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EUCHARIST:
WORSHIP '81
This issue of the Bulletin presents five major papers on the eucharist, as given at the symposium of the Canadian Liturgical Society, Worship '81.

The talks represent an ecumenical approach, and show where scholars are working in the continuing study and dialogue of our days.

Liturgy committees, catechists, clergy, students, and many others will find this issue a rich source of prayer, study, and discussion in the spirit of chapter 17 of John's gospel and Vatican II.
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Welcome

Robert G. Oliver

On behalf of the board of the Canadian Liturgical Society, I extend to all of you a most hearty welcome to Worship '81.

The Canadian Liturgical Society is a voluntary gathering of persons, lay and clerical, academically, professionally, and/or pastorally inclined, who are concerned to discuss the substance of Christian worship across denominational lines, that we may all grow and develop in understanding and mutual respect so that we may ever more faithfully respond to God in worship.

Our first symposium was held in Ottawa in 1969, under the general title, Worship. Successive themes have been on Prayer (Toronto, 1972), Celebrating the Word (Hamilton, 1975), and Christian Initiation (Winnipeg, 1977). Now we are in London for Worship '81, on the Eucharist. We deeply regret that this conference, which had been planned for a year ago, was of necessity cancelled, causing great inconvenience to many people, including many of you here present now. Two of the papers which had been prepared for that occasion have since been published, and may be obtained in the National Bulletin on Liturgy. The papers of the 1975 and 1977 symposia are also published and available in book form.

Because of the significance of the theme, and the concern of so many for an in-depth discussion, we continued with our plan to study the eucharist. Here we are brought to focus at the point where we are most united (included) and at one in Christ; but also at the point where we are most divided (excluded). Because of the centrality of this sacrament, here the line has been drawn to separate members from non-members of the Church, and believers from believers. We all work together, eat together, study together, pray together, and play together, even acknowledge one baptism in the Church, but here is where we demonstrate our exclusiveness and our mutual excommunication. So, happily, for these days we are going to think on these things as we hold one another in honor and love and respect.

To this end we have invited our distinguished speakers to lead us in our conversation. They will be introduced to you at the proper time. For now let me say, on your behalf, how delighted we are that they have found it possible to be here and to take the time for the preparation of their respective papers.

May God bless us as we, members of his Church from many communions, meet together in his name to deepen our understanding of the holy eucharist.

---

1 See Eucharist as celebration, by Marion J. Hatchett, and Eucharistic convergence, by W. Morrison Kelly, in Bulletin 76 (vol. 13, November-December 1980, pages 196-215). This issue remains available from CCCB Publications, 90 Parent Ave., Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7B1, at $1.65 (in Canada), and $2.20 (outside Canada, in U.S. funds), postpaid. Dr. Kelly is one of the founders of the Canadian Liturgical Society.

2 The proceedings of these symposia are published as Celebrating the Word (1975), and Initiation Theology (1977). Edited by James Schmeiser, they are available from The Anglican Book Center, 600 Jarvis Street, Toronto, Ontario M4Y 2J6. These books were reviewed in Bulletin 63, pages 125-126; and in no. 68, page 92.
LECTURES

Christian community and eucharist

Bernard Cooke

Dr. Bernard Cooke was born at Norway, Michigan. He did graduate work at St. Louis University and received his doctorate in theology from the Institut Catholique in Paris. He has taught at Marquette University, the University of Windsor, the University of Calgary, and is presently at the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester, Massachusetts.

In introducing the speaker, Dr. James Schmeiser of the Canadian Liturgical Society board noted:

Dr. Bernard Cooke is a theologian who has labored for years in the realm of liturgy. He has published numerous books and articles which have focused on the sacraments, the community, and the commission to present and celebrate the word within our midst. The titles of some of his works indicate this focus: Formation of Faith; Christian Sacraments and Christian Personality; The God of Space and Time; Beyond Trinity; Christian Community: Response to Reality; the monumental work of Ministry to Word and Sacrament; Rethinking Your Faith; and Theology in an Age of Revolution.

I will briefly paraphrase a comment of Frederick McManus on the work of Dr. Cooke: "His works grow out of the reflections of the Church over many centuries, but they turn always to the concrete reality of this moment and the great expectations of the future. They should help to bring the abstract doctrine closer to the situation of this moment in history, this moment in the life of each Christian present. The goal is the same as that of all Christian teaching, that we may be no less committed than Christians of the past — and indeed may come a little closer, through sacramental celebration, to the blessed hope of the Lord's coming and of our fulfillment as his people."

*   *   *

4
In the keynote address he gave to the Catholic Theological Society of America in 1979, Regis Duffy dealt quite directly and challengingly with a problem that, I believe, deeply troubles many of us. Talking about that Christian action which in various traditions we call “Eucharist” or “The Lord’s Supper” or “Communion” or “the Mass” or “the Divine Liturgy,” Dr. Duffy suggested that in many instances it may be counter-productive because it is counter-symbolic for those involved in it. Bluntly put, many Christians might be better off not to go to church; their faith might flourish better if it were not suffocated by our Sunday services. Perhaps one does not have to be quite so stark in describing our continuing liturgical malaise; but, I think it undeniable that we have here a matter of ultimate importance whose neglect would strike at the very root of Christianity’s existence and mission.

But the challenge comes not just from such prophetic voices; it comes from our own recent experience. Probably more than most other Christians, those of us who for some time have worked to revitalize the liturgical life of the Church passed through a period of euphoria about liturgical awakening. For those of us in the Catholic tradition, the fact that Vatican II’s first major document dealt with basic liturgical reform and that this document’s internal logic led the Council toward that revolutionary reconsideration of Christian community which marks the Council’s Constitution on the Church, seemed to spell the inception of a new era. In this newly-emerging Church, the liturgy would be the great agent to produce alive and committed Christian communities. But, it is now more than a decade since Vatican II, and, while a keen observer acquainted with the centuries-long evolution of Christian faith and life and therefore patient with the slow pace of genuine conversion can see movement toward more genuine Christianity, we have learned that eucharistic liturgies — not even carefully-planned and well-executed liturgies — do not automatically produce Christian community. This more realistic view of liturgy’s limited power to bring about community is, I think, one of the things that binds us ecumenically.

In the frequent discussion of eucharist and Christian community during the past decade or two, we have learned to accept the reciprocal influence of these two elements: any vital celebration of eucharist presupposes some Christian community whose faith it expresses and thereby deepens; in proportion, as there is a genuine sharing of Christianity in the assembled liturgical community the eucharistic action is a true profession of faith. And, on the other hand, insofar as the eucharistic action is one in which the people share personally, consciously, deliberately, and corporately, this action results in a deepened community among those people. But what is this community; and how does eucharist draw from it and develop it by giving expression to it? My remarks today will be an attempt to provide some elements of response to these questions.

First, a preliminary remark: I am aware that there is an ambiguity about the word “community” which, as it applies to “Christian community” is as old as the use of koinonia in Acts 2. “Community” can refer to the persons who comprise a particular group, or it can refer to the sharing that takes place among those persons, their communing. It is on this latter more active, more process, sense that I will be concentrating, though obviously the other sense is always part of the connotation.
All the Assembled People Are Active

If one uses the active notion of community and applies it to the eucharist, this would seem to necessitate a view of that action in which the entire group of assembled people is active — and this is the first observation I wish to make. There has been for long, and to a considerable extent there is still, a presumption by many that the eucharist is the action of an ordained celebrant. Others attend this action, they are even at times described as participating in it; but it is the official celebrant who acts in persona Christi, it is his central activity that God uses instrumentally to sanctify the assembly, and the faithful are described as receiving communion rather than as communing with one another. It is this view of the action that needs to be corrected.

It is the assembled Christians as identifiable disciples of the risen Christ who are the primary embodiment of that risen Lord and of his Spirit. Not as individuals but as a people they are the fundamental sacramental symbol, the body of Christ. But to insist on the corporate dimension of their sacramentality is not to reduce it to some generic Christian significance; in each Christian assembly for eucharist, the particular meanings of each person and each life experience as these interrelate are an intrinsic element in the assembly's significance. It is the meaning that each person in the community has for the others (as well as for himself or herself) that is more operative in the effectiveness of the sacramental action than is the symbolic meaning of bread or wine. People are the key symbolic reality in eucharist.

However, if the assembled Christians are to be an effective symbol of community, a symbol that can act with sacramental efficacy to help bring about that ultimate community which is the kingdom of God, the action of the eucharist must become truly a sharing, something done in common by both celebrant and people. Distinction of roles there can and by the nature of the action must be, but there is no place for a distinction between those who act and those acted upon — all act, all act upon. The eucharistic action is meant, then, to be one of communing, of sharing, of doing something in common — not just acting simultaneously or even in harmony, but rather acting corporately.

At the most basic, this shared activity is that of Christian faith. Not exactly a new notion, since for centuries Christian sacramental acts were seen as professions of faith; and we have never totally lost the understanding which the very structure of sacramental liturgy demands. Today, with modern studies into the nature of religion and particularly with the distinction now being made between faith and belief, we can perhaps develop anew the idea of sacraments professing faith. As you know, many scholars of religion use the term "faith" to refer to that deeper level of positive response to life's experience in which one accepts oneself and one's world with openness and responsibility and thereby accepts, at least implicitly, one's creaturely orientation to the transcendent. This is the level of basic honesty and loving concern and growing human maturity. "Belief," on the other hand, is used to designate the formulations — doctrinal, ritual, life style — by which the underlying faith is shaped in some particular fashion. Thus, the faith of a Muslim is shaped by the beliefs of Islam while the faith of a Christian is shaped by the beliefs and practices of his particular Christian tradition.

Ideally, of course, faith and belief are found together in a living integration of understanding and affectivity; but they are to quite an extent separable: an indi-
individual can have a rather profound and open attitude toward his or her life but have had little opportunity to find appropriate expression of this in some belief system. On the contrary — and unfortunately this is probably more often the case — a person can adhere to a structure of belief without the underlying acceptance of himself, his world, or the true God. Authentic ritual cannot co-exist with this sort of dichotomy; it demands an increasing interpenetration of the two elements; faith becomes more consciously and maturely personal as it finds appropriate expression, and beliefs and practices take on increased vitality and relevance as they are interiorized in a life of personal faith.

Applying all this to the Christian eucharist, the assembled community is meant to share not just belief but faith in the risen Lord, in his Father, in the presence of their Spirit in the Church. The action of eucharist is not just a statement of beliefs through word and ritual gesture. It is even more than a public witness that these men and women consider these beliefs to be true, in some sense even an ultimate wisdom. It is more than externalized acceptance of a particular stance toward human life, of a certain set of values. It is all of these, but beyond that it is a shared public commitment to fidelity. It is a pledge to that fidelity to Christ which we name discipleship; it is a pledge to fidelity to God as the Father of our Lord Jesus and as such our Father; it is a pledge to follow faithfully the movement of their Spirit in our midst. This means that the action of eucharist is meant to be the experience of really sharing, in a deep personal way, the presence of the Lord Jesus and of his Father through open acceptance of their Spirit which they are sharing with us.

But eucharist is meant also to be a pledge of fidelity to one another, for it is an acceptance of relationship more profound — as Jesus’ own teaching tells us — than even our own bonds of family. The ties that link us because together we accept Jesus as our brother will, we believe, pass into the life beyond, when bonds of human kinship and historical simultaneity will have given way to the unending bonds of personal love. Because eucharist is intended to be this kind of commitment to one another, it is meant to provide in large part for what so many humans seek today: a support community that can allow them to live freely and genuinely because they have some stable base of security and acceptance.

Christian Mission

The second major area of sharing which the eucharist is meant to express sacramentally is that of Christian mission. When one recalls the theological teaching (found, for example, in the thought of Thomas Aquinas) that the priesthood of Jesus himself is nothing other than the finality intrinsic to his incarnational existence, one can see just how basic to all Christian existence is the mission we share from baptism. Once initiated into the mystery of the risen Lord, engrafted into his body which is the Church, we exist with the same purpose and destiny that gives meaning to the risen life of Jesus: we are directed to the eschatological fulfillment of the kingdom of God, i.e., the final realization of personal community. In our next session! together, I hope to develop the notion that the Spirit is the source of this mission, indeed one might well describe the Spirit as this mission — so I will not dwell on this at present.

1 See pages 23-28, below.
Again, I wish at this point to mention only briefly the fact that the eucharistic community, brought to deeper faith and life by the Spirit sought in *epiklesis*, is intended to be a shared process of decision, a corporate determination of the action demanded by the dictates of the gospel. Decision is, of course, more than just the specification of what should be done; it is the practical determination to do what is seen to be the appropriate thing. Another way of viewing such an acceptance of Christians' mission is to see it as the people's response to the covenant relationship offered to them by God.

Let me reflect for a short time on this covenant aspect of Christian eucharistic community, for it touches some of the currents of recent liturgical revitalization. Those of you whose religious traditions carry you back to the Wesleyian revival of the eighteenth century will remember the importance of "covenant" in the mentality of the Wesleys themselves and the great stress laid by John Wesley on the annual ceremony of covenant renewal. And you are even better acquainted than I am with the extent to which contemporary efforts to revitalize Methodist liturgy have returned to Wesley's focus on covenant. In Catholic liturgical developments since mid-century, it is difficult to find anything more fundamental in its impact than the recovery of the Easter vigil — and clearly the liturgy of that central celebration is one of tracing the whole dispensation of covenant through its history and into the lives of today's Christians. As eucharistic *anamnesis* it is a recapitulation of Sinai and prophetism, of Davidic promise and creation itself as rudimentary covenant, of post-Exilic renewal of covenant, of Jesus' supper with his disciples, and of centuries of Christian celebration of Jesus' Passover.

Mere mention of covenant thrusts us immediately into a context of community. God's initiating activity in covenant has from the beginning been one of bringing a *people* into being. Obviously, this social effectiveness of the divine action in no way works against the growth of individual freedom and dignity within the people; but such maturation of persons is clearly meant to take place within a *people*. Today we feel that we have made some major strides in understanding the extent to which the development of the individual human is a matter of the appropriate relationships among persons; maturation is inseparable from socialization. Yet, this has been the clear implication of covenant in its Israelitic and its Christian forms: a man or woman becomes more profoundly and genuinely a human person by participating responsibly in that community of persons, i.e., that active sharing among persons, which flows from God's *berith* with humanity.

Today, we are wrestling, not just in religion, but in the whole of human life, with the dynamics of human society, trying to discover and nurture the forces that will bring us together, hoping to eliminate the powers of conflict and dissolution that threaten to destroy our very existence on this planet. The temptation always is to look for some magical formula or structure or process that will solve it all — some seek the solution in Marxist dialectic, others in imposition of "law and order," still others in a flowering of technology. We forget often that the inner spirit of a people, rather than its external institutions, may be its source of unity. Yet, the incredible history of Israel (and to quite an extent also the inexplicable continuation in history of Judaism) stands as a witness to the creative power of the covenant between God and his people: Israel as a social reality in human history can be explained only as a people emerging from this covenant; nothing else can account for its existence and its unbelievable ability to survive. Might not we conclude that the vitality and sur-
vival of Christianity depends, too, upon the extent to which it is a people of eucharistic covenant?

**Eucharist As Shared Joy**

Thus far, then, we have talked a bit about the manner in which Christian eucharist is a sharing, a communing, in faith and in mission. There is just one more aspect of communion with one another in eucharist that I would like to mention, one that is often overlooked but which is (I believe) a key to our present efforts to renew Christian liturgy. I refer to the nature of eucharist as **shared joy**.

Whatever it is that happens in genuine eucharist, it clearly is response to the preached gospel. While there can be a too narrow understanding of the evangelical dimension of eucharist, one that downgrades its sacramental effectiveness, there is no question but that eucharist is radically evangelical. In its origins the eucharistic prayer was seen — and properly so — as prophetic proclamation. Not just the use of scriptural readings forms a liturgy of word; the entire action is enacted gospel word, the proclamation of the joyous gospel of Jesus' triumph over death. But what is the appropriate response to this word?

The answer to that question is provided, I believe, by the sixteenth and seventeenth chapters of John's gospel where, in the so-called "last discourse" Jesus says that he has said what he did, in order that his disciples may have peace and joy, in order that his own joy may find fulfillment in them. Clearly, we are not talking here about some superficial kind of enjoyment; we are talking about that joy which is the final stage of love, that joy which comes in possession of the ultimate good which one has longed for and sought. To seek any good we must know that it is and what it is; so, Jesus in all his public teaching conveys his experience of this God whom he knows in unique familiarity as his Father, the source of his own unshakable peace and joy. What he desires for his disciples is that they come to share in this same peaceful joy by accepting the saving offer of friendship that comes through him from this Father.

When people possess joy that they wish to share with others, they celebrate. Appropriately, we speak of "celebrating the eucharist"; but in so many actual instances of eucharistic liturgy the term seems a basic misnomer. There is very little of what we ordinarily think of as celebration that occurs in many churches on a Sunday morning; people seem to be enduring rather than enjoying; no one seems to regret the end of services. Just imagine the experience of a child coming to an ordinary Sunday parish eucharist or communion service; it is scarcely what that child would think of as a celebration; everything enjoyable is forbidden — no moving around, no talking, no noise, no looking around or signalling friends, nothing that people do at parties. Now, what is the significance of that action for that child, what meaning can such an activity (or lack of it) have? Yet, the eucharist as the central sacramental action of the Church is meant to transform human life and human experience **by the meaning it conveys**.

The immense practical implications of what we have just mentioned are rather evident. How can people really see faith as a joyous and fulfilling experience when it is expressed in such an unattractive way? How can young people, idealistically committed to working for the betterment of their world, believe that it is better to spend time at such a lackluster activity instead of participating in some project that
will help their fellow humans? Perhaps Israel did find its God in the experience of the desert; but I am far from convinced that we can expect the same for Christians doomed to a liturgical desert, with little or no hope of reaching a promised land. What a loss — and it is an avoidable loss — this represents for Christians who have a birthright to decent eucharistic liturgy.

But, I do not wish to sound pessimistic. I am not. And the reason I am not is that we have come to realize much more accurately what our dissatisfaction is all about, what our eucharist can and should become; and that knowledge is the first step in accomplishing what is needed. One cannot seek an unknown goal, desire an unknown good, make decisions about means to an end when one knows not what that end is. But we do know, not completely, but surely much better than we did just a short time ago, what we should be trying to accomplish in liturgical reform. Sharing that knowledge and working together to implement it will, I am sure, be a major component in the very communing about which we have been speaking.

**COURSES IN PASTORAL LITURGY**

Good courses in liturgy are being offered in North America. Some of these are given during the summer, some during the school year, and some in shorter institutes.

Further information may be obtained by writing to the following:

- Program of Liturgical Studies  
  Department of Theology  
  University of Notre Dame  
  Notre Dame, IN 46556  
  U.S.A.

- The Graduate School  
  St. John's University  
  Collegeville, MN 56321  
  U.S.A.

- School of Religious Studies  
  The Catholic University of America  
  Washington, DC 20064  
  U.S.A.

- Aquinas Institute  
  3642 Lindell Boulevard  
  St. Louis, MO 63108  
  U.S.A.

- Program of Church Music and Liturgy  
  St. Joseph's College  
  Rensselaer, IN 47978  
  U.S.A.

- The Center for Pastoral Liturgy  
  The Catholic University of America  
  Washington, DC 20064  
  U.S.A.

- The Georgetown Center for Liturgy, Spirituality and the Arts  
  3514 "O" Street, NW  
  Washington, DC 20007

- Irish Institute for Pastoral Liturgy, approved by the Irish hierarchy: A one-year program, commencing each September. Four areas of specialization: Church at prayer, eucharist, sacraments, theology of liturgy. The curriculum includes lectures in scriptures, theology, human sciences, music, art, and architecture.

  Applications should be made early to Rev. S. Swayne. Director, Irish Institute of Pastoral Liturgy.  
  College St., Carlow, Ireland.
Theology of eucharist

Dr. David Hay is a retired professor of systematic theology and lecturer in Liturgics at Knox College, Toronto. A Scot, he trained at the University of Edinburgh, and was ordained a minister of the Church of Scotland. He came to Canada as a professor at Knox, where he became an institution.

He has been president of the Canadian Council of Churches, moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, and convenor of the revision committee for the Book of Common Order (1964). Recently he was awarded an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree from St. Michael's College in Toronto.

* * *

The Church’s Spiritual Sacrifice

To reduce my subject to manageable proportions, I shall discuss the theology of the eucharist in relation to the theology of liturgy. Hence my subtitle, “The Church’s Spiritual Sacrifice.” It is not a bad idea to get a representative of the Reformed tradition to do this because Reformed theology has no theology of liturgy. The admission may sound like a disqualification, but on the other hand it gives one an open field. There are encouraging signs that Protestants want to rediscover liturgy. This lecture will attempt to outline the problems and suggest where the answer lies, for certainly a good theology of liturgy and a good theology of the eucharist go hand in hand.

Let me first show that I am not alone in acknowledging Reformed innocence in the matter of liturgy by quoting the opening words of the best book yet produced on the subject from the Reformed side. It came from the pen of the French scholar, Jean-Jacques von Allmen, and begins:

The theme of “worship” has never been treated as a major one in the thinking of the Reformed Churches. It even arouses in us a certain suspicion — a suspicion which is probably one of the outstanding features of Protestantism.¹

How are we to exorcise the prejudice and fill the lacuna? Let me begin by examining the Westminster Confession of Faith on the subject, reminding you of its considerable representativeness, for the Westminster Assembly had an ecumenical purpose: its Confession was taken over, with modifications, by Congregationalists and Baptists, and the Church of England received a large infusion of Calvinism. Chapter XXI is headed, “Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day,” and begins:

The light of nature showeth that there is a God, who hath lordship and sovereignty over all . . . and is therefore to be feared, loved, praised, called upon, trusted in, and served, with all the heart, and with all the soul, and with all the mind. But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to . . . any [other] way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture.

Those of you who are familiar with the Barthian repudiation of natural theology will not fail to notice that worship is first grounded there: “The light of nature showeth . . . etc.” Whether we are Barthians or anti-Barthians we shall agree, I am sure, that Christian liturgy cannot be derived from the general human situation to the neglect of the special divine revelation that the Church’s tradition and the scriptures testify to, even though Old Testament usages are largely adaptations from general folk rites. The Divines therefore go on to what is a truly splendid statement: “But the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself,” and then they refer us to the scriptures.

The next thing to notice, later in the chapter, is the heavy emphasis upon the Sabbath day, which in its turn is grounded in the law of nature and said to be further divinely enacted in the fourth commandment. I suspect that the Divines, not being able to base worship on the Lord’s day upon tradition, not even on a tradition visible in the New Testament itself, were forced back on a commandment of the Jewish Law, forgetting our Lord’s teaching (which Calvin had not forgotten) that he had fulfilled the Sabbath. Having found this general and Sabbatarian basis for worship, the Divines failed to explore its Christian origins. Not that they neglected the scriptural items of worship or that they failed to offer piecemeal doctrines about them, but they failed to investigate the relation of the historical economy of revelation to what the Church does in worship.

This blank space has been invaded by all kinds of factors and influences that are erosive of liturgy and churchliness, some of them generated by the Divines themselves as they pursued their “further reformation.” Among these factors the following may be named, although they cannot be strictly isolated from one another, and the Protestant world is so divergent that their operation is far from uniform. What they have in common is retreat from, diminution or denial of, or at least discomfort with the historical, bodily, visible features of divine revelation and its churchly enshrinement. They are illustrations of Paul Tillich’s contrast between Protestant principle and Catholic substance.

(i) In an appendix to their Directory of Public Worship, the Westminster Divines deny that any times, except the Sabbath, or any places can be capable of special holiness. Out went the Christian year, biblical though it was, along with church dedications, special respect for church vessels, crosses, furnishings, and symbols. At the same time, Christian art was put beyond the walls. Possibly in reaction against relics of the saints and suchlike, Professor James Denney once said that the
great discovery of the Reformation was that religion is concerned not with things but with persons. In view of the fact that human existence is implicated right and left with things and that the Church is nothing without its sacramental things and book, his statement is a sorry blunder. But it is all of a piece.

(ii) Too often the Holy Spirit has been thought of as pure, divine Spirit descending from heaven upon the interior human spirit, loosed from history; and even Christ in his ascended state has been "divinised" as if he had no glorified body. The incarnational reference of *Filioque*, earthly and heavenly, has been omitted. Worship "in spirit and in truth" became retreat into the invisible, non-material world of eternity. To such a mentality, the Church is an essentially invisible entity. Dix says very well that to the Puritans worship was a matter of the head and the heart over against all external ceremony (although it must be remembered that the good Puritans adhered loyaly to the sacraments).²

(iii) The slogans, "justification by faith," "direct access," and "born again," have laid such stress on human subjectivity as to encourage the delusion of a one-to-one relation with God, Father, Son, and Spirit, apart from any mediation. "The universal priesthood of all believers" has tended to be a phrase of the same tendency.

(iv) *Sola scriptura:* William Chillingworth said, with far too much truth, that the bible, and the bible alone, is the religion of Protestants. Taken extremely, this principle lifts the bible out of history. From being the Church's supreme norm it has now for many become the Church's foundation. Hence the fierce defence of it. Hence the incredible extension of freelance Christianity in our time. It is characteristic that the epithet *holy* is applied by Protestants with freedom only to God and the book.

(v) The breach in the unity of the Church at the Reformation and the subsequent multiplication of divisions seriously diminished a historical consciousness of the Church as one body continuing from the apostles. Apostolical succession was widely reduced to ideational identity with them, and their primacy, especially St. Peter's, was explained away.

(vi) Although for all the major Protestant groups loyalty to two sacraments has been a standing check to the flight from "externals" in religion, their ceremonial character has brought upon them an aura of suspicion, and stress upon them is widely regarded as dangerous and "catholicising."

Two further specific erosions will be dealt with as this lecture proceeds.

To recur finally to the Westminster Divines, it is worthy of note that while they grounded worship in the wrong way, in a general concept and the Sabbath day, when they came to the doctrine of the Church they actually offered a liturgical definition of it:

Upon this catholic visible church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God (i.e., in brief, Ministry, Word, and Sacraments), for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto (XXV, 3).

It is much to be regretted that they did not build their chapter on worship on this excellent statement, with its affirmation of the real presence by the Spirit making use of the divinely appointed media. They would then have been on the right road to explaining what it means to say that “the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself.” Picking up this clue that the Christian ministry and liturgy arise precisely at the historical place at which the divine self-disclosure is itself granted, we must repair their work on the basis of the truth that God makes history.

1. **God Makes History**

Recent biblical scholarship is unanimous upon this principle. For our immediate purposes we must enforce the corollary that the divine act precedes the divine word. True, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” But that ultimate Word is not known or heard until God acts. No man has seen God at any time and by the same token neither has he heard God at any time. Seeing and hearing can come only by meditation. In both creation and redemption this is so. God creates “by his Word,” but that creating Word is not heard until the creation stands forth, and then “the heavens declare the glory of God.” So also is it in redemption. “The Word was made flesh,” and then we beheld his glory. The divine deed precedes and yields the divine word.

It follows that the Reformed emphasis upon the priority of the word must be corrected. It must be granted on the credit side that this emphasis repaired a sad gap that had appeared in the liturgy. It restored the preached word as an inherent element. But unfortunately it did so in an exaggerated way, that introduced an opposite lapse, an erosion that was not present before, for now the eucharist became infrequent. The emphasis upon word came to its acme in Karl Barth with his one-sided claim that proclamation is the superconcept of revelation. One should rather say that the superconcept is deed, God’s mighty acts, and that the word is contained in the deed. Even Calvin said that God is known by what he does. It is no wonder that in the end Barth lost the sacraments, except as testimonies to human faith.

G.E. Wright’s book, *God Who Acts*, is a most useful counterword to the “God Who Speaks” emphasis. At the same time he makes the valuable observation that while the bible has little theology of our kind, viz., discursive or rational theology, its pages are crowded with what he calls “recital theology,” that is, verbal proclamations of God’s mighty acts. The acts are the burden of the recitals, which are frequently creedal affirmations, liturgical in nature. It would not be at all absurd to assert that the bible is *in extenso* testimony to God’s deeds of grace through the whole history of salvation.

In mentioning creedal recitals we have already moved into what should be the next step. If God makes history in specific times and places, the question must arise how these deeds are to be effectual after they are over. Creeds are one of the ways. There are also traditions, legends, writings, festivals, and especially liturgical rites and usages, Church-action in world-time, yet also and ever in divine time, in which the divine history recurs and recurs under the aspect of finalisation. History, divine and human, is inescapably bodily, a complex of space, time, mind and matter. Any impulse of worship that attempts to escape this bodiliness cannot be Christian.
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worship because it will be an attempt to escape God’s history. Among these institutions we must now pay special attention to the liturgical memorial.

2. Divine History and the Liturgical Memorial

This matter must be given special attention because Protestantism has been seriously off the rails at this point since a sad blunder on Calvin’s part. This is the second additional erosion to which I referred.

We read in the Old Testament that in the very moment of the Exodus a Passover usage was adapted as a means by which the deliverance would keep on recurring among the holy people for all time. Similarly, as our Lord faced the cross, which on the mount of transfiguration was called the Exodus that he was to accomplish in Jerusalem, he consummated the Passover by the institution of his new Passover, whereby his New Israel would continually participate in his passion. For the Christian this is what it means to say that the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself. The Church is to offer a memorial to God the Father of his Son’s divine redemption.

I wish we could say that this teaching is pretty familiar today. But it does not describe the frame of mind in which Protestants in general, whether clergy or laity, approach the holy table. Their minds are dominated by the words, “This do in remembrance of me.” As we know, people like simple explanations, and what can be simpler than remembering Jesus? There is no mystery in that. On the other hand, it is pleasing to find that at a dialogue some four years ago between the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, the participants agreed: “When Christ gives the apostles a commission, ‘Do this in remembrance of me,’ the word remembrance means more than a merely mental act of recalling.” But how much more? I am surprised that the combined group consented to use the word “remembrance.” In the Greek it is anamnesis, but though abstract in form it can also bear the meaning of the concrete mnemosunon. We must take a brief look at a few examples of memorials in the Old Testament.

There was the rainbow, to remind God of his covenant; there were two onyx stones on the shoulders of Aaron’s ephod, set in gold and inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes, and also a breastplate of twelve previous stones, all for a memorial before God of his people; there was shewbread, twelve cakes with incense burning on them, “for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord”; there was a perpetual incense before the Lord upon its own altar; very strikingly, there was a memorial of trumpets, apparently as much to arouse God as to summon the people for a particular Sabbath and sacrifice. Of these things and much else one may read in Max Thurian’s two volumes, The Eucharistic Memorial.

The major point is that the purpose of memorials was to put something into God’s remembrance rather than man’s. If that sounds ridiculous, the answer will soon come. Of all memorials, the most important was the Passover, particularly because Jesus fastened on it. “This day shall be unto you for a memorial . . . . Ye
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shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations." They were to feast on the lamb whose blood on the doorposts was a reminder to God of his people in that house (Exod. 12).

The most instinctive resistance of Protestants to the idea that in the eucharist the Church offers to the Father a memorial of his Son's passion and resurrection goes back to Calvin. He agreed that the early Fathers taught that the eucharist was a commemoration of Christ's sacrifice, but he could not abide the thought that it was a sacramental presentation to the Father of Christ's sacrifice because he regarded that notion as responsible for the blasphemous belief in a repetitive immolation of Christ upon the altar. Therefore he turned away from our Lord's explanation of his institution, and invented another one about signs and seals. So doing, he damaged the heart of the sacrament as an act toward God. In his teaching how far the sacrament was a sacrifice he allowed only the sacrifice of praise and ourselves. In fact, he adopted from Luther the principle, "as widely as giving differs from receiving, does a sacrifice differ from the sacrament of the Supper." In the sacrament, he says, using a quite unbiblical expression, we receive the benefits of Calvary. The wrong kind of repetition in which many ignorant priests and laity believed in the Reformation period, although it was not the doctrine of the Church, was surely due to a disjunction between the sacrament and the cross. This disjunction led to a wrong idea of repetition. Fatally, Luther and Calvin perpetuated the disjunction, still separating the sacrament from the sacrifice, although the point of a sacrament is that it creates an identity. What they should have done was to re-explore the biblical evidence and rediscover the memorial as a uniquely God-given instrument for the recapitulation of his saving deeds.

In preaching on this subject, I find congregations ready to receive the spiritual significance of the memorial. In Toplady's well known hymn we sing:

Nothing in my hands I bring.
Simply to Thy Cross I cling.

We know what Toplady meant, but for Christians there is a greater truth. We do not in fact come before God with nothing in our hands, but having in them the body and blood of God's own Son. It is by his command that we "Do this." We offer only what he has put into our hands to offer, so that we may be fully encompassed with his grace. That is what it is to make the memorial. Here we have liturgy almost at its sublimest. We begin to see even more fully what it means to say that the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself, and it will be impossible for us to yield to the widespread error of imagining that there can be any genuine Christianity without participation in the Church's liturgy.

Yet there is still a sublimier step to take, which is also the clinching demonstration of the Godward intention and action of the memorial. Some fifty years ago, the Scottish Presbyterian theologian, H.J. Wotherspoon, discoursing upon the vision of the heavenly altar in the book of Revelation, wrote:

Midway in the hemicycle stood a Lamb, as if it had been slain, but living: the centre of universal adoration. This is the Redeemer, the Heavenly Christ,
appearing in the presence of God for us — our High Priest, whose offering is Himself, the marks of past death upon Him, His wounds the evidence. Christ in the Heavens is Himself the Memorial, the Anamnesis before God of His Passion and Death.⁹

The ultimate proof that a memorial is in the first place a reminder to God emerges in this wonderful linkage by Wotherspoon of the earthly memorial with the heavenly. No past misunderstandings, no reductionist theorizings or impairment of the mystery must be allowed to occlude this great light shed by the eucharist upon itself, that it is the offering of the Church by which in Christ and the Spirit and by his command we make the memorial on earth that he makes in heaven.

The heavenly intercession is the answer to those who, from John Knox on, have objected to a memorial offered to God on the specious ground that God, who forgets nothing, cannot be reminded of anything. As Wotherspoon says, that attitude would make all prayer impossible. It would also render the heavenly intercession impossible. Admittedly we are dealing in figures, and we must complete this figure by keeping in mind, as Colin Dunlop has said, that the heavenly intercession is the one prayer of which we can be sure that it is always answered.¹⁰ That truth keeps the figure in balance. It tells us also that all prayer must be in the name of Jesus. It tells us why we use the Lord’s prayer so much. The memorial is an accommodation to our need. Of course God forgets nothing, but he has provided this mode of approach to himself so that we may come boldly to the throne of grace, and so that the once-for-all act of Calvary may be once-for-all, present now and always as our access to God. In short, our acceptable sacrifice.

William Milligan, a Scottish theologian of the same stamp as Wotherspoon but writing before him, was concerned to say how erroneous it is to restrict Christ’s sacrifice to the cross.¹¹ Western theology, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, has tended to do this. Gustav Aulén in Christus Victor names this emphasis upon the immolation as the Latin type of doctrine.¹² Against this one-sidedness the epistle to the Hebrews provides the answer:

But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building: Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us (9: 11-12).

The Jewish high priest, as we have noted, went into the Holy of Holies with the memorial gems of the people upon his vestments. Here we have textual justification of Wotherspoon’s insight that the true memorial is Christ himself in the heavenlies, and that the Church’s memorial which he prescribed is his way of incorporating his Church into his sacrifice. The cross and the heavenly presentation together constitute the one sacrifice. Christ does not offer himself alone. He takes
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his body, the Church, with him. "We can think or speak safely only if we see Christ as Celebrant of His own Memorial." On the previous pages, Wotherspoon also says, "The Eucharist is our co-operation with Christ in His Heavenly Ministry." 13

Pope Pius XII issued an encyclical, Mediator Dei, twenty years after Wotherspoon's lectures. I quote from Charles Davis' Liturgy and Doctrine a short sentence from the encyclical. The liturgy is "the public worship which our Redeemer, the head of the Church, offers to the heavenly Father and which the community of Christ's faithful pays its Founder, and through him to the eternal Father; briefly, it is the whole public worship of the mystical body of Jesus Christ, head and members." 14 When pope and Presbyterian say the same thing, something must have come out right. Once again we find ourselves compelled to say: Here is the Church's spiritual sacrifice; here is the acceptable worship of God, instituted by himself.

Now if the sacrifice of Christ is not only once, but also once for all, what kind of miracle of chronology is involved? We must look at:

3. History and the Epiclesis, or The Epiclesis and Two Time Scales

The epiclesis is the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine that they may become the body and blood of Christ, and upon the worshippers that by the bread and wine they may participate in his sacrifice and glorification. The doctrine of the Spirit and an eschatological understanding of time help us to grasp how the memorial overcomes the pastness of the past and the futurity of the eschaton by bringing both into the present.

I remarked earlier that people like easy explanations and that to think of the eucharist as only a ceremonious remembering of Christ in our heads and hearts dissipates all troublesome (save the mark!) miracle and mystery. At the same time, of course, it dissipates the sacrament. How can our unity with Christ's passion and intercession be anything other than a miracle, a miracle that must extend not only to us but also to the bread and the wine as the modes of the miracle? Calvin observed, "We say that Christ descends to us, as well by the external symbol as by his Spirit, that he may truly quicken our souls by the substance of his flesh and blood. He who feels not that in these few words are many miracles, is more stupid." 15 Indeed, to defend Calvin a little, it may well be that, assuming that a memorial was a mere remembering, he turned from it as inadequate to the miracle and found his explanation in sign and seal. There are no simple explanations, yet with these things faith feels very much at home.

Taking up the temporal problem, the availability of the past and the future in the sacramental action, one should continue the quotation from Hebrews:

For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purification of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience to serve the living God? (9: 13-14).

The phrase, "through the eternal Spirit," is not to be taken in the fashion of Greek thinking as if Christ's sacrifice belonged to a timeless Now of eternity. How can a now be timeless? The eschatological understanding of time in the bible is different from the Greek. A word used by Dix and others, metahistory, is preferable. As metaphysics is concerned with reality at a deeper level than physics, so metahistory is a dimension of time beyond finite time. Einstein's multidimensional view of space-time may be an exploitable analogy. The incarnation is an event for the Godhead as well as for our history. The incarnation has not ceased, though now glorified in form. This happening in the Godhead implies a divine supertime. There may be mythology in this statement but a simplistic demythologizing would destroy the mystery. God's eternity is not bare timelessness, but metahistory. His saving deed belongs not merely to our time in the past but to a divine time that transcends our past, present, and future. Through the “eternal” Spirit the deed in our past time is available to us now from the divine time in which it was also originally enacted. Similarly, the future eschaton is available. Our own power to recall the past, sometimes with extraordinary vividness, and clairvoyance of the future — although the latter is the happy hunting ground of spookery — show that past and future can be available to us. We can scarcely deny to the Divine its own unique transcendence of our past, present, and future or deny a gift of the Spirit that can to a degree put us in that time. As a hymn says:

And thus that dark betrayal night
With the last Advent we unite,
By one blest chain of loving rite,
Until He Come.17

I think we have in eschatology or metahistory the answer to Schillebeeckx' criticism of Odo Casel. Casel's view is that the event or act of Christ's passion and resurrection is present "in mystery" in the sacrament by the Spirit. Personally I am strongly inclined toward Casel's understanding precisely because the "mighty act of God" calls for an analogous action in the eucharist — analogous because it cannot be simple repetition. This required sequentiality gives a dynamic instead of a static view of the real presence. Schillebeeckx' protest runs:

Whatever is historically past cannot now, in any way at all, be made once more actually present, not even "in mystery." Whatever has already happened in history is irrevocably past and done. . . . The historicity of the man Jesus and of his human acts of redemption shares inevitably in the irrevocability of temporal events. Should we wish to maintain the contrary, we should support a new form of Docetism, we should deny the genuine historicity of Jesus' existence as man.18

I should question the use of the term, “Docetism.” The Docetists regarded the humanity of Jesus as a semblance or phantasm. If Casel is to be charged, the charge should be the opposite one, too much intensifying of the historical. For another thing, Schillebeeckx seems to be working with a Greek rather than a Hebrew view of time. He says that in Christ's historical redemptive acts "there already was an ele-
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17 George Rawson's hymn, "By Christ redeemed, in Christ restored. . . ."
ment of something perennial; and enduring trans-historical element which now becomes sacramentalized in an earthly event of our own time in a visible act of the Church."\(^{19}\) The expression, "an element of something perennial," is too weak, too Greek, for the invasion of the divine presence into time. The perennial is not the eschatological. Lastly, it must be said that if the past event cannot be present, neither can the eschaton. It is to Casel's credit, as I have suggested, that he has brought a fresh biblical dynamism into the discussion of the real presence, and I am also drawn to him because he insisted, before Vatican II and more strongly, that the preached word, which is also sacramental in type, is vital to the liturgy.

To resume what I have been saying about the *epiclesis* and history, to which, I trust, this little encounter with Schillebeeckx has contributed, the language of scripture and — dare I say? — our own sacramental experience demand that we discern a unique kind of temporality in the chief sacraments. How otherwise can St. Paul speak of our dying and rising with Christ in baptism (Romans 6)? If this is an identification in imagination or sentiment only, the event is not sacramental. Although of course both imagination and sentiment play their role, the "objective" divine-human deed, the death and resurrection, must be the truly causal factor. If so, it is necessary to say that the real presence in the sacrament is not that of the Glorified One simply, even though he have "rich wounds yet visible above, in beauty glorified." If I may be pardoned an appalling bathos, one would think that the wounds of a glorified savior would have healed long since. Why is the heavenly Lamb "as it had been slain"? Are these just pious fancies or are they indications that the cross must be present to be shared as well as the glory? Either these figures are empty, and the Church is full of new Docetists tampering with the irrevocability of time, or else we must discern in the sacraments an eschatological dimension of time of a unique kind in the Spirit.

At the risk of tedium, let me press the point that we do not have the presence only of the glorified Christ in the sacrament by referring to our Lord's words to the apostles, "This is my body, (given) for you." The apostles were offered sacramental participation in the death about to take place, so that they might participate in it repeatedly after the resurrection. The meaning is, "This is my body now being given for you, now given to you, and now made my future memorial and yours for your perpetual participation in my death and exalted life." How can we exclude the action of the cross from the action of the sacrament? That must be there as well as the glorified state.

4. **What Happens to the Elements? Transignification?**

I am sure that most members of this conference would want to insist that in the eucharist, under the dominical word and the *epiclesis*, something happens to the bread and the wine and not only to us. Valuable new ground, although also old in its way, is being broken by Roman Catholic scholars who are pressing beyond transubstantiation, designedly not against it but beyond it, to "transignification" and "trans-finalisation."\(^{20}\)

Speaking of the tree of life in the garden and of Noah's rainbow, an earlier writer says:

\(^{19}\) Ibid.

They had a mark engraven on them by the word of God to be proofs and seals of his covenant. The tree was previously a tree, and the bow a bow; but when they were inscribed with the word of God, a new form was given to them: they began to be what previously they were not . . . . If he [God] had impressed memorials [N.B.] of this description on the sun, the stars, the earth, the stones, they would all have been to us as sacraments.”

He goes on to say that there is another kind of symbol, not just natural objects, with which God does this, and that is religious ceremonies. The writer is John Calvin.21 I quote him because I have a strong hope that the new work on transignification, the essence of which is given in these words of Calvin, may draw together Roman, Reformed, and Lutheran theologians.

Let me linger for a moment upon an important point made by Calvin. The natural objects, he says, have a mark engraven on them by the word of God. Here we have the biblical notion of “the word with power.” This is the word by which all things were made. “For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast” (Ps. 33: 9). Peter and Paul speak in this way of the preached word of God (1 Pet. 1: 23-25; 1 Cor. 2: 4-5; 4: 19-20). We must remember that the word, “This is my body,” was uttered by him who was the incarnation of the Word by whom all things were made. John Donne has said it all in a beautiful quatrain:

*He was the Word that spake it;*
*He took the bread, and brake it;*
*And what that Word did make it,*
*I do believe — and take it.*22

What the Lord first said on earth, he now says from heaven, by his ministers.23

5. Communion

As I near my concluding section, I must press another feature of action in the presence. That is the communion of the faithful. Wotherspoon corrected a serious misconception in Reformed attitudes. There are two movements or stages in the sacrament, he says; the Godward and the manward, the memorial of Christ and communion in him. The commemoration has priority, and the second is dependent upon it. “The commemoration takes precedence of the reception.”24 As we may put it, our Lord’s offering to the Father, present in the sacrament, comes before and is the source of our communion in his sacrifice.

In their zeal to correct abuses, the Reformers missed this point. Rejecting a repeated immolation in the sacrament, rejecting the notion that it was the sacrament

22 Ascribed also to Princess Elizabeth.
23 In discussion, Dr. Monika Hellwig made the appealing suggestion that we forget the medieval metaphysics of transubstantiation and use the popular meaning of the word *substance*. We would then have “substantiation,” that is, the substance of the bread and wine would mark the substance of Christ’s body and blood, and the unnecessary complications of the “trans” would disappear.

Presumably the result would be the same as the Lutheran “in, with, and under,” and not far from the Westminster Divines’ “spiritual relation or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified” (XXVII, 2). Dr. Hellwig is not to be held accountable for the words in which I have attempted to express her suggestion.
of the sacrifice, rejecting also the reservation of the sacrament for purposes of adoration, and misunderstanding the meaning of the memorial, they fastened their attention on receiving. As Calvin says, “The Lord, therefore, has given us a table at which we may feast, not an altar on which a victim may be offered; he has not consecrated priests to sacrifice, but ministers to distribute a sacred feast.”25 We see here why among Protestants the table is called not an altar but a table, although to St. Paul, as I Corinthians 10 shows, they are one and the same thing, for an altar is a table on which gifts for God are offered and from which gifts come to us from God. Here, at any rate, we see why Calvin's favorite name for the sacrament was “the Lord’s supper,” with which we may compare the similar term, “holy communion.” On the other hand, Dix observes that Christians in the early Church were called, not communicants, but offerers.26 Once more we see how the Protestant turning away from the basic action in the liturgy came about.

It is necessary to insist that everything of Christ is in the sacrament of Christ. “Everything” must include his own sacrifice, not just its consequences or benefits. Therefore, the commemoration takes precedence of the reception. We can out-Calvin Calvin at this point, for the sign-manual of his theology is supposed to be emphasis upon the Godward aspect in everything.

6. The Church’s Spiritual Sacrifice

At the beginning of the lecture I gave it this subtitle, because I wanted to draw together the theology of liturgy and the theology of the eucharist. Everyone will agree that the eucharistic service in its total form (that is, including the preached word) is the Church’s liturgy par excellence. There must be other liturgical rites, but this is the surpassing, normative one.

Great themes have had to be omitted from this paper, particularly what it means for the Church to be the body of Christ bearing about in the world the dying of the Lord Jesus. My task has been to work at the thesis that the acceptable way of worshipping the true God is instituted by himself. I now wind up with an observation upon the word “acceptable.”

Gerhard von Rad makes much of it. “What is certain is that the priests as the mouthpiece of Yahweh pronounced the placet upon the offering or refused.” If the meat was unclean or the procedure faulty, the sacrifice was rejected. “Thus only the addition of the divine word made the material observance what it was meant to be, a real saving event between Yahweh and his people. Only in virtue of the declaratory word of the priest did the sacral event become a gracious act of God.” Earlier he writes, “This special aspect of the ritual act has hitherto been overlooked, but it is without doubt the most important part of the whole procedure.”27

The word and the notion run right through scripture. The ultimately acceptable sacrifice is that of Christ. “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Mt. 3: 17). In him, the Church offers her spiritual, acceptable sacrifices (Jn. 4: 24; Rom. 12: 1; 1 Pet. 2: 5, etc.), because she is herself “accepted in the Beloved” (Eph. 1: 6). God’s great gift to the Church is that she is graced with acceptable worship.

Like our previous topic, *Eucharist and community*, a discussion of eucharist and Christian ministry could lead us into a comprehensive examination of Christianity. So, time will permit only the perusal of three or four aspects of the questions; these will be central enough to provide some insight and some basis for conversation together.

First, then, I would like to reflect with you on the manner in which the celebration of eucharist is the source of Christian ministry. Very simply put, the eucharist is the source of all Christian ministry because it is the continuing mystery of Pentecost. We are accustomed to thinking of eucharist as continuing *anamnesis* of Jesus' death and resurrection, but sometimes forget that Pentecost is an intrinsic element in Jesus' resurrection: nothing created can exist without its final cause and the final cause of the Christ in his risen being is the communication of that Spirit he now shares in fullness with his Father. In the Eastern Church, with its traditional emphasis on the *epiklesis*, there has been a somewhat sharper awareness of the Spirit's role in eucharist. Fortunately, we are all becoming more conscious of this today.

Our ecclesiology tells us that the risen Lord shares the life of resurrection with his body which is the Church by the gift of his own Spirit; this Spirit which is at once the Spirit of prophecy, the life-giving Spirit, the Spirit that alone can express Jesus' own filial relation and ours to his Father. It is this Spirit, animating the Christian community and impelling it toward its priestly purpose of furthering the kingdom of God, that is the internal sending or *mission* of the Church. This is not to reduce the Spirit to nothing more than the social finality of the Church as a human community; rather, it is to place the life-dimension of this community clearly within the order of personal life that comes from and is nurtured by the divine gift of self to human beings.

Earliest Christianity saw the various gifts of ministry — prophecy and teaching and governing and healing, etc. — as coming from the power of the indwelling Spirit in response to the intrinsic needs of the Christian community. Just as the human body has need of its various organic powers, so the Church needs the diverse ministries carried on by those commissioned to various roles. Basically, then, the emergence of those ministerial patterns appropriate to the life and mission of the Church flow from the Spirit in response to the needs of men and women within the Church, as well as in the world to which the gospel must be preached.

---

1 See pages 4-10, above.
Early Christian theology, particularly that expressed in the Lukan gospel, sees this Spirit origin of ministry beginning with Jesus himself. Whereas Israelitic prophets, like Isaiah or Jeremiah, were told that they were given the prophetic Spirit even from their mother's womb, the very generation of Jesus is attributed by Luke to the power of God's Spirit. So, too, when Jesus enters upon his public ministry, Luke describes him as coming from the desert "in the power of the Spirit." And, as he announces the theme of his prophetic teaching in Nazareth, Jesus works from the Isaian text: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has appointed me to preach good news to the poor." One could continue to describe the details of this Spirit christology in the New Testament writings, but I think the point is clear: the Church, like its risen Lord, is involved in ministerial service because it is filled with the Spirit of God. It is this Spirit, sought in ever greater measure by eucharistic epiklesis, that is the source of ministry for the Church in its journey through history.

The second point I would like to suggest is this: the eucharistic action is Christianity's only ultimate formulation of law, and therefore the most basic norm for judgments regulating the exercise of Christian ministry. (To be more accurate, we might have to amend that statement and call the eucharist the "penultimate law," since personal conscience is the ultimate law for each of us; but I am not sure that we would have to do such amending, since — as we will see — eucharist itself is meant to be a thoroughly personal though corporate process of conscience judgment.)

In his classic Gifford lectures, Religion and Culture, Christopher Dawson has an intriguing and profound chapter on the relation between ritual and law. His thesis is that the health and true humanness of a civilization depends upon maintaining a proper balance between these two elements. If law overbalances ritual, life becomes shackled, initiative is stifled, flexibility disappears from private and public life and the human spirit is suffocated. On the other hand, if ritual is only religious enthusiasm without normative guidance, fanaticism and social chaos can result, protection of freedom and rights disappears, reason becomes obscured by undisciplined emotional responses. I think there is great wisdom and insight in this analysis; but what I find full of promise in our present discussion is the fact, which we have scarcely begun to exploit within Christianity, that eucharist is not just the balance but the organic integration of these two great social forces.

Let us try to unpack the understanding of this reality by a quick recall of what we mean by Christian discipleship. To be a disciple is to discover and adopt the world view and goals and strategy of a master — not slavishly or mindlessly, but freely and maturely because one has come to respect the wisdom and personal integrity of this master. Out of respect and genuine affection for this person, the disciple seeks always to do that which pleases the master. This in no way need imply subservience; rather, it is an honest acknowledgement of true leadership. So, from Christianity's earliest days, men and women have been exhorted to "put on that mind which was also in Christ Jesus." The imitation of Christ has become the central principle of Christian spirituality, and implementation of this principle has carried Christian attitudes and striving through Christ to his Father about whom Jesus said, "I do always the things that please him."

Another element we might briefly ponder is evangelization as it occurs within the Christian people. Clearly, all truly Christian activity is response to the gospel; and the authentic proclamation of the gospel is, therefore, one of the essentials in the life
of the Church. But, the gospel is effectively good news and practically challenging when it is not only preached but **experienced**; it must touch and enter into people's lives, so that it can dynamize from within — for it is leaven. It must not only be listened to, it must be **heard**. Only then can it be the principle from which Christian discernment of the Spirit can proceed, discernment that can guide the community's choice of ministerial goals and procedures.

But, the gospel that must be heard and experienced is not fundamentally a message; it is the person of the risen Lord. And this is quite obviously where eucharist is meant to play a central and indispensable role. It is eucharist that is supreme proclamation of the gospel, because it is the making present to the faith-filled consciousness of the assembled people the risen Christ himself. The Master is with us in eucharist and we celebrate his presence; our response to him who is the gospel is our pledge to discipleship, our pledge to do always the things that please him. It is in this eucharistic setting that we profess our faith, not simply by giving our intellectual assent to some particular doctrinal formulations about our beliefs, but by giving ourselves in committed friendship and allegiance to the Lord. This is the most solemn kind of promise — begun, of course, in our baptism — to grow in identification with Christ's outlook and values, to work for our own liberation and that of other humans by breaking with evil ourselves and opposing its enslavement of our sisters and brothers. Responding to the mystery of Jesus' resurrection which is, as Paul told the early Christians, God's great proof of his fidelity, we renew our own pledge of faithfulness. In the light of our human frailty and inconstancy, this pledge of future fidelity is always an act of conversion.

Not only on the level of personal response, individual and corporate, to the risen Christ, but on the level also of careful theological delineation of understandings, the eucharist is the basic law governing our ministerial choices. The reality of the risen crucified one is that which states most sharply and unmistakably the manner in which God and therefore we serve the men and women of our world. This way of service — and God's ways are not our usual human ways — is one of love overcoming evil by absorbing it. Instead of resisting evil with evil, which only continues the circle of suffering and oppression and hostility, Jesus himself confronted evil squarely and knowingly even unto its bringing him to death and did not succumb to it by returning hatred. “Love your enemies” was a principle he not only taught but also lived. What his resurrection — which we celebrate in eucharist — reveals is that the power of love is great enough to pass through death and bring forth life in even greater abundance. Full life is intrinsically the outcome of evil overcome by love. Realistically, conscious as we Christians are of the awesome power of evil, we believe that love coming from God's own love is able to overcome, for love is God's own creative power.

What this means in down-to-earth terms is that our decisions as to how we will plan ministries to be effective must be governed by this insight. Time and time again, we will be tempted to see our cleverness and ingenuity and organization as the key to helping others — and forget the real dynamic that must be at work if human lives are to be transformed. Human expertise is not only desirable in the ministry, it should be sought and developed; but it is the instrumentality through which the ultimate transforming power of God's saving love can touch the minds and hearts of men and women. The kingdom of God is brought to realization in proportion to men and women embracing truth in honesty and opening in loving concern to one
another. What is involved is nothing less than an incessant conversion of human historical existence in its entirety; something only the power of God working sacramentally through the likes of us is able to achieve.

The thread running through this historical process is the ever-repeated celebration of eucharist, which itself is constantly changing as it gives expression to and challenges the lived-out faith and life of Christians. Each celebration of eucharist is a call to conversion that finds its specific imperative in terms of the experiences and potential of those persons who are gathered together. And the call comes in the invitation to deeper friendship with Christ, and to deeper friendship with one another. This is what is implied — and obviously everything is part of that implication — in the words of Jesus at the supper: "One commandment I give you, that you love one another as I have loved you."

Not only is eucharist the source and the norm of Christian ministry; it is the celebration of our ministerial existence — which is the third element in my remarks. In my earlier talk I tried to develop a bit the topic of celebration, and to stress the basic importance of genuine celebration to the sacramental effectiveness of eucharist. Here I wish to point only to the interconnection of eucharistic celebration with the formation and sustenance of a ministering community.

There is no need in the present group to draw attention to the importance in liturgical renewal of a sense of celebration. More than one prominent figure in contemporary liturgical study has highlighted the need to develop among Christians a basic ability to celebrate; for this is a presupposition to real celebration in eucharist. Eucharist is thanksgiving, expression of gratitude for all that God has given us, but even more, for God being the God he is; and the native way for humans to externalize their appreciation is to celebrate. So, eucharist is meant to celebrate all those aspects of human experience which could not be except for the saving act of God in Jesus' death and resurrection — and one of these is Christians' ability to minister to the deepest human needs of men and women.

What is involved here is, of course, much more than a general feeling of gratification because one can be useful to others. What is at stake is the establishment of a fundamental meaning to our human existence. Whether the threat to meaning is as radical as Tillich suggests in his *Courage to Be*, where he sees it to be the great source of anxiety for contemporary humans, there can be little question but that for many humans today it is difficult to find much meaning for their lives. So much of human accomplishment is in terms of large-scale processes that submerge the individual's achievement; so little of what is achieved lasts for more than a few years; so seldom are there clear goals which we have a sense of reaching. Yet, without some basic meaning, our lives quite literally make no sense.

And without some enduring and relatively ultimate meaning to life, no individual or group can come to self-identification. It is symptomatic of much of the present situation that numbers are becoming more and more that by which we are identified — social insurance number, credit card number, car registration number, bank account number, other numbers — so that we are easier to handle in a computerized society. Men and women are quite generally sensitive to the meaning that comes to one through service to others; obituaries, for one thing, often refer to the service that the deceased has performed for his other fellow humans. When one is involved in Christian ministry, this meaning is intensified, for the service that is
ministry extends beyond the ordinary bounds of helping one another. The service of Christian ministry, while it certainly is a practical concern for and helping of people, is the establishment of the kingdom of God. Though carried on in history, it carries on beyond the limitations of a given time-frame; it shares in the same ultimacy that each human personality possesses.

What we can and should celebrate, then, in Christian eucharist is the vocation to ministry we receive by baptism and by the Spirit within us directing us to the needs of men and women today. The ultimacy of meaning in such ministry is grounded in the hope of history's eschatological fulfillment; this is the hope we witness to as we make present in our midst the risen Lord.

Such celebration of ministry will intensify our commitment to that ministry, for it will continuously remind us of the privilege this entails, and will help sustain our appreciation for this vocation despite some of the suffering and setbacks and monotony that any long-term service of people can bring. To put it in terminology we used some decades ago, eucharist is a grace of perseverance.

That brings me, then, to my last point. If eucharist is the source, the norm, and the focal celebration of Christian ministry, it is because it itself is the key act of Christian ministry. Christian ministry is exercised (or at least is meant to be exercised) in celebration of eucharist in fuller and more efficacious form than in any other action of Christians.

This can sound like one of those theological statements which are obviously true if one remains in the realm of abstract logical relations of ideas, but which seem empty of meaning when one tries to understand them in terms of down-to-earth life experience. Particularly today when the social and economic needs of millions are so pressing, when people are tired of talk, talk instead of honest action, it can sound like pious emptiness to speak of eucharist as that which most comes to grips with humanity's needs.

Giving real meaning to this statement rests on the conviction (which is, quite clearly, a matter of Christian faith) that it is God who is humanity's savior through the sending of his Word and Spirit. Without in any way going back to a previous underestimating of the intrinsic contribution of human efforts in the task of salvation, we must not let the pendulum swing too far in the opposite direction and forget that it is God's power alone that can overcome the ultimate destructiveness of sin. The power in question is, of course, the power of truth and love by which his Word and his Spirit lead us to freedom and life. The principal function of the Christian community is to unleash this power in history.

To be effective, this divine power, which by its very nature must work with persons as persons, has to touch people. This transforming God must somehow become present to men and women, which is something quite other than his creative sustaining of them (and the rest of the universe) in existence. How such presence of God to humans is effected is, as you well know, a matter of the sacramentality, i.e., the priesthood of the Christian people.

Two of the more important pieces of theological writing in the last half-century, Schillebeeckx' Christ, The Sacrament of the Encounter with God and Karl Rahner's The Church and the Sacraments, drew our attention to this revolutionary understanding almost two decades ago; but we have scarcely begun to appropriate it as our
own. Despite all the retention of scholastic language and the need he felt to respond
to the abstract problematic of manual theology and Tridentine confessionalism,
Rahner states the basic principle clearly: "The Church as the continuation of Christ's
presence in the world is the fundamental sacrament of the eschatologically trium­
phant mercy of God." The Christian community has as its basic ministry the respon­
sibility of sacramentalizing God's saving action in the world.

Pursuing this question carries us back to something we discussed in the earlier
paper, the eucharist as profession of faith by the assembled Christians. It is only in
consciousness that our personal presence to one another is established, and that
presence is personally real in proportion as we are truly conscious of one another.
It is in the consciousness of the risen Lord in our midst and our openness to him as
transforming Word that we Christians serve as the matrix, the "location" and "entry
point," for God's saving presence to our world. While the entire life of Christians,
individually and corporately, is a sign to the world that God is a God of people, that
God's compassion and power are a source of ultimate hope, eucharist is meant to be
the most formal and explicit expression of that sign-dimension of Christianity. Not
implicitly, but with the full communicative power of enacted word, the eucharistic
action proclaims the saving gospel by being the anamnesis of Jesus' Passover.

Eucharist cannot function in this profound fashion, as sacrament of divine
saving presence, if it is only external utterance, if it is not the expression of authentic
faith and understanding: only utterance proceeding from understanding is genuine
word. Christian priesthood can find its appropriate ministerial realization only in
eucharistic liturgy that celebrates the community's awareness of the risen Lord and
his Spirit among them. But, if eucharist is this kind of celebration, it serves as the
thread of intelligibility that ties together the experiences of humanity into a mean­ing­
ful history and thereby redeems them. This is the fulfillment of Christian ministry
whose purpose is to nurture the evolution of human history toward ultimate human
community, i.e., the kingdom of God.

NEXT ISSUE

Steps to Better Liturgy is the title of the next issue of the National Bulletin on
Liturgy. The many steps discussed in this Bulletin are actions that are involved in
every good celebration of community worship. Even more important are the atti­
tudes of prayer, praise, reverence, and love that lie behind these actions and are
expressed by them.

Good liturgy is the result of faith and hard work by all concerned. Magic
formulas or instant gimmicks cannot create good liturgy.

Bulletin 83 offers a simple means by which each parish and community may
assess its Sunday worship, and see how it can continue to celebrate good liturgy and
offer greater praise to God.

This issue will be in the mail early in March. Make sure that you renew your
subscription for 1982: see page 42, below, for further information.
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* * *

For the past twelve years I have been teaching liturgy in a theological seminary. With most classes I have between thirty and thirty-six class hours that can be devoted to the history of the development of the various rites. When I was asked to talk on Twenty-five years of eucharistic development, my initial reaction was that this would be easy, for I have often covered several centuries in the development of a particular rite in a one-hour lecture. When I began to work seriously on the talk I came to realize that within my own Church, and within most Churches, Catholic or Protestant, more has happened in regard to eucharistic development within the past twenty-five years than in the four hundred years which immediately preceded. I came to feel that rather than attempting to cover the field in a general manner it might be both easier and more profitable to talk in detail about twenty-five years of eucharistic development in the tradition I know best, that of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and let my hearers draw parallels or contrasts to other traditions.

Twenty-five years ago I was a green young priest in a small college town in South Carolina. I had been introduced in seminary to works of Father Gabriel
Hebert¹ and Dom Gregory Dix.² Louis Bouyer's *Liturgical Piety*³ had just been published, and I had found that terribly exciting. I had begun to dream of the day when the *Book of Common Prayer* would be revised in a manner which dealt with some of the concerns and incorporated some of the insights of the liturgical movement, but the *Prayer Book Studies*⁴ which were being published with recommendations for *Prayer Book* revision seemed merely to be tinkering with the old rites in the interest of "enrichment." If anyone had predicted the changes in the eucharistic texts, ceremonial, and teaching which have come about within the last twenty-five years, or the remarkable degree of convergence, I would have thought that that person needed help.

I want us to consider changes in scheduling of services, the title and the shape of the rite, the eucharistic prayer texts, eucharistic ceremonial, and eucharistic theology.

**The Scheduling of Services**

Certainly many Anglicans throughout the centuries have believed that the *Prayer Books* have been based on the principle that morning and evening prayer are daily services, and that morning prayer is to be followed by the eucharist on all Sundays and major holy days. The rubrics until 1892, in fact, required — even if there were none desiring to receive communion on those days — that the priest follow morning prayer with the liturgy of the word portion of the eucharistic rite in order to keep this ideal before the people. When the rubrics were loosened in 1892, some parishes chose to make the eucharist the principal service on Sundays at the expense of substantial exposure to the scriptures; others chose to make morning prayer the principal Sunday liturgy on many Sundays at the expense of the sacrament. Certainly a major concern of those most active in the recent revisions has been to recover a Sunday and holy day rite with both a substantial liturgy of the word and a celebration of the sacrament. The 1979 *Prayer Book* states quite explicitly that the holy eucharist is "the principal act of Christian worship on the Lord's day and other major feasts."

I have no figures for twenty-five years ago, but my impression is that at that time a majority of Episcopal Churches in the United States normally celebrated the eucharist only once a month at the principal Sunday service. A recent spot check of two churches in each diocese indicated that now this is true for only six per cent of the churches. This shift is due to changes in eucharistic teaching and piety and to the revision and enrichment of the eucharistic rite, especially the enrichment of the lectionary.

Certainly these developments have their parallels in more frequent communications in the Roman Catholic Church and in more frequent celebrations of the liturgy of the sacrament in Protestant Churches, the new Presbyterian liturgy recommending that the liturgy of the word might be followed by the liturgy of the sacrament as often as every Sunday.

---

The Title of the Rite


The word eucharist is used as a title for the rite in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy and is used with increasing frequency among Catholics and Protestants.

The Shape of the Rite

It was taken for granted among Anglicans until the late nineteenth century that any public celebration would be immediately preceded by morning prayer with at least three psalms and substantial readings from both the Old and New Testaments. The liturgy of the word of the eucharistic rite still held rather closely to the late medieval Sarum epistle and gospel lectionary. The 1892 revision's permission to celebrate the eucharist without preceding it immediately with morning prayer left a very much impoverished liturgy of the word.

In the 1549 Prayer Book Cranmer attempted to restore the communion of the people as the climax of the rite, the center of the rite, the center of eucharistic piety. He forbade the elevations at the institution narrative which had become the center of eucharistic piety in the late middle ages. Since the piety did not shift from seeing the sacrament elevated to receiving the sacrament, the rite was revised in 1552 so that the communion of the people would take place immediately after the institution narrative, at the place of the elevation of the cup in the medieval rite. An abbreviated version of the conclusion of the 1549 eucharistic prayer was postponed until after the communions. In a further effort to downplay the offertory aspect of the rite, the 1552 book made no provisions for the placing of the bread and wine upon the altar within the rite; apparently that was to be done by the priest or clerk before the service. In the 1662 revision a presentation was restored, but it was linked with the money offering which was separated from the eucharistic prayer by a lengthy intercession and exhortation, and by a penitential order which consisted of an invitation, general confession, and absolution, and the recitation of scriptural texts assuring the people of forgiveness (the "comfortable words"). The bread was to be broken during the recitation of the institution narrative rather than after the prayer. These revisions left a very cumbersome and shapeless liturgy of the sacrament.

The 1953 Prayer Book Studies IV restored the Gloria in excelsis to the entrance rite, but it did not do anything to improve the liturgy of the word. The only changes in the shape of the liturgy of the table were moving the breaking of the bread to a position immediately after the Lord's prayer which followed the eucharistic prayer, and following that with a versicle and response,
The peace of the Lord be always with you.

People:  
And with thy spirit.

Though this text was historically associated with the exchange of the peace, no action was indicated.

The bishops of the Anglican Communion meeting at Lambeth in 1958 presented some guidelines for liturgical revision. The report recommended an Old Testament lesson, in correspondence to the epistle and gospel, “at the principal eucharist on Sundays,” that the three lessons might be separated by psalms which “underline or develop the theme of the lessons,” and that the sermon might be better placed between the lessons and the Nicene creed. It recommended that exhortations be shorter and fewer, that corporate expressions of penitence be modified both in length and language, that the prayers of the people be recovered (with congregational responses or in a litany form), that the people be associated with the offertory and that it be more closely connected with the eucharistic prayer, and that events for which thanksgiving is offered in the prayer not be confined to Calvary but include all the principal “mighty works of God.” The document draws attention to the “scriptural and primitive” concept of “consecration through thanksgiving.”

While the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy was being prepared, an Anglican document was also being prepared for the purpose of implementing the Lambeth resolutions of 1958. It called for a brief, flexible entrance rite. The liturgy of the word should include readings from the Old Testament or an epistle and the gospel, followed normally by a sermon and the creed, with psalmody or canticles between the readings. The liturgy of the word should be followed by intercession for the Church and the world, normally in litany form. The liturgy of the sacrament should consist of the presentation of the gifts, followed by a prayer “in the form of a thanksgiving for creation and for God’s mighty acts in Christ and in sending the Holy Spirit,” ending with the Lord’s prayer, and followed by the breaking of the bread and the communion of clergy and people. The communion should be followed by a brief expression of praise, and “a simple sending out, without a blessing.”

The trial use Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper in Prayer Book Studies XVII, published in 1966 and authorized by the General Convention of 1967, was greatly influenced by the recommendations of the 1958 Lambeth Conference and of the Inter-Anglican Committee. The entrance of the ministers could be accompanied by a psalm or hymn. The rite began with an opening acclamation inspired by Eastern models:

Blessed be God: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

People:
And blessed be his kingdom, now and forever. Amen.

This was followed by the collect for purity and the summary of the law. Next came the Kyrie or the Trisagion, followed in festal seasons by the Gloria in excelsis or the Te Deum.


The ministry of the word began with the collect of the day. An Old Testament lesson, an epistle, and a gospel were to be read from "a pulpit or some other suitable place." The first two lessons might be followed by a psalm or hymn. The gospel led directly into the sermon, followed on Sundays and festivals by the Nicene creed which was restored to the plural form and shorn of the later *Filioque* addition. On occasion the creed might be followed by a penitential order consisting of an invitation, a general confession, the "comfortable words," and an absolution. (This penitential order could, however, be used before the rite or after the summary of the law.) A litany form of the prayers of the people was introduced by the exchange of the peace. This was the position which the peace occupied in the baptismal rite of Hippolytus.

The rubrics called for representatives of the people to bring the offerings of money and of bread and wine to the deacon or priest. Sentences were provided for use at the presentation of the offering. The eucharistic prayer incorporated notes of thanksgiving for creation and incarnation as well as the cross, an eschatological reference in the anamnesis, and an epiclesis upon the people as well as upon the gifts. The Lord's prayer followed immediately, and then the breaking of the bread. The fraction was to be followed by a silence, and then an anthem or proper hymn. The anthem printed in the rite began with a sentence reminiscent of a form used at an analogous point in the 1549 *Prayer Book*, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the feast." That sentence was followed by the *Benedictus qui venit* used in a manner reminiscent of some Eastern liturgies. An invitation to communion followed, consisting of a translation of the ancient *Sancta sanctis* of Eastern liturgies, followed by a sentence based on words of administration of earlier *Prayer Books*:

*Holy things for the People of God:*
*Take them in remembrance that Christ gives himself for you,*
*and feed on him in your hearts*
*by faith, with thanksgiving.*

The words of administration were abbreviated to an ancient form, "The body [blood] of our Lord Jesus Christ keep you unto everlasting life," so that they might conveniently be said individually for each communicant. The one fixed postcommunion prayer was followed immediately by a dismissal.

There was much criticism of the 1967 rite. The language had been modernized too much to suit some, but not enough to suit many. Various details and texts in the rite were subjected to a great deal of criticism, but the restoration of three lessons and the reordering of elements in the liturgy of the word (with the exception of the peculiar placement of the exchange of the peace) and the shape of the liturgy of the table were generally received with favor.

*Services for Trial Use,*7 authorized in 1970, attempted to meet many of the criticisms of the 1967 rite. Following a path taken in several other provinces of Anglicanism, alternative traditional language and contemporary language rites were provided.

---

7 *Services for Trial Use: Authorized Alternatives to Prayer Book Services* (1971, Church Hymnal Corporation, New York).
Rite One, the form in traditional language, dropped the opening acclamation, restored permission to use the decalogue, and restored the summary of the law to the form of the earlier American books. The collect of the day was followed by one or two lessons (each of which might be followed by a psalm, hymn, or anthem), the gospel, the sermon, and on Sundays and festivals the Nicene creed. A slightly revised form of the new Roman Catholic eucharistic lectionary was proposed. A revised form of the old prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church followed the sermon or creed, though several alternative forms were provided for the prayers of the people. These intercessions were followed by the penitential order, which introduced an optional exchange of the peace in its ancient place as a conclusion of the liturgy of the word and an introduction to the liturgy of the table. The presentation sentences were dropped. A slightly revised form of the 1928 eucharistic prayer was printed in the rite. Two alternatives were provided: one was the 1967 prayer, and the other an abbreviated form of the 1928 prayer. The Benedictus qui venit was printed for optional use after the Sanctus. The prayer of humble access was restored for optional use as a communion devotion after the breaking of the bread. The Sancta sanctis was made optional. The lengthy sentences of administration of the 1928 book were restored, as was the 1928 blessing, though an alternative shorter form of blessing was also given. The dismissal was made optional. This was an extremely conservative rite, incorporating important changes but designed to be comfortable for those resisting change.

Rite Two, the form in contemporary language, provided a special opening acclamation for the Great Fifty Days:

Alleluia! Christ is risen.

People:

The Lord is risen indeed. Alleluia!

Rite Two made the collect for purity optional, and omitted the summary of the law. The Gloria in excelsis "or some other song of praise" was to be used on festal occasions. The Kyrie or Trisagion was to be used in its place at other times. The structure of the liturgy of the word from the first lesson through the Nicene creed was the same as in Rite One. A new general confession and an absolution were provided for optional use before or after the prayers of the people. A list of concerns to be included in the prayers of the people was given, and several forms were provided, but the use of one of these forms was not required. A form could be prepared for the occasion or gleaned from some other source. Of the seven forms provided, two were based on ancient Eastern litanies, one on the ancient solemn collects of Good Friday, one on a form in trial use in the Church of New Zealand, and one on a form in trial use in the Church of England. Two other forms were new to the book. The optional exchange of the peace led into the preparation of the table, the eucharistic prayer, and the Lord's prayer. The breaking of the bread was followed by silence and an optional fraction anthem and the Sancta sanctis, which might be followed by a sentence based on the old words of administration. Alternative sentences of administration, based on early liturgies, were provided, "The body of Christ, the bread of heaven" and "The blood of Christ, the cup of salvation." Two alternative post-communion prayers were printed. A blessing might be said prior to the dismissal. In Rite Two the common texts of the International Consultation on English Texts (ICET) were used for the songs of the people, the salutation, the Nicene creed, the
Sursum corda, and the Lord’s prayer. A number of additional proper prefaces were provided for both rites.

In addition to Rite One and Rite Two, Services for Trial Use included “An Order for Celebrating the Holy Eucharist,” which has come to be known as “Rite Three.” This consisted of a list of elements considered essential for a eucharistic celebration. This order provided freedom for situations in which Rite One or Rite Two, principally designed for the Sunday gathering of the congregation, might be too formal, too verbose, or too demanding. The order of the elements was the same as that in Rite One and Rite Two.

Despite the fact that the Society for the Preservation of the Book of Common Prayer [1928] was beginning to make loud noises and claiming that no one liked the new rites, the sales of Services for Trial Use far exceeded expectations, reaching 800,000 copies, or approximately one for every three Episcopalians. The 1973 General Convention authorized a number of minor changes, and the eucharistic rites with these changes were included in Authorized Services 1973.\(^8\)

More extensive changes were made in the interval between the 1973 convention and that of 1976. The 1976 convention voted overwhelmingly to authorize the Proposed Book of Common Prayer, which became the official Prayer Book of the Episcopal Church in the United States when it was ratified by the 1979 General Convention.

The opening acclamation, with the alternative for the Great Fifty Days and an alternative for Lent and other penitential occasions, was restored in Rite One. The Filioque was restored to the Nicene creed. A slightly revised version of the 1928 form of the Nicene creed in the first person singular was provided as an alternative. The prayer for the whole state of Christ’s Church was further revised. The “comfortable words” were returned to the 1928 position, following rather than preceding the absolution. The text associated with the peace again became obligatory, though an actual exchange among the people was not required. The offertory sentence was made optional. The eucharistic prayer was restored to its 1928 form, though a revised version which was both abbreviated and enriched was provided as an alternative. The Agnus Dei was printed in the rite along with the “Christ our Passover,” for optional use as an anthem after the fraction. Both of the forms for administration from Rite Two were printed also in Rite One as alternative sentences of administration.

Some of the same changes were made in Rite Two. The general confession was revised. Four alternative eucharistic prayers were provided, three of them revisions of forms which dated back to Services for Trial Use.

Minor changes were also made in “Rite Three,” An Order for Celebrating the Holy Eucharist.

The basic shape for the liturgy of the word — three readings, separated by psalms or hymnody, followed by sermon, creed, and prayers of the people — and the basic shape for the liturgy of the table — preparation of the gifts, the eucharistic prayer, the breaking of the bread, and the communion of clergy and people — found in the rites of our new Prayer Book is also that of the revisions of the Roman Catholic Church and of almost all of the Protestant Churches of the United States.

\(^8\) Authorized Services 1973 (1973, Church Hymnal Corporation, New York).
and Canada. In most of the revisions the peace has been restored to its ancient position as the connecting link between the liturgy of the word and the liturgy of the table. In our rites the penitential element can serve as an introduction to the liturgy of the word, as it does in many revisions, but normally it functions as a response to the liturgy of the word and as preparation for the liturgy of the table.

The Eucharistic Prayer

The first American revisers, in the period immediately after the American Revolution, felt that the eucharistic prayer of the English 1662 book was deficient when compared to ancient liturgies because it lacked an anamnesis, an oblation, and an epiclesis. They adopted for the 1789 Prayer Book an amended form of a eucharistic prayer which was being used among the nonjuring Episcopalians of Scotland. That prayer dated back to the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637 which had restored elements of the 1549 prayer which had been omitted in the revision of 1552.

Prayer Book Studies IV, published in 1953, proposed a revision of that prayer with two important changes: a reference to the incarnation was included in the post-Sanctus, and the epiclesis was revised. The epiclesis had read,

... vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Savior Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.

That epiclesis could certainly be interpreted as fostering a receptionistic doctrine of the eucharist. Prayer Book Studies IV proposed a substitution based on the 1549 and 1637 Prayer Books and ancient liturgies:

... vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the most blessed Body and Blood of thy dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ.

Prayer Book Studies XVII, "The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper," authorized in 1967, included a more drastic revision of the eucharistic prayer. In earlier rites the title "Prayer of Consecration" had been used in a rubric which preceded the post-Sanctus; in this proposal the title "The Consecration" precedes the Sursum corda. The post-Sanctus incorporates thanksgiving for creation and incarnation as well as the cross. An eschatological note, "looking for his coming again in power and great glory," is restored to the anamnesis. The epiclesis invokes the Holy Spirit upon the people as well as the gifts.

Services for Trial Use, authorized by the General Convention of 1970, titled the prayer "The Great Thanksgiving." That work included in Rite One revised forms of the 1928 prayer as well as the 1967 form. In Rites Two and Three it contained other forms, one of which (A) was based upon the prayer of Hippolytus. Each of these new prayers incorporated thanksgiving for creation and incarnation as well as the cross, each included an eschatological reference, and each had a more traditional form of epiclesis than the 1928 book. Two of these forms (C and D) had the epiclesis in the Alexandrian-Roman position prior to the institution narrative rather than in the West Syrian position after the anamnesis and oblation. The Benedictus qui venit was restored after the Sanctus, though its use was optional in Rite One.
The 1979 *Prayer Book* contains eight eucharistic prayers. The 1928 prayer is retained in Rite One, but an alternative abbreviated and enriched version is provided. The most controversial issue in the discussions of the Eucharistic Committee was whether to print the 1928 prayer in the rite or to relegate it to an appendix, printing the enriched form in the rite. The issue was not which was the better prayer. There seemed to be unanimous agreement on that, but a very slight majority believed that printing the 1928 prayer in the rite was a political necessity. Rite Two contains four eucharistic prayers. Prayer A is a contemporary prayer inspired by the prayers of earlier Anglican *Prayer Books*. Prayer B is based upon Hippolytus, incorporating material from two of the prayers of *Services for Trial Use*. Prayer C is a revised form of a contemporary prayer included in *Services for Trial Use* which incorporates a number of congregational responses and places the epiclesis in the Alexandrian-Roman position. Prayer D is the work of an ecumenical committee based upon the prayer of St. Basil in the form of the Roman Sacramentary but revising the prayer on the basis of the earlier versions. This is the first Anglican eucharistic prayer which includes intercessions.

Any of the prayers from Rite One or Rite Two may be used in "Rite Three." Two additional forms are provided which contain fixed texts for the core of the prayer, the institution narrative, anamnesis, oblation, and epiclesis, but allow the celebrant freedom in the giving of thanks for creation and redemption.

All of the prayers are Trinitarian in structure. Thanksgiving is offered to God the Father for his work of creation and redemption. The work of Christ is recalled. The Holy Spirit is invoked. Each prayer ends with a Trinitarian doxology.

All the prayers new to this edition of the *Prayer Book* place the eucharist in the theological context of creation and incarnation. All the prayers new to this edition restore an eschatological reference to the anamnesis and a more traditional form of epiclesis. All invoke the Holy Spirit upon the people as well as upon the gifts. The prayers of Rite Two all include an acclamation.

Many of the revisions of other Churches have incorporated many of the same notes as our new prayers. The prayers of Hippolytus and of St. Basil have served as the basis for prayers adopted by a number of Churches, and our Prayer D, based upon the Roman Catholic version of the prayer of St. Basil, has been adopted by the Consultation on Church Union, by several denominations in the United States, and by Canadian Anglicans.

**Ceremonial**

The last twenty-five years have brought many changes in ceremonial practices to the Episcopal Church in the United States. Some of these changes are ordered by the rubrics of the new *Prayer Book*, but others have come for other reasons. Some come from greater knowledge of the tradition, some from respect for the new Roman rubrics, some from adaptation to new or renovated buildings.

The 1967 liturgy had the celebrant first approach the altar at the offertory. In effect this was a restoration of a common Anglican practice prior to the changes of the "ritualists" of the late nineteenth century, for until then it had been common for the liturgy of the word to be led from the prayer desk and pulpit at which morning and evening prayer were said. The 1967 liturgy suggested the pulpit as the place for
the reading of all three lessons. This effort to restore the pulpit as the place for the readings and preaching, thereby restoring the pulpit as a symbol of Christ's presence in his word as the altar is a symbol of his presence in his sacrament, has been gaining ground.

From 1550 until the early seventeenth century Anglican priests, for the liturgy of the table, had celebrated facing the people across a “holy table.” In the seventeenth century the table began to be placed against the east wall in an altar-wise position, but the priest celebrated from the north end, so that the people might focus their attention upon the bread and cup upon the altar and that the priest might not seem to stand between them and God. In the decades immediately before and after the beginning of the twentieth century it became normal for the priest to face eastward. Though facing the people across the altar is not mandated by the rubrics of the new book, it is implied by some of the rubrics and is a growing custom.

The 1549 Prayer Book retained the late medieval custom of using wafers rather than real bread, though it specified that the wafers be “larger and thicker” than in times past and that each wafer be broken into “two pieces, at the least.” The 1552 revision restored the use of real bread. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century wafers gradually replaced bread, as late as the 1930s in the conservative Charleston, South Carolina, parish which I later served as rector. The rubrics of the new liturgy imply the use of real bread, for the concelebrants are directed to assist in the breaking of the bread. Though some clergy are clinging to the use of wafers for reasons of convenience or because of concern for particles, the use of real bread is growing. This restoration has been welcomed by many elderly parishioners who had continued to resent the substitution of “goldfish food.” In some places where real bread has not become the exclusive use, whole wheat priests' hosts have been substituted for individual wafers, being broken for the communions of the people. In that way the people receive something that looks, feels, and tastes more like bread, and this better symbolizes both receiving from one loaf and Christ's body broken for us.

In recent decades, for the protection of purificators, white wine had often been substituted for the more significatory red wine. In recent years there seems to be a shift back to the more significatory red.

It used to be that in our larger churches the altar was often set with a number of chalices, one or more for each chalice-bearer. Rather than a table displaying one bread and one cup, it resembled a sideboard displaying the family silver. The rubrics of the new rite recommend that during the eucharistic prayer there be on the altar only one cup, and if need be a flagon for additional wine, from which chalices might be filled after the breaking of the bread. In this manner the symbolism of the one cup is highlighted, and the pouring out of Christ's blood is symbolized by pouring the wine after the breaking of the bread, after the pattern of certain Eastern liturgies.

It used to be that all the clergy and acolytes communicated before the first members of the congregation took a step to approach the altar. It was as if the clergy received at a “high table,” and the laity were communicated from what remained after their feast. Rubrics in the new book, in order to offset this, specify that the clergy are not to communicate until “the people are coming forward to receive communion.” This is an effort to signify that we all receive at one table.
The rubrics of the 1967 liturgy and those which have followed it have designated particular liturgical functions for each of the four orders: lay persons, bishops, priests, and deacons. The functions of the various orders, the nature of the Church, and the symbol of the eucharist as a sacrament of unity are expressed liturgically within the rite. The bishop has a clear prerogative to be the principal celebrant and to preach. In the absence of a bishop, a priest serves as chief celebrant. Other priests assist as concelebrants. Deacons act out their roles as servants of the Church and heralds of the gospel by reading the gospel, leading the prayers of the people, preparing the table, assisting in the administration of communion, performing the ablutions, sending the people forth into the world, and taking communion to the absent. Lay persons exercise special gifts as cantors, choir, or instrumentalists; function as servers or acolytes; read the lessons which precede the gospel; and present the eucharistic elements in the name of the congregation.

From the late nineteenth century the Episcopal Church in the United States had been torn apart by “churchmanship.” A major aspect of this struggle had to do with ceremonialism. Various vestments and ceremonial actions which had not been normative within Anglicanism since the Reformation were reinstituted. Through the efforts of the “ritualists” many worthy practices were recovered, but many of their efforts exhibited more zeal than knowledge. Wafers replaced bread. The eastward position of the celebrant was reinstated. Churches were built or remodelled in manners which were defeating to congregational participation. Choirs were placed between the clergy and people. Ceremonial actions which came into use with the old Roman canon in the late middle ages were imposed upon a West Syrian-type eucharistic prayer. In some of the more extreme parishes non-communicating Masses became the norm for the principal services of Sundays and major holy days. As the Roman Catholic scholar, Louis Bouyer, expressed it, “What the Anglo-Catholics of a hundred years ago were able to borrow from the Catholics of the time were precisely those features which now appear to Catholics to be among the weakest points in their recent liturgical practice.” It is not surprising that a polarization developed. It is surprising that many of the antagonists of the “ritualists” adopted so many of the customs which they at first castigated. Eventually in all but a very few U.S. Episcopal churches the choir was moved up front, wafers replaced bread, the eastward position was adopted by the priest, and other changes were accepted which at an early stage had been hallmarks of “ritualism.”

The new *Prayer Book* has sounded the death knell for many of the old churchmanship battles. Those on one side were given an enriched liturgy of the word; those on the other a remolded and enriched liturgy of the table. Historical research also played an important part. Greater knowledge of the patristic and medieval periods, and the new Roman rubrics, caused some to simplify ceremonials and others to accept certain ceremonial actions which they had formerly resisted. Some, for example, have cut back from thirty-three signs of the cross in the eucharistic prayer to the one at the epiclesis which was typical of the first thousand years, which is the one allowed by the new Roman rubrics; others, realizing that a signation can be traced back to the third century or the second, rather than being a late medieval innovation, have been willing to take it up. More clergy are living within the rubrics of the new book than were living within the rubrics of the 1928 book.

The earlier *Prayer Books* had been based on the principle that one stands to pray unless directed to kneel. The “ritualists” had adopted the principle that kneeling
was the proper posture for prayer, regardless of the type of prayer. The new rites, in accordance with the tradition of the early Church and of the Eastern Church to this day, have opened the way for the recovery of the tradition of standing for corporate prayer; the command to kneel in the eucharistic rite is restricted to prayers of confession.

The Prayer Books since 1552 required that the people kneel for communion, following the custom which was coming into practice in the West in the late middle ages. The new liturgies, beginning with the 1967 Liturgy of the Lord's Supper, have dropped that requirement, in order that the traditional standing posture and the eucharistic concepts which it signifies may be recovered.

There are many parallels to the ceremonial changes taking place in the Episcopal Church in other Churches. On the one hand, the new Roman Catholic rites have greatly simplified ceremonial, whereas the new Lutheran Book of Worship and its companion volumes suggest many actions not recommended in prior Lutheran liturgical books. As in the shape of the rite and the liturgical texts, there is a remarkable convergence in ceremonial directions and practices.

**Eucharistic Theology**

Development in the theology of the sacrament might be seen by a comparison of the catechism and the eucharistic prayers in the old and the new Prayer Books. The catechism questions and answers concerning the eucharist were slightly revised in 1789:

**Question:** Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?

**Answer:** The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was ordained for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.

**Question:** What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?

**Answer:** The outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper is, Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.

**Question:** What is the inward part, or thing signified?

**Answer:** The inward part, or thing signified, is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

**Question:** What are the benefits whereof we are partakers in the Lord's Supper?

**Answer:** The benefits whereof we are partakers in the Lord's Supper are the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are strengthened and refreshed by the Bread and Wine.

**Question:** What is required of those who come to the Lord's Supper?

**Answer:** It is required of those who come to the Lord's Supper to examine themselves, whether they repent them truly of their former sins, with stedfast purpose to lead a new life; to have a lively faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of his death; and to be in charity with all men.
These questions and answers might be contrasted with those of the new Prayer Book:

Q. What is the Holy Eucharist?
   A. The Holy Eucharist is the sacrament commanded by Christ for the continual remembrance of his life, death, and resurrection, until his coming again.

Q. Why is the Eucharist called a sacrifice?
   A. Because the Eucharist, the Church's sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, is the way by which the sacrifice of Christ is made present, and in which he unites us to his one offering of himself.

Q. By what other names is this service known?
   A. The Holy Eucharist is called the Lord's Supper, and Holy Communion; it is also known as the Divine Liturgy, the Mass, and the Great Offering.

Q. What is the outward and visible sign in the Eucharist?
   A. The outward and visible sign in the Eucharist is bread and wine, given and received according to Christ's command.

Q. What is the inward and spiritual grace given in the Eucharist?
   A. The inward and spiritual grace in the Holy Communion is the Body and Blood of Christ given to his people, and received by faith.

Q. What are the benefits which we receive in the Lord's Supper?
   A. The benefits we receive are the forgiveness of our sins, the strengthening of our union with Christ and one another, and the foretaste of the heavenly banquet which is our nourishment in eternal life.

Q. What is required of us when we come to the Eucharist?
   A. It is required that we should examine our lives, repent of our sins, and be in love and charity with all people.

As you can see, the new catechism deals with several aspects of the eucharist which were not touched on in the old: the eucharist is taught to be an anamnesis of Christ's life, death, and resurrection, not just of his death; the eucharist is depicted as an eschatological feast; it is taught to be a sacrifice; the adverb "spiritually," which was subject to various interpretations, has been removed from the answer concerning the "inward and spiritual grace," and that answer has been revised in a manner which sets forth a more objective view of the sacrament — "the body and blood of Christ given to his people, and received by faith" is substituted for "the body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful"; in the old catechism the benefits are said to be "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls," whereas the new catechism sets forth the benefits as "the forgiveness of our sins, the strengthening of our union with Christ and one another, and the foretaste of the heavenly banquet."

The new eucharistic prayers, as we have seen, express this enriched eucharistic theology. The older eucharistic prayer and the section on the eucharist in the catechism were polemical documents expressing emphases of the Reformation. The
post-Sanctus of the older Anglican prayers was unlike any other eucharistic prayer. It expresses the mind of Thomas Cranmer, the canon lawyer, in language more reminiscent of canon law than of proclamation or prayer:

... who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.

Another evidence of the acceptance of a more objective view of the eucharist lies in the new rubrics which allow for reservation of the sacrament. Earlier Prayer Books mandated that any consecrated elements remaining after the communion of the people be consumed immediately after the blessing, and that none be carried out of the church. For the communion of the sick there had to be a special celebration. The 1967 rite allowed reservation for “the communion of the sick, or of others who for weighty cause could not be present at the celebration.” In order to make the sacrament available at times when a priest might not be present, the 1970 Services for Trial Use allowed a deacon to distribute communion from the reserved sacrament at the conclusion of the liturgy of the word. That book also provided for communion from the reserved sacrament on Good Friday.

Many of the new emphases in eucharistic theology can be paralleled in the revised rites of other Churches, and a remarkable convergence can be seen in the joint statements concerning the eucharist which have come out of conversations between representatives of various traditions.

The past twenty-five years have produced greatly enriched rites. My hope is that the years immediately ahead will produce rites which will have been enriched by deeper study, building upon a broader ecumenical base, and exhibiting an even greater convergence in both rites and teaching.

---
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* * *

The eucharist is the center of all we do and are and hope as Christians. It is perhaps for that very reason that it is so difficult to realize the dynamic thrust forward that is the very essence of eucharist. It is perhaps because eucharist demands so much and offers more than we are usually quite ready to receive. Every eucharist takes us to the heart of the redemptive mystery in a ritual action that calls for fulfillment in the total life of the community that celebrates.

Paul, in the First Letter to the Corinthians, puts the matter bluntly and with inescapable simplicity:

"When we bless the 'cup of blessing,' is it not a means of sharing in the blood of Christ? When we break the bread, is it not a means of sharing in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we, many as we are, are one body; for it is one loaf of which we all partake" (I Cor. 10: 16-17).

"For the tradition which I handed on to you came to me from the Lord himself: that the Lord Jesus, on the night of his arrest, took bread and, after giving thanks to God, broke it and said: 'This is my body, which is for you; do this as a memorial of me.' In the same way, he took the cup after supper, and said: 'This cup is the new covenant sealed by my blood. Whenever you drink it, do this as a memorial of me.' For every time you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord, until he comes" (1 Cor. 11: 23-26).1

This is the common ground upon which our various eucharistic traditions are built. It interprets a prior tradition and it also stands as a continuing corrective to

1 All biblical quotations in this paper are taken from The New English Bible, Oxford Study Edition (1975, Oxford University Press, New York).
the practical focus and understanding of the subsequent tradition. It leads us to ask three questions:

1) What is the transformation of the worshippers and their world that is envisioned in the celebration of the eucharist?

2) How can we expect that transformation to come about?

3) What are the implications for the planning and conduct of eucharistic celebrations?

The transformation that is envisioned has to do with union, communion, with Jesus Christ. But the ritual points neither backward only by way of commemoration of the Jesus of history as he walked among us and preached and healed and counselled, nor forward only to the risen Christ resplendent in heavenly glory. The ritual is very specific in pointing to a moment, the paschal moment, the passage from death to life — a moment that has become the axis of history because it looks toward the yet unfulfilled final coming of the Lord. The transformation has to do then with a sharing in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

One could, of course, think of this either passively or actively. That is, it could be understood as a sharing in the consequences of Christ's death and resurrection as designated beneficiaries, so to speak. Then the eucharist would be seen as affecting us in a more or less arbitrary way, more or less adventitious or extrinsic to the stuff and substance of our own living.

On the other hand, the sharing could be understood as an entering into the dying and rising of Jesus actively, by somehow doing it with him. In this case more than ritual celebration would be required because there would necessarily be a change in consciousness, in behavior, in lifestyle.

The first understanding can, in fact, never be wholly rejected because of the utter gratuity of God's outreach to us in the person of Jesus and because of the initiative of Jesus in the sacrament and the cumulative effect of Church response and Church tradition. For all these reasons there is no doubt that the eucharist is a source of overwhelming grace prior to any response to it that any of us might make. However, that understanding is also seriously inadequate if not balanced by the second mode of understanding it. The recurring and pervasive temptation of Christians of all denominations appears to be in the direction of a purely passive rather than of an inordinately active interpretation. This paper, therefore, addresses the understanding of the eucharist as demanding active participation.

What does it mean then to invite Christians in the eucharist to enter into the death and resurrection of Jesus? There can be no doubt that the early Church looked upon the deaths of martyrs as the clearest and fullest realization of what it meant, and was apt to describe such deaths in eucharistic language and imagery. With decreasing numbers of martyrdoms, consecrated virgins seemed to take place of the martyrs in the esteem of the community. Yet it is neither the renunciation of life in itself nor the renunciation of sexual partnership in itself that constitutes the fullness of realization, the more complete entering into the death and resurrection of Jesus.

It is quite clearly the radical gift of self expressed in these renunciations that is at stake and has become highly visible in these renunciations.

Clearly, the call to a radical gift of self is for all Christians and not only for the martyrs and virgins. Even in the New Testament the self-gift is spelt out not only in terms of faith and trust in God, but in the plainest language in terms of the quality and concrete demands of community with others. It is in the context of a discussion of eucharist that Paul writes:

"'We are free to do anything,' you say. Yes, but is everything good for us? . . . does everything help the building of the community? Each of you must regard, not his own interests, but the other man's . . . .

"'Is my freedom to be called in question by another man's conscience?' . . . I always try to meet everyone half-way, regarding not my own good but the good of the many, so that they may be saved. Follow my example as I follow Christ's" (1 Cor. 10: 23-33).

"When you meet as a congregation, it is impossible for you to eat the Lord's Supper, because each of you is in such a hurry to eat his own, and while one goes hungry another has too much to drink . . . . are you so contemptuous of the church of God that you shame its poorer members?

"He who eats and drinks eats and drinks judgment on himself if he does not discern the Body" (1 Cor. 11: 20-29).

In these passages, Paul locates the heart of the matter in a sensitive, community-building charity which has to do both with the spiritual nourishment of consciences and with the physical nourishment of the poor of the local community. He links both to the very essence of the eucharist, for the "discerning of the body" that is the test of respectful and legitimate celebration of the Lord's supper, seems to be a sensitivity to that body of the risen Christ that is the Church and a sensitivity to the far-reaching demands of the communion and interdependence of its members. To which the Didache or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles from the second century adds:

"As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountaintops, and after being harvested was made one, so let your Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom" (9: 4).

"If anyone is holy, let him come; if anyone is not, let him repent" (10: 6).

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus of the early third century, addressing itself to the question of the transformation envisioned in the eucharist, placed it in context of anamnesis (the not-forgetting, remembering, becoming aware) of Jesus who made eucharist, that is gave thanks, by offering his body broken for others and his blood shed for others:

"Who fulfilling Thy will and preparing for Thee a holy people stretched forth His hands for suffering that He might release from sufferings them who have believed in Thee" (iv: 7).

---

3 For an extensive argument supporting and developing this idea, see "Eucharist at Corinth: You are the Christ," by John C. Haughey, in Above Every Name, edited by Thomas E. Clarke (1980, Paulist Press, Ramsey, NJ): pages 107-133.
"And when these things have been accomplished, let each one be zealous to perform good works and to please God, living righteously, devoting himself to the Church, performing the things that he has learnt, advancing in the service of God" (xxiii: 12).4

The elements of community, self-forgetfulness, and compassion come sharply into focus in these texts as the transformation to be expected in the eucharist. However, one might ask whether the early Church defined these concerns rather narrowly and only with reference to the members of the worshipping community. This is evidently not so, because here and there one meets references that matter of factly assume a universal reference. Thus Cyril of Jerusalem, in the fourth century, writes sweepingly:

"Then, after the spiritual sacrifice is perfected, the Bloodless Service upon that Sacrifice of Propitiation, we entreat God for the common peace of the Church, for the tranquillity of the world; for kings; for soldiers and allies; for the sick; for the afflicted; and, in a word, for all who stand in need of succour we all supplicate and offer this Sacrifice."5

In spite of a steadily increasing accumulation of conventional liturgical language and symbolism, there is a dogged persistence of the elements indicated above in the teaching and testimony of the Churches.6 The transformation is a process of becoming aware (anamnesis) of the inner reality of the self-gift of Christ to the Father for others, and this is seen to have community and apostolic dimensions. That is to say, it is concerned with a realization and maturing of what we are by the gift of Jesus Christ, and with a sense of mission to share the gift with others. There is a complementarity between receiving the gift of Jesus in his death and giving it to others by one's own sharing in that death, perhaps because the nature of the gift is precisely one of restored trust and integrity that makes it possible to be for others, as parents nourish and cherish children to a maturity in which they in turn can become parents. In the community that is the Church, the body of the risen Christ, we are involved in a kind of parenting relationship to one another without the benefit of prior maturity, though we draw on the strength and compassion of the risen Jesus as it is mediated in the cumulative strength and compassion of the community and its traditions.

The transformation might, then, be described as one from a sense of one's own unfulfilled needs as desperately and overwhelmingly urgent to a sense of peace, trust, forgiveness, joy, overflowing spontaneously into sensitivity to the suffering and unfulfilled needs of others. It might also be described as a transformation from a state of siege in which special interest groups (local, linguistic, cultural, economic, national, religious denominational, and others) seek to maintain the interests of the group against all outsiders, to a state of peace and trust in which barriers begin to crumble. Yet again, the transformation might be described as one from wanting and seeking many inadequate and unsatisfying things for oneself to a gradually

---

4 See Liturgies of the Western Church, by Bard Thompson (1961, Meridian, NY), which gives on pages 20-23 the text quoted here, and situates it in its context, pages 13-24.


sharpening focus on the one and only thing that matters, namely to be attuned to the will of God.

How, then, do we expect this transformation to come about in the eucharist? It would seem to be basically by three factors: the ritual itself, that is the blessing, sharing, and consuming of bread and wine; the constant biblically fostered meditation on the death and resurrection of Jesus as the meaning of the ritual; and the continual founding, shaping, and constituting of the community in this ritual.

First of all, the ritual calls us to share a symbolic meal, a token piece of bread taken with thanksgiving to God the Father and provider of the fruits of the earth for all. The ritual calls us to receive this bread as the self-gift of Jesus and to become one with him, being what he is and doing what he does. It calls us therefore to believe, realize, and accept that Jesus has become nourishment and the staff of life for us. It calls us to believe, realize, and accept our destiny to be nourishment and the staff of life for others. But what does it mean to be bread for others? It means in the first place to respond to physical needs by sharing one’s substance and resources not on the basis of any pretentious judgment of merit but on a generous and sensitive appraisal of need. It also means fostering the dignity, self-confidence, and social adjustment of the vulnerable by respect, support, friendship, and the expectation of greatness. It means sensitive and generous and unwearying responses in face-to-face relationships as well as courageous and onerous action in and upon the structures of society. To be bread for others means practical concern for the petty and perhaps self-inflicted anguish of the next-door neighbor but also the awareness of world hunger and the willingness to enter into the changes in lifestyle and national economy that may be entailed in responding to it.

The very words of eucharist, as they have come to us from apostolic times, link the self-gift of Jesus to us inextricably with his death. It is not difficult to see that every self-gift or self-surrender to another involves a metaphorical death to selfish goals, habits, attachments, pettiness, and even a death to some legitimate independence, rest, and enjoyment. Yet the meaning of the death of Jesus as redemptive, as liberating us, as offering us a gift of new life, as bread that nourishes us, is an inexhaustible meaning. Eucharist therefore takes us through cycles of biblical readings in the context of which we can see the death and resurrection in ever new perspectives. The biblical readings intersect with ever new life experiences of both individuals and whole communities, and these life experiences also put the mystery in different perspectives.

Readers of the bible learn to identify sin as that all-embracing, all-pervasive disorientation that corrupts and disintegrates both persons and structures of society. That disorientation is the displacement of the center and goal and purpose of life from God to finite selves. The death of Jesus by crucifixion in pursuit of his mission to embody the compassionate mercy of God in the world is the most radical recentering or reorientation that could be accomplished within the network of human freedoms. It pits itself directly in opposition to the stranglehold of sin, that ultimate self-centeredness that is impervious to everything except a self-gift in death.

A community is transformed by entering progressively deeper into the meaning of this as the dialogue between scriptural inspiration and everyday lived experience is played out in the context of the eucharistic celebration. It is in this context that the community continually constitutes itself and is challenged to appropriate its authen-
tic identity in Christ. The individuals are in process of becoming a community with one another because they habitually face one another at eucharist. They become a presence and a force in the world because they habitually turn outward again from their common eucharist.

However, as we all know, it is all too possible for eucharistic worship to become perfunctory, routine, self-congratulatory, self-soothing, and apparently unproductive. One might, therefore, ask what implications for the planning and conduct of eucharistic celebrations might be drawn from a consideration of the transforming power that is in the eucharist. Detailed strategies are not the subject matter of this paper, but general principles might be drawn from the above.

If the transformation envisioned is from a stance of grasping spiritual comfort and reassurance and perhaps a status of group acceptance for oneself to a stance of spontaneous sensitivity to the needs of others, it would seem that the personal needs must be fulfilled in such a way as to overflow in concern for others. People evidently need much reassurance of forgiveness, healing, reconciliation. On the other hand, the challenge to look out from oneself, and from one's worshipping community, can not wait until all within have attained a measure of reconciliation and inner peace. The challenge on behalf of the needy must be made in season, out of season, but it must be made with compassion for those who are not able to respond.

If the transformation is to come about by the ritual itself, it would seem that the ritual must consist of signs that really signify in their immediacy, in their classic simplicity, in their high visibility to the whole congregation, in their participatory character, and in a certain silence surrounding them all that allows for personal assimilation both cognitive and motivational.

If the transformation is to come about by the biblically guided meditation on the meaning of the death and resurrection of Jesus, then good readers (not dramatic but prayerful) are important. So is a calm context in which the readings can really be heard, and so are opportunities outside the eucharistic celebration for deeper study and more leisurely meditation of texts. What would seem most contrary to the goals and purpose of the eucharist is any atmosphere of entertainment.

If the community is to found, constitute, and shape itself continually in the eucharistic assembly and to draw its inspiration and sense of identity in the world from the eucharistic celebration, this suggests the need for a certain spontaneity and flexibility both in the mode of celebration and in the pattern of relationships in the community. More particularly it seems to suggest a strong need to recognize the variety of gifts in the community in a diversity of ministries and leadership roles.

Perhaps the most important observation about the implications for planning and conduct of eucharistic celebrations is the following. If the transformation envisioned in the celebration is the gift of grace received within the human freedoms interacting in the congregation, the atmosphere that will foster receptivity to grace is one of prayerfulness and good-humored tolerance and practical, serviceable generosity. The only way to bring about such an atmosphere is by being like that oneself.