

The Historical element in Liturgy

by

Principal A. RAYMOND GEORGE,
Richmond College, University of London.

UNTIL the fashion shifted from biblical theology to radicalism, preachers often said that the Christian faith was rooted in history, and, if their interests included liturgy, they said that this or that feature of worship reminded us of this fact. Thus, for instance, the inclusion in the Creed of the words 'suffered under Pontius Pilate' was held to be striking testimony to the scandal of particularity, in contrast alike to the undated 'incarnations' or appearances of the gods in Greco-Roman or oriental religions and to the transcendence of the particular in theologies tinged with Hegelianism.

In this lecture I want first to inquire what parts of Christian worship do thus refer to historical events, and to what events; and secondly to ask in what relation the worshipper or act of worship is deemed to stand to those events.

What forms of Christian worship shall we examine? A case might be made that the fundamental act of Christian worship is the complete rite of Christian 'initiation', as it is called, the baptismal eucharist, which still finds an echo in the Roman Easter Vigil. But it would take too long to consider the rites of baptism and confirmation all down the ages. I shall take the ordinary Sunday eucharist of the great liturgies as typical. Many Protestants indeed do not celebrate the eucharist each Sunday, despite the intentions of Luther and Calvin; but the eucharistic liturgies include the service of the word. I consider liturgical texts because they are easy to compare. If it were thought that the ideal form of service is that in which as many items as possible, even the words of the prayers, are free and extemporaneous, then comparison would obviously be almost impossible.

I

In any typical liturgy there are several parts in which we should expect to find at most only incidental references to the historic events. Thus for instance a declaration of forgiveness might contain a reference to the death of Christ, but a confession of sins would hardly refer to the mighty acts of

God at all ; nor, very often, would the intercessions, though the Litany in the *Book of Common Prayer* does so magnificently in the passage beginning ' By the mystery of thy holy Incarnation '. The items which I shall consider are the hymns or chants, the collect, the lessons, the sermon, and the great eucharistic prayer.

The chants traditionally sung in divine worship are the Psalms, which have played a great part in Christian worship. They were diverse in their origin and purpose, but some of them, such as 78, narrate kerygmatically a good deal of history. In their emphasis on thanksgiving they may be regarded as the ' eucharistic ' liturgy of the old Israel. In their structure they teach us much of the nature of biblical prayer, particularly in their transition from thanksgiving to petition. Compare the first and last verses of Psalm 44 : ' We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us : what thou hast done in their time of old Arise and help us : and deliver us for thy name's sake '. In most eucharistic liturgies the Psalms have shrunk to a verse or two as Introit, Gradual, Offertory and so on, though they have survived in full in the choir offices. But the Church of Scotland has well retained the custom of singing several verses of the Psalms at its principal services, and now has the satisfaction, in this as in some other matters, of seeing other communions reverting to the same primitive practice. I doubt, however, whether the historical Psalms are among those most often sung. Indeed Rome is about to confine their use in the Divine Office to certain special seasons. Joint Liturgical Group considerably pruned them in *The Daily Office*, though the Church of England in its adaptation of those proposals in *The Calendar and Lessons* has recommended their use as lessons in certain weeks of the year. But in the principal act of worship the Psalms are not likely to be historical ; and in any case even the historical Psalms naturally do not narrate the acts of God in Christ.

Loose paraphrases of the Psalms may, however, make David ' speak like a Christian ', and the English type of hymn, which largely originated in this way, often narrates historical events. So indeed do the Latin hymns such as ' All glory, laud, and honour '. The popular hymns indeed for the festivals (several of them by Charles Wesley) often narrate the historical events with profound theological comments, but to examine the place of history in hymnody would take us too far from our theme, though it might well form a parallel study.

The Collect very often has the characteristic which we noted in the Psalms. It starts with reference to a particular event. Take for example the traditional Collect for Whit-Sunday : ' God, who as at this time didst teach the hearts of thy faithful people by the sending to them of light of thy holy Spirit '. It then proceeds on the basis of this event to offer a petition : ' Grant us by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things ' and so on. As we shall see, it thus anticipates the structure of the eucharistic prayer itself. The Collects are for various reasons under heavy fire today in many circles ; but it seems good to me to strike this note early in the service.

The lessons are of course all taken from the Bible, which comes to us from the past. But liturgies vary as to whether they make more use of the historical books or the prophets or the Wisdom literature or indeed use the Old Testament at all. Most liturgists want three lessons, but the almost universal attrition of the original three or more to two is said by some to show that in practice congregations can give their mind only to two. At any rate from the Roman, Anglican and Lutheran eucharists until very recently the Old Testament had virtually disappeared. The Anglican choir offices by insisting on one lesson from the Old Testament and one from the New seem to lay more emphasis on history, and the same is largely true of the English Free Churches (though these sometimes have only one lesson) and, I presume, of the Church of Scotland, though it is not always clear, at least in England, whether this arose from a genuine regard for the Old Testament or a mistaken desire to assimilate the principal service to an Anglican choir office. But if the Old Testament lesson, in order to avoid the harsh and sometimes murderous stories of the historical books, be a cheerful passage from Deutero-Isaiah or (in Anglicanism) a few safe reflections from the Wisdom of Solomon, and the New Testament be from James or even indeed from much of Paul, we are no nearer to hearing any historical narrative. It must not be taken for granted that this is a ground for complaint. I recently heard much religious teaching in schools dismissed as ' Syrian history and geography ' ; and while this has its place, it also has its limitations if the liturgy is to hold our interest today.

The sermon certainly deserves to be counted as a major part of the Church's principal acts of worship, but sermons cannot easily be compared, as they are mostly unrecorded. But the published sermons of the past, like hymns, might

afford scope in this respect for a parallel investigation to this present investigation of liturgy.

The Creed we may briefly dismiss. Creeds were composed originally in connection with baptism, and subsequently they were also used as tests of orthodoxy. The Creed came comparatively late into the Eucharist. It serves admirably to underline the mighty acts, but its very success in doing this has in some traditions dimmed the sense of the need to do so elsewhere. In effect it duplicates the great eucharistic prayer. A somewhat similar change has occurred in its use at baptism. Probably at first the candidate simply acknowledged Jesus as Lord ; but in the earliest baptismal liturgy known to us, that in the *Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* three questions are put to the candidate, one about each person of the Trinity : each time he responds and is dipped into the water. There is neither Creed nor Trinitarian formula corresponding to the present ' I baptize you in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit '. Out of these questions the Creed may have developed. The writer of a modern baptismal liturgy is tempted to put the substance of the Creed interrogatively and then to have the Apostles' Creed recited affirmatively. Indeed much the same material may occur in the baptismal prayer, whether or not that is called the blessing of the font. Much the same material is thus used three times. Similarly in the Eucharist the older recital lies in the Great Prayer, and it is arguable that the Nicene Creed would be better omitted as a duplication which in some circles today tends to hinder the development of the Great Prayer.

To this prayer we now turn. We cannot expect many references to the historic events in the Oblation or the Epiclesis or the intercessions which sometimes occur in the Great Prayer, as they do, for example, in the Roman rite, though now not only there. It is often said that we should expect to find them in the Anamnesis. But this way of putting it ignores the recital which originally occurred in the earlier part of the prayer.

Let us test this by looking at Hippolytus, which is the oldest surviving eucharistic liturgy, if we leave out the *Didache*, of which we can hardly say whether it is Eucharist or Agape. In Hippolytus⁽¹⁾ after the dialogue later known as *Sursum Corda* we read :

We render thanks unto thee, O God, through thy beloved Child Jesus Christ, whom in the last times thou

⁽¹⁾ IV. 4-11. Translation mainly from G. Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome* (ed. H. Chadwick), London, 1968, pp. 7-9.

didst send to us (to be) a Saviour and Redeemer and the Messenger of thy counsel ; who is thy Word inseparable, through whom thou madest all things and in whom thou wast well pleased ; 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 the Holy Spirit and a Virgin ; who fulfilling thy will and preparing for thee a holy people stretched forth his hands for suffering that he might release from suffering them who have believed in thee ; who when he was betrayed to voluntary suffering that he might abolish death and enlighten the righteous and establish the limit and demonstrate the resurrection, taking bread . . .

Then follow the words of institution, which conclude ' You do it in remembrance of me '.⁽²⁾ Then come the words ' Remembering therefore his death and resurrection ',⁽²⁾ which constitute what is technically known as the Anamnesis. Though it refers to the two events of supreme importance, it is confined to a very few words, and is purely resumptive of what has gone before. The next words are ' We offer ', and with these we are launched on the section known as the Oblation. When we refer back to the earlier passage we can easily draw up a list of the historic events referred to. Some of them, such as ' though when thou madest all things ' are no part of ordinary history, and the passage is heavily laden with interpretation or what Ritschl would have called ' value-judgements ', even for instance the word ' Christ ', but that is a universal and legitimate feature of Christian utterance. The fact remains that the passage has a historic basis, in the sense that it confidently describes certain events which, remarkable as they were, the author deems actually to have happened in this world of space and time.

We notice that the references to the resurrection are slight and those to the ascension and heavenly session and to the pentecostal sending of the Holy Spirit are non-existent, though there are four other references to the Holy Spirit in the prayer. I do not believe that it is due to any reluctance to speak of the resurrection as an event outside history, the kind of reluctance which in the opinion of some caused St. Mark to break off his Gospel abruptly. It is perhaps due to a technical difficulty. The author desired to narrate the institution in its chronological place. But having done this he was almost forced by the word *anamnesis* in the words of

⁽²⁾ Here I depart from Dix's somewhat loaded translation.

institution to proceed to what is now called the Anamnesis, that is to the statement that we are now doing this in remembrance of Christ. Most liturgies do not repeat the word *anamnesis*, but use *memnemenoi* or in Latin *memores*, but the connection of thought is obvious. Once an author has reached this point, he cannot go back to those mighty acts which follow the Last Supper. Strictly speaking both death and resurrection are excluded by this method, but most authors use various ingenious methods to get them in ; this author for instance, got the resurrection into a subordinate clause : but he was not able to deal with subsequent events. One way which later writers took was to expand the Anamnesis by references to the ascension, the heavenly session, the eternal intercession, and even the expectation of judgment. This is perhaps one of the reasons why the Anamnesis has survived, despite its partly resumptive and therefore repetitive character ; it has, however, the disadvantage that the space given to these new items, which relate the later events, is disproportionately brief. This problem still worries the writers of liturgies. This liturgy of Hippolytus has recently been used by the Roman Church as the basis for their new Eucharistic Prayer II, and though considerable liberties have been taken with it, as for instance by the insertion of the *Sanctus*, it is interesting that it still contains no reference to the ascension and heavenly session.

The disproportionate brevity with which these events are treated, if they are treated at all, reaches its height in the next liturgy, to which I shall refer, that in *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII 5 ff ; possibly a theoretical liturgy never in actual use. It is not so much that the Anamnesis is short, but that the earlier narrative is disproportionately long. In Brightman's edition⁽³⁾ the dialogue is completed before the bottom of page 14, but all the pages from there to the bottom of page 18 are occupied with a version of the Old Testament narrative, though the last incident referred to is in Joshua 6. Then comes the *Sanctus*. The original position of this in the Great Prayer is a matter of dispute, but at any rate in this, as in many later liturgies, it separates the Old Testament from the New. The New Testament narrative is then given in fair detail, rather more than a page, but this seems rather short in comparison with the Old. Unlike Hippolytus, this liturgy then refers with main verbs to the resurrection, ascension and heavenly session *before* it reaches the words of institution. Thus in a sense the problem is tackled ; yet the author does

(3) F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, 1896, pp. 2-27.

not take advantage of the opportunity to refer to them at any length ; they occupy less than three lines, and the resumptive account of some of them, together with the Parousia, in the Anamnesis, though much longer than in Hippolytus, takes less than four. Why is the account of the resurrection and so forth *before* the words of institution so short ? In an Anamnesis inasmuch as it has nouns, not verbs, the account must be short ; but at this earlier point the author could have spread himself, and the fact that he does not do so shows that the theory that I outlined in connection with Hippolytus is not the sole explanation. Perhaps the difficulties felt when Hippolytus' method was followed had produced a habit of treating these great events briefly. Or perhaps it was felt that, important as these events were, they were not capable of being turned into extended narrative. After all the resurrection appearances occupy only a chapter or so of the Gospels. Indeed the proportion of lengths of narrative in this liturgy correspond roughly to those in the Bible, not only as regards the relation of the resurrection to the life of Christ, but also as regards the relation of the New Testament to the Old. The same cannot be said, however, of the allocation of space within the Old Testament narrative.

I shall not consider other obsolete liturgies, but the main liturgies of the great communions now in actual use, some of which of course are ancient in origin. For the Orthodox rite I take that of St. Chrysostom⁽⁴⁾. The result is disappointing. The passage before the *Sanctus* does not clearly refer to any Old Testament event except for slight references to the creation and the fall. The New Testament narrative interestingly quotes John 3 : 16, but then moves with extreme speed, and the only clear reference to ' the cross, the tomb, the resurrection on the third day ', in a rite not otherwise terse, is contained in seven words of the Anamnesis.

The Roman rite on the other hand is comparatively terse, but the Canon is not the best part of it. If we follow the deplorable custom of regarding the Canon as starting at the *Te igitur* after the *Sanctus*, then it is so occupied with repeated oblations that the historical narrative is largely confined to these words in the Anamnesis, namely ' his passion, his resurrection from the dead and his ascension into glory ', which occupy about as much space as the incidental references to Abel, Abraham and Melchisedek. But of course before the *Sanctus* come the proper prefaces, which contain a wealth of historical material.

(4) Brightman, pp. 353-99.

It is interesting to see how the Romans are treating this problem in their current liturgical renewal, to which they are devoting immense energy and scholarship. More prefaces are being written and the existing ones revised, and more stress is being laid on the preface as an integral part of the Great Prayer. Incidentally, I take the word 'Preface' to mean that which is pronounced before the action, not that which is a mere preliminary part of the prayer. The dominant note in these prefaces is that of thanksgiving, and a lack felt in the rest of the prayer is thus being consciously supplied. Moreover new Anaphorae (as the Romans themselves sometimes term the Great Prayer) have now been authorised, both in Latin and in English. The old Canon is called the first eucharistic prayer; one based on Hippolytus, as we have seen, is the second, though the distinctively Hippolytan section can be replaced by another preface. The third, which may prove the most popular, has no preface of its own, but uses that of the Season or Feast: the historical element is confined to three or four lines of Anamnesis, together of course, as always, with the words of institution, and also the new acclamation which Rome has now borrowed from the East. But the fourth has a fixed preface, and after the *Sanctus* has a fairly long history of salvation. It is therefore said to be 'more appropriate for use in assemblies of the faithful which have a deeper knowledge of sacred scripture'. It is not likely to be the most popular, but it seems to me the best. Why is not a full narrative thought necessary in the others? The reply is twofold: first, that the proper prefaces taken together supply the need, or in other words the whole history of salvation is conveyed not in any one Mass but in the course of the whole Christian year; and secondly, that such a narrative would reduplicate the Creed, to which we have already replied. We shall return to this matter of the prefaces.

The Lutheran liturgies need not detain us. Luther's opposition to the Roman great prayer led him in *Formula Missae*, 1523, to omit everything but the dialogue, a little bit of the Common preface, the words of institution, the *Sanctus*, and the *Benedictus qui venit*, in that order. He might from his own point of view have retained some of the proper prefaces but he did not of course lose much historical narrative by omitting most of the Canon. We must not forget the historical elements in the new stress on preaching and in the new hymns. Modern Lutheran liturgies have re-instated a consecration prayer of a more normal type, partly under Anglican influence.

As the typical example of Reformed liturgy I shall take the first order in the *Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland*, 1940. I hope I may not go astray in seeking to comment on a liturgy which will be much more familiar to you than it is to me. It has the words of institution, for different purposes, both before and after the great prayer, but not during it. The great prayer contains a common preface referring to creation and providence, to which proper prefaces may be added. After the *Sanctus* and *Benedictus qui venit* it proceeds by taking up both these themes in the words 'Verily holy, verily blessed art thou' thus including the opening words of a Jewish *berakah*. It then follows St. Chrysostom in quoting John 3: 16; takes the phrase 'not as we ought but as we are able' from *Apostolic Constitutions*, and proceeds to this whole list of the mighty acts:

we bless Thee for His holy incarnation, for His perfect life on earth, for His precious sufferings and death upon the Cross, for His glorious resurrection and ascension, for His continual intercession and rule at Thy right hand, for the promise of His coming again, and for His gift of the Holy Spirit.

This liturgy does not need the words of institution at this point, and thus escapes the difficulties which they bring to the chronological order; and so immediately by way of the traditional 'Wherefore' (the *Unde* of the Roman Mass) it can proceed to an Anamnesis which does not need to be lengthy and avoids being repetitive; 'having in remembrance the work and passion of our Saviour Christ, and pleading His eternal sacrifice'. This liturgy thus contains much fuller historical references than its distant ancestor, Calvin's Genevan liturgy of 1542.

All Anglican liturgies go back to that of 1549, which before the words of institution speaks only of Christ's sacrificial death. But its brief Anamnesis is of singular beauty: 'having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension'. Possibly Cranmer with his medieval concentration on the death of Christ thought that no fuller reference to the resurrection was necessary. Unfortunately when the prayer was dislocated in 1552, even these words were lost; and their long absence has taken a certain joy from the Anglican eucharist in England. Scotland regained them in the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637.

I take the English Anglican liturgy known as *Alternative Services: Second Series* as typical of recent revisions. It has

a somewhat extended history of salvation before the *Sanctus*, so that the beautiful Anamnesis, now restored in a slightly altered form, is more than ever resumptive, and I imagine that radicals may soon call for its omission. This pattern certainly shows how wrong it is to look for the historical references only or mainly in the Anamnesis. Liturgists who regard *Apostolic Constitutions* VIII as the norm will deplore the placing of the New Testament narrative before the *Sanctus* but that rite never represented the tradition of the West. This is not the place to discuss the theory that the *Sanctus* originally stood at the end of the Great Prayer, but let us for a moment assume its truth. Perhaps we can also conjecture that the words of institution originally stood outside the prayer as they do in the Church of Scotland today; that would harmonise with the principle that one does not recite a rubric, one performs it⁽⁵⁾. Thus the whole prayer may have consisted in a thanksgiving for creation and redemption, presumably with some element of narrative, culminating in the *Sanctus*. This harmonises with the theory, based on Jewish modes of thought, called 'Consecration by thanksgiving'. But perhaps when this 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. What we now have in such rites as *Second Series*, the *Liturgy for Africa*,⁽⁶⁾ 1964, the *East Africa United Liturgy*,⁽⁷⁾ 1966, and the experimental *Sunday Service of the Methodists*, 1968, is a return to the custom of putting a fairly lengthy narrative before the *Sanctus*, and at any rate abbreviating the oblation and epiclesis. Indeed if our tentative theory is correct, all that is essential to consecration is what in such rites precedes the *Sanctus*, and what follows it is but the vestigial remains of what was once wrongly thought necessary. The acid test would be to prescribe only the preface for a second consecration. It is the tendency, more or less explicit, to think in this way which has recently led to the decline or disappearance of the Epiclesis. This has in the past been rightly valued in Scotland alike by the Church of Scotland and by the Episcopalians, and has stood as a bulwark against the

(5) "On ne récite pas une rubrique, on l'exécute" (P. Benoit, *Rev. Bibl.* XLVIII (1939) p. 386, cited in E. L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi*, London, 1965, p. 58 n.

(6) Colin O. Buchanan (ed.), *Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-1968*, London, 1968, pp. 65-6.

(7) Buchanan, pp. 85-6.

general Western tendency to lay excessive stress on the words of institution. The World Council of Churches Faith and Order Commission has reminded us of the anamnestic and epiclesis character of the Eucharist. It is not a magic rite in which we can automatically secure an effect ; we need to invoke God's blessing. Moreover, even though it may be only an explanatory and non-essential addition, it may yet be of great value. But the attempts sometimes made at meetings of the Faith and Order Commission to insist on an explicit epiclesis as essential somewhat ignore the notion of 'Consecration by Thanksgiving' which underlies rites of this type.

A small technical point is that this kind of scheme makes the proper prefaces superfluous and in any case difficult to insert, as they must come at varying points in the thanksgiving (as the great prayer is now often called). *A Liturgy for Africa* solves the problem by omitting them completely, as does the *Sunday Service of the Methodists*. The Anglican *Second Series* sees the need for having two different points at which to insert them, according to their content, and in general plays them down. But Rome, not being so convinced of the need for a recital of the history of salvation, except in its new eucharistic prayer IV, is multiplying them. One could wish that some ecumenical agreement could check this divergence at a time when so many other things are tending to converge. But perhaps a prior question is whether a church does well to have more than one eucharistic prayer.

To sum up this part, the classic liturgies do indeed contain in their great prayers some reference to the great creative and redemptive acts, but for various technical reasons the narratives are often brief, interrupted, and varying in position. On the whole perhaps the conclusion is surprising and disappointing, but we may take comfort from the modern tendency to restore or establish such a narrative more fully.

II

We now ask in the second place in what relation the worshipper or act of worship is deemed to stand to these events. When the narrative occurs before the Anamnesis we usually say that we are thanking God for them (e.g. Hippolytus) or blessing God for them (*Book of Common Order*). But the Anamnesis raises a subtler question. A vast amount has been written in recent years

about the meaning of this word in the Institution-narrative itself, which is bound to colour our interpretation of *memnemenoi*, *memores*, 'having in remembrance', in the passage which follows it, the so-called Anamnesis. We cannot here trace this debate. Roughly speaking writers from the 'Catholic' side claim that the word has a far richer meaning than that of a mere psychological act of remembering, and some from the Evangelical or Protestant side have conceded this and have been glad to assert that the memorialism of a Zwingli has not been the mere memorialism which 'Catholics' have often accused it of being. Accordingly in English (and similarly, I believe in other languages) it has been asserted that such words as 'remembrance' and 'memory' are too weak to convey this meaning. Phrases like 'dynamic recalling' are in vogue, and some would even write the word 'recall' into the liturgy. Those who do not go so far nevertheless prefer 'memorial' to 'memory'.

I sympathise very much with attempts to establish a rapprochement between 'Catholic' and Evangelical views of the Eucharist; and I am grateful for such reconciling statements as those of the World Council of Churches Faith and Order Conference at Montreal, 1963, and for many passages in the Vatican Council's *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*. Nevertheless I feel obliged to make some critical observations on this point. There are two quite distinct assertions. One is that the word *anamnesis* has a Godward rather than a manward reference so that the familiar words in I Corinthians 11: 24-25 should be translated: 'Do this to remind God of me'. There are various discussions of this, notably that by Professor Jeremias, and I do not propose to comment further. The second assertion, which is somewhat vaguer, is that to the Israelite this word (and the corresponding root ZAKAR) refers to a dynamic rather than a merely psychological recalling. It is this assertion which I feel needs not so much defending as defining. I give as a typical example of it, though without the word 'dynamic', some sentences from A. G. Hebert:

So far is the idea from that of a mere psychological remembering that the widow of Zarephath can say to Elijah, "Art thou come hither to bring my sin to remembrance, and to slay my son?" (I Kings 17: 18). Yet Elijah has said no word to her about her sins. She means that the coming of that holy man has set in motion spiritual forces so that the guilt of the sins, which could otherwise have lain dormant (covered, as it

were, in layers of dust), now awakes to activity and pounces on the life of her child⁽⁸⁾.

He goes on to say that the 'remembering' is objective and concrete, and he eventually uses the hyphenated expression 'objective-remembrance'. He links this with the biblical idea of the effectiveness of a 'name'; we might add that the same is said of a 'word' especially a blessing or a curse. All this can be linked with prophetic symbolism. That which we might regard as a bare sign, effective only at the psychological level, seemed to the Hebrew mind to be effective in itself or at least at a deeper level; or perhaps we should say that the same Lord who inspired his prophet to give the sign effected also its fulfilment. We may also link this rich concept of remembrance with the annual observance of the Passover, in which the participants felt that they were in some sense reliving the original events.

Yet these familiar considerations do not entirely stifle one's doubts. It is easy to say that the Hebrew mind (or perhaps the Semitic mind generally) had a distinctive concept of remembrance, but must not the concept be in any language basically the same? Indeed we may ask how in any language any kind of 'remembering' can be other than 'psychological', since it is, almost if not quite by definition, something which goes on in the mind.

Other writers, abandoning the line that this is distinctively Hebraic or Biblical, refer to it as a familiar human experience that there are two kinds of remembering, a mere mental recollection and a living evocation of the past, and they distinguish between mere past events like the signing of *Magna Carta* and the decisive events of the Bible story. But what is meant beyond the fact that some memories have a vivid emotional accompaniment and refer to past events which are still especially influential and effective? And are not all past events effective in varying degrees? Surely the present is what it is because of innumerable past events, and not only of certain decisive ones.

We are now skirting round the vexed question of eucharistic sacrifice. Is the Eucharist a sacrifice or a memorial? The attempts to give a richer meaning to 'memorial' loom large in the attempted rapprochement, though we must also reckon with 'Catholic' tendencies to give a broader meaning to the word 'sacrifice' and to give accounts of the relation of the past to the present which draw

⁽⁸⁾ Art. 'Memory' in A. Richardson (ed.), *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, London, 1950, p. 143.

heavily on the word 'eternal'. No doubt the Eucharist is a special case, but the question seems to me to be related to the question of the relation of past to present in worship in general, just as I think the other vexed question of the presence of Christ in this sacrament is best considered in the light of his presence in worship in general, as is most helpfully done in the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*. I do not intend now to go far with either of these questions, but I wish to make two slight suggestions.

The first refers to the work of the Holy Spirit. According to the discourses in the Fourth Gospel, whether or not they are the genuine words of Christ, the Paraclete will bring to our remembrance all that Christ said (John 14 : 26). The word *hypomnesei* is of course akin to *anamnesis*. The Holy Spirit is the link between the past and present. The role is exactly described by Charles Wesley :

Come, Thou everlasting Spirit,
Bring to every thankful mind
All the Saviour's dying meant,
All His sufferings for mankind :

True Recorder of His passion,
Now the living faith impart,
Now reveal His great salvation,
Preach His gospel to our heart.

Come, Thou witness of His dying ;
Come Remembrancer divine,
Let us feel Thy power, applying
Christ to every soul, and mine.⁽⁹⁾

An epiclesis of this kind perhaps only makes explicit what is implicit in the liturgical epiclesis (itself not strictly essential), but in doing so reminds us strongly of the link between the anamnestic and epicletic elements in the Eucharist.

Yet there is a danger here that Christ may be regarded as a passive object to be manipulated by the Holy Spirit. This is avoided by my second observation that the real link between past and present is for the Christian Christ himself. Whatever is meant by his presence at the Eucharist and whatever may be its relation to the elements, it can hardly be less than what Jesus promised, whenever two or three are gathered in his name (Matt. 18 : 20). The reason why 'Catholics' insist so strongly that the eucharist *is* a sacrifice

⁽⁹⁾ Originally in *Hymns on the Lord's Supper* ; now *Methodist's Hymn Book* No. 765.

is their fear lest it be said that we are saved by a mere transaction, which no instructed Protestant would hold ; the reason why Protestants insist so strongly that it is *not* a sacrifice is their fear lest the other view may detract from the uniqueness of the sacrificial death of Christ on the Cross, which no instructed ' Catholic ' would do. The insistence on the presence of Christ, ' the same yesterday and today ' (Heb. 13 : 8), should allay both these fears. He *was* crucified, and cannot except in some highly metaphorical sense be crucified afresh ; but he *is* present and thus carries within himself, so to speak, the saving act on the cross. Christ remembers this, even if we do not. For this reason we should expound the doctrine of the eucharistic presence before that of eucharistic sacrifice. It is indeed not a static presence, simply to be related to the elements as in the old disputes about transubstantiation, receptionism and so on. The eucharist is a miracle of time rather than of space, a past act effective in present time, rather than a Christ located in things in space, but it is the act of *Christ* with which we are concerned, and thus we must begin from him.

Thus the relation of past history to present Christian worship does not lie ultimately in anything peculiar about Jewish memory or prophetic symbolism or the like. These ideas may be significant or they may be ideas which man come of age ought to outgrow. The relation lies in the presence of Christ. Magna Carta was influential, but King John is not present when we invoke it. Even the saints in heaven are present in our worship only because they are in Christ. Past events like Passover or Christmas do not really recur at yearly intervals as the ' today ' or ' this night ' of hymn or liturgy picturesquely puts it. Changes in the Calendar and space-travel prevent us from taking such ideas too seriously. But we believe that Christ is really present in our worship, and thus the uniqueness of the relation of present to past in Christian worship stands or falls with the doctrine of his resurrection.