CHAPTER X

THE THEOLOGY OF CONSECRATION

THE eucharist, then, manifests the true being of the church as the Body of Christ and of the christian as the member of Christ, because it manifests the being of Christ as the Redeemer—the Redeemer by the sacrifice of Himself. It is the act of Christ in His Body the church, transferring all who are 'in Him' into the eternal Kingdom of God beyond time. Of this interpretation the imagery of the eternal High-priest offering the earthly eucharist at the heavenly altar became the accepted expression from before the end of the first century, as the evidence of Clement shews. The heavenly Christ as the abiding 'propitiation for our sins' is the supernatural life of all who are His, who in the eucharist are at once 'offered' and 'brought to' the Father.[1] The individual effectively fulfils himself in this world as a living member of Christ above all by discharging personally his own proper function in the Body of Christ, his proper 'liturgy' (as bishop, cleric or layman) whose climax is his share in the 'doing' of the great corporate action of that Body prescribed by our Lord.

The eucharist, the characteristic vital act of the Body of Christ, is performed by the church as a whole (not merely by the clergy on behalf of the laity) in those two actions in which all have their part, offertory and communion. These are summarised by the twofold plural command, 'Take ye; eat ye . . .' (*labete, phagete*).[2] These words are no part of the authentic text of our oldest account of the institution, in 1 Cor. xi. 24, and the second, at all events, is very doubtfully original in Mark xiv. 22. Their real source in the liturgical tradition appears to be Matt. xxvi. 26, from which they have been interpolated into the other scriptural accounts of the last supper in many biblical MSS. But even if they are an addition to the absolutely primitive report of what our Lord actually said at that supper, they are in Matt. a first century addition—a sufficient indication that the apostolic church already understood by the command to 'do this' a *double* action, offertory and communion, and not one action only, to 'eat'.

The 'Liturgy' of the Celebrant

Between these two corporate actions of offertory and communion is set the prayer—the prayer which consecrates and so sacrifices. This is performed not by the whole church but by one member of the Body only on behalf of the Body. It was so from the beginning, from the days when the bread-blessing and the *berakah* were said by the primitive president of the

[1] Dan. vii. 13. [2] Matt. xxvi. 26.

christian *chabûrah* in the name of the whole society at the beginning and end of its corporate meal, following the invariable jewish custom which had been observed at the last supper. It is for S. Paul the business of him 'who fulfils the place of a private person'[1] to say 'Amen' to the *eucharistia* (=*berakah*, thanksgiving) said by someone else. So for Clement a generation later it is the 'proper liturgy', the especial function, of the *episcopē*, 'the bishop's office', to 'offer the gifts'.[2] This is what distinguishes the christian 'high-priest' from the 'priestly' people of God.[3] Is there not here some contradiction between this exclusive prerogative of an individual or of one particular 'order' in the Body, and that *corporate* offering of the eucharist which is insisted on in 1 Cor. xi. (as Dr. Moffat and others have so carefully emphasised) and which reappears in Clement's own appeal, 'Let each of you, brethren, make eucharist to God according to his own order'?[4]

Not at all. Because Christ is one with His church in its corporate unity as His Body, the eucharist which is His act cannot be the act only of the christian individuals present at it, whether considered singly or as a mere aggregate, but of the church as an organism. But equally because Christ is One in Himself, any particular eucharist is not the act of the local church only, even in its organic unity; it must be the act of the whole catholic Body of Christ, throughout the world and throughout the ages. The eucharist is the 'coming' to the Father of redeemed humanity 'in Christ', and can never be less than that, however many or however few may be present at any particular celebration. The eucharistic prayer states the total meaning of what is there done; and that meaning can only be authoritatively stated by one who is entitled to speak not only for the congregation there present or even for the whole local church, but for the universal church in all ages and all places.

There is only one member of a local church in pre-Nicene times who bears a commission from outside itself, its bishop ordained by bishops from other churches to a share in the universal apostolic commission. The bishop can speak for his own church in virtue of his election by it as the chosen centre of its unity, the chief organ of its corporate being, and the guardian of its tradition. But he can speak also for the universal church, because he has been accepted and consecrated into that apostolic college to which our Lord committed not the charge of particular churches but a special relation to or function in His Body, the whole church. As such the bishop has authority to witness to and in the universal consent of the whole catholic church.

The local *episcopē*, the 'bishop's office' in a local church, is already for Clement in the first century the christian 'high-priesthood', the earthly representative of that 'High-priest of our offerings' Who 'abideth in the heaven of heavens', into Whose eternal offering of Himself the earthly

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 16. [2] 1 Clem., 44. [3] *Ibid.*, 40. [4] *Ibid.*, 41.

eucharist is taken up. As such the bishop is by office and 'liturgy' the proper minister of all sacraments to his own church, though he was soon forced by growth of numbers to exercise much of that ministry by delegating it to presbyters.

By contrast with the pre-Nicene bishop, who though president of a local church is also a successor of the apostles and a guardian of the universal church, the pre-Nicene presbyter is essentially the man of his own local church, the 'elder' chosen and ordained within itself for the day-to-day decision and administration of its own local concerns as a member of its 'executive committee', under the 'chairmanship' of its bishop. It is true that the steady practice of the church for some fifteen centuries past has now attached the exercise of the 'high-priestly' office of eucharistic celebrant to the second order of the ministry as well as to the bishop, as a regular and normal thing, so that this is now an inseparable duty and privilege of the presbyterate. It is, indeed, commonly regarded as the chief function of the presbyterate, with which in consequence the idea of eucharistic 'priesthood' has now become especially associated, to the practical exclusion of the old idea of the whole 'priestly' body of the church offering its priestly service to God in the eucharist. This is an unfortunate and unforeseen consequence of the hesitation felt in the fourth century (when the presbyterate for the first time found itself becoming chiefly employed in the administration of the sacraments) about applying to the second order the full title of 'high-priest', traditionally given to the bishop as minister of the sacraments. The compromise was then accepted of equating the presbyterate, not with the 'high-priesthood', but with the 'priesthood', of the Old Testament, while retaining 'high-priest' as a regular description of the episcopate. This usage described well enough the relation of a bishop and his presbyters as it had come to be in the fourth century. But it ignored the fact that the title of 'high-priest' had originally described the bishop simply as celebrant of the eucharist, and was intended to distinguish him not from the presbyters only but from the whole of the rest of the 'priestly' body, christians at large, laity as well as clergy. It was a great loss when the idea of this corporate priesthood of the whole church in the eucharist was obscured by attaching the title of the eucharistic 'priest' especially to the celebrant-presbyter. But it leads only to a further confusion of the whole idea when it is sought (as in much of the literature of the 'Liturgical Movement' in this country) to re-emphasise the 'priesthood of the laity' and the corporateness of the offering, without at the same time recognising that the celebrant-presbyter is in fact fulfilling the original '*high*-priestly' ministry of the bishop in the midst of the 'priestly' church, as the bishop's deputy.

We shall not get our ideas straight about the 'corporateness' of the eucharistic action or the 'priesthood of the laity' or the relation of the celebrant to the congregation or the function of the eucharistic prayer in

the whole rite, unless we bear this fact in mind—that the celebrant, whether bishop or presbyter, is the '*high*-priest' in the midst of the 'priestly' people. But to complete the conception we need also to bear in mind the original distinction between the ministries of the universal church and the local churches, between apostles and elders, which meets us in Acts. The bishop is from one point of view only the chief minister of a *local* church, the president of the local council of presbyters. But he also came to exercise a ministry of the universal church as a successor of the apostles and a sharer in their universal commission. The ministry of all sacraments is exercised in the name of Christ and of His Body, that universal church which knows no local or temporal limitations. As such this ministry is properly only exercised by the episcopate as successors of the apostles. The ministry of the presbyter being by origin and in itself of local authority only, when he dispenses the sacraments he must be exercising the universal or 'apostolic' ministry of the bishop as the latter's delegate. Because every eucharist is the act of the whole church, the prayer which fixes its meaning as such an act is essentially a function of the universal ministry, the episcopate. And though the bishop in 'offering the gifts' by the prayer acts as the chosen 'high-priest' of his own local church, and frames it according to the local tradition of his church, he also imparts to that tradition all the authority of a recognised official 'witness' to the universal tradition of the catholic church. This function is exercised by presbyters, however normally and regularly, only by delegation.

The Function of the Prayer in the Eucharistic Action

The eucharistic prayer thus vindicates for the present particular eucharistic action of a local church the whole accumulated depth of meaning attached to the eucharistic action by the universal church at every celebration since the crucifixion. The prayer said by the bishop or his authorised deputy takes up the corporate official act of his church into the corporate act of the whole Body of Christ, Head and members together, as 'the Son of Man' (='the people of the saints of the Most High') 'comes' from time to the Father. Thus it becomes true that 'This is My Body', both of the local church self-offered at the offertory to become the Body, and of its offering. By the prayer of the Body of Christ the cup also of which that particular local church drinks is declared with the faith of the whole redeemed covenant-people and the authority of the Redeemer and Founder of the covenant Himself to be 'The New Covenant in My Blood'. It is the identity of the catholic church's action with the action of Christ Himself in His offering which constitutes 'the' eucharist. It is the identification of the action of a local church with that of the whole church which constitutes any particular celebration 'a' eucharist.

This is the meaning of being 'in *the communion* of the catholic church'—

that the whole Body of Christ accepts and makes its own and is, as it were, *contained in* the eucharistic action of a particular congregation. The eucharist of a group or society which repudiates or is repudiated by the catholic whole is thereby defective, however holy its members and however 'valid' the orders of its ministers. Its sacrament cannot have as its *res*, its 'spiritual benefit', the 'unity of the mystical body' in the full sense, just because the eucharistic action of that group or society cannot be fully identified with that of the whole church. We may willingly believe that our Lord will never turn away without grace any individual who comes to Him in good faith through devout participation in such eucharists. Yet it remains one effect of the hideous anomaly of schism within the Body of Christ, that though a schismatic church may have taken the greatest care to preserve a 'valid' succession; though like the Novatianists of the third century and the Donatists of the fourth it may make its boast of this and of the purity of its doctrine against the corruptions of the catholics; though it may truly consecrate and offer the Body and Blood of Christ in its eucharist; it is yet deprived of the full *res*, the 'spiritual benefit', of the eucharist—'the unity of the mystical body'—if its sacrament be done outside that unity. 'Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift'[1]—holds true of churches as well as individuals.

So the prayer consecrates and sacrifices together—sacrifices by consecrating. For consecration in itself is nothing else but the acceptance by the Father of the sacrifice of Christ in His members—the sacrifice of 'the Body of Christ' in all its meanings.

From the beginning the prayer had this double function of stating a meaning which is at once an offering and a blessing, sacrifice and consecration. If we go back to the jewish pre-history of the rite, the bread-blessing and the *berakah* were more than a recognition of the fact that God provided the food and the drink. The blessing of His Name for them in some sense offered them back to God, and also 'released' them, as it were, for human consumption. The pagan, the Samaritan, the apostate, could not take part in the jewish *berakah* because it had this aspect of 'offering'. In jewish eyes 'it was sacrilege to partake of God's bounty without pronouncing the blessing of His Name for providing it. All belongs to God and we share in what is His when consecrating it by a blessing.'[2] This double action has been taken over into the christian prayer. We still offer to God 'of Thine own gifts and bounties', as the Roman canon has it. But it is no longer only God's natural bounty for which we thank Him, but His gift of 'the Bread of heaven in Christ Jesus', to quote again the words of administration in Hippolytus. The eucharistic prayer retains the character of the table-blessing of the New Covenant.

[1] Matt. v. 24.
[2] F. Gavin, *Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*, p. 69.

And that Covenant is 'in My Blood'. From the day that our Lord's judicial execution by crucifixion was interpreted as 'atoning', and therefore as in some sense sacrificial, the vague sense of 'offering back to God' contained in the old jewish conception of the *berakah* was powerfully reinforced. Only a few hours before that sacrificial death He had Himself declared that 'This' bread 'is My Body' and 'This cup' is the Blood of the sacrificial Victim of the New Covenant. The inference that when His followers 'did this' as He had simultaneously commanded them to do it 'for the *anamnesis* of' Him, what is done with 'this bread' and 'this cup' is what He forthwith did with His Body and Blood—offered them in sacrifice—was irresistible. For the purely jewish church of the years immediately following the passion, sacrifice was necessarily of the essence of a covenant with God, not only for the inauguration of a covenant but as the centre of the covenanted life. For that jewish church the altar on Mt. Moriah and the daily sacrifice upon it still furnished an apparent proof that Israel was yet somehow the covenant-people of God.[1] Even S. Paul, for all his radicalism, still feels a strong sense of the continuing privilege of Israel in possessing the *latreia*, the divinely ordered worship of the Temple.[2] The fact that the Messiah by His sacrificial death had instituted a New Covenant did not destroy the inherited idea of the centrality of sacrifice in any divine covenant. On the contrary it enhanced it. And what our Lord had said and done at the last supper could not but concentrate the full force of this upon the eucharist. It was the common jewish expectation that the 'Thank-offering' alone of all sacrifices would continue in the days of the Messiah.[3]

It was the interpretation of the death of Jesus as sacrificial, reinforcing the vague idea already latent in the *berakah* of 'offering' the food of the *chabûrah* meal to God, which made the sacrificial interpretation of the eucharist inevitable from the outset. In the light of Calvary, Easter and Ascension together (understood in combination as the sacrifice and acceptance of the Messiah) no other interpretation of what Jesus had said and done at the last supper was possible for jews. In estimating the speed with which this interpretation of the eucharist was grasped we have to bear in mind that no belief whatever in Jesus as Messiah could make head against the ignominy of Calvary except upon the sacrificial interpretation of His death. Specifically christian Messianism *depended upon* that as its pre-condition. (It must, therefore, antedate S. Paul's conversion and come from the earliest days.) In its details the death of Christ might be equated with more than one kind of sacrifice, as S. Paul equates it with the Passover and the Epistle to the Hebrews with the Day of Atonement. This was only a matter of interpretation and illustration. In point of fact the Passover illustration was found to be more strikingly applicable to the christian feast

[1] Acts ii. 46; iii. 1; vi. 7; xxi. 26. [2] Rom. ix. 4.

[3] *Pesachim* 79[a]. On the continuance of sacrifice in the Messianic Kingdom, see the very interesting rabbinic passages collected in Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T.*, iv. 935–6.

of the *Pascha* as the annual commemoration of the actual historical *events* by which redemption was achieved;[1] while the Day of Atonement interpretation was felt to apply more naturally to the eucharist as the *anamnesis*, the 're-calling', of the *effects* of redemption. But when S. Paul in 1 Cor. v. 7 spoke of the death of Christ as a sacrifice and went on in turn to speak of the eucharist as the 'shewing forth' of that death in 1 Cor. xi., he was not launching upon the church two new ideas which would eventually lead to the interpretation of the eucharist as sacrifice by combination. He was merely repeating those interpretations of the eucharist and Christ's death, the combination of which from the outset had alone made the primitive jewish christianity of the Jerusalem church possible.[2] The proof that they had already been combined long before he wrote 1 Cor. is the existence of pre-Pauline christianity.

We have seen how the second century material which comes from the early christian re-writing of the *berakah* in terms of the New Covenant (*e.g.*, Hippolytus *a–d*, *cf. S. James b–f*) concentrates on the divine economy of redemption, on the plan of God for man from creation onwards, and on the Person and office of God the Son as Creator and Redeemer of mankind, rather than on the historical events by which Jesus of Nazareth wrought that redemption. Yet even this 'Thanksgiving for the New Covenant' necessarily finds its climax in the mention of the 'stretching forth of His hands' 'for His voluntary passion' (Hippolytus *d*). The eucharist is, as Justin said, above all 'the *anamnesis* of His passion which He suffered on behalf of the men whose souls are (thereby) cleansed from all iniquity'.[3] This is the foundation-sacrifice of the New Covenant.

But side by side with this element of 'Thanksgiving for the New Covenant' instead of the Old, the christian *eucharistia* inherited another element from the jewish *berakah*, another idea, the blessing of 'the Name' of God which released the food of the *chabûrah* for its consumption. This idea continued in an obscure way to operate in the christian understanding of the prayer. It does not seem fanciful to relate this aspect of the *berakah* more closely to the idea of 'consecration', while the 'covenant-thanksgiving' is related to the covenant-sacrifice. We have already several times referred to that passage of Theodotus which relates the 'transformation of the Bread into spiritual power' to the 'hallowing by the power of *the Name*'.[4] A similar notion lies behind the phrase of Irenaeus that 'the bread receiving the invocation (or 'naming', *epiklesis*) of God is no more common bread but eucharist'.[5] It seems, indeed, likely that the whole

[1] Hippolytus, *On the Pascha*, iii (*c.* A.D. 210), seems to be the first christian document which equates the eating of the Passover with the reception of holy communion, but this is in a sermon for the paschal vigil, where such an identification would naturally suggest itself. Justin (*Dial.*, iii.) used the Passover symbolism of the historical events of the Passion, but never of the eucharist.

[2] *Cf. pp.* 76 *sq.* [3] *Dial.* 41. [4] *Exc.* 82, *cf. p.* 170.

[5] *Adv. Haer.*, iv. 18, 5.

primitive usage of the word *epiklesis* in connection with the eucharist is intimately connected with this jewish 'blessing of the Name' in all food benedictions, obligatory on jews and primitive christians alike in their table-blessings.[1] As we have seen, the formal traces of this idea lasted long in the church, especially in the rule that the prayer must begin with a 'Naming' of God and end with a 'glorifying of the Name', usually in the form of a somewhat elaborate Trinitarian doxology;[2] though it might be, as in *Addai and Mari* (and some other cases) a glorifying of 'the Name' of Christ. Similarly baptism 'in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' eventually prevailed, though the at least equally primitive formula 'in the Name of Jesus' was accepted as valid by the especially conservative church of Rome, apparently right down to the Council of Trent.[3]

Fourth Century Ideas of Consecration

By the fourth century, however, we meet with considerable changes everywhere in the ideas about consecration. Nowhere does the primitive nucleus of the prayer, the 'thanksgiving series', appear to have retained its original force as the prayer which 'eucharistised' the food. Its place as what may be called the 'operative' part of the prayer has been taken now by something presumed to have a more directly 'consecratory' intention, from the 'second half' of the prayer. In some churches it is the recital of our Lord's words—'This is My Body', etc.—which is now taken to identify the Bread and Wine with what He Himself had said that they are, His Body and Blood. This idea found in fourth century writers so representative of different traditions as Ambrose at Milan,[4] Chrysostom at Antioch,[5] Sarapion in Egypt,[6] and Gregory of Nyssa in Asia Minor,[7] must be presumed to go back in its origins at least to the third century. It might even be traced back to the second, since something like it is found in Justin;[8] while Hippolytus' prayer is clearly developed on the basis of the

[1] Dom Connolly has well brought out this aspect of *epiklesis* in an important article, *J.T.S.* xxv. (July, 1924), *pp.* 337 *sqq.* (*cf.* Armitage Robinson, *Theology*, viii. Feb. 1924, *pp.* 89 *sqq.*). But Dom Odo Casel (*Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, iv., *pp.* 169–178) is justified in his criticism that this idea of the 'potency of the Name' does not account for everything in ancient christian usage of the word. It seems, *e.g.*, impossible to bring the use of it by such a writer as Cyril of Jerusalem under this heading satisfactorily. What seems to be true is that it accounts satisfactorily for every single usage of *epiklesis* by the christian writers of the second century. In the later third and fourth century the word widens its meaning a good deal in some christian writers, another mark of the slow oblivion of jewish ideas in the increasingly hellenised churches of the period.

[2] *Cf.* Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.*, vi. 4.

[3] Pope Nicholas I consulted by the Bulgarian bishops in the ninth century decided in favour of the validity of this form, as had Pope Stephen I in the third century and S. Ambrose in the fourth; in which they were followed (with reservations) by S. Thomas Aquinas (*S. Th.*, iii. 66, 6 *ad Imum*).

[4] *de Mysteriis*, ix. 52.

[5] *de Prod. Judae*, i. 6 (*cf. p.* 281).

[6] *Cf. p.* 163 (section *d*).

[7] *Oratio Catechetica*, 37.

[8] *Ap.* I. 66 (*cf. p.* 159).

central constructional position of the account of the institution in the prayer as a whole. But we have seen that Sarapion in the fourth century has already overlaid this idea (and the other, probably older still, of the importance of the 'Naming' of God) with the idea of a petition for the 'advent' of the Word upon the bread and wine parallel to His 'advent' at the incarnation in the womb of Mary. There need be no question—I do not see how there can be, in view of the language employed—that this petition would be understood by those who used and heard it as 'effecting consecration'. This idea of an 'invocation' of the Word found, as we have said, in other fourth century writers in Egypt, Syria and Cappadocia and in some later Gallican prayers in the West, in effect connects back the consecration of the eucharist with that initial 'thanksgiving' for the incarnation which formed one of the 'thanksgiving series' in the first half of the prayer.[1]

At this point it is important to note that the pre-Nicene theology of the incarnation as a rule regarded it, not as we do, as the effect of a conception 'by the *Holy Ghost* of the Virgin Mary', but as a conception 'by *the Logos* (the Word, the Second Person of the Trinity) of the Virgin Mary'. The eternal Word of God Himself, the creative *Logos* 'coming down to us' as Athanasius himself said, 'formed for Himself the Body from the Virgin'.[2] However perverse it may seem to us, 'the Spirit' which came upon Mary and 'the Power of the Most High' which overshadowed her (Luke i. 35) were unanimously interpreted by the second century christian writers as meaning the *Second* not the Third Person of the Holy Trinity.[3] And this interpretation, general in the pre-Nicene church, lasted on in many quarters during the fourth century. It is accepted and used by all the anti-Arian stalwarts, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose and Gregory Nazianzene, as a normal expression of orthodoxy. This 'Spirit = Word' terminology is obviously related to the 'Spirit = Presence-of-God' terminology, of which we have found traces in Syria.[4] It is also likely that both are originally connected in pre-christian jewish thought with the idea of the sanctity and 'power' of the Name of God, though this is not a matter which need concern us here.[5] The 'Spirit = Word' terminology is, like the 'Spirit =

[1] *Cf.* Hippolytus, *c.* (*p.* 157), *Addai and Mari d.* (*p.* 179) and the trace of it in Sarapion (a^2); *cf. p.* 163.

[2] Athanasius, *de Incarnatione* 18 (*c.* A.D. 318).

[3] *E.g.* Justin *Ap.*, I. 13 (commenting on Luke i. 35): 'The "Spirit", then, and the "Power" from God it is correct to understand as none other than the *Word*'. Hippolytus, *contra Noëtum* 4: 'For He was Word, He was "Spirit", He was "Power" ' (*cf. ibid.* 16, cited *p.* 254, *n.* 1). Tertullian: (*adv. Praxean*, 26) 'This "Spirit" of God will be the "Word" Himself'; and again, 'The "Spirit" is the Word, and the Word the "Spirit" '. *Cf.* Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.*, v. 1, 3; S. Cyprian, *Q. Idola non.* 11; Lactantius, iv. 12, etc.

[4] *Cf. pp.* 183 *sq.*

[5] *Cf.* Exod. xxiii. 20 *sqq.*: 'Behold I send an Angel before thee . . . beware of him and provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for *My Name* is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice and do all that I speak . . .', where the 'Angel' seems to combine all the notions of the 'Presence', the 'Name' and the 'Word' of God, together with the 'sanctity' and 'awfulness' of that Name.

Presence' idea in christian usage, a survival of the New Testament conception of the 'presence' of the heavenly Christ as the 'quickening Spirit'[1] in His members on earth, already spoken of.[2] What is important to our purpose here is that such language was still currently used of the eucharist in the fourth century, so that S. Ambrose does not hesitate to say to catechumens about the sacrament, 'The Body of Christ is the Body of "Divine Spirit", for the Spirit is Christ.'[3]

The parallel made by Sarapion and his contemporaries (which does not appear, I think, before the fourth century) between the consecration of the eucharist and the incarnation is important. It is obvious that as soon as the incarnation came to be understood generally as a 'conception by the Holy Ghost' and not a 'conception by the Word', the parallel would be likely to suggest that the eucharist also is an operation of the Holy Ghost. And the old terminology of 'Spirit = Presence' was as likely to lend itself to this transference of ideas about eucharistic consecration as the 'Spirit = Word' terminology. We do in fact find the argument that as Christ's Body was conceived in the womb of Mary by the Holy Ghost, so His Body is 'made' in the sacrament by the operation of the Holy Ghost, elaborated at some length in later Eastern writers, beginning with S. John of Damascus.[4] But I do not think it is found either in Syrian writers or elsewhere[5] before his time (*c.* A.D. 690–760).

But this parallel with the incarnation is not the basis of the theory of eucharistic consecration as an operation of the Holy Ghost when we first meet this idea, either as a theological doctrine in the *Didascalia* (Syria, *c.* A.D. 250)[6] or as practically expressed in the liturgy, in the Jerusalem rite described by Cyril in A.D. 347. Cyril's rite had no 'thanksgiving series' and therefore no memorial of the incarnation to which his petition for consecration could refer back. His invocation is based on no such parallel: 'We entreat God . . . to send forth the Holy Ghost . . . that He may make the bread the Body of Christ . . . *for whatsoever comes in contact with the Holy Ghost, this is hallowed and transformed.*'[7] No doubt such language is ultimately derived from the sort of 'Spirit = Presence' terminology found in *Addai and Mari* (rather than the 'Spirit = Word' terminology found in the pre-Nicene churches outside Syria). But there is no doubt whatever that by 'Spirit' here Cyril himself means the Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Trinity. His petition for consecration is explicitly based not on a parallel with the incarnation, but on a theological theory about the office and mission of God the Holy Ghost in Himself. Cyril is here thinking in

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 45. [2] *Cf. pp.* 259 *sq.* [3] *de Mysteriis*, 58.

[4] *de Fide Orthodoxa*, iv. 13.

[5] S. Ambrose, *de Mysteriis* 53, has a comparison of the consecration with the Virginal conception by Mary, but there is no suggestion that both are operations of the Spirit; the emphasis is only on the supernatural character of both happenings. Ambrose (in 54) goes on at once to attribute consecration not to the Spirit but to our Lord Himself acting by the words of institution.

[6] *Cf. p.* 278. [7] *Cat.*, xxiii. 7.

terms of the doctrine of the Trinity, not like Sarapion in his invocation of the Word, in terms of the doctrine of the incarnation. Thus, though the invocations in Sarapion and Cyril are both 'consecratory' and so superficially parallel, they really rest upon rather different ideas about consecration.

There is a further point in which Cyril differs not only from Sarapion but from the whole pre-Nicene church. Sarapion follows the universal tradition in making the eucharist emphatically an action of Christ, the Word, the Second Person of the Trinity. But from end to end of Cyril's account of the liturgy and throughout his eucharistic teaching, Christ plays only a *passive* part in the eucharist. He is simply the divine Victim Whose Body and Blood are 'made' by the action of the Holy Ghost, that the earthly church may offer Him to the Father 'in propitiation for our sins'. The older tradition was that He is the *active* agent in the eucharist, who offers the church as found 'in Him'. Though Cyril is well acquainted with the conception of the heavenly High-priesthood of Christ as a general idea,[1] it is noticeable that he never applies this to the eucharist.

This is so considerable a change in eucharistic doctrine that it is desirable to be sure how far Cyril is an innovator in this respect. We have already seen that in the third century the Syrian *Didascalia* had remarked that 'the eucharist through the Spirit is accepted and sanctified'.[2] This occurs in the course of a polemic by the author against certain Syrian christians who are still observing the jewish ritual laws of 'uncleanness'. Some women among them are under the impression that at certain periods they ought to abstain 'from prayer and the scriptures and the eucharist'. The answer of this author is that they themselves do not imagine that in such periods they have ceased to possess the Holy Spirit given them in confirmation. 'Prayer is heard through the Holy Spirit, and the eucharist through the Spirit is accepted and sanctified, and the scriptures are the words of the Holy Spirit. If the Holy Spirit is in thee, why dost thou keep thyself from approaching the works of the Holy Spirit . . . Whether is greater, the bread or the Spirit that sanctifieth the bread?' So, later in the same chapter,[3] he inveighs against those who still regard the jewish rule that all contact with a corpse renders 'unclean'. 'Do you', he says, 'come together even in the cemeteries and read the holy scriptures and without demur perform your "liturgy" and your supplication to God; and offer an acceptable eucharist, the likeness of the royal Body of Christ, both in your congregations (*ecclesia*) and in your cemeteries and on the departures of them that sleep—pure bread that is made with fire and sanctified with invocations . . .' It would probably be unwise, as Dom Connolly says,[4] 'to put two and two together' and to conclude from a combination of these two passages that the author of the *Didascalia* necessarily used a liturgy

[1] *Cat.* i. 4; x. 4; x. 16; xi. 1.
[2] *Ed. cit.*, *p.* 244.
[3] *Ibid.*, *p.* 252.
[4] *Ibid.*, *p.* lii.

resembling that of Cyril at Jerusalem a century later. So far as this latter passage goes, its evidence as regards practice would be entirely satisfied by the older notion of *epiklesis* as a hallowing by the invocation of the Name of God. But it is quite clear from the earlier passage that this author did share Cyril's theory that 'consecration' is effected by the action of the Holy Ghost, however the idea may have been expressed in his liturgy.

Cyril therefore had at least one predecessor in Syria as regards his theology, though so far as I know this statement of the author of the *Didascalia* is unique in all the third century christian writings, both in Syria and elsewhere. And so far as third century Syrian liturgical practice is concerned, if *Addai and Mari* is at all a representative rite with its eucharistic prayer addressed directly to the *Son*, then the Syrian churches were in line with the rest of the christian world in regarding the eucharistic consecration as effected by the Son, and not by the Spirit.

In the fourth century our Syrian evidence is considerably more extensive. From round about A.D. 330 comes the *Dialogue* of an otherwise unknown Syrian author called Adamantius. In this occurs the statement, put into the mouth of the heretical disputant, 'The Spirit comes upon the eucharist'. His orthodox opponent at once asks 'Why, then, did you say that the Spirit came down for the salvation of *all* men', since only christians receive the eucharist?[1] Evidently we have here another instance of the old confusing 'Spirit = Word' terminology, since this is a reference back to a previous discussion about the purpose of the incarnation. But it illustrates, I think, the sort of way in which this terminology could assist the spread of the new theory of consecration by the Holy Ghost.

An older contemporary of Cyril in Syria is Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea, the great church historian, in some ways the most learned christian of his time, though not a clear-headed or profound theologian. It is significant that in all his voluminous works which appeared throughout the first generation of the fourth century, this Syrian author never once refers eucharistic consecration to the action of the Third Person of the Trinity. True, he comes near it once in interpreting John vi. 63, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing', as referring to the eucharist. This he understands as meaning 'Let not the off-hand hearing of what I have said about (eating) flesh and blood disturb you; for these things "profit nothing" if they are understood sensually; but the Spirit is the life-giver to those who are able to understand spiritually'.[2]

This is hardly Cyril's doctrine; and Eusebius' usual teaching is the doctrine of the eucharist as the act of the heavenly High-priest through His earthly Body, the church.[3] So firmly rooted in Syrian liturgical practice

[1] Adamantius, *Dial.* II (*ap.* Origen. *Opp. ed.* C. Delarue, Paris 1773, I. i., *p.* 824).
[2] *On the Theology of the Church*, iii. 12.
[3] *Cf. e.g.*, *Demonstratio Evangelica* V, iii. 18. 'Our Saviour Jesus, the Christ of God, after the manner of Melchizedek still even now accomplishes by means of His ministers the rites of His priestly work among men.'

was this doctrine of the eucharistic priesthood of Christ that the Syrian Arians (with whom Eusebius was suspected if not actually convicted of sympathy) were able to use it to emphasise in an heretical way the subordination of the Son to the Father.[1]

A writer who is roughly a contemporary of Eusebius, but a man of a very different calibre, is Aphraates, an East Syrian bishop and monk. His simplicity and earnestness represent the native genius and tradition of the Syriac-speaking semitic churches of the Syrian countryside at their best, as Eusebius with his Greek learning represents the hellenism of the Syrian cities. Aphraates again has no reference to consecration by the Holy Ghost; in his references to the eucharist he always takes it for granted that it is the act of the Son.[2] A rather later writer who is naturally taken together with Aphraates is S. Ephraem Syrus, the great poet of the Syrian churches. We have already seen that far from agreeing with Cyril that it is the Holy Ghost who makes the bread to be the Body of Christ, Ephraem on occasion exactly reverses Cyril's idea, and says that it is Christ Who 'called the bread His Body and filled it with Himself and the Spirit'.[3]

S. Cyril's Doctrine of Consecration and the Rite of Jerusalem

It is important to realise that Cyril, though (as usual) he was not entirely an innovator in his doctrine of consecration, is still isolated among his own contemporaries even in Syria; because his doctrine was destined to have a swift and far-reaching effect. There can be little doubt, I think, that in framing it Cyril is chiefly influenced by the text of the Jerusalem liturgy as it was used by him in church. In that liturgy as he describes it, the whole weight of the eucharistic action rests on the single paragraph of the invocation, and the 'offering' which immediately follows. The 'thanksgiving series' has been replaced by the preface and sanctus borrowed from Egypt; then comes the invocation and offering; and the whole of the rest of the 'second half' of the prayer has been swallowed up in the unprecedentedly developed intercessions. Except for the single paragraph of the invocation all is either mere preliminaries or consequences. There is thus no option but to treat the invocation as 'consecratory', in and by itself. And in view of its actual phrasing there was no possibility but to treat the Holy Ghost as the active agent and Christ Himself as purely passive in the eucharist, as Cyril does. His theology is based upon his prayer.

[1] So the Arian compiler of the Liturgy of *Ap. Const.*, viii. '. . . Thee the whole bodiless and holy array of heaven worships; Thee the Paraclete worships (!) and before all Thy holy Servant Jesus the Christ, our Lord and God and the Messenger and High Captain of Thy power, the eternal and perpetual High-priest; Thee the well-ordered armies of the angels worship . . .' (This is what the compiler wrote; the text printed by Brightman, L. E. W., *p.* 18, is the ancient bowdlerised version of most MSS.)

[2] *Demonstratio*, xii. 6 (ed. Graffin. *Pat. Syr.*, i. 516–7); xxi. 9 (*ibid.*, 957); xxi. 10 (*ibid.*, 960).

[3] *Cf. p.* 266.

The influence of the Jerusalem rite on those of other churches in the formative period of the later fourth and early fifth century was very great indeed, and Cyril's form of invocation was adopted widely, especially in the East. But in other churches it was incorporated into eucharistic prayers of a more traditional construction, which still contained a 'thanksgiving series', and in some cases already possessed an institution narrative and an *anamnesis* section, none of which were to be found in Cyril's rite. The inclusion of such an invocation with its clear and novel doctrinal implications in prayers which had been framed upon other ideas raised obvious problems of interpretation.

The Invocation of the Spirit

At Antioch, where an invocation of some kind had been adopted before A.D. 390, probably as a sort of supplement appended to the prayer proper, Chrysostom makes no real attempt to harmonise the old and the new. We have already seen how admirably he could expound the old conception of the eucharist as the action of the heavenly High-priest. Yet on occasion he, like Cyril, can speak as though Christ were purely passive in the eucharist: 'When the priest stands before the table holding up his hands to heaven and calling on the Holy Ghost to come and touch the elements, there is a great quiet, a great silence. When the Spirit gives His grace, when He descends, when you see the Lamb sacrificed and consummated, do you then cause tumult . . .?'[1] Here Christ is passive, and for the same reason that He is made to be so in Cyril's explanation; it is impossible to state the matter otherwise when the explanation is given in the terms of this type of consecratory invocation. Where Chrysostom transfers the 'operative' effect to another section of the prayer, we find him equally naturally taking a different view. 'It is not man who makes the gifts which are set forth to become the Body and Blood of Christ, but *Christ Himself* Who was crucified for us. The priest stands fulfilling a *rôle* (*schēma*) and saying those words, but the power and the grace are of God. "This is My Body", he says; these words transform ('re-order', *metarrhythmizei*) the elements. And just as that which was spoken "Increase and multiply and replenish the earth" was said once but is for all time operative in bestowing on our nature the power of procreation, so this which was spoken once *maketh complete* the sacrifice at every altar in the churches from then until now and until His coming again'.[2]

[1] Chrysostom, *Hom. In Coemet., App.* 3 (*Opp.* ed. Montfaucon, Paris, 1836, ii. 474 D). For similar teaching see *de Sacerdotio*, iii. 4 (i. 468 A); *de s. Pentecoste*, i. 4 (ii. 548 C.), etc.

[2] *de Prod. Judae*, i. 6 (*Opp.*, ii. 453 B). For similar teaching see *ibid.*, ii. 6 (*ibid.* 465 B); *in Mat. Hom.*, lxxxii. 4 (vii. 889 D), etc. For what seems to be a survival in Chrysostom of the old 'Spirit = Word' terminology in connection with the eucharist, see *in Heb. Hom.*, xiv. 1 (xii. 201 B).

Consecration by the Son and by the Spirit may be reconcilable doctrines, but they are two different ideas. Yet Chrysostom himself never attempts to reconcile these two ideas, which reflect the existence of different and unharmonised elements in the Antiochene prayer as he knew it. The same incoherence is not to be found in Cyril's theology, because the Jerusalem rite had eliminated everything from its prayer which might suggest another explanation than that plainly demanded by the language of its invocation. It seems clear that the difficulty of assimilating a consecratory invocation of the Holy Ghost on something like the Jerusalem model into a traditional prayer and theology which regarded the eucharist as the direct act of Christ Himself had not been satisfactorily met at Antioch in Chrysostom's time—nor, indeed, has it ever been met quite convincingly in all the fifteen centuries since.[1]

The Invocation as Effecting the 'Resurrection'

It is, however, from the region of Antioch and not long after Chrysostom, in the *Catecheses* of Theodore of Mopsuestia, that we first meet with an exposition of the liturgical action which attempts to solve this difficulty. It was afterwards universally adopted by the devotional writers of the Byzantine church and is still generally accepted (with certain modifications) in the Eastern Orthodox churches to-day.

Theodore writes thus: 'We must think therefore that the deacons who (at the offertory) carry the eucharistic bread and bring it out for the sacrifice represent the invisible hosts of ministry (*i.e.* angels) with this difference, that through their ministry and these memorials (? *hypomnēmata*) they do not send forth Christ our Lord to His saving passion (like the angel in Gethsemane). When they bring up (the oblation at the offertory) they place it on the altar for the completed representation of the passion, so that we may think of Him on the altar as if He were placed in the sepulchre after having received His passion. This is why the deacons who spread linens on the altar[2] represent the figure of the linen cloths at the burial . . . (The deacons) stand up on both sides and agitate all the air above the holy Body with fans . . . they shew by this the greatness of the Body which is lying there; for it is the custom when the corpse of the great ones of this world is carried on a bier, that some men should fan the air above it . . . the same is done with the Body lying on the altar, which is holy, awe-inspiring and remote from all corruption, a Body which will very shortly rise to an immortal being.

[1] The best explanations I know are those of Nicolas Cabasilas in the fourteenth century (*Exposition*, 27–32. M.P.G. cl. 425 *sq.*), and Simeon of Thessalonica in the fifteenth (*Exposition* 86–88. M.P.G. clv. 733–730). That of Mark of Ephesus in the same period (M.P.G. clx. 1080–1089) is too inaccurate in its statements to be of much interest to-day. The modern orthodox manuals do no more than elaborate Cabasilas and Simeon, who in turn develop John Damascene.

[2] *Cf. p.* 104.

'It is in remembrance of the angels who continually came to the passion and death of our Lord that the deacons stand in a circle and fan the air and offer honour and adoration to the sacred and awe-inspiring Body which is lying there. . . . This they do in order to shew that because the Body lying there is high, dreadful, holy and true Lord, through its union with the Divine nature, it is with great fear that it must be seen and kept.

'These things take place while all are silent, for before the liturgy begins all must watch the bringing up and spreading forth before God of such a great and wonderful object with a quiet and reverent fear and a silent and noiseless prayer. When our Lord had died the apostles went back and remained at home in great silence and immense fear. . . . When we see the oblation (placed) on the table—which denotes that it is being placed in a kind of sepulchre after its death—great silence falls on those present. . . . They must look at it with a quiet and reverential fear, since it is necessary that Christ our Lord should rise again in the awe-inspiring liturgy which is performed by the priestly ordinance, and announce our participation in unspeakable benefits'.

This is one of the passages in ancient christian writers in which we find something like a new immolation predicated of the Body of Christ in the eucharist. What is disconcerting is to find that this is connected with the *offertory*, not with the consecration. All this 'fear' and 'adoration' on which Theodore here lays such emphasis, and the fanning and other marks of reverence are addressed to what we should call the 'unconsecrated' elements, 'before the liturgy begins'. Yet so it certainly is. Theodore goes on from this point to describe the deacon's proclamations, the kiss of peace, the *lavabo* of the clergy, the reading of the diptychs (lists of names for intercession), certain preparatory prayers of the priest, the dialogue and finally the eucharistic prayer. This he calls 'the *anaphora*' (the earliest use, if I remember rightly, of this Byzantine technical term for the eucharistic prayer) and also 'the sacrifice' and 'the immolation of the sacrifice'. It is only when he has described the major part of the prayer that he reaches the main point of his interpretation, with his account of the consecratory invocation of the Holy Ghost. This in the rite of Mopsuestia was clearly of the same type as that in the North Syrian rite of *Ap. Const.*, viii., and as such a modification of that of the Jerusalem rite.

'It is necessary, therefore, that our Lord should now rise from the dead by the power of the things that are being done, and that He should spread His grace over us. This cannot happen otherwise than by the coming of the grace of the Holy Spirit[1]. . . . Therefore the priest offers prayer and supplications to God that the Holy Spirit may descend, and that grace may come therefrom upon the bread and wine so that they may be seen (? *hina phanōsin*) to be truly the Body and Blood of our Lord, which are the

[1] Rom. viii. 11.

memorials (? *hypomnēmata*) of immortality. Indeed the Body of our Lord, which is from our own nature, was previously mortal by nature. When the priest therefore declares them to be the Body and Blood of Christ, he clearly reveals that they have become so by the descent of the Holy Spirit, through Whom they have also become immortal, inasmuch as the Body of our Lord after it was anointed and had received the Holy Spirit was clearly seen so to become. In this same way, after the Holy Spirit has come here also we believe that the elements of bread and wine have received a sort of anointing from the grace that comes upon them and we hold them henceforth to be immortal, incorruptible, impassible and immutable by nature, as the Body of our Lord was after the resurrection.'[1]

This last sentence, teaching 'transaccidentation', is sufficiently remarkable; but what are we to make of the rest? It is quite clear that Theodore regards the bread and wine as being in some sense the Body and Blood of Christ from the moment the deacons bring them from the sacristy at the offertory. As such they are 'fearful', 'holy and true Lord' and to be treated with 'adoration', 'silent fear' and so forth, before the prayer or even the preparations for it have begun. But the sacrament at this stage is only the *dead* Body of Christ, entombed upon the altar.[2] It is the invocation of the Holy Ghost which Theodore declares brings about the 'resurrection' in the eucharist. The only comment we need make for the moment on this conception is to point out that the actual terms of his invocation as he reports them contain no trace whatever of this idea. The elements are there described as 'bread and wine' and not as the 'dead Body' of Christ. The Spirit is invoked upon them in order 'that they may be seen to be truly the Body and Blood of our Lord', not to bring about their resurrection. And Theodore himself is sufficiently conscious of the plain meaning of the prayer to add that 'when the priest declares them to be the Body and Blood of Christ, he clearly reveals that they have *become* so by the descent of the Holy Spirit', in the invocation and not at the offertory. There is evidently a disconnection between Theodore's explanation and the prayer of his rite.

But his statements give the clue to certain very peculiar features of the later Byzantine rite and the Byzantine devotional tradition. In this rite at the 'great entrance' (offertory procession) the deacons (and since the twelfth century the celebrant with them, an unprimitive feature which destroys the symbolism) bring the unconsecrated elements from the 'table of *prothesis*', where they have been elaborately prepared before the

[1] Theodore, *Catecheses* v. and vi. (*ed. cit. pp.* 86–104. I have curtailed the intolerable prolixity of some of the sentences, but everything above is from his text except the words in brackets).

[2] But Theodore does not share the horrible idea taught by certain High Anglicans of the seventeenth century that the *dead* Body of Christ is what we actually receive in holy communion. This is the very antithesis of the primitive notion of the risen Christ as the *life* of the church in the eucharist.

liturgy begins, in a solemn procession to the altar.[1] During this the people offer adoration to the elements borne by before their eyes, while the choir sings the *Cherubikon*, a hymn composed in the later sixth century:

> 'We who the Cherubim mystically figure forth
> and sing the thrice-holy hymn to the life-giving Trinity,
> lay we aside all worldly cares
> that we may receive the King of all things
> guarded invisibly by the armies of angels.
> Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.'

Here are Theodore's deacons representing the angels, though they are no longer silent.

The profound reverence and actual worship rendered to the unconsecrated elements during this procession have been a source of embarrassment to Eastern theologians, and a standing puzzle to liturgists who have put forward various explanations—that anciently the reserved sacrament was carried in this procession (as in Gaul, but this custom was unknown in the East) or that it derives from the bringing of the *fermentum* from the bishop's liturgy to that of the parish churches (but this rite was always most elaborated at the bishop's own liturgy; and the *fermentum* was abandoned in the East by the fourth century). Theodore's explanation supplies the genuine origin. All the rest of his symbolism has passed into the Byzantine rite—the bearers of the elements representing the angels; the fanning deacons representing the angels hovering round the cross (the liturgical fans are in the form of metal seraphs to this day); the altar as the tomb of Christ—all these things are commonplaces of the Byzantine expositions of the liturgy.

What has not survived among them, however, with the explicitness found in Theodore is what gives coherence to this whole conception of the eucharist in his explanation of it—the idea that the elements, by the mere fact that they are the offering of the church, are already the Body and Blood of Christ from the moment of the offertory, apart from and before the uttering of the eucharistic prayer; and that the purpose of the prayer is to impart to them the *risen* life. Anyone who examines the prayers of the Byzantine *prothesis* (preparation of the elements at a table on the left of the altar before the liturgy begins) will observe that they with the accompany-

[1] In the palmy days of the Byzantine court in the eighth century the following was the order of this procession: first a sub-deacon with a lighted taper, then the archdeacon bearing on his head the veiled paten with the unconsecrated bread, behind him other deacons bearing empty patens. Behind them an arch-priest bearing the chalice with unconsecrated wine, followed by other priests with empty chalices. There followed another priest with the 'holy lance' (for cutting the bread at the preparation of the elements) and the spoon for administering communion. At the rear followed an escort of other deacons carrying the liturgical books, crucifixes, the sponge (for cleansing the vessels), the fans, relics, banners, etc. and finally, carried in solemn state, the *pallium* (scarf) of the episcopal celebrant, who himself awaited the procession at the altar.

ing rubrics are intended to reproduce vividly the treatment of our Lord's Body in His passion[1] (*e.g.* the 'stabbing' of the bread with the 'holy lance'). When this particular section of the *prothesis* was added to the liturgy (tenth–twelfth centuries) the idea that the *preparation* of the elements represents the passion itself and the offertory represents the entombment of His Body, 'after having received the passion' as Theodore says, was evidently still working among the Byzantines. It has since been allowed to 'fade' to its modern form, *i.e.* that from the preparation onwards the elements are the 'image' or 'likeness' (*eikōn*) of the Body and Blood, which become the 'reality' by the invocation of the Holy Ghost upon them.[2] The people still continue to pay reverence and worship to the elements at the offertory, though the original reason (that they were already the dead Body of Christ) has been somewhat modified. But this is only an instance of a rather mechanical adherence to liturgical tradition which particularly marks Byzantine church life after the ninth century.

The same ceremony of the 'great entrance' is now found through Byzantine influence in some of the other Eastern rites; and it is always accompanied by a chant connecting the procession with the angels. In the Greek version of the liturgy of *S. James* the chant is a hymn known from its first word *Sigēsato*, which has been attributed to S. John of Damascus (eighth century) and is in any case not likely to be much older than his time. It is well known to Anglicans in Moultrie's admirable translation, 'Let all mortal flesh keep silence' (English Hymnal No. 318). But it is an indication of the strangeness to our way of thinking of the whole conception of the eucharist which this hymn embodies, that though it was composed and is used in the East solely as an *offertory* chant, I do not think I have ever heard it used in an Anglican church except in connection with the *consecration*. Both the ceremony of the 'great entrance' and the *Sigēsato* are absent from the Syriac liturgy of *S. James*, a sufficient indication that this conception of the eucharist as the *anamnesis* of the resurrection in particular was no part of the original Syrian tradition. It must have entered the Byzantine rite from some other quarter, most probably from Asia Minor. The same idea of the offertory as in some sense 'pre-consecrating' the sacrament is now found among the Nestorians,[3] amongst whom it appears to have been introduced by Narsai of Edessa towards the end of the fifth century. But he avowedly borrowed the whole conception from Theodore of Mopsuestia.[4] The same notion is also found among the Armenians,[5] who seem to have borrowed the idea directly from Byzantium.

[1] Brightman, L. E. W., 356, 15–357, 20.

[2] This is not quite the New Testament and primitive usage of the word *eikōn*, but an adaptation of it evolved in Byzantine times as a result of the eighth century controversies in the East about the use of 'images' (*eikones*) in christian worship.

[3] Brightman, L. E. W., *p.* 267, *ll.* 30 *sqq.* (*col. a*).

[4] *Liturgical Homilies*, ed. Connolly, *p.* 3, *cf.* 14, 16.

[5] Brightman, L. E. W., *p.* 430, *ll.* 18 *sqq.* (*col a*).

We have already noted that the modern Eastern presentation of this theory, that the preparation and offertory of the elements makes them in some sense 'figures' of the Body and Blood of Christ, represents a certain 'toning down' of the idea as found in Theodore of Mopsuestia, that the offered bread is as such the dead Body of Christ and entitled to adoration. The reason for this weakening of the keystone of the whole conception in Byzantine eucharistic theology does not seem hard to divine. It is quite impossible to reconcile such an idea with the actual wording of the Byzantine liturgical prayers themselves. The authentic tradition that it is the prayer which establishes the meaning of the actions of offertory and communion, and therefore sacrifices and consecrates, is too plainly expressed in the Byzantine liturgies not to have imposed itself again to some extent in the course of time even on this aberrant explanation of the course of the eucharistic action. As in Theodore's rite, the alternative eucharistic prayers used in the Byzantine rite contain nothing whatever which can be twisted into supporting the idea that the invocation accomplishes a *resurrection* of a Body already present. (It is noteworthy that such an idea has no explanation whatever to give of the consecration of the chalice—either in Theodore or in later writers who adopt this theory.) The invocation formula of the liturgy of *S. John Chrysostom* (which appears to date in its present form from the sixth–seventh century) is closely akin to that of Cyril of Jerusalem: 'We entreat and beg and beseech Thee, send down Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts that lie before Thee, and make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, and what is in this cup the precious Blood of Thy Christ, transforming them by Thy Holy Spirit'. Apart from the irrelevant interpolation of 'upon us and', not found in Cyril's form, and ignored in the rest of the invocation by the liturgy of *S. John Chrysostom* itself, this is purely a 'consecratory' invocation. As the text stands it can be interpreted in no other sense. The invocation in the liturgy of *S. Basil* (which is a later revision of a prayer at least as old as the fourth century, which seems to have come originally from Asia Minor, not Constantinople) is longer than that of the Constantinopolitan liturgy of *S. Chrysostom*, and substitutes the phrase '*shew* (*anadeixai*) this bread to be the very Body of Thy Christ', for the latter's word 'make'. This is more akin to the phrase of Theodore of Mopsuestia (as we might expect in a prayer originally from Asia Minor) and to the liturgy of *Ap. Const.*, viii.; and it is noteworthy that *anadeixis* is S. Basil's own word for the 'consecration'.[1] Here again, though the word 'shew' might suggest that the 'Body' as such is already present and requires only to be 'manifested', there is nothing whatever to suggest that the invocation effects a 'resurrection'. In the face of such explicit language as that of the prayers used in the Byzantine rites themselves, it would inevitably be difficult for the Byzantine clergy and the official tradition to press with any rigorousness

[1] *de Spiritu Sancto*, xxvii. 66.

the explanation of the eucharistic action given by Theodore, whatever might be the case among the laity, separated from the actual performance of the liturgy by the solid screen of the *ikonostasion.*

The 'Eastern' and the 'Western' ethos

It is commonly said by liturgical theorists that while the Western rites find their centre and inspiration in the thought of Calvary, those of the East are chiefly concerned with the thought of the Resurrection. I am not disposed to deny that this is true so far as concerns the *devotional* approach to their own rites by Western and Eastern christians for the last thousand years. But it is exceedingly important to point out that this contrast of devotional approach has no basis whatever in the actual *prayers* of the Western and Eastern liturgies. The Western rite is specifically the *anamnesis* 'of the blessed passion of the same Christ Thy Son our Lord, *and also* of His resurrection from hell *and also* of His glorious ascension into the heavens', just as it is in those of the East (save that these latter rites have added the commemoration of His session and second coming). Apart from this there is no mention whatever of the passion in the whole Roman canon, save in the brief phrase 'Who on the day before He suffered took bread . . .' And there is equally no single trace of the so-called 'Eastern' conception to be found from end to end of the prayers of the Eastern rites, except only in the Byzantine preparation of the elements (which in this aspect is known to be an addition developed after the year A.D. 900), and in offertory chants and prayers (which again are known to date only from the sixth century and after). On the contrary, the plainest statement of what is supposed to be the 'Western' emphasis which I recollect in any liturgy is to be found at the beginning of the institution narrative in the Eastern rite of *S. Basil* (something as genuinely ancient as anything now in use in the East): 'And He left unto us these *memorials* (*hypomnēmata*) *of His saving passion,* which we have set forth according to His command. For being about to go forth to His voluntary and life-giving death, in the night in which . . .'[1] There could be no clearer evidence that East and West were originally at one upon the interpretation of the eucharist as being primarily what S. Paul called 'the shewing forth of the Lord's death', and S. Justin 'the *anamnēsis* of His passion';[2] even though that death and passion cannot be separated in the coming of the Kingdom of God from their consequences in the resurrection and ascension.

One can readily see how the Eastern 'ethos' could be developed from a one-sided insistence on certain elements of primitive tradition—*e.g.*, that the eucharist was instituted to 'demonstrate the resurrection' (Hippolytus *e*) and 'for new life in the kingdom of heaven' (*Addai and Mari i*). But the interpretation of the whole eucharistic action as essentially an '*anamnesis* of

[1] Brightman, *op. cit.*, *p.* 327, *ll.* 19 *sq.* [2] *Dial.* 41.

the resurrection' from a passion accomplished, as it were, in the sacristy 'before the liturgy begins' (for this is what the whole conception amounts to) is first found only in Theodore of Mopsuestia early in the fifth century; and it is fully developed in expression by the Byzantine *prothesis* only after another 500 years. It is hardly likely that the Byzantines derived the idea directly from Theodore, for he bore a bad reputation among them—which he fully deserved—as having been an out-and-out Nestorian before Nestorius himself. On the other hand, unlike most of the Byzantine liturgical tradition, this idea is not of Syrian origin. It was unknown in fourth century Syria, and it fits the 'Antiochene' type of liturgy such as *S. John Chrysostom* as awkwardly as it fits the rite of Mopsuestia described by Theodore. It is an interpretation artificially imposed on liturgies which were originally framed on a quite different interpretation of the eucharist. And since these liturgies are themselves of a form which had not been completely developed until the very end of the fourth century, the adoption of this interpretation of them is to be dated later still—in the fifth or sixth century; for no church would *form* a new liturgy to express a conception of the eucharistic action quite different from that which it actually believed at the time.[1]

The Tradition of Asia Minor?

If one examines closely the fragmentary data to be gathered from the liturgy of *S. Basil*, from the writings of S. Basil himself, from Theodore's account of the actual text of the rite of Mopsuestia (not his explanation of it) and from *Ap. Const.*, viii., it is possible to gather a fairly clear idea of the original form of the conception which underlies all this group of rites from the southern fringe of Asia Minor. The bread and wine, by the very fact that they are *laid upon the altar* as the offering of the church, Christ's Body, according to His command at the last supper, become the 'memorials' (*hypomnēmata*) of His redeeming passion. (Very much the same idea is to be found in Sarapion in Egypt in the fourth century—'to Thee we have offered (at the offertory) the bread, the likeness (*homoiōma*) of the Body of the Only-begotten. This bread is the likeness of the holy Body because' our Lord at the last supper said it was to be so.) And then in the invocation, 'the Spirit'—*i.e.* originally the '*Presence*'—of our Lord is asked 'upon the bread and the cup' (as Sarapion asks for the Advent of the Word) to 'demonstrate' or 'manifest' (by its effects in communion?) the reality *of the union* of the church's offering with His own—on Calvary and at the altar in heaven. So understood, the tradition of Asia Minor, though it has peculiar features, is at bottom only another way of expressing the classical

[1] It is at least possible that this view of the eucharist as an *anamnesis* primarily of the resurrection originated in the churches of Asia Minor, but the whole question of the liturgical tradition of Anatolia still awaits investigation. I will venture a prophecy that we shall eventually find it impossible to bring the core of that tradition under the general heading of 'Antiochene', as is now usual, though it has undergone considerable Antiochene influence at various periods.

tradition of the eucharist, as the *anamnesis*—the making present by effects—of the passion and resurrection. It 'shews' (*anadeixai*) the Lord's *death* as the Messianic sacrifice. This is fundamentally in line with S. Paul and the whole of the rest of primitive tradition.

The 'Great Entrance' and the Preparation of the Elements

What has caused the obvious distortion in Theodore's explanation and in the later Byzantine conception is the necessity of accounting for two elements in the shape of their liturgies which are a foreign importation into the original scheme. These are (1) The offertory procession of the deacons from the sacristy, a Syrian custom which has replaced the original offering by the church corporately before the altar. Whatever its original intention of mere convenience, this had evidently become by Theodore's time an imposing ceremony, which had completely eclipsed that simple placing of the oblation on the altar—the altar, let us not forget, which was the symbol of Christ Himself—which primitively constituted or symbolised the conjunction of the church's offering of itself with that of Christ by Himself in the passion. It is now the *procession* which attracts attention, which impresses and evokes religious emotion; the actual offering has become merely the terminus of this. It is therefore the procession which Theodore has to account for, and since it can hardly be interpreted as in itself the central act of the eucharist (though it has already by the fifth century become the moment of the greatest ritual splendour in the whole rite and remains so still among the Byzantines) it must be regarded as the *consequence* of something. And since this is the opening of the eucharist proper, the whole centre of gravity of the rite has been shifted back to 'before the liturgy begins'—to something which has happened in the sacristy, in fact. The Byzantine *prothesis* only puts into action the underlying conception by its obvious symbolism of the enacting of the passion outside the eucharist altogether, and apart from the assembly of the church, 'before the liturgy begins'.

(2) But since the eucharist cannot thus have its primary significance transferred to a point before it begins without absurdity, a wholly fresh focus has to be found for it within the rite, and this is found in the 'resurrection' of the 'dead Body' of Christ entombed upon the altar. And since in the New Testament the resurrection takes place by the operation of the Spirit, this could provide a new explanation of the awkward and novel doctrine that the Holy Ghost and not God the Son is the active agent in the eucharist. The difficulty about the whole scheme is that it has nothing to do with the doctrine expressed and demanded by the Eastern liturgical *prayers* themselves. The pivot of the whole scheme, the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is capable only of one meaning—*viz.* that it effects the 'consecration', the making to be present in some way of a Body and Blood

which are *not* already upon the altar. This is its plain meaning in Cyril of Jerusalem, the first evidence we have of the use of such an invocation in the liturgy. It is also its plain meaning in the writings of Chrysostom at Antioch when the use of such an invocation was spreading rapidly at the end of the fourth century; it is the plain meaning of the words in the liturgies of *S. John Chrysostom*, *S. Mark*, *S. James* and the Armenian rite to-day. And though the actual wording of the invocations of *S. Basil*, of Theodore and of *Ap. Const.*, viii. seems to betray a derivation from what is ultimately a somewhat different idea—that of 'manifestation' rather than 'consecration'—yet this latter is the meaning to which they have all been assimilated. Nor was their original significance a 'resurrection' of the 'dead Body' of Christ, but a 'making real' or 'obvious' of the 'memorial of the passion' *at* the eucharist, not before the eucharist begins.

The Invocation in the Modern Eastern Rites

This curious evolution is an illustration of the difficulty of interpretation caused by the importation into other rites of an invocation paragraph of the type made fashionable in the later fourth century by its use in the 'model' church of Jerusalem. At Jerusalem it caused no such difficulty, because the whole prayer was framed upon the theory which this paragraph so unequivocally expresses, that the Holy Ghost is the active agent in the eucharist and Christ Himself only the passive Victim. But appended to or inserted into other prayers already complete in themselves and framed on the doctrine that Christ Himself is the agent in the eucharist, the invocation demanded explanation. It must either reduce the remainder of the prayer to the level of a mere accompaniment to itself, or be ignored. This was inevitable. At its origin in Jerusalem this paragraph (with the sentence offering the sacrifice) *was* the whole of the 'eucharistic' prayer proper. Everything else consisted of preliminaries (the preface and sanctus) and of what in Cyril's opinion was dependent upon 'consecration'—the intercessions, whose special value was that they were offered 'over the sacrifice'. In the result, this type of invocation did come to take the same sort of central importance in the rites of other churches that it had in the Jerusalem rite. Whenever it was inserted, it reduced the remainder of the prayer to the level of a mere preparation for itself or dependence upon itself. The older interpretations of the eucharistic action to be found in local rites like those of *S. Mark* and *S. Basil* have been buried below the surface of their prayers by what is essentially the interpretation put upon the eucharist by Cyril of Jerusalem. And this interpretation, though it may go back obscurely to the 'blessing of the Name' of God in the original judaeo-christian *berakah*, and though Cyril had at least one fore-runner in the person of the third century Syrian bishop who wrote the *Didascalia*, was essentially something altogether new to the churches of the fourth century.

This interpretation of the eucharist and the liturgical practice which enshrines it are dear to the Eastern churches, and now venerable enough with age to pass unquestioned. It is in any case unsuitable for members of a church which accepted a complete upheaval of its own liturgical tradition by the authority of Parliament and the Privy Council less than four centuries ago to criticise on the ground of its unprimitive character a much smaller innovation freely accepted by the worshipping churches 1,400 years ago. No one has a right to require the East to abandon what has become its tradition. But the Easterns in their turn can hardly expect others to adopt it. It has the unfortunate effect of obscuring the universal understanding (which they themselves maintain with a happy illogicality) that the earthly eucharist is the act of Christ Himself, the High-priest of the heavenly altar, Who Himself offers, Himself prays, Himself consecrates, in the offering of His sacrifice. Upon this central conception the whole pre-Nicene church built its synthesis of all the wonderful variety of meanings seen in the single eucharistic action by the New Testament writers and the ancient authors. The Easterns have found their own ways of adhering to this truth, despite a doctrine of consecration by the Holy Ghost which can only be stated in terms which make of Christ a purely passive Victim in the eucharist. Viewed from the standpoint of liturgical history, it is an accidental result of the conflation of rites based upon two different conceptions of the eucharistic action. Historically the development of the present Eastern rites, and with them the present Eastern doctrine, is intelligible enough. Any doctrine which did not make the invocation clause the centre of the eucharistic action would be in plain contradiction with the language used by the liturgical prayers. But viewed in itself the Eastern doctrine brings not clarification but confusion, not gain but loss, in the understanding of the eucharist. We Westerns have enough confusions and losses of our own to deplore in the field of eucharistic teaching and devotion, without seeking to follow theirs.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

The Eastern Teaching on the Invocation

THE Eastern teaching as to the precise function of the *Epiklesis* or Invocation of the Holy Ghost in the eucharistic rite has varied a little at times, and is so often misrepresented, that it may be useful to state the facts plainly.

The teaching of Cyril of Jerusalem and Chrysostom in the fourth century has been sufficiently stated; that of S. John of Damascus (eighth century) goes a step further. In the course of the controversy about the use of images he was confronted by his opponents (who held that the eucharist is the only lawful 'representation' of Christ) with the fact that in

the liturgy of *S. Basil* the elements are referred to as the 'antitypes' of the Body and Blood of Christ between the words of institution and the invocation. Damascene (who rightly replied that the eucharist is not a 'representation' of Christ, but His very Self) answered that this word referred to the still *unconsecrated* elements, since the consecration is not effected by the words of institution but by the subsequent invocation. This teaching he repeats more than once[1] in quite unequivocal terms.

He had, however, some difficulty in disposing of the passage of Chrysostom *de Prod. Judae*, I. vi, already cited (*p.* 281) in which the latter had said that the priest says ' "This is My Body"; this word transforms the elements'. Damascene rewrites what immediately follows in Chrysostom thus: 'In the beginning God said "Let the earth bring forth grass" and to this day *when the rain cometh*, urged on and strengthened by the command of God it bringeth forth its increase. God said "This is My Body" and "This is My Blood"; and "Do this for the *anamnesis* of Me". And this is done by His almighty command until He come. For thus He said, "until He come"; and the overshadowing power of the Holy Spirit comes as rain upon this new husbandry by the invocation'. But it is worthy of note that Chrysostom's illustration is not drawn from husbandry, with its useful possibility of the intervention of the rain, but from human generation. And Chrysostom's conclusion is the opposite of Damascene's: 'This word once spoken at every altar in the churches from that day until this and until He come, *maketh perfect* (*apartismenēn ergazetai*) the sacrifice'.

It was only in the fourteenth century that the question came to the fore again, this time in disputes between Greeks and Latins. Cabasilas and Simeon of Thessalonica already referred to (*p.* 282 *n.* 1) were the principal Greek apologists. Neither carries the matter any further than Damascene. Both deny the consecratory force of the words of institution in themselves, but only as fructified and applied by the invocation. Cabasilas is driven to misquote as well as misinterpret the passage of Chrysostom above. But both are careful to insist that though the invocation of the Holy Ghost is the consecration, Christ is the Priest Who consecrates thereby, though it is the Father Who is invoked to send down the Spirit.[2]

At the Council of Florence agreement was reached on this matter between the Eastern and Western churches somewhat along the lines of Chrysostom's teaching, but by a formula which insisted on the consecratory force of the words of institution in themselves which it was allowed that the invocation fructifies. But the Greeks accepted this only out of dire political necessity, and soon repudiated the settlement. Ever since then the general tendency of Orthodox theologians has been in the direction of

[1] *de Fide Orthodoxa*, iv. 13. M.P.G. xciv. 1141–1152 *passim*; *Hom. in Sabb. Sancto*, 35. M.P.G. xcvi. 637.

[2] Cabasilas, M.P.G., cl. 437. (I confess I do not fully understand this very embarrassed passage.)

stiffening opposition to the doctrine that the words of institution consecrate. There have been 'Westernising' reactions against this, especially in Russia in the seventeenth century, where the first edition of the *Orthodox Confession* of Peter Moghila, Patriarch of Kiev, stated that the words of institution consecrate. A censored edition by the Greek Meletius Syrigo restored the ordinary Greek teaching. Since the eighteenth century most Russian theologians have adopted the modern Byzantine view that the institution narrative is purely historical, and that the consecration is effected solely by the invocation.[1] This is in effect a return to the doctrine of Damascene behind Cabasilas, and ultimately to that of Cyril of Jerusalem.

Where the modern Orthodox doctrine differs from that of Cyril and of the earlier writers in general is in making a consecratory invocation a *sine qua non*. Cyril and his fellows had no idea of condemning other rites than their own; they were speaking affirmatively only, of the rites they themselves knew and used. The modern Orthodox do condemn rites which do not contain a consecratory invocation.[2] An example interesting to Anglicans will be found in *Russian Observations on the American Prayer Book*, an official document, edited by W. H. Frere.[3] The first observation made by this committee of the Russian Holy Synod is that the American invocation 'cannot satisfy the Orthodox, since the phrase used is only "to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine" with no explicit mention of "making them" or "shewing them to be" the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ' (*p.* 2). Before the rite could be accepted as tolerable by the Orthodox this omission would have to be remedied (*p.* 35). On this shewing it would appear that a great deal of the discussion among ourselves about the 'oriental character' of the second paragraph appended to the Prayer of Consecration in the proposed Prayer Book of 1928 was rather beside the point. It may or may not have been desirable in itself. But it was not a satisfactory *epiklesis* as the Easterns understand the term.

Historically, the invocation of the Holy Ghost in the eucharistic prayer has been the cause of a good deal of unnecessary misunderstanding between the Byzantine and Roman churches. This was comprehensible when bitterness on political grounds had already arisen betwen them and each side was therefore only seeking to accentuate its theological differences from the other and treasuring every ground of condemnation which it could invent—though it is hardly a frame of mind which will ever irradiate eucharistic theology (of all subjects) with a very revealing light. But it was

[1] An exception among modern Greek theologians should be mentioned, K. I. Dyovuniotis, *Ta Mysteria*, Athens, 1913, *p.* 115–16, who insists that the whole rite from the *prothesis* onwards (including the lections) is necessary to the consecration, though he adds that the invocation 'especially' (*kyriōs*) effects consecration.

[2] *Cf.* P. Bernadakis, *Catechesis* (Constantinople, 3rd ed. no date), *pp.* 169–170; Anthimus VII., Patriarch of Constantinople, *Encyclical Letter*, 1896, § 10, and many others.

[3] *Alcuin Club Tracts*, xii. (1917).

nothing less than fantastic that in 1927–28 we Anglicans should have permitted ourselves to discuss this subject chiefly by the method of hurling at one another some of the well-worn brickbats of the period of the fourth Crusade, without trying to investigate the subject afresh from a strictly scientific point of view.[1] History, and especially liturgical history, has a much clearer word to say on the matter than the theologians and ecclesiastical politicians then allowed to be heard. This is not the place to go into the scientific aspects of the question with any fulness, for it would furnish matter for a monograph. But I will try to suggest briefly the historical considerations within which it will one day have to be discussed.

1. It is quite easy to put together a long collection of Greek and Oriental pronouncements from the mediaeval and modern sources of which the following appears to be the most highly authorised in modern times. 'The one, holy, catholic and apostolic church of the Seven Oecumenical Councils was wont to teach (*paredecheto*) that the precious gifts (*i.e.* the eucharistic elements) are hallowed after the prayer of the invocation of the Holy Spirit by the blessing of the priest'.[2] After reading some twenty modern Greek Catechisms and Manuals, and between ten and twenty mediaeval Greek theologians on the matter, I think I can answer for it that this is entirely typical of the Greek tradition, which shews no wavering or inconsistency about this from at all events the eighth century onwards. The Russian tradition is much less clear-cut right down to the eighteenth century, though it has since come into line with that of the Greeks. The theological and liturgical tradition of the lesser Eastern churches so far as it is accessible, though rather less precise than the Greek, is in general agreement with it. Before the eighth century one can cite occasional Eastern authors, *e.g.* Chrysostom, *Hom. de Prod. Judae*, I. vi., and Severus of Antioch,[3] who—at least on occasion—take an entirely different view. But taking it by and large this is the unanimous Eastern view from the middle ages onwards: The petition that the Holy Ghost will 'make' or 'shew' or 'transform' the bread and wine to be the Body and Blood of Christ *effects*

[1] The chief exception to this stricture in the literature of the Prayer Book controversy is the article of Armitage Robinson already cited (*p.* 211 *n.* 2). Examples of the brickbat method of discussion will be found in the pamphlet *The Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Prayer of Consecration*, by J. W. Hunkin (Cambridge, Heffer, 1927)—a fascinating illustration of all the known methods of misusing historical evidence—and the article *In Defence of the New Prayer Book*, by the present Bishop of Gloucester, *Church Quarterly Review*, civ., *pp.* 200 *sqq.*, esp. 208 *sqq.* (I cite these two because they appear then to have been on opposite sides, though Dr. Hunkin's conclusion—with which I personally happen to agree—is in complete contradiction with his preceding historical argument.)

[2] *Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople to the Papal Encyclical on Union*, 1896, *p.* 32.

[3] *VIth Book of Select Letters of Severus of Antioch*, ii. 2. ed. E. W. Brooks, *p.* 237: 'The priest . . . pronouncing his words in the person of Christ, says over the bread, This is My Body. . . . Accordingly it is Christ Who still even now offers, and the power of His divine words perfects the things provided so that they may become His Body and Blood.'

the consecration of the eucharist. Whether or not importance is to be attached to the previous recitation of the institution (they vary about this), without the invocation in an 'operative' form there is no consecration. It is not a desirable extra but a *sine qua non*, an essential or even *the* essential of the rite.

Those who have advocated its introduction among ourselves have often sought to obscure this feature of Eastern teaching. But it is to Easterns something really important, as the Orthodox rejection of the American form—'to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine'—as insufficient, indicates. And for my own part, looking at the matter purely historically, I cannot help thinking that the Greeks are, from their own point of view, entirely right, and ought to be allowed to know their own tradition better than their Western imitators. From the first formulation of the present Eastern tradition in Cyril of Jerusalem in A.D. 347 this has been the only reasonable interpretation of the words of the liturgical prayers themselves. It is not a matter of the gradual intensification of an idea originally reconcilable with a consecratory use of the institution. The unambiguous word '*make* this bread the Body', etc. is attested earlier in our sources than words like *apophēnē*, which might mean either 'make' or 'shew'; and the Jerusalem rite of the fourth century, in which—so far as the extant evidence goes—the whole practice and theory originated, had not, as we have seen, any institution narrative at all. It is true that the liturgies of *S. Basil* and *S. Chrysostom* as they now stand pray that God will send down the Holy Ghost '*upon us*' as well as upon the elements. But it is also noteworthy that no such addition to the petition is to be found in the fourth century sources. And the Greek theological tradition (rightly, as I think) makes nothing of this clause in its explanations of the invocation; indeed, I remember only one modern Greek manual which so much as mentions it.[1] The authentic 'Eastern' formulation of doctrine is that the invocation consecrates the eucharist. By the action of the Holy Spirit upon the elements the communicants receive the Body and Blood of Christ.

2. It is easy also to find Western prayers, and Western teaching, which are inspired by the same idea—but as regards the liturgies at all events there is nothing which can be thought to antedate that great expansion of Byzantine ecclesiastical influence in the West which accompanied the Western expeditions of Justinian in the sixth century. When we turn to the oldest Western evidence available we find another idea which, I suggest, exactly reverses the conception of the Greek invocation. A fragment of the book of S. Fulgentius of Ruspe *contra Fabianum* appears to preserve reminiscences of the 'second half' of a sixth century African eucharistic prayer. The passage is as follows:

'Therefore since Christ died for us out of charity, when at the time of

[1] *Leitourgikē*, P. Rompotos, Athens, 1869, Bk. ii. 2, *pp.* 247–8.

sacrifice we make commemoration of His death, *we pray that charity may be bestowed upon us by the advent of the Holy Spirit:* humbly beseeching that by that self-same charity whereby Christ was moved to stoop to the death of the cross for us, *we also having received the grace of the Holy Spirit* may hold the world as crucified unto us and may endure to be crucified unto the world; and imitating the death of our Lord, as Christ in that He died, died once, but in that He liveth, liveth unto God, so we also should walk in newness of life and receiving the endowment of charity should die unto sin and live unto God. . . . For the very participation of the Body and Blood of the Lord when we eat His bread and drink His cup, doth admonish us of this that we should die unto the world and have our life hid with Christ in God . . . so it comes about that all the faithful who love God and their neighbour drink the cup of the Lord's charity, even though they drink not the cup of the Lord's bodily passion. . . . The cup of the Lord is drunk when holy charity is preserved . . . for by the gift of charity is bestowed upon us to be in truth that which in the sacrifice we mystically celebrate (*i.e.* the Body of Christ). . . . And so holy church when at the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ she *prays that the Holy Ghost may be sent unto her,* asks for that gift of charity, whereby she may preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace: and since it is written that "love is as strong as death", she asks for that charity, which she remembers to have moved her Redeemer freely to die for her, for the mortification of His members that are upon earth. And so the Holy Spirit sanctifies the sacrifice of the catholic church: and therefore the christian people perseveres in faith and charity, while each of the faithful by the gift of the Holy Spirit worthily eats and drinks the Body and Blood of the Lord, because he both holds the right belief about his God and by living righteously is not separated from the unity of the Body (of Christ) the church'.[1]

This does not tell us a great deal about the actual wording of the prayer he is referring to. But to me it does not seem possible that Fulgentius could have written as he does here if the petition for the Holy Ghost had not been framed in quite different terms and with a quite different object from that of Cyril of Jerusalem and the Eastern 'invocation' tradition in general. This can hardly have been a petition for the consecration of the sacrament; from what he says of it, it must have been in the nature of a prayer *for the communicants.* It thus links up quite naturally on the one hand with that petition in Hippolytus (*k*) 'that Thou wouldest grant to all who partake to be made one, that they may be fulfilled with Holy Spirit'. On the other hand the same note is sometimes struck in the later Gallican and Mozarabic *post-pridie* prayers, which stand in the same position, of which this will serve for a specimen: (After the institution-narrative): 'This is the victim of love and salvation, O God the Father, whereby the world was reconciled unto Thee. This is that Body which hung upon the cross.

[1] Fulgentius, *contra Fabianum, Fragm.* 28

This also is the Blood which flowed from its holy side. Giving thanks therefore unto Thy love for that Thou didst redeem us by the death of Thy Son and save us by His resurrection, we beseech Thee, O God of love, to incline Thy mind unto us, that sprinkling these offerings with the benediction of Thy Holy Spirit, Thou wouldest impart holiness unto the inward man of them that receive (*sumentium uisceribus sanctificationem adcommodes*) that purified thereby from the stain of our sins we may rejoice abundantly in this day of our Lord's resurrection'.[1]

Clearly there is here no idea of 'consecration' in the petition for the Spirit. The elements are already the Body and Blood before it is reached. This is not the Eastern petition at all, which is concerned with the elements and consecration, but a quite different idea—a prayer concerned with the communicants and communion. It is closely related to that primitive teaching, of which we have seen ancient examples from East and West alike, that in receiving holy communion we receive an access of *pneuma* or 'spirit'. (*Cf. pp.* 266, *sq.*) Whereas the present Greek doctrine is that by the action of the Spirit on the elements we receive the Body and Blood of Christ, this reverses the idea and suggests that by receiving the Body and Blood of Christ we receive the action of the Spirit on our souls. There is not much doubt from the general lay-out of the evidence which is the older notion. But what I am concerned here to point out is that *both* views were certainly current from the fourth–eighth centuries. In discussing the evidence of particular writers in this period it is important to distinguish which way they are regarding the matter. This has not as a rule been done in such discussions of the matter as have come my way, with confusing results on the historical elucidation of the question.

3. In matters of controversy no doubt theology dictates the contents of liturgical prayers. Cranmer, for instance, framed a new liturgy to express what seemed to him a truer theology than that which underlay the old English rites. But in matters which are not controverted the *rôles* are reversed, and theology is apt to be a commentary on prayers, though not always a very faithful or illuminating one. There were no eucharistic controversies worth speaking of in the first eight centuries, and that 'the rule for prayer should determine the rule for belief' could anciently be taken as a maxim in such matters. The primary evidence, where it is available, on this question ought to be that of the liturgical prayers themselves. Where the explanations even of ancient commentators do not closely fit their terms (as *e.g.* in the case of Theodore and the rite of Mopsuestia, *p.* 287) it can be taken that the prayer represents the older evidence.

4. If the evidence of the fourth century prayers be analysed by itself it is obvious that no single or simple theological idea will suffice to explain the beginning of the present oriental liturgical *practice* in respect of the invo-

[1] Mozarabic *post-pridie* for fourth Sunday after Easter. *Lib. Moz. Sacr., ed. cit. ol.* 313.

cation or *epiklesis*. It is quite clear that the liturgical traditions embodied in the invocations of (*i*) *Addai and Mari*, (*ii*) Cyril of Jerusalem, (*iii*) Sarapion, (*iv*) *Ap. Const.*, viii, Mopsuestia, and *S. Basil*, do not represent one identical eucharistic theology. They need to be disentangled from one another, as well as from that other (and apparently older) theology of invocation represented by Hippolytus (*k*) and Fulgentius of which we have just spoken.

5. It was not only practice, represented by the phrasing of the invocations used in the different liturgies, which varied. There are considerable variations in the *teaching* about the invocation among the fourth and fifth century authors who used them. We need to bear in mind here two things: (i) The possibility that Greek writers of this period are 'translating' expressions from their liturgies, or from older writers, which in themselves represented the older and vaguer 'Spirit = Presence' or 'Spirit = Word' terminologies, into the ideas of developed fourth century Trinitarian theology, in which 'Spirit' means precisely and only the Third Person of the Trinity. Such 'translation' was done in all good faith, and is a typical example of the systematising and rationalising service rendered by Greek thought in general, and by Greek theology in the particular history of christian thought. But it is not necessarily true that the theological idea intended by the older expression was preserved in the process. (ii) The idea of a 'moment of consecration', and with it of an 'essential' or 'operative section' or clause of the prayer seems to come in somewhat suddenly in the fourth century. Dependent on this, but not necessarily identical with it, is the idea of a 'petition for consecration'. The Greek invocation is an example of a 'petition for consecration' which is regarded as the 'operative clause' and the 'moment of consecration'. But the *Quam oblationem* of the Roman canon is just as much a 'petition for consecration' though it has never been regarded as in itself 'consecratory' or marking the 'moment of consecration'. There are other examples of this latter type, which should be carefully distinguished from the other.

6. The *structural* importance of the institution narrative in the development of the 'second half' of those prayers which already embodied it in the second and third centuries has already been discussed (*cf. pp.* 227 *sqq.*). But this does not necessarily imply that it was then taken as strictly 'consecratory' in the later sense. Personally I see no evidence that it was so understood before the fourth century. What it does seem reasonable to say is that when the idea of a 'moment of consecration' did first arise—in the fourth century—the institution narrative would present itself as the obvious point at which to place that 'moment', by those whose rites already contained it. In those rites in which it was *not* then contained a different 'moment' would have to be found. The fact that no one tried to place the 'moment' in the christian *berakah* or 'thanksgiving series', which had formed the original nucleus of all prayers, indicates that the idea did not

arise until after the hellenised churches had a fairly lengthy development behind them, during which they had forgotten their origins.

A rough analysis of the contents of Hippolytus' prayer and *Addai and Mari*, representing Western and Eastern pre-Nicene types respectively, will help to make the matter clearer.

Hippolytus	Addai and Mari	
Thanksgiving Series (*a–d*)	Thanksgiving Series (*d–e*)	
'Link' (*e*)	'Link' (*f-g*)	
Institution Narrative (*f–g*)	Petition for Consecration	(*i*)[1]
Offering of Sacrifice (*h–j*)	Offering of Sacrifice	
Prayer for Communicants (*k*)	Prayer for communicants	
Doxology (*l*)	Doxology (*j*)	

These two rites are roughly parallel in their contents except that the one contains a fully developed institution narrative where the other has a 'petition for consecration'. But what is remarkable is that in the later development of the type of rite represented by Hippolytus, the 'link' actually turns into a 'petition for consecration'—the *Quam oblationem* of the canon, whose character is parallel to that of a good many Gallican and Mozarabic *post-sanctus* prayers. And the 'link' in the Eastern rites does turn into a full institution narrative coming before the offering of the sacrifice (*cf. S. James*); there are the obvious germs of this already in *Addai and Mari* (*g*). That is to say that the mere necessity of expressing the fulness of the eucharistic action led quite independently to the insertion of the *same* sort of things quite independently in these two very different traditions. Only the accidents of development caused the position of the petition and the institution to be reversed in the two types of rite. Why then did the two traditions come to attach such a different importance, the one to the petition and the other to the institution?

If we compare the rite of Cyril of Jerusalem as he himself describes it with *Addai and Mari*, we find that the preface has taken the place of the 'Thanksgivings' and the sanctus that of the 'link', while the old 'prayer for the communicants' has become the 'general intercessions', thus:

Preface
Sanctus
Petition for Consecration
Offering of Sacrifice (*cf. S. James l*)
General Intercessions

As we have said, when the ideas of a 'moment of consecration' and an 'operative clause' came in, there is nothing in this prayer so constituted to

[1] It seems fair to say that *Addai and Mari* (*i*) does contain all three notions of petition for consecration, offering—'this *oblation* of Thy servants'—and prayer for the communicants, though they are not clearly distinguished. For the 'offering' at this point *cf.* also *S. James* (*l*) and also (*i*).

which these ideas could be attached *at all*, except the 'petition for consecration'. I would be prepared even to go a little further. Granted that there is a real complexity about the *theological* origins of the doctrine of consecration taught by Cyril, and that it has obscure but genuine relations with older ideas of some variety (concerning the 'power of the Name', 'Spirit = Presence', etc., as well as the theological doctrine concerning the operation of the Holy Ghost alluded to in the *Didascalia*), nevertheless a practical point of much greater simplicity arises in connection with the use of such a prayer. How soon would listening to it and worshipping by it actually *give rise* to the ideas of a 'moment of consecration' and an 'operative clause' among those who heard it—among the ordinary christian people? Cyril himself shews no sign of hesitation or apology over such ideas. They are already fully accepted in his *milieu*. Nor does he, like some of the later Easterns, try to allow some 'preparatory' force as regards the consecration to all that part of the prayer which precedes the invocation. For him it is the invocation alone which is 'operative'.

Cyril was certainly not the inventor of the idea of a 'petition for consecration'. But Cyril, or rather Cyril's rite, is the first extant evidence for the *identification* of the 'petition for consecration' with the 'moment of consecration', in the later Greek fashion.

7. Having regard to all these points, it might be advantageous in discussing the historical question of the invocation and the present oriental doctrine concerning it, to distinguish clearly two separate questions: (*a*) The pre-Nicene origins and the post-Nicene variations of the particular ideas and practices described in the *Catecheses* of S. Cyril of Jerusalem. (*b*) The consequences upon Eastern eucharistic *theology* of the fusion of Cyril's type of *rite* with others which in the later second or third century had already developed a full institution narrative. (*S. James* gives us a fourth-fifth century example of the actual process of fusion.)

The full discussion of both these questions must necessarily pass beyond eucharistic and liturgical history proper into the field of eucharistic theology. But even the theological discussion will have to be conducted in the light of the very striking historical contrast already spoken of, *viz.* that while the pre-Nicene church with absolute unanimity (except for one sentence in the *Didascalia*) regards the eucharist as the action of the Second Person of the Trinity and speaks of Him always as *active* in it, Cyril and the whole theological tradition of which he is the earliest representative regards the Third Person of the Trinity as the agent of the eucharist, and speaks of Christ as *passive* in it. The two ideas may be held side by side, as in the later Greek tradition. What has yet to be demonstrated is that they can be stated in combination as parts of a single coherent idea. It is interesting to find that no author in the fourth century ever tried so to combine them. They state one *or* the other, or in the case of Chrysostom now one and now the other, without any attempt at a reconciliation.

Evidently the Antiochene church had not yet fully accepted the same doctrine as Cyril had taught at Jerusalem when it adapted his rite.

The present Eastern teaching is a combination of three things—that consecration is effected by the action of the Third Person of the Trinity; that consecration is effected by a 'petition for consecration'; and that the 'petition for consecration' marks the 'moment of consecration'. Those scholars who desire to shew that the orientals have preserved what was primitively universal in this matter will have some difficulty in finding that *combination* of ideas before the fourth century.