

CENTENARY LECTURE: Some New Anaphoras Compared

THE CENTENARY LECTURE GIVEN AT EDINBURGH ON 11TH AND AT ABERDEEN ON 12TH
NOVEMBER 1982 BY THE REV PRINCIPAL A RAYMOND GEORGE.

The liturgiologist, unlike perhaps the person in the pew, will always regard the eucharist, the full service of word and sacrament, preaching-service and the Lord's Supper, as the centre of Christian worship and the anaphora, canon, prayer of consecration, eucharistic prayer of thanksgiving as the centre of the Lord's Supper. We are all familiar with the four-action shape, popularized by Dom Gregory Dix in The Shape of the Liturgy. Our Lord took bread, blessed it (or, as some versions have it) gave thanks, broke it, and gave it to the disciples, and so, apart from the breaking, with the wine; but the Church soon reduced these seven actions to four. We now see that of these four the taking and the breaking were utilitarian, not but what we may well imitate them. The heart of the matter lies in the eating and drinking, together with the grace before meals which precedes them, the thanksgiving which should mark every Christian meal but which on occasions turns the meal into a Christian eucharist.

Though the early church had plenty of anaphoras, by the time of the Reformation not many were in widespread use. Though there were other rites, e.g., in the non-Chalcedonian churches of the East and in places such as Milan in the West, the two chief survivors were the liturgy of St Chrysostom (or on occasion St Basil) in the East and the Roman Mass in the West, which assumed what was meant to be its final form in the Tridentine Mass of 1570. The rites of the churches of the Reformation, Reformed, Lutheran, Anglican, were written in some degree of dependence on or conscious opposition to the Roman Mass, and many of them have not been changed a great deal since until quite recently. The Church of England's Book of Common Prayer 1662 differed only slightly from that of 1552 and remained unchanged for several centuries. Other churches changed their rites to some extent, notably the Church of Scotland through the influence of this Society, but on the whole there was a kind of liturgical freeze-up, which has only thawed in our own day.

We are now privileged to live in a great age of liturgical renewal. It was said in 1976 that more anaphoras had been composed in the previous ten years than in the preceding millennium. These may, moreover, not merely be compared with each other, but assessed in relation to recent developments in our knowledge of the history of liturgy, in eucharistic theology and in theology in general.

We must confine ourselves to a few typical examples. Pride of place must here be given to The Book of Common Order (1979), and I shall refer particularly to the third order. It would not be fitting, however, for me, coming from another tradition, to seem to be mainly engaged in commenting, however appreciatively, on that order, and I shall consider also the Roman Mass of 1970. This has four canons, the old one and three new ones, and I take eucharistic prayer IV as the fullest, though perhaps not the most popular. For Anglicanism I turn to The Alternative Service Book 1980 (ASB), which, together with the book of 1662, is now the norm of worship in the Church of England, the mother-church of that communion. For my chief example I take the First Eucharistic Prayer of Rite A. For the Free Church tradition I take my own church, the Methodist Church of Great Britain. The Methodist Service Book of 1975 is somewhat unusual in that, apart from reproducing the rite of 1936, which is substantially the Anglican rite of 1662, it has only one anaphora; it was thought that in a tradition which still, regrettably in my opinion, rarely has weekly communion, the simplicity which this would give to the layout of the book would outweigh the possible monotony. I also include a rather neglected anaphora, the Eucharistic Prayer of Joint Liturgical Group (JLG), a body recognized by the churches as their organ of co-operation in this field, in which scholars of the Church of Scotland have played a leading part. This anaphora, intended for use on ecumenical occasions, is published in the Daily Office Revised with Other Prayers and Services, 1978.

The first context in which we shall compare them is that of liturgical scholarship, in particular the study of ancient anaphoras. Liturgiologists are sometimes accused of antiquarianism, and there is indeed no reason why we should be bound by the details of ancient models, but it would be foolish to ignore them. The form of the classic anaphoras is well-known, but the article by W Jardine Grisbrooke on 'Anaphora' in J G Davies (ed.) A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship very conveniently lists the customary ten parts as follows:-

- 1 Introductory Dialogue
- 2 Preface or First Part of the Thanksgiving
- 3 Sanctus
- 4 & 5 Post-Sanctus and Preliminary Epiclesis
- 6 Narrative of the Institution
- 7 Anamnesis
- 8 Epiclesis
- 9 Intercessions
- 10 Doxology

This order is that of the new Roman prayers; the old Roman Canon and the Eastern rites, both Antiochene and Alexandrine, all have minor variations.

Your 1979 liturgies all include the narrative of the institution within the prayer, which is something of an innovation in Reformed liturgy.* Your first order is unusual in putting the anamnesis before the narrative.

There is not one of these items, not even the dialogue, which does not raise various problems, but the chief problems are raised by the preface and the post-Sanctus, the epiclesis, and the anamnesis. When I spoke to this Society in 1969 on 'The Historical Element in Liturgy', printed in your Annual No 40 (May 1970), pp. 3-17, I suggested that the narrative of institution may have originally stood outside the prayer, as it then did in the Church of Scotland, and that the whole prayer may have originally consisted of a thanksgiving for creation and redemption, presumably with some recital of the mighty acts of God in Christ, culminating in the Sanctus. I then said 'This harmonises with the theory, based on Jewish modes of thought called "Consecration by thanksgiving". But perhaps when the Church lost sight of this theory, or when it found it necessary to make Jewish assumptions clear for Gentiles, it added other items, the words of institution, the anamnesis, oblation, and epiclesis to make explicit what had hitherto been implicit in the thanksgiving and of course in the action'. I still hold this.

Judged by these standards, most of the anaphoras we are considering come out well; they nearly all contain a lengthy thanksgiving, some (as I prefer) wholly before the Sanctus, some, such as Roman eucharistic prayer IV, partly before and partly after the Sanctus, as in some eastern liturgies. They can also be classified in that some, like the Church of Scotland first order, are capable of the insertion of proper prefaces, some, like your second and third orders, are not. The first method has the advantage that it lays more stress on the varying seasons of the Christian year, but it has the disadvantage that the common parts of the preface which surround the proper preface are almost always short and omit many of the mighty acts of God (though these may briefly appear in the anamnesis), so that a year's worship rather than a single eucharist is necessary before the whole range of the mighty acts is covered. Perhaps the ideal method, especially when the eucharist is relatively infrequent, is to include the whole range at every eucharist but nevertheless also briefly to expound at the appropriate point the act which the season commemorates. It would however make a rather cluttered page and a rather long prayer.

Much scholarship has recently been devoted to the Jewish antecedents of the thanksgiving. It used to be said that it was based on a Jewish blessing or berakah, and indeed the Methodist service has in its brief post-Sanctus a reminiscence of such prayers: 'We praise you, Lord God, King of the universe'.

It could not go at the beginning of the whole thanksgiving because that place is taken by the usual dialogue. Recent scholarship, however, has investigated much more fully the forms of the Jewish prayers that influenced the anaphora. I am fortunate that in 1969 I did not actually use the word berakah as I might easily have done, for berakoth (blessings), at least at first, seem always to have been in the third person; a late example is the Benedictus (Luke 1: 68). As Mark 14:22 uses the word 'bless' (eulogésas) about the bread, it may indeed be true that our Lord uttered the customary Jewish berakah, but St Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:24 uses the word eucharistésas, 'gave thanks', and it is now suggested that the Christian anaphora was influenced not by berakoth but by Jewish thanksgivings in the second person in a different form from berakoth, the relevant Hebrew verb being yadah, which means not only 'thank' but 'confess' or 'acknowledge'. On this I am greatly indebted to Thomas Talley, chapter on 'The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development' in Kenneth Stevenson (ed), Liturgy Reshaped. However that may be, the main contention still holds that the classic form of the anaphora begins, after the dialogue (which itself has Jewish roots), with an extended thanksgiving which has been influenced by Jewish modes of prayer and must be considered as an essential part, if not indeed the essential part, of the anaphora.

We now come to the epiclesis, with which we must take the anamnesis. A typical anamnesis has two parts; the first is a clause about remembering, usually an adjectival or participial clause. I draw my example from the earliest known anaphora (leaving out the eccentric Didache), namely, the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, which can conveniently be studied in the edition by Geoffrey J Cuming (Grove Liturgical Study No 8). The clause is 'Remembering therefore his death and resurrection'. This clause I shall henceforth call the anamnesis proper. Then there is a further clause, usually containing a verb in the indicative; in Hippolytus 'we offer to you the bread and the cup, giving you thanks because you have held us worthy to stand before you and minister to you'. This is usually called the oblation, but some object to the idea of offering at this point. Therefore, as the clause indicates that we do something in obedience to our Lord's command, I shall call it the obedience clause. Although in my judgement it is really explicative of what is already implied in the preface or other thanksgiving, it is the most difficult part of the anaphora to compose, for it raises the whole delicate problem of eucharistic sacrifice, on which much is still being written.

This is followed in almost all liturgies by a petition to God to do something, which is called epiclesis. But whereas in Antiochene liturgies, such as

St Chrysostom, this is the only epiclesis, in Eastern liturgies of the Alexandrine type, there is also an earlier epiclesis between the Sanctus and the narrative of the institution, which Grisbrooke calls a preliminary epiclesis, a slightly question-begging term. The question what epiclesis, if any, the Roman rite has, depends on the precise definition of epiclesis. An epiclesis is sometimes defined as a prayer asking the Father to send the Holy Spirit to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. In that narrow sense the old Roman Mass, now prayer I, lacks it. But in other liturgies sometimes the Logos is invoked as well as, or even instead of, the Spirit; it is asked that the Spirit may descend, sometimes on the elements, sometimes on the people, sometimes on both; and the effect of the descent is sometimes described as showing the elements to be or transforming them into the body and blood of Christ, sometimes that the people may receive the benefits of communion. In that last pair of alternatives the former may be described as a consecratory and the latter as a non-consecratory epiclesis, though it would be anachronistic to draw that distinction at too early a date. And sometimes the prayer is simply that some divine action may be done as we obey Christ's command. It is in that broad sense that we say that the old Roman Mass, like the Alexandrine rite, has an epiclesis in both positions. In the so-called preliminary position it has the Quam oblationem, a prayer asking God to bless the oblation that it may become to us the body and the blood. This might be thought to be consecratory. In the latter position there are prayers asking God to accept the gifts as he did those of Abel, Abraham and Melchizedek, and to convey them by the hand of his angel to the heavenly altar.

Now Thomas Talley in the chapter to which I have already referred contends that the classic Order is first oblation, then consecration, in other words that of the Antiochene tradition, found also in the Anglican Prayer Book which Parliament rejected in 1928. It is also in Hippolytus, though the epiclesis there is not explicitly consecratory and might not even be genuine. On this view there is no preliminary epiclesis, but the gifts are offered in the obedience clause, which is oblationary in wording, and then there is an epiclesis, which in some of these rites is explicitly consecratory. Rome upset this with its epiclesis in the preliminary position; but St Thomas Aquinas managed to read the order oblation - consecration into the Roman Mass by seeing the offertory prayers and the words of institution as the consecration and playing down the significance of the obedience clause and the second epiclesis. But in the sixteenth century Roman theologians saw it otherwise; they thought consecration preceded oblation. 'Unlike St Thomas, Catholic theologians of that time seem quite comfortable with the

notion that consecration makes significant oblation possible, while reformers recoiled from such a theology of eucharistic sacrifice to the extent of removing any suggestion of a memorial-oblation of the gifts (and, indeed, any notion of the oblation of bread and wine even at the offertory). Clearly if the bread and wine are already consecrated and thereby according to Roman theology have become the body and the blood, then, when they are subsequently offered, what is being offered is not mere bread and wine, but the body and the blood; and Protestants objected to this.

These interlocking problems are all further complicated by the question of the moment of consecration. This was not considered in the earliest times, but for a long time until recently Romans have thought that the consecration is effected by the words of institution, Hoc est enim corpus meum etc. Therefore they could not follow the custom of having a consecratory epiclesis in the second half of the prayer. The epiclesis, such as it is, in the earlier position sounds consecratory, but simply leads up to the words of institution which were essential.

The East has not been troubled by this question. The Antiochene Liturgies, as we have just seen, have a consecratory epiclesis in the later position; the Alexandrine ones have epicleses in both places, worded in various ways; it is thus shown to be possible to have a preliminary epiclesis without holding the Roman theology. The Eastern theologians, when they are in controversy with Rome, say that anamnesis, oblation and epiclesis are all necessary, so that the moment of consecration must be the end of the epiclesis in the later position.

Now the fashion everywhere is to say that the prayer as a whole effects the consecration. Nevertheless, Rome has played safe, so to speak, and in each of its three new anaphoras it has included a preliminary epiclesis, which moreover includes an explicit reference to the Holy Spirit such as was lacking in the old canon. Thus eucharistic prayer IV has :

Father, may your Holy Spirit sanctify these offerings.

Let them become the body and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord.....

The later epiclesis is clearly only for the fruit of communion:

...by your Holy Spirit, gather all who share this bread and wine into the one body of Christ, a living sacrifice of praise.

We now turn to see how other modern rites handle the epiclesis. ASB, like Rome, has a preliminary epiclesis of a consecratory type, and a later epiclesis which is very vestigial. Perhaps some Anglicans wished to play

safe about the moment of consecration; others perhaps just wished not to omit any element of a full eucharistic prayer. JLC follows the same pattern. It is interesting that the more Protestant rites, i.e. the Methodist and your own, follow the Antiochene model and have no preliminary epiclesis at all; but whereas the Methodist service has only a very vestigial epiclesis after the anamnesis, asking that by the power of the Holy Spirit we may share in the body and blood, your rite has in the later position a full consecratory epiclesis:

By the presence and power of the Holy Spirit bless and consecrate
these gifts so that the bread which we break may be for us a sharing
in the body of Christ.....

It must be noted, however, that nearly all modern rites include a reference to the coming of the Holy Spirit in the preface, so that we ought not to say, as people sometimes do, that the whole pattern of the anaphora is Trinitarian; but indeed the references in the preface to Christ already falsify that description. The preface may have originated in a Jewish table-prayer connected with creation, but as soon as references to Christ came in, the preface went well beyond the first Person of the Trinity.

We now go on to the related problem of the wording of the obedience clause. In Hippolytus' liturgy the Church of Rome simply said 'We offer to you the bread and the cup', and this came before the epiclesis; but later, as we have seen, the middle of the Roman Canon acquired the order: explicit consecratory epiclesis (though without explicit reference to the Spirit:), narrative of institution, anamnesis and obedience clause, non-consecratory second epiclesis; and then the wording of the obedience clause was subtly altered to "We offer you the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation", and what was really intended, though not explicit, was that this was an oblation of the body and blood of Christ. The recent Roman eucharistic prayer IV makes this explicit for the first time: 'we offer you his body and blood', and as the theology of all four prayers is presumably meant to agree, it is now clear that this is the meaning of the more restrained phrases in the other prayers. All this Thomas Talley, like many non-Romans, greatly deplores.

All this lies behind the controversies which the Church of England had some years ago about the wording of the obedience clause. The so-called 'Catholic' party, wishing to strike some oblationary note in it, commended the innocent words of Hippolytus 'We offer you the bread and the cup'. They were ancient; they said no more than the obvious truth that in this service we make bread and wine available for God to use. But Evangelicals objected

to any reference to offering or sacrifice on our part except of praise or of ourselves, and also thought that the phrase was condemned by its subsequent history, then represented by the traditional Roman Canon, a sort of guilt by association. The 'Catholic' party then ceased to press for the words on the ground that they said less than the full 'Catholic' doctrine intended. Now the new Roman prayer IV, as we have seen, makes explicit for the first time what had for a long time been understood to be implicit in the old words of the traditional Roman Canon, and the Evangelicals have now to that extent been justified in their objection to Hippolytus as the start of this process by his use of the word 'offer'.

The Church of England has now played safe in Rite A Third Eucharistic Prayer, which is modelled on Hippolytus; they have embodied what remains of Hippolytus' phrase in a longer passage:

we celebrate this memorial of our redemption;
we thank you for counting us worthy
to stand in your presence and serve you;
we bring before you this bread and this cup.

The phrase 'bring before you' is subtly different from 'offer', and the main thrust of the passage lies in the verb 'celebrate'. The intervening phrase about counting us worthy to stand is almost directly from Hippolytus and is widely found in modern anaphoras.

The other eucharistic prayers in ASB face the same problem. The 'Catholics' want the obedience clause to be plainly oblationary; the Evangelicals do not. In all these prayers therefore the issue is somewhat blurred. Thus in the first prayer, the one which we are primarily considering, the anamnesis proper is put into the indicative 'we remember', which gives it greater emphasis; later there is added the Pauline verb 'and proclaim' and finally

we celebrate with this bread and this cup
his one perfect sacrifice.

The words 'we offer' do not occur.

Similarly JIG has 'we celebrate the perfect sacrifice.....', and incidentally reduces the anamnesis proper to the noun phrases which are the objects of the verb 'celebrate', with no use of the verb 'remember'.

The Methodist service, echoing the fears of the Reformers, has

Therefore, Father, as he has commanded us,
we do this in remembrance of him,
and we ask you to accept our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

The anamnesis proper is very brief because, now that the mighty acts of God are recited in the preface, only a brief resumptive anamnesis seems necessary, and the words 'we do this' echo the scriptural words 'Do this, whenever you drink it, in remembrance of me', which precede the passage, though separated from it, perhaps unfortunately, by the acclamation, which might well have come later. The words 'we do this' are compatible with the evangelical objection to oblation, but do not require it. The scriptural phrase is neutral and may be interpreted by any theology which for other reasons is thought proper.

The Church of Scotland third order has a longer anamnesis proper, and then proceeds 'and pleading his eternal sacrifice we do this in obedience to his command'. In its choice of the vital word 'do' it agrees with the Methodists. In view of the importance of this subject we had better look also at the other two orders. The first has 'pleading his eternal sacrifice, we thy servants set forth this memorial'. The word 'memorial', which is also found in the ASB second and third prayers, reflects the current insight into the meaning of the Greek word anamnesis, and we shall come back to it. Your second order elevates 'plead' to the indicative and has 'we now plead his eternal sacrifice and set forth this memorial'. I touched on these questions in 1969, but now, as then, I have no time to argue them fully. I myself would drop the word 'eternal' before 'sacrifice', for it seems to me to go beyond the evidence of the Epistle to the Hebrews. I cannot disagree with the idea of pleading, though I do not quite know how the use of 'plead' as a transitive verb with a direct object would be translated into Greek or Latin, and I sometimes think that sound theology should be capable of such translation.

The second and third Scottish orders thus have the Antiochene order, i.e. no preliminary epiclesis, but institution-narrative, anamnesis, epiclesis and obedience clause; but to say that these follow what Talley regards as the original sequence, oblation consecration, would be a little misleading, as the obedience clause is not in the form of an oblation, and the epiclesis, though using the word 'consecrate', probably carries with it little idea of a moment of consecration. The first order is most unusual in putting the institution-narrative after the anamnesis and obedience clause, but the relation of that whole piece to the epiclesis is the same.

I must add for the sake of completeness that I have not discussed what form the offering of ourselves should take. It may be implicit, as in the classic liturgies, or expressed in a post-communion prayer, as in Cranmer's

service of 1552 and its descendants, or expressed in the anaphora, as for instance in your third order, 'may we ourselves become a living sacrifice' , or even more explicitly as in the Methodist service, 'accept us as we offer ourselves to be a living sacrifice,' which in no way contravenes the notion that 'we offer' is to be avoided in relation to the elements or to the body and blood.

There is one further matter related to the anaphora, namely the manual acts of taking and breaking. I understand these to be utilitarian acts of our Lord, devoid of theological significance, yet now to be imitated in our representation of the Lord's Supper. Nearly all the rites have the fraction after the eucharistic prayer. It is a peculiarity of the original Anglican and Methodist rites to have it at the words 'he brake it' in the institution-narrative. But the taking has had a more varied fate. The Roman, Anglican and Methodist rites, though they had preparatory actions at an earlier point, had originally ritual takings (bread and cup) at the corresponding words in the institution-narrative. The Romans have not varied this, but the Anglicans in Rite A and the Methodists have placed the taking before the thanksgiving, in accordance with the fourfold shape, though the Anglicans have a preliminary note 'In addition to the taking of the bread and the cup at section 36 the president may use traditional manual acts during the Eucharistic Prayers'. Our Lord indeed after taking the bread may have retained it in his hands during the thanksgiving, and so with the cup, but it is hardly possible now to hold them both throughout the whole thanksgiving, so that any taking of them during the institution-narrative gives an impression of taking them twice.

But here the Church of Scotland has a quite distinctive usage. Though the thanksgiving is preceded by the bringing of the elements (and I approve distinguishing this from the taking) and subsequently their unveiling, there is in your second and third orders no taking either before or during the eucharistic prayer. In your first order before the thanksgiving the Minister says 'I take these elements of bread and wine to be set apart from all common uses to this holy use and mystery', but there is no rubric requiring him to take them. But after the eucharistic prayer there is a further section, nameless in the first order, called 'The Breaking of Bread' in the second order and 'The Action' in the third order, in which the institution-narrative is read again, and the taking and breaking of the bread and the raising of the cup are directed at the corresponding words. It would be interesting to hear some account of this distinctive usage.

Having compared these anaphoras in the light of current liturgical scholarship, let us now, secondly and briefly, compare them in the light of recent ecumenical scholarship about the meaning of the eucharist. Recent years have seen various consensus statements. The one which has gained the greatest publicity in England is that of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC), whose Final Report published in 1982 embodied the Windsor statement on Eucharistic Doctrine of 1971 and the longer Elucidation of it in 1979. It is important, however, to remember that these were not the only such statements; a number of others were gathered in Modern Eucharistic Agreement, 1973; there have been a number of others since them, notably the World Council of Churches' Faith and Order Commission statement Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry, 1982, the Lima Document, on which the Roman Catholics also have worked, for though their Church does not belong to the World Council, it does belong to this Commission. The two issues which cause most controversy in eucharistic theology are presence and sacrifice. The former controversy has not much troubled the liturgies, for such concepts as transubstantiation, consubstantiation and the like find no place in them. Roman prayer IV has -

Father, may your Holy Spirit sanctify these offerings.

Let them become the body and blood

We note the omission of nobis which slightly softened the corresponding sentence in the old Roman Canon. Is it 'for us' or, as in JIG, 'to us'? 'Become' is defensible, though strange to Protestant ears. After all our Lord said 'This is my body'. The question is in what sense we take 'is' : est or significat? And in either case, in what precise sense? Whatever serves to explain or qualify our Lord's 'is' will probably serve also for 'become'.

Your own third order, as we have already seen, has -

By the presence and power of the Holy Spirit bless and consecrate these gifts so that the bread which we break may be for us a sharing in the body of Christ.

The last part of this is of course from 1 Corinthians. Methodism says - Grant that by the power of your Holy Spirit we who receive your gifts of bread and wine may share in the body and blood of Christ. This does not associate our sharing so closely with 'the bread which we break', but the use of 'share' (Greek koinonia) is, as in your own liturgy, an echo of St Paul.

These ways of handling the eucharistic presence do not differ so widely as the theologies of the respective churches. The liturgies are relatively

neutral; they permit, but do not require, various interpretations, whether 'high' or 'low'. They are patient of a variety of interpretations, yet strong in biblical phrasing.

Eucharistic sacrifice is a much more difficult matter. Here the consensus statements all agree in laying great emphasis on the concept of anamnesis viewed as an objective memorial made in the presence of God, and they show a marked reticence in referring to the eucharist as a sacrifice, though the ARCIS Elucidation asserts that it is possible to say 'that the eucharist is a sacrifice in the sacramental sense, provided that it is clear that this is not a repetition of the historic sacrifice' (p. 20). In our discussion of the obedience clause we have seen that, with the exception of the Roman Church, all the churches have followed this reticent line. The Anglicans have been forced by their internal disputes to adopt a multiplicity of phrases such as 'celebrate', 'proclaim', 'make the memorial', often using several in the same prayer in a sort of nervous anxiety to get it right, and you also use the word 'memorial', which directly reflects the current view of anamnesis, about which I made some observations in 1969. It is interesting that the wording of Roman eucharistic prayer IV, already quoted, 'we offer you his body and blood', shows no sign of the restraint which even the Romans observed in the past and which other new liturgies abundantly illustrate. This may be because the Roman prayers were prepared in the 1960s, before the ARCIC report; it must also be remembered that the ARCIC report has yet to receive the approval of the Roman authorities, and it would not be surprising if they were slow to adopt the rather restrained view of eucharistic sacrifice which is now to some extent uniting other churches.

Finally, I ask how far the new anaphoras reflect the consensus, such as it is, of wider theology. The Dean of Worcester (T G Baker) in Questioning Worship and J L Houlden in The Eucharist Today, edited by R C D Jasper, pp. 168-76, among others, have suggested that the liturgiologists live in a world of their own and have failed to reflect current theological insights. I agree entirely that the liturgy must reflect sound theology, though theology may sometimes learn from the liturgical tradition. The relation between lex orandi and Lex credendi is a delicate one, as Geoffrey Wainwright has shown in his Doxology. But the question is: what are the agreed theological insights of our day? Not all would go so far as, for instance, the authors of The Myth of God Incarnate. The chief complaint seems to be that the luturgies do not demythologize the biblical imagery and are too much rooted in the past. Such a problem faced the International Consultation

on English Texts in its word on the creeds. There are obvious objections to the word 'descended', but they apply equally to the word 'ascended', and if that is paraphrased, what are we to call Ascension Day? JLG says in its notes on the preface of its canon 'As far as possible the mighty acts of God are expressed in terms of present activity rather than as past events'. Thus the ascension becomes 'you..... have made him Lord of all'. But the note goes on to say that the ideas are borrowed from scripture, and indeed the canon says:

He was born

and accepted death upon the cross:

you raised him from the dead.

The pulpit surely is the place for such demythologizing as is necessary. The liturgy, as the best liturgies have always been, should be patient of a variety of interpretations, while remaining firmly based on the biblical revelation. Broadly speaking, the anaphoras which we have been considering (and they are typical of many others) have been faithful to that principle.

FOOTNOTE re TOP p5

- * (It should be noted, to complete the picture, that a member of the 1980 General Assembly successfully moved that the following be added to the Deliverance of the Public Worship and Aids to Devotion Committee: "Regret that in the Book of Common Order (1979) the use of the Words of Institution as part of the Eucharistic Prayer is preferred; and wish to make it clear that their use as a warrant continues to be normal usage in the Church of Scotland" .) Editor

REVIEWS

"The Orthodox Liturgy" (Congregational Edition): Oxford University Press, 1983 pp 226 £8 bound

Oxford University Press publishers and printers are to be commended for producing this very fine English translation of the Orthodox Liturgy. The handsomely bound and beautifully printed volume, liturgically significant and of ecumenical relevance, as well as being devotionally and spiritually enriching, contains the Divine Liturgies of S. John Chrysostom and S. Basil the Great, and the Divine Office of the Presanctified Gifts, together with the Ordering of the Holy and Divine Liturgy, the Office of Preparation for the Holy Communion and the Prayers of Thanksgiving after the Holy Communion. The use of a traditional red cursive print for the rubrics in the forms of