

## CHAPTER VII

### THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER

LET us look back for a moment. We have seen that the eucharist is primarily an action, our obedience to our Lord's command to 'Do this'; and that this action is performed by the Shape of the Liturgy, the outline of the service viewed as a single continuous whole. We have also seen that the *meaning* of this action is stated chiefly in the great eucharistic prayer, which formed the second item of that 'four-action shape' of the eucharist which has come down almost from apostolic times. Since this prayer was originally 'the' prayer, the only prayer in the whole rite, it was there that the whole meaning of the rite had to be stated, if it was to be put into words at all in the course of the service. We have also noted that, while the tradition as to the outline of the rite was always and everywhere the same, there was no such original fixity about the content and sequence of this prayer. Its text was subject to constant development and revision, so that it varied considerably from church to church and from period to period, and even (probably within narrower limits) from celebrant to celebrant.<sup>1</sup>

In this chapter we shall set out the oldest specimens of ancient local traditions of this prayer which have come down to us, together with other material which throws light upon them.

The traditions we shall chiefly consider now are three—those of Rome, Egypt and Syria, for Rome, Alexandria and Antioch were the three most important churches in pre-Nicene times. But there were other traditions of the prayer elsewhere, some of them equally ancient, in North Africa, Spain and Gaul in the West, and in the apostolic churches of the Balkans and Asia Minor in the East. Unfortunately, by the accidents of history it happens that no texts of the eucharistic prayers of these churches have survived from pre-Nicene times, or indeed from any period at which their evidence can usefully serve for even a tentative comparison with the really ancient material.<sup>2</sup> Our survey is thus bound to be very incompletely representative of the whole liturgical wealth of the pre-Nicene church as it actually existed, and the reader may reasonably wonder how it would be

<sup>1</sup> In pre-Nicene times the normal celebrant was, of course, the bishop, who certainly always had freedom to phrase the prayer as he wished within the traditional outline. But there is evidence to show that when a presbyter deputised for the bishop he was not more restricted. It was a freedom belonging to the celebrant, not to the episcopal office, though doubtless presbyters tended to copy their own bishop to a large extent.

<sup>2</sup> The Visigothic and Mozarabic rites of Spain, the *débris* of the Gallican rites of Gaul and the Byzantine liturgy of *S. Chrysostom* are all products of such changed circumstances of the church, that even if material is still to be found in them which is as old as the fifth century—which has yet to be proved—it is not possible to compare it closely with the material we shall be using here.

affected if these lost traditions could be included. I believe that the answer is 'very little in principle and a great deal in detail', because of the form of the conclusions to which the extant material actually leads. The missing traditions of the prayer, if they could be recovered, would probably shew in its structure and phrasing a diversity equal to, or even greater than, those which survive. Such little evidence as we have about them suggests that they were verbally as independent of the prayers which we do know as these clearly are of one another. On the other hand this fragmentary evidence, and still more the incidental statements about the eucharist in the writers from these churches, suggest equally strongly that their fundamental understanding of the rite, that 'meaning' of it which their eucharistic prayers sought to state, was the same in all essentials as that found in the prayers which have survived. Diversity of form and a fundamental identity of meaning seem to have been the marks of the old local tradition everywhere.

(i) *The Roman Tradition*

We begin once more with the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, the most important source of information we possess on the liturgy of the pre-Nicene church. This invaluable document contains the only pre-Nicene text of a eucharistic prayer which has reached us without undergoing extensive later revision. We have to be on our guard, however, against interpreting all the other evidence exclusively in the light of this single document (which raises almost as many fresh problems as it solves, from one point of view), just because it is in this way of such unique interest and importance. In itself it represents only the local tradition of Rome, though at an early stage, before developments had become complicated.

After the opening dialogue, already sufficiently commented, Hippolytus' prayer runs thus:

- (a) We render thanks unto Thee, O God, through Thy Beloved Servant Jesus Christ, Whom in the last times Thou didst send (to be) a Saviour and Redeemer and the Angel of Thy counsel; Who is Thy Word inseparable (from Thee);
- (b) through Whom Thou madest all things and in Whom Thou wast well-pleased;
- (c) Whom Thou didst send from heaven into the Virgin's womb, and Who conceived within her was made flesh, and demonstrated to be Thy Son, being born of Holy Spirit and a Virgin;
- (d) Who fulfilling Thy will and procuring for Thee an holy people, stretched forth His hands for suffering (or for the passion) that He might release from sufferings them who have believed in Thee;
- (e) Who when He was betrayed to voluntary suffering (or the passion) in order that He might abolish death and rend the bonds of the

- devil and tread down hell and enlighten the righteous and establish the ordinance and demonstrate the resurrection,
- (f<sup>1</sup>) taking bread <and> making eucharist to Thee, said: Take, eat; this is My Body, which is [*or will be*] broken for you.
- (f<sup>2</sup>) Likewise also the cup, saying: This is My Blood which is shed for you.
- (g) When ye do this ye do [*or make ye*] My 'anamnesis'.
- (h) Now, therefore, doing the 'anamnesis' of His death and resurrection
- (i) we offer to Thee the bread and cup
- (j) making eucharist to Thee because Thou hast made us worthy to stand before Thee and minister as priests to Thee.
- (k) And we pray Thee that [*Thou wouldst send Thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of Thy holy church*]<sup>1</sup> Thou wouldst grant to all who partake to be made one, that they may be fulfilled with <the> Holy Spirit for the confirmation of <their> faith in truth;
- (l) that we may praise and glorify Thee through Thy Servant Jesus Christ through Whom honour and glory <be> unto Thee with <the> Holy Spirit in Thy holy church, now and for ever and world without end.

Ry Amen.<sup>2</sup>

We may analyse the structure of the prayer thus:

- (a) Address: Relation of the Father to the Eternal Word.
- (b) Thanksgiving for Creation through the Word.
- (c) Thanksgiving for the Incarnation of the Word.
- (d) Thanksgiving for Redemption through the Passion of the Word.
- (e) Statement of Christ's purpose in instituting the eucharist.
- (f) Statement of His Institution of the eucharist.
- (g) Statement of His virtual command to repeat the action of (f) with a virtual promise of the result attaching to such repetition.
- (h) Claim to the fulfilment of the promise in (g).
- (i) Offering of the elements
- (j) constituting obedience to the command in (g), with an interpretation of the meaning understood by this obedience.
- (k) Prayer for the effects of communion.
- (l) Doxology.

This prayer was written down more or less verbally in this form at Rome c. A.D. 215, but the author emphatically claims that it represents traditional Roman practice in his own youth a generation before. It appears certain

<sup>1</sup> This clause is more likely (on the textual evidence) to be a fourth century addition than part of Hippolytus' third century text. Cf. my edition of *Ap. Trad.*, London, 1937, pp. 75 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ap. Trad.* iv., 4 sq. (Words in < > are not in the original, but supplied to help the sense in translation).

that some of the phrasing in *a-e* is of his own composition, and represents his own peculiar theology of the Trinity; and it is at least possible that the wording of other parts of the prayer is from his own pen. But this does not make it improbable that the *structure* of the prayer as a whole (including *a-e*) and some of its actual wording were really traditional at Rome. The following parallels from the writings of Justin Martyr (Rome *c.* A.D. 155) all occur in professedly eucharistic passages, and some are even more remarkable in Greek than in English for the resemblance of their phrasing to that of Hippolytus.

(*a*) The bishop 'sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the Name of the Son and the Holy Ghost' (*Ap.* I. 65).

(Jesus is the 'Beloved', the 'Servant', the 'Saviour', the 'Redeemer' and the 'Angel of God's counsel' in a number of passages in Justin, though none of them are explicitly about the eucharistic prayer; the Word is 'not separable' from the Father (*Dialogue*, 128) but again this is not explicitly connected with the eucharistic prayer.)

(*b-d*) The eucharist was instituted 'that we might at the same time *give thanks to God for the creation* of the world with all that is therein for man's sake, and for that He has *delivered* us from the evil wherein we were born, and for that He *loosed* (*the bonds*) of powers and principalities with a complete losing by *becoming subject to suffering according to His own will*' (*Dialogue*, 41).

(*c, d, g*) 'As by the Word of God Jesus Christ our Saviour was made flesh and had flesh and blood for our salvation, so also we have been taught that this food "eucharistised" by a formula of prayer which comes from Him . . . is the flesh and blood of that Jesus Who was made flesh. For the apostles in the memoirs which are by them, which are called "gospels", have recorded that thus it was commanded them (<to do>): that Jesus took bread and gave thanks and said "Do this for the *anamnesis* of Me: This is My Body"; and likewise took the cup and gave thanks and said "This is My Blood"' (*Ap.* I. 66).

(*h*) 'The offering of fine flour ordered (<in the Old Testament> to be offered on behalf of those who were cleansed from leprosy was a type of the bread of the eucharist, which Jesus Christ our Lord ordered to be done [*or 'sacrificed'*] for an *anamnesis of His passion* which He suffered on behalf of men, whose souls have (<thereby>) been cleansed from all iniquity' (*Dialogue*, 41).

(*i*) 'The sacrifices which are offered to God by us gentiles everywhere, that is the bread of the eucharist, and the cup likewise of the eucharist' (*Dialogue*, 41).

(*j*) The bishop 'sends up eucharists (thanksgivings) *that we have been made worthy of these things by Him*' (*Ap.* I. 65). 'We (<christians>) are the true high-priestly race of God . . . for God accepts sacrifices from no one but by the hands of His own priests' (*Dialogue*, 116).

(*k, l*) These have no verbal parallels in Justin's allusions to the eucharist like the above, though the same sentiments are to be found at large in his works.

We can thus at the least say that there is nothing whatever in the specifically eucharistic teaching of Hippolytus' prayer which would have been repudiated by Justin sixty years earlier.

How far, then, does the tradition represented by Hippolytus' prayer go back? I shall suggest later that at least the general *structure of the first part* of Hippolytus' prayer was an inheritance from the days of the Jewish apostles at Rome, which the Roman church with its usual conservatism had maintained more rigidly in the second century than some other churches. We shall find that this prayer as a whole is more 'tidy' in arrangement and more logical in its connections, less confused by the later introduction of inessentials, and more theological and precise in its expression of what is involved in the eucharistic action, than the others we shall consider. Here it is necessary only to draw attention to the careful articulation of its central portion (*e-j*).

The only point of any difficulty which arises in interpreting this prayer is the question of the exact bearing of (*e*). Is it to be understood as stating that our Lord went to His 'voluntary passion' in order that He 'might abolish death' etc.; or does Hippolytus mean that He *instituted the eucharist* in order that 'He might abolish death', etc.? Grammatically the sentence could mean either; and though to our way of thinking the former meaning may seem much more obvious, it seems from other passages in Hippolytus' works that he did think of holy communion precisely as the means whereby Christ intended to bestow on us these benefits of His passion. Thus he speaks of communion as 'the food which leads thee back to heaven, and delivers from the evil powers and frees from hard toil and bestows on thee a happy and blessed return to God.'<sup>1</sup> Similarly, commenting on Luke xxii. 15 ('With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer') Hippolytus remarks, 'This was the passover which Jesus desired to suffer for us. *By suffering He released from sufferings* (cf. Prayer (*d*) above) and overcame death by death and *by a visible food bestowed on us His eternal life*. . . . Therefore He desired not so much to eat as He desired to suffer *that He might deliver us from suffering by <our> eating*.'<sup>2</sup> In the face of these and certain other expressions which Hippolytus uses elsewhere, it seems unnecessary to argue further. Hippolytus regards holy communion as the means by which Christ 'abolishes death' and 'rends the bonds of the devil' in the faithful communicant. It is a means of 'enlightenment' and a 'demonstration of the resurrection' (cf. John vi. 53-57). The institution at the last supper 'establishes an ordinance'—a phrase in itself difficult to interpret of the passion.

The institution narrative of (*f*) is in fact the pivot of the whole prayer as

<sup>1</sup> *On the Pascha*, v. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* vi. 5.

it stands. It is the climax or point of all that precedes, and the starting point of all that follows. The command and promise it contains (*g*) are the justification for all that is done and meant by the church at the eucharist. This is carefully defined in (*h*), (*i*), (*j*), as (1) the offering of the bread and cup (2) which is the 'priestly' action of the church, and therefore a sacrifice (3) because it is the *anamnesis* of His own death and resurrection commanded by our Lord to be 'done'; or as Justin (*sup.*) calls it, 'What Jesus Christ our Lord commanded to be done for an *anamnēsis* of His passion, which He suffered on behalf of men whose souls have (thereby) been cleansed from all iniquity.' In other words, the eucharist was regarded in the second century as the divinely ordered '*anamnēsis*' of the redeeming action of our Lord. A good deal therefore turns on the word *anamnēsis*, which we have so far left untranslated.

This word, which the Authorised Version translates as 'Do this in remembrance of Me' in the New Testament accounts of the institution, is more common in Roman writers in connection with the eucharist than elsewhere in pre-Nicene times. As we shall see, it does not appear in the parallel sections of some traditions of the prayer. It is not quite easy to represent accurately in English, words like 'remembrance' or 'memorial' having for us a connotation of something itself *absent*, which is only mentally recollected. But in the scriptures both of the Old and New Testament, *anamnēsis* and the cognate verb have the sense of 're-calling' or 're-presenting' before God an event in the past, so that it becomes *here and now operative by its effects*. Thus the sacrifice of a wife accused of adultery (Num. v. 15) is 'an offering "re-calling" her sin to (God's) remembrance' (*anamimēs-kousa*); *i.e.* if she has sinned in the past, it will now be revealed by the ordeal, because her sin has been actively 're-called' or 're-presented' before God by her sacrifice. So the widow of Sarepta (1 Kings xvii. 18) complains that Elijah has come 'to "re-call" to (God's) remembrance (*anamnēsai*) my iniquity', and therefore her son has now died. So in Heb. x. 3, 4, the writer says that because 'it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins' (in the sight of God), the sacrifices of the Old Testament were no better than a 're-calling' (*anamnēsis*) of the offerers' sins before God. And though in this passage there is some indication that *anamnēsis* has here partly at least a psychological reference to the Israelites' own 'conscience' of sins, it is plain from the passage as a whole that it is primarily before God that the sins are 're-called' and 'not purged' or 'taken away'. It is in this active sense, therefore, of 're-calling' or 're-presenting' before God the sacrifice of Christ, and thus making it here and now operative by its effects in the communicants, that the eucharist is regarded both by the New Testament and by second century writers as the *anamnēsis* of the passion, or of the passion and resurrection combined. It is for this reason that Justin and Hippolytus and later writers after them speak so directly and vividly of the eucharist *in the present* bestowing on the

communicants those effects of redemption—immortality, eternal life, forgiveness of sins, deliverance from the power of the devil and so on—which we usually attribute more directly to the sacrifice of Christ viewed as a single historical event *in the past*. One has only to examine their unfamiliar language closely to recognise how completely they identify the offering of the eucharist by the church with the offering of Himself by our Lord, not by way of a repetition, but as a 're-presentation' (*anamnēsis*) of *the same* offering by the church 'which is His Body.' As S. Cyprian puts it tersely but decisively in the third century. 'The passion is the Lord's sacrifice, which we offer.'<sup>1</sup>

These three points may be said to stand out from our cursory examination of the Roman eucharistic prayer: (1) The centrality in its construction of the narrative of the institution as the *authority* for what the church does in the eucharist. Its importance in this respect is greatly emphasised by being placed out of its historical order, after the thanksgiving for the passion. (2) What is understood to be 'done' in the eucharist is *the church's offering and reception of the bread and the cup*, identified with the Lord's Body and Blood by the institution. This 'doing' of the eucharist is our Lord's command and a 'priestly' act of the church. (3) The whole rite 'recalls' or 're-presents' before God not the last supper, but the sacrifice of Christ in His death and resurrection; and it makes this 'present' and operative by its effects in the communicants.

### (ii) *The Egyptian Tradition*

We have no pre-Nicene text of the eucharistic prayer from Egypt. The earliest document of this tradition which has come down to us is a prayer which is ascribed in the unique eleventh century MS. to S. Sarapion, bishop of Thmuis in the Nile delta from before A.D. 339 to some date between A.D. 353 and *c.* A.D. 360. Whether the ascription to Sarapion personally be correct or not (and it is quite possible, despite certain difficulties) the prayer is undoubtedly Egyptian, and in its present form of the fourth century, from before rather than after *c.* A.D. 350. But there are strong indications that this extant form is only a revision of an older Egyptian prayer, whose outline can be established in some points by comparison with eucharistic passages in third century Egyptian writers.<sup>2</sup> We shall not go into this reconstruction in any detail here. Our business is only to establish summarily certain differences from the third century Roman prayer of Hippolytus, and also certain very important similarities of ideas, which seem to belong to the third century Egyptian basis underlying the present text, as well as to the present text itself.

<sup>1</sup> *Ep.* 63, 17.

<sup>2</sup> For certain parts of the prayer this was done in some detail, *Theology*, xxxvii. (Nov. 1938), pp. 261 sq.

## Prayer of Oblation of Bishop Sarapion.

- (a<sup>1</sup>) It is meet and right to praise, to hymn, to glorify Thee, O uncreated Father of the Only-begotten Jesus Christ. We praise Thee, O uncreated God, Who art unsearchable, ineffable, incomprehensible by any created substance. We praise Thee Who art known of Thy Son the Only-begotten, Who through Him art spoken and interpreted and made known to every created being. We praise Thee Who knowest the Son and revealest to the saints the doctrines concerning Him: Who art known of Thy begotten Word and art brought to the sight and understanding of the saints (through Him).
- (a<sup>2</sup>) We praise Thee, O Father invisible, giver of immortality. Thou art the source of life, the source of light, the source of all grace and truth, O lover of men, O lover of the poor, Who art reconciled to all and drawest all things to Thyself by the advent (*epidemia*)<sup>1</sup> of Thy beloved Son. We beseech Thee, make us living men; give us a spirit of light, that we may know Thee, the true (God) and Him Whom Thou hast sent, Jesus Christ; give us (the) Holy Spirit that we may be able to speak and tell forth Thine unspeakable mysteries. May the Lord Jesus speak in us and (the) Holy Spirit and hymn Thee through us.
- (b<sup>1</sup>) [For Thou art far above all principality and power and rule and dominion and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come. Beside Thee stand thousand thousands and ten thousand times ten thousands of angels, archangels, thrones, dominations, principalities, powers: by Thee stand the two most honourable six-winged Seraphim, with two wings covering the Face and with two the Feet and with two flying, and crying 'Holy'; with whom receive also our cry of 'Holy' as we say
- (b<sup>2</sup>) Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth; full is the heaven and the earth of Thy glory.
- (c) Full is the heaven, full also is the earth of Thine excellent glory. Lord of powers, fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy partaking: For to Thee have we offered this living sacrifice, this unbloody oblation.]
- (d<sup>1</sup>) To Thee have we offered this bread, the likeness of the Body of the Only-begotten. This bread is the likeness of the holy Body, because the Lord Jesus Christ in the night in which He was betrayed took bread and brake and gave to His disciples saying: Take ye and eat, this is My Body which is being broken for you for the remission of sins. Wherefore we also making the likeness of the death have

<sup>1</sup> This is a regular Egyptian word for the incarnation. Originally it meant the state entry of a governor into his province. It was also used for the 'appearances' of pagan gods.



offered the bread, and beseech Thee through this sacrifice to be reconciled to all of us and to be merciful, O God of truth;

- (d<sup>2</sup>) [and as this bread had been scattered on the top of the mountains and gathered together came to be one, so also gather Thy holy church out of every nation and country and every city and village and house and make one living catholic church.]
- (d<sup>3</sup>) We have offered also the cup, the likeness of the Blood, because the Lord Jesus Christ taking a cup after supper, said to His own disciples: Take ye, drink; this is the New Covenant, which is My Blood, which is being shed for you for remission of sins. Wherefore we have also offered the cup, offering a likeness of the Blood.
- (e<sup>1</sup>) O God of truth, let Thy holy Word come upon (*epidēmēsato*) this bread that the bread may become Body of the Word, and upon this cup that the cup may become Blood of the Truth;
- (e<sup>2</sup>) and make all who partake to receive a medicine (*lit.* drug) of life, for the healing of every sickness and for strengthening of all advancement and virtue, not for condemnation, O God of truth, and not for censure and reproach.
- (f) For we have called upon Thy Name, O Uncreated, through the Only-begotten in <the> Holy Spirit.
- (g) [Let this people receive mercy, let it be counted worthy of advancement, let angels be sent forth as companions to the people for bringing to naught of the evil one and for the establishment of the church.
- (h) We entreat also on behalf of all who have fallen asleep, of whom also this is the 're-calling' (*anamnēsis*)—(*There follows the recital of the names*)<sup>1</sup>—sanctify these souls, for Thou knowest them all; sanctify all who have fallen asleep in the Lord and number them with all Thy holy powers and give them a place and a mansion in Thy kingdom.
- (i) And receive also the eucharist of the people and bless them that have offered the oblations (*prosphora*) and the eucharists, and grant health and soundness and cheerfulness and all advancement of soul and body to this whole people.]
- (k) Through Thy Only-begotten Jesus Christ in <the> Holy Spirit: (R; of the congregation) As it was and is and shall be unto generations of generations and world without end. Amen.

This is much longer than Hippolytus' prayer, but from the point of view simply of eucharistic teaching it says no more than the terse and direct theological statements of the Roman prayer, and it says it less precisely and adequately. A variety of new themes have found their way into the contents, but they obscure the simple outline found in Hippolytus without adding anything essential to the scope. The structure may be analysed thus:

(a) *Address*. This is much more elaborate than that of Hippolytus, but is

<sup>1</sup> This rubric is in Sarapion's text.

concerned with the same subject, the relation of God the Father to God the Son (to the exclusion in each case of the Holy Ghost). The first paragraph directly repudiates the teaching of Arius that the Son does not know the essence of the Father and is a creature. This makes it clear that it has been re-written (or perhaps added bodily before the second paragraph) during the second quarter of the fourth century, when the Arian controversy was at its height. If the older formula contained anything equivalent to Hippolytus' thanksgivings for creation, incarnation and passion, only the faintest traces remain, in the references to 'every created being' and 'the advent' of the Son, with no allusion to the passion at all.

(b) *Preface*. What seems to have altered the character of (a) is the introduction of the sanctus, and of the preface introducing it. The note of 'thanksgiving' and the word itself have disappeared from the address, which has become a sort of theological hymn leading up to the preface. Omitting certain very interesting theological changes in (b) which can be shown to have been made in the fourth century,<sup>1</sup> we note only that the use of the sanctus at the Alexandrian eucharist, preceded by a preface closely resembling Sarapion (b), can be traced in the writings of Origen at Alexandria c. A.D. 230.<sup>2</sup> This is the earliest certain evidence of the use of this hymn in the liturgy. Earlier citations of the words of the angelic hymn from the scriptures by Clement of Rome and Tertullian do not necessarily reflect a use of it at the eucharist, and it is absent from Hippolytus' liturgy and from some other early documents. It is also noticeable that while the later Alexandrian *Liturgy of S. Mark* shews little trace in other parts of its eucharistic prayer of being descended from a prayer at all closely resembling that of Sarapion, in the one point of the wording of its preface *S. Mark* exhibits only small verbal variations from the text of Sarapion (b). The simplest explanation of these various facts is that the use of the preface and sanctus in the eucharistic prayer began in the Alexandrian church at some time before A.D. 230, and from there spread first to other Egyptian churches, and ultimately all over christendom. If this be true, Sarapion's (b), though an integral part of the text in its present (fourth century) form, is an interpolation into the original local tradition of the prayer at Thmuis, as is indicated by its having been borrowed almost verbally from the liturgy of Alexandria. We have no means of judging when this Alexandrian paragraph was first incorporated into the liturgy at Thmuis, whether as part of that revision which formed our present text of the prayer—which is certainly responsible for the present form of (a) and may quite well have included a recasting of the whole opening part of the prayer (Sarapion was a close friend and prominent supporter of S. Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria from A.D. 328–373)—or by some earlier revision at Thmuis during the third century. But at Thmuis the preface has received no local development or variation worth mentioning from the Alexandrian text, which in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Theology*, xxxvii. (Nov. 1938), pp. 271 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*

the conditions of the period suggests that its incorporation was not of long standing when the present revision was made.

(c) *Prayer for the acceptance of the 'living sacrifice'*. This section is difficult to interpret. At first sight it marks an abrupt transition from the worship of the sanctus to the offering of the eucharistic oblation of the bread and the cup. The phrase 'the unbloody sacrifice' is used by fourth century writers (first by Cyril of Jerusalem A.D. 348) to mean the specifically eucharistic offering of the consecrated bread and cup; and a prayer having a definite reference to the consecration of the bread and cup, at this point *before* the recital of the institution, is a peculiar characteristic of some later Egyptian eucharistic prayers.

Nevertheless it is open to doubt whether this was the original application of (c), even if by Sarapion's time it had already come to be interpreted in this sense. There is a certain difficulty in the prayer that God would 'fill this sacrifice' with *His* 'partaking', which is awkward on any interpretation, but especially so if (c) be really a prayer about the bread and the cup. And there is an unexpectedness about the phrase 'this *living* sacrifice' applied to the elements on the altar at this stage of the prayer without any sort of warning, even allowing for the fact that the idea of a 'moment of consecration' had hardly developed in the fourth century (as the next section of the prayer sufficiently indicates). But it would be a good deal easier to understand if it has a connection with the previous petition, 'we beseech Thee make us *living* men'. In this case the 'living sacrifice and unbloody oblation' of (c) will have reference to the 'sacrifice of praise' offered in the hymn of the sanctus, and not to the eucharistic offering which follows. It is at least worthy of notice that in a pre-Christian Jewish work (c. 100 B.C.) *The Testament of the xii Patriarchs*, the angels in heaven are said to offer 'a rational and unbloody oblation' to God,<sup>1</sup> and it is in this angelic worship of heaven that the congregation has just been joining by the sanctus. Similarly a second century Christian writer, Athenagoras,<sup>2</sup> speaks of 'the lifting up of holy hands' by Christians as 'an unbloody sacrifice and rational liturgy', clearly with reference to prayer and praise rather than to the eucharist as such. In this case Sarapion (c) would represent originally a prayer for the acceptance of the sacrifice of praise offered in (b),<sup>3</sup> much as (d<sup>1</sup>) contains a prayer for the acceptance of the eucharistic sacrifice of the bread and wine offered in the preceding sentence; and as (i) is a prayer for the acceptance of 'the eucharist of the people' offered in the whole preceding prayer.

Such an interpretation of (c) eases the abruptness of the main transition of thought, which comes not between (b) and (c), but between (c) and (d). The transitions are not very well managed anywhere in this prayer, but it seems easier at this point if there is a passage of ideas from the offering of

<sup>1</sup> *Testament of Levi*, iii. 6.

<sup>2</sup> *Legatio pro Christianis*, xiii. Cf. also Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, X. iv. 68.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also the Alexandrian preface on p. 218.

the worship of the sanctus as a 'living sacrifice' of praise, to the offering of the eucharistic 'sacrifice of the death'. This carries with it the implication that (c) (which thus depends on the sanctus) is also an interpolation into the original form of the rite of Thmuis. A good deal has been built on the application of (c) in this prayer to the eucharist by some writers; but it does not really seem to make much difference to the specifically eucharistic theology of the prayer to exclude (c) from consideration in this respect.

(d) *The Offering and Institution.* As a preliminary to understanding this section it is best to dispose of ( $d^2$ ), which completely destroys the symmetry, otherwise obvious, between ( $d^1$ ) and ( $d^3$ ). The unsuitability of describing the corn from which the eucharistic bread has been made as having been originally 'scattered on the tops of the mountains' among the mud-flats of the Nile delta makes it plain that this is not an authentic product of the native tradition of the prayer at Thmuis, but a rather unimaginative *literary* quotation. It is in fact borrowed from the prayers for the agape found in *Didache* ix.<sup>1</sup> (In the Syrian or Transjordanian setting in which the *Didache* was probably composed, cornfields on the hill-tops occasion no surprise.) As an elaboration of ( $d^1$ ), ( $d^2$ ) is still a rather glaring 'patch', which has not yet produced a similar elaboration of ( $d^3$ ). This suggests that it had not very long found a place in the prayer when the present recension was made. It may even have been introduced as a 'happy thought' by the last reviser, since it virtually duplicates matter found more in place in (g), which is itself an addition to the original outline of the prayer.

By contrast with Hippolytus, Sarapion in (d) fuses the formal statement of the offering of the elements with the narrative of the institution, which Hippolytus keeps distinct (*cf.* Hipp. (f) and (i)). Sarapion also states explicitly that the actual offering has already been made at the offertory, which Hippolytus leaves in the background. We have already seen the reason for this in the fact that 'the' prayer had originally to put into words the meaning of the whole rite, of what precedes as well as of what follows. Thus Sarapion can say 'We have offered' (before the prayer began) even though the whole prayer is itself headed in the MS. 'Prayer of Offering' or 'Oblation'. Finally, even more plainly than in Hippolytus, the narrative of the institution is here pivotal for the whole prayer, as the supreme authority or justification for what the church does in the eucharist—'This bread is the likeness of the holy Body *because* the Lord Jesus took bread', etc.

(e) *Prayer for Communion.* This section forms a single whole, even though it falls into two distinct parts. It is a prayer for communion, the first part of which is concerned with the means and the other with the effects. In contrast with Hippolytus, where the institution narrative is taken as *implicitly* identifying the bread and wine with the Body and Blood of Christ by virtue of His own promise, Sarapion's prayer shews a new desire for an *explicit* identification. This desire is found in other fourth century writers also, but

<sup>1</sup> *Cf.* p. 90.

hardly before that time. The way in which, e.g., (*d*<sup>3</sup>) goes out of its way to emphasise this identification of the bread and wine with the Body and Blood by the institution narrative itself, with the peculiar formula '... drink, this is the New Covenant, *which is My Blood*' (instead of 'in My Blood', Luke xxii. 20), suggests that at one time the Hippolytan understanding of the force of the institution narrative had prevailed in Egypt also. It was only later that it was felt to need reinforcing by an explicit petition for the identification of the elements with the Body and Blood, such as we get here in (*e*).

However this may be, Sarapion is not unique in the fourth century in feeling this, or in the way in which he expresses himself, by a prayer for the 'advent' (*epidēmēsato*) of the Word, parallel to His 'advent' (*epi.ñēmia*) in the incarnation (*cf.* *a*<sup>2</sup>). S. Athanasius in the same period in Egypt writes: 'When the great prayers and holy supplications have been sent up *the Word comes upon the bread and the cup and they become His Body*.'<sup>1</sup> The same idea is found in a number of Ethiopic rites which are of Egyptian connection, if not actual origin. Outside Egypt S. Jerome in Syria sixty years later speaks of bishops as those who 'at the eucharist pray for the advent of the Lord',<sup>2</sup> and similar language is used in Asia Minor in the fourth century, and later still in Italy, Gaul and Spain.<sup>3</sup> This introduction of a prayer for 'the coming of the Lord', the Son, the Second Person of the Trinity, is a straightforward conception, which only makes explicit the ideas originally involved in the reference to the incarnation and in the institution narrative in earlier versions of the prayer. The implications of these references had already been made plain by writers like Justin in the second century.<sup>4</sup> But the introduction of such a petition alters to some extent the balance of the prayer as a whole, by weakening the position of the institution narrative as the central pivot of the whole prayer.

Even in so early a specimen as that of Sarapion, the prayer of (*e*<sup>1</sup>) is definitely 'consecratory' in form, and thus prepares the way for the conception of a 'moment of consecration' within the eucharistic prayer as a whole. This conception was eventually accepted by East and West alike, though they chose different 'moments' to which to attach the idea. It was by a third development, a sort of theological refinement upon this secondary stage of any sort of explicit prayer to reinforce the old identification of the elements with the Body and Blood through the institution narrative, that the Greeks evolved during the fourth and fifth centuries the 'tertiary' stage of a prayer that specifically the Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Holy Trinity, would (in some sense) 'make' the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ. This became for them the 'moment of consecration'; a

<sup>1</sup> *Fragment vii. ad Baptizandos*, P.G. 26. 1935.

<sup>2</sup> *In Soph.* iii. P.L. xxv. 1377.

<sup>3</sup> *Cf. Theology*, xxviii. (Apr. 1934), pp. 197 sq.

<sup>4</sup> *Cf. e.g.* p. 159 (*c, d, g*).

'moment' which the West, when it adopted the idea from the East, continued to place at the old pivot of the prayer, the institution narrative. Had the West wished to follow the East in divorcing the 'moment' from the institution, it could have found one at the prayer *Quam oblationem* of the Western canon before the institution narrative, which is just as much 'consecratory' as is (*e*<sup>1</sup>) in Sarapion. Rome therefore reached this secondary stage of a petition for consecration apart from the institution; but remained there, without advancing to the 'tertiary' stage of the Eastern prayer for the sending of the Holy Spirit. Sarapion's prayer in (*e*<sup>1</sup>) thus foreshadows the parting of the ways between later Eastern and Western liturgical ideas.

(*e*<sup>2</sup>) Having prayed for the means of communion, Sarapion prays for its effects. Here it is noticeable that whereas Hippolytus' prayer for the communicants confines itself to purely spiritual effects, that of Sarapion recognises that the sacrament is a 'drug' or 'medicine' of life, for the body as well as the soul. We need not suspect that this difference represents a 'rapid decline of spirituality between the days of persecution and those of the established church of the fourth century', as one English writer has suggested. (Sarapion himself felt the full force of the Arian persecution of the catholics, and probably died in exile.) It is quite true that Hippolytus at this point says nothing of the eucharist as concerned with the human body; but in his section (*e*) he has quite clearly stated that one purpose of the institution of the eucharist is 'to abolish death' etc., which amounts to much the same thing, though put in a different way. In point of fact, Sarapion rests on old Egyptian tradition in what he calls the eucharist here. Clement of Alexandria, c. A.D. 190, had pictured our Lord as saying to the soul: 'I am thy nourisher, giving Myself as bread, whereof he that tastes shall never more have experience of death, and daily giving Myself for the drink of immortality.'<sup>1</sup> We shall see in the next chapter that these ideas go back right through the second century into the New Testament itself. The Roman canon follows the tradition of Hippolytus in that it prays only for spiritual benefits for the communicants—that 'they may be filled with all heavenly benediction and grace', a conservatism which is followed by our Prayer Book 'Prayer of Oblation'. But our words of administration—'preserve thy *body* and soul'—have gone back to the wider view of the effects of communion, by contrast with the Roman words—'preserve thy soul unto everlasting life'. In more discreet language our form contains Sarapion's teaching that the eucharist is a 'drug' or 'medicine of life' for the body as well as the soul.

(*f*) *The Invocation.* We have already spoken of the great importance attached in the primitive christian and the pre-christian jewish tradition to the 'glorifying of the Name' of God at the close of the *berakah* or *eucharistia*, the 'Thanksgiving' at the end of supper. We have a further hint in this clause of the part played by this conception. The prayer in (*e*<sup>1</sup>) and

<sup>1</sup> *Quis dives salvetur?* 29.

(e<sup>2</sup>) for the identification of the elements with the Body and Blood of Christ and for their eternal effects upon the bodies and souls of the communicants—the petition of the whole eucharistic prayer—is here understood as being efficacious chiefly ‘because they have called upon the Name of God’. So again, Clement of Alexandria, citing an even earlier Egyptian writer c. A.D. 160, with whom Clement does not disagree on this point, says: ‘The bread is hallowed by the power of the Name of God, remaining the same in appearance as it was <when it was> taken, but by <this> power it is transformed into spiritual power’.<sup>1</sup>

Whatever the danger of approximating to mere magic in such ideas, we have to recognise that the special efficacy of prayer ‘in the Name of God’ or ‘of the Lord Jesus’ is clearly found in the New Testament, not only in the teaching of the apostles—and in their practice, e.g., in the matter of exorcisms—but also in the teaching of our Lord Himself.<sup>2</sup> There is no clear dividing line to be drawn between the application of such ideas to the sacrament of the eucharist, and to that of baptism, whether this be given ‘in the Name of’ the Holy Trinity or, as primitively, ‘in the Name of the Lord Jesus’. We accept it placidly in the case of baptism out of use and wont, because the church happens to have retained it in its full primitive significance in baptism. We are startled at it in the case of the eucharist, because there the church early overlaid it with other ideas. But in the time of Sarapion it had not yet entirely lost its primitive force in the eucharist, and it is likely that this clause was deliberately retained out of a lingering sense of the importance of the old conception, when the intercessions which follow in the present (fourth century) text were first interpolated at this point in the prayer.

(g), (h), (i) *The Intercessions, for the Living, the Dead and the Offerers.* These are an addition to the original outline of the prayer, of a kind which was made in most churches at some point within the prayer before the end of the fourth century. When the eucharist was celebrated apart from the synaxis in the pre-Nicene church there was a real loss in the absence of any intercessions whatever. There was a natural desire to replace them in some way; and it is quite possible that in some churches the custom arose during the third century of treating the intercessory ‘prayers of the faithful’, which really formed the close of the synaxis, as a sort of invariable preliminary to the eucharist, even when this latter was celebrated without the rest of the synaxis. (But Sarapion’s own arrangement in his collection of prayers still puts the intercessions at the opposite end of the book to the prayers of the eucharist proper, in an altogether separate service.)

The alternative was to insert some intercessions at a fresh point within the eucharist itself. The rigidity of the primitive outline, which permitted of only one prayer at the eucharist, ‘the’ eucharistic prayer, necessitated their being included somehow within that, whatever confusion to its primi-

<sup>1</sup> *Excerpta ex Theodoto*, 82.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Mark ix. 39; John xiv. 13, etc.

tive shape and purpose this might cause. Even when the two services were celebrated together, there was a natural desire to associate a prayer for the 'special intentions' with which the eucharist was being offered as closely as possible with the act of offering, and this would lead to the same result. The existence of some prayer for the communicants towards the close of the prayer (in all the traditions with which we are acquainted) led in some churches to the development of this part of the prayer to cover other objects of intercession as well, as here at Thmuis, and also at Jerusalem, where it is probable that the practice started. In the fourth century such a position for intercessions acquired the further sanction of the idea of the special efficacy of prayer in the presence of the consecrated sacrament, which we shall find attested by S. Cyril of Jerusalem in A.D. 348.<sup>1</sup> But Jerusalem in the fourth century, and especially S. Cyril, are in the forefront of 'liturgical advance', and there is no sign of this further special development of ideas in Sarapion.

Alexandria and Egypt generally adopted another notion, that the special intentions of the sacrifice ought to be named *before* it was actually offered. We find accordingly that the Alexandrian intercessions were inserted into the opening of the prayer, before the sanctus. At Rome the intercessions for the living settled down at the beginning of the prayer (but after the sanctus), and those for the dead (originally only inserted at masses for the dead) at the end. Elsewhere other points were chosen; *e.g.*, at Edessa they were interpolated after the sanctus and the first half of the eucharistic prayer, immediately before the consecration.<sup>2</sup> There was no uniformity about this, because each church began to copy others in 'modernising' its liturgy at different moments and under different influences, inserting now the preface and sanctus, now intercessions for the living, now commemorations of martyrs and so on, at whatever point in its own local tradition of the prayer seemed most fitting; and in doing so it borrowed now verbally, now only in ideas, now from one source, now from another, or added native compositions and elaborations of its own as the liturgical gifts and knowledge of its successive bishops permitted.

The general result, when the synaxis and eucharist came to be fused into a single rite, celebrated as a normal rule without a break, was a duplication between the old intercessions, the 'prayers of the faithful', at the close of the synaxis, and the new intercessory developments within the eucharistic prayer. The old 'prayers of the faithful' tended after a while to atrophy in most rites, or even to disappear altogether, as at Rome and in the Syriac *S. James*.

The chief points of interest in Sarapion's intercessions are: (*h*) The description of the eucharist as the *anamnesis* of the dead—clearly in the same sense as at Rome of 're-calling' something *before God*. But the word is not applied to the eucharist as the *anamnesis* of the passion in Sarapion, though

<sup>1</sup> Cf. p. 199.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. p. 179 n.



it is found in this sense in Origen in third century Egypt. In (i) the prayers for the offerers are of interest as the earliest Egyptian evidence for the custom of each communicant bringing his or her own *prosphora* for themselves. To be one of 'the people' (laity), to offer the *prosphora* and to partake of communion, were still all virtually the same thing in Sarapion's time in Egypt, to judge by the way the petitions in (e<sup>2</sup>), (g), and (i) repeat one another in their prayers for 'advancement'. In the later Alexandrian intercessions also, those for the dead immediately precede those for the 'offerers'.

(j) *The Doxology*. In the present text this is reduced to meagre dimensions. Probably the interpolation of the intercessions has eliminated an older fully developed form at (f), which marked the conclusion of the prayer. That (j) does *not* preserve the original conclusion postponed to the end of the interpolated intercessions, seems clear from the fact that the traditional people's response 'As it was' etc., does not attach itself to Sarapion's conclusion either grammatically or in sense, though it is appended in the MS.

Comparing the whole prayer with that of Hippolytus one may say that though it is more than probable that Sarapion ultimately derives from a prayer on the *berakah* model, and though there are certain points of contact between Hippolytus and Sarapion in structure, it has in any case lost touch with its original type much more than has the older Roman prayer. Additional themes like the sanctus and the intercessions have complicated and obscured the outline so much that no clear verdict could be given on this question of derivation from the *berakah* from the study of Sarapion's prayer taken alone. And certainly there has been no borrowing between the Roman and Egyptian prayers in the course of development. In the central part of the prayer [Sarapion (d)-(f)=Hippolytus (e)-(j)] the differences of phrasing and arrangement are very marked indeed, considering that both prayers are dealing with exactly the same subject.

But this obvious independence of the two traditions only brings into greater relief their agreement on the substance of those points which we noted as outstanding in Hippolytus' statement of the meaning of the eucharistic action:

(1) The bread and the cup are explicitly stated to be 'offered' to God—though in Sarapion separately, in Hippolytus together. (2) Sarapion explicitly calls this a 'sacrifice', as Hippolytus calls it a 'priestly' ministry; the meaning is the same though the statement is diverse. Though the eucharist is not called 'the *anamnēsis* of the passion', as in Justin and Hippolytus, it is called 'making the likeness of the death'. And (3) as in Hippolytus, the pivotal importance of the narrative of the institution in the prayer, as the ground of the eucharist's effective 're-calling' before God of the sacrifice of Christ, does not in any way obscure the fact that it is Calvary and not the Upper Room which is thus 're-called'.

*(iii) The Syrian Tradition*

In Syria the church of Antioch claimed and was accorded a primacy from, at the latest, some while before the end of the second century. But for a variety of reasons this was never so effectively exercised as was that of Alexandria over Egypt. Despite a cleavage of race and language between the native Copts and the large population of immigrant Greeks, Egypt had been a self-conscious unity under the leadership of Alexandria for centuries before the coming of christianity. The unchallenged supremacy of the Alexandrian bishop over all the churches of Egypt only gave christian expression to an enduring political and geographical factor in past Egyptian history. But from pre-historic times Syria has always been a mosaic of different races, cultures, religions and languages, which no political framework has ever held together for long. The welter of Canaanite tribes of very diverse racial origin which the Hebrews under Joshua succeeded in overcoming in the hills of Southern Syria is typical of the pre-historic background of the whole country. It is equally typical of its history that the invading Israelite confederacy should promptly have disintegrated into its original tribal units under the Judges; and even after it had been welded into a single state under Saul and the House of David, should have split again after less than a century into the rival states of Israel and Judah. The North and East of Syria were no less prone to division than the South throughout their history—until only yesterday, when the four separate republics of French Syria and the two states of Palestine and Transjordan under British mandate still divided a country which seems geographically destined to be a unity, but which is racially and culturally one of the least united in the world.

During the century *c.* 250–150 B.C., the Seleucid kings of Antioch made the most promising of all the many attempts to unify Syria, on the basis of the introduction everywhere of Greek language and culture. They hoped this would be a general solvent of all the diverse local traditions, and act as a cement for the motley elements over which they ruled. They were thwarted by the stubborn adherence of large parts of the population to their ancient cultures, of which the resistance of the jews of the South under the Maccabees is only the most obvious and violent example.

The Seleucids failed in their main object, but they had a good deal of incidental success with their chosen means, the introduction of that form of later Greek civilisation which we call 'Hellenism.' Henceforward Syria was riven by a new division, running right across all its old fractions, that between hellenism and the old native cultures, which diverse though they were, may be classed together as predominantly semitic. This new cleavage does not run along racial lines, for the vast majority of the hellenists were not immigrants but hellenised Syrians. Nor was it primarily geographical,

though naturally Antioch and the great coast towns were strongholds of hellenism, as the hinterland was of the native tradition. But there were large purely oriental quarters in Antioch itself and whole Aramaic-speaking districts in its neighbourhood; on the other hand there were at times strong Greek influences at work in Edessa and Damascus, inland cities which were normally centres of semitic culture; while some of the smaller cities on the Eastern frontier were completely hellenised. The backbone of the semitic tradition was the peasantry of the countryside, as the peak of hellenism was found in the towns. But there were Greek-speaking country districts, while some towns, especially in the East—Edessa, Palmyra, Damascus—were strongly semitic by tradition, and others like Aleppo and Emesa (Homs) formed a sort of debarable land between the two cultures. In short, Syria was an older underlying patchwork of races, languages, traditions and religions, with a recent and different patchwork of hellenism and the surviving native cultures superimposed upon it. The underlying patchwork is *local*, but the only line of division one can draw between hellenism and the oriental traditions is purely *cultural*. By A.D. 300 a man might be a Syrian (which could mean racially a mongrel of half-a-dozen different strains) and yet as hellenised and westernised in speech and mind and habit of life as an inhabitant of Athens or Alexandria or even Rome. And his next-door neighbour might be equally Syrian by blood and remain as completely oriental in culture and language and thought as his forefathers a thousand years before. Or he might be bilingual, with some sort of footing in both worlds. First Rome and then Byzantium inherited the hellenising policy of the Seleucids; and while these European powers ruled the land, Antioch, which had been founded as the capital of hellenism in Syria, remained the administrative and ecclesiastical capital. With the return of semitic ascendancy after the Arab conquest in the seventh century, dominance returned to the old semitic centre of Damascus, to which both the Arab rulers and the christian patriarchs transferred their courts. Henceforward Antioch slowly declined into insignificance.

The patriarchate of Antioch saw itself as the christian heir to the Seleucid tradition of the leadership of all Syria in the path of hellenism; and with only two brief exceptions (under the heretical patriarchs Paul of Samosata in the third century and Severus in the sixth), it identified itself with the 'royalist' hellenising movement throughout its history. But in adhering to this policy the patriarchs had to face in the ecclesiastical field just those same centrifugal tendencies and obstinate local traditions which faced every attempt at political centralisation. When Bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem in A.D. 451 succeeded after twenty-five years of manoeuvring in extracting from the general council of Chalcedon formal recognition of his see as an independent patriarchate over Palestine, he only added a christian chapter to the long story of the wars of Israel with Syria which punctuate the Books of the Kings, and are continued by the revolt of the Maccabees

against the Seleucids. And besides this inveterate separatism of the South there were other pockets of local resistance to all Antiochene or hellenistic domination, less strongly marked but in the end equally tenacious. Against the overwhelming political power of Rome or Byzantium these local patriotisms could only express themselves in terms of ecclesiastical resistance, under the pretext of doctrinal heresy culminating in schism. But these dissident churches drew their strength from racial and cultural forces far more than from theological nicety. Apart from a whole succession of obscure and fantastic popular movements like that of the Messalians in the fourth century (most of which were hardly sufficiently christian to be classed as heresies) we have to reckon, first, with the great East Syrian revolt against Antioch in the fifth century, which adopted the banner of the Nestorian heresy; and secondly, with its doctrinal opposite, the West Syrian revolt of the sixth century which called itself Monophysite; and thirdly, with the Maronite schism in the Lebanon of the eighth century, which took the excuse of Monothelism. We need not here concern ourselves with the doctrinal pretexts. The real dogma of all the rebels was 'anti-Byzantinism' or 'anti-hellenism' as the 'orthodoxy' of Antioch was always in practice 'Caesaro-papism.' Between them the royalist patriarchate and the nationalist schisms shattered Syrian christianity as a living force, and left it permanently weakened to face the pressure of mohammedan political conquest. To-day more than three quarters of the descendants of the old christian inhabitants of Syria are mohammedans, and the christian remainder is so riven into fragments as to be a negligible missionary power. The islamic populations of Syria and Egypt no less than their schismatic churches are permanent monuments of the long attempts of the church of Constantinople to dominate the christian world in the interest of the Byzantine emperors.

It is not surprising that this background of abiding cultural division and local separatism should have left its mark on the liturgy. But the liturgical divisions of Syria, by a series of historical accidents, do not entirely coincide with those of ancient ecclesiastical politics or present doctrinal allegiance. In the field of liturgy we can distinguish four main influences which cross the present sectarian divisions in a most confusing way:

- (1) The old rite of the church of Antioch itself, which is very imperfectly known;
- (2) The other early West Syrian liturgical traditions, which we shall ignore;
- (3) The East Syrian tradition, centred in Edessa;
- (4) The South Syrian tradition of Jerusalem.

(1) What may be called the 'patriarchal' rite of Syria was the so-called *Liturgy of S. James*. It is generally taken that, as it stands, this is *not* the old local rite of Antioch, which is known to us only obscurely from a number of sources, of which the most reliable are hints to be found in the Antiochene

writings of S. John Chrysostom (c. A.D. 360–397).<sup>1</sup> *S. James* as it stands is closely connected with the fourth century rite of Jerusalem, which was adopted by the Antiochene church at some point in the fifth century—when is uncertain. It had not yet happened when S. John Chrysostom left Antioch in A.D. 397, and it is reasonable to suppose that it did not happen after A.D. 431, when Bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem greatly embittered relations between Jerusalem and Antioch by claiming not merely independence (which he successfully asserted twenty years later) but jurisdiction over Antioch itself for his own see. The unique position of Jerusalem as the ‘holy city’ and above all its prestige as a model of liturgical observance were such during the turn of the fourth and fifth centuries as to cause the adoption of Jerusalem customs to a greater or lesser extent by other churches all over christendom. It is not surprising that it should have influenced its own patriarchal see in these respects with especial force at this time. At all events, Antioch to some extent adopted and adapted the Jerusalem *Liturgy of S. James*, probably between A.D. 400 and 430, and made it the patriarchal rite so far as Antiochene influence extended.

Strangely enough, though the patriarchs of Antioch thus introduced the Jerusalem rite into North Syria, they did not themselves remain faithful to it, and ultimately abandoned its use altogether. In pursuit of their usual hellenising policy they had begun (? in the seventh century) to use a version of the Greek *Liturgy of S. Basil*, as at least an occasional alternative to their own rite of *S. James*. After some centuries of increasing ‘Byzantinising’, they ended in the thirteenth–fourteenth century by dropping all trace of their own Syrian rite in favour of the full rite of Byzantium, upon which power the Antiochene orthodox patriarchate had by then become helplessly dependent. Thus *S. James*, though the patriarchal rite of Antioch, is neither a ‘pure’ descendant of the original rite of the Antiochene church, nor the rite which has been used by its patriarchs for the greater part of their history.

(2) North-West Syria followed its patriarchs in adopting *S. James*, but with one important reservation. While the structure and framework of *S.*

<sup>1</sup> To this, or before this, most liturgists would add the *Clementine Liturgy of Apostolic Constitutions* viii., with the admission that its editor has adapted the Antiochene rite to an unascertained extent to suit his own personal ideas. Dr. Baumstark and Dom Engberding have both hinted—the subject has not been pursued further than that—that light might be thrown on the old Antiochene rite by a study of certain Maronite peculiarities, especially in the Maronite *Liturgy of the Apostles*. This line of approach certainly offers more hope of a successful reconstruction of old Antiochene practice (on some points and taken in conjunction with other sources) than that process of taking *Ap. Const. au pied de la lettre*, while formally voicing a mild suspicion of the author’s good faith, which has hitherto formed the chief English contribution to the debate. I have a suggestion of my own to make below as to the old Antiochene rite. And I strongly suspect that the rite taken as the basis of his work by the compiler of *Ap. Const.* was not that of Antioch itself but of some other North Syrian city, a rite of the same general type, but with traditions of its own.

*James* everywhere came into use, the text of its eucharistic prayer never achieved the same prescriptive authority in N.W. Syria as the rest of the rite. Some seventy alternative eucharistic prayers are known from this region, composed at all periods from the fourth-fifth centuries down to the fifteenth. In other words, the working authority of the Antiochene patriarchate was never sufficiently strong in the nearest parts of its own territory, even before the great revolts of the sixth century, to break down the old tradition that every church could follow its own usage in the phrasing of its eucharistic prayer, and that celebrants could remodel this within certain limits at their own discretion. The general outline of these prayers follows that of *S. James* fairly closely as a rule. But some of them exhibit very interesting and probably ancient variations, and have been only roughly adapted to fit the *S. James* type; while even those prayers which follow it more closely are verbally independent compositions on the same theme rather than mere imitations.

But by the time of the Monophysite schism (sixth century) *S. James* had obviously become the standard West Syrian tradition. For a while after that royalists and schismatics used the same rite, until the royalists came to think of it as a badge of local particularism and abandoned it for the rite of Constantinople. This left it to the exclusive use of the Monophysites, among whom it now survives in an Arabic translation, though before the seventeenth century it was generally used in an ancient Syriac version (which is still in use in a few christian villages round Damascus). The Syriac appears to have undergone more than one revision since the sixth century, sometimes to bring it into greater conformity with Byzantine innovations, sometimes in complete independence of these. Even in the hostility to Byzantium the provincials could not help being more than a little impressed by the Byzantines' own valuation of themselves as the source of all that was 'correct' in matters ecclesiastical. They were consequently always apt to adopt the latest Byzantine customs after more or less delay, and so gradually to Byzantinise their own rites. Modern and mediæval Monophysite MSS. of *S. James* differ textually from one another more considerably than those of any other rite—another symptom of the permanent lack of central authority in matters liturgical in Syria.

(3) North-East Syria seems never to have adopted *S. James*, having gone off into Nestorianism and independence too early to have been much influenced by its adoption by the patriarchs of Antioch. Instead, this part of the country adopted as its standard liturgy the ancient rite of the church of Edessa, the Liturgy of *SS. Addai and Mari* (the traditional 'apostles' of Edessa). This may well be connected originally with the second century rite of Antioch, whence Edessa had received the faith; though this is no more than a very reasonable conjecture. Edessa was a semi-independent state on the Eastern Roman frontier, a strong centre of semitic culture and tradition, though theologically it also acted as a channel for the diffusion

of Greek ideas to the purely unhellenic regions around and east of itself. Even Nestorius, whose teachings the later school of Edessa professed to follow, was an ecclesiastic of Antioch who became patriarch of Constantinople; and his teachers Theodore and Diodore, who were venerated as Nestorian 'doctors', were likewise thoroughly hellenised, even though all three were from inner Syria and probably racially non-hellenic. The Edessan liturgy has therefore undergone some infiltration of hellenic ideas even in the earliest texts now available.

But it is of unique interest and importance none the less, because it is basically still a *semitic* liturgy,<sup>1</sup> the only remaining specimen of its kind. It is cast in a different idiom of thought from that of the eucharistic prayers of the hellenistic christianity which had developed out of S. Paul's missions to the hellenistic world north and west of Syria. Its special importance lies in this—that any agreement of *ideas* with these hellenistic prayers which may be found to underlie the marked peculiarities of *SS. Addai and Mari* helps to carry back the eucharistic tradition of the church as a whole behind the divergence of Greek and Western christianity generally from that oriental world to which the original Galilaean apostles had belonged. The obscure history of the Syrian liturgies has a special interest just because it illustrates that contrast between the whole mind and thought of the hellenic and semitic worlds which rarely meets us with any definiteness in christian history outside the pages of the New Testament. We shall therefore conclude this chapter by examining two Syrian eucharistic prayers which are expressions of the two aspects of Syrian tradition, those of the more semitic *Liturgy of SS. Addai and Mari* and of the more hellenistic *Liturgy of S. James*. There is much to be learnt from their different ways of expressing what is fundamentally the same liturgical tradition.

#### *The Liturgy of SS. Addai and Mari*

- (a) Worthy of praise from every mouth and of confession from every tongue and of worship and exaltation from every creature is the adorable and glorious Name [of Thy glorious Trinity, O Father and Son and Holy Ghost,]
- (b) Who didst create the world by Thy grace and its inhabitants by Thy mercy and didst save mankind by Thy compassion and give great grace unto mortals.
- (c<sup>1</sup>) [Thy majesty, O my Lord, thousand thousands of those on high bow down and worship, and ten thousand times ten thousand holy angels and hosts of spiritual beings, ministers of fire and spirit, praise Thy

<sup>1</sup> The credit for drawing attention to the importance of *SS. Addai and Mari* in this and other respects belongs to the Rev. E. C. Ratcliff, whose reconstruction of its original form is to be found in a brilliant essay in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxx, pp. 23 sq. Though I have ventured to differ from him in certain details, I am, like all other students, indebted to his essay for my understanding of this liturgy.

Name with holy Cherubim and spiritual Seraphim offering worship to Thy sovereignty, shouting and praising without ceasing and crying one to another and saying:

- (c<sup>2</sup>) Holy, holy, holy Lord God of Hosts; heaven and earth are full of His praises and of the nature of His being and of the excellency of His glorious splendour. Hosanna in the highest, and Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is He that came and cometh in the Name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest! And with these heavenly hosts]
- (d) We give thanks to Thee, O my Lord, even we Thy servants weak and frail and miserable, for that Thou hast given us great grace past recompense in that Thou didst put on our manhood that Thou mightest quicken it by Thy Godhead,
- (e) and hast exalted our low estate and restored our fall and raised our mortality and forgiven our trespasses and justified our sinfulness and enlightened our knowledge, and, O our Lord and our God, hast condemned our enemies and granted victory to the weakness of our frail nature in the overflowing mercies of Thy grace.<sup>1</sup>
- (f) And we also, O my Lord, Thy weak and frail and miserable servants who are gathered together in Thy Name, both stand before Thee at this time
- (g) and have received by tradition the example which is from Thee,
- (h) [rejoicing and glorifying and exalting and commemorating and performing this (great and fearful and holy and life-giving and divine) likeness of the passion and death and burial and resurrection of our Lord and our Saviour Jesus Christ.]
- (i) And may there come, O my Lord, Thy Holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation of Thy servants, and bless and hallow it that it be to us, O my Lord, for the pardon of offences and the remission of sins and for the great hope of resurrection from the dead and for new life in the kingdom of heaven with all those who have been well-pleasing in Thy sight.
- (j) And for all this great and marvellous dispensation towards us we will give Thee thanks and praise Thee without ceasing in Thy church

<sup>1</sup> At this point the modern Anglican editors have inserted the narrative of the institution from 1 Cor. xi. 23-5, apparently because they could not conceive of a eucharistic prayer which did not contain such a feature, and thought this the most appropriate point at which to insert it. It is found in no MS. here or elsewhere in the prayer, and the Nestorians themselves seem to have no tradition of interpolating it at any point. In Malabar in the fifteenth century they were accustomed to do so *outside* the prayer, just before the fraction—a sufficient indication that the rite did not originally contain it within the prayer. Apparently *Addai and Mari*, like the 'Fragments of a Persian Anaphora' from the same region published by Bickell, never included a narrative of the institution. As we shall see, its absence was made good in another way. After (e) the MSS. all insert an intercession, but this is clearly an interpolation of a relatively late date, part of which had not yet been inserted so late as the tenth century. For the 'Persian Anaphora' cf. the revised text, ed. R. H. Connolly, *Oriens Christianus*, N.S., xii.-xiv. (1922-4), pp. 99-104.



redeemed by the precious Blood [of Thy Christ], with unclosed mouths and open faces lifting up praise and honour and confession and worship to Thy living and life-giving Name now and ever and world without end.

Rj Amen.

Before commenting in detail on this prayer there are two general observations of some importance to be made. (1) So far as can be ascertained the biblical text which underlies the scriptural citations in this prayer is not a Greek text, but one of the Syriac versions—which, it is not possible to distinguish. It would appear certain, therefore, that unlike most other Eastern vernacular rites, *Addai and Mari* was not originally a translation from the Greek, but was composed in Syriac.

(2) Whatever may be the case in the opening address of the prayer and certain phrases elsewhere, the body of this eucharistic prayer is undoubtedly addressed not to the Father but to the Son. Phrases such as 'Thou didst put on our manhood' (*d*), and 'the example which is from Thee' (*f*), are quite inapplicable to the First Person of the Trinity; and 'Thy . . . servants who are gathered together in Thy Name' is a reference to Matt. xviii. 20—'Where two or three are gathered together in My (our Lord's) Name, there am I in the midst of them.' However surprising the idea of a eucharistic prayer to the Son may seem to us, it was not very unusual in antiquity. Besides the Egyptian *Liturgy of S. Gregory* and another Egyptian eucharistic prayer published by Hyvernat, there are three Ethiopic liturgies all addressed to the Son. In Syria itself the Monophysite *Second Liturgy of S. Peter* and two lesser Maronite liturgies are directed to the Son, as is *part* of the eucharistic prayer of the Syriac *S. James* itself,<sup>1</sup> which is followed in this by nearly all the sixty or seventy lesser Syriac liturgies. Evidently there was a strong tradition on this point in Syria generally. In the West there are distinct traces of such a custom having once been common in Mozarabic and Gallican eucharistic prayers; and the repeated condemnation of the practice by two North African councils at the end of the fourth century proves that it was not unknown there either. The fact that *SS. Addai and Mari* is addressed to the Son is thus only a proof of antiquity, and not an exceptional peculiarity.

(*a-c*) *Address, Memorial of Creation, Preface and Sanctus*. It seems fairly clear that the preface and sanctus, which have no connection with what precedes and follows, are an interpolation, and that *Addai and Mari* (like Hippolytus) originally did not contain any such feature. 'Came and cometh' in the Benedictus is found also in the Syriac *S. James*, which may give us a clue as to whence the whole passage was borrowed (*cf. p. 188*). What is more difficult to decide is the authenticity of (*a*) and (*b*). The address to the Trinity has obviously been rewritten, but Mr. Ratcliff has pointed

<sup>1</sup> *Cf. p. 190 n.*

out that (a) 'Worthy . . . of confession from every tongue . . . is the Name . . . of Thy . . . Trinity' is reminiscent of Philippians ii. 9-11, where, however, 'the Name' is the Name of Christ. It seems, therefore, probable that the interpolation of the sanctus has led to the re-writing of (a) in *Addai and Mari* (much as we saw that it has done in Sarapion); but in *Addai and Mari* this has been effected by the substitution of an address to the Trinity for an older address to the Son. In this case the phrase 'Thou didst save mankind by Thy compassion' finds a natural explanation.

(d-e) *Thanksgivings for Incarnation and Redemption.* There is nothing of much importance to be said about these clauses, except to draw attention to the parallel with Hippolytus (c) and (d) of the memorials of the incarnation and redemption in *Addai and Mari* (d) and (e). There is also some similarity of language between *Addai and Mari* (e) and Hippolytus (e), but the real parallel with Hippolytus (e) in thought is in *Addai and Mari* (i).

(f) *The Presence.* This is the first important structural difference of *Addai and Mari* from Hippolytus. Part of what is put *after* the institution narrative in Hippolytus (f) ('because Thou hast made us worthy to stand before Thee') *Addai and Mari* places *before* its own equivalent to an institution narrative. We have already noted the implication of the allusion to Matt. xviii. 20, 'Where two or three are gathered together in My Name, there am I in the midst of them.' In the reference to 'standing before Thee' in *Addai and Mari*,<sup>1</sup> there is probably an allusion to Luke xxi. 36—'pray . . . that ye may be worthy . . . to stand before the Son of Man.' Behind all this section (f) of *Addai and Mari* lies the New Testament idea of the eucharist as an anticipation of the second coming and last judgement. (In scriptural language to 'stand before' God has often the sense of 'to appear for judgement'.) But it is all put by way of allusions which are unfamiliar to us, though doubtless conveying their meaning with sufficient clearness to those who used and framed the prayer.

(g) *The Institution.* *Addai and Mari* has no explicit institution narrative, but it has an equivalent to it in this brief allusion to what happened at the last supper. The important point to notice is that structurally it plays precisely that pivotal part in the whole prayer which the extended narrative plays in other prayers. It states the *authority* for performing the eucharist and justifies the petition for communion which is about to follow. The difference of treatment from Hippolytus and Sarapion should not be allowed to obscure this fundamental similarity between the two types of prayer.

(h) *Statement of the Purpose of the Eucharist* (= Hippolytus (h)). This section of *Addai and Mari* in its present form has in any case been re-written, since it suddenly refers to our Lord in the third person, instead of addressing Him directly like the rest of the prayer. The whole connection

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps also in that of Hippolytus (j).

of thought between (*g*), (*h*) and (*i*) is very confused and difficult to follow. Mr. Ratcliff, emphasising the parallel between 'example' in (*g*) and 'likeness' in (*h*), is disposed to omit the words 'great and fearful and holy and life-giving and divine' in (*h*) as a later expansion, but to retain the rest of (*h*) as an original part of the prayer. Interpreting 'the great and marvellous dispensation' of (*j*) as 'the passion and death and burial and resurrection' mentioned in (*h*), he would exclude (*i*) altogether from the original form of the prayer. He regards its interpolation—at all events in this position—as a later insertion made to bring *Addai and Mari* more into line with Greek Syrian liturgies (cf. *S. James*, *j*<sup>1</sup>, *j*<sup>2</sup>, p. 191).

I confess that I cannot, as at present advised, quite accept this reconstruction, for a variety of reasons. First, this does not help us as regards the sudden 'switch' in the address of the prayer from the Son to the Father, about which Mr. Ratcliff offers no suggestion; nor does it mend the halting construction of the whole sentence. It is impossible to be dogmatic in such a case, but it seems to me that the real interruption to the sequence of thought in the prayer lies precisely in this clause (*h*), with its sudden wordiness and change of address, and its equally abrupt mention of the specific events of 'the passion, death, burial and resurrection' which the prayer has carefully avoided mentioning everywhere else. (Cf. *e*.) The prayer as a whole is concerned with the eternal *effects* of redemption mediated by the eucharist, not with the historical *process* of the achievement of redemption in time. If (*h*) be omitted, the grammar, sequence and intention of the prayer become clearer. The 'example which is from Thee' (*g*) then justifies the petition for communion in (*i*); the allusion to the last supper (*g*) explains 'the oblation' of the church in (*i*). As we shall see, there is a close connection of thought between (*g*) and (*i*) which would make them complementary in any form of the prayer. I conclude, therefore, despite the acknowledged authority of Mr. Ratcliff on the history of the Syrian liturgy, that it is (*h*) which is an interpolation inserted to bring *Addai and Mari* more closely into line with Greek Syrian liturgies; and that (*i*) is an integral part of the prayer in anything like its present form. Some indication of the importance of the point is that with the elimination of (*h*) there disappears the only direct reference in the whole prayer to the passion and resurrection of our Lord.

(*i*) *Prayer for Communion*. The interpretation of this section is technically a somewhat delicate matter. It is natural that those scholars who accept the theory that some petition that God would 'send' the Third Person of the Holy Trinity to 'make' the elements the Body and Blood of Christ<sup>1</sup> was an essential part of every primitive eucharistic prayer, should be disposed to see here only one more example of what they conceive to have been the universal primitive practice. It is equally natural that those scholars who believe such an *epiklesis*-petition to have been a Greek invention of the

<sup>1</sup> I.e. the petition known as the *epiklesis*, exemplified e.g. in *S. James*, *j*<sup>2</sup>, p. 191.

fourth century should be inclined to treat the whole section as a later interpolation intended to bring *Addai and Mari* into line with Greek fourth century developments.

Both ways of regarding it seem rather too simple to fit all the facts of the case. On the one hand, (i) is hardly an *epiklesis* at all, in that it does not actually pray for any sort of conversion of the elements, but for something quite different, namely for *the benefits of communion*. It is in fact a petition for those benefits exactly parallel to the clauses we have already found forming the essential petition of the eucharistic prayer before the doxology in Hippolytus (k) and in Sarapion (e<sup>2</sup>). On the other hand, the terms in which *Addai and Mari* frames this petition are so obviously primitive (and, I would add, so obviously un-Greek), resting as they do upon that Jewish eschatological doctrine which tended to be lost to sight in gentile christianity after the second century, that one must hesitate a good deal to regard (i) as any sort of *late* invention. As regards its later *transference* from somewhere else in the rite to this point, this is a possibility. But we cannot eliminate this section without cutting out of the prayer as a whole every element of petition whatsoever, which is in itself an improbable form for such a prayer to take after the second-third century.

Finally, while I agree that there is no vestige of evidence in any Greek or Latin author outside Syria during the first three centuries that the Holy Ghost was recognised as playing any part whatever in the consecrating of the eucharist (which in that period is invariably ascribed to the Son), there is one Syrian piece of evidence<sup>1</sup> that 'Holy Spirit', in some sense, was recognised as playing some part in the consecration by Syrian churchmen during the third century, if not earlier. *Addai and Mari* is not a Greek or Latin document but a Syriac one, and it is best considered in relation to its own special background of semitic Syrian thought and altogether apart from the ideas of the Greek and Latin churches. We can therefore leave the whole controversy about the Greek *epiklesis* on one side for the moment, and consider this clause of *Addai and Mari* simply in what it says itself—'May there come, O my Lord, Thy Holy Spirit and rest upon this oblation . . . and bless and hallow it that it be to us . . . for the pardon of offences . . . and for the great hope of resurrection from the dead and for new life in the kingdom of heaven . . .' What exactly is the meaning of 'Thy Holy Spirit' here, in a prayer addressed to the Son?

A quotation from the standard work on Jewish theological doctrine, which is remote from all suspicion of partisanship on questions of Christian liturgy, will give us the clue. 'Christians speak of God's being in their churches, and of the presence of the Holy Spirit in their religious assemblies or with the individual in secret prayer, without meaning anything different. In Jewish literature also the "Holy Spirit" frequently occurs in connections in which "the Presence" (*shekinah*) is elsewhere employed

<sup>1</sup> Cf. p. 278.

without any apparent difference of usage . . .<sup>1</sup> There are certain limitations to be observed in this Jewish equating of 'the presence' of God with 'the spirit' of God. But it is clear that in the Old Testament 'the spirit of the Lord' which brings superhuman strength, wisdom, insight, etc., is not intended to represent a personal agent, but a force—in the older stories often almost a physical force. In general 'the spirit of the Lord' is rather a manner of conceiving of God Himself as active in a thing or person, than even a divine attribute. 'The spirit of the Lord' seems to refer particularly to God's presence as *energising* (and is therefore especially connected with the excitement of prophesying); while the much rarer term 'the holy spirit', though equally impersonal, seems to refer to God's presence as 'brooding' or 'resting' on a thing or person, like 'the cloud' of the *shekinah* resting upon the Mercy Seat. Thus in a well-known verse of the fifty-first Psalm, 'Cast me not away from *Thy presence*' is equated with 'Take not *Thy holy spirit* from me'. In the Mishnah there is a tale of a gathering of rabbis at Jamnia, at which a mysterious voice was heard saying, 'There is here a man who is worthy that the holy spirit should rest upon him, but that his generation is not worthy'. The Talmud in telling the same story substitutes 'the presence' (*shekinah*) for 'the holy spirit', apparently with no consciousness that it is making any change. Cases are even known in which different MSS. of the same Jewish work use the terms *shekinah* (presence) and *ruh-haḥodesh* (holy spirit) indifferently in copying the same sentence.

Nor was this conception of 'holy spirit' as virtually meaning the 'presence of God with power' confined to Judaism. Without entering here into obvious cases of its appearance in early Christian writers, it is enough to point out that it was taken up into the usage of the Jews who wrote the Christian New Testament. Thus S. Paul can say of the risen and glorified Lord in heaven now 'energising' on earth through His members, 'The Lord is that Spirit'.<sup>2</sup> And a modern New Testament scholar can sum up a discussion of the Pauline doctrine of the Mystical Body with the words: 'The Spirit is the element or power whereby the glorified Body or Person of Jesus *is present* to us and inflows upon us.'<sup>3</sup>

If we may take it that in the very archaic prayer of *Addai and Mari* the words 'Thy holy spirit' applied to the Son are to be understood as the virtual equivalent of 'Thy presence' or 'the power whereby Thy glorified Body is present to us', in the fashion of the Old and New Testament writers, the whole construction and meaning of the petition become perfectly clear and straightforward. The prayer is addressed to the Son, Who is reminded of His own 'example' given at the last supper. 'May Thy glorified Body or Person come upon this oblation of Thy servants to bless and hallow it that it may be to us *the means of sharing here and now in Thy glorified life*'. Such at least seems to be the only reasonable interpretation

<sup>1</sup> A. F. Moore, *Judaism*, I, p. 437. (Cf. III. n. 167, p. 134.)  
G. M. Farrer in *The Parish Communion*, p. 80 (italics mine).

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. iii. 17.

of the actual things for which the petition as it stands makes request. I venture to think that this is not a 'later' but a very early conception indeed of the results of receiving holy communion, exactly in line with that conception of the whole eucharist as an anticipation of the second coming of our Lord which began to die out in most churches before the end of the third century, or even earlier.

Two small points remain to be noted. First, it may be asked why a petition for the 'coming' of our Lord—the Word—in (*e.g.*) Sarapion should be a later development of the prayer, while in *Addai and Mari* it seems to be an integral part of the structure. Development varied from church to church, but I think we can see one reason in this case in the different form of reference to the last supper in the two prayers. In Sarapion, as in Hippolytus, the quotation of our Lord's words of institution *sufficed to identify* the church's bread and wine with the Body and Blood of our Lord's promise, by their actual recitation—'This bread is the likeness of the Body *because* the Lord Jesus took bread saying . . . This is My Body . . .', as Sarapion puts it. But where, as in *Addai and Mari*, the reference to what took place at the last supper was in the form of a mere allusion, there was needed further verbal expression of the identification of the church's offering with what our Lord Himself had pronounced it to be. This is expressed by *Addai and Mari* in its usual allusive style by the prayer addressed to the Son, 'May there come, O my Lord, Thy presence upon this oblation of Thy servants.' Some such petition would be felt to be necessary in eucharistic prayers upon this particular Syrian model from a very early date, in a way not so pressingly felt where an institution *narrative* could be understood to supply the identification.

Secondly, all that Hippolytus expresses about the nature of the eucharist by calling it the 'priestly ministry' of the church, and Sarapion expresses by calling it a reconciling 'sacrifice' and by 'offering the likeness' of the Body and Blood, is expressed in *Addai and Mari* by the one word, 'this *oblation* of Thy servants', which from the context is clearly the bread and the cup. For all its great differences of form and arrangement *Addai and Mari* witnesses quite sufficiently to the one universal interpretation of the eucharist as sacrifice, even though the hellenistic liturgies have developed this idea more explicitly, as *Addai and Mari* in turn develops other aspects (*e.g.* the second coming) which these leave in the background.

(*j*) *The Doxology*. Here again an attempt has been made to redirect the prayer to the Father, by the insertion of the words 'of Thy Christ'. But we have already learned from (*f*) that 'Thy Name' in which the communicants are 'gathered', and which in (*j*) is 'glorified', is the Name of Jesus, so that the interpolation is obvious. The doxology here is not an ascription of praise to the Three Persons of the Trinity—nothing so theological! It is simply a 'glorifying of the Name' in the old Jewish fashion, and a remark-

ably beautiful one. We may compare it with the very ancient (possibly pre-christian) jewish prayer known as '*Half-Kaddish*' which in the synagogue ritual marks off the close of separate parts of the service: 'Magnified and hallowed be His great Name in the world which He created according to His will. May He establish His Kingdom in your lifetime and in your days, and in the lifetime of all the house of Israel speedily and in a near time. May His great Name be blessed for ever and to all eternity.' In *Addai and Mari* the world *has been* 're-created' by the precious Blood, and the Kingdom *has been* established; the communicants are within it even in this world and they already bless and magnify 'the living and life-giving Name' of Jesus for evermore in 'new life in the kingdom of heaven with' all the saints, for 'the great and marvellous dispensation' of redemption. The eucharist itself is here the direct fulfilment of the old jewish eschatological hope.

*Addai and Mari* is obviously peculiar among eucharistic prayers, both in its subtle allusiveness to so much in the New Testament background of the eucharist which other early prayers leave undeveloped, and in its strange ignoring of elements which they explicitly state. To come upon a eucharistic prayer which from beginning to end in its original form has no mention of God the Father or of the Holy Trinity, of the passion of our Saviour or His resurrection, which does not so much as use the words 'bread' and 'wine' or 'cup', or 'Body' and 'Blood', or speak the Name of 'Jesus' is in itself remarkable. No less unusual is the omission of any explicit mention of 'partaking' or 'communion'. All these things are no doubt latent there and taken for granted; but they are not of the framework of this prayer, as they are of the framework of prayers that have been inspired by the systematic Greek theological tradition. *Addai and Mari* is a eucharistic prayer which is concentrated solely upon the *experience* of the eucharist, to the momentary ignoring of all other elements in christian belief and thought. *Maranatha!* '*Our Lord, come!*' (or perhaps 'has come'), *the ecstatic cry of the first pre-Pauline aramaic-speaking disciples*, is the summary of what it has to say.

These things need to be taken into account in estimating the age of this prayer, for the substance of which the later second or early third century hardly seems too early a date. However that may be, it is obviously archaic enough in form and feeling to be comparable with the prayer of Hippolytus from the opposite end of the christian world and the opposite pole of christian thought. It is not only in their contents that the two prayers form a contrast, so that what each develops and insists upon the other leaves unsaid or barely hinted at. It is in their whole background of thought and genius that they are different. Hippolytus, for all the relics of old jewish form, is thoroughly hellenic in its attempt to frame its statement of the essential meaning of the eucharist in rational relation to the whole christian revelation. *Addai and Mari* is equally semitic in the intensity of its absorp-

tion in the eucharistic experience, and in its concentration upon eschatology to the exclusion of philosophising.

But when one has recognised the great differences not only of structure but of mentality which lie behind them, and which demonstrate their wholly independent history, the underlying agreements are the more striking. One need only refer back to the three points we noted as distinctive of the substance of Hippolytus' prayer to see at once that they are found, perhaps with a different emphasis, but unmistakably the same points, in this wholly different semitic tradition. (1) The institution at the last supper is central in the construction of the prayer, as the *authority* for what the church does in the eucharist. The difference in the fulness of reference between the two prayers does not in the least affect the pivotal nature of the reference in both cases. (2) The essence of the eucharist—what the church does in the eucharist—is the *oblation* of the bread and the cup. This is identified with the Lord's Body and Blood by His own promise and command, to which *Addai and Mari* makes a bare but sufficient allusion in the reference to 'the example which is from Thee.' (3) The whole rite 'recalls' before our Lord, not the last supper, but the redemption He has wrought for mankind, and makes this present and operative by its effects in the communicants.

In *Addai and Mari*, by contrast with Hippolytus, the emphasis is not on the historical process of redemption by the passion and resurrection, but on its eternal results. That is ultimately the great difference of idea between them; and even this idea, which is emphasised in *Addai and Mari*, is found in a subordinate position in Hippolytus (*e*).

#### *The Liturgy of S. James*

We have already spoken of the history of this rite, of which the present text both in Greek and Syriac descends from an Antiochene (? early fifth century) edition and expansion of the fourth century rite of Jerusalem. This older Jerusalem form is known to us only from the account of it given by S. Cyril of Jerusalem to the newly confirmed, who had just attended it for the first time, in Easter week A.D. 348. The Greek *S. James* will be cited as Jg and the Syriac as Js, and the summary by S. Cyril as C. In the original the passages of C which we reproduce here are absolutely continuous (*Catechesis*, xxiii. 5-11), though they have to be broken up here in order to relate them to the text of Jg and Js, which has been expanded after S. Cyril's time. Jg and Js have been revised independently of each other, now one, now the other representing a better text. I follow as a rule Jg, for convenience, noting only some of the variants of Js. Words between † . . . † are not in Js. Matter underlined in Jg is derived from C.



*Jg (and Js)*

*Preface and Sanctus. (a)*

*People: It is meet and right.*

*Priest: Truly is it meet and right, fitting and our bounden duty to praise Thee, to hymn Thee, to bless Thee, to worship Thee, to glorify Thee, to give thanks unto Thee, Maker of all things visible and invisible, †the treasury of eternal good, the source of life and immortality, the God and Lord of all, † Whom the heavens praise and the heaven of heavens and all the power thereof, the sun and moon and all the choir of the stars, earth, sea and all that in them is, †the assembly of the heavenly Jerusalem, the church of the first-born whose names are written in the heavens, the spirits of the righteous and prophets, the souls of the martyrs and apostles, † angels, archangels, thrones, dominations, principalities, virtues—dread powers, Cherubim with many eyes and the six-winged Seraphim who with two wings cover their faces and with two their feet and with two they fly, and cry one to the other with ceaseless voices and unsilenced praising the hymn of victory of Thine excellent glory, with clear voice singing and shouting, glorifying and crying and saying:*

*People: Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth*

Full is the heaven and the earth of Thy glory.

Hosanna in the highest.

Blessed is He that [*Js adds came and*] cometh in the Name of the Lord!

Hosanna in the highest.

*C xxiii. 5-6*

5. 'Next you say, It is meet and right. For when we make eucharist (*i.e.* give thanks) we do a thing which is meet and right. For He doing not what was meet but above what was meet gave us free benefits and made us worthy of such good things.

6. 'Then we make mention of the heaven and the earth and the sea, of the sun and moon, the stars and all creation rational and irrational, visible and invisible; angels, archangels, powers, principalities, virtues, dominations, thrones, cherubim with many faces, as though we said with David 'O magnify the Lord with me' [Ps. xxxiv. 3]. We also make mention of the Seraphim, whom Isaiah in the Holy Spirit saw standing around the throne of God, with two wings covering the Face [*i.e. of God*] and with two the Feet and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth. For therefore do we say this praise of God which we have been taught by the Seraphim, that we may become partakers in the praises of the armies of the heavens.'

*Address. (b) Priest:* Holy art Thou, O King of the ages and Lord and giver of all holiness; and holy is Thine only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, by Whom Thou madest all things; and holy is Thine all-holy Spirit, Who searcheth all things, even the deep things of God;

*Memorial of Creation. (c)* Holy art Thou, ruler of all things, almighty, good, awful, merciful, most chiefly shewing pity for the work of Thy hands, Who didst make man from the earth in Thine own image and likeness,

*Memorial of Fall and O.T. (d)* Who didst bestow freely upon him the delight of paradise, and when he transgressed Thy command and fell from thence, Thou didst not despise nor forsake him in Thy goodness, but didst chasten him as a merciful father; Thou didst call him by the law and instruct him by the prophets;

*Memorial of Incarnation. (e)* Lastly Thou didst send Thine only-begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ into the world that He might by His coming renew and raise up Thine image (in mankind). Who coming down from heaven and being incarnate of (the) Holy Ghost and Mary the Virgin Mother of God, lived among men and wrought all things for the salvation of our race.

*of Passion. (f)* And being about to accept His willing and life-giving death by the cross, sinless on behalf of us sinners,

*of Institution. (g)* In that night in which He was betrayed, or rather gave Himself up for the life and salvation of the world, took the bread into His holy and undefiled and blameless and immortal hands, and looking up to heaven and showing it to Thee His God and Father, gave thanks and hallowed and broke and gave it to His holy disciples and apostles, saying:

[*The deacons exclaim:* For the remission of sins and for life eternal]

Take, eat; This is My Body Which is broken for you and given for the remission of sins.

[*The people:* Amen.]

Likewise after supper He took the cup and mixed it of wine and water, and looked up to heaven, and showed it to Thee His God and Father, and gave thanks and hallowed and blessed and filled it with holy spirit and gave to His holy and blessed disciples saying:

Drink ye all of it: This is My Blood of the New Covenant Which is shed for you and for many and given [*lit.* shared out] for the remission of sins.

[*The people:* Amen.]

Do this for My *anamnesis* ; for as oft as ye do eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do proclaim the death of the Son of Man and confess His resurrection till He come.

[*The deacons:* We believe and confess.

*The people:* Thy death, Lord, we proclaim and Thy resurrection we confess.]

*Anamnesis.* (*h*) <sup>1</sup>And we sinners making the *anamnesis* of His life-giving sufferings, His †saving cross and † death and †burial and † resurrection on the third day from the dead and session at the right hand of Thee, His God and Father, and His second glorious and fearful coming, when He shall come to judge the living and the dead, when He shall reward every man according to his works—spare us, O Lord, our God—or rather according to His own pitifulness,

*First Offering of Sacrifice and Prayer for Communion.* (*i*) we offer unto Thee, O Lord, this fearful and unbloody sacrifice, beseeching Thee that Thou deal not with

<sup>1</sup> Js has in this passage 'Making the *anamnesis* therefore O Lord of Thy death and Thy resurrection on the third day from the dead', and so addresses the prayer to the Second, not the First Person of the Trinity, down to the beginning of (*j*<sup>1</sup>).

us after our sins nor reward us after our iniquities, but according to Thy leniency and Thine unspeakable love towards mankind overlook and blot out the handwriting that is against us Thy suppliants; and of Thy free grace bestow on us Thy heavenly and eternal gifts that eye hath not seen nor ear hath heard nor hath entered into the heart of man (to conceive), but which Thou hast prepared, O God, for them that love Thee; †and cast not away Thy people because of me and my sins, O Lord Thou lover of men†; for Thy people and Thy church entreat Thee.

[*The people:* Have mercy upon us, O Lord God the Father almighty.]

*1st Invocation.* (*j*<sup>1</sup>) Have mercy upon us, O God almighty, †have mercy upon us, O God our Saviour, have mercy upon us, O God, after Thy great mercy† and send forth upon us and upon these gifts that lie before Thee Thine all-holy Spirit, the Lord and life-giver; that shareth Thy throne with Thee, O God and Father, and with Thine only-begotten Son; that reigneth with Thee, of one substance and co-eternal; that spake in the law and in the prophets and Thy New Testament; that came down in the likeness of a dove upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the river Jordan and remained upon Him; that came down upon Thine holy apostles in the likeness of fiery tongues †in the upper room of the holy and glorious Sion in the day of holy Pentecost.†

*2nd Invocation.* (*j*<sup>2</sup>) Send down, O Lord, upon us and upon these gifts that lie before Thee Thy self-same Spirit the all-holy that hovering with His holy and good and glorious coming He may hallow and make this bread the holy Body of

*C xxiii. 7-11*

7. 'Next, having sanctified ourselves with these spiritual hymns, we entreat God that loveth mankind to send forth the Holy Spirit upon the gifts that lie before (Him)—[*The Holy Ghost elsewhere in C is described as: 'Who came down upon the Lord Jesus Christ in the likeness of a dove, Who energised in the law and the prophets' (Cat. iv. 16); and as: 'The Holy Ghost, Who spake in the prophets, and at Pentecost came down upon the apostles in the likeness of fiery tongues here in Jerusalem in the church of the apostles on the hill' (Cat. xvi. 4).*]

—that He may make the bread the Body of Christ, and the wine the Blood of Christ.

Christ [*The people: Amen.*] and this cup  
the precious Blood of Christ [*The people:*  
*Amen.*]

2nd *Prayer for Communion.* (*k*) that they may be unto all that partake of them for the forgiveness of sins and for eternal life, unto the hallowing of souls and bodies, unto fruitfulness in good works, unto the establishment of Thy holy catholic and apostolic church which Thou hast founded upon the rock of the faith that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, delivering it from all heresy and scandals of them that work iniquity, preserving it until the end of time;

2nd *Offering of Sacrifice.* (*l*) We offer unto Thee, O Lord [*Js adds:*] this same fearful and unbloody sacrifice

*Intercessions.* (*m*<sup>1</sup>) on behalf of Thy holy places, which Thou hast glorified by the epiphany of Thy Christ and the visitation of Thine all-holy Spirit, and chiefly for the holy and glorious Sion the mother of all churches, and for Thy holy catholic and apostolic church throughout all the world; do Thou now bestow upon her, O Lord, the rich gifts of Thine all-holy Spirit.

(*m*<sup>2</sup>) Remember, O Lord, especially within her our holy fathers and bishops throughout the world, rightly dividing in orthodoxy the word of Thy truth.

(*m*<sup>3</sup>) Remember, O Lord, according to the abundance of Thy mercy and Thy pity me also Thy humble and unprofitable servant and the deacons that stand around Thy holy altar and grant unto them a blameless life, preserve unblemished their diaconate and make them worthy of a good degree.

(*m*<sup>4</sup>) Remember, O Lord, the holy and royal city of God (*i.e.* Antioch) and

For whatever comes in contact with the Holy Ghost is hallowed and transformed.

8. Next, after the completion of the spiritual sacrifice, the unbloody worship,

over this sacrifice of propitiation we entreat God for the common peace of the churches;

for the good ordering of the world;

every city and region and them of the orthodox faith that dwell therein, <remember> their peace and safety.

(*m*<sup>5</sup>) Remember, O Lord, our most pious and Christ-loving emperors, the pious and Christ-loving empress, all their servants and armies, and <grant them> help and victory from heaven; lay hold upon shield and buckler and stand up to help them [*Jg adds from the Byzantine rite: †subdue unto them all the warlike and savage peoples that delight in war; convert their minds, that we may pass a peaceable and quiet life in all piety and godliness.*]

(*m*<sup>6</sup>) Remember, O Lord, them that travel by sea and by land, and christians that sojourn in strange countries; those of our fathers and brethren that are in bondage and in prisons, in captivity or exile, in the mines, in torture or in bitter slavery†]—

(*m*<sup>7</sup>) Remember, O Lord, them that are diseased and sick and them that are possessed by evil spirits and speedily help and deliver them, O God.

(*m*<sup>8</sup>) Remember, O Lord, every christian soul that is afflicted and distressed, and that needeth Thy mercy and help, O God; and convert them that are in error.

(*m*<sup>9</sup>) †Remember, O Lord, those of our fathers and brethren that labour, and serve us for Thy holy Name's sake.

Remember, O Lord, all men for good, have mercy upon all, O Lord, and be reconciled unto us all.†

[*Jg here inserts a Byzantine interpolation, and then resumes its own text with:*]

(*m*<sup>10</sup>) Vouchsafe also to remember, O Lord, all them that have been pleasing unto Thee from the beginning of time in

for the emperors; for the army and the allies;

for them that are sick;

for them that are afflicted; and, in a word, for all that are in need of help we all ought to offer this sacrifice.

9. Next, we call to remembrance all them that have fallen asleep before us; and

their several generations, our holy fathers, the patriarchs and prophets, apostles and martyrs

(*m*<sup>10a</sup>) [*The following passage is introduced from the Byzantine liturgy*] confessors and holy teachers, and every righteous soul perfected in the faith of Thy Christ. (*The following is not Byzantine, but interpolated:*) Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, because thou didst bring forth the Saviour of our souls.

(*Byzantine:*) Chiefly our all-holy, undefiled and blessed-above-all, the ever-virgin Lady Mary the Mother of God; saint John, the glorious prophet forerunner and baptist—(*The following is not Byzantine, but is not found in Js, and is taken from the Jerusalem diptychs*) †the holy apostles Peter and Paul, Andrew, James, John, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Thaddaeus, Matthew, James, Simon, Jude, Matthias; Mark and Luke the evangelists; the holy prophets, patriarchs and righteous; saint Stephen, first of deacons and first of martyrs; and all Thy holy saints from the foundation of the world. † (*The original text of Jg resumes thus:*—)

(*m*<sup>10</sup> *continued*) not that we are worthy to make mention of their blessedness, but that they too, standing beside Thy fearful and dreadful judgment seat may in their turn make mention of our wretchedness, and we may find grace and mercy before Thee, O Lord, for succour in our time of need.

(*m*<sup>11</sup>) [*Js only*] Remember also, O Lord, our holy bishops who have gone to their rest aforetime, who interpreted for us the word of truth, who from James the

first the patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs,

that God by their prayers and intercessions would receive our supplications.

Next, also for our holy fathers and bishops that have fallen asleep before us

archbishop and apostle and martyr even to this day have preached to us the orthodox word of truth in Thine holy church . .

[*Jg and Js*] Remember, also, O Lord the God of the spirits of all flesh, them that we remembered and them we have not remembered of the orthodox †from righteous Abel unto this very day.† Do Thou Thyself refresh them †in the land of the living, in Thy kingdom, in the joy of paradise† in the bosoms of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob our holy fathers, whence pain and grief and tribulation have fled away, where the light of Thy countenance surveyeth all things and shineth perpetually.

(*m*<sup>12</sup>) [*Jg only, Byzantine*: †And grant us to make a christian end and to please Thee, and direct our lives without sin and in peace, O Lord, Lord; and gather us together under the feet of Thine elect when Thou wilt and as Thou wilt, only that it be without shame and without iniquity.†]

*Prayer for Pardon. (n)* Through Thy only-begotten Son, our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ; for He alone has appeared upon earth without sin, through Whom both to us and to them in Thy goodness and love of mankind.

[*The people*: remit, forgive, pardon, O God, our offences, voluntary and involuntary, those we know and those we know not of,] by the grace and pitifulness and love of mankind of Thy only-begotten Son;

and in a word of all who have fallen asleep among us, believing that this is the greatest aid to their souls, for whom the entreaty is made in the presence of the holy and most dread sacrifice.

10. And I want to convince you of this by an example. For I know many people say: If a man leave this world in sin, what is the good of remembering him in the prayer? But, truly, if a king were to banish men with whom he was angry, and then those who were not like them were to make a crown and offer it to him on behalf of those who were being punished, would he not grant them some relaxation of the punishment? In the same way, we offering prayers to God for the dead, though they were sinners, do not make a crown, but we offer Christ sacrificed for our sins, propitiating God that loveth mankind on their behalf as well as on our own.



*Doxology.* (o) With Whom blessed be Thou and glorified with Thine all-holy and good and life-giving Spirit, now and for ever and world without end. [*The people: Amen.*]

[*Js substitutes this doxology:* that in this as in all things Thine all-honoured and blessed Name may be glorified and magnified, with the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ and Thine Holy Spirit, now and ever and world without end—*which is a 'glorifying of the Name'*. Cf. *Addai and Mari* p. 180.]

(p) *Priest:* Make us worthy, O Lord that lovest mankind, with freedom and without condemnation, with a clean heart, with soul enlightened and with unashamed face and holy lips, to dare to call upon Thee, our holy God and Father in heaven and to say: Our Father . . .

11. Next, after these things we say that prayer which the Saviour taught His own disciples, and with a clean conscience we call upon God our Father, saying, Our Father . . .

After our discussion of the contents of the prayers previously considered there is no need to comment closely on *S. James*. The reader will be able to see for himself just how fully and yet how independently (g) (h) and (i) in *S. James* once more illustrate those three points which we originally noted from the prayer of Hippolytus as containing the essential statement of the meaning of the whole eucharistic action.

But this is in *S. James* as it is given here, which is substantially a fifth century edition. There are obviously problems concerning the relation of this to (1) the summary of the rite of Jerusalem given by S. Cyril in his *Catecheses*, c. A.D. 350, and (2) the old fourth century rite of Antioch. A full discussion of these problems would involve entering into technical questions of the greatest interest to a specialist but not essential to the purposes of the general reader, and involving many complications. It seems better therefore only to point out quite cursorily some indications of the history underlying the present text of *S. James*.

#### *The Rite of Jerusalem in the Fourth Century*

S. Cyril's summary of the eucharistic prayer opens with a preface of which the greater part is recognisable in *S. James* (a), taken over verbally into its text. There is a curious detail, however, in Cyril's phrasing which is *not* taken over by *S. James*, but which suggests that the Jerusalem pre-

face was originally borrowed from the Egyptian tradition of Alexandria (where the use of the preface and sanctus was probably first developed). The third century Alexandrian writer Origen in treating of the two seraphim in Isaiah vi., in close connection with the eucharistic preface and sanctus, makes it clear that he interprets Isaiah vi. 2 as meaning that the two seraphim 'had each six wings; with twain he covered the Face of God and with twain he covered the Feet of God and with twain the seraph (itself) did fly'.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly we find the seraphim in Sarapion's preface (Sar. b<sup>1</sup>), 'With two wings covering the Face' (*to prosōpon*), i.e. of God. By the time of S. Athanasius the Alexandrian church had altered this to the usual later form, 'their faces' (*ta prosōpa*), as we find in the text of *S. James*, and as is attested at Antioch in the later fourth century by S. Chrysostom.<sup>2</sup> But Cyril of Jerusalem, like Sarapion, still keeps to the third century Egyptian interpretation, a sign of the quarter from which the Jerusalem rite had originally borrowed the use of the preface and sanctus.

After the sanctus comes the great puzzle in Cyril's account of his eucharistic prayer. 'Next (*eita*), having sanctified ourselves with these spiritual hymns (i.e. the sanctus), we entreat God to send forth the Holy Spirit . . .' Is it really possible that in the Jerusalem rite the invocation of the Spirit followed *immediately* after the sanctus, with no thanksgiving for creation, incarnation and passion, no narrative of the institution or *anamnesis* clause, or anything else, between? That is what he appears to say, but the statement has appeared so improbable to successive commentators and liturgists that they have all tried hard to make him say something else. So, e.g., Brightman:<sup>3</sup> Cyril 'is only expounding the salient points of the rite, and for the purposes of his exposition the whole passage between the sanctus and the intercession would be a single paragraph with the form of invocation for its essential point.' He then goes on to try to find passages elsewhere in Cyril's writings which 'may be assumed to represent the contents of the (missing) paragraph.'

I confess I am sceptical of such methods of dealing with a writer who elsewhere shews himself so faithful a summariser. Brightman fails to find a single phrase other than scriptural quotations common to Cyril and that part of the text of *S. James* which we here label (*b-i*). One observes, too, that 'next' (*eita*) is one of Cyril's habitual transitions, and that it invariably means with him what it says—'next'. Thus (xxiii. 4 and 5), after commenting on 'Lift up your hearts' and 'We have them with the Lord', Cyril says, 'Next, the priest says "Let us give thanks unto the Lord" . . .' (and after a comment on this) . . . 'Next, you say "It is meet and right".' So in his account of the eucharistic prayer (*p.* 192), 'Next, after the completion of the . . . sacrifice, we entreat etc. . .', where the intercessions do actually come 'next' in the text of *S. James*. 'Next we call to remembrance all them

<sup>1</sup> Origen, *de Principiis*, iv. 3. 14.

<sup>2</sup> L. E. W., p. 469.

<sup>3</sup> *de Poenitentia*, ix. 1.

that have fallen asleep', where there is good evidence that the clause commemorating the saints did come 'next' to the petition 'for all that are in need'; and so on. Everywhere else in *Catechesis* xxiii. when Cyril seems to omit even a few words of the rite from his commentary he appears to insert not 'next' (*eita*) but 'after this' (*meta tauta*) before resuming his summary. I find it difficult to assume that in this one case by 'next' Cyril meant 'After a great part of the prayer has been said.' And if he did mean that, why associate the invocation so closely with the sanctus: 'Next, *having sanctified ourselves with these spiritual hymns*, we call upon God, etc. . . .?' He is going through the contents of the prayer for the benefit of those who have just attended the eucharist for the first time in their lives, for whom such skipping about would be quite unnecessarily confusing. On the whole it seems much more likely that Cyril means what he says, and that the invocation in the fourth century Jerusalem rite followed immediately upon the sanctus, however unexpected such an arrangement may be to us, with our modern presuppositions as to the 'proper' arrangement of a consecration prayer.

This invocation is of a type we have not hitherto met. There is no room here for the old Syrian equivalence of 'spirit' with 'presence'. What is intended is unmistakably a prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Holy Trinity, as at Pentecost. Whether the elaboration on the office of the Holy Ghost now found in (*j*<sup>1</sup>) of *S. James* stood in Cyril's rite or not,<sup>1</sup> his sixteenth and eighteenth *Catecheses* make it clear that he held the doctrine of the full Personality and Godhead of the Holy Ghost with a precision and clarity not very common among his contemporaries. (The Godhead and consubstantiality of the Third Person of the Trinity were authoritatively promulgated only in A.D. 381 by the Council of Constantinople, after more than a generation of controversy and confusion on the matter.)

Not only is the invocation itself in Cyril given a precision of address which is lacking in that of *Addai and Mari* (*i*), but the petition which follows in Cyril—'that He may *make the bread the Body of Christ*,' etc.—has been given a different turn to that of the old Syrian invocation in *Addai and Mari*, 'that He may bless and hallow it, that it may be to us for the pardon of offences', etc., which is really a prayer for the *benefits* of communion. That of Cyril is a prayer for the *means* of communion. In Cyril a new idea, that of the 'transformation' or 'conversion' of the elements, finds clear liturgical expression.

This is not wholly a revolution. Second century writers like Justin, Irenaeus and Hippolytus could write that 'the food which has been made eucharist is the Flesh and Blood of that Jesus Who was made Flesh';<sup>2</sup> the

<sup>1</sup> I should suggest that it did not. The passages from his fourth and sixteenth *Catecheses*, which offer somewhat similar material, could quite as well be due to an independent use of scripture as to reminiscences of liturgical phraseology.

<sup>2</sup> Justin, *Ap.* I. 66.

reserved sacrament 'is the Body of Christ',<sup>1</sup> 'the cup and the bread receive the Word of God and *become* the Body and Blood of Christ'.<sup>2</sup> But there is a real step, even if it be an inevitable one at some point or another, from such language to the formulation of a theological theory as to *how* the identification of bread with Body, wine with Blood comes to be—a theory about 'the effects of consecration'. And that step is taken for the first time in the fourth century, and among extant writers for the first time explicitly by S. Cyril of Jerusalem.

It is true that the idea of such a petition is at least half developed in the eucharistic prayer of his older contemporary, Sarapion: 'O God of truth, let Thy holy Word come upon this bread *that the bread may become* Body of the Word . . .' The idea of the necessity or desirability of such a petition was 'in the air', as we say, in the first half of the fourth century, perhaps in some circles in the third century. But Sarapion's language is still linked with older ideas (*cf.* Irenaeus, 'The cup and the bread receive the *Word* of God'). This is, one might say, the product of 'popular' rather than 'scientific' theological reflection upon the mystery of the eucharist—that the Word Himself, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, Whom the communicant receives in communion, should be invoked to 'come upon' the elements (in some sense), as He took to Himself the Body formed in the womb of Mary. But Cyril gives clear-cut expression in his liturgy to a different theological theory, which is more evidently a product of the schools: 'to send forth the Holy Spirit that He may make the bread the Body of Christ . . . for whatsoever comes in contact with the Holy Spirit is hallowed and transformed.' After that the way is clear, on the one hand for the development of the idea of a 'moment of consecration', and for the Eastern identification of that 'moment' with the invocation—in Cyril's rite no other possibility could suggest itself—and on the other for a clearer definition of doctrines of 'conversion' or 'transformation' of the elements, issuing ultimately, by a process of selection, in a particular metaphysical explanation—transubstantiation.

After the invocation Cyril's rite appears to 'complete the sacrifice' (in his own phrase) by an act of offering, as found in the text of *S. James (I)*. It then proceeds to the intercessions, on the ground that 'this is the greatest aid to their souls, for whom the entreaty is made *in the presence of the holy and most dread sacrifice*.' Once more here is a novelty, or rather two novelties. The idea of the special efficacy of prayer in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament (developed long afterwards in the Teutonic countries of the West in such practices as 'Exposition') is here revealed as an originally Eastern notion. So far as I know nothing similar had been said by any author before Cyril. From at least the later second century it had been customary everywhere to offer the sacrifice for particular objects, but the

<sup>1</sup> Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.*, xxxii. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* iv. 18. 4.

matter had not been further defined. Once again there is not exactly anything wholly revolutionary in what Cyril says, but again there is a logical and (to my mind) a theological step in the process of developing an accepted practice into a theological theory. And again Cyril is the first whom we know to have taken that step.

The other novelty lies in the use of the word 'most dread' (*phrikodestatos* = literally, 'what makes one's hair stand on end') of the consecrated sacrament. This 'language of fear', which Cyril uses in one or two other places, is unexampled in any previous writer treating of the eucharist. Scrupulous care against accidents to the sacrament had been insisted on by earlier writers;<sup>1</sup> they emphasise on occasion that we should 'fear' to make an unworthy communion.<sup>2</sup> But they suggest nothing corresponding to 'fear' or 'dread' of the consecrated sacrament as such. This idea of the 'awfulness' of the sacrament, however, soon became a commonplace with Syrian writers (notably Chrysostom) from whom it passed into the Eastern liturgies, though it never took much hold in the West. Again Cyril stands out as the representative of an innovation destined to a long future, not wholly out of connection with the past, but distinctly something new. When we add that Cyril is the first writer to mention the commemoration of saints in the eucharistic prayer (and he has a theological theory about that, too) we begin to understand the sort of man and the sort of rite in the sort of church we are dealing with. The church of Jerusalem in the fourth century is 'very advanced' and S. Cyril is 'a very extreme man', with no overwhelming reverence for old-fashioned churchmanship.

Is such a prayer as his summary seems to describe—preface and sanctus, followed at once by a consecratory invocation, offering, intercessions and Lord's prayer—a possibility? Or must we believe with the older liturgists that Cyril's summary omits without trace half the contents of his eucharistic prayer? The reader has the whole of the textual evidence before him. For my own part I believe that he means what he says and has adequately described the whole of his rite.

If so, can we see how such a rite, of so unexpected a form, could come into existence? What has happened to the old 'thanksgiving' section which opened the traditional form of the prayer in other churches?

We have already seen that the introduction of the preface and sanctus from Alexandria had in effect destroyed the 'thanksgiving' opening in Sarapion's prayer at Thmuis. The introduction of the preface and sanctus has done the same thing in the present Roman canon. Sarapion's prayer has filled up its place with its theological hymn (*a*<sup>1</sup> and *a*<sup>2</sup>) and its prayer about 'the living sacrifice' (*c*). It seems entirely possible that the introduction of the Alexandrian preface and sanctus at Jerusalem should have had

<sup>1</sup> Tertullian, *de Corona* 3; Hippolytus, *Ap. Trad.* xxxii. 2, 3; Origen, in *Exod. Hom.*, xiii. 3.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Origen in *Psalms xxxvii*; *Hom.*, ii. 6.

the same sort of result as at Thmuis, but that there the gap was not filled up at all, as it was not filled up at Rome.

But, it may be said, at Thmuis and at Rome the disuse of the 'thanksgiving' section still left intact the institution-narrative and what followed. Why are these missing, along with the 'thanksgiving', at Jerusalem? There was in any case no stereotyped line of development in the different churches in the course of such changes; but a particular answer suggests itself in this case. At Rome and Thmuis the reference to the last supper formed a considerable part of the prayer—a *narrative*. In Syria, if *Addai and Mari* be any guide, it was a mere *allusion* to the last supper, which, however pivotal in the structure of the prayer, was from the first supplemented with some sort of petition. Such an allusion *could* be dropped more easily than a full narrative in the course of an extensive alteration of the traditional prayer, provided that the petition to which it pointed was retained and elaborated in such a way so as to include somehow the allusion to the last supper.

This seems to be roughly what has happened at Jerusalem. If we look back at *Addai and Mari* for a moment (*p.* 179), after the allusion to the last supper as 'the example', there comes the petition (*i*) for 'holy spirit' (*i.e.* 'presence') with the 'offering' of the elements (in the phrase 'this oblation of thy servants'). This issues into the petition 'to bless and hallow it', developing into a prayer for the benefits of communion ('that it may be to us for the pardon of offences,' etc.). If we look at Cyril's rite now, it seems that the invocation has been rephrased so as to include *the force of both* the reference to the last supper *and* the vague invocation of 'holy spirit' on 'the oblation'. The change of the petition from 'bless and hallow it that it may be to us for the forgiveness of sins and eternal life', to the exact theological notion 'that the Holy Ghost may make the bread the Body of Christ' etc. does recall the last supper by its terms (bread, Body, wine, Blood) in a way that the petition in *Addai and Mari* (*i*) fails to do. The offering of the sacrifice in the brief phrase of *Addai and Mari*, 'this oblation', has been made more explicit in Cyril; and the prayer for the communicants has become Cyril's unprecedentedly developed intercessions.

I feel bound to point out that the last three paragraphs are in themselves mere speculation, as no other page in this book is speculative. Yet I think it may be claimed that these are 'scientific' speculations about facts, in the sense that though we are not able to make a connection between *ascertained* earlier facts about the third century rite of Jerusalem (of which nothing is known) and the account of it given by S. Cyril, we have to relate Cyril's rite, unusual as it appears at first sight, quite closely to the general Syrian liturgical background. If his terminology be closely examined, it will be recognised, I think, by anyone methodically acquainted with the development of such things, that it is unmistakably post-Nicene in its key-words. This means that it is in large part a product of some revision not more than twenty years before Cyril commented upon it for the catechumens in

A.D. 348. Though each separate item has been equipped with a basis of an up-to-date theological theory, which has largely dictated the actual form of each item in the revised prayer, it would not be quite fair to describe the fourth century rite of Jerusalem as a mere collection of the latest ideas from all over the place, put together into a liturgy without any regard whatever for local tradition. Things did not happen quite in that way in the church before the sixteenth century. For all its superficially novel form, the Jerusalem liturgy is still integrally related to earlier Syrian tradition as this is exemplified by *Addai and Mari*. (In saying this I do not mean to suggest that *Addai and Mari* as such was in use at Jerusalem in the third century, but merely that something on the same lines may be taken as by far the most probable form of the earlier Jerusalem use.) In Cyril the old semitic eschatological tradition of the Syrian eucharistic prayer has been hellenised and 'theologised' and transformed, with an obvious desire to be up-to-date and correct. But it is still fundamentally Syrian even in the form in which he describes it. The great influence which the rite of Jerusalem was destined to exert directly and indirectly on all the Eastern rites (and even on some Western ones) during and after the fourth century renders this a fact of outstanding importance.

How far does Cyril's rite still conform to those basic ideas which so far we have found reproduced so faithfully but in such various ways by the prayers we have studied? There is one difference which stands out—the prayer has been given an entirely new pivot instead of any reference to the last supper—the invocation. But even here the elaboration of its terms to include the words 'bread', 'Body', 'wine', 'Blood', does something to restore the loss. Yet this seemed to other Eastern churches which adopted the Jerusalem form of invocation insufficient to satisfy the traditional sense of the necessity of some clearer allusion to the last supper. We shall find in a moment *S. James* supplying an institution-narrative from another source, and this is typical of all the Eastern rites which adopted this peculiar Jerusalem form of invocation. In Cyril's rite there was no option but to regard the invocation as the 'moment of consecration', an idea which was coming in during the fourth century in the East. Elsewhere, by retaining the old institution-narrative or allusion alongside the newly adopted 'consecratory invocation', the Eastern rites laid the foundation of that liturgical and theological duality (not to say confusion) in their theory of the consecration and the eucharistic prayer, which all the efforts of their theologians from Chrysostom to Cabasilas and Mark of Ephesus have never quite succeeded in explaining, or explaining away. It has its roots not in theological theory but in liturgical history.

As regards the other two points, the eucharist is still explicitly something 'offered' to God, though it is no longer stated to be 'the bread and the cup' which the church offers, but 'this fearful and unbloody sacrifice'. It is not easy to say whether the rite is regarded more particularly as the representa-

tion of the last supper or of Calvary, because all explicit mention of either event is lacking throughout the whole prayer—a survival of the same sort of Syrian ‘allusiveness’ as we have found in *Addai and Mari*. If the terms of the invocation recall the last supper, the phrase at the end of the intercessions, ‘we offer Christ immolated for our sins, propitiating God . . .’, recalls the sacrifice of the Cross. But there is nothing here corresponding to the explicitness of the *anamnesis* of Christ’s death and resurrection in the prayer of Hippolytus, or of the ‘likeness of His death’ in Sarapion.

But the most important difference between the Roman and Egyptian prayers and those of Syria lies in the absence from the latter of all mention of ‘partaking’, of actually receiving holy communion. *Addai and Mari* shares this omission with Cyril, but at least in *Addai and Mari* there is a prayer for the benefits of communion in its invocation petition (*i*). Even this has gone from the Jerusalem rite, in the elaboration of its invocation to include the reference to the last supper. No doubt the idea of receiving communion is there in the background, and the practice is presupposed for all present at the liturgy, as Cyril himself makes clear.<sup>1</sup> But this does not alter the fact that the idea of communicating has been ousted from all explicit mention in the eucharistic prayer by the one-sided emphasis on the offering of the sacrifice for various objects, whereby ‘we offer Christ immolated for our sins, propitiating God for them as well as for ourselves’ (xxiii. 7). This is the key-phrase of Cyril’s commentary. A Western massing priest a thousand years later might have been more familiar with this terminology of the fourth century Eastern father than were his own third century predecessors. Again there is here something which one cannot exactly call a revolution. One can parallel both halves of this statement in substance—separately—in the third and even in the second century. But once more Cyril has taken a logical and probably a theological step in advance, not only in combining them, but in framing his exposition of the eucharistic action *exclusively* in terms of this thought-out theological theory of sacrifice, with no adequate mention of the theology of communion. One can see where things are going along this line—straight to the non-communicant eucharistic piety of the Byzantines and of the later middle ages in the Western church.

To sum up S. Cyril’s liturgy, its ideas are still connected with those of the pre-Nicene past in more than one way, but they are no longer identical with them. They are, however, quite representative of new developments which would carry very great weight in the later fourth and fifth centuries, the period which was decisive in the formulation of later liturgical tradition.



*The Rite of Antioch in the Fourth Century*

This must be very summarily treated here because a thorough discussion would involve complicated textual questions concerning the relation of *S. James* to the liturgy of *S. Basil*, which is not in question in this chapter. It would also require detailed textual comparisons with certain passages in the Antiochene writings of S. John Chrysostom (c. A.D. 370-397) and other evidence. But a number of points can be briefly indicated.

*S. James (a)*. In this preface section of *S. James* everything seems to be satisfactorily accounted for by the text of the Jerusalem preface in Cyril until we reach the words 'with ceaseless voices and unsilenced praisings the hymn of victory' which are not represented in Cyril. It is at least worth noting that these particular phrases are cited from the liturgical preface at Antioch by S. John Chrysostom before *S. James* had been adopted there.<sup>1</sup>

*(b-c)*. These sections are not cast quite in the form of a 'thanksgiving', but rather of a brief review of sacred history. It would be difficult to give the 'thanksgiving' form directly to a narrative which included the Fall. But a mention of Eden and the Fall and the O.T. dispensation generally in this part of the prayer appears to be an Antiochene peculiarity; it is found only in liturgies which derive from the Antiochene tradition.<sup>2</sup> It is again worthy of notice that a similar mention of Eden and the Fall and the Law and the Prophets in this part of the eucharistic prayer is found in Chrysostom's Antiochene writings.<sup>3</sup>

There is a relationship between *S. James (b-c)* and the equivalent parts of the liturgy of *S. Basil*, which is not close enough to describe as 'borrowing' on either side but which is nevertheless unmistakable in places. It might well be accounted for by their being independent versions of the same original tradition.

*S. James (f, g, h)*. But this relation is different when we come to the institution-narrative and *anamnesis* section of *S. James*. There (after a momentary divergence in *f*) the texts of *S. James* and *S. Basil* are identical, except for the most trifling verbal changes. One rite has directly borrowed off the other, and it appears to be *S. James* which is dependent on *S. Basil*. A full institution-narrative was certainly already to be found in the Antiochene rite in the time of Chrysostom, who attributes to it a central importance in the rite.<sup>4</sup> So far as they go, his quotations agree with the present institution-narrative of *S. James (g)*, but this could be due to a common use of 1 Cor. xi. as the basis of the account. There seems to be no trace of an *anamnesis* section in Chrysostom, and all account of an *anamnesis* is

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the evidence collected in Brightman, L. E. W., p. 479, ll. 46 sq.

<sup>2</sup> Its appearance in the mediaeval text of the Alexandrian liturgy of *S. Mark* is due to a later (? sixth century) revision. It does not appear in the fourth-fifth century text of *S. Mark* found in the Strassburg Papyrus No. 254.

<sup>3</sup> Brightman, *op. cit.* p. 479, ll. 22 sq.

<sup>4</sup> Brightman, *op. cit.* p. 479, ll. 50 sq.

missing from the verbose description of the rite of Mopsuestia (of Antiochene type) by his contemporary Theodore. If *Addai and Mari* be an adequate guide, it was precisely the institution-narrative which would need amplifying and the *anamnesis* section which would have to be supplied from somewhere else in an old Syrian tradition, if this were being brought up to date in accordance with most other Greek liturgies in—say—the fourth or fifth century. This would account for the borrowing here in *S. James*.

One notices the eschatological emphasis of the latter part of (*h*) in *S. James* (cf. *Addai and Mari f*), including the vivid touch—'Spare us O Lord our God'—which represents the last judgement as actually taking place. Evidently the Syrian tradition which understood the eucharist as an anticipation of the second coming had not weakened when this prayer was composed.

*S. James (i)* goes on to offer the sacrifice in a single phrase, and then to pray for the forgiveness of sins and 'Thy heavenly and eternal gifts', in substance though not in phrasing very much as in *Addai and Mari (i)*.

It seems worthy of attention that if a doxology were appended after the words 'them that love Thee', we should have in *S. James (b-i)* a complete eucharistic prayer, parallel in content to but verbally independent of the eucharistic prayer of Hippolytus. Such a prayer would also have a good many points in common with *Addai and Mari*. But here there would also be the big differences that *S. James (b-i)* contains a complete institution-narrative and an *anamnesis* (probably derived bodily from *S. Basil*) but no invocation of 'holy spirit' in any form (up to this point). None of this matter (*b-i*) is derived from Cyril's Jerusalem rite, but some of it has distinct points of contact with the scattered allusions to the fourth century rite of Antioch in Chrysostom.

*S. James (j, h)*. However, *S. James* in its present form goes on to add an invocation—in fact, as we have seen, two. One of these (*j*<sup>2</sup>) evidently contains matter derived from the Jerusalem rite described by Cyril. The other (*j*<sup>1</sup>) is in a form which there is some reason to believe was in use in the region of Antioch in the later fourth century, since it reappears in substance in the invocation of the liturgy in *Ap. Const.*, viii.<sup>1</sup> It is also clear from Chrysostom that an invocation of some kind was already in use at Antioch in his day, though it seems impossible to make out the text from his allusions.<sup>2</sup> But one notes that both invocations in *S. James* come after the point at which the analogy of other rites would lead us to expect such an invocation to be placed (*i.e.* one would expect an invocation in *S. James (i)*, following the words 'beseeching Thee' in its first sentence).

*S. James (k)*. In (*k*) *S. James* produces a second prayer for the communicants in the same terms, 'for the forgiveness of sins and for eternal life', as

<sup>1</sup> Brightman, *op. cit.* p. 21, ll. 3 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> Brightman, *op. cit.* pp. 474, l. 20 and 480, ll. 1 sqq.

that in *S. James (i)*. With *S. James (k)* we may compare the prayer for the benefits of communion in *Addai and Mari (i)*. But the brief allusion in the latter to 'Thy church' has been expanded in *S. James (k)* into a rudimentary intercession for 'Thy holy catholic and apostolic church'. There is evidently a good deal of duplication in all this part of the rite; there are two invocations, two prayers for the benefits of communion, two offerings of the sacrifice, two prayers for the 'holy catholic and apostolic church', and so on.

*S. James (l, m, n)* are mostly taken over from the fourth century Jerusalem rite.

One general inference which seems to impose itself from this brief survey is that the fourth century Jerusalem rite was fused with the fourth century rite of Antioch to produce the 'patriarchal' rite of Antioch (the present *S. James*) rather by way of addition to the Antiochene local tradition than by way of substitution for it. Considerable fragments of the supposedly 'lost' old rite of Antioch are to be found embedded in the present text of *S. James*.

Their discernment, however, is likely to be a more complicated matter than the mere subtraction of what can be detected as 'Jerusalem' material by comparison with Cyril. There seems to have been more than one stage in the process of compilation to form the present text of *S. James*, and the details of the process can hardly be accurately disentangled in the present state of the materials. In this connection I would draw particular attention to the place of the 'non-Jerusalem' invocation material in (*j*<sup>1</sup>) and (*j*<sup>2</sup>) (which has attracted to itself the similar material derived from the Jerusalem rite). Instead of coming in (*i*) where on the analogy of other rites we should expect it, it is placed as a sort of appendix to the body of the remains of the old Antiochene eucharistic prayer, *after* the point at which one would look for a doxology to the old Antiochene prayer. This is interesting, because Mr. Ratcliff has pointed out<sup>1</sup> that there are traces of a third century Syrian practice of placing an invocation of the Spirit *outside* the eucharistic prayer proper, immediately before the fraction. If the present order of *S. James* preserves (as it seems to do) the outline of the old Antiochene rite, this may have been the original position of the invocation when it was first introduced at Antioch. Strange as it may seem to us with our presuppositions, such a position is really not an unnatural one. The Nestorians of Malabar in the later middle ages inserted the institution-narrative, which their own rite (*Addai and Mari*) did not contain at all, in that very place just before the communion. They had come to realise that other churches valued and used it and they wanted to include it somehow in their rite, but there seemed no suitable position for its insertion within the structure of their own traditional eucharistic prayer. When many Syrian churches were making such an invocation the central pivot of their rite, Antioch, the

mother church of Syria, might well feel that something of the kind ought somehow to find a place in its own rite, and yet be unwilling at that time to disturb its own traditional arrangement of the prayer in this particular matter. A 'supplementary' position for new items, after the eucharistic prayer proper and before the communion, is a common form of compromise attested in all rites. (The position of the Lord's prayer is an obvious example.) In course of time such supplements are always apt to be fused into a single whole with the original body of the prayer, or at least to be treated as inseparable from it, by mere invariable association (*cf.* the position of the Lord's prayer at Milan, between the conclusion of the eucharistic prayer and its doxology).<sup>1</sup>

Be that as it may, the evidence of duplication and conflation in all this part of the eucharistic prayer of *S. James* seems undeniable. Whatever the exact explanation, we have here plain traces of the complicated sort of process by which during the fourth-fifth centuries the great historic rites gradually assumed their final form.

<sup>1</sup> *Cf. p. 131.*