it is—the construction of the prayer itself would still oblige us to believe that it was originally framed as two halves and not as a unity.

It is equally likely that liturgical experts who accept the theories of Lietzmann and his school will see here chiefly a return to the essential point of the traditional theory—*the single origin of the eucharistic rite*. This involves the rejection of that original 'duality' which scholars like Ceriani and E. Bishop avowed that they found in early liturgical history, and which their modern successors have traced to a fundamental division in eucharistic doctrine and practice between S. Paul and the judaic apostles headed by S. Peter. I must answer plainly that in its modern contemporary form this theory is only one more of those visitations by the ghost of F. C. Baur to which theological scholarship is still occasionally liable. The Tübingen romance of an apostolic schism is no more soundly based in the early history of the liturgy than it is in any other branch of church history. Its survival among liturgists after it had been discarded as untenable by historians (with the exception of Lietzmann himself in his *Beginnings of Christianity*, E.T., 1937) has been the principal hindrance to the progress of liturgical studies in the past twenty years.

S. Paul was a jew and a rabbinic student and a pharisee. Like the jewish church before him he used a thoroughly jewish rite at the eucharist, as did the Pauline churches after him. That was inevitable. The 'Pauline' eucharist arose at Jerusalem, from a new meaning given to something authentically, integrally, traditionally jewish, the *chabûrah* meal of the last supper. I have set out the evidence, and by that every theory in the end must stand or fall. But I claim that on the evidence it is right to assert that in the last analysis Frere and his predecessors were right, as against Lietzmann and his followers and predecessors, in attributing to the eucharist and the liturgy which performed it a single origin, and not a dual one. Their failure lay in a refusal to pursue the question to its roots, and to insist that if there was such a single aboriginal type of eucharistic prayer, it must in the nature of the case have been on a jewish model and not on a

Greek one. Developed in this direction the traditional theory of a single origin to the liturgy 'fits' the evidence at every point as the theory of a dual origin has never fitted it because it is not true.

Certainly there was a duality—it might be truer to say a plurality—about the interpretation of the eucharist from the beginning. One can trace it even in the New Testament.[1] But it is a multiplicity of meanings seen in a single action. That action was one and fixed from the evening of the last supper—'do this'—and the rite that ensured its perpetuation was one and fixed in its form so far back as we can trace. What grew—as our Lord meant it to grow—and broadened and deepened and enriched itself in ever new ways as the christian generations passed was the meaning drawn from the words 'for the *anamnesis* of Me'.

[1] *Cf. p.* 4.