

Zeitschrift: Revue internationale de théologie = Internationale theologische Zeitschrift = International theological review
Band: 5 (1897)
Heft: 20

Artikel: The Scottish Eucharistic office
Autor: Farquhar, J.T.F.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-403398>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 01.09.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

THE SCOTTISH EUCHARISTIC OFFICE.

There is a small western communion which in days of heavy tribulation clung fast to apostolic order and all but sealed her testimony with her life; which also in the darkest hours of trial was bold with noble disregard of the dictates of seeming expediency to remodel her Eucharistic Service, not so as to render it identical with that of a powerful sister, whose goodwill was valuable, but on the contrary so as to separate it from the debased western type in its essential characteristics, and to restore to it a more primitive cast, which by a right instinct she drew from the precious heritage of the East.

This small Communion is the Scottish, and now when Christendom from East to West is stirred by the awakening of a spirit which is striving to reedify and revivify the one orthodox and catholic Church, the Scottish Eucharistic Office¹⁾ may well possess an interest beyond the borders of its own land.

It is itself, not its history, that is our concern just now, and I will do no more than confess the bare fact that the legislation of 1863, necessary in part to meet a real crisis, but shortsighted and disastrous in its actual extremes, came short only of abolishing the office altogether, and, it may be added, has in fact succeeded in stereotyping in vulgar opinion the extraordinary misconception by which it is identified with Romanising tendencies.

¹⁾ Let me here acknowledge my great debt especially in matters of fact to the present Bishop of Edinburgh's work on this subject.

Still however it survives, and of intrinsic interest has lost not one whit, so my task also remains, and I will attempt to describe it, looking only at this one thing, a clear and consistent and therefore also a definitely conceived exposition of my subject.

In doing this, disputed points of Eucharistic teaching cannot be altogether avoided, let me then once for all emphasise the fact that it is with forms not with doctrines that I am really dealing, and that a little consideration will often show that the latter are touched even less frequently than at first sight may appear. In any case I never forget that my words are my own and bind nobody else, that as a matter of fact there are those who love the Office as warmly as I do myself, who nevertheless would not subscribe to everything I say, and that for my part I would assuredly be the last to give any man to understand that he had no real heritage in the Church, simply because he could not express himself exactly as I do regarding the nature of the Sacraments. Finally let none accuse me of "Protestantism" in the evil sense of that ambiguous term, for my one desire is to attain to what is truly primitive.

We note first that there is no standard copy of the Office, and especially in the wording of the rubrics variations exist; I follow here an edition founded on that put out by the Primus and Bishop Forbes in 1764, but in truth for the general purposes of this exposition which is not concerned with minute points of textual criticism, one edition would serve as well as another.

In order that a clear idea may be had of the general structure, the organic development, of the office, a synopsis of the same is appended to which reference is made by means of capital letters in the margin.

A glance at this synopsis will show that while as has been said the structure in the central parts is Eastern, there is a close affinity in other respects between the English and Scottish Offices, indeed to a very large extent the wording of the prayers is such that the same type might almost serve for the printing of the corresponding portions of each; there is in the Scottish a general tendency to greater richness of thought and expression, due doubtless as its structure is, to Eastern influence; this similarity makes a comparison between the two offices very striking and very instructive.

And now to the root matter:

A. All things necessary having been prepared, the presbyter begins the service with the recitation of the *Lord's Prayer*, in which contrary to the otherwise universal custom the people do not join, keeping silence even at the Amen, and it may be that we have here a genuine survival of the uncongregational worship of the Middle Ages; there is no express rubric on the point, we simply have the curious but universal use. Then the *Prayer for Purity of Heart* prepares us as well for the whole service as for what immediately follows, namely the contemplation of *the Perfect Way*, by which we examine ourselves according to St. Paul's warning, and consider the true character of eternal life. In the English Office this is done by means of the Decalogue, but in the Scottish there is offered the happy alternative of the Divine Law of Life as enunciated by our Lord himself, the Love of God and Man; and with regard to the Decalogue itself its true place in Christian worship is recognised by the rubric which directs that when it is read the people shall remain "all the while kneeling and asking God mercy for the transgression of every duty therein either according to the letter or to the mystical importance of the said commandment."

There is of course an ambiguity in these words, but there can be no hesitation I think as to the intention of those who framed them.

After the recitation of the Perfect Way comes most appropriately the *Collect for Guidance*, to which there is offered as an alternative the choice between the same two *Collects for the Queen* that alone are found here in the English Office. — A curious liturgical phenomenon. For my own part at least I do not find that it is on the Queen's behalf that the contemplation of perfection rouses such anxiety that neither for myself nor for mankind in general have I any room left for prayer, and my loyalty is amply satisfied by the opportunity of praying for my sovereign which is offered at a later and more appropriate part of the service, that is in the *Prayer for the whole Church*. The real explanation of the arrangement may be that those who are responsible for it desired to represent the King as the embodiment on earth of God's authority, which is nevertheless a sufficiently extravagant and undiscerning view.

B. We proceed next to the *True Faith*. This section consists as in the English Office of the *Collect Epistle and Gospel for the Day, the Nicene Creed, and the Sermon*. The whole congregation joins in the recitation of the Creed, and custom permits the singing of a hymn immediately thereafter.

The purpose of this section is that we may examine our faith by the true standard, receive edification therein, and make open and united profession of the same.

C. Then comes the *Long Exhortation* which custom invariably omits, but which in itself is quite relevant and well placed, inasmuch as it continues and particularises with a view to the Eucharistic service the general instruction in Christianity which precedes.

D. Then we come to *Offering*. First as in the English Service of our substance for the support of the Church or such particular purpose as may be deemed expedient; to this the people are invited by the presbyter with the words "Let us present our offerings to the Lord with reverence and godly fear", a selection of *Scripture Sentences* being read during the time occupied in making the collection, bearing on the various aspects of giving, emphasising chiefly the idea of oblation. The "devotions of the people" being brought to the presbyter "in a bason provided for that purpose", he is directed to "humbly present it before the Lord, and set it upon the Holy Table" with a beautiful *Sentence of Dedication* founded on David's words on the store provided for the building of the Temple.

E. "The presbyter shall then offer up and place the Bread and Wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table." The idea of offering is thus continued and particularised, being brought to bear directly upon the main purpose of the service actually in operation, and therefore I have ventured to name this part *the Excellent Offering*, — that which is so by an excellency. The difference here from the English service is slight but so characteristic as to deserve notice: there the priest is simply directed to "place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient", the idea of offering being markedly absent, as it is also from the immediately preceding section, where the sentences to be read during the collection seem almost deliberately chosen to touch as lightly as possible on this aspect of giving, where also there are no words of de-

dication, and the priest is directed to “humbly present and place the collection upon the Holy Table. Yet, be it said, we do find a little later that prayer is made to God to accept our alms and *oblations*”.

F. The Table being now solemnly set out and furnished, we advance to *Eulogy and Eucharist*. First by the versicles and responses of the *Sursum Corda* we are raised to the thought of praise and thankfulness in general, as soon the Presbyter declares saying “it is very meet, right and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks”, and after reference has been made if required to any special season in a *Proper Preface*, we all as created beings join with the Angels in the blessing “Holy, Holy, Holy”. Undoubtedly historically the proper prefaces are a survival of the *Great Eucharist* treated in the next section, and also in some ancient models it is impossible to separate the Thanksgiving into two distinct portions at all, but if we take our Office as it is, it seems better to proceed as we are doing.

G. Then immediately the *Prayer of Consecration* begins, and mark in what manner. — The thanksgiving and blessing in which we are engaged is brought to the climax necessary for redeemed mankind, and applied to the supreme gift of Jesus Christ come in the flesh. “All glory be to Thee, Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that Thou of Thy tender mercy didst give Thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption.” This is the characteristic and essential thanksgiving, the *Great or Excellent Eucharist*, which, corresponding exactly to the thanksgivings or blessings recorded to have been pronounced by our Lord over the Bread and the Cup when He instituted the service, begins the act of direct conformity to his command: “Do this in remembrance of Me”, and is vital to the proper form of the service.

These are positive statements to make on such a serious point, but they are so framed not from lightheaded dogmatism but for the sake of clearness, and I will now endeavour to justify them, and even if some of the propositions which I advance are capable of more discussion than I give them here, let it be remembered that the main purpose of this paper is descriptive, and thus though the extreme importance of the point before us demands some argument, it will be sufficient

if it be argument, in outline. Let each point then be impartially considered, and let the harmony of the whole, if such there be, add fresh strength to the conclusion.

From the literary form alone of the four scriptural accounts of the Institution, without regard to the subject matter, it follows as by far the more natural interpretation that there is no distinction to be made between the words *εὐχαριστεῖν* and *εὐλογεῖν*, the latter indeed is used only twice, that is by St. Matthew and by St. Mark with regard to the Bread. What act then is denoted by these words? The narratives were all written by men well acquainted with the Passover ritual and intended for readers equally so, such could place only one interpretation upon them namely that they referred to the normal Passover blessings or to blessings not differing from them in such important manner as to deserve notice on that account, that is they were ascriptions of praise to God for the good gifts of bread and wine, and to the ordinary Jew would have no scope beyond mere earthly life. But they were followed by the momentous declarations "this is My Body" and "this is My Blood", coupled with the command to continue the performance of the service; hence the Christian looks deeper and as he looks majesty and blessing unfold before his eyes. Be it observed first that these are declarations of an existing fact and are not precatory, imperative, or in any way causal, and this at once guards us against a whole class of misunderstandings, those namely of which the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation is the chief, for had our Lord contemplated anything different from a sacramental change, i. e. a change in the relation of the elements to and in the spiritual sphere, it is incredible that He would not have been more explicit as to how and when the change had been, and was in future to be, effected. But leaving negatives, we understand that our Lord bids us thank God for the food that nourishes to eternal life, that this food is His own most sacred Body and Blood, that He will accept the sacrament in our service as a memorial sacrifice, and in that He bids us eat thereof that He will not fail to respond to our doing so "worthily" by granting us the reality.

Already then if we would repeat our Lord's blessing in its true sense for ourselves, it is evident that a Eucharist, a Blessing of God over the Bread and the Wine for the Incar-

nation and Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ is to be accounted of the very essence of the right form of the Divine Liturgy.

In the words of the ancient rubric¹⁾ “He (the celebrant) shall give thanks over a loaf because it is the symbol of the flesh of Christ and over a chalice of wine because it is the blood of Christ which was outpoured for all that believe on Him”.

What we infer from the canonical narratives appears also from catholic tradition. The primitive name of the service was the Eucharist. That curious and ancient document the Didache all the more valuable here just because it is throughout a mere string of quotations, gives as the Eucharistic office a thanksgiving over the Cup “for the Holy Vine of David Thy Son, which Thou hast revealed to us through Jesus Thy Son”, and over the bread “for life and knowledge which Thou hast revealed to us through Jesus Thy Son”. And neither here nor in any other witness to the form of the absolutely primitive liturgy is there any trace of the presence of the recital of the Institution, of the Oblation or of the Invocation; in fact St. Paul was obliged to *remind* the Corinthians, not in irony but in straightforward guise, that the Eucharistic Service was also a Memorial Sacrifice and to include in his exhortation an account of the Institution in a manner which forbids us to suppose that any such was formally recited at the Corinthian celebrations. And this I say not to depreciate the importance or to deny the very early introduction of the liturgical elements in question, but certainly to emphasise the unique importance of the Eucharist.

Turn we to liturgical remains, we find the evidence all in harmony with the position taken above; not only is the Eucharist present in every Anaphora, but also as a matter of nomenclature “the whole central action of the liturgy whatever its scope in detail was originally included in *εὐχαριστία*”.²⁾

This is not the less but the more striking as a witness to the truly primitive model, when we reflect how soon and how completely other aspects of the Service were developed and

¹⁾ Sahid. Eccl. Can. 46 v. Brightman.

²⁾ Brightman, p. 589.

dwelt upon, and the true importance of the *εὐλογία* forgotten to such an extent that this its own name would almost have suggested the Invocation rather than itself. In many extant Western liturgies the Christian climax of the Eucharist is placed in the Proper Preface and so has acquired an instability most lamentably exemplified in the unique type of the modern English, which on nine Sundays out of ten contains no explicit Christian Blessing at all, possessing not even any such phrase as "Hosanna to Him who cometh in the name of the Lord": but there is nothing even in the West to suggest that the Thanksgiving for the food that nourisheth to eternal life was anything but primitive and universal. As for direct testimony to pre-Gelasian use in Rome, the Canons of Hippolytus in appointing that a newly ordained Bishop shall celebrate Mass, show us that the Anaphora opened with a thanksgiving, but go no further into details.

Such then are the more or less familiar considerations that lead to the conclusion that the Eucharist is the essential kernel of the Eucharistic Office, that is of man's part in the Sacrament in addition to partaking. This however must not be misinterpreted as if it limited the service to the bare thanksgiving and made all else superfluous; a bare thanksgiving in such a matter is an impossibility, and where more is present in reality it is right that more should be expressed. Moreover God has a part, and we should not only receive His gifts in faith, but also make recognition in our prayers that He it is on whom all depends, and that we believe in His bountiful loving-kindness. Nay, were it not for God's part the Sacrament would be bare indeed.

Lastly the only alternative to the general view taken above seems to be that so ably advocated by Dr. Watterich, but while my imperfect knowledge of German is sufficient to reveal him to me as one at whose feet I ought to sit in the matter of liturgical learning, yet when he is compelled to say that "the oldest subapostolic tradition has completely *abandoned* the apostolic form and *forgotten* the dramatic character of the Account of Institution" (Intern. Rev. No. 17, p. 92), I feel it to be a hard saying, and am the bolder therefore to abide still by my old belief.

But now to return to the Scottish Office, the contention has been justified that the compilers in restoring the Excellent Eucharist have restored a truly primitive and scriptural element, an element vital to the true form of the Liturgy.

H. Next follow in close connection the *Manual Acts*, that is those recorded as having been performed by our Lord Himself, and simultaneously the *Account of Institution* is recited, as in most liturgies, in a dependent clause, as an explanatory justifying commentary on the Blessing and the Acts fixing them as the intended fulfilment of the Lord's commands. The direct development of the consecration thus proceeds along by way of the celebrant's acts rather than by way of his words, which latter refer immediately not to the present but to the past; but it is to be remarked that utterly as the compilers eschewed the Roman theory of transubstantiation it is probable that some of them at least laid all the stress usual in the West upon the utterance of the Words of Institution as being not only exceedingly important but even as absolutely and directly necessary for a valid Eucharist.

We recognise that the consecration in one aspect of the same is now complete. For as when Christ had blessed and broken He said "This is My Body", so likewise the Church having now blessed and broken, the bread in St. Chrysostom's phrase "is worthy to be called the Lord's Body". The rest of the matter is for God's performance, and thus while it would be bald and jejune to say no more, the evidence of Scripture, of ancient liturgical remains, and I think also of reason, teaches us that bare liturgical necessity is already satisfied, that the essential part of the Church's Act previous to reception is finished. The ethical analogue is that God will give all things to the thankful.

Meanwhile it is right to note that as a matter of phraseology there is no warrant in actual Church usage for assigning any definite point at or after which it becomes correct or necessary liturgically to speak of the Body and the Blood of Christ. On the one hand we find the "Concise Explanation", which deals with the preparation for the Service, saying of a certain portion of the bread that "it is the front of the all-holy Body of Christ", with which agrees also the wording of the very ancient Sahidic Canon quoted above; and on the other

hand to take the Liturgy of St. James as our example, a rubric, at a point in the service subsequent to all and everything that has ever been regarded as necessary for consecration, speaks of signing "the Bread" with the cross.

Finally under this head, though the question naturally rises what should be thought of the English Office which in the specifically Christian form is not a Eucharist at all, the attempt to answer it would carry us far beyond the scope of this paper, and we must be content simply with remembering that the general thanksgiving may be held to include the particular, that the service is in expressed intention a fulfilment of Christ's command, and chiefly that we need not greatly fear lest God's favour should be dependent upon the perfection of the form of man's offering.

I. It now remains to perfect the service by giving expression to further realities necessarily contained therein, so the *Great Oblation* proceeds to make "with these Thy Holy Gifts which we now offer unto Thee, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make, having in remembrance His blessed Passion and precious Death, His mighty Resurrection and glorious Ascension, rendering unto Thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same". Elevation though not generally practised, and perhaps even undesirable as being liable to be misunderstood, is obviously in itself appropriate here both as symbolically entreating God to look upon the death of His Son, and as exhibiting the same to the people to stir up their humble thankful remembrance and quicken their faith. The Oblation manifestly supplies a part towards complete consecration; it not only shares in the nature of the Great Eucharist, but it also offers and dedicates the elements to God, so that they, being surrendered into His keeping, may be used by Him as instruments of His gracious purpose.

K. That He will do so is the prayer of the *Invocation* which immediately follows. It must be confessed that the Scottish compilers have made here a verbal departure from primitive models as serious and regrettable as a mere verbal departure could well be; indeed to one who read the Scottish Invocation in isolation and did not consider it in its relation to the whole service, it would inevitably suggest

Roman transubstantiation or its equivalent. On the other hand we know that nothing was farther than this from the minds of those who impressed its actual form on the prayer, and also it is notable that inasmuch as Rome attributes the transubstantiating efficacy to the Words of Institution so no Romanist could use our Invocation in its present position as impetrating transubstantiation, inasmuch as this in his view would have been already effected.

In the present Scottish wording we pray God “to bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy Gifts and Creatures of Bread and Wine that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son”, and there we stop short, whereas in all ancient forms there are further words which point expressly to the true spiritual interpretation; thus in one prayer is made that the Spirit coming down “upon us and upon these holy gifts set forth may by His holy and good and glorious presence hallow and make this bread the holy Body of Christ, and this cup the precious blood of Christ that they may be unto all who partake of them unto the remission of sins etc. . . .”; in another that the Spirit may make the bread “a living Body, a saving Body, a heavenly Body for our souls and bodies &c. . . .”; and even the Clementine Liturgy which is of all the least unlike our own in that it omits all mention of the recipients in the main petition conjoins closely with the same the expanding clause “that they who partake may be confirmed in godliness etc. . . .”. The Scottish form then is wholly unprimitive and withal harsh and bald to a degree that may not only disturb the peaceful uncriticising mind of the worshipper but may even prove a stumbling block to the simple. But it is no worse and none need really scruple in prayer to join in words which our Lord Himself used, not indeed in prayer, but in a sacramental declaration.

When it was objected by the Scottish Commissioners under Cromwell that the more primitive Invocation in the book of 1637 implied “the corporeal presence of Christ’s Body”, in that “the change here is made a work of God’s omnipotency”, Laud answered “Well, a work of omnipotency it is whatever the change be. For less than omnipotence cannot change those elements either in nature or in use to so high a service as they are put in that great Sacrament. And therefore the invo-

cating of God's Almighty Goodness to effect this by them is no proof at all of intending the corporeal presence in the Sacrament".

So also now it is in their use, and in God's sight, not in nature that we desire the material elements to be changed. We hereby impetrate God both to accept the Oblation in its sacrificial aspect and also to answer it by cooperating with and ratifying the consecration by the presbyter so that the elements may in the fullest sense of our Lord's words be His Body and His Blood, that they may be not only a signum, but also a signum efficax, a means whereby God will supply through the spirits of the worshippers the food of eternal life.

The position of the Invocation taken along with a general survey of the other facts that have been before us, strongly confirms us in holding that it is not to be regarded as the equivalent of the Blessing pronounced by our Lord, that it is not the germ of the Anaphora to which other matter has been prefixed, but rather that it is a supplication added when, but not before, the lapse of a little time had allowed the Church to realise the full meaning of its glorious legacy and to seek expression for its longings.

Why it was that the Scottish compilers, in other respects so regardful of primitive example, invented our present form of the Epiklesis I cannot say; possibly they thought they were following the Clementine, possibly they wished to emphasise the fact that God's Spirit and not man's is the true source of life, and also that in the sacrificial as well as in the lifegiving aspect of the Service the work of the Spirit was required, but we need not delay to consider the point, our concern is with the service as it stands. In which connection however it remains to say that as there is no authorised copy of the Scottish Liturgy so many persons consider themselves quite justified in use in returning to forms of a more primitive character, and such a course has at least in one case received explicit episcopal sanction.

Next follows the *Threefold Petition for Acceptance*, which indeed is not to be considered as a separate element from the Invocation; it is in language almost identical with the first of the two post-communion collects in the English Office.

L. The symbols of Christ's sacrifice having now been consecrated and offered with supplication of the Spirit, and lying before God on the Holy Table which thereby becomes an Altar of Anamnesis and Pleading, the people are invited to make their requests known to God "*Let us pray*" the Presbyter is directed to say "*for the whole state of Christ's Church*". The prayer following is almost verbally the same as that in the English Office "*for the Church militant here in earth,*" the difference in title preparing us for the somewhat fuller and more triumphant commemoration of the departed with which our own form closes. Next follows the *Lord's Prayer* in which all join, prefaced by the Presbyter with the words "*as our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us we are bold to say*".

Beautiful and edifying as the construction of our Office is, in its theoretical design, it is right here to acknowledge one practical drawback. The long Consecration Prayer followed by the long Prayer for the Church without the relief of diaconica or any other thing lays great strain not only upon the vivid attention of the celebrant but inevitably also upon that of the people; for the sound of the one voice long continued, and this not the voice of a preacher facing his people with varying tone, but the voice of a sober reader turned away from them reciting words familiar to all, puts the mind if not the body to sleep. A very prevalent Scottish usage, now, alas, quite passed away, but well within the memory of the old, was the adoption of the westward position by the celebrant, who then faced his people, made attention more easy for them, and emphasised certain aspects of the service too much neglected in modern days. Whether this custom was itself a deliberate revival *de novo* of ancient practice or the temporary flicker of a dying inheritance I am unable to say.

M. Still pleading in act through the Memorial Sacrifice we now come to *Penitence*. First the same *Invitation* as in the English Office "*Ye that do truly and earnestly repent etc. . .*". Slight differences in wording are to be found, among which we may notice the omission of the words "*with faith*" from our form, which is characteristic of the tendency before noticed to lay emphasis rather on the power of God than on the co-operation of man. In the *Confession and Absolution* which duly

follow, there is nothing that need detain us; and finally in the *Comfortable Words* we may remark that another translation has been used. "I will give you rest" answers to the English "I will refresh you" and "worthy of all acceptation" to "worthy of all men to be received", with other slight differences.

N. It is now at length that we come to the *Reception of the Sacrament*, which is most fittingly introduced by the *Prayer of Humble Access*, differing only verbally from that in the E. O. The difference though slight is characteristic of the Eastern influence under which the S. O. was compiled; "may be made clean — by His most sacred body" we read in place of — "by His body".

The celebrant in administering is directed to say only the former of the two clauses found in the E. O.; there is no doctrinal significance in the omission of the second, which being a parallel to our Lord's words "do this in remembrance of me", has for us been anticipated by the great emphasis already laid upon the memorial aspect of the service by the Great Oblation. At this point then in the S. O. emphasis is laid upon the gift of eternal life as the result of "eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of Man". And perhaps also on what may be called the precatory use of the sacraments, the act of receiving is the ritual translation of the prayer of the administrant, or rather since Christ appointed the former let us say that the prayer of the administrant is the verbal interpretation of the act of the recipient; who also on his part is directed to respond Amen.

When the number of communicants is large, it is wonderful what a gain of reverence there is in the shorter form of administering words. Less haste and more speed; less danger for the celebrant of falling into vain repetition or confused utterance, and less for the people of that distracting interval in which for many reasons it is so hard to pray. Perhaps also the more united reception may somewhat lessen what is the inevitable weakness of all modern, or even extant Offices, namely the isolation of each communicant from his neighbour; we cannot love God without loving our brother, and our services are surely short of perfection when it is so easy to attend Holy Communion in a church for twenty years and not know the name or even the face of another man who has done

the same; surely short of perfection when it is so easy for the Pharisee to tolerate the Publican beside him, not because he recognises a brother, but because he has never really noticed that he was there. But here is danger of digressing.

A rubric directs that "if the consecrated Bread and Wine be all spent . . . the Presbyter is to consecrate more according to the form prescribed beginning with the words "All Glory be to Thee . . ." and ending with the words" . . . that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son" that is he must use the Great Eucharist, the Manual Acts with words of Institution, the Oblation and Invocation".

Thus probably consecration in one kind is not contemplated as it is in the English; for though the manual acts might be omitted without impropriety in the case of the element of which there was no lack already consecrated, and though conceivably in the Invocation also reference to it might be omitted, yet it would be, though of course not so grave an error, at least as liturgically preposterous to make the Oblation in one kind as it would be to communicate in one kind, and it is not to be supposed that this could properly be met by offering a second time what by the previous Consecration was already in God's hands.

After reception comes a short *Exhortation*, which like the former, is omitted by custom, though not invariably. It introduces a *Thanksgiving* for the privilege and the benefits of the Eucharistic Service, with prayer for perseverance. This Thanksgiving is the second alternative of the English post-communion collects.

O. This ended the *Gloria in excelsis* follows which is an expanded "Hallelujah" or "Hosanna", — the spiritual counterpart of a parting burst of cheering.

There are various verbal differences from the E. O. of which one very noticeable; to the words "Heavenly King, God the Father Almighty" are added these "and to Thee O God, the only begotten Son Jesu Christ and to Thee O God the Holy Ghost". This change was almost certainly due to the influence of Codex A, which contains the oldest extant written version of the hymn,

Θεὸ πατὴρ παντοκράτωρ
Κύριε υἱὲ μονογενὲς
Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ
Καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα.

But even from this the emphatic assertion of the Divinity of the Three Persons found in the S. O. is absent, and Dr. Neale may have hit upon part of the truth when, in evident ignorance indeed of Codex A, he wrote:

“The Alteration of the Gloria in Excelsis is perhaps indefensible, yet I confess that in that century of Arianism (the 18th) when the enemy came in like a flood there is something noble in the courage with which an obscure and persecuted Church interpolated the Catholic faith of the blessed Trinity into a hymn which in the altered sentence had not previously borne witness to the doctrine of Nicaea and Constantinople.” The form of Codex A is that also of the ancient Celtic churches of our land, as the four extant copies of the old Irish use testify, and it is also the form of the old Ambrosian rite; in fact though the Roman and English form has the older look it has really but one witness on its side against many.

The repetition of “thou that takest away the sins of the world have mercy upon us” is omitted.

Then with the *Blessing* the people are allowed to depart.

In some copies of the S. O. there follows this note “According to a venerable custom of the Church of Scotland the Priest may reserve so much of the consecrated gifts as may be required for the communion of the sick and others who could not be present at the Celebration in Church”. This is quite true though few I fancy do so in fact, but clearly it has no especial connection with the S. O., for since it is the recognised custom of the Church, the mere use of the E. O. could not in Scotland override it, the rubric forbidding it being, in its disciplinary aspect, clearly extraneous to the Celebration itself, and it is the Liturgy only not the enactments of England that we have adopted.

Synopsis S. O.

The subdivisions: (*a*) states the leading thought; (*b*) describes the same subjectively or adds some explanatory comment; (*c*) gives the actual material in the text of the Office.

A. (*a*) The Perfect Life; — (*b*) We examine ourselves by the Divine standard, and pray for mercy and guidance; (*c*) Lord's Prayer — Collect for Purity of Heart — Decalogue, or Law of Love — Collect for guidance, or on behalf of the Queen.

B. (a) The True Faith; — (b) We examine ourselves in the same, receive edification and make common profession; — (c) Collect, Epistle and Gospel — Creed — Sermon.

C. (a) The Christian's Privilege; — (b) We are exhorted concerning the one special act of worship ordained by Christ; — (c) The long Exhortation.

D. (a) Offering of Substance; — (b) For God's general use; — (c) The collection with suitable sentences from scripture and the presentation upon the Holy Table with David's words of offering.

E. (a) Excellent Offering; — (b) That is, of the bread and wine prepared for Christ's appointed service now in action; — (c) The rubric simply directs this to be done prescribing no words.

F. (a) Blessing and Thanksgiving; (b) As due to God from all Creation at all times and seasons with a specifically Christian reference at the great festivals; — (c) Sursum Corda — Proper Preface — Angelic Hymn.

G. (a) Excellent Blessing; — (b) For Christ's Incarnation. The Christian counterpart of the Passover blessings, and thus the first act of sacramental conformity with Christ's command "Do this"; — (c) The opening words of the Prayer of Consecration.

H. (a) Manual Acts with Account of Institution; — (b) The Presbyter now performs the actions recorded of Christ, reciting meanwhile the scriptural narrative as showing what we intend by our service and as our authority for it; — (c) Continuation of Prayer of Consecration.

J. (a) Memorial and Oblation; — (b) With renewed thanksgiving we offer to God that which we have set apart by blessing to be the sacrament of Christ's Passion, and we make explicitly both before God and man the appointed memorial; — (c) Continuation of Prayer of Consecration.

K. (a) Invocation; — (b) We beseech God to ratify our action, spiritually to accept our Oblation and make it for us in the full sense of Christ's words His Body and His Blood. Finally in three aspects we entreat God to receive us; — (c) Conclusion of Prayer of Consecration.

L. (a) Supplication; — (b) Prayer is made for the whole Church, and this most fitly with the Memorial Sacrifice lying on the Altar; — (c) Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church — Lord's Prayer.

M. (a) Penitence; — (b) Most fitly also at this time we make confession of our sins, receiving absolution and comfort; — (c) Invitation — Confession — Absolution — Comfortable Words.

N. (a) Communion; — (b) Each worshipper now humbly completes his obedience; more closely associates himself with the Service; is sacramentally united with Christ in faith that God will grant eternal life to those who now receive its pledges; and returns thanks to God; — (c) Collect of Humble Access — Reception — Short Exhortation — Collect of Thanksgiving.

O. (a) Departure; — (b) Finally we stand to ascribe glory to God; kneel to receive His blessing; and so reverently depart; — (c) Gloria in excelsis — Blessing.

J. T. F. FARQUHAR,

Rector of S. Mary's Church, Dunblane.
