T H E E U C H A R I S T A N D H I S T O R Y

by

Torquil John Macleod
Paterson

A thesis submitted to Rhodes University, Grahamstown,
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy,
January 1990

A B S T R A C T

Thesis: The Eucharist and History

By: Torquil John Macleod Paterson

Submitted to: Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 1990.

The thesis delineates an existential view of history, in which the **eternal** is defined as the ground of authentic human life which underlies true historical action. The **historical** is the manifestation of the eternal in the unique moment, and redefines the ahistorical conditions of human life. The **ahistorical** is the social and ideological conditioning of all human knowledge, usually presented in terms of various kinds of myth and ritual. The ahistorical contains both good and bad elements, but always has the tendency to become oppressive and is therefore constantly in conflict with the historical. The life of Jesus is described as the perfect expression of the eternal in true historical action, by which he came into conflict with the ahistorical of his society, as expressed in his death. By his resurrection, his life breaks the limitations of time and becomes transformative enabling all subsequent historical action.

The eucharist is described as engaging with each of these dimensions of our existence. By being itself a ritual action containing a myth, the eucharist has an ahistorical form and therefore easily engages with the ahistorical dimensions of society. However, without a constant dialogue with the historical, the eucharist, as an ahistorical medium, can become allied to the dominant forces of society and become a means of oppression.

The eucharist has at its centre the remembrance of the historical action of Jesus. True historical action in the present will result from a proper hermeneutic of the gospels. The eucharistic anamnesis must be regarded as part of the wider search for a relevant contemporary christology. The eucharist remembers the Last Supper, which is a parable

of the whole life of Jesus and a prelude to his death and is a sacrifice in that it has a sacrificial form, and leads to our historical action, which will usually take the form of a conflict with the ahistorical and have sacrificial dimensions.

The eternal only becomes present in our historical action, but the eucharist, by uniting us with the transforming power of the death and resurrection of Jesus, is a powerful aid to such action. The eucharist also provides the opportunity for resonances between Jesus and the ground of our being, thus enabling deep shifts of attitude and consciousness. Three fundamental prerequisites for human life are isolated and related to the eucharist: belonging, nurturing and giving.

In order for the eucharist to ennable historical action is must hold these dimensions in tension. In its actual form it does this through the balance between the Words of Institution and the Epiclesis, which, in turn, provide the christological ground of the eucharist and relate this to the present through a particular pneumatology. The real presence is described by the thesis in a way which connects the eucharistic presence with the historical Jesus and leads to our historical action.

Finally, some consequences of the thesis for eucharistic practice are suggested. The relationship between the ahistorical form of the eucharist and the anamnesis is important. In this way the eucharist objectifies the ahistorical, reflects on this in terms of the historical action of Jesus, and reforms the ahistorical by modelling a response. This should lead to a more authentic expression of the eternal in the contemporary world.

C O N T E N T S

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 History, the individual and the community

Every age's, indeed every individual's, understanding of history is almost to be equated with its world-view. History is, therefore, an extremely general and highly fluid category and as such it is extremely difficult to use with any precision.[1] The usual alternatives between cyclic and linear time, or between two history and single history models, demonstrate this.[2] Since this work is not devoted primarily towards the development of an understanding of history, but towards an analysis of the eucharistic tradition in the light of a particular understanding of history, this introduction will not debate these alternatives but will simply delineate the position adopted.

Each person's life emerges slowly and painfully out of the union between the individual and his or her mother.[3] Through the struggles of infancy the individual learns

---

[1] For different perspectives on "history", see E. Breisach, "Historiography: An Overview," Encyclopedia of Religion (New York: MacMillan, 1987) vol 6, pp. 370-383; C.T. McIntire, "History: Christian Views," ibid. pp. 394-399. Also J.V.L Casserley, Toward a Theology of History (London: Mowbray, 1965); V.A. Harvey, The Historian and the Believer (London: SCM, 1967); H. Butterfield, Christianity and History (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1949); A. Toynbee, An Historian's Approach to Religion (Oxford: OUP, 1956); R.G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946); and J. Kent, The Unacceptable Face. The Modern Church in the Eyes of the Historian (London: SCM, 1987).

[2] For a single history model see G. Gutierrez, A Theology of Liberation (London: SCM, 1974), pp. 153ff. O. Cullman attempts to overcome Augustinian dualism through christocentricity, but still retains the distinction between history in general and salvation history; see his Christ and Time (London: SCM, 1951) and Salvation in History (London: SCM, 1967).

[3] For a similar line of thought see J.L. Segundo, Faith and Ideologies (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1984), pp. 10ff. For a more technical acount of moral and religious development see R. Goldman, Religious Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964).

selfhood, and through education learns the related lessons of acquiring communal values and the ability to reflect critically on these values. Then in old age the individual slowly has to hand over the world to the next generation and resign him or herself to a new wiser union with the collective. In death the historical existence of the individual ends and his or her contribution to society becomes part of the accumulative wisdom of the ages.[4]

During this life cycle the relationship between the individual and the community goes through various stages. In infancy the individual is largely identified with his or her immediate community, and the move towards adulthood involves learning to relate selfhood responsibly towards community. Old age sees a growing dependence on the community and a handing over of the guidance of the community to the next generation in the move towards the still, lonely point of death.

Individuality and being in community are deeply and inseparably connected. Individuality has to be wrested from the collective, from the community, yet the community provides the opportunity and possibility for individuality.

Both the individual and the community exist in time. In the continuum from past into the future the individual exists only briefly as he or she arises out of community and sinks back into community. Without some differentiation between the community one enters and the community one leaves, while formally one may know that time progresses, this would not be a true historical consciousness since individuality would not stand out in any way. Historical consciousness depends upon the human ability to objectivise self over and against the community and to discern changes in the community.

The relationship between individual and community is one of mutual dependence but also of necessary conflict. Every

[4] A useful parallel can be discerned between the progression hrough life and the development of the Old Testament, from law early childhood), to prophecy (adulthood), to wisdom (old age).

age has to strive for the correct balance between the needs of the individual and the community. This involves a constant struggle since rather different and competing dynamics are at work each aiming for dominance. The individual seeks freedom from the community in order to influence it and the community seeks to use the individual for its own purposes.

By far the most common imbalance in the relationship between individual and community is the domination of the individual by the community. In primitive cultures this is often so acute that the individual hardly appears to have a conscious independent existence. In this respect such cultures are analogous to the very earliest phase of the modern individual's life when the individual is emerging from the psyche of the mother. Such a phenomenon as the representation of the whole tribe or nation by a king is only possible when individuals all define their existence in terms of the king. A comparative study of culture will demonstrate how, in such societies, individuality as we know it is only the property of the ruling elite, who then view their communities as extensions of their own desires. In such an environment the ruling class will define the nature of the society and will subjugate the individuality of all others to this end. Totalitarianism is the result and is found in history from ancient Egypt, through Nazism, Stalinism, into modern nationalistic dictatorships.

Such an overemphasis on the community at the expense of the individual must lead to the quenching of initiative in society. Organization of whole societies around the interests of a few must lead to stagnation, and may well be one of the major factors leading to the decline of civilisations. That within such societies, individuals, or dissident groups, will attempt rebellion is not simply a protest against oppression, but it is an expression of the denial of the necessity for individuality in human being. Deprived of active participation in determining and striving

towards the goals of society the oppressed need to rebel in order to affirm, or even to discover, their humanity.

In the OT the law is the chief means by which the social contract is fixed, and it is possible to see OT law as a deliberate attempt to limit the power of the ruling class, whereas Babylonian law, for instance, is simply an expression of the power of the king and Marduk and the pantheon are thinly disguised images of the rulers. In contrast, the OT law is the expression of the covenant between God and the whole people and the interests of minority groups are zealously defended against the very real possibility of oppression. While law is by nature determined and used by those in power as a vehicle for oppression, the OT demonstrates that it does have the potential of curtailing that oppression.

Law is not enough, however. Law has to be administered and is too easily corrupted. A more zealous advocacy of the individual is required. In the OT we find this in the major prophets. The domination of individual rights by the powerful is hotly denounced, but the key to the prophets' defence of the poor lies in the redefinition of the relationship between community and individual. The individual is judged by him or herself, not as an extension of either the present rulers or as an inheritor of the past.[5] Such a defence of the individual coincides in OT theology with the emergence of a proper doctrine of creation and of history, as can be seen so very clearly in the theology of Deutero-Isaiah.[6]

In the paradigmatic period of Israelite history, the Davidic monarchy, we find society governed through three competing principles, the law, which establishes the

---

[5] See Jer 31:29 and especially Ez 18, the whole of which is oncerned with the relationship between individual and corporate esponsibility; see W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel (London: SCM, 1970), pp. 34-249.

[6] See C. Westermann, Isaiah 40-66 (London: SCM, 1969), pp. 6f.

covenant with the whole people, the monarchy, which is meant to be an expression of the law, but is often in fundamental conflict with the law and continually tries to subvert the law to its own ends, and the prophets, who even at this early time were interpreting the law to protect the individual against the perversion of the law by the king.

The Old Testament is a history of a community with a developing consciousness of individuality mainly as a result of the work of the prophets. The New Testament looks back on this and regards Jesus, the individual, to be the perfect expression and culmination of the community: he is the new Adam as well as the new Israel. In Jesus we find the perfect pattern for relating the individual to the community and therefore of true historical being. That Christianity has at its centre an individual person, Jesus, who is regarded as the revelation of God, establishes the individual as the starting point in every aspect of Christian theory and practice but this in a particular way. The appeal to repentance and faith obliges the individual to respond. The church, as the archetype of true human community, is founded upon those who believe, who are justified by faith. However much the church is regarded as acting sacramentally towards the individual, such action is always a means towards a personal and individual response to grace. Thus, the community is conceived of as a free association of individuals loving each other sacrificially. By each individual treating every other individual as if they matter more than self, the principle of the priority of the individual is carried out of the sphere of selfish interest into genuine altruism. Instead of the priority of the individual self, Christianity establishes the priority of the individual other and in this way founds true community.

However, the prophetic protest against the domination of the individual by community and the individualism of Christianity when perverted, can tip the scales in the other direction so that the individual tyrannizes the community. At least one strand of western history begins in the

prophets, passes through Paul, is kept alive by monasticism, which for all its communal life was the place for the development of the individual, is taken up in the Renaissance, is magnified by Luther, is developed by existentialism, and comes to fruition in either rampant capitalism or in anarchy.

The modern world has failed satisfactorily to establish a balance between the individual and community, and it is still emerging from the inheritance of the nationalistic days of colonialism which culminated in two world wars. Even in the United States of America, held out as the bastion of individual, democratic, human rights, nationalism of a phobic kind has long conditioned its foreign policy. Similarly the political problems of South Africa can be reduced to a conflict between the complementary rights of individuals and communities.

Recently a more disturbing result of the domination of the individual over the community in western culture has come to light, namely, the way this leads to the domination and oppression of nature by humankind.[7] In one sense this domination is akin to the domination of the ruling elite over the rest of society and it is often part of this. But it appears that the underlying idea of the exaltation of the individual over and against community carries itself over into a fracturing of the sense of community between humankind and the natural world. Economic development is pursued (for the interests of the dominant elite) in a grand and suicidal exploitation of nature. The realization of the imminent collapse of the biosphere as a result of human rapacity is forcing a re-evaluation of the basic philosophy inherent in western culture. The magnification of the individual, which is so productive in industrial capitalism, needs to be restrained by an awareness that humankind not

---

[7] See S. McFague, Models of God. Theology for an Ecological, Nuclear Age (London: SCM, 1987), and J. Moltmann, God in Creation. An Ecological Doctrine of Creation (London: SCM, 1985).

only needs to exist in human community but as part of the wider community of creation.

Thus, while the domination of the individual by the community is oppressive of both the individual and the less powerful and leads to a static history, the opposite, in which the urge towards power by the individual leads to the oppression of the earth and which idolizes progress, also leads to disaster.

There is an urgent need for models which will affirm the individual and the community as existing together in a mutual symbiosis. This chapter will continue to develop one such model and the rest of the thesis will demonstrate how the eucharist can be an aid in maintaining the necessary balances between the different dimensions of our historical experience which in turn arise out of our being both individuals and in community.

1.2 History and ideology

The attempt to formulate an understanding of our historical existence can be approached from a rather different perspective. All human thought can be described as ideological. Ideology is defined here as having two references with neither being pejorative as in Marxist theory. Firstly, by virtue of the fact that we think in categories which are to hand, and these categories reflect our place in the world, every statement or contention reflects the attitudes of society. All knowledge is therefore bound up with and conditioned by society.[8] Secondly, such a societal origin and conditioning of knowledge interacts with the means by which the human existential orientation of basic values is to be implemented.[9] Ideology, then, refers to the social origin of

---

[8] See P.L. Berger and T. Luckman, The Social Construction of eality (New York: Doubleday, 1966).

[9] See J.L. Segundo, Faith and Ideologies (Maryknoll, NY: rbis, 1984).

all knowledge and to the means by which core values of society are implemented.

When the ideological nature of all language has been recognised, it must be acknowledged that religious language is often the objectification and refinement of human ideology, and that religious language is often, if not usually, closely associated with legitimizing a claim to social power, whether this be from the side of the oppressed or those seeking liberation. One of the fundamental issues for religion today is whether religion can contain within itself the objectivity and power to avoid the constant claims and counterclaims by factions in society for its legitimating authority.[10]

The attempt to provide Christianity with this objectivity has led many to suggest that it is not a religion. This can lead to the kind of "objectivity" advocated by Barth or to radical secularity, which seems to be the direction Bonhoeffer was taking.[11] Another line of thought is taken by J.L. Segundo, who finds in his christology a means of objectifying the ideologically conditioned human knowledge.[12]

We read in the gospels of a Jesus who objectifies the dominant ideologies of his time through a series of conflicts. These conflicts enable us to penetrate into the structures of knowledge of the time, and begin to separate out the various presumptions held by competing parties. We

---

[10] For a discussion of ideology and the church in South Africa see J. Leatt, T. Kneifel, K. Nürnberger (eds), Contending Ideologies in South Africa (Cape Town: David Philip, 1986).

[11] See K. Barth, Church Dogmatics I.2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1956), pp. 280ff: "The Revelation of God as the abolition of religion". And D. Bonheoffer, Letters and Papers from Prison (London: SCM, 3rd rev ed, 1967), p. 280 for comments on Barth, and for his own emerging understanding p. 285.

[12] See especially his The historical Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1985). This is a development of his famous "hermeneutic circle" first expounded in The Liberation of Theology (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1976).

can only approach the christological conflicts through our own inherent attitudes, but the objectification of knowledge by Jesus acts back upon us. Such a dialectic will not produce an abstract, objective truth, but it can set up a critique in our own systems of knowledge and behaviour. The purpose of christology is not to arrive at a knowledge of the past person of Jesus, but to allow his historical person to illuminate the ideological dimension to our own present day thought. Such a hermeneutic process produces a measure of objectivity to our theological statements, not an objectivity which exists over and against our knowledge, but a process of constant revision within our knowledge.

In primitive cultures the cult with its associated myths is the means whereby such ideology is proclaimed and enacted. Such cults are the means whereby the social order is maintained, individuals allotted certain functions in the community, and the community organized economically. Traditional mythic language places and orients society in the present as originating out of a myth and proceeding to a myth. This remote past and future often become fused into a single transcendent ideal world. In this way the past and future are divinized, and may be regarded as ahistorical. In this way the limits of present historical action are laid down by the ahistorical, mythic environment.

Usually the cult is a conservative re-enactment of this myth in order to enforce individual participation. The criticism of the cult by the prophets is therefore part of their defence of the individual against the forces of coercion in society. At the point of interaction between cultic priest and prophet we must expect great friction and conflict.[13] What the prophetic individual is trying to do is in fact to alter the myth, that is, to alter the whole way the society regards itself. Since this usually will involve overt or hidden claims to social power, the result will

---

[13] For a contemporary study of this conflict see J. De Gruchy, Ministry in Context and Crisis (London: Collins, 1987).

often be the silencing of the prophet. But, if he or she manages to be successful, the result will be an adaptation of the myth.

Similar dynamics are at work in our contemporary historicized existence. In the secular world we do not regard our knowledge of past history as a myth, yet the great swings in historiography reveal how closely our reading of past events is tied up with our expectations of the future. The writings of history have largely taken over from the primitive myth telling. We have come to realize that past events are just the same as present events in that both can only be viewed ideologically. There is simply no way to a neutral, objective viewpoint. All we can do in reading history is attempt to enter into the various currents and tensions within the event.

The interaction between past event and our present ideology is complex and impossible to describe fully, because it is in the very nature of the ideological to be largely unconscious. One of the functions of the conflict in the process is to bring the unconcious into fuller consciousness or at least to provide the possibility of such objectification.

The importance of conflict in the objectification of knowledge is most powerfully portrayed on the cross, which is the ultimate judgment upon the ideological captivity of the Jewish and Roman leaders of the time.[14] By recalling this historical base the church's theologia crucis continues as a means of allowing that event to engage with our present ideological captivities.

The objectification of present ideology looks back to the past in the event of the cross, but it does not relate solely to the past but to the future and to human depth. Jesus is remembered not simply as a past figure but as a prophetic individual who lived ahead of his time and who

---

[14] See J. Moltmann, The Crucified God (London: SCM, 1974), pp. 112ff.

insisted on interpreting the present and past in the light of that future.[15] But this is only an intensification of a general anthropological datum. Our reading and remembrance of the past is part of our placing of ourselves in the present moving into the future. The prophet, however, has a different view of this future than that embodied in the dominant myth, and the prophet's task is to direct the society towards a new future through radical critique of its current ideology. This process does not entail the eradication of ideology, but the alteration of ideology.

Thus, to return to the theme of the previous section, without such a development of ideology no history strictly speaking is possible since the individual would just be assumed into the ideological justification of society. From this analysis it can, therefore, be concluded that ideological conflict is in fact essential, if not definitive, for history as such, and that history-making takes place through such conflict. The particular Christian contribution to this process rests upon an interpretation of the historical person of Jesus as uniquely objectifying the ideology of his time, and the whole Christian task involves bringing the very foundations of our thought into a dialectical relationship of constant criticism with the cross of Jesus.

1.3 The eternal, the historical and the ahistorical

Human existence is individual and communal, and both individuals and communities understand themselves ideologically. Through a complicated interaction between the individual, the community and their ideological self-understanding this human existence is experienced as historical. The nature of this historicity will now be explored in more detail. Three categories will be defined: the historical, the ahistorical and the eternal.

---

[15] See J. Moltmann, Theology of Hope (London: SCM, 1967).

Before introducing the categories themselves, it seems necessary to describe the relation between past, present and future. Often it is supposed that time moves from the past into the future. The contrary is true: the future moves into the past through the present. Or, even more accurately, the present constructs the future, and invites that future into the present, and by so doing makes it the past. In a very real way, then, only the present exists.[16]

Great care must be taken at this point and several alternatives delimited. Various philosophies have defined existence in terms of each of the dimensions of time. The past can be regarded as existing because it is fixed and is no longer in a state of flux, and the future can be identified with a future ideal world, the goal of all history. Or the past and the future can be identified in a thoroughly idealistic definition of existence. An existential philosophy will, however, define existence in terms of the present, because the person only exists as an agent in the present while still having memory to remember the past and hope with which to anticipate the future.[17]

Such a philosophy will frankly embrace the difficulty posed by defining existence in terms of a moment, which by definition only exists to give way to the next. Static categories, as employed in classic Greek metaphysics, do not appear to describe a reality which is dynamic and in a state of constant flux. Instead of relating human existence to a constant being, we should relate it to constant orientation,

---

[16] For a detailed treatment see J. Moltmann, God in Creation (London: SCM, 1985), pp. 104-139.

[17] This analysis is indebted to M. Heidegger, but does not follow him in detail nor does it use his terminology; see Being and Time (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962). Similarly echoes will be found of the thought of S. Kierkegaard; see Philosophical Fragments (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1985), and Concluding Unscientific Postscript (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1968).

in which human life creates new possibilities for its authentic expression.[18]

Using such an approach the category the historical will not refer simply to the past, but to the creation of history in the present moment. The previous discussion has shown how history is only created through the individual becoming conscious of him or herself over and against the dominant ideology of the community. The historical will only come into being, therefore, through the prophetic critique of the dominant ideology. Through such historical action the individual and community will become aware of past, present and future, but not simply as time, but as a social and political reality either minimizing or maximizing the conditions of authentic human existence. Nor is the historical the only dimension of the present. Human existence is only historical when it is creating history in this way. It is quite possible, sometimes desirable, sometimes not, for human existence not to be historical. When human existence is not historical in the present it is part of either the positive and negative ahistorical. These will be examined in a moment.

The past must be considered as having an historical dimension, not only in that it once contained historical elements, but in that it is possible to remember the historical moment of the past in such a way that that remembrance becomes a truly historical moment in the present. All human knowledge contains elements of past and future; it is an act of memory and anticipation. But in a real way we cannot know the present, because it passes from the future into the past in a way which prevents any abstract cognition. We do not know the present, we can only will in the present. The act of decision separates the present from both the future and past for we cannot decide in either of these. The authentically historical arises out

---

[18] See J. Macquarrie, Three Issues in Ethics (London: SCM, 1970), pp. 46-70.

of reflection on the past and future as an orientation for action. In this way remembrance becomes historical through decision.

The ahistorical dimension of the past, present and future, exists in two ways, the one positive and the other negative. The ahistorical is not, therefore, a derogatory term. The historical can only exist together with the ahistorical, and in fact exists for the ahistorical. The ahistorical consists of the ideological elements of knowledge and society as defined previously. This can exist in the present moment as a guide for historical action in a variety of ways: religious myth, past history, analysis of contemporary society, political programmes, expectations of the future, both realistic and utopian. All these contain positive and negative elements, in that some elements of them will be good and necessary and fostering a true relationship between the individual and community, while some elements will be the legacy of past sin and the projection of present sinful desires into the future. The purpose of historical action in the present is to reinforce the good and to combat the evil, and so to hand on to the next generation a better environment, earthly as well as spiritual (in the most holistic sense possible).

For example, in the present historical action cannot be addressed to every issue. The individual is limited in terms of time, energy and opportunity. The vocation of the individual is to seize every possible opportunity and to make him or herself authentically human by affirming the good deposited by the faithfulness of one's forebears and to conquer the evil which is to hand. This making of self is not, however, a selfish task, but, if the deep connection between the community and the individual is recognised, to make the self will involve remaking the community as the basic condition for individuality. But much good and much evil will go by one and will even be part of one's actions in the present without emerging into the conscious present.

This remains ahistorical, whether it is a guide or a hindrance to one's action.

The final category used in this thesis is the eternal. The eternal is to be found within the past, the present and the future, and is the ultimately valuable and the good within them. One would like to hope that once the eternal had been brought forth through the historical into the ahistorical it would be eternal in the traditional sense of everlasting, but, unfortunately this is sometimes not the case. The eternal is not a static ideal. Because these definitions begin from the individual moment, the eternal is also unique. Understood in its influence through time it can be thought of as eternal, but in any one moment the eternal is unique. Every individual has to struggle to find the eternal dimension of his or her existence in each moment, and every generation has to make the elements of eternity achieved by its predecessor the eternity of its own time. A failure to do this can result in the eternal of the previous generation's historical action becoming part of the next generation's negative ahistorical dimension.

The eternal, as defined here, is not a temporal category but, because it represents the abiding conditions and value of human life, it is often represented in enduring temporal terms. This is, however, potentially dangerous since it gives the impression that the eternal "exists" independently of the historical. This would define the eternal in terms of a metaphysic foreign to the existential analysis used here. The eternal does not exist for us except as expressed in the ahistorical or the historical. It is a quality within them, which is only realized properly in unique historical action.

The best way we have of describing the eternal is in terms of myth. The eternal preconditions of authentic human action are portrayed in religious myths both as belonging to the past and the future. In this way the good elements of the ahistorical present the eternal to the present and provide the framework whereby the eternal can act back upon the ahistorical through historical action. In the present

the eternal will be the ultimate grounds upon which truly authentic historical action is to take place and will be mediated to the individual through religious myth, ethical argument, tradition, psychological depth, and perhaps in other ways as well.

Such myths not only represent the cumulative wisdom of the ages, that is, the deposit of action recognised by the community to have been historical and thereby a useful, but not necessary guide for contemporary historical action, but the myths also engage with the depths of humanity found within every individual. The relationship between the myths of society and the depths of the psyche will be explored later in this thesis. For the moment it is sufficient to posit a mutual relationship between the two. The eternal influences historical action both through the myths of society and its prompting of authenticity from within us. The individual and the community can be seen as related in the way they are bound together by the myths of the society both outwardly and inwardly. Historical action, prompted by the eternal, is required for the purification of the ahistorical both at the macro level of society and at the micro level of the psyche.

Historical action is, therefore, always an engagement with the eternal in the formation of new ahistorical myths. In this way the pretences and subterfuges, indeed the false ideologies of the present, are exposed, in a search for individual appropriation of eternal truth. In this way true harmony with the eternal can become the guide towards liberating historical action. From the conflict between the ahistorical myth and the eternal within the individual historical action emerges, and this influences the ahistorical myths of the present preparing the way for the next cycle of the dynamic movement of human history.

It is possible, therefore, to distinguish between the **historical**, which is the present moment as a positive engagement with the ideological limitations on human knowledge and behaviour, and the **ahistorical**, which is the

system of thought and the socialisation exercising control over the present, and the eternal, which is the ultimate ground of the authentically historical. Every moment in time places us in a setting in which historical action is required in order for a freer human community to be established. This is achieved through the eternal acting through the historical to modify the ahistorical.

None of the three dimensions of our historical being can exist by itself. The historical is a constant critique and dynamic movement within the ahistorical guided by the eternal; it can never exist without the ahistorical. But the relationships between the three are not equal. The ahistorical is largely the expression of social control and domination, and therefore of its very nature is continually attempting to force the historical into oblivion. The eternal within human nature never allows this to happen completely. Even in the darkest moments of human history a spark of true humanity can be found from which a new struggle for liberation can be kindled. It can also happen that the opposite occurs and a collapse of the ahistorical leads to chaos in which human life is equally intolerable, yet here too forces of cohesion and new stability will be found to be at work seeking to restore the balance between the ahistorical and the historical founded upon the eternal.

1.4 The historical Jesus

It has become customary to contrast a christology "from above" with a christology "from below".[19] The understanding of human existence used here necessitates a christology "from below", in which the very historicity of Jesus establishes an eternal dimension with which every subsequent generation can engage. This eternal dimension has been

---

[19] For different treatments of this see J.A.T. Robinson, The Human Face of God (London: SCM, 1973); J. Sobrino, Christology at the Crossroads (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1978) and E. Schillebeeckx, Jesus (New York: Crossroad, 1979); and J.P. Mackey, Jesus. The Man and the Myth (London: SCM, 1979).

described in traditional dogmatics in terms of the resurrection and the power of the Spirit in the church, which in turn have been interpreted, along with the whole dogmatic structure, in terms of the platonic structure of being. An existential analysis will attempt to avoid the abstraction of platonism and interpret these theological foci in terms of the human experience to which they correspond. Such an existential theology will not be concerned with God as an existent outside of human experience, nor will it attempt to establish a connection between the person of Jesus and us through appeal to a risen being. Instead the very conditions of human existence will be understood to be redefined by Jesus (as is symbolised by the resurrection), and our union with him (through the Spirit) will involve participation in that redefinition of humanity.

Such a theology will begin from, and constantly return to, the person Jesus, who by his historical action most perfectly expressed the eternal within the ahistorical structures of his time, and by so doing established a means whereby we can similarly become historical agents.

This christological approach to our historical existence differs from the various attempts to develop a philosophy of history along Trinitarian lines. From Luke in Acts, to Joachim of Fiore, through to Hegel and Marx, in their different yet related ways world history was regarded as progressing through various stages analogous to the Persons of the Trinity. Instead of using the doctrine of the Trinity as a means of dividing history into stages, the Trinity can be understood as a way of interpreting the historical action of Jesus.[20] The New Testament data upon which the later doctrine of the Trinity is based arises out of the need to explain the eternal import of the person of Jesus. In the early dogmatic development the understanding of the person

---

[20] Similar thought is found in J. Moltmann, The Trinity and the Kingdom of God (London: SCM, 1981), and J.P. Mackey, The Christian Experience of God as Trinity (London: SCM, 1983).

of Christ and the Trinity were closely bound together, and fairly soon the person of Jesus came to be interpreted through the symbol of the Trinity, whereas the relationship should be the other way round.

Jesus acted in the power of the Spirit to redefine for his time who God is. Authentic historical action arises out of the eternal in the ahistorical and redefines the ahistorical. While the Trinity, as a symbol, can be interpreted like this, it would appear to be useful to retain Trinitarian language because it demonstrates how this historical action always contains within it the relationship between the individual and the community. Within the Trinity Jesus is understood as an expression of individuality within community. And further, the connection between christology and Trinity reveals how necessary the historical Jesus is for the Trinity. Without the historical action of Jesus the symbol of the Trinity would never have been developed. Indeed, the Trinity can be understood as a way of symbolically describing how the historical action of Jesus itself creates the hermeneutic circle whereby our action is related to his. The historical Jesus bursts from the limitations of his temporality and spatiality in the resurrection and becomes once more historical in our action through the Spirit, and all of this is an expression of God's action in the world.

Jesus is then the archetypal expression of historical being and action. Precisely because of his uniqueness, the various dimensions of history are fused together in him. His historical action is eternal, and eternity is demonstrated in his historical action. While the conflict between himself and the ahistorical dimensions of his time were not resolved on the cross, the resurrection is a sign to the world that the ahistorical dimension to human life is indeed in the process of purification through the action of Christ and through our identification with his action.

1.5 The eucharist and time

Time by itself is not a historical category. One can presume the existence of time in a formal sense outside and within human experience. Time only becomes historical when the opportunities presented within time are seized and acted upon. Rather too much has sometimes been made of the semantic distinction between chronos and kairos in Greek.[21] J. Barr has demonstrated that the New Testament does not always reflect the distinction in which chronos refers to formal time, while kairos refers to the time of opportunity or promise.[22] Nevertheless, the distinction is philosophically useful and fundamental to this analysis. Consciousness of history involves an awareness of time, and particularly in the sense of kairos. The study of history is not concerned solely with what happened, but with the motivations, possibilities and consequences of particular actions. To become historical is to be aware of time, not simply abstractly, but as something which limits one's individual being (being-unto-death) and forces one to treat every moment as a challenge and an opportunity for the realisation of self in community.

The New Testament uses many temporal categories to describe the historical action of Jesus. He fulfills the past. He proclaims the present as a moment of promise and expectation. The church takes over this experience of time by looking back to Jesus, by experiencing him in the present and by looking for his coming in the future. The eucharist has always contained some of this temporal language, but by itself the eucharist does not convey one attitude towards time. In different periods the stress has differed. For

---

[21] This is true of the Kairos Document (Johannesburg: Skottaville, 1986).

[22] See J. Barr, Biblical Words for Time (London: SCM, 1962); Barr was reacting against the work of J. Marsh, The Fulness of Time (London: Nisbet & Co, 1952); see also G. Delling, "kairos", Theological Dictionary of the New Testament vol 3, pp. 455ff.

instance, in many early eucharists the experience of time was almost wholly anticipatory; in other periods time was viewed more in terms of fulfillment. For the eucharist to convey a truly historical consciousness the formal language related to time needs to reflect Jesus' attitude towards time. This will be explored in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

However, language gains its meaning not only from itself, but from the interpretative context in which it is used. Here the formal structures in the eucharist which carry attitudes towards time are introduced, and it is demonstrated how divergently these can be interpreted. This is done in order to show that the eucharist by itself does not carry a proper historical consciousness, but that this can only be found in the eucharist when it is interpreted as a bearer of the historical person, Jesus. Without this hermeneutic check the temporal references fail to convey a historical attitude towards time; instead time becomes an ally of the oppressive dimension of the ahistorical.

The eucharist relates the present to the past and to the future. The past remembered in the anamnesis is not any past, but the events of Jesus, who himself is regarded as the centre and fulfillment of all time. The chief purpose of the anamnesis is to bring the present into union with his sacrificial death. But the present not only finds meaning from the past; it is an expectation of the future, particularly of the return of Christ and the union of all creation with him. This balancing of the present between the past and the future has been described by Thomas Aquinas as commemorative of Jesus, demonstrative of his saving death in the present, and prognostic of the fullness of salvation.[23]

---

[23] Summa Theologiae 3a. 60.3. In modern theory the theme has been taken up by J. Moltmann (The Church in the Power of the Spirit (London: SCM, 1977), p. 243): "The Christian experience of time and the corresponding theological understanding of time will consequently take their bearings from the Lord's supper, and only cautiously look for other experiences of history." See also, the section "The sign of the Trinitarian history of God's dealings with the world" ibid. pp. 256-258; and most recently the

This is the formal structure in which the developed eucharist treats time, but an interaction has always taken place in the church between the eucharist and wider concerns, which have caused the church to develop or change its historical awareness. This means that the formal anamnesis, for instance, could mean something rather different depending on the church's understanding of time and history. It is not the intention in this section to document the church's changing awareness of history, but only to establish that such changes affect the way the eucharist is interpreted.

G. Dix has argued that the Constantinian settlement resulted in a major transition in the church's experience of time and that this profoundly affected the interpretation of the eucharist.[24] The argument is that, prior to Constantine, the relationship between church and state was closely associated with its eschatological expectation.[25] Eschatological expectation (especially expressed in apocalyptic terms) is a way of reflecting on the church's minority and oppressed status in society. In such a setting the present is experienced as a dislocation from its fulfillment. This dislocation finds expression in the attitude of the church towards society, shoring its defences and fuelling its apologetics and missionary zeal. However, after the Constantinian settlement eschatology became a much more formal element in theology and ceased to have the same driving, social force.

> As the church came to feel at home in the world, so she became reconciled to time. The eschatological emphasis in

---

section "The eucharistic community of creation" in God in Creation (London: SCM, 1985), pp. 69-71.

[24] For modern debate on the transition in the church as a result of the Constantinian settlement see A. Kee, Constantine versus Christ (London: SCM, 1982).

[25] For a more modern statement of this theme relating to other areas of church life see J. Moltmann, The Trinity and the Kingdom of God (London: SCM, 1981), pp. 191ff.

> the eucharist inevitably faded. It ceased to be regarded primarily as a rite which manifested and secured the eternal consequences of redemption.... Instead, the eucharist came to be thought of primarily as the representation, the enactment before God, of the historical process of redemption, of the historical events of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus by which redemption had been achieved.[26]

Dix's argument is not that the form of the eucharist itself changed significantly, but that the different emphasis in eschatology altered the church's interpretation of what it was doing. Dix supports his claim by pointing to the development at this time of the liturgical year, whose cyclic view of time minimises the linear element of eschatology and reflects the church's becoming at home within time.

The liturgical year, and the eucharist interpreted as an act of union with the original time, embody a particular mythical attitude towards time which is inimical to a proper historical consciousness. The eucharist is capable of colluding with the mythic consciousness of time, or of being a bearer of the historical consciousness of Jesus. There is an acute tension here between the vehicle (the eucharist as a ritual action) and the content (the historical action of Jesus), which will be apparent throughout this thesis.

"Feeling at home in the world" results from collusion with the dominant forces of society. While the church was a minority and oppressed, time was experienced as caught between fulfillment and expectation with the emphasis being upon expectation; fulfillment was not experienced in the present, but was awaited in the future. As soon as the church became "established" the formal language of expectation remained, but failed significantly in its task of social criticism.

It is significant that primitive eschatology has surfaced throughout church history in minority, fringe

---

[26] G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London: Dacre Press, 1945), p. 305.

groups, usually politically dissident, and that modern political theology has consciously seen itself as returning to an eschatological mode of thinking fairly closely aligned with the very early church. This is well represented in the radical critique of traditional eucharistic theology by J.L. Segundo. In order to reject the alliance between the eucharist and the oppressive structures of society, Segundo points out that the eucharist does not contain references to the present. This means that time is considered as having a past and a future but it does not exist meaningfully in the present:

> This Mass is characterized by unvarying liturgical elements, pre-established readings, an unchanging Eucharistic service, and the eternal return of the same feasts on the yearly liturgical calendar. In short, it constitutes the polar opposite of a religion based on historical sensitivity.[27]

Behind Segundo's criticism is a concern as to how time is experienced. He regards the traditional eucharist as reflecting a historical consciousness which is passive: expectation is vague and not a spur to present action. That this is in fact so can be seen in the analysis of time in the liturgy by H.B. Meyer, who appeals for a retention of the mythic view of time in the modern world. The social and political consequences of this are made explicit. The affirmation of salvation history in the mass

> implies an interpretation of the past and of the future which for humanity as a whole and for every individual provides orientation, establishes trust and holds back fear and resignation.... It liberates one from the heroic resignation of the existentialistic "being unto death'. But is also relieves one of the compulsion to revolutionary upheaval, to the radically autonomous and secularized ethic of being alone responsible for the completion of the world.[28]

---

[27] The Liberation of Theology (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1976),p. 40. Also The Sacraments Today (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1974).

[28] H.B. Meyer, "Time and the Liturgy. Anthropological Notes on Liturgical Time," Studia Liturgica 14 (1982), p. 18.

This quote reveals the tension. The orientation provided by the eucharistic view of time is necessary and useful, but all too easily this lapses into a social passivity. Meyer's fear of secularisation is not shared by Segundo who himself thinks of history as a dynamic movement towards the liberation of the oppressed. For him anamnesis and expectation are not purely abstract theological concepts but arise out of an experience of the present as alienation. The present time is not what it should be and provides the challenges and opportunites for historical action. This he does not find in the eucharist as he knows it.

The church's awareness of history will always be reflected back onto the interpretation of the eucharist. The challenge is one of fundamental hermeneutics. Because the eucharist embodies Jesus' attitude towards time and history, the church's interpretation of the New Testament data will be fundamental to eucharistic theology. Different christologies will lead to different eucharists. Yet the formal placing of the present between anamnesis and expectation in the eucharist should provide clues for interpreting time correctly.

1.6 Catholicity, contextualisation and the eucharist

The eucharist is perhaps the chief means whereby the church realizes itself.[29] This has been understood as taking place in two different modes: Jesus, at the Last Supper and derivatively in every eucharist, calls the church into being, and the church gathers and celebrates the eucharist in order to express its very being and to be recreated by Jesus. Every aspect of the church's life is reflected in

---

[29] See Vatican II, The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy sec 2: "For it is the liturgy through which, especially in the divine sacrifice of the Eucharist, 'the work of our redemption is accomplished,' and it is through the liturgy, especially, that the faithful are enabled to express in their lives and manifest to others the mystery of Christ and the real nature of the true Church" (Vatican Council II. The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1975), p. 1).

Jesus. Every aspect of the church's life is reflected in some way in the eucharist, both in its form and its content.

The church itself is regarded as existing in two modes, the one universal and the other local, and the eucharist expresses these dimensions of the church by being regarded as an act of union with the church as the mystical body of Christ and as the gathering of the local community.[30] As the local congregation celebrates the mystery of Christ's body and blood the whole body of Christ is present (Mt 18:20; I Cor 11:29). The body of Christ becomes present in three distinct but mutually interrelated ways: the body of Christ is the blessed bread received by the faithful, who are then reintegrated into the body of Christ, the church, which in turn is the eschatological presentation of the fullness of creation sanctified in its head, even Christ, our Lord.[31]

This polarity in the definition of the church and the eucharist indicates how the church as catholic only exists as such in local expression, or, inversely, the local being of the church needs to have a catholic dimension. This relationship between the catholic and the local corresponds, but not exactly, to the relationship between the ahistorical and the historical. If the historical is a proper expression of the eternal, it will unite the individual to the best interests of the community and will thereby transform the ahistorical. What the distinction between catholic and local does not do is to incorporate an overt sense of value.

---

[30] This statement is based on the double significance of the word ekklesia in the NT. See K.L. Schmidt, "ekklesia", in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament III p. 506: "Each community, however small, represents the total community, the Church." For a modern treatment of the implications of this theme, see H. Küng, The Church (London: Search Press, 1971). pp. 263.

[31] Perhaps the most famous treatment of these themes is that by Augustine in his Sermon 227: "If you receive (the body of Christ) well, you will become what you will receive." See also K. Rahner, The Church and the Sacraments (London: Burns & Oates, 1963).

There is a need for the proper expression of local issues over and against the need for a central united definition. In previous generations it was simply presumed that the current orthodoxy was universally applicable. Now cultural and social consciousness reflects the pluralism of the modern world, and it is increasingly difficult to establish grounds upon which to recognise the authenticity of different expressions of the gospel. The present analysis would seem to contribute a means of doing this by regarding all doctrinal statements which have universal, or at least more than local, significance as part of the ahistorical, whereas local or interest bound theologies will be more closely associated with the historical.

The tension between the local and the universal does not coincide directly with the historical and ahistorical dimensions of history. The universal church, as a visible organisation could and should act historically, but all too often it merely provides the limits for individual Christian action and represents to the moment the ahistorical in its ambiguity. Likewise the local need not be particularly historical, for it too can be blind to the proper challenge of the time. It is impossible, however for the universal to become historical without having local import, because then it would not effect anything at all. Theology needs to bear in mind that it operates at a variety of different levels: it is local as well as universal, but in both of these it needs to be engaging the ahistorical elements of society through historical action guided by the eternal. Historical action can be best achieved and maintained by a thorough-going contextual theology, yet this should not ignore the universal elements of the present moment, and in so doing it may well be well served by theological specialists who are not engaged directly in contextual reflection.[32]

---

[32] For treatment of contextualisation see R. Schreiter, Constructing Local Theologies (London: SCM, 1985) and P Frostin, Liberation Theology in Tanzania and South Africa (Malmö: Lund University Press, 1988).

Local theologies must be constructed to engage local situations in theological debate, but we still need a theological meta-language through which different local theologies can converse and have dialogue. The theological task concerns both levels of theological language. It must be involved in detailed and strategic local engagement as well as in dialogue with similar tasks in different situations and cultures.[33]

In South Africa today to achieve the correct balance between these two tasks is crucial. We have to be fully immersed in the struggle for freedom and liberation, but we will only maintain a correct course in that struggle by listening to voices of sanity and direction from outside the nightmare of distortions and lies. We proclaim a message of local reconciliation arising from God's act of new creation of the whole created order. We anticipate and hope for a proleptic foretaste of that final union between peoples, creation and God in our land. That universal, catholic, message is what we bear to our divided land. Our theological task can be summed up as the rediscovery of the particularity of catholicity.

The eucharist expresses this theory very clearly. The blessed bread is a localized presence of the historical person of Jesus, under the form of the memorial of his historical death, but this same Jesus is transformed through the resurrection into the ahistorical, glorified Lord; the church is both the local and universal church of today, whose task it is to redeem the present moment through its union with Christ; and the church is the mystical bride of the eschatological Christ, a herald and sacrament of the fullness of all things in God.

One of the ways in which the church represents the threefoldness of this signification is through its ordained

---

[33] See J. Cumpsty, "Bounty in Bondage" in Bounty in Bondage. Essays on South African Anglicanism, ed. F. England and T.J.M. Paterson (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1989), pp. 191-211.

ministry which presides over the eucharist. The bishop/presbyter represents the local congregation, the universal church and Christ himself. It is therefore fitting that the bishop/presbyter should preside at the eucharist in which this signification is so important. This has been recognised by the important document Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry,[34] but the emphasis upon the importance of the local congregation, and the inability of the churches to provide ordained ministers for every congregation, continue to provoke discussion of lay presidency of the eucharist.[35] Whatever the outcome of this debate, the more important issue is that the whole church is directed towards historical action in the present and is not simply a means of reaffirming the ahistorical inheritance of the past.

What is required of the eucharist is that it provide an environment and a language whereby the eternal can find expression through the dialogue between the catholic, ahistorical, language of the tradition, and the local, historical, expression of this.

---

[34] Geneva: WCC, 1984. For comment on this see G. Wainwright (ed), Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry. A Liturgical Appraisal of the Lima Text (Rotterdam: Liturgical Ecumenical Center, 1986).

[35] See especially, L. Boff, Ecclesiogenesis (London: Collins, 1986), pp. 61-75.

Chapter 2

The ahistorical and the eucharist

2.1 The ahistorical

Having previously defined the ahistorical as a society's world view or ideology, it will be useful to begin this closer study of the ahistorical dimension of history in its relation to the eucharist with a statement of what the ahistorical (as used here) is not.

In common speech the historical refers to events that happened or happen or perhaps even to events that will happen. The historical would be the "factical". Such simplicity is problematic in that we find that even normal, everyday happenings are not accessible in themselves, but can only be apprehended or understood from a particular vantage point. Immediately this is noticed apparently brute fact assumes complex depth. If one were to follow the custom of everyday speech, such vantage points from which we regard events could be called the ahistorical. This would almost coincide with the definition used in this essay, but this would imply an acceptance of the assumed definition of the historical which is not existential.

Unfortunately, in common speech, because the complexity of events is not sufficiently reflected, the ahistorical usually refers to something quite different. It is presumed that there is another realm of events outside or beyond the historical. The difference between the historical and the ahistorical, in this view, usually relates to natural causality. Everything which can be explained scientifically (or could be conceived of as eventually being so explained) is historical, whereas God's action in the world (which is presumed to be beyond the description of science) is ahistorical. The bible readily provides many instances of miracles which "prove" that ahistorical events happen. Revelation itself is thought of as ahistorical, in that it is not the result of human thought but of divine

inspiration. In this way human history is thought of as having two dimensions: a history of natural causality, and certain different, ahistorical events which are irruptions into the natural order. These two dimensions correspond to the dualism between nature and grace. The ahistorical, understood in this way, would be the manifestations of God's action within the historical but in a manner which is recognizably ahistorical. Understood temporally such events are considered to be manifestations of the eternity of God within our historical existence.

It needs to be emphasized that this is **not** the sense in which these terms are used in this essay. This is not the place to enter into the many difficulties in the common view, as outlined here, save to say that the underlying dualism and its understanding of natural causality cannot be accepted. Those elements which need to be retained from this common conception of the ahistorical will be described in this study as the eternal, and the term "the ahistorical" will be reserved for the ideological conditioning of human knowledge and action.

The ahistorical is not, then, the timeless, but is the framework of historical action. Because of the close connection between the ahistorical and the historical it is not possible to treat them completely separately. The two terms are, in fact, co-relatives, and, in describing the ahistorical, one is really describing the influence the ahistorical has upon the historical. As indicated in the terms themselves, these two dimensions of human existence exist in some tension with regard to each other. Indeed, they can be diametrically opposed to each other, and there will always be a measure of conflict between them. As indicated in the previous chapter, this conflict can be understood as the necessary expression of the creative relationship between the community and the individual.

However, the conflict between the historical and the ahistorical also arises out of the way the ahistorical is linked with the past and future and has a particular

attitude towards the present. There would appear to be a continual tendency of the ahistorical to claim reality for itself and thus to make the present less than real. This idealization of the past and the future perhaps arises out of the problematic nature of the present. Our present experience is always ambiguous: it is a mixture of good and evil, opportunities seized and missed, hopes and failures. How simple it is to avoid a frank embracing of this reality by developing an ideal world in the past and the future through which to interpret the difficult present! When the ahistorical, which is simply an ideological interpretation of the present, assumes the proportions of an ideal past and future, and is thus regarded as ahistorical in the sense of outside of time, constructive action in the present is virtually impossible because it will either be conceived of as a bringing of the ahistorical into the historical or as an escape from the historical into the ahistorical. Then, immediately one has lapsed into the common view of a dualism between the historical and the ahistorical, and the ahistorical has neatly stepped aside from criticism by the historical.

The only way to avoid this idealization of the past is to regard the past as similar to our present in that it also existed once in the present as a historical moment bounded by the ahistorical. Our access to that past, as historical (in the defined sense of this study) is only possible as we enter into the dynamic relationship between the historical and the ahistorical in that past event. The past is not, therefore, simply to be regarded as ahistorical, but it is ahistorical with regard to our present if we fail to enter into the right critical relationship to it, and even then it will always be relatively ahistorical to our present since historical action in the past is impossible.

That the ahistorical is so difficult to bring into view is because it lies always at the edge of our consciousness. The moment it is brought into critical consciousness it ceases to be ahistorical. It would appear to be part of

human nature to be extremely lazy in this critical task, and the lazier we are the more we are dominated by the ahistorical. It is only by forcefully and critically pushing one's human experience to the limits, by being "resolute",[1] that, through the resultant conflicts, layers of the ahistorical are exposed. This process will involve a revaluation of ideology, but this will occur only as the present moment assumes more and more importance and is wrested from the control of the past and the future. The ahistorical is, then, the horizon of human experience at any one time, but can also be considered temporal as the way the present is conceived of in its relation to the past and the future.

Some justification needs to be given for the order in which the dimensions of history are related to the eucharist in this study. Because of the priority of the historical over the other two dimensions, it could seem right to begin with the historical. However, this would overlook the way every historical action arises out of and ends in the ahistorical. The historical simply cannot exist alone. In the tradition with which we are here concerned this fact is to be discerned in the way there is a slow development from cult, being an expression virtually exclusively of the ahistorical, towards the critique of the cult by the historical. This critique is first offered by the prophets, and is brought to its conclusion by Jesus, who, by virtue of his perfect expression of the eternal, presents us with a unique interrelation of the ahistorical, the historical and the eternal. The eucharist, as the cultic expression of Christianity, should be a means of carrying through history the particular historical action of Jesus. It has, however, all too often reverted to the pattern criticized by the prophets and Jesus himself, and has become a vehicle for the domination of the historical by the ahistorical. It,

---

[1] See Heidegger, Being and Time (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), pp. 434f.

therefore, seems correct to order the discussion from a consideration of the ahistorical, to the historical and the eternal, before considering aspects of the eucharistic tradition.

This chapter begins with a closer study of the myth/ritual background to the eucharist before examining ways in which the eucharist inherits and interacts with this legacy.

2.2 The inheritance of myth and ritual

The precise sense in which the eucharist is a ritual activity embodying a myth is a central issue for this study. Without therefore at this stage defining this, the general inheritance of myth and ritual taken over from primitive religions and slowly refined down the ages can now be analyzed as background to a closer study of the way in which the eucharist adopts or rejects this inheritance.

The definition of myth has been a matter for controversy for many years in theology, and has spilt over from a technical question in Old Testament theology into almost every other discipline.[2] The controversy has been notoriously careless about the definition of its terms,[3] and too often no distinction has been made between myths of primitive peoples which are inseparable from ritual,[4] and myths like those of Gen 1 and 2-3, which describe a world view as a prehistory, and descriptions of historical events

---

[2] For the religious language school's treatment of myth, see I.T. Ramsay, Religious Language (London: SCM, 1957); J. Macquarrie, God-Talk (London: SCM, 1967), pp. 168ff; R.S. Barbour, Myths, Models and Paradigms (London: SCM,1974), pp. 19ff; and T. Fawcett, The Symbolic Language of Religion (London: SCM, 1970).

[3] See M. Wiles, "Myth in Theology," in The Myth of God Incarnate ed. F.H. Hick (London: SCM, 1977), pp. 148-166.

[4] See E.O. James, Myth and Ritual in the Ancient Near East (London: Thames & Hudson, 1958), p. 298: "Myths without ritual are a specialized later form of mythology."

which may have been embellished or even invented,[5] or which represent boundary experiences which cannot adequately be described as normal "events". The only way through the morass of complications and dead ends would appear to be to make a fairly clear distinction between these three, that is, between 1) the myths of primitive cults, 2) those like Gen 1-3, and 3) the stories of divine interventions in history, of which the gospel records and especially the Easter narratives are the chief Christian examples. To describe them all by the same term "myth" ignores the very real differences between them.

Perhaps the most authoritative definitions of myth come from a convergence of thought between modern anthropology[6] and sociology.[7]

In primitive society generally, myths, with their corresponding ritual, seem to have fulfilled many functions. They were aetiological in that they often contained a story about creation, and perhaps more importantly, they relate the world's origins to a society's means of subsistence. The myths also serve as a theodicy, explaining how things have gone wrong in the world, and they are soteriological in that they give the community some means of assisting in putting

---

[5] See P. Ricoeur, "Myth and History", Encyclopedia of Religion vol 10 (New York: Macmillan, 1987), pp. 273-282.

[6] See M. Eliade, Birth and Rebirth (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), Myths, Dreams and Mysteries (London: Harvill, 1960), Images and Symbols (London: Harvill, 1961), Myth and Reality (London: Harper & Row, 1964), and the important works for OT scholars, S.H. Hooke (ed.), Myth and Ritual (London: OUP, 1933); ibid., The Labyrinth (London: SPCK, 1935); also E.O. James, Myth and Ritual in the Ancient Near East (London: Thames & Hudson, 1958).

[7] See P.L. Berger & T. Luckman, The Social Construction of Reality (New York: Doubleday, 1966), P.L. Berger, A Rumour of Angels (New York: Doubleday), The Sacred Canopy (New York: Doubleday, 1969), and The Social Reality of Religion (London: Faber, 1969). A good summary of the field is found in F.W. Dillistone, The Power of Symbols (London: SCM, 1986), pp. 109-116, who refers to the work of Raymond Firth, Mary Douglas, Victor Turner and Clifford Geertz.

them right again. E.O. James describes the myths as containing

> the deepest realities, the theophany which men live. These are at once material, dealing with the food-supply, the cycle of birth and death in nature and man; spiritual, relating to the divine ordering of the universe and its processes; and ethical, formulating compelling reasons for human conduct and the regulation of society. It is a reality lived. Consequently, every vital religion must have its mythology because myth is the natural language of religion just as ritual is its dramatization in worship.[8]

In similar vein G. Wainwright writes that ritual signs

> are the solemn way by which a community formulates its common mind on the meaning of life and of the world, and by which it transmits its vision of the truth to new generations and to those who come to it from outside.[9]

Myth and ritual fulfill these functions through the construction of a sacred reality: "Religion is the human enterprise by which a sacred cosmos is established."[10] Such a mythological sacred cosmos acts as an ahistorical boundary to a society, and the repetition of the ritual is the means of reinforcing that reality and interacting with it. The myth and ritual together provide a world view and locate the community within it. This is so much the case that outside of a particular mythological/ritual setting reality itself changes. This is the reason for the cultural barriers between societies and why different religions and denominations find it so important to have different ritual expressions.

While this sacred canopy is a product of a society, it is experienced by that society as a given, which stands over and against the society often in an alarming and threatening way: "Man concocts institutions, which come to confront him

---

[8] E.O James, Myth and Ritual in the Ancient Near East, p. 307.

[9] Doxology (London: Epworth, 1980), p. 121.

[10] P.L. Berger and T. Luckmann, The Social Reality of Religion (London: 1969), p. 26. See also P.L. Berger, The Sacred Canopy (New York: Doubleday, 1969).

as powerfully controlling and even as menacing constellations of the external world."[11] Perceived in this way the tension between the ahistorical and the historical is very complex. The ahistorical myth is actually a product of historical action. Such myths reflect the justifying features of a society's economic and political ambitions amongst a variety of other matters. Although certain formative (prophetic!) figures may contribute to the making of such myths, they are essentially the product of whole societies, even civilizations. Within such a mythic environment individuals, or even groups within society, experience the myth as a given within which life is to be lived and given meaning and value. In this way a host of historical factors produce an ahistorical myth which in turn dominates and conditions the historical.

Such ahistorical constructions have a very important function in that they are essential for the cohesion of human community and for the development of morality, for instance.[12] Unfortunately, they can also have a negative function in that they usually express the values and ambitions of the dominant class in society, and thus they become agents of oppression.[13] It is significant that usually the management of the cult in society is placed in the hands of the ruling class, who use the cult, with its myth and ritual, as a means of social control, whereas the elements

---

[11] P. Berger, The Social Reality of Religion, p. 9. For this thesis in M. Weber, see M. Hill, A Sociology of Religion (London: Heinemann, 1973), p. 169.

[12] This is the essential thesis of E. Durkheim's The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1915).

[13] For the influence of class upon consciousness see K. Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia (London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co, 1940).

in society which rebel against this control develop a prophetic and anti-cultic tone.[14]

Cultic worship achieves these ends because of its propagation of a particular way of viewing time, which is never viewed abstractly, but only in association with the ideological justification of society in the myth. Most myths contain a picture of a blissful past and can be described as "a narrative resurrection of a primeval reality." Redemption is regarded as a re-entry into this mythological state, a return to the centre, to a place safe from the threatening chaos.[15] The ambiguities of the present are dramatized in the myth as a cosmic struggle between the forces of order and chaos, of light and dark, of good and evil, and through ritual engagement with this battle the participants in the cult can orient themselves in their own struggles.

The possibility could be found at this point for historical action should the myth require active historical participation for the outcome of the struggle, but unfortunately myth does not work like this. Because myth guarantees the outcome of the struggle before historical action takes place, historical action must be rendered ultimately useless. This can result in a cyclic view of history or in a strong denigration of present ordinary, secular time. M. Eliade describes how the ritual of the myth is a means of participating in the mythological drama and, therefore, of entry into a qualitatively different kind of time:

---

[14] It is probable that the origins of classical prophecy in the OT are to be found in the cult. See M. Hill, op. cit. p. 43, who quotes P.L. Berger: "Canonical prophets began their careers as Nabis, socially located within the cultic institutions, but their message drove them beyond the cultic definitions of their function" ("Charisma and religious innovation: the social location of Israelite prophecy," American Sociological Review 28.6 (1963), 948). But see Amos 7:14.

[15] M. Eliade, Images and Symbols, pp. 42ff, who shows how this centre is often represented by a mountain which is the navel of the earth, the source of creation. The centre can also be represented by a cosmic tree, up which one climbs to heaven.

> From the mere fact of the narration of a myth, profane time is - at least symbolically - abolished: the narrator and his hearers are rapt into sacred and mythical time.... In the traditional societies men endeavoured, consciously and voluntarily, to abolish Time - periodically to efface the past and to regenerate time - by a series of rituals which, as it were, reenacted the cosmogony.[16]

In a purely mythic environment, while the myth engages with the present, there is strictly speaking no history. The past is the myth, and the future is a return to the myth. Any new discoveries made in the course of time, or cultural adaptations, or radical political changes resulting in changes to the cult, are not experienced as historical development, but are simply incorporated into the myth.

In this setting religion, instead of promoting active ethical engagement, devolves into magic, a manipulation of the myth. The only way to prevent this religious use of the ahistorical myth is through a critique of the myth along the lines of the OT prophets who insist on the necessity of a dialectic between historical action and experience, on the one hand, and the myth, on the other hand, with the priority being with the historical action and experience.

Much of this tension between the historical and the ahistorical can be discerned in the relationship between priests and prophets in the OT. The priests in the period of the Davidic monarchy were the main exponents of the royal theology legitimating the rule of the king,[17] while prophetic groups lived with the perennial temptation of being drawn

---

[16] M. Eliade, Images and Symbols p. 58.

[17] G. Von Rad (Old Testament Theology I (London: SCM, 1975), pp. 306-324) points out that the Davidic kings established themselves initially by force, and then were legitimated by prophets. The priests continued this legitimating process by upholding the cult in Jerusalem in which the king had such an essential part. For the importance of Jerusalem see R.E. Clements, God and Temple (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965).

completely into the establishment.[18] This resistance to the legitimating function of myth takes the form of a historicizing of Israel's religion. Instead of merely opposing myth with myth or attempting to adapt the myth, the prophets "were the ones responsible for historicizing Israel's religion, for integrating the cosmic vision into history, for causing myth to retreat before a more "secularized," "humanistic" world view."[19] The prophets, therefore, represent the historical doing battle with the ahistorical:

> In a world which viewed divine activity primarily on the cosmic level, and which looked upon the flux and change of the historical realm as something to be overcome through the ritual of the cult, prophetic faith began to speak of a God who effected the salvation of his people precisely in the flux and change of history.[20]

P.D. Hanson interprets this struggle as that between "vision" and "reality", where the priestly and kingly traditions adapt the vision of myth to support reality, while the prophetic, and later the apocalyptic, traditions begin from reality and mould new visions critical of reality and as spurs for present action to change reality.[21] Hanson's analysis explains why apocalyptic seems so little concerned with the cult; it is essentially a protest literature. However, even protest groups need their own inner cohesion

---

[18] The conflict between the kings and the prophets is a major theme of the Deuteronomic history; see Samuel's attitude towards the monarchy (I Sam 8), David's ambivalent relationship with Nathan, Ahab and Elijah, and the story of Micaiah ben Imlah (I Ki 22).

[19] See P. D. Hanson, The Dawning of Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), p. 17.

[20] ibid. p. 18.

[21] ibid., and see also his The Diversity of Scripture (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), where the tension is expressed as between Form and Reform.

and therefore have to develop ritual forms to live out their myths.[22]

One of the major functions of myth is the integration of the individual at major transitions of life into different responsibilities and privileges in the community.[23] Since the cult mirrors the community, such life transitions are often experienced as participation in the cult in new ways. Thus the myths not only place the community in a sacred and ahistorical world, but place the historical individual within the community in that world. This orientation of the individual within the ahistorical has social as well as existential dimensions. Social stratification and diversification of labour can be ensured through the cult, yet, precisely because the myth is beyond criticism by virtue of being divine, the individual cannot criticize the part allotted to him or her by the myth. Rejection of the role assigned by the myth is interpreted as blasphemy and such questioning usually results in exclusion from the cultic assembly.

But, more positively, the individual can be oriented towards the major existential facts of life through the cult. Most myths revolve around birth and death; each transition in life is a death and a rebirth into a new state of life. The myth and ritual adopt other natural and social symbols and so provide a sense of meaning to human life and a way of participating in restoring meaning when this is lost. The ahistorical myth has, then, a cosmic as well as an existential function and orders the world `out there' as

---

[22] In this regard the distinction made between church and sect by the sociology of religion is significant. The cult of a church would produce a world view for a whole society, whereas the cult of a sect would produce inner cohesion to the group and govern its interaction with wider society, but would not have quite the same significance. In Mannheim's terms the cult of a church would become the vehicle for Ideology (in his pejorative sense), whereas the cult of the sect would be conditioned by Utopian thinking.

[23] A. van Gennep, The Rites of Passage (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1961).

well as orienting the individual in that world from within. The myth places the individual and present history within a specific context.

That all this theory is not remote from our immediate context can be demonstrated by at least one interpretation of the African experience of time which coincides remarkably closely with this description of time in the primitive myth. J. Mbiti describes the African experience as a relationship between two dimensions, which for lack of better terms are called the sacred and the profane. The profane dimension "is the ageless and mundane rhythm of birth, life, and death; birth, life, and death; ad infinitum."[24] The sacred dimension, on the other hand, "is the storehouse of all phenomena and events, a vast ocean of Time where everything gets absorbed into an aspect of reality which is neither after nor before."[25] This latter dimension is constantly drawing the former to itself.

> History, or profane time, must be transcended since it is associated with endlessness, weariness, movement, and fatigue. Archaic man is able to return, through ritual, periodically to in illo tempore and abolish history. In this return he is able to find equilibrium and rest.[26]

Mbiti's contrast is between a secular history and a timeless realm and his thought is open to the criticisms mentioned above. In such a mythic setting the timeless and sacred realm must at least largely be an expression of the ahistorical. Mbiti sees the meeting between his two dimensions of time as occuring chiefly through ritual, and in the Christian world, in the eucharist. As a result, in his understanding of the eucharist Mbiti presents a model of history in which the ahistorical dominates and conditions the historical. As we shall see, the chief reason why this

---

[24] B.W. Burleson, "John Mbiti as Anti-Historian of Theology," Africa Theological Journal 16.2 (1987), 105.

[25] ibid. quoting from J. Mbiti, Christian Eschatology in Relation to Evangelisation of Tribal Africa (Cambridge: CUP, 1963), p. 161.

[26] Burleson, op. cit. p. 106.

cannot be a proper solution to the tension between the ahistorical and the historical is the centrality of the cross of Jesus and its implications for our existence today.

If Mbiti is correct that a modern historical consciousness is alien to the fundamental categories of African thought and experience, this is enormously important for the concerns of Black Theology which is attempting to historicize theology. That this problem is not being adequately addressed can be seen from the following quote from T.A. Mofokeng:

> All the different theological concepts which are dealt with - creation, liberation, justice, reconciliation etc. are defrozen and injected with a dose of historicity by a people for whom history and time had stood still until they decided to move them. Black people have been awakened to regard "the world as history in the making" and themselves as active participants in its making and moulding. To them history is not simply harmonious but conflictual as well because of inherent contradictions and antagonism among blacks and whites. It is dialectical and stumbles through moments of harmony and conflict in its forward movement. In opposition to a notion of history which moves independently of the human agency, with God alone in action, a notion that creates passivity among the oppressed who cannot wait an extra day longer for change, black theologians emphasize black people's agency as co-workers with God.[27]

A proper black theology of the eucharist would have to take Mbiti's understanding of traditional African time and show how the eucharist incorporates certain of its dimensions, but also how the eucharist goes beyond this by including certain very historical themes, and even perhaps how the eucharist cannot be fully understood if seen solely as an expression of the realization of an ahistorical reality within our history. This is an area where further research would be most useful.

---

[27] See T.A. Mofokeng, "Following the Trail of Suffering: Black Theological Perspectives, Past and Present", in Journal of Black Theology in South Africa 1.2 Nov 1987, 21-34.

2.3 Ritual and the eucharist in the modern world

In the modern world many assume that it is possible to pass beyond myth and live in a completely "secular society". When the term myth is used pejoratively this assumption is usually to be found, as in Bultmann's original attempt to "demythologize" the message of the New Testament.[28] Bultmann's presumption was that the world-view of the New Testament was mythological while ours is not. Instead of regarding the theological task as demythologizing it may be more apt to describe it as a "remythologizing".[29]

Increasingly we are aware that every act of knowing takes a symbolic form, whether this be at the level of ordinary language or at the deeper level of personal or religious discourse. We live in a symbolic universe, indeed humans can be called the great symbolizers.[30] This is so because all language and knowledge is related to communication and unite communities of discourse in common acts of knowing. Every thought is made possible by this community of discourse and will bear some imprint of the community's scale of values and its reason for being. The belief that a mythless society can exist ignores this basic datum of human knowledge. All language places the participants in its universe of meaning, and therefore, whether overtly or not, carries a mythological, ahistorical content.[31]

---

[28] For Bultmann's original paper and the subsequent controversy see H.-W Bartsch, Kerygma and Myth 2 vols (London: SPCK, 1953 and 1962).

[29] For a theological treatment of the symbolic nature of all human language, and therefore of the importance of myth see P. Tillich, The Shaking of the Foundations (London: SCM, 1949), Theology of Culture (New York: OUP, 1959), pp. 51ff.

[30] See E. Cassirer, An Essay on Man (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1944).

[31] For a radically secular view of language, which nonetheless demonstrates the point see D. Cupitt, The Long Legged Fly (London: SCM, 1986).

The attempt to pass beyond myth and ritual ignores the communal element in human communication and therefore opens human society to a variety of destructive forces. When individuals withdraw from active participation in a critical way from the cult, the ahistorical tends to take over and govern society, whether this be in a sacralized state or in a radically secular milieu. This is evident in the frankly mythical content of Marxism.[32] As Eliade puts the matter:

> It seems that a myth itself, as well as the symbols it brings into play, never quite disappears from the present world of the psyche; it only changes its aspect and disguises its operations.[33]

Or again:

> We cannot say that the modern world has completely eliminated mythical behaviour; but only that its field of action is changed: the myth is no longer dominant in the essential sectors of life: it has been repressed, partly into the obscurer levels of the psyche, partly into the secondary or even irresponsible activities of society.[34]

M. Douglas has demonstrated the consequences to society of a devaluation and despising of ritual.[35] Without healthy ritual, social cohesion has to be created through various types of regression into magical securities, such as fundamentalism and revivalism. Similar problems arise for individuals, and Douglas expresses the matter poignantly: "Alas for the child from the personal home who longs for non-verbal forms of relationship but has only been equipped with words and a contempt for ritual forms."[36] Accordingly, unless we wish to hand over control of ourselves and the

---

[32] M. Eliade, Myths, Dreams and Mysteries (London: Harvill, 1960), p. 24-26.

[33] ibid. p. 27.

[34] ibid. p. 37. See also R. Grainger, The Language of the Rite (London: DLT, 1974), pp. ix-xi, and p. 60: "Mankind has an instinct for ritual...the frustration of this instinct...is pathogenic."

[35] Natural Symbols (London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1970).

[36] ibid. p. 53.

world to unseen demonic forces, "We should seek not to destroy, but to restore the language of myth."[37]

Every society lives and orients itself within an ahistorical setting and enforces its world view through some kind of ritual. The church is no exception. Here the two chief sacraments, baptism and eucharist, are the ritual means of incorporating believers into the society of the church and of directing and influencing their lives. However, the church does not live divorced from the wider society of which it is but a part, and christians will have to live in two kingdoms, in two ahistorical societies, between which there can be considerable tension and conflict with both systems claiming allegiance. In this struggle the church claims to be a sign of a more perfect society than the present, a representation of the dawning kingdom of God, a model in the present of future possibilities. It is, therefore, enormously important that the ritual centre of the church, that is, the eucharist, adequately reflects the relationship of church to society, and by so doing influences the ahistorical structures of society.

The church and the eucharist exist in a reciprocal relationship. The church creates the eucharist as a powerful, evocative symbol disclosing to the church its essential being. The eucharist contains the fullness of the church's gospel, that is, the eternal, within the eucharist's ahistorical form, from which historical action originates. As such the eucharist is the chief hermeneutic link between the eternal and the historical.

To relate liturgy to culture is an age-old concern which is reflected in art and architecture as much as in actual form and content. Such elements all add to the ahistorical setting of the eucharistic celebration. In Anglican theology A.G. Hebert deserves mention for his attempt to depict the parish communion as the centre of social cohesion and

---

[37] Karl Jaspers, "Myth and Religion" in Kerygma and Myth ed. H-W. Bartsch, vol 2 (London: SPCK, 1962), p. 145.

community.[38] F.W. Dillistone has written prolifically on the relation between Christian symbols and the modern world, and would see the liturgy of the church as the primary place where the two worlds of symbolism need to meet and mutually enrich each other.[39] In Roman Catholic theology much is being made of the work of Christopher Dawson, who has argued that western culture arose from the way, during the fourth and fifth centuries, the liturgy was "the means by which the mind of the gentiles and the barbarians was attuned to a new view of life and a new concept of history."[40] The modern liturgical revival from Guérganger in France to Virgil Michel in the United States of America has been concerned with the liturgical influence on culture, and has, for instance, attacked the negative aspects of secularization by regarding liturgy as integrating the individual and community, labour and spirituality, religion and life. In the Roman Catholic Church of the United States of America one of the great disappointments of the present time is the way in which the liturgical revival has failed to impact significantly on wider culture and M.F. Marmion ascribes the reasons for this as the subjectification of present day reality, which he sees as inimical to the liturgy's objectification of reality, to the intimization of society, which shies away from the open communality of the eucharist, and to the politicization of culture, which robs the liturgy of its hold on the individual through the individual's awareness of

---

[38] A.G. Hebert, Liturgy and Society (London: Faber & Faber, 1935).

[39] F.W. Dillistone, Christianity and Symbolism (London: Collins, 1955), "The Sociology of the Liturgy," Christianity in its Social Context (London: SPCK, 1967), pp. 41-53, Traditional Symbols and the Contemporary World (London: Epworth, 1973), and The Power of Symbols (London: SCM, 1986).

[40] Religion and the Rise of Western Culture (Garden City: Image Books, 1958), p. 41, quoted in M.F. Marmion, "Liturgy and the Present Crisis of Culture", Worship 62.2 (1988), p. 98.

the holy and numinous.[41]

The failure by the church to influence society in this way has very serious consequences for society:

> The consequences (of the complete waning of religious influence), not only for the arts and for high culture, but also, and perhaps more importantly, for the standards of civic order, social responsibility, and individual integrity, may be that the future of western civilization itself may be thrown into jeopardy.... The functions that were in the past supplied by, or at least serviced by, religion, may now be left unserviced, and so to raise the question of whether in the future the conditions of life will ever be wholly human without the operation of some such agencies.[42]

There are also serious consequences for individuals in whom the conflict between church and society rages. Unless the two systems are related, even if conflictually, a schizoid condition will develop, in which religion and life are not related.

The eucharist contains a wealth of attitudinal information and it communicates this in symbolic and non-rational ways. In what follows the ritual form of the eucharist is discussed, and in the following section some of the content of the eucharist which can be described as having ahistorical elements will be dealt with.

In many ways the ritual form of a celebration provides the ahistorical framework for the hermeneutic task of relating the eucharist to the contemporary situation. At best the ritual embodies certain core values, enables communal worship, and facilitates a response at levels of being not accessible outside of ritual. But the conservative, if not fixed, nature of the ritual constrains the interaction with the historical, limits expectations and conditions the response of the worshipping community. The ritual can, then, be enormously powerful in forming the Christian community both positively and negatively, but,

---

[41] ibid. pp. 98-123.

[42] B. Wilson, Religion in Sociological Perspective (London: OUP, 1982), p. 88.

because it is largely performed as a given not open to criticism, its influence is not noticed.

The early church instinctively celebrated the eucharist as a ritual action.[43] The stylized nature of the eucharistic action is very early indeed and can be discerned in the way the sequence, taking, blessing, breaking and giving, has influenced the NT texts.[44] But perhaps the major influence on the ritual comes, not from the ritual of the festal meal but from the realm of sacrifice through which the church interpreted its action. Even the technical term eucharistia may well have been adopted because it was more suited to a sacrificial understanding.[45] As early as the Didache the eucharist was called a sacrifice.[46] Quickly the eucharist developed a sacrificial ritual form which moved through the offering (the prosphora), to the sacrifice itself (the anaphora), to the meal (the communion).[47] There is no doubt that we are here in the realm of ritual; all that is open to discussion is the manner and meaning of the ritual.

In order for the liturgical assembly to model the kingdom of God in the present adequately, its form, as well as its content, needs constant critical appraisal. Unfortunately, instead of the eucharist influencing society,

---

[43] See H. Wybrew, "The Setting of the Liturgy," in The Study of Liturgy, ed. C. Jones, G. Wainwright, E. Yarnold (London: SPCK, 1978), pp. 432-439.

[44] This observation is foundational for the work of G.Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London: Dacre Press, 1945).

[45] See T. Talley, "The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development," Liturgy Reshaped ed. K. Stevenson (London: SPCK, 1982), p. 51.

[46] Did 14.1-2, which recalls Mal 1:11 and 14, often used by the Fathers. For details see D. Stone, A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist vol 1 (London: Longmans, 1909), pp. 42-54, and more recently F.M. Young, The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom (Philadelphia, 1979).

[47] Prosphero is first used of the offering in Justin, I Apol, 65.3, also 67.2, etc. In Hippolytus the whole prayer is an action of offering an oblation.

all too often the influence has been the other way round with the dominant patterns of social relationship being reflected in the liturgical assembly.

In the broadest possible way it is possible to view eucharistic history in three periods.[48] In the earliest church we seem to catch glimpses of an egalitarian community, not without structure and authority, but deliberately ordered to be inclusive and living a life of joyful freedom.[49] However, perhaps as early as Ignatius of Antioch church government started to be modelled on secular models and became more hierarchical and authoritarian. This is reflected in the position of the eucharistic president, who more and more took on the nature of a high priest - eventually the bishop became a feudal lord. Instead of the eucharist being celebrated by the community, it became an action performed by the bishop, or priest, for the people. This tendency becomes established in the second period of eucharistic history which extends from the Constantinian settlement down to very recent times. The manner of celebration of the eucharist in the High Middle Ages typifies the way social relationships influence the eucharist. With the whole of society existing in two hierarchical orders, the emperor, lords and serfs on the one hand, the pope, the bishops and the laity on the other, church architecture and ritual exactly followed this pattern. It is only in the dissident groups of the Middle Ages, leading to the Reformation, that we can discern the critical consciousness of the early church kept alive. These movements were heralds of the third period of eucharistic history which takes place as part of a much wider return to the pre-Constantinian pattern of church-state relations in

---

[48] The following is indebted to E. Schillebeeckx, The Church with a Human Face (London: SCM, 1985).

[49] For freedom as typical of the church see H. Küng, The Church (London: Search Press, 1971), pp. 150ff. Also J. Moltmann, The Church in the Power of the Spirit (London: SCM, 1977), pp. 76ff.

the modern world. The liturgical movement, while claiming to be conservative, even archaic, has influenced the manner of eucharistic worship in many traditions in a more participatory and informal direction. In the more catholic traditions the simple change of the position of the altar to enable the president of the eucharist to face the people heralds a major symbolic shift of meaning.

When the church regards itself as no longer allied to the state, it can find a manner of celebration which is deliberately subversive of the value structures of society.[50] There is no ready formula for calculating how this can be done, and particular care needs to be taken within so-called democratic societies that the church, and the eucharist, does not simply mimic society without a critical analysis of the virtues and vices of the democratic ideals adopted. For instance, the model of the church as a family can be exceedingly claustrophobic to many in a context of splintering nuclear families. A more appropriate model, at least for public celebrations, may be found in the symbol of the church as a city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven. This would accord better with modern secular life and enable a large variety of styles of life and culture to live harmoniously alongside each other.

To ensure that the eucharist is a proclamation of the best society for the time one constantly needs to ask what values are imported by the form of the ritual. Simplistic answers must be avoided because the most formal and stylized celebration and the most informal and spontaneous need not necessarily impart very different values. Formal liturgy can be extraordinarily inclusive in that it does not demand a high degree of personal involvement, while the relaxed, participatory form of eucharist is only really fitting in a setting in which a high degree of personal commitment can be

---

[50] For the church as the bearer of the disturbing memory of Jesus see J-B. Metz, Faith in History and Society: Towards a Practical Fundamental Theology (London: Burns and Oates, 1980), pp. 88f.

presumed. The only way of ensuring this appropriateness is if there is a constructive interchange between those designing and planning the liturgy and the concrete demands of the historical present. Each celebration needs to find the appropriate form for the eternal values to be communicated at that time.

The most detailed analysis of the eucharist along these lines is that of T. Balasuriya who shows how the liturgical practice of Ceylon reflected the patterns of the colonial system.[51] He argues for a eucharist more appropriate to small, unofficial groups striving for "the integral liberation of persons".[52] His eucharist would be a reflection of his ideal society which is frankly Marxist and classless. Balasuriya is a victim to Utopian thought (in the bad sense) in that he fails to perceive that the cohesive function of the eucharist in society is indeed important. In his concern to develop a eucharistic theology to convey the message of liberation he regards the eucharist as authentically celebrated only in small, unofficial groups, who "in participating in the sacrifice of Christ, ... find inspiration and strength in their efforts to be more authentic persons committed to the integral liberation of persons".[53]

It is not necessary in this thesis to be drawn into particular debates which belong in the sphere of ethics. The point to be made here is that this ethical debate has to impinge upon the form of the eucharist in order that its cultic form can present a myth in constructive critical dialogue with the myths of society. Only in this way can the ahistorical boundary of the historical be constantly reformed and become a help, rather than a hindrance, for historical action.

---

[51] The Eucharist and Human Liberation (London: SCM, 1977).

[52] ibid. p. 39.

[53] ibid. p. 39.

The eucharist is therefore a ritual embodying a myth, and is continuous with the general background of myth and ritual. However there is a major discontinuity between the eucharist and this background in the historical referend of the eucharist, namely, the historical action of Jesus. Something much more secular happens in the eucharist than would be allowed in a strictly ritual setting. But before embarking on a discussion of the historical and the eucharist, three further elements related to the ahistorical need to be dealt with.

2.4 Creation and eschaton as the setting for the historical

The eucharist adopts the biblical view of history, which itself follows the general pattern of the mythological by placing the present within the setting of an idealized past and future. The way in which the eucharist orients the present towards these ahistorical limits fundamentally affects historical action.

In order to be able to assess to what extent the eucharist does in fact fulfill its proper function in this regard, it is necessary to begin with a short description of the historicizing of the myth of creation in the Genesis stories and related texts in the OT.

Creation only emerged as a major theme in OT theology as a result of interaction with the Babylonian myth during the Exile, although the theological foundations for this development were laid by the early major prophets such as Amos. We can follow the way the themes of the transcendence and uniqueness of God were related to a developing understanding of creation and human history through Amos to Jeremiah, culminating in Deutero-Isaiah.[54]

---

[54] E.g. Is 45:18ff. For comment see C. Westermann, Isaiah 40-66 (London: SCM, 1969), pp. 172ff.

We can discern several areas of creative tension between the Babylonian myth and its use in Gen 1.[55] Significantly there is no indication of the cultic use of Gen 1. The Babylonian myth is only alluded to in the account and is completely removed from its cultic setting. Because of the now fundamentally historical cast of mind of the priestly writer, he finds no need to develop a cultic form of the creation myth.[56] This is part of the historicizing of creation reflected in the narrative of creation in seven days.[57] From this time on, the fundamental theological form is not myth but narrative. God is the God who creates human time and opens up the future through his promise.[58] Creation is the foundation of the covenant and the promise, and every act of salvation will be a new act of creation.[59]

Also implied in this new world view is a very different theodicy. Here the priestly writer feels free to incorporate earlier more traditional material. This is probably a major reason for the inclusion of Gen 2-3 in his final work. In contrast to the theodicy of Babylon, where evil is explained

---

[55] For much of what follows see B.S. Childs, Myth and Reality (London: SCM, 1960), pp. 38ff; and C. Westermann, Creation (London: SPCK, 1974).

[56] One of the ways in which this is manifested is in the genealogies. For these see Gen 5, and the comment by G. von Rad, Genesis (London: SCM, rev ed 1963), pp. 65ff.

[57] One of the effects of the creatio ex nihilo of Gen 1 is a desacralizing of creation. It is this which makes human responsibility and history, in the strict sense, possible; see G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology vol 1 (London: SCM, 1975), pp. 49ff, and, as a development on this, see G. Gutierrez, The Liberation of Theology (London: SCM, 1973), p. 159.

[58] Thus Gen 1 and Gen 12:2 form two parts of the Priestly writer's understanding of history. The sabbath stands as a constant reminder within history of the goal of God's covenantal grace. For the Sabbath see K. Barth, Church Dogmatics III.2, pp. 457ff, and also J. Moltmann, God in Creation, pp. 276ff.

[59] For the relation of creation and covenant, see the major treatment by K. Barth which comprises the whole Church Dogmatics III.1. For creation and salvation see Gutierrez, A Theology of Liberation, pp. 149-187.

in terms of a mythical struggle between gods, we now find the solution presented as a struggle arising out of our human ethical response to God's law. This leads to the introduction of the concept of sin, which is so important to our theological understanding history. No longer can history be the fatalistic outworking of a divine struggle, but what happens in human history is the result of human freedom.

But more than this: the Genesis accounts are careful to demonstrate how human freedom, while the cause of human suffering and futility, cannot run its course towards destruction because it is undergirded and sustained by God's providence. The whole bible story narrates how God repeatedly comes looking for Adam and Eve hiding in the garden (Gen 3:9); after the details of the curse on Adam and Eve, God helped them precisely within the limitations of their guilt by making them tunics (Gen 3:21); Cain, the murderer, is given a mark of protection (Gen 4:15).[60]

This providential grace is transformed in Gen 12 into the idea of promise. From this a new tension arises in the cult between God's promise and human sin. Penitence becomes, not a return into the myth as in Babylonian ritual, but a reappropriation of promise. The deeply historical nature of this penitence arises out of the content of the promise which relates to the inheritance of the land, and turns on ethical obedience to the law as a means of faithfulness to the covenant. Nowhere is the tension between God's promise and human sin more evident than in Ezekiel, where we find the constant refrain that God should not allow his own glory and purpose to be frustrated by human sin. Thus the exodus, judgment and restoration are all acts by God to guard the honour of his name.[61] The tension between promise and sin is finally resolved in the act of new creation envisaged by

---

[60] A good treatment of these themes is found in D. Bonhoffer, Creation and Fall (New York: Macmillan, 1978).

[61] Ez 20:1-44, esp vs 22. Compare Ez 20:5f with Ex 6:2ff; also see Ez 36:22. Some of these references would appear to be the work of the redactor of Ezekiel.

both Jeremiah and Ezekiel in which human freedom co-operates with God's grace.[62]

These historical themes almost completely swamp the Babylonian myth, and cause the cult of the New Temple, whatever its particular cultic form, to be the locus of the celebration and renewal of Israel's historical awareness. This development in the Old Testament conception of history leads to a definite cultic appropriation of the ahistorical references to creation, not, as indicated, in a myth of creation, but inversely in the cultic recitation of God's mighty acts. Instead of a myth of creation, we find mythic references to creation in the historical narrative itself. By this means the themes of human freedom, responsibility and divine promise can be integrated into a cosmic ahistorical myth.

The New Testament instinctively follows the direction of the Old Testament through its association of Jesus with the creative Word.[63] By so integrating the historical person, Jesus, into the divine creative act, creation and human historical action are fundamentally related. Creation is not simply a neutral backdrop before which human history is played; there is a inner connection between creation and human history. Creation is the ground making human history possible, but human history is itself creative and part of the evolving history of creation. This inner connection is only possible when creation has been finally wrested from the mythological realm into the secular. Such a reorientation of the mythical creation narrative enables a theology of creation to orient and guide historical action, rather than to dominate, if not eradicate, it. A danger does arise, however, in the eucharist that the cultic remembrance

---

[62] Jer 31:31, 32:38ff, Ez 18:31. 36:13f and Ez 16:59-63, which is probably a later addition.

[63] See Jn 1:2-3, Col 1:16 and Heb 1:2. It is interesting that this kind of late NT speculation often reveals signs of at least being preserved in liturgical/hymnic form.

of Jesus will obscure this historicizing of creation. This problem will be the subject of the following chapter.

The eucharist itself contributes to the Christian understanding of creation as well as being a bearer of the tradition. The eucharist developed out of the affirmation of the goodness of creation contained in the Jewish Birkath Hammazon. In the Didache this affirmation has not yet become christological: "You, Lord Almighty, created all things for the sake of your name..."[64] We take a step further in Justin, where the prayer is "to the Father of all in the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit",[65] and "we bless the Maker of all things through his Son Jesus Christ and through the Holy Spirit over all that we receive."[66] But in Hippolytus we reach the definitive statement: "We render thanks to you, O God, through your beloved child Jesus Christ...who is your inseparable Word, through whom you make all things."[67]

In some liturgies, as in Hippolytus, the Jewish peon to God the creator has been eclipsed by the focus on redemption. This disturbs the balance which should orient redemption towards the restoration of the goodness of creation and prevent redemption being too exclusively associated with either the redemption of human society or individuals.

Local liturgies can express the society's particular understanding of creation in their eucharistic preface, and in this way provide the ahistorical framework for the historical action of redemption. A particularly good example of this is found in the Liturgy of St Mark, where there is a reference to the annual flooding of the Nile:

> [Send the good rains richly on the places that ask for them and need them; by their falling, cheer and renew the

---

[64] Did 10:3.

[65] Apol I 65:3.

[66] I Apol 67:2.

[67] Hipp. 4-5.

face of the earth, that by their drops it may spring up rejoicing.]
Bring up the waters of the river to their proper measure; [by their rising] cheer [and renew] the face of the earth; water it furrows, multiply its crops.
[bless, Lord, the fruits of the earth; keep us safe and unharmed;] grant them to us for seedtime and harvest, [that by their drops it may spring up rejoicing.][68]

Modern eucharistic prayers in general have done little to contextualize the often merely formal references to creation in their prefaces. The following are exceptions to this. From Zaire we have:

Holy Father, we praise you through your son Jesus, our mediator. He is your Word, the Word that gives life. Through him, you created heaven and earth; through him your created our river, the Zare. Through him, you created our forests, our rivers, our lakes. Through him you created the animals who live in our forests, and the fish who live in our rivers. Through him you created the things we see, and also the things we do not see.[69]

And from the industrialized West we have a prayer from the Reformed Church of France:

O God of love and holiness, our Creator and our Father,
to give you thanks always and everywhere.
In your image you made us all;
your universe you put in our care;
your creation you entrust to our hands,
with all its wonders and its travail
You make us partners in your labours
and invite us to share in your rest.[70]

A great deal more could be done in integrating some of the major themes of modern theology into the eucharistic preface. Some of the major concerns would be: the misuse of the paradigm of domination which has led to industrialization destroying the earth, the scourge of poverty,

---

[68] R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed (London: SPCK, 1975)(=JC), pp. 44f. Words in square brackets are absent from the Coptic.

[69] M. Thurian & G. Wainwright (edd), Baptism and Eucharist: Ecumenical Convergence in Celebration (Geneva: WCC, 1983), p. 208.

[70] ibid. p. 152.

starvation and over population, racism and sexism. One way of doing this may be to have a set theological framework with opportunity for local emphases, so that different themes can be highlighted, and the focus of redemption which is to follow in the prayer can be related specifically to this theme.

The ahistorical element in the eucharist is not confined to an analysis of creation, but will also include an eschatological expectation. This is not the place for a lengthy exposition of the current confusions over eschatology within christian theology. Opinions vary from the fundamentalist insistence upon an expectation of an end to history at the second coming of Christ, to more sophisticated theological models, to radically secular interpretations of eschatology as in Marxism. While the science and religion debate has resulted in a sophisticated theological treatment of creation, a corresponding theological effort has not been applied to eschatology. As Moltmann rightly complains, eschatology has not been integrated into Christian theology but hangs as an appendage at the end of Christian doctrine.[71]

The function of the eschatological expectation throughout the various biblical traditions is to encourage the present to anticipate God's promised future. Eschatology is therefore not actually about the future but about the direction and potential of the present for the future: it is about hope. When this hope is joined with a sound doctrine of creation, eschatology becomes closely aligned with missiology.[72] Eschatology will be a presentation of models of the kingdom of God, which the church should be striving to

---

[71] Theology of Hope (London: SCM, 1967), p. 15.

[72] ibid. p. 284.

live in order to draw the world towards its fullness in God.[73]

Care should be taken to present models of the kingdom which are utopian in the realistic sense of a goal and vision which directs a concrete liberatory praxis, but which are not utopian in the wrong sense, in that they must not be so remote that they cannot evoke effective commitment.[74]

Within eucharistic theology and liturgy eschatology has remained purely formal and at the highest level of theological abstraction. One can discern two strands of eschatology in the eucharist. The first relates the expectation of Christ's return and the end of history as such. In this regard the liturgies continue to reflect the apocalyptic eschatology of the New Testament. One of the more extraordinary recent liturgical developments has been the reintroduction into most modern liturgies of the acclamation, "Christ has died, Christ has risen, Christ shall come again", which arose out of the New Testament cry "Maranatha".[75] This has entrenched a literalistic, and thoroughly mythological, eschatology in the liturgy and has excluded more modern interpretations.

The Sanctus provides another kind of eschatological focus, which is not directed towards another realm at the end but towards a platonic heaven in the present.[76] This idealized and dehistoricized eschatology operates in some competition with the other more historical eschatology.

---

[73] For God, eschatology and politics see G. Gutierrez, A Theology of Liberation, pp. 213ff.

[74] ibid. p. 237.

[75] This would seem to have come about through E.C. Ratcliff's contribution to the Liturgy for the Church of South India.

[76] There is a parallel here with Jesus' action of lifting his eyes to heaven, which is incorporated into the liturgies apparently through conflation of the Last Supper accounts with Mk 6.41. See The British Museum Tablet (JC 39), The Liturgy of St Mark (JC 48), Apost Const (JC 71), The Roman Rite (JC107) etc.

Through most of Christian history there has been a ready synthesis of the two, but in a more secular and historicized milieu such idealized eschatology has little place.[77]

Although it cannot be directly proved, it seems probable that the developing stress in the third and fourth centuries on the Sanctus and on an otherworldly eschatology (while the other more historical conception continued as a formal element in the liturgy) corresponds with the gradual accommodation of the church to the Empire. The argument by G. Dix concerning the church's accommodation to time in the fourth century has already been noted in chapter 1. Participation in heavenly worship can still be part of a highly historical eschatology as in the book of Revelation, but all too easily the critical dimension to such worship can disappear and the liturgy can be experienced as lifting one from the present into heaven. In this way the liturgy can be an escape from the present instead of a means of engaging more constructively with the present. An idealized eschatology can therefore distract attention from the proper goal of eschatology, namely the transformation of this world into the kingdom of God.

A rediscovery of a missiological eschatology should result in a re-evaluation of the Sanctus tradition, and perhaps to its being placed in its possibly original position at the conclusion of the eucharistic prayer.[78] In this way the eschatological references in the eucharistic

---

[77] See J. Cochrane, Servants of Power (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1987), pp. 229-231.

[78] G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945), p. 165. For closer argument see E.C. Ratcliff, "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora," in Liturgical Studies ed. A.H. Couratin & D.H. Tripp (London: SPCK, 1976), pp. 18-42. The Sanctus seems to be alluded to in I Clem 34:5f, and is connected with the notion of the heavenly altar in Irenaeus, Adv Haer iv.18. Almost certainly the Sanctus was not part of the original prayer of Hippolytus. Ratcliff argues convincingly that the Sanctus was originally interpreted as consecratory. This explains the Alexandrian stress on the play on the word "Full".

prayer will cease to be divided between a heavenly, platonic idealism, and the more biblical and historical.

Just as was the case in the consideration of the references to creation in the eucharist, so it will be for the vision of the eschaton. The traditional symbolic language should be given some contemporary content in order to direct historical action. Without this interface with the historical, the ahistorical symbols will either become devoid of any meaning or will become aligned with unconscious presuppositions taken over from the prevailing secular eschatology. Eschatology is perhaps the area of Christian discourse most open to ideological infiltration in that, not only is the preferred future modelled here, but also the means for attaining that future tends to be obliquely referred to. If society is modelling one kind of future to the Christian community, and that community does not consciously project an alternative in its ritual forms then the symbolic war will be lost.

Chapter 3

The Historical Dimension to the Eucharist

3.1 Introduction

> Faith is in fact this paradox, that the Individual as Individual is superior to the universal, is justified over against it, not subordinate, but superior to it, but always, however, in such a way that the Individual, after having been as Individual subordinate in the universal, becomes the Individual through the universal, and as Individual superior to it; so that the Individual as Individual stands in an absolute relationship to the absolute.[1]

This statement by S. Kierkegaard aptly describes the acute tension there is in our lives between the individual (one element of the historical) and the absolute and universal (experienced as the ahistorical or the eternal). At one level the individual can only find him or herself within the parameters of the universal, but, at a perhaps deeper and more profound level, the individual needs to be established as an absolute precisely by standing against the universal. In the terms of analysis used in this essay, this would be translated as being in accord with the eternal but in conflict with certain elements of the ahistorical. Being is, thus, an experience not only of being thrown into the world, but of taking a definite attitude towards being in general. In this way the individual, and the individual moment in time, when properly grasped, becomes the foundation of the universal, and, as Kierkegaard puts a similar point elsewhere, "the moment in time must have such decisive significance that for no moment will I be able to forget it, neither in time nor in eternity, because the eternal, previously nonexistent, came into existence in that moment."[2]

---

[1] S. Kierkegaard, Fear and Trembling (London: OUP, 1946), p. 64.

[2] Philosophical Fragments (New Jersey: Princeton Univ. Press, 1985), p. 13.

In the previous chapter the eucharist was related to the ahistorical. We discovered in the course of the investigation that it is impossible entirely to separate the ahistorical from the historical since they co-exist as co-relatives. The relationship between them is now viewed from the other perspective.

3.2 Jesus and history

Although by no means uniformly so, Jewish society in the time of Jesus would appear to have been strongly influenced by apocalyptic ideas. Jesus himself seems to have arisen from an apocalyptic milieu, which was bound up with the class struggle of Galilee.[3] His own preaching of an imminent kingdom of God, as well as the usage of the tradition of the coming Son of Man, both place him in this context.[4]

Daniel and other pre-New Testament texts show that apocalypticism regarded history as divinely governed and coming to a climax in a great cataclysm in which God would vindicate himself and his chosen in the face of the suffering of the present. Apocalyptic was an attempt to provide a theology of history, making sense of the seeming absurdity of God's claims to vindicate the faithful.[5] From the Maccabean revolt through to Revelation, apocalyptic provided a very real means of coping with intolerable situations, means which were not escapist but which engaged the oppressive structures of society at a profound and meaningful level.[6] As such, apocalyptic provides a world view

---

[3] See G. Theissen, The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983), pp. 249ff.

[4] For details on the background to the Son of Man expectation see, for example, H.E. Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition (London: SCM, 1965).

[5] E. Schillebeeckx, Jesus (New York: Crossroad, 1986), pp. 119-126.

[6] The modern suspicion of apocalyptic, as seen for instance in A. Nolan (God in South Africa (Cape Town: David Philip, 1988), p. 132) arises from a justifiable fear of the kind of millenarianism which is either totally pietistic or suicidal, as

appropriate to times of acute crisis, and which enables constructive action when normal avenues are closed.[7]

Much of this apocalyptism is found in the New Testament, but a careful examination of the texts reveals that both John the Baptist and Jesus used apocalyptic material in their own way as a vehicle for their own proclamation. Neither can be considered as simple purveyors of the apocalyptic tradition.[8] John the Baptist, for instance, appeals to key ideas and symbols from the early prophetic tradition, and no trace of the apocalyptic `two aeons' doctrine is found in his preaching,[9] and his attitude towards the future is not that of an apocalyptist trying to discern the signs of the times but it is rather "the raw prophetic voice of doom".[10] This prophetic note is seen in the way John effectively excommunicated the whole of the religious establishment of his time through a "frontal assault" on three essentials of Judaism:

> The eschatological expectation of the destruction of Yahweh's and therefore Israel's foes; Israel's own final victory and worldwide dominion; the guarantee of salvation entailed by the promise to Abraham. All this, past and present, John submits to a complete overhaul; he thinks and lives solely in terms of the future.... The future for John is God's exclusive potential. Present and past, therefore, lie under the critique of God's future.[11]

It is therefore entirely fitting that we should have no record of John taking any part in the Jewish sacrificial or cultic assembly nor does his teaching concern itself with

---

in the Xhosa cattle killing (see J.B. Peires, The Dead will Arise (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1989)).

[7] This can be maintained without one having to come to any "objective" evaluation of the truth of that world view.

[8] For a detailed study of the texts see T.W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM, 1949), pp. 39f, and also J. Jeremias, NT Theology (London: SCM, 1971), pp. 43f.

[9] Schillebeeckx, Jesus, p. 129.

[10] ibid. p. 130.

[11] ibid. p 135.

this,[12] and that the outward sign of repentance should be baptism with its implication that all Israelites should consider themselves as Gentiles before God.[13] For John, repentance and baptism mark a clean break with the past, and indeed a complete break with the structures of present society, and an orientation towards God's future historical judgment; baptism marks this break with the present and entry into a new community of eschatological expectation.

Like John the Baptist, Jesus bases his proclamation on the coming kingdom of God, but instead of the kingdom being solely a future event as in John the Baptist, it breaks into the present in the love and acceptance of the poor and oppressed by Jesus.[14] The miracles of healing were signs of this dawning kingdom,[15] and most of the parables were

---

[12] See the earlier discussion of cult as the means par excellence of maintaining the status quo.

[13] Some have raised doubts as to whether proselyte baptism was practiced before John the Baptist. W.F. Flemington (The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism (London: SPCK, 1964), pp. 4f) gives convincing arguments that it was, but, even if it was not, the use of baptism would have implied a critique of the Jewish understanding of circumcision similar to the debate in Jn 8:39ff about descent from Abraham.

[14] The classic study of the preaching of the coming kingdom by Jesus is W.G. Kümmel, Promise and Fulfilment (London: SCM, 1957). For a more recent and more theological enquiry see N. Perrin, The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus (London: SCM, 1963). The summary statement, "The kingdom of God has come near," should be interpreted together with the beatitude, "Blessed are the poor." For this see H. Hendrickx, The Sermon on the Mount (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1984) p. 15: "The blessedness of the poor at the coming of the kingdom is to be found, therefore, not in the justice or piety of these privileged people, but in the justice of God." Also important is the intercession of the Lord's Prayer: "May your kingdom come." For this see E. Lohmeyer, The Lord's Prayer (London: Collins, 1965), pp. 88ff.

[15] See H. Hendrickx, The Miracle Stories of the Synoptic Gospels (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1987), p. 25: "Jesus' miracles are in the first place a sign of the dawning of the eschaton, the kingdom of God in our world of misery and injustice, and its immediate radiation on people, in particular, in favour of the poor of all kinds." The early tradition is developed into a dramatic statement by Matthew in Mt 8; see H.J. Held, "Matthew as Interpretor of the Miracle Stories," in G. Bornkamm, et al

dramatic and provocative symbols designed to force a disclosure of the kingdom in situations of conflict.[16] The proclamation of the coming kingdom is thus transformed from the threat of judgment into an offer of salvation.[17] Probably references to the future of an apocalyptic nature remained as part of the preaching of Jesus, but these do not seem to be what was fundamental or distinctive about him, and much that the New Testament records which is definitely apocalyptic may well be later reflection by apocalyptic Christianity.[18]

Jesus' message of salvation is that the kingdom is at hand, that salvation is experienced here and now through faith. He makes the kingdom present, but the fullness of the kingdom can only be glimpsed through anticipation of the eschatological event in his miracles and in the transformation of individuals and society. The urgency of this moment of faith is described in temporal terms through the use of the word, kairos.[19] The preaching of the kingdom by Jesus does not take place as part of the normal march of

---

(ed), Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (London: SCM, 1963), pp. 165-299.

[16] See especially the formative work of J. Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus (London: SCM, rev ed 1972).

[17] E.g. Lk 7:34 and 15:2.

[18] It could be, for instance, that the tradition of the coming Son of Man, while possibly originating with Jesus, was preserved and adapted by its use in the cultic worship of the very early church; see D.E. Aune, The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), pp. 94f. For a study of Mk 13 see D. Wenham, The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), who argues that there existed a form of the eschatological discourse predating the synoptic gospels, which could have originated with Jesus.

[19] See Mk. 1:15, and discussion in chapter 1.

events, but is the centre of all time, the fullness of time, and the time from which all other time draws its meaning.[20]

Jesus himself seems not to have been concerned with recasting the cultus of the time, nor does he continue the baptismal practice of John.[21] Rather we find evidence of the development of the formal and festal meal as the sign and celebration of his proclamation. The dominant idea is that the meal anticipates the eschatological meal.[22] In its original setting, the meals of Jesus were deliberately and provocatively open in contravention of the Jewish ritual of

---

[20] See esp. Gal 4:4 (where chronos is used in the sense of kairos!). See O. Cullmann, Christ and Time (London: SCM, 1951), and K. Barth, Church Dogmatics (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1960) III.2, pp. 460f.

[21] Critics seem to think that Jn 3:22 and 4:2 indicate that Jesus may have baptized early in his ministry. We have no evidence that this was an important part of his activity. See H. Conzelmann, John vol 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 218. For an attempt to synthesize the different texts to conform to traditional Roman Catholic teaching see R. Schnackenburg, The Gospel according to John vol 1 (London: Burns & Oates, 1968), pp. 410f.

[22] The expectation of a future banquet probably arose out of the meal celebrating the establishing of a covenant (Ex 24:9ff; also Gen 31:54, Ex 18:12; I Sam 9:11; and Dt 12:5ff, 14:23, 15:20, 27:7; also Prov 9:1-6; Ecclus 6:19, 15:3, 24:19-21). The expectation of a new covenant naturally led to the idea of a sumptuous banquet which sometimes became bizarre and extravagant and was associated with the theme of the renewal of Eden (Is 48:21, 49:9f; Ez 34:13f; Is 25:6-9, 34:6, 65:13; Jer 46:10; Zeph 1:7; Ez 39:17-20; Zech 9:17; also 4 Ezra 8:52-54). II Bar 29:5-8 is a particularly important reference. It appears to be a relic of an older fragment, which is also quoted from Papias in Irenaeus, Adv Haer V.33.3 (cf. R.H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament vol 2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), p. 497). Charles dates II Baruch in the latter half of the Ist Century AD, but A.F.J. Klijn dates it in the first or second decade of the 2nd Century (The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, ed. J.H. Charlesworth (London: DLT, 1983), vol 2, p. 617). Since the tradition seems to be fixed by this time, we can with some confidence date it to the time of Jesus or even before.

the time,[23] and many of Jesus' parables about feasts should surely be regarded as arising from this context.[24] By anticipating the eschatological meal, these festal meals of Jesus model and symbolize the dawning kingdom, and in this sense can be understood as inaugurating that kingdom. The meal presents and contains "the fullness of time," in that the present moment is joined to the eschatological fullness of Jesus. The festal meal had, therefore, several functions: a celebration of community, inclusion of outsiders into fellowship, and an anticipation, or even inauguration, of the eschaton.

The tradition only gives small glimpses of these meals, but their importance can be seen from exegesis of the tradition of the Feeding of the Five Thousand,[25] and of the resurrection meals of Jesus, which look back to his earlier festal meals.[26]

Thus, the meals of Jesus graphically portray his attitude towards the coming Kingdom, and they express his more general attitude towards the coming kingdom in a symbolic form. They are, therefore dynamic expressions of how every moment in the present should be regarded as a summons to faith to realize this promised future. This means that the present is experienced as a tension between God's promise and its realization, and

> (the past) must again and again be recalled and brought to mind in the present, and...it must be so expounded to the present that the latter can derive from history an understanding of itself and its future path and can also

---

[23] Mk 2:15, 3:20, 11:19, 14:3; Lk 11:38, 15:1, 19:1-10. See G. Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology (London: Epworth, 1971), pp. 26-28; Schillebeeckx, Jesus pp. 211f, and J. Moltmann, The Church in the Power of the Spirit, pp. 242-260.

[24] E.g. Mt 22:1-14 and 25:1-13.

[25] Mk 6:41 and //s, 8:6 and Jn 6:11. For comment see V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan, 1963), p. 324.

[26] Lk 24:30-31; 24:41-43; Acts 10:39-41; Jn 21:10-14. See Schillebeeckx, Jesus, pp. 215ff.

find its own place in the history of the working of God's promises.[27]

The past is always remembered with a view to orienting the community towards the fulfillment of God's promised future. In the meals of Jesus, the promised future breaking into the present was the coming kingdom of God. From here the basic dynamic is established which is carried forward into the eucharistic life of the early church, where the eucharist becomes the locus for the expectation of the return of Christ. Thus the particular attitude towards past and future in the eucharistic cult finds its foundation in the particular eschatological thinking of Jesus. It is important to emphasize that in Jesus' expectation of the future we find no escapism from the present; indeed, quite the contrary. This future expectation seems to free him for surprising and innovative action in the present.

Jesus' own anticipation of the kingdom in his life and proclamation is the foundation for our Christian view of history, but we have also noticed how Jesus seems to have celebrated this in his festal meals. This, therefore, can be regarded as the foundation of later eucharistic eschatological thinking. Here we find what D.E. Aune has described as "the merging of the past events of salvation history with the future eschatological fulfilment in the present cultic moment,"[28] and which is understood by much later tradition in terms of commemoration, demonstration, and prognosis,[29] or as J. Moltmann puts it: "In the coincidence of remembrance and hope, history and

---

[27] J. Moltmann, Theology of Hope (London: SCM, 1967), p. 109.

[28] The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), p. 16.

[29] See Thomas Aquinas, Scriptum super Sententias Magistri Petri Lombardi IV, ed. M.F. Moos (Paris, 1947) I.1.1 (29), Liber de Veritate Catholicae Fide contra errores Infidelium seu summa contra Gentiles. edd. C. Pero, D.P. Marc, D.P. Caramello (Rome, 1961) 57 (3966f), and Summa Theologiae IIIa 60.3. for the general theory, and for the eucharist ST 73.4.

eschatology, it is the sign of present grace, which confers liberty and fellowship."[30]

3.3 Jesus, the Last Supper and the coming Kingdom

A detailed historical construction of the events of the Last Supper is probably impossible. We have three main traditions: the Lucan-Pauline texts,[31] the shorter Lucan text,[32] and the Marcan. The Lucan-Pauline and the Marcan

---

[30] The Church in the Power of the Spirit, p. 243.

[31] Here reference is made to the Lucan longer reading, which was probably taken over from the Pauline tradition, perhaps as late as in the Fourth Century as part of the process of the codification of scripture during the formation of the canon, and may well also have coincided with the incorporation of the Words of Institution into the eucharistic rite. The most detailed treatment of the problem is to be found in R.D. Richardson, "A further inquiry into eucharistic origins with special reference to New Testament problems," in H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper (Leiden; E.J. Brill, 1979), pp. 220-702. For slightly different arguments leading to similar conclusions, see G.D. Kilpatrick, The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy (Cambridge; CUP, 1983), pp. 31ff. The assessment of J. Jeremias arguing for the authenticity of the longer text on the grounds that it conforms better to a Passover meal is not plausible, nor is his explanation of the shorter text as produced by the disciplina arcani any more likely; see Eucharistic Words (London: SCM, 1966), pp. 125f.

[32] It is not possible to argue the difficulties of the Lucan text in detail. Scholars of repute still hold divergent positions. The arguments can be summarized as follows:
1) For the longer reading: This is supported by the vast majority of manuscripts, and it is not impossible to regard the rather odd series of events as credible in a Passover context (see esp. J. Jeremias Eucharistic Words).
2) For the shorter reading: vs 19b-20 read like an interpolation from I Cor 11, or a related source. The shorter text is more difficult, but could also be the most authentic tradition of all, in that it would be the most Jewish and the least like the Hellenistic Lord's Supper. Arguments about Luke's understanding of the atonement impinge on the assessment of the Lucanisms of the text. It is still highly probable that Lk 22:15-16 are Luke's attempt to place the event in a Passover setting.
The present writer is convinced by the arguments of R.D. Richardson ("An Enquiry"), against the opinion of Jeremias and I.H. Marshall (Last Supper and Lord's Supper (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1980)), that the shorter text should be regarded as the more authentic, but that this does not imply a simple adoption of the text as the most historical.

traditions arise out of the eucharistic practice of the Hellenistic communities and probably bear very little of historical value.[33] The debate as to whether or not the Last Supper was a Passover is now largely superseded in favour of the thesis that the meal was a continuation of the fellowship meals of Jesus with his disciples.[34] If any formal Jewish liturgy can be regarded as used, we should probably point to the birkat ha-mazon .[35]

Amidst the plethora of later interpretations, probably the most authentic tradition is part of the shorter Lucan text which describes Jesus as taking farewell of his friends while still urgently expecting the coming kingdom.[36] While

---

[33] The hellenisms of I Cor 11:23-32 can quickly be seen by comparing it with the much more Jewish I Cor 10:14. the taking...giving thanks, breaking and saying is very stylized with parallels in Mk 6:41, 8:6 and Jn 6:11. See G. Bornkamm, "Lord's Supper and Church in Paul," Early Christian Experience (London: SCM, 1969), pp. 123-160, and E. Käsemann, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Last Supper," Essays on New Testament Themes (London: SCM, 1964), pp. 108-135. Mk 14:22-25 bears no relation to its Passover setting. Vss 18-21 and 22-25 should be regarded as separate items of tradition; see V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan, 1963), p. 543.

[34] See G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (Westminster; Dacre Press, 1944), pp. 50ff; L. Bouyer, Eucharist (Indiana: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1968), pp. 84-99; J-P Audet, "Literary Forms and Contents of a Normal Eucharistia in the First Century," The Gospels Reconsidered (Reprint from Studia Evangelica International Conference on the Four Gospels in 1957) (Oxford: Blackwells, 1960), pp. 16-35; T. Talley, "The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development," in K. Stevenson (ed), Liturgy Reshaped (London: SPCK, 1982), pp. 48-64; ibid., "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church according to Recent Research: Results and Reflections," Studia Liturgica 11 (1976), 138-158. I.H. Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper (Exeter: Paternoster, 1980), p. 20, is correct in rejecting the haboroth and kiddush meals as possible backgrounds.

[35] For the basic critical work see L. Finkelstein, "The Birkat Ha-Mazon," The Jewish Quarterly Review 19 (1928/9), 211-262.

[36] Lk 22:18: "I will not drink...from the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." The "from now" is probably a Lucanism.

the Passover theme in Lk 22:15 may be Lucan, the theme of the coming kingdom in vs 16 runs contrary to Luke's eschatology and rings true to what we know of Jesus' teaching. Vs 17 reflects the Jewish blessing, and does not include the saying, "This is my blood". The replacement of "blessing" by "giving thanks" is probably an indication of later development. Vs 18 likewise seems to contain Lucanisms and foundational material. Vs 19a is more difficult to evaluate, since it has so many form critical similarities with other material. What is significant in the Lucan shorter text is that the cup and bread sayings do not balance each other. The bread saying is much more stylized, and could be regarded as a development from something more primitive and more akin to the cup saying. All these uncertainties make any conclusions based upon detailed historical reconstruction of events at the Last Supper very tendentious.

What we seem to be left with is a Jewish meal, along the lines of the festal meals of Jesus, which is used to interpret the coming death of Jesus in the context of continued eschatological expectancy. E. Schillebeeckx makes this a crux in his interpretation of the Last Supper. Although we cannot enter into the mind of the Jesus who surely was aware of the mounting opposition to his teaching and person, we can, Schillebeeckx argues, presume that Jesus had begun to reflect on the consequences of his rejection for his fundamental message of the coming kingdom. The Last Supper is the highpoint of such reflection, in that here Jesus anticipates his death, interpreting it as a final and complete surrender to his Father and as an act of total service to his people. Without projecting the later interpretation of Jesus' death as sacrificial into the Last Supper, we can still legitimately regard him as willingly and knowingly embracing death as the final purpose of God, and as an act precipitating the coming of the kingdom. Thus, a concrete historical act of obedience gives way to the coming kingdom.

> ...in the very face of death Jesus offers the cup of fellowship to his disciples; this is a token that he is not just passively allowing death to overcome him but has actively integrated it into his total mission, in other words, that he understands and is undergoing his death as a final and extreme service to the cause of God as the cause of men, and that he has communicated this self-understanding to his intimate disciples under the veiled sign of extending to them the fellowship-at-table shared with his friends.[37]

This is the formative moment of the historical dimension of the eucharist. It is the concrete embracing of the meaninglessness of death, of the futility of defeat, in the trust that such action can be the most decisive victory over evil. Here there is no room for any avoidance of the pain of decision. All the history of Israel, every moment of preparation and proclamation in the life of Jesus, is directed to this one moment in which Jesus embraces his destiny and hands that same task over to his friends. They too are called, in fellowship with him, to the same act of loving service and surrender in order to make sense of the world.[38]

Not for a moment will the texts allow us to forget the conflictual setting of the Last Supper. The mounting tension of the journey of Jerusalem culminates in the march into Jerusalem and the confrontation in the temple. The Last Supper itself is full of darkness and misunderstanding now etched into the tradition in the record of Judas's betrayal. The Supper itself leads directly into the garden of Gethsemane to the trials of Jesus and his death. No interpretation of the eucharist can ignore its origin in this vortex of conflict between Jesus and the authorities of his time. This was truly a historical action aimed directly towards the transformation of the ahistorical elements of his society. Jesus' insistence on healing on the Sabbath, his refusal to obey the various purity laws, his freedom

---

[37] Schillebeeckx, Jesus, p. 311.

[38] Paul understood his own apostolic ministry in this way, and the theme is encapsulated in Col 1:24.

with respect to the class structures, all bear their fruit on the cross and are carried forward into the church in the eucharist.

The Last Supper is an acted parable expressing the whole content of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. His whole life, death and resurrection shatters the ahistorical structures of the time and assume eternal dimensions precisely because it is a historical action so sharply focussed. Because the person Jesus acts so perfectly in tune with the will of God, his historical action is an expression of the eternal and becomes archetypal and timeless. The relationship between the eternal and the historical is completely reciprocal in Jesus himself. His action can be described as both expressing and creating the eternal. In Jesus, then, the perfectly historical bursts apart the parameters of the ahistorical and establishes the eternal.

There is, however, no possibility of the eternal being expressed as a universal outside of a historical moment. Certain guidelines, attitudes and values usually associated with the eternal are found in the ahistorical, but for these to be really eternal they need to be expressed historically. This means that care should be taken in regarding the Last Supper as the expression of some eternal truth. Rather the Last Supper, as an expression of the whole life, death and resurrection of Jesus, creates, precisely because of its unique historicity, its own eternity.

In this the Last Supper provides us with a basic clue to the Christian life. We are not to regard ourselves as simply obeying God's will in order that God can act in the world. The relation between God's presence and action in the world is more closely tied to our action than that. It is precisely through conformity to the type of historical action seen on the Cross, and typified (made into a transforming symbol!) in the Last Supper, that God is "created" in the world.

There is a constant danger in our reflection on the person of Jesus that we see him as the expression of the

timeless, eternal, will of God. Nothing could more undermine the content of the Christian gospel. The Christian belief in revelation stands or falls on the belief that Jesus, as the person who died on the cross, disclosed the being of God. The concrete and specific becomes the disclosure of God, not the other way round.

> The Incarnation is not a "principle" that is applied subsequently within history (to particular phenomena), but the inner principle of history itself: its coordinating point (Col 1:17), its final ground (Rev 1:8), its "fulfillment" (Gal 4:4; Mk 1:15), its absolute concretion, in which alone what is earlier and what is later in time become genuine history. Only if the constant ground of history is itself conceived historically does the nature of history fully appear.[39]

Viewed in this way we have to come to the conclusion that Jesus at the Last Supper (as completed on the Cross) was creating a symbol of the presence of God at the point of greatest human isolation and suffering. This creative act does not summon God from beyond into the present, but in a very real way creates God.[40] The Last Supper should be considered in the light of Gethsemane which follows so swiftly and the Marcan cry of dereliction, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me." Through his embracing of this suffering, by symbolically identifying himself with the bread and wine and acting out his coming death, Jesus creates God in the midst of godlessness.

The Last Supper, as an expression of the fullness of Jesus' proclamation, was a way of defining God in the face of the host of idolatorous conceptions of God holding people

---

[39] See J.B. Metz, Theology of the World (London: Burns & Oates, 1969). p. 23, n.13.

[40] For the theme of creating God in the face of idols, see P. Richard, "Biblical Theology of Confrontation with Idols," in The Idols of Death and the God of Life (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1983), pp. 3-25. For an interpretation of Jesus as revealing God in the face of idols, see J. Sobrino, "The Epiphany of the God of Life in Jesus of Nazareth," ibid. pp. 66-102. And for an exploration of the idea that the gospel attempts to make God exist in the face of protest atheism, see J. Casanas, "The Task of Making God Exist," ibid. pp. 113-149.

captive. Like so much of the gospel message of Jesus, it contains a radical critique of the religious establishment of the time, and creates a disclosure of God at a point of maximum alienation precisely because Jesus himself at this point willingly enters into the darkness of the passion in full trust in his Father.

3.4 The anamnesis

Of all eucharistic concepts anamnesis is perhaps the most pertinent to this study, for it is precisely through historical remembrance that the once and for all nature of an historical happening transcends the limitations of time and becomes relevant and contemporaneous with all time. The precise nature of this act of remembrance and the presence contained within it needs careful examination.

Even before examining the technical notion of anamnesis, it should be noted that from the earliest time through to our modern eucharists, the eucharistic anamnesis has been part of a wider act of remembrance.

From the very beginning the cultic recollection of Jesus kept the tradition alive.[41] Some of the more obvious indications of the use of the tradition in the cult have been mentioned already. This cultic use of the historical tradition has to some extent freed it of the immediate constraints of direct historical facticity, but this only to demonstrate to the listener that this Jesus can be and is immediately present in every historical situation: "It is this same Jesus who will come again".

The use of the gospels in the very early church led to their importance and preservation, and they continue the same function in the eucharist of the church: they illuminate some dimension of the life of the Jesus who is

---

[41] It is, for instance, probable that the Passion Narratives were collected and assumed their primitive form in the Passover celebrations of the Jerusalem church; see E. Trocmé, The Passion as Liturgy (London: SCM, 1983).

about to become sacramentally present in the eucharist.[42] From the gospels it is established that the Jesus of the sacrament is the same Jesus as the man of Galilee. This is no cultic invocation of some atemporal person; the formal and public recollection of the ministry of Jesus is fundamental to the rite.

The past event is not, therefore, interesting in itself, but only as it produces faith in the present and stimulates us to direct historical action today. Like the gospel records themselves, the eucharistic gospel narration, as also the eucharistic anamnesis, has the function of addressing our particular context, and of locating Jesus' presence in our concrete acts of faith and obedience in the present. Just because the presence of the Jesus of the gospels is not immediately discernable in the present, the congregation is exhorted through the sermon or homily towards an act of recognition of Jesus' contemporary disclosure of himself. Without this aid, all too easily the eucharistic recollection, even when rooted in the recollection of the person of Jesus, can lose its historical focus and become romantic and magical. Such a loss of meaning occurs simultaneously at both ends of the process: the Jesus of history is not seen as a concrete person facing particular social and political challenges of his time, and, because of this lack of a proper christology, it becomes impossible to discern the presence of Jesus in the present.[43]

---

[42] See K. Rahner, "The Word and the Eucharist." Theological Investigations IV (London: DLT, 1966), p. 267: "Because God's revelation must be a word to ordain us to a supernatural end, the natural sign cannot be absolutely decisive. It follows that in the manifestation of grace which is called the sacrament, the word is necessarily and inevitably the decisive element."

[43] See J.L. Segundo, The Historical Jesus of the Synoptics (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis , 1985), p. 7: "So we must keep going back and writing gospels. That does not take any of the wonder or exclusivity away from the moment when the first canonical Gospels were written. Today, centuries later, the Spirit of Jesus can see to it that the new gospels are spiritually as faithful to Jesus as the first ones were."

The recollection of the person of Jesus in the present has to be part of a process of authentic hermeneutics, which, following Segundo, has to arise out of concrete and meaningful contemporary questions, which lead to fresh insight into the text, by which process the presence of Jesus in our midst is reconceived.[44] It is only within this general and non-sacramental milieu that the strictly sacramental anamnesis takes place. Without such a meaningful "hermeneutic circle" no proper anamnesis can occur, for Jesus would not be becoming properly historical in the present. The Jesus of yesteryear, or, perhaps worse, the Jesus used to legitimate some vested power in society would be invoked. Neither of these would be the free Jesus of the gospel records, who through word and sacrament becomes present in his church.

The eucharistic anamnesis is, then, part of the wider hermeneutic process of the whole church, but the fact that the gospels themselves arise out of a particular cultic, if not eucharistic use, indicates that the setting in the eucharist contributes something important, if not essential, to this process. Gospels and eucharist belong together, and the eucharistic anamnesis provides an important hermeneutic perspective on the text.

One of the more important characteristics of the gospels is the apparent overemphasis on the passion narratives. Through this device, the gospels themselves indicate that the whole record of the ministry of Jesus is to be interpreted in the light of the passion. So too, the use of the gospels in the wider eucharistic celebration links the gospel records to the eucharistic sacrifice.

Scholarly opinions vary as to the origin of the anamnesis saying in I Cor 11:24f. Almost all scholars would regard it as not historically authentic, and as one of the

---

[44] J.L Segundo, The Liberation of Theology (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976), pp. 6ff.

more important acts of interpretation by the early church.[45] Some see it as arising out of the "historical embolism" of the Jewish birkat ha-maz on,[46] others regard it as a development of Hellenistic meals commemorating the departed.[47] The argument for the Hellenistic background is that the text shows other Hellenistic features, and the idea of the memorial meal explains the commemoration of an individual. However, apart from other technical difficulties, this background does not seem to explain the full meaning of the text, and it especially fails to explain the powerful presence of Christ in the meal. It is probable that authentically Jewish ideas were retained and expressed in hellenistic terms.

The strictly exegetical question is difficult to solve, but various elements in OT thought provide several rich possibilities of interpretation, which are all taken up in some way or other in the later eucharistic tradition. The recitation of God's mighty acts in the OT cultus is the original concept lying behind the "historical embolism" of the birkat ha-mazon. In this way the power of God in the past is made present. Here anamnesis is always associated with praise and thanksgiving; this provides a useful link between a memorial of a death and the joyful element of thanksgiving in the meal.[48] A dimension of this cultic

---

[45] M. Thurian, The Eucharistic Memorial I (London: SPCK, 1960), p. 17, argues that the anamnesis saying is original.

[46] See especially L. Ligier, "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist", Studia Liturgica 9 (1973), pp. 161-185, who shows how the Kippur institution narrative in the synagogue liturgy became incorporated into the second and third pericopes of the birkat hha-mazon. This is a direct parallel to the development in eucharistic liturgy.

[47] See G. Bornkamm, "The Lord's Supper and Church in Paul," Early Christian Experience (London: SCM, 1969), pp. 140; E. Käsemann, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," Essays in NT Themes (London: SCM, 1964), pp. 108-135.

[48] See G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (Westminster; Dacre Press, 1944), pp. 242ff.

invocation is the appeal to God that he should come to save his people. Understood in this way, anamnesis opens itself to an eschatological interpretation, and becomes almost equivalent to the prayer, maranatha.[49] Sometimes in the OT the verbal form of anamnesis takes on a meaning stronger than "to remember" and means "to proclaim".[50] This would explain the proclamatory nature of I Cor 11:26.[51] The memorial idea is, in fact, more widespread in the OT than even this. Oblations or sacrificial memorials serve as a memorial of the offerer of sacrifice before God.[52]

Such background provides almost limitless possibilities of interpretation and a way of combining both the invocation of a powerful presence and the possibility of intercession. This is the link so essential for a proper understanding of the eucharistic sacrifice, in which real presence and intercession go hand in hand.

The command, "Do this in remembrance of me", establishes the eucharist as a rite whereby the church keeps alive the

---

[49] J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words (London: SCM, 1966), pp. 244-253.

[50] E.g. Ex 23:13, Ps 45:18 LXX.

[51] See G.D. Kilpatrick, "Anamnesis", Liturgical Review 5 (1975), 35-40, and The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy (Cambridge: CUP, 1983), pp. 14ff. One should not, however, insist that the verb takes on this strong meaning in every instance, as in II Cor 7:15 and II Tim 1:6.

[52] Lev 2:2, 24:7f and also Ecclus 35:2,6,7 and 45:16.

historical remembrance of Jesus.[53] Yet all remembrance is ambivalent and open to distortion and co-option. The anamnesis by itself does not guarantee that the remembrance is indeed of this Jesus, who on the night he was betrayed took, blessed, broke and gave as a symbol of his approaching death. As has been noted, all too easily the remembrance can lose its particular historical referend and assume purely ahistorical and cultic proportions. This is especially the case when the remembrance is closely connected with the idea of the sacramental real presence of the risen Lord. When this is the case the mystical dimensions of the sacramental encounter can virtually eliminate the historical memory. To some extent this has already begun to happen in our texts, for we are unable to determine with any certainty what actually happened at the Last Supper. Already the cultic experience of the Hellenistic church has overshadowed the history, despite the insistence in the tradition on rooting the cultic events in a particular event. It is only as the eucharistic tradition is placed within the more historical setting of the gospel and passion narrative that the anamnesis gains content. Without this, as in Corinth, there will always be a tendency for the anamnesis to lose its historical basis and become solely a cultic invocation. In I Corinthians Paul's treatment of the eucharist is part of his proclamation of the "folly of the cross" in the face of the enthusiasm of the "wise".[54]

---

[53] It is perhaps impossible to establish with any certainty that this was indeed the intention of Jesus at the Last Supper. It is at least possible that the Last Supper was conducted in such a highly eschatological context that such a ritual remembrance would be impossible. Yet the very founding of a group of disciples to carry forward the work of Jesus after his death would give us the foundation required for regarding this command as a legitimate development. See E. Schillebeeckx, Jesus, pp. 311f.

[54] See H. Conzelmann, I Corinthians (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), p. 57 and 194f. When anamnesis is interpreted solely in the light of Jesus' High Priestly function and his eternal intercession at the right hand of the Father (as in Heb 7:25), then the eucharist is regarded as a cultic transaction, and

The church's constant search for an appropriate christology can be understood as an attempt to express the eternal in an historical way within a certain ahistorical context. In the eucharist this process should be reflected in the particular content given to the anamnesis. In order for the anamnesis to be a genuine historical remembrance it needs to have present historical implications. For instance, just as the Last Supper gains its meaning from the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, so also the eucharistic anamnesis only gains meaning from the present life of Jesus lived by the church. There is however a reciprocity in this process, because the eucharistic action itself provides a hermeneutic framework for the wider christological question.

That the anamnesis is of Jesus as he establishes the powerful symbol of his death provides us with a cornerstone of this continuing process of interpretation. Our remembrance is of a person faced with death, but who embraces failure in order to express the victory of God. The eucharistic anamnesis will always, therefore, ground our eucharistic theology in the cross. However much we come to view the cross in the light of the resurrection, the anamnesis will continually re-establish a theologia crucis.

---

becomes devoid of all historical content. The eucharistic interpretation of Hebrews is far from evident (R. Williamson, "The Eucharist and the Epistle to the Hebrews," New Testament Studies 21 (1974), 300-12, and O. Moe, "Das Abendmahl im Hebräerbrief. Zur Auslegung von Hebr 13,9-16," Studia Theologica 4 (1951/2), 102-108), and even if the eucharistic anamnesis should be connected with the symbol of Christ's eternal intercession, it should be emphasized that in Hebrews the eternal intercession is firmly grounded upon the once-and-for-allness of the historical death on the cross. The use of ephapax, demonstrates the uniqueness of the historical death of Christ even in such a platonic schema of thought; see Heb 7:27, 9:12 and Rom 6:10; also Stählin, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament I, pp. 383f. In other traditions the same point is made in different ways: it is the slain lamb who is at the heart of the throne (Rev 5:6); in Jn 20:19 he appears in his risen glory bearing the marks of the passion.

The New Testament itself provides its own evidence for this. John's gospel does not give us an account of the Last Supper. Instead we are given the acted parable of the Foot Washing. This is to be interpreted as encapsulating the whole of the Jesus story as an expression of selfless service and love.[55] The parable takes us out of the realm of romanticism through its cutting introduction of the class conflict of the time. Jesus' service involves taking the nature of a slave, and dying the death of the accursed and despised.[56] The parable of Jn 13 finds echoes in Lk 22:24-27, where once again the Last Supper is connected with service.

A further element in the eucharistic tradition which militates against a false and ahistorical anamnesis is the conflict surrounding the event. With these roots the anamnesis cannot be romanticised, but must stand as one of the chief means whereby the particularity and offence of Jesus' death continually ward off the church's attempts to tame it.

> Mere cultic representation of the risen Lord's death is not enough to guarantee God's presence among people in any infallible way. The Christian way to obtain union with God is to follow in the footsteps of the historical Jesus. It is he who shows us how we are to lead a Christian life and thereby gain access to God. We can celebrate his life and journey with doxologies, but it is even more important to follow in his footsteps: "Let us keep our eyes fixed on Jesus, who inspires and perfects our faith.... Remember how he endured the opposition of sinners; hence do not grow despondent or abandon the struggle (Heb 12:2-3).[57]

The whole notion of anamnesis based on the command "Do this as a remembrance of me" contains an acute tension. On

---

[55] From the vast literature see R.E. Brown, The Gospel According to John vol 2 (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971), pp. 563ff.

[56] Compare Jn 13:4 with Phil 2:7. For crucifixion as the most despicable form of execution see M. Hengel, Crucifixion (London: SCM, 1977).

[57] J. Sobrino, Christology at the Crossroads (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1978), p. 304.

the one hand, it is the command on which the cultic repetition of the eucharistic cult is based, and, on the other hand, the remembrance is of a once and for all event, which in itself spells the end of all cult.[58] How can a cultic act, usually a powerful vehicle of the ahistorical and so opposed to the historical become the medium for the remembrance of a unique historical event and the instrument for present historical action? This is one of the fundamental questions of eucharistic theology. All too easily the church has allowed the eucharist to be a cultic, holy, activity not at all expressive of the disturbing memory of Jesus. This happens when the eucharist is considered to be an end in itself, thus removing its connections with the historical both in the past and the present. The eucharist must exist within a double hermeneutic loop: on the one hand, it engages with the historical events of Jesus; on the other hand, it interacts with the present life of the church in the world. When the church gathers, the eucharist is the cultic means of re-enacting that historical, once and for all event, in the present life of the church. Unless this re-enactment itself is seen as a mediating activity having its goal and consequences in the life of the church in the world, it will lose its proper meaning and become subsumed into the ahistorical in a negative way.

One of the consequences of this is that the eucharist must continue to be like the meals of Jesus, in which he shocked the religious establishment of his time by his radical inclusiveness. It is this inclusiveness which eventually led to his death, and which is the especial content of the anamnesis. We remember the Jesus who opened his arms on the cross to embrace all people, whose death meant the rending of the curtain of the temple, thus doing away with the distinction between the sacred and the

---

[58] J. Moltmann, The Crucified God (London: SCM, 1974), pp. 43f.

profane.

> Cultic religion must be replaced by the spreading of the word of the cross, the celebration of faith and the practical following of Jesus. The cultic division between the religious and the profane is potentially abolished in faith in the Christ who was profaned by crucifixion. Thus the eucharist, like the meals held by Jesus with 'sinners and publicans', must also be celebrated with the unrightous, those who have no rights and the godless from the 'highways and hedges' of society, in all their profanity, and should no longer be limited, as a religious sacrifice, to the inner circle of the devout, to those who are members of the same denomination.[59]

3.5 The Eucharistic Sacrifice

Sacrifice is the basic form of ritual ahistorical worship, and could, therefore, have been dealt with in chapter 1. This was not done in any detail because the sacrifice of Christ bursts out of that mould to become a truly historical sacrifice. The connection between the anamnesis and the eucharistic sacrifice is very close indeed, as is revealed in the liturgies; the contents of the previous section should therefore be presumed here.[60]

The description of the death of Jesus as sacrificial is both necessary, in that it presents the most profound truth about his redemptive love, and awkward, in that none of the categories at hand for the New Testament writers can fully describe this unique event.[61] This is a new kind of

---

[59] J. Moltmann, The Crucified God p. 44. See also ibid., The Church in the Power of the Spirit (London: SCM, 1977), p. 259.

[60] See L. Scheffczyk, "Eucharistic Sacrifice," Sacramentum Mundi vol 2, p. 274. The specific content of the anamnesis is the whole saving act of Christ, including his life, death and resurrection, but, as stated below, this should be regarded as the complete sacrificial act of Christ. Some of the ideas of this section have previously appeared in my "A Liturgy for Liberation," Bounty in Bondage (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1989), pp. 69-72.

[61] Thus Christ's death is understood as sacrificial, whether in terms of the Day of Atonement ritual as in Hebrews (9:23-28), or of the Passover as in John (1:28f, 19:36) and as in Paul (I Cor 5:7; cf I Pt 1:19), or of the more general ideas of ransoming and reconciliation (II Cor 5:14ff; Rom 3:24f; Eph

sacrifice, something that perfects and concludes the Old Testament system.[62]

The New Testament writers describe the Last Supper in sacrificial terms,[63] indeed the Last Supper tradition seems to have played a formative part in the developing of the New Testament understanding of the death of Christ.[64] Three major lines of thought are presented by the texts: firstly, the eucharist is linked with the great covenant sacrifice of Ex 24. In this way the eucharist becomes the means by which the church as the new people of God is gathered together and nurtured by its head. Secondly, the background of Jer 31:31 is recalled with its promise of an inward and intimate union between God and his people. Thirdly, the passover setting is implied together with the theme of deliverance and redemption.

Before engaging in a closer study of the eucharistic sacrifice, sacrifice in general needs to be dealt with in greater detail. A simple and all encompassing definition of sacrifice and its effects cannot be given.[65] Sacrifice seems to arise out of the very fabric of life. It contains praise for the goodness and giftedness of life, an awareness of the joyful costliness of love, the pain of alienation and the reparation needed for reconciliation, the integration of the individual into community, the mystery of the transitoriness

---

2:16: Col 1:20).

[62] This is, of course, especially the theme of the writer to the Hebrews.

[63] Among the many studies, a convenient summary is J. Ratzinger, "Is the Eucharist a Sacrifice?", Concilium 3.4 (1967), 35-40.

[64] See R. Pesch, Das Abendmahl und das Jesu Todesverständnis (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1978). For the connection between Mk 10:45 and 14:24 see M. Hengel, Atonement (London: SCM, 1981), pp. 34f.

[65] A useful summary of general studies on sacrifice and their relation to theology is found in M.F.C. Bourdillon & M. Fortes, Sacrifice (London: Academic Press, 1980).

of human life bounded by birth and death. Virtually every profound element of human experience can only be understood and expressed in sacrificial terms.

Amidst all this variety it is difficult to isolate one element as of greater importance, but perhaps the theme of transformation demonstrates how sacrifice seems always to be about transition through one of the numinous thresholds of human life. The cycle of the seasons is dramatically represented in the various harvest and New Year festivals, thus integrating the natural rhythm of nature with human birth and death. Major changes in the community need to be celebrated as death to the old way of life and resurrection to the new. The individual assuming new status in the community is transformed into a new creature. The smoke rising from the sacrifice indicates the return of the whole of creation back to God, the return of human community into the time of primitive bliss. Fragmentation and hostility give way to harmony and peace. All this is archetypally presented in the life, death and resurrection of Christ understood as one sacrificial, salvific event.[66]

Sacrifice is the way major transitions in the ahistorical are effected.[67] The inherent conflict between the historical and the ahistorical is expressed through sacrifice, and ritual sacrifice is the means of objectifying and dealing with this conflict. The means whereby the historical adapts the ahistorical is through concrete historical action which is often sacrificial in nature. The eucharist as a sacrifice is meant to be an expression of the sacrificial death of Jesus as well as of the church's

---

[66] From the vast literature see R.J. Daly, The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice (London: DLT, 1978); E. Masure, The Christian sacrifice (London: Burns & Oates, 1944), The Sacrifice of the Mystical Body (London: Burns & Oates, 1954); F.C.N. Hicks, The Fullness of Sacrifice (London: SPCK, 1953); and now G.W.E.C. Ashby, Sacrifice (London: SCM, 1988).

[67] Here I follow the thought of Durkheim and Geertz. See C. Bell, "Ritual, Change, and Changing Rituals," Worship 63 (1989), pp. 31-41.

sacrificial, ethical engagement with the ahistorical. As with the anamnesis of Jesus, so also with the eucharist as a sacrifice. It is all too easy for the eucharist to be considered a sacrifice without reference to the basis of the ritual in the ethical sacrifice of Jesus' death, and without considering the implications of the eucharist for Christian ethics.[68] Properly understood the eucharist as a sacrifice is the cultic expression of the sacrifice of Jesus and the means of conforming the church to continue his redemptive, sacrificial action.

Even in the Old Testament, sacrifice, in at least most of its forms, contains a check against its own innate tendency to ignore the historical. The covenant sacrifices, and their derivatives, arose out of historical events and were means of proclaiming the law and ordering the new community according to its demands. In order to achieve this, the sacrifice comprised the death of victim, the proclamation of the law and consent to obey, the ceremonial binding of life together through the blood, all of which are ceremonially celebrated in the sacrificial meal. The meal acted within the ritual as a sacramental sign of the historical consequences of the sacrifice. Expiatory sacrifices are a means of expressing historical alienation and repentance and are the means of effecting reconciliation and restoration of community. Thanksgiving sacrifices returned the gifts of God to the creator and celebrated the giftedness of all of life. Sacrifice was always bound up with life. It is only when the ethical consequences of sacrifice are neglected that sacrifice withdraws completely from the historical into the ahistorical and merits the wrath of the prophets.

When this connection is lost, sacrifice ceases being transformative and becomes oppressive. Without the reciprocity between the historical and the ahistorical in

---

[68] For this theme see G. Wainwright, "Eucharist and/as Ethics," Worship 62 (1988), pp. 123-137.

sacrifice, the sacrifice cannot be about the transformation of human community and individuals. In most of the major controversies over the nature of sacrifice, and the eucharistic sacrifice, this is what has happened.

For instance, when sacrifice is defined almost exclusively in terms of the death of the victim, ignoring the inclusion of the meal and the ethical dimension of the sacrifice as vital parts of the sacrifice, as it has been by most of the Christian tradition, the nature of the eucharistic sacrifice has been seriously misunderstood.

It is probable that Luther was rejecting a particular popular conception of the eucharistic sacrifice which was not the majority theological position at the time.[69] Nonetheless Luther's vehement rejection of the eucharistic sacrifice reveals a deep concern to integrate the offering of ourselves into the eucharist, that is, to give the eucharistic sacrifice a historical dimension. Luther tends to equate sacrifice with a human work, and mistrusts the idea because it seems to be an attempt to manipulate God. Yet, because of his consciousness of the eternal priesthood of Christ and his union with the church he can write:

> We do not offer Christ as a sacrifice, but...Christ offers us. And in this way it is permissable, yes, profitable, to call the mass a sacrifice; not on its own account, but because we offer ourselves as a sacrifice along with Christ.... By our praise, prayer, and sacrifice we move him and give him occasion to offer himself for us in heaven and ourselves with him.[70]

---

[69] See F. Clarke, Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation (London: DLT, 1960), and J.F. McCue, "Luther and Roman Catholicism on the Mass as Sacrifice," in P.C Empie & T.A. Murphy, Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue III (Minnesota, 1967), pp. 45-74. For more sympathetic Lutheran expositions see G. Aulen, Eucharist and Sacrifice (Edinburgh, 1958), and Y. Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical and Catholic (London: SPCK, 1953).

[70] "A Treatise on the New Testament, that is, the Holy Mass (1520)," Luthers Works vol 35 (Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1960), p. 99. See also "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," LW 36, pp. 50f.

Despite the very cultic language, this description is a plea that the eucharistic sacrifice does not stay within the cult, that is, remain ahistorical, but that it includes the sacrifice of the church, that is the historical acts of the church in union with the present Christ.

Similar misunderstandings as those found in Luther have bedevilled the debate within Anglicanism. From the Reformation to the present Evangelicals have tended to follow Luther and suspect the idea of the eucharistic sacrifice as somehow detracting from the uniqueness of the death of Christ,[71] while the Anglo-Catholics have followed the ancient tradition of the Fathers in insisting that the eucharist is a sacrifice which contains and presents the sacrifice of Christ.[72]

The work of the Roman Catholic A. Vonier was very influential. He stated that "the eucharist is not a repetition of the sacrifice, nor is it the completion of the sacrifice; it is simply the sacrifice itself, present in the unique mode of a sacrament."[73] This statement somewhat begs the issue, but reflects the deep seated belief that in the eucharist the sacrifice of Christ is offered to the Father, but not in any way repeating what was done on Calvary. This is only comprehensible if one regards the Cross as a wholly unique event which creates the eternal, and is therefore in a very real way contemporaneous with all time, and that Christ's union with the Church enables the offering of the church to be identified with Christ's own offering. Those who speak of the eucharistic offering

---

[71] For a contemporary exposition of the Evangelical position see D. Gregg, Anamnesis in the Eucharist (Bramcote: Grove Books, 1976).

[72] See E.L. Mascall, Corpus Christi (London: Longmans, 1953), pp. 89ff; A.M. Allchin, "The Eucharistic Offering," Studia Liturgica 1 (1962), pp. 101-114.

[73] A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist (London: Burns & Oates, 1925), p. 96. For similar views see the works of E. Masure, and for more sophistication L. Bouyer, Life and Liturgy (London: Sheed & Ward, 1956).

> do so not because they wish to assert any offering of ours independent of Christ, but because they believe that by the power of the Holy Spirit, the Church's offering of itself on the basis of Christ's redemptive act, is so closely united with Christ's offering of himself, that we can be said to offer him, as he offers us.[74]

This explains why the eucharist has taken on the form of a sacrifice; it is the church's offering of itself, not by itself however, but only in union with Christ's offering of himself. The mystical identity of Christ with the church carries the sacrificial nature of his life through time:

> Just as Christ the Head could enter into his glory only through suffering (Lk 24:26), so his members too continue these suffering unto glory, and he suffers in them until the end of time; his Cross is still mysteriously present where a member of Christ is crucified.[75]

In this way the historical act of Christ is transformed into the eternal, and every truly historical action of the church in every age participates in the one sacrifice of Christ. Such is the inner dynamic and power of Christ at work transforming the ahistorical through tranformative sacrificial love.

---

[74] Allchin, op. cit. p. 114.

[75] K. Rahner, "The Eucharist and Suffering," Theological Investigations 3 (London: DLT, 1967), p. 169.

Chapter 4

The eternal and the eucharist

4.1 The eternal as human value

One of the difficulties of the existential description of our historical existence used in this study is that the many continuities of life can be overlooked or obscured.[1] We live our lives as a continuum in which the adult can look back on the child and recognize a continuity of being. Or, to follow a major new trend in modern theology, we live our lives as part of a narrative interlocking with the stories of the lives of others and of society. As has been indicated, one of the vehicles for continuity is the ahistorical, by which past experience is carried into the present. Serious personal and social crises occur when this continuity is fractured, whether by bereavement, exile, forced removals, or social revolution and war. Such discontinuities reflect major shifts in the ahistorical. But our individual lives do not derive their continuity solely from the ahistorical. We do not move from moment to moment as if each moment were discrete and only connected to the next through the ahistorical; we live oriented through certain core values, which are sometimes mediated through the ahistorical, at other times through human depth itself, or they are even created by the historical. Thus individuals can live through major social dislocations and still retain a personal sense of identity and purpose, or, conversely, an alteration of core values can be a more profound rebirth than any social revolution. Such personal conversions can involve a radical reorientation of the individual, and are

---

[1] See M. Heidegger, Being and Time (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), p. 442.

interpreted usually, but not always, religiously in terms of a new relationship with God.[2]

Such core values can be described as the eternal, but they are not eternal in the traditional, platonic, idealist sense, nor are they abstract principles, but from within any given context they represent the good within the ahistorical and the very ground of authentic human being. Because of the underlying continuity in human being from one moment to another, and even from one society to another, the eternal, even if not existing outside of the historical, can be discerned in the abiding, constant conditions for authentic human life. These will, however, need to be discerned from within each historical setting and the urge to thrust one's own interpretation of authenticity on others will have to be resolutely resisted.

The relativism and pluralism of modern life has rendered the appeal to a set of values problematic: there are so many counter-claims as to which values are the most important. Nonetheless, as A. MacIntyre demonstrates, for the narrative of a life or a society to have any coherence and intelligibility it must be based upon some core values through which one interprets one's life to oneself and can be held accountable by others.[3] Every community will seek the good together and will be directed in this quest by certain core values. The core values of the Christian tradition are to be found in the life of Jesus, and the tradition will have coherence only as it embodies such values, or can be seen to exist in flagrant disregard for such values. It is the task of every generation to rediscover these values

---

[2] For an important attempt to relate conversion to sacramental theology see D.L. Gelpi, Charism and Sacrament. A Theology of Christian Conversion (New York: Paulist Press, 1976).

[3] See A. MacIntyre, After Virtue (London: Duckworth, 2nd ed 1985). For the present purposes values and virtues can be treated as equivalent.

through its hermeneutic of the gospels and to live them historically.[4]

Values do not exist by themselves, but are always contained within or under historical action. Accordingly, the eternal does not exist by itself, but only as embodied in the ahistorical or lived in the historical. Individuals and societies are motivated by a scale of values, which provide meaning and depth to human life, and through which their action is organized. Every community of discourse is, in fact, based upon an organisation of value, which is often buried very deeply in the structure of language, or the myth, itself. Religion is concerned with bringing these values into communal consciousness in order to refine them through renewed engagement with the tradition.[5] The ritual dimension of religion imparts these values to individuals and the community. The ahistorical formulation of the eternal in ritual form should be the means of stimulating the engagement between the eternal and the historical. This dynamic will also occur reciprocally, in that the demands of historical action, directed by the eternal, will necessitate a reformulation of the ahistorical form of the ritual.

4.2 God's eternity and time, the eternal and the historical

Care needs to be taken in the translation of traditional Christian language of God's eternity, understood as either embracing time or outside of time, into existential categories. Religious symbols of eternity may not, in fact, represent the eternal in an existential sense, but may be more appropriately designated part of the ahistorical. Only when they represent the ultimate in human value will they embody the eternal. However, the traditional debate over the relationship between God's eternity and time provides many clues for a delineation of the relationship between the

---

[4] ibid. pp. 218f.

[5] See D. Cupitt, The New Christian Ethics (London: SCM, 1988).

eternal and the historical. In what follows "eternity" will refer to the traditional description of God as eternal, whereas "eternal" will continue to retain the meaning defined for this thesis.

The relationship of God to time is a primary issue in the mythic narrative of Gen 1, where time is created along with the rest of the world. Creatio ex nihilo involves the creation of time. God is therefore not temporal in the same way we are: God's eternity embraces, creates and sustains our time. The enfolding of time by eternity is well represented by the way the creation narrative balances the progression of the days of creation against the constant return of the Sabbath.

The creation of time involves special difficulties: is this act within or outside of time itself? This is probably not the correct alternative and we should rather follow Moltmann in regarding time as originating in the divine resolve.

> The unique transition from eternity to time is to be found in this self-determination of God's. In this essential resolve, God withdrew his eternity into himself in order to take time for his creation and to leave his creation its own particular time.[6]

This divine resolve has traditionally been identified with the Word spoken by God, with the Second Person of the Trinity. In the doctrine of the Trinity we find, then, an attempt to span the divide between eternity and time. The Second Person is not only the mediator of creation, but is also the revealer and ultimately the God-Man. In this way in traditional dogmatics the Trinity presents a model for integrating eternity and time. But the Trinity also provides the link between traditional dogmatics and the existential analysis used here. The Trinity is not simply an expression of eternity. Through the identification of the Second Person with the historical person, Jesus, and by approaching the Trinity as an explanation of the true historicity of Jesus,

---

[6] God in Creation (London: SCM, 1985), p. 114.

the Trinity represents the way the eternal becomes historical in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus.

Further insight can be obtained through a description of the treatment of these issues by both K. Rahner and K. Barth. Rahner is surely correct when he bases his understanding of history on freedom. Where the possibility of self-actualization exists, there is history.[7] Thus, created matter, and the animal world in general, cannot be regarded as existing in history, even though we know it has a beginning and an end and even a genesis from one kind of life to another. Only in human nature is time made into an arena of choice and freedom, and thus only human nature can be said to be historical. History, as we humans apprehend it is a function of our self-actualization and freedom. In a more perfect way than we can comprehend, God contains history within his own being. The intra-Trinitarian relationships express this divine actualization and freedom, and through the person of Jesus the Trinity becomes the ground for human historicity. In this way God can be regarded as holding perfect historicity in his eternity, or, in God the eternal and the historical co-inhere.

There are strong points of contact with the thought of K. Barth. Barth, like Rahner, bases his treatment of history on the divine freedom: "Eternity is the principle of His freedom inwards", while time is "the formal principle of His free activity outwards".[8] This means that, while "eternity is the simultaneity of beginning, middle and end, and to that extent it is pure duration",[9] the existence of order and succession in the Trinity implies the possession of perfect time:

> If in this triune being and essence of God there is nothing of what we call time, this does not justify us in

---

[7] For the following see Foundations of Christian Faith (London: DLT, 1978), pp. 126-175.

[8] Church Dogmatics II.1 (Edinburgh: T & Clarke, 1957), p. 609.

[9] ibid. p. 608.

> saying that time is simply excluded in God, or that His essence is simply a negation of time. On the contrary, the fact that God has and is Himself time, and the extent to which this is so, is necessarily made clear to us in His essence as the triune God. This is His time, the absolutely real time, the form of the divine being in its triunity, the beginning and ending which do not mean the limitation of Him who begins and ends, a juxtaposition which does not mean any exclusion, a movement which does not signify the passing away of anything, a succession which in itself is also beginning and end.[10]

It is through the possession of this perfect time in himself that God can be seen as reaching out through his Word to create the world with time, while retaining an absolute contemporaneity with the whole of created history. The main difference between God's eternity and our history is

> the fact that there is in Him no opposition or competition or conflict, but peace between origin, movement and goal, between present, past and future, between "not yet," "now" and "no more," between rest and movement, potentiality and actuality, whither and whence, here and there, this and that.[11]

Our time, which limits our freedom by placing us in present, past and future, is therefore understood to be an imperfect representation of God's eternity.

Barth's ascription of perfect time to God is important because such an understanding shows how our time can be redeemed. Eternity is the freedom to create the possibility of time and indeed the freedom to become temporal:

> True eternity has the power to take time to itself, this time, the time of the Word and Son of God. It has the power itself to be temporal in Him...When He subjects Himself to time He does freely what He does not have to do. He masters time. He re-creates it and heals its wounds, the fleetingness of the present, and the separation of past and the future from one another and from the present.[12]

---

[10] ibid. p. 615.

[11] ibid. p. 612.

[12] ibid. p. 617.

This is precisely the relationship between the eternal and the historical as defined in this essay. The eternal in any one moment provides the possibility of transformation of the present, whereby the apparent constraints of the past on the present are broken and the apparent impossibilities of the future are made possible thus making the present into an opportunity for new creation. The eternal bears forgiveness as well as hope.

However much this may be illuminating, Barth's exposition does have its difficulties. As R.H. Roberts has shown,[13] Barth never fully passes beyond the position of his Romans in which eternity invades time and obliterates it. The reason for this, Roberts argues, is Barth's insistence on the analogia fidei. Because, in Barth, God is encountered in the eternal act of God's now in the realm of faith, the natural order ceases to have any share in God's "perfect time", and history as such ceases to have any real significance. Although Barth became much more sophisticated in the Church Dogmatics, the analogia fidei remains, thus preventing history from encompassing the natural order. Roberts maintains that Barth's christological solution to the problem fails, indeed it may aggravate the difficulty, because Jesus is described as so perfectly man that he fails ultimately to share our humanity:

> The danger that we encounter in Barth's account is...whether the 'mid-point' really is truly temporal, whether it does in fact determine human time or remains a purely theological construction, in danger of being...a 'dream'.[14]

It is precisely these fears which lie behind modern theologies "from below". Can one begin from eternity and establish true temporality? Perhaps Roberts is right that this is very difficult for Barth because of the rejection of

---

[13] "Karl Barth's Doctrine of Time: Its Nature and Implications," Karl Barth. Studies of his Theological Method ed S.W. Sykes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), pp. 88-146.

[14] ibid. p. 122.

the analogia entis, but it is possible that his insights, which accord well with those of Rahner, can be incorporated into another and more existential theological schema.

Instead, therefore, of regarding the problem as the relationship between God and time, this essay postulates that the Trinitarian solution of eternity and time is a model describing the existential experience of the relationship between the eternal and the historical. In our present now there is a dimension of depth which we can only call the eternal in that our lives are grounded in that aspect of human continuity, in which reside the very preconditions for authentic human life. The traditional treatment of eternity and time indicates our experience of the eternal as providing the basis for the historical. The eternal seems to enfold the historical yet also wells up from within the historical guiding and directing it. Just as the Trinity provides the basis for the relationship of eternity to time, so here the Trinity (understood as an explanation of the historicity of Jesus) indicates the relationship between the eternal and the historical. Every historical moment has the quality of being expressive and of being guided, and in this way can be understood as revelatory of the eternal.

The eternal is, therefore, a quality to the present, or, to use Johannine terms, it is eternal life, life in all its fullness.[15] When every potentiality is realized, when the appropriateness of the hour is discerned, perfect balance is achieved and the present becomes more than a passing moment of time; human life, instead of being borne along in the current of time, seizes time and transforms it.

---

[15] Note R. Bultmann's comment on Jn 1:4a: "(Life)...is not vitality itself, but the power that creates this vitality" (The Gospel of John (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), p. 32).

4.3 The risen Lord as the symbol of the transformative power of the eternal

The life, death and resurrection of Jesus is the representation of God's eternity within time, or, of the way the eternal becomes historical. The resurrection should be regarded in two ways: firstly, the resurrection is declaratory of the true nature of the person of Jesus.[16] That he is the embodiment of the eternal within the historical is only glimpsed from time to time during his life. All the ambiguity of historical action surrounds him. The eternal in the historical is rarely obvious. It has to be discerned and is only seen with the eyes of faith. As on the cross the presence of the eternal is wholly obscured. The resurrection provides the light with which the presence of the eternal on the cross and in the whole life of Jesus can be seen. Secondly, the resurrection displays the abiding consequences of authentic historical action. True historicity transforms the ahistorical to such an extent that it has consequences far beyond the immediate present. The risen Lord declares that his historical action truly creates the eternal and is the basis of all subsequent historical action. The risen Lord is therefore a symbol of the eternal reflecting light back on to the ambiguities of his own history and forward into our own time. The light of the risen Christ can be seen in the life of the historical Jesus in his distinctive and transforming freedom. Jesus is perfectly historical because he is perfectly free, free from sin while being free for all men, free to embrace death and free for eternal life. The various kinds of miracles, the special nature of his relationships, all indicate his freedom from the ahistorical constraints of his time. In the nature miracles the power of the risen Christ is displayed through his command over nature. The faith of Easter is the prism through which the ministry of Jesus is perceived.

---

[16] See the treatment of the resurrection in W. Pannenberg, Jesus - God and Man (London: SCM, 1968), pp. 66ff.

The New Testament cult similarly experiences reality from the perspective of the resurrection, but draws a further conclusion and interprets the present through the expectation of the eschaton. D.E. Aune writes of this experience of time:

> Since the core of Christian existence and experience centred in corporate worship, and the principal phenomenon of this worship was the experience of the merging of the past events of salvation history with the future eschatological fulfillment in the present cultic moment, eschatology and cult must be regarded as inextricably interrelated from the very beginning.[17]

This is especially true of John's gospel, but is essential to every level of the tradition.[18] The Jesus of faith is the pre-existent Word, the man born of Mary, as well as the exalted Lord, and it is not possible to separate any one dimension of his past, present and future from his one presence to faith. He is "the Alpha and the Omega...who is and who was and who is to come, the sovereign Lord of all" (Rev 1:8).[19] "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and for ever" (Heb 13:8). For the New Testament it is precisely because of the eternal nature of his existence that he can be for us in our temporality and be our redeemer; only because of this can he exist within time as a definite, unique, and limited person. The classic phrase in the New Testament which spans the eternal and the uniquely historical is the ephapax of Hebrews. Here the uniqueness of the cross is linked to the eternal intercession of Christ as

---

[17] The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), p. 16.

[18] For instance, Aune shows how this is true of the adaptation of the Son of Man imagery in Acts 7:55f and Mk 14:62, op. cit pp. 94ff.

[19] See the important exegesis of this in K. Barth, Church Dogmatics III.2 (Edinburgh: T & T Clarke, 1960), pp. 465f. Also note how the "to come" replaces the natural reference to the future, thus interpreting history, not as a flow of future through the present into the past, but as conditioned by the advent of the Messiah, see J. Moltmann, God in Creation, p. 133.

high priest. What in the platonic mind set of Hebrews occurs on two levels of reality, is here described in one. The eternal is not the idealisation of the historical, but is the ultimate meaning and purpose of the historical.

It was H. Lietzmann who pointed out that two traditions of the eucharist seem to emerge from the early period, the one focussing primarily on fellowship with the risen Lord, and the other commemorating his death.[20] While one does not have to follow his conclusions as to the origin of the eucharist, his observations remain valid. The shorter Lucan account of the Last Supper reflects the more eschatological type and is carried forward into Acts, being marked by the distinctive phrase "the breaking of the bread". The Didache falls into this tradition since it is a eucharist to the Father, but does not mention either the death of Christ nor the institution at the Last Supper. The Anaphora of Addai Mari likewise reduces reference to the death of Jesus to the minimum, does not contain the words of institution, and, most significantly of all, the prayer appears to be addressed to the risen Christ instead of to the Father as is normative.[21] The Western tradition, represented by Paul, Hippolytus, and the Roman rite, has a much stronger stress on the death of Christ.

The early liturgies which so apparently overemphasize the resurrection indicate how important the experience of the resurrection was for the development of the eucharist. Only glimmerings of this are to be seen in the New Testament itself in the narratives of meals with the risen Christ, whose eucharistic connotations can be demonstrated through

---

[20] Lietzmann's formative work Mass and Lord's Supper (1926) has now been reissued with a monumental commentary by R.D. Richardson (Leiden: A.J. Brill, 1979).

[21] For a detailed account see E.C. Ratcliff, "The Original Form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari: A Suggestion," Liturgical Studies edd. A.H. Couratin and D.H. Tripp (London: SPCK, 1976), pp. 80-90. On this point see p. 85: "This is eucharistia pure and simple.... the rite has no necessary connection with the Last Supper, the connection is rather with the Emmaus Supper."

extra-canonical evidence.[22] The festival meals of the parables of Jesus, the meals of Jesus with sinners, the feeding of the five thousand, the petition in the Lord's Prayer, are all signs of the eschatological banquet with the risen Christ anticipated in the eucharist.[23] The eucharist is the occasion of the prayer "Maranatha" through which the presence of the risen Lord is invoked.[24] The connection of the eucharist with Easter was entrenched through its celebration on a Sunday,[25] which eventually was developed into the centrality of the Easter Pasch for the liturgical cycle as is so beautifully and dramatically presented through the "Blessing of the New Fire and the Lighting of the Easter Candle":

> Christ yesterday and today
> the beginning and the end
> Alpha
> Omega
> all times belong to him
> and all the ages

---

[22] See Lk 24:30f and also Jn 21:13, Acts 10:41, Rev 3:20. The heterodox sources are Clem. Hom. 14:1, Acts of Peter 5, Acts of Jn 106-10, Acts of Thomas 27, 49f, 133; see H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, p. 195ff; O. Cullmann, "The Meaning of the Lord's Supper in Primitive Christianity", Essays on the Lord's Supper (London: SCM, 1958), pp. 8-12, and ibid. Early Christian Worship (London: SCM, 1953), p. 15.

[23] See G. Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology (London: Epworth, 1971), pp. 21-58.

[24] I Cor 16:22 and Rev 22:20. Although this prayer is also directed towards the future coming of Christ, its primary purpose is the experience of Christ in the liturgical assembly; see D.E. Aune, The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity. *Supplement to NovT* 28 (Leiden: A.J. Brill, 1972).

[25] Justin Apol I 67.3. See esp. A.G. Martimort, I.H. Dalmais, P. Jounel (eds), The Church at Prayer - Volume IV: The Liturgy and Time (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986); T. Talley, "Liturgical Time in the Ancient Church: The State of Research", Studia Liturgica 14 (1982), pp. 34-51; and P.G. Cobb, "The History of the Christian Year", The Study of Liturgy eds. C. Jones, G. Wainwright, E. Yarnold (London: SPCK, 1978), pp. 403-419.

to him be glory and power
through every age for ever. Amen.[26]

The presence of the risen Christ at the centre of the eucharist is the central symbol of the eternal. Explicit reference to the risen Lord is found in the liturgies, as in the Sursum Corda. How important this is for the eucharist can easily be demonstrated through reference to the Patristic interpretation of the eucharist, but this also indicates how easy it is for this emphasis to ignore its necessary connection with the historical person of Jesus and the cross. Ignatius of Antioch described the eucharist as the "medicine of immortality, an antidote that you should not die but live forever in Jesus Christ".[27] There is in Ignatius a tendency to underestimate the importance of the historical flesh of Christ, which is probably a result of the struggle with docetism, and which manifests itself here in an overemphasis on union with the risen Lord to the exclusion of present obedience.[28] That this is not a complete surrender to gnostic dualism can be seen in a parallel text: "I desire the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ...and I desire his blood as drink, which is incorruptible love".[29]

In the Alexandrian tradition, in accordance with its dominant Logos christology, the eucharist is thought of as a

---

[26] An Anglican Prayer Book (London: Collins Liturgical, 1989), p. 203.

[27] Eph 20:2.

[28] See H. Köster, "Geschichte und Kultus im Johannesevangelium und bei Ignatius von Antiochen," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 54 (1957), 56-69, and J. Betz, Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter I.1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1955), pp. 86f.

[29] Rom 7:3. For the necessity of faith in the eucharist see Trall 8.1 and Philad 5:1. See also V. Corwin, "The Church and the Sacraments," St Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1960), pp. 189-217, and S.M. Gibbard, "The Eucharist in the Ignatian Epistles," Studia Patristica 8,2 (=TU 93) (1966), pp. 214-218.

means of union with the eternal Logos. So, the early Cyril of Alexandria interprets the eucharist as the way the faithful enter into the union between the Logos and flesh established in the person of Jesus: "And as the Body of the Word Himself is Life-giving, He having made it His own by a true union passing understanding and language; so we too who partake of His holy Flesh and Blood, are quickened in all respects and wholly, the Word dwelling in us Divinely through the Holy Ghost, humanly again through His Holy Flesh and Precious Blood."[30] For Cyril, "every eucharist is a dramatic reincarnation of the Logos who is there again in the body, and whose own flesh is given to the communicant."[31] This must be interpreted through his christology: the early Cyril devalued the soul of Christ and his full humanity, in that the flesh of Christ was simply a vehicle for the Logos. Cyril's position changed considerably through the Nestorian controversy, but his early writings certainly open him to the accusation of Nestorius that "Cyril's doctrine implies that the humanity was transformed into divinity, the body ceasing to be body, so that Christ's humanity no longer has any solidarity with ours."[32] Without judging between the two adversaries, we can note how Cyril emphasizes the eternal transcendent element in Christ and how this is also found in his eucharistic teaching. The implied platonism, with the corresponding devaluation of the historical, is evident in the following: "And if he gives life to that which has been

---

[30] Adversus Nestorius iv.5. Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church. trans. E.B. Pusey. (Oxford, 1881), p. 145. Cyril's theology can be divided into two periods: the early period before the Nestorian controversy, in which he largely reiterates the theology of Athanasius, and the later period of the Nestorian controversy, in which he makes major adjustments and advances to his position (A. Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition rev. ed. (London: Mowbray, 1975), pp. 414-417 and 473ff). The Comm in Io. comes from the earlier phase.

[31] H. Chadwick, "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy", JTS 2(1951), 155.

[32] ibid. p. 157.

corrupted through his unique union with his holy flesh, how much more will we profit from the life giving blessing, when we eat of it? He will truly change those partaking of it into his own good, that is, into immortality."[33]

Perhaps more evocative of the eternal presence of the risen Lord than the words of the rite, or its explanation, is the manner of celebration. The risen Lord is quickly associated with the many timeless elements in the eucharist. Any observer entering into a eucharistic celebration of most Christian traditions will perceive a highly stylized activity, which gains value through almost precise repetition. The presiding clergy as well as the participant laity know what their roles are, which are largely formalized and depersonalized through the wearing of vestments and the use of prescribed movements and texts. This is emphasized in many traditions by the archaic nature of vestments, art, music and architecture. Although modern liturgical reform has largely eliminated linguistic archaisms, this is not without its disadvantages and the criticism of present day conservatives against the use of modern language in the liturgy should not be swept aside too lightly. Archaism presents the participants with a sense of history which makes the liturgical event a bearer of the eternal and adds to its numinosity.[34] Worship must contain an element of mystery, in which the present is confronted with eternity represented through the constancy and stability of the ritual. Worship entails a familiarity with something strange, an easy dwelling within a mystery, in which it is

---

[33] Cyril of Alex, Comm in Ev. Io. vi.53 (PG 23, 361E). Such thought is, of course, not confined to Alexandria, but is found to some extent in all traditions. See, for instance, Gregory of Nyssa, Or. Cat. 37, where the Logos transforms the elements that they should become the means of our divinisation.

[34] See R. Otto, The Idea of the Holy (London: OUP, 1931), p. 67: "(The 'mysterious') finds its most unqualified expression in the spell exercised by the only half intelligible or wholly unintelligible language of devotion, and in the unquestionably real enhancement of the awe of the worshipper which this produces."

realized that the God who is completely other is also the God who knows us intimately. In this way our historicality is brought into harmony with God's eternity.

In the liturgical rite itself, and especially in the eucharistic canon, such bearers of the eternal are very important. Through the repetition of the words of institution at the heart of the celebration, the action is founded upon a historical event, but is given authority and becomes eternal through more-or-less fixed usage down through the ages and in the whole church of the present day.

The relationship of the symbol of the risen Christ, whether presented in the content or form of the rite, to the eternal is complex. As indicated, timelessness does not of itself refer to the eternal; this could equally be the ahistorical. Only when such references to the risen Christ and to the "eternity" of the ritual carry with them authentic human values can they be said to be aiding the historical through its interaction with the eternal. This will happen when the risen Christ is seen as the chief symbol of transformation: he is the crucified raised to life. This is not a natural progression: the new breaks in creating possibilities out of nothing. The risen one also always comes from the future drawing us through apparent impossibilities into his promised glory.

The celebration of the eucharist should not become so contextual and contemporary as to ignore the eternal as manifested in the presence of the risen Lord. This would cut the present off from the very power which it needs for transformation. We can see this as important at three levels, that is, 1) for the sense of meaning in individual lives, transcending the paralysis of guilt and hopelessness and fostering freedom through the transcending of self in worship; 2) for the cohesion and unity of the church, which can take many local forms but still be worshipping the one risen Lord; and 3) as a bearer of universal truths and values, which are basic for any and every contemporary and contextual proclamation of the gospel to society.

However, the eternal in the eucharist provides many dangers. Since it is presented largely within the ahistorical it can be subverted by and used by the ahistorical in legitimating itself. This happens very easily and is found whenever archaisms become allied to social and political conservatism. That this need not be the case is evident from the social radicalism of Anglo-Catholicism at its best.[35] The only way of preventing this subversion of the eternal by the ahistorical is, once again, to insist on the hermeneutic check of the historical, both with reference to the person of Jesus and to the contemporary present. The risen Lord is the power of the cross let loose in the world, and his risen presence is today found, not in the houses of the powerful, but in the shacks of the poor. The liturgical celebration needs to keep its roots in the cross and the experience of dispossession of the poor, while joyfully proclaiming the possibility of transformation through the power of the resurrection. The movement from the world to the risen Christ and back into the world needs to be explicit both in the liturgical form and in its explication.

The resurrection is a symbol of the glorification of all creation, and the eucharist should proclaim this recapitulation in all its facets: the elements represent the material world taken up and united with the risen body of Christ; the eucharistic community is the church, the eschatological representation of renewed human society; the ritual, with its movement, gestures, and art foreshadow the aesthetic beauty of culture expressive of God's glory; individuals experience the forgiveness of sin and are empowered for active participation in the struggle for justice and truth in society in union with the risen Christ. As G. Martelet put it: "The true revolution must emerge from

---

[35] The most famous example is the address by Bishop F. Weston: "You cannot worship Jesus in the Tabernacle if you do not pity Jesus in the slum...." (quoted in K. Leach, The Social God (London: Sheldon Press, 1981), pp. 9f.)

the Lord's Supper, and no one should be able to check the transforming consequences that this mystery imposes on the historic structure of the world."[36]

4.4 The eternal in human depth

Jesus is the perfect expression of the eternal not only because he is the perfect expression of God, but also because he is perfectly human. The eternal, as the ground of authentic human life, addresses us through Jesus but is also to be found (however dimly and in fragmented fashion) within every person. The eucharist should be designed to resonate with this human depth in order to maximise its potential for guiding historical action.

Carl Jung has appealed to modern society to make peace and restore unity with the archetypal images of the divine which exist in the subconscious.[37] Jung has shown how various images reassert themselves in dreams at various times and cultures, thus attesting to a fundamental and universal archetype. The mandala figure is the expression of this universal archetype, which Jung describes as usually taking the form of a circle with a square inside it.[38] Jung argues that ritual and the eucharist in particular should be the means for the realisation of this archetype allowing it to have its proper influence on individuals and community.

Jung regarded the function of ritual and dogma as twofold. Firstly and positively, they represent in a codified and universalized way the universal archetype. In Christian dogma this is taken a step further, in that the eternal becomes historical: the ritual is based upon the

---

[36] The Risen Christ and the Eucharistic World (London: Collins, 1976), p. 183.

[37] See C.G Jung, Modern Man in Search of a Soul (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, 1936), pp. 226-294 for a powerful description of the plight of modern people.

[38] For this see his Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious and Aion, vols 9.1 and 2 of the Collected Works.

historical Christ, who, "lived a concrete, personal, and unique life which, in all essential features, had at the same time an archetypal character."[39] It is this archetypal power of the life of Christ which lifts it out of the ordinary and creates the gospels. The gospel message of Christ is presented in such a way so as to produce resonances with the archetype's form in the psyche of the hearers. There is thus at the same moment a universal and a particular focus:

> Ultimately, every individual life is at the same time the eternal life of the species. The individual is continuously "historical" because strictly time-bound; the relation of the type to time, on the other hand, is irrelevant. Since the life of Christ is archetypal to a high degree, it represents to just that degree the life of the archetype. But since the archetype is the unconscious precondition of every human life, its life, when revealed, also reveals the hidden, unconscious ground-life of every individual. That is to say, what happens in the life of Christ happens always and everywhere.[40]

Jung points out how the dogma of the Trinity, for instance, cannot be the construct of the rational mind, but has to be a particular representation of the universally felt need to present the divine in the form of a triad. However, Jung goes a step further and suggests that the triad needs to be completed into a quaternity. The triad represents the denial or suppression of evil, or the shadow, which needs to be integrated into consciousness, the individual becoming responsible for the negative potentialities within him or her.[41] Jung is, therefore, not

---

[39] C.G. Jung, Psychology and Religion in Collected Works vol 11 Psychology and Religion: West and East ed H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958), p. 88.

[40] ibid. p. 89.

[41] "A Psychological Approach to the Dogma of the Trinity", ibid. pp. 107-200. For a detailed study of Jung's relationship to Christianity see M. Stein, Jung's Treatment of Christianity (Wilmette, Illinois: Chiron Publications, 1985). For Stein's study of the Trinity essay, see pp. 115-134.

orthodox at all, and use of Jung in Christian dogmatics is usually very selective.[42]

The symbols of the subconscious are, for Jung, primarily concerned with integration and transformation: they embrace the contradictions in life and enable the individual either to live with them or to resolve them. The most universal and satisfactory form in which this transformation takes place is in the drama of repentance, sacrifice, and redemption, which is, of course, so central to the Christian faith and the eucharist in particular.[43]

Secondly and negatively, even if necessarily, dogma and ritual provide a barrier and protection against the more disturbing and disruptive elements of the subconscious psyche. By the very codifying of what is right and wrong, experience is ordered, and where order breaks down the ritual provides a means for restoring harmony: "There are any amount of magical rites that exist for the sole purpose of erecting a defence against the unexpected, dangerous tendencies of the unconscious."[44] And "during the last two thousand years we find the institution of the Christian Church taking over a mediating and protective function

---

[42] For "orthodox" Christian interpretations of Jung see, C. Bryant, Jung and the Christian Way (London: DLT, 1983), and M. Kelsey, Christo-Psychology (London: DLT, 1983). A rather more accurate interpretation can be found in J. Garrison, The Darkness of God: Theology after Hiroshima (London: SCM, 1982), pp. 124-171.

[43] ibid. p. 46: "Dogma...aptly expresses the living process of the unconscious in the form of the drama of repentance, sacrifice, and redemption." See especially Jung's essay, "Transformation Symbolism in the Mass", ibid. pp. 201-298. For Stein's discussion of this essay, see op. cit. pp. 135-138.

[44] "Psychology and Religion" p. 18. Also the interesting comment in Modern Man in Search of a Soul, p. 232: "Whenever there is established an external form, be it ritual or spiritual, by which all the yearnings and hopes of the soul are adequately expressed - as for instance in some living religion - then we may say that the psyche is outside, and no spiritual problem, strictly speaking, exists."

between these influences and man."[45] Jung regards direct apprehension of the archetype as potentially dangerous, and regards religion as having an important function in defending us against unmediated and direct religious experience and presenting such experience in a mediated form. This introduces a basic tension into religion, since the essence of religion is immediate experience. Good religion, therefore, has to provide just enough space for its first and positive function to be fulfilled, namely, to mediate the divine archetype, but, secondly, it must exercise just sufficient control to keep the powers of the psyche in check constructively.

The importance of this balance, according to Jung, is quickly discerned through his analysis of the consequences of the Reformation:

> With the demolition of protective walls, the Protestant lost the sacred images that expressed important unconscious factors, together with the ritual which, from time immemorial, has been a safe way of dealing with the unpredictable forces of the unconscious.... In this way Europe became the mother of dragons that devoured the greater part of the earth.....[46] It is not very difficult to see that the powers of the underworld - not to say of hell - which in former times were more or less successfully chained up in a gigantic spiritual edifice where they could be of some use, are now creating, or trying to create, a State slavery and a State prison devoid of any mental or spiritual charm.[47] There are not a few people nowadays who are convinced that mere human reason is not entirely up to the enormous task of putting a lid on the volcano.[48]

Jung, thus, argues for the necessity of myth and ritual in modern society. Only through this can the individual be brought into harmony with the divine, the particular integrated into the universal. But more than this, the

---

[45] ibid. p. 19.

[46] This is a reference to the First World War.

[47] This was written in 1937, and is probably a reference to emerging Nazism.

[48] ibid. p. 47.

archetypes have an important historical function. The fundamental archetype represented in the myth and ritual reaches out from the primitive past into the present orienting the present into the future. Jung would not regard such orientation as prescriptive, but rather as representing the fundamental symbolic content which makes individual and social life possible, and which can only be violated at humankind's own peril.

Jung's treatment of eucharistic symbolism focuses on the sacrificial nature of the ritual as well as on many rather esoteric practices. His major concern is to show how the individual can be identified with the transformation of Christ in his death and resurrection. This is extremely useful, but Jung's attempt to describe the eucharist in terms of his mandala figure appears to be rather forced. It may be that various ritual practices and architecture do represent this archetype, but the majority of eucharistic celebrations do not in fact conform to his pattern in any detail.

While not following Jung in this particular, it is still possible to develop Jung's essay in the following way. The eucharist as a whole would appear to move through the stages of Jungian therapy. The therapeutic relationship is seen to move from history taking, to insight and interpretation, into the struggle leading to transformation. The eucharistic analogue to this is the move from confession to the proclamation of the word, which leads into the eucharistic sacrifice and communion. Essential to the liturgy, likewise, is a counterpart to psychological transference and counter-transference: the liturgy will only work through an identification of the eucharistic symbols with the self and an appropriation of the consecrated symbols to the self. All this is possible because of the exchange basic to the life of Christ, who took our humanity that we might share his divinity.

It is possible to interpret and develop Jung to regard the eucharist not as a representation of the mandala figure,

but as the means whereby the church and individuals within the church are enabled to construct for themselves their own symbol of the eternal. This can be suggested from Jung's own therapeutic practice, and his awareness that the archetype is, in perhaps the profoundest sense of all, historical, in that it roots the present in the accumulated wisdom of the past, and, through a call to integration and wholeness, orients present action constructively into the future. Further, the necessary tension between wholeness and universality on the one hand, and the partial and individual on the other, creates the existential imperative towards present action and fulfillment which prevents the participant from losing him or herself in a mystical absorption into timelessness. Jung is insistent that the archetype needs to be appropriated in every moment by the individual through the seizing of responsibility for the present.

4.5 The eucharist as bearer of eternal values

The eucharist, as the chief symbol of the risen Christ and the Christian community, should impart the central values of the Christian faith. It is probably this which has led several writers to call for a eucharistic spirituality.[49] Much that is insightful has come from these calls, yet the appeal for a eucharistic spirituality is such a truism, one wonders why it is necessary. The eucharist, because it contains and represents the whole salvific act of Christ, simply is Christian spirituality. There is nothing which is not related in some way to the eucharist.[50] Most discussion about spirituality revolves around providing patterns for Christian life appropriate for particular types of

---

[49] See N. Lash, Theology on the Way to Emmaus (London: SCM, 1986), p. 201; J.P. Mackey, The Christian Experience of God as Trinity (London: SCM, 1983), pp. 255ff.

[50] Vatican II, The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Sacrosanctum Concilium 1.2; and Hugh of St Victor, De Sacramentis II.8.1 (PL 176, 461D).

individuals in certain circumstances. This is most necessary, yet all such variations of Christian lifestyle can be included within a eucharistic spirituality. Since the eucharist includes everything, it is almost impossible to delimit what a eucharistic spirituality might be: it is simply the whole Christian faith.

Since the eucharist is transparent to the person of Jesus, any description of the values inherent in the eucharist will bring us directly into the sphere of ethics in general, but eucharistic theology can contribute meaningfully to this task through an exposition of central themes in the eucharistic tradition. Almost by definition such an exposition cannot be complete: it is only half of the dialogue and it is a task always on the way.

The core values of human life can perhaps best be approached through the universal requirements of a newly born baby and the corresponding response of the parents. From this we see the need for the baby to belong to the parents, the necessity for the parents to give warmth, affection, and food to the child. The eucharistic tradition contains much to illuminate the themes of **belonging, nurturing,** and **giving.**

Belonging

The eucharistic community consists of those who have recognized the claim of the love of Jesus: it is the community of the new covenant. The love of God in Jesus is a demonstration that all belongs to him. His all inclusive love reaches out beyond the limits of respectable society to include all and sundry. His love, reaching through the suffering of the cross, indicates that no sin is so weighty that it can separate us from the love of God. The eucharist is primarily a declaration of love by God in Christ.[51]

"This is my blood, the blood of the covenant, shed for many" (Mk 14:24). The eucharist symbolizes the effective

---

[51] For a treatment of the covenant love of God see E. Schillebeeckx, Christ (London: SCM, 1980), pp. 85-100.

love of Jesus through which the new covenant is established (Rm 5:6-11), and whenever we drink of his blood we recognize that we are his vine (Jn 15:1; Did 9:2), his sheepfold (Jn 10:1ff). The intimacy of the common life between Jesus and his church is well represented in the eating and drinking. His very life is given and received: we share in the body and blood of Christ (I Cor 10:16). Having become "in Christ" in baptism (Rm 6:1-11), in the eucharist the mystical union is fed and intensified in a reciprocal mutual indwelling (Jn 15:4).

Christ gives his body on the cross for the church, and continues to do this in the eucharist. By this act of giving the church becomes the body of Christ (I Cor 10:17; 11:29 and 12:12). The connection between the eucharistic body and the church was perhaps first developed by Paul in writing I Cor, but was quickly established in the liturgical tradition in the metaphor of the grains of wheat gathered for the making of bread (Did 9:4), and was developed by Augustine into the theme: "If you receive it well, you will become what you will receive" (Sermo 227). Although Luther understood the theme of covenant in a legal sense rather than the biblical, he still grasped this essential with the fullest clarity. He time and time again returns to the idea of the Lord's Supper as a promise: through the mass we are absolutely certain of this irrevocable promise that he loves us, has forgiven our sins and given us everlasting life.[52]

Because we belong to Christ, we belong to each other. The covenant establishes a community of mutual belongingness in which there are responsibilities and privileges. The eucharist is the means whereby the love of Christ for the church is established between its members: "love one another; as I have loved you, so you are to love one another" (Jn 13:35). "As the Father has loved me, so I have loved you. Dwell in my love. If you heed my commands, you will dwell in my love, as I have heeded my Father's commands

---

[52] "The Babylonian Captivity," Luther's Works 36, p. 40.

and dwell in his love" (Jn 15:10). In this mutual belonging peace is established and maintained (Jn 15:27 and 20:21). The dissensions at Corinth were so offensive because they rent the body of Christ asunder at the point at which it should be most united. The liturgical tradition has entrenched this through the greeting of the peace, which perhaps is to be found even in the New Testament (Rm 16:16; I Cor 16:20; II Cor 13:12; I Pt 5:14), and is clearly liturgical in Justin (I Apol 65:2).

To belong is a primary condition for human life, and perhaps the primal fear is of abandonment.[53] The baby belongs to the mother and father, and in this arm affirmation finds the possibility of being and growth. In later life belonging to a community it equally important to the individual, but is expressed very differently. Inherent in our notion of belonging is the negative element of possession for domination. The covenant love of God claims Israel as God's own, not for domination, but for joyful freedom. The parent claims the child in order that the child should become its full, individual self. Where belonging becomes a claim for domination it becomes demonic.

Jesus' festal meals, and now the eucharist, proclaim the loving claim of Jesus reaching out, as on the cross, to those who are lost and experience life as abandonment and dereliction. The eucharist should also be the place where true belonging is proclaimed in the face of the constant temptation to domination.

In its pastoral discipline the church has to combine the welcoming love of Jesus for the sinner and his demands for repentance. Belonging is not earned, but, nonetheless, it imparts certain responsibilities. Pastoral practice has sometimes tended to obscure the eucharist as a sign of belonging, by making admission to communion a special privilege to the Christian elite. Present debates in

---

[53] See F. Lake, Clinical Theology (London: DLT, 1966), pp. 132ff.

Anglicanism over the relationship between baptism, confirmation and admission to communion are sometimes indicative of this. All the baptized should naturally be welcome at the Lord's table and exclusion from the table should only be for the purpose of defining fundamental obligations of the Christian life.[54]

Nurturing

The infant has a need to belong and to be nurtured. Nurture is an expression of constructive care aimed at growth in all the dimensions of human life, the physical, the emotional, the mental, the aesthetic and the moral. Nurture is particularly expressed in the relationship of parent to child, but it is to found in all healthy relationships, and communities should be structured in order to be maximise the potential for nurture and growth. Baptism into the eucharistic community corresponds to human birth, whereas the eucharist is the means of growth into the fullness of union with Christ.

Nurture is especially associated with food, although the purely physical aspects of nurture are simply the prerequisite for the imparting of culture. The eucharist is food: "My flesh is real food; my blood is real drink" (Jn 6:55). By using the fundamental symbols of human life, food and drink, the eucharist focusses attention on the economic foundations of decent human life. The eucharist should be a constant judgment upon a society in which there is plenty as well as abject poverty. To celebrate the eucharist amongst the wealthy should imply a judgment involving an invitation to a simpler lifestyle and an awareness of the need to share. To celebrate the eucharist among the poor may involve thanksgiving for what one has and a willingness to co-operate in order to provide the basic necessities of life. The eucharist is a communal activity which should celebrate

---

[54] For a radical treatment of this theme, see J. Moltmann, The Church in the Power of the Spirit (London: SCM, 1977), p. 245.

the way production is more efficient when organised communally than by each individual acting separately. As such, the eucharist is the perfect medium of worship in any community development project and in "basic Christian communities".

The eucharist is celebrated with bread and wine, both products of human civilisation and culture. Proper human life needs far more than just physical food. Dignity is given to life through creative work, play and art. These too need stimulating and can be expressions of nurture. The form of the eucharistic gathering, its music, ceremonial and artistic content all impart human value and lift life out of the basic and humdrum into the richness of the festival. The festal character of life is symbolised by the wine sanctified through the story of the miracle at the wedding at Cana. In primitive religions festivals are times of crisis in that in them the possibilities for good and evil are maximized. That the aid to festivity, such as wine, can itself become a social curse is a parable of the intrinsic ambiguity of human life and of our potential for good and evil. In communities in which alcoholism is rampant it does make sense to substitute the wine with something else, but it is still necessary to maintain the festal character of the eucharist.[55]

Nurture takes place in an atmosphere of joy and celebration; it is doxological in character. Nurture implies a glimpse of possibilities and an infusing of ability and confidence to achieve these possibilities. The model of Jesus portrayed in the eucharist in the gospel and in the eucharistic enactment of his life, death and resurrection provides the paradigm of human possibility, and the eucharistic food provides the strength and energy for growth towards that goal, that we may all "attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature

---

[55] For the importance of festival see H. Cox, The Feast of Fools (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1969), and God in Creation (London: SCM, 1986), pp. 303f.

manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph 4:13).

Giving

In order for relationships of belonging and nurturing to avoid domination they should be characterized by free and joyful giving. The parent gives to the child and the child learns slowly to overcome instinctive self concern and to give in response. Indeed the goal of nurture is training in sacrificial love, which is characterised by giving.

Belonging by itself fails to define the individual. Individuality arises out of concern for self and concern for others. Christian love, as epitomized on the cross and enacted in the eucharist, constantly calls us to define ourselves, not through self concern, but through the ability to give. This "anthropological revolution" redefines selfhood and subjectivity in terms of the other instead of the self.[56] Such a definition of self in terms of the possibility of giving is only possible once the fear of death, which lies at the heart of grasping self concern, is overcome.[57] In facing the fear of death the individual becomes able to overcome the natural distrust of the other and move towards affirming the other as belonging. Such free giving empowers the other in turn to face the undertow of selfishness, so closely tied up with fear of death, and to move towards constructive being and action.

The eucharist graphically represents this overcoming of selfishness by Jesus, and by the act of identifying with his death, enables the Christian to move towards a life more closely modelled on his giving of self. Jesus took, blessed,

---

[56] See J.B. Metz, The Emergent Church (London: SCM, 1981), pp. 34-47). For similar thought incorporating insights from feminist theology see F. Edwards, "Neo-Feminist Spirituality: An Evolutionary Perspective," Journal of Theology for Southern Africa 66 (1989), pp. 53-61.

[57] See, for instance, R. May, Power and Innocence (London: Fontana, 1976).

broke and gave the bread (Mk 6:41; 14:22) so symbolizing his whole life. Jesus is the gift of his Father's love to the world (Jn 3:16). Given as a sign of love, he is given over through betrayal to wrongful trial and execution (Jn 13:11; I Cor 11:23). The poured out blood and the tortured body are represented in the eucharistic wine and bread which we receive in order to enable us to overcome our fear of death. Through the transformation of death into life in the resurrection, we, in receiving the symbols of the passion, are enabled to overcome our instinctive destructiveness and participate in the new life of Jesus.

The gift of the life of Jesus is perceived by the eucharist to be the ultimate expression of the giftedness of the whole of creation. The Jewish benedictions lie behind Jesus' own act of blessing, and the eucharistic consecration is properly understood not as something done to the elements, but as a recognition of their representing the giftedness of all of life.[58] When all things are perceived as given, then nothing is possessed, and we are freed to perceive life as through the eyes of Jesus, who could marvel at the lilies of the field and the birds of the air (Mt 6:25ff).

Giving of self is a recognition of the giftedness of self and that all things acquire value by being gifted. Liturgically the truth of giving is represented in the offertory, which is the beginning of the sacrificial cycle of consecration and transformation. Giving itself is the driving force which transforms death into life, and in the eucharist our giving is evoked by and united to the fundamental gift of the life of Jesus on the cross.

Giving involves serving. Giving can still be paternalistic and lack serious involvement; service, however, can only be performed from a position of humility and self abnegation. The eucharist treats giving as service

---

[58] For a rhapsodic treatment of this theme see T de Chardin, The Hymn of the Universe, (London: Collins Fontana, 1970).

as is seen in the parable of the washing of the feet in Jn 13, which is an attempt to recapitulate the whole life, death and resurrection of Jesus. By giving his life for his friends, Jesus gives us an example: "In very truth I tell you, a servant is not greater than his master, nor a messenger than the one who sent him. If you know this, happy are you if you act upon it" (Jn 13:17). So important is this that it has found its place in the Lucan tradition: "The highest among you must bear himself like the youngest, the chief of you like a servant.... Here am I among you like a servant" (Lk 22:26f). The Maundy Thursday Liturgy displays this dimension of the eucharist, but it is an important theme which should never be ignored in a world whose power structures are based upon domination and oppression rather than service.

* * * * * *

Belonging, nurturing and giving correspond to three basic elements in the experience of Jesus himself. He knew the belonging and nurturing of an earthly family and there learnt how to give. Theologically this is expressed in his knowledge of the love of his Father, the indwelling of the love of the Holy Spirit, and his own sacrificial love expressed on the cross. The eucharist, by uniting us with Christ brings us into the mystery of the Trinity, and by so doing, brings us face to face with the eternal.

Chapter 5

The Holy Spirit as the power of the eternal in the historical

The eternal manifests itself through the historical, and by so doing adapts the ahistorical. For the eucharist to be one of the main ways in which this happens in the church, the Anamnesis needs to be have two poles: on the one hand, the earthly Jesus needs to be remembered as a truly historical person, and, on the other hand, that remembrance needs to empower and drive our present historical living of the eternal. The link between these two poles consists of the abiding presence of Christ, the risen Lord, ruling the church through the Spirit, which should be considered to be the power by which the eternal becomes historical. A particular pneumatology will, therefore, be essential for the eucharist to be considered in this way; without this the two poles of the Anamnesis will not be held together, and the eucharist will fail to be an embodiment of the eternal in the historical.

This chapter begins with a short exposition of this understanding of the Spirit. Then the relationship between the Words of Institution and the Epiclesis in the eucharist will be examined, in order to demonstrate how their relationship carries forward this understanding of the Spirit. This will lead into a discussion of the real presence.

5.1 The Spirit of the crucified Christ

There is no doubt that the New Testament church experienced the Spirit as the source of its life and power. It is through the Spirit that the risen Lord becomes present in and rules the church.[1] The Spirit is considered as having

---

[1] See C.K. Barrett, The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: SPCK, 1947), and J.D.G. Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit (London: SCM, 1975); also J.V. Taylor, The Go-Between God (London: SCM, 1972).

a dual relationship to Christ, in that the Spirit derives from and relates the church to the risen Christ, and the Spirit has its goal in Christ as it impels the church in its mission towards the fullness of all things with Christ at the eschaton. These two dimensions of the Spirit's work are now considered in more detail.

One of the conflicts in the New Testament church concerning the Spirit arises out of the tendency to minimize the connection between the experience of the Spirit in the church and the cross of Christ. When this happens the connection between the risen Christ and the cross is severed.

Paul's critique of the "enthusiasm" of elements within the Corinthian congregation is an example of this.[2] Paul, who is notoriously disinterested in the plain historical details of Jesus, still roots his theology in the cross and refuses to be drawn into a pure theologia gloriae, thus indicating his awareness, within his own theological framework, of the importance of the historical. The Corinthians were proposing a Christianity which emphasized ecstatic experience at the expense of normal ethics and as a means of by passing the demands of a theologia crucis. Paul's response is firmly to relate the Spirit to the church as the body of Christ and to place the eucharist at the centre of the church's life in a way which emphasizes its origins in the conflicts of the passion.[3] Elsewhere Paul attacks the same kind of enthusiasm: "We are God's heirs and Christ's fellow-heirs, if we share his sufferings now in order to share his splendour hereafter",[4] about which E. Ksemann writes: "Where Christ is present in the Spirit, we can in no way escape following the Crucified. The enthusiastic premises of the section lead to

---

[2] For this interpretation of I Cor see H. Conzelmann, I Corinthians (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

[3] See. E. Käsemann, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Last Supper," Essays on New Testament Themes (London: SCM, 1964).

[4] Rm 8:17; see also 2 Cor 13:4.

a markedly anti-enthusiastic conclusion".[5] For Paul, the Spirit is the power of the resurrection, but not the means of escape from the cross. Between virtually all the major antinomies in Paul's thought, between death and life, wrath and freedom, law and grace, we can discern the transforming power of the Spirit. "Now the Lord is the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom".[6] It is permissible therefore to move beyond Paul's own understanding, and to describe the Spirit as the eternal possibility in every moment prompting truly historical action by making the cross of Christ alive in our action today.

Wherever this kind of enthusiasm is found there is a breakdown of morality. Various moral disorders abounded at Corinth as did oppression of the "weaker" members of the church. In order to establish a basis for sound ethics Paul has to relate the gifts of the Spirit to the cross. Whenever this connection is broken, sin appears to prevent the eternal becoming historical. All too easily the experience of the Spirit is, in fact, delusory, and, as the major spiritual writers of the church insist, the only check on whether or not an experience is of God is whether it has its historical counterpart in a more holy life.[7]

In the New Testament the Spirit also impels the church in its mission in the world towards Christ in the eschaton. The Spirit is the "first fruits" or "guarantee" of the promised glory.[8] In this way the Spirit continues the manner

---

[5] Romans (London: SCM, 1980), p. 229:

[6] 2 Cor 3:17. For commentary, see V.P Furnish, II Corinthians (New York: Doubleday, 1984), pp. 234ff.

[7] See Teresa of Avila, The Life of Saint Teresa tr J.M. Cohen (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1957), p. 76ff, where, in the parable of the gardener, the flowers are the virtues; the concern for discernment of spirits is prominent in John of the Cross, Ascent of Mount Carmel tr. E. Allison Peers (London: Burns & Oates, 1983), e.g. p. 139 and in Ignatius of Loyola.

[8] 2 Cor 1:22, 5:5; Rm 8:23; Eph 1:14.

of relating past, present and future in the preaching of Jesus. The Spirit anticipates the future in the present and draws the present forward. This dimension of the working of the Spirit has a cosmic element and is a continuation of the Old Testament theme of the activity of the Spirit in creation.[9] The Spirit enters into and transforms the broken and dead giving them healing and new life.[10] The transforming power of the Spirit embraces the whole creation and directs all things towards their consummation in Christ.[11]

As indicated in chapter 2, the eschatological vision held out to the church is one of the chief embodiments of the ahistorical. When the Spirit is seen as the power directing the church in its mission in the world to effect this vision, we perceive how the Spirit, through becoming historical transforms the ahistorical. The ahistorical eschatological vision can, however, become perverted if it does not remain in touch with the suffering of Christ on the cross. The Spirit must remain the Spirit of the crucified Christ.[12]

5.2 The Words of Institution and the Epiclesis

Such a historical understanding of the Holy Spirit will be expressed in the eucharist in terms of a close connection between the Words of Institution, which correspond to the cross, and the Epiclesis, which is recalls Pentecost. In order for this to happen the Epiclesis cannot be considered to be just one, distinct moment in the eucharist: the whole eucharist is epicletic in character, in that it is an invocation of the Spirit to enter into our present through

---

[9] See Gen 1:1. The Spirit is also related to OT Wisdom.

[10] See Ez 37.

[11] See H. Mühlen, "Die Kirche als die geschichtliche Erscheinung des übergeschichtlichen Geistes Christi," Theologie und Glaube 55 (1965), 270-289.

[12] See J. Moltmann, The Church in the Power of the Spirit p. 64.

the symbols of the passion enabling it to be a truly historical moment. All the various dimensions of the eucharistic canon have an epicletic character:

> Their common aim is to realize the Christian mystery, that is, to extend to the Body of Christ, the Church, the salvation, deification and membership that Christ himself has gained for us through his incarnation, his death, his resurrection and glorification through the Spirit, and finally the gift of Pentecost.[13]

The Epiclesis should be regarded as as extension of the Anamnesis, indeed it is the invocation of the eternal, which was present in the past action of Christ, to become once more present in the assembled church. The purpose of the Spirit is that the risen Christ, bearing the marks of his passion, should live on in his people. The developed Epiclesis has a double intention: it is consecratory both of the elements and the assembled church. The eucharist "Spirit-izes" the bread and wine in order that the church should be "Spirit-ized".[14] In this way both Christ and the church are bound up together in the one action of the eternal becoming historical.

But, just as in Paul's rejection of the enthusiasts' understanding of the Spirit, care needs to be taken that this epicletic interpretation of the eucharist does not begin to avoid the cross. All too easily "Spirit-ized" can be interpreted as divinized in the sense of avoiding the present harsh realities of life. It is, however, the nature of the Spirit to be instrumental in the incarnation of Jesus, in driving him into the wilderness to be tempted, in his exorcisms and healings. Similarly, for the present church to be divinized means deep and agonized involvement in the present. The invocation of the Spirit in the eucharist should, therefore, be closely associated with the

---

[13] Y. Congar, I Believe in the Holy Spirit vol 3 (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983, p. 229.

[14] J.H. McKenna, Eucharist and Holy Spirit The Eucharistic Epiclesis in 20th Century Theology (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon/Alcuin, 1975), p. 202.

Anamnesis and direct the church in its costly mission in the world. Indications of this connection are to be found in the eucharistic tradition, but various cross currents do obscure the central insight from time to time.

In the very early church the distinction between the risen Christ, the Logos and the Spirit was not very clearly established. It is, therefore, possible to pursue this analysis sometimes referring to the relationship of the risen Christ, or the Logos, to the Words of Institution.

In many early eucharists the risen Christ virtually obscures the historical Jesus. As has been demonstrated, in those traditions which looked back for the origins of the eucharist to meals with the risen Christ the dominance of the resurrection virtually obliterated references to the Last Supper and the cross. Here the Words of Institution are not found, or are perhaps only obliquely referred to.[15] In these traditions the eucharist is primarily the locus for encounter with, or expectation of, the risen Christ. That many of these communities were heterodox or even gnostic associates this type of eucharist with a christology which does not account adequately for the humanity of Christ.

The origins of the Epiclesis in this very early period are difficult to discern with certainty. The debates between J.W Tyrer, R.H. Connoly, O. Casel, F. Nötscher and J. Betz reveal the variety of nuances that can possibly be given to the evidence.[16] Probably the Epiclesis originally arose out of elements in the Jewish berakoth, and involved the invoking of a name upon a person or a thing: "Implied in this naming, however, was an appeal that the person invoked be actively, effectively present to, and in a sense take possession of, the person or thing upon which he was invoked."[17]

---

[15] See above ch 4.

[16] See McKenna, pp. 92-96.

[17] McKenna, p. 101.

In the **very early liturgical data** (see above p. 108 n.22) in the heterodox sources this invocation is solely of the risen Lord or of his coming again, but in the mainline tradition the very presence of the Words of Institution in the eucharist gives the invocation a historical content.

However, there is considerable ambiguity as to the significance of the Words of Institution. Even in I Corinthians the possibility exists that the Words of Institution are more explanation of the ritual than actual liturgy,[18] and this is even more probable in the evidence from Cyril of Jerusalem, whose eucharist may have been closer to the Addai and Mari type than the texts first suggest.[19] In the Roman tradition, represented by Hippolytus and Justin, the Words of Institution are much more thoroughly integrated into the eucharist but their precise significance needs careful investigation.

A close study of the Words of Institution in Justin reveals a slight doubt as to their liturgical use, adaptations of form which remove them from their historical origin, and a theological conflict between the reliance on the historical tradition and Justin's Logos theology.[20] The precise function of the Words of Institution cannot be conclusively established because of ambiguities in the interpretation of I Apol 66:2: "so also the food is

---

[18] See, A. Farrer, "The Eucharist in I Corinthians," in R.E. Clements (ed), Eucharistic Theology: Then and Now (London: SPCK, 1968).

[19] In Addai and Mari the allusion to the Last Supper gives the authority upon which the church celebrates the eucharist, and as such is similar to Hippolytus (Dix, Shape, p. 181), but such a cursory allusion cannot fulfill the same function of rooting the action in the historical context of the Last Supper. For Cyril and the words of institution see Dix, pp. 197f.

[20] E.C. Ratcliff has noted that the form of the words of institution in Justin is a compilation from Mt and Lk and could be reliant on Tatian's Diatessaron: "The Eucharistic Institution Narrative of Justin Martyr's First Apology," in Liturgical Studies (ed. A.H.Couratin & D.H.Tripp) (London: SPCK, 1976), p. 43.

eucharistized through the word of prayer which (who) is from him". This could be a reference to the Words of Institution or to a Logos Epiclesis.[21] Even if the Words of Institution were used in the rite itself, their actual form (similarly Irenaeus[22] and Hippolytus) reveals a lack of interest in the historical event. Ratcliff comments:

> The collective effect of these instances of the omission (in Justin and Hippolytus) is the implication that the Last Supper, the occasion and background of the institution of the Eucharist, was of little or no importance in early thinking about the Eucharist either as sacrament or as rite. In the liturgical tradition of Justin's time and of the period immediately after him the Lord's bread and cup appear in detachment from their historical setting.[23]

We do not have to look very far to find the reason for this. The eucharistic consecration would appear to be viewed in the light of Justin's Logos theology. In the second century no clear distinction was made between the Logos and the Spirit,[24] and the result is an association of the eucharistic consecration with the incarnation.[25] In the eucharist, once again the Logos becomes flesh. Such a schema must devalue the original incarnation, and the historical

---

[21] See O. Perler, "Logos und Eucharistie nach Justinus I Apol c.66," Divus Thomas 18 (1940), 296-316; J.H. McKenna, Eucharist and Holy Spirit, pp. 50f.

[22] See Irenaeus, Adv Haer. iv.17.5.

[23] op. cit. p. 46.

[24] Justin does use Trinitarian formulae, but they are all liturgically related and are not integrated into his basic philosophy, see I Apol 61:3, 61:13, 65:3, and 67:2; for this in Justin see E.R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr (Jena, 1923), p. 186 and L.W. Barnard, Justin Martyr (Cambridge: CUP, 1967), p. 105. An interesting chapter in the development of a proper distinction between the Logos and the Spirit is found in Theophilus, who in the interpretation of Prov 8:22 relates Wisdom to the Spirit, see Ad Autolychus I:7, II:10 and 18. For more detail see my "The Logos, Trinity and Incarnation in Early Greek Apologetics," unpubl MA thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 1977.

[25] See. N.S. Clark, "Spirit Christology in the Light of Eucharistic Theology," The Heythrop Journal 23 (1982), 270-284.

context becomes even less important when the first incarnation is not viewed particularly historically. In Justin's understanding of the incarnation there is little room for the historical person, in that the Logos does not assume a body or take on humanity.[26] As E.R. Goodenough states:

> The Christ was truly a man. He became anthropos en anthropois not anthropos ex anthropôn. His blood was not from the human race but from the power of God.... the process of man-becoming took place in the womb of the Virgin, but his blood was not made from Mary's blood, His flesh was not her flesh...Christ was a new creation, like the first creation of old, made directly by God.[27]

In Justin, therefore, we find a situation of some conflict. His underlying theological schema does not leave much room for a concern with the historical person of Jesus, yet there is a thoroughly orthodox awareness that the historical person is important. This leads to the inclusion of the Words of Institution into the eucharist, but there are indications that they occupy a fairly formal position with the eucharist being considered more as a reincarnation of the Logos than based upon the historical action of Jesus.

There is simply not enough evidence to say whether or not Irenaeus used the Words of Institution, but the probability is that his rite was rather similar to Hippolytus.[28] Irenaeus presents a eucharist which has a Logos Epiclesis, but which attempts to avoid the resultant dehistoricizing of the eucharist through his stress on the

---

[26] Jasper and Cuming, in Prayers of the Eucharist p. 19, translate the relevant part of the liturgical text, "took flesh and blood for our salvation," which is incorrect and misleading.

[27] The Theology of Justin Martyr (Jena: Walter Biedermann, 1923). p. 242; most of the evidence for these views comes from I Apol 33, but see also I Apol 46.5 and Dial 139.4.

[28] See E.C. Ratcliff, "The Sanctus and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora," Liturgical Studies, ed. A.H. Couratin & D.H. Tripp (London: SPCK, 1976), p. 26, who describes Irenaeus as the bridge between Justin and Hippolytus.

sanctification of creation.[29] His strongly anti-docetic Logos theology manifests itself in the eucharist in his references to the way the eucharist feeds even "the substance of our flesh", and by the way denial of the "flesh of the gift of God" denies the hope of the resurrection of the body and of the goodness of the whole of creation. In this way, just as the inherently dangerous Logos/sarx christology of Irenaeus is saved from its potential dangers, so also his eucharistic theology enables a dynamic engagement of the Word made flesh with the church's "fleshly" present, but at no stage is the eucharist related to the historical circumstances of the Last Supper and therefore doubt must remain whether our fleshly present would be interpreted historically.

One has to be extremely careful over the text of Hippolytus especially in the final two sections which may or may not contain an Epiclesis.[30] There are strong grounds for the thesis that the original prayer concluded not with an Epiclesis at all, but with the sanctus, which can be considered to be one of the forebears of the Epiclesis.[31] Although not probable, it is still possible that many features of Hippolytus owe their provenance to the fourth century. Here the text as in Jasper and Cuming's Prayers of

---

[29] See Adv. Haer iv.18.5 and v.2.2-3. Another relevant text is a reference to a prayer of invocation in Adv. Haer I.13.2.

[30] See McKenna, op. cit. pp. 20f, who, together with Dom Botte, regards the prayer for the Holy Spirit upon the church as authentic. The main reason for possible excluding it is that it is missing in The Testament of our Lord. Also see R.H. Connolly, "The Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus," Journal of Theological Studies 39 (1938), 350-69, and C.C. Richardson, "The so-called epiclesis in Hippolytus," Harvard Theological Review 40 (1947), 101-8.

[31] See E.C. Ratcliff, op. cit. But H. Chadwick seems to prove that the Sanctus was not used in the eucharist in Rome prior the fifth century (See G. Dix, The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome ed H. Chadwick (London: SPCK, 1968), p. h.). Ratcliff's argument is that a primitive conclusion with a sanctus was suppressed, and that only later did the Sanctus return taking its place after the Preface. Dix (op. cit.) also argues that the original did not include the epiclesis.

the Eucharist is presumed. In this rite the redemptive sacrifice of Christ is so dominantly in the forefront that one is left with no doubt that the victorious presence of Christ in the Church is a result of his death:

> Fulfilling your will and gaining for you a holy people, he stretched out his hands when he should suffer, that he might release from suffering those who have believed in you. And when he was betrayed to voluntary suffering that he might destroy death, and break the bonds of the devil, and tread down hell, and shine upon the righteous, and fix the limit, and manifest the resurrection.[32]

The Words of Institution are followed by a definite Anamnesis: "Remembering therefore his death and resurrection". This establishes without any doubt the basis of the rite, but it must be pointed out that the death of Christ is not interpreted historically in the sense of this study. The soteriology in view has been well documented by G. Aulen and, because it does not seriously grapple with the humanity of Christ, but views his death almost exclusively as the action of God in him, his death can hardly be called truly historical.[33] The framework of thought in which Hippolytus is expressed prevents the Words of Institution becoming a truly historical reference, but the pattern of the prayer is open to a more historical interpretation.

Hippolytus is the first prayer in which the Words of Institution are clearly related to an Epiclesis, and the main intention of the Epiclesis is not consecratory but it is a prayer for fruitful communion.[34] Thus the intention of the rite is not towards the creation of a sacramental presence, but towards the mediation of Christ's victory on the cross to the church. The prayer for a fruitful communion

---

[32] Jasper and Cuming, p. 22.

[33] See Christus Victor (London: SPCK, 1934).

[34] See McKenna op. cit. pp. 20ff. One of the major elements in establishing the text is Hippolytus's theology of the Spirit (see Connolly op. cit. p. 363). One of the possibilities is that there was here a Logos epiclesis which later tradition has "rectified".

is the second pole of the Anamnesis, in which the church opens herself to the consequences of the recalling of the past and thus making that act of recollection a truly historical event. The power of the eternal in the past becomes present and once again historical. By including the Words of Institution and the Epiclesis as a prayer for fruitful communion the anaphora of Hippolytus is the ancient eucharistic prayer most amenable to a historical interpretation. It is, therefore, not surprising that in our historical age there has been a widespread return to the Hippolytan rite.[35]

We see, then, how the Logos speculation made it difficult to view the Words of Institution as a reference to the truly historical dimension of the Last Supper as a basis for the church's eucharist, also how the lack of a clear pneumatology made it difficult to establish a presence of Christ in the eucharist which is both related to the historical Jesus and the resurrection. Both the historical Jesus and the eucharist tend to become manifestations of the same Logos. This must necessarily undermine the dependence of the eucharistic presence upon the historical Jesus. Justin minimizes the difficulty through the use of the Words of Institution; Hippolytus does the same and adds his contribution, namely an Epiclesis which is directed towards the sanctification of the faithful thus adding a dynamism into the historical present.

The Alexandrian eucharistic tradition is largely hidden from us until the fourth century.[36] Perhaps the most interesting expression of the result of the Logos/sarx

---

[35] It is unfortunate that such resurrections of the Hippolytan rite have failed to do proper justice to the problem of the text, and. for instance, insist on including a Sanctus in the middle of the prayer (see, for instance, the new eucharistic rites of the CPSA, An Anglican Prayer Book (London: Collins Liturgical, 1989), p. 129f).

[36] Some of the relevant earlier texts are Clement of Alex Paed. II.2, and Origen Comm on Mt xi.14, Comm on I Cor. xi.34 (quoted in Journal of Theological Studies 9 (1908), p. 502).

christology on the eucharist is the startling glimpse we get of the eucharistic thought of Apollinaris.[37] In a strict parallel with his christology, where the humanity of Christ becomes one phusis with the Logos, the elements were regarded by Apollinaris as assumed into a consubstantial union with the Logos, and by participation in the eucharist the communicants take this divinity into themselves in a very physical way. The intention of Apollinaris was to regard the eucharist as an extension of the historical incarnation, but the result is to dehistoricize both the incarnation and the eucharist. The result is a eucharist which is understood as an irruption of the divine into the present, not so much to sanctify the present moment, but to lift the present into divinity. Just as the light of the resurrection dispels the gloom of Calvary, so too the eucharist completely dominates the sacrifice of the church promising her divinization, not through the moral perplexities of identification with Christ's sacrifice, but through faith union with the risen Christ.[38] Many of these elements can be discerned in Serapion and even more in Cyril of Alexandria.

The authenticity of the anaphora of Serapion has been contested,[39] but it probably reflects the liturgical usage of

---

[37] For the texts see H. Lietzmann, Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule (Tübingen, 1904), fr. 116 and 155. Critical comment is found in W.H. Bates, "The Background of Apollinaris's Eucharistic Teaching," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 12 (1961), 139-154.

[38] For further details see T.F. Torrance, "The Mind of Christ in Worship: The Problem of Apollinarianism in the Liturgy," in Theology in Reconciliation (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1975), pp. 139-214.

[39] Dom B. Botte has argued from the many indications of Arian language that it could not have originated from Serapion, the friend of Athanasius. This argument was already rebutted in J. Wordsworth, Bishop Serapion's Prayer Book (London: SPCK, 1923), and recently by J.H. Crehan, "Eucharistic Epiclesis: New Evidence and a New Theory," Theological Studies 41 (1980), pp. 699f.

Egypt and the milieu out of which Arianism grew.[40] Serapion includes a Logos Epiclesis, which is the culmination of the tradition already sketched, and is the last such prayer before the doctrinal question begins to be resolved.[41] Serapion reflects the position with respect to the Spirit which prevailed prior to the Arian and the pneumatomachian controversies.[42] The prominence of platonic categories in the prayer together with the Logos Epiclesis combine with the rather strangely separated and formalized repetition of the Words of Institution to give a prayer in which the historical person and the death of Jesus have little significance. The bread and wine become the likeness of the holy body/blood, thus using terminology which will always tend to make the ultimate reality refer to a transcendental truth.[43] In Serapion we discover a dead end in eucharistic theology. This is a remnant of the theology which has to be swept away with Arianism, and we must look to other sources for new beginnings.

The theological ferment in Alexandria associated with the rejection of Arianism coincides with great strides in the development of the eucharistic liturgy, although we have some difficulty in dating all the developments, because the various fragments of liturgies of the Alexandrian type

---

[40] Signs of rather crude editing of the final form of the prayer remain revealing it to be a composite from different origins. For some of the details see H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, pp. 157f. Also L. Bouyer, Eucharist, p. 208.

[41] It is possible that the Logos epiclesis in Serapion is not originally Egyptian. Whether or not it was included into the text before, by or after Serapion, we cannot tell, but it does not form part of the usual Egyptian pattern, where the epiclesis is a development of the Sanctus and follows it immediately (see Bates, op. cit. pp. 146f).

[42] It is Athanasius' reply to Serapion which paved the way for the fourth century development in its pneumatology (see esp. Ep. ad Serapionem I.48 (PG 26, 536ff)).

[43] See A. Gerken, "Dogmengeschichtliche Reflexion über die heutige Wende in die Eucharistielehre," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 94 (1972),p. 204.

cannot be dated with certainty.[44] From points of contact between the Liturgy of St Mark and what we know of Cyril of Jerusalem we can safely assume that something like St Mark was in use in Alexandria by the late fourth century.[45] This Liturgy has a strong doxological tone arising from the introduction of a hymn of praise to God the creator in the preface. The prayer then continues with extended intercessions, which culminate in the sanctus. The first Epiclesis follows in the characteristic Egyptian manner, thus connecting the glory of the whole creation with the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. The Words of Institution lead to a formal Anamnesis which carefully separates the death, resurrection, ascension and second coming. The sequence is followed with a developed second Epiclesis, which corresponds to Pentecost, and which has a double intention, namely the sanctification and consecration of the bread and a prayer for a fruitful communion. The result is a very well balanced rite in which the death and resurrection of Christ neatly complement each other, and the purpose of which is the glorification of all creation through the church's faithful union with Christ in the eucharist and in mission. There would not appear to be any one moment of consecration; indeed, there are three parts to the consecration: the first Epiclesis, the Words of Institution and the second Epiclesis. But the intention would not appear to be solely directed towards the production of consecrated elements, but upon the dynamic movement of God through creation, through the death and resurrection of Christ, through the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, towards the glorification of all. By linking consecration to the Trinitarian schema (creation in the Sanctus, redemption in the Words of Institution, and sanctification through the

---

[44] Of these the most important are the Strasbourg and the Deir Balyzeh papyri. For these and other texts see Jasper & Cuming, p. 37-41.

[45] See G.J. Cuming, "Egyptian elements in the Jerusalem Liturgy," Journal of Theological Studies ns 25 (1974), 117-24.

second Epiclesis) the elements are the point of intersection of a complicated and interlocking symbolism.

Such a Trinitarian structuring of the eucharistic prayer was hardly possible prior to the Arian controversy, and is a demonstration of how various parts of the theological endeavour interact upon each other. It is impossible to prove direct dependence of the Liturgy of St. Mark upon the dogmatic controversies, but the close relationship between eucharistic and other debates, and the coincidence of timing, makes it more than likely that we should relate the triumph of the framework of St Mark to this background; it was part of the emerging orthodoxy.

We only know of St Mark from later sources, and it may therefore bear the imprint of later times. This is not true of the record of the Jerusalem rite left to us by Cyril of Jerusalem, although the interpretation of the texts is not without its difficulties.[46] The chief difficulty is establishing whether or not the eucharist in Jerusalem included the Words of Institution. They clearly have great significance for Cyril, but when he comes to describe his rite there is no direct mention of them.[47] However, it is possible that the following refers to their recitation: "Then, after the spiritual sacrifice, the bloodless service, has been perfected."[48] This remains an area of uncertainty, but other points of contact between Cyril and Addai and Mari lead us to conclude that we have in Cyril a rite in transition reflecting elements of the East Syrian, the Alexandrian, and the Antiochene patterns.

---

[46] Once again there are questions of authenticity. The Mystagogical Catecheses may originate from John II, Cyril's successor.

[47] Dix, Shape, pp. 197f, argues that Cyril did not use the Words.

[48] The idea of completing or perfecting the spiritual sacrifice is elsewhere connected to the Words of Institution; see John Chrysostom, De prod.Iudae i.6 (F.E. Brightmann, Liturgies Eastern and Western vol 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1896), p. 479.

The major new element introduced in Cyril is a developed consecratory Spirit Epiclesis, which gives a new importance to the elements themselves.[49] Since we cannot be sure that the Words of Institution were even used, although he explains the rite through reference to them, this has the unfortunate effect of removing the cross of Christ from the centre of the prayer. While something like the preface of St Mark and the intercessions may have been used, what we are left with does not have a clear historical basis. Also language referring to the "most dread sacrifice", and Cyril's use of typological language dehistoricises the liturgy by removing its connection with its effects in the world and by placing great emphasis on the present cultic action. The considerable influence of the mystery religions upon the church of the fourth century is evident at this point.

This tendency is to some extent placed in check by the definite inclusion of the Words of Institution in the Liturgy of St James and St John Chrysostom and by the close connection made in teaching on the eucharist by Gregory of Nazianzus and John Chrysostom between the sacrifice of Christ, the sacrifice of the eucharist, and our ethical sacrifices.[50] The careful balancing in Chrysostom of the Words of Institution and the Epiclesis as complementary moments of consecration is important in the unification of Christ's sacrifice with the sacrifice of the church, making both Christ's sacrifice present in the eucharist and united to our own.[51]

---

[49] For greater detail see B.D. Spinks, "The Consecratory Epiklesis in the Anaphora of St James," Studia Liturgica 11 (1976), 19-38. The epiclesis in Apol Const 8 bears upon this issue.

[50] See Stone, The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist I, pp. 116ff, and Dix, Shape, pp. 243.

[51] See Dix, Shape p. 281 for Chrysostom's de Prod Iud I.vi and his insistence on the importance of the words of institution, and Dix p. 293 for John of Damascus on the importance of the epiclesis.

The abiding tendency of patristic models, and particularly the Alexandrian tradition, to fail to deal adequately with the humanity of Christ and the resultant tendency to dehistoricize the eucharist can be seen in Cyril of Alexandria.[52] Cyril follows in the eucharistic tradition of Apollinaris, but with some important differences. The eucharist is the means whereby the risen body of Christ becomes once more incarnate and can give life to our mortal bodies. At this point the difference between Cyril and Nestorius emerges. Nestorius, in line with his christology, seems to have regarded the bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ but not sharing in the divinity of Christ. Cyril, on the other hand, insisted in his christology on the union of the Logos with the man Jesus and that the saving power comes from the Logos. When this is carried over into the eucharist it means that the bread becomes the body of the risen, glorified Christ, that is of the Logos. In this schema there is a tendency to minimize the importance of the historicity of Jesus, although H. Chadwick's assessment would seem to be too harsh:

> For Cyril...the union of Christ's flesh and the Logos is parallel to the union of the eucharistic bread with Christ's flesh. For Nestorius the union of the eucharistic bread with Christ's flesh is parallel to our relation to Christ's humanity. For him Cyril's doctrine implies that the humanity was transformed into divinity, the body ceasing to be body, so that Christ's humanity no longer has any solidarity with ours. This in turn strikes at the heart of Nestorius' soteriology.[53]

This would seem not to take sufficiently into account the way Cyril does counter the inherent difficulty of his Alexandrian theology through a strong stress on the worshippers' union with the mind of Christ through the Spirit. Through the eucharist the church is drawn into the

---

[52] The standard work on Cyril's eucharistic doctrine continues to be A. Struckmann, Die Eucharistielehre des heilegen Cyrill von Alexandrien (Paderborn, 1910).

[53] H. Chadwick, "Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy," Journal of Theological Studies ns 2 (1951), 157.

hypostatic union between the human and divine in Christ. The Epiclesis is the means by which the church is united with the totus Christus and particularly with his human mind. Thus the Spirit is not to be regarded as a power separate from the cross of Jesus, but as the means whereby the historical Christ is mediated to us through his risen glory. This is encapsulated in the liturgy in the doxological formulae which stress that the worship is directed to the Father with or through the Son with the Spirit.

> It is then in pneumatological terms that Cyril understands the intimate union between us and Christ: the presence of the Mind of Christ in us and his offering of our mind to the Father, for the Spirit, he reminds us, is the Mind of Christ, and it is in the same Spirit that our mind is sanctified and lifted up through Christ into God. Nothing of all this takes place, and we have no participation in God or in the vicarious activity of Christ, however, except in and through the Spirit and his distinctive activity in uniting us to the Son and through him to the Father.[54]

That the eucharist is the means of bringing into the present church the totus Christus is nowhere better seen than in the Commentary on the Divine Liturgy by Cabasilas, which can be regarded as the authoritative interpretation of the Byzantine Rite and the theology of the Orthodox Churches. Here the whole eucharist follows the pattern of the life of Christ, with the introductory ceremonies symbolic of the annunciation, incarnation and epiphany. Then follows the eucharist proper which recalls and makes manifest the sacrifice of Christ, which for Cabasilas embraces the death, the resurrection and the ascension. This culminates in the symbolism of Pentecost. The intention would appear to be to create an inner comformity between the life of the present church and the pattern of Christ's life. Just as Christ's sacrifice involves a transformation from the cross to the resurrection, a double transformation

---

[54] T.F. Torrance, "The Mind of Christ in Worship: The Problem of Apollinarianism in the Liturgy", in Theology in Reconciliation (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1975), p. 182.

occurs in the eucharist: on the one hand, the eucharistic elements are transformed, and on the other hand, the church is also transformed into its proper being, that is, the body of Christ, and all of this is achieved through the power of the Holy Spirit.[55] Cabasilas also argues for consecration both by the Words of Institution and the Epiclesis, the one not being sufficient without the other. The priest stands in the stead of Christ, but transformation is effected through prayer, that is, by the Spirit.[56] The main danger for Cabasilas, and the Eastern Churches, is that the Anamnesis of the historical Jesus can so easily be robbed of its historical content through its ritual form, but, as has been shown in Chapter 3, this is a perennial problem only resolved through constant and detailed hermeneutics.

While the Eastern tradition tends towards a devaluation of the Words of Institution in favour of a consecratory Epiclesis but found balance in John Chrystom and the rest of the tradition, the Western tradition developed in the opposite direction. By so concentrating on the consecratory effect of the Words of Institution and by not having, or not emphasizing, an Epiclesis, the western tradition found it difficult to describe the continuities and transformations between the earthly body of Jesus, his risen body and the eucharistic presence. The importance of the Spirit to the eucharist is only kept alive in the western tradition by Augustine and resurgences of Augustinianism which culminate in Calvin.

Ambrose, like his predecessors begins his thinking about the eucharist from the Logos, but in a different form to

---

[55] Commentary on the Divine Liturgy (London: SPCK, 1966), sec. 38.

[56] ibid., secs 27-29.

Justin.[57] Instead of a Logos Epiclesis we find consecration taking place through the words of Jesus, who is identified with the Word spoken at creation.[58] This word is perfectly at liberty to change creation, and consecration is considered to be a changing of the very nature of the elements.[59] The consecration reflects his conception of the relation between

---

[57] We are hampered in our study of Ambrose by not having a complete text of his eucharistic liturgy, and by complications over the authenticity of texts. Arguments for the authenticity of de Sacr are given by O. Faller ("Ambrosius der Verfasser von De Sacramentis," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 64 (1940), 1-14, 81-101), and by J. Schmitz ("Zum Autor der Schrift De Sacramentis," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 91 (1969), 59-69). The main modern opponent of Ambrosian authorship is K. Gamber ("Ist Niceta von Remesiana Der Vervasser von De Sacramentis?" Ostkirchliche Studien 7 (1958), 153-172, and 9 (1960), 123-173, and also his "Ist der Canon-Text von de Sacramentis in Mailand gebraucht worden?" Ephemerides Liturgicae 79 (1965), 109-116. The prehistory of his rite is also mysterious as is its relationship with Roman practice. (See J.A. Jungmann, The Early Liturgy to the Time of Gregory the Great (London: DLT, 1960), and also The Mass of the Roman Rite (New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1959). Also J. Beumer, "Die ältesten Zeugnisse für die Römische Eucharistie feier bei Ambrosius von Mailand," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 95 (1973), 311-324).) In this regard the rite of Hippolytus is little help since we cannot be sure that it was ever used in Rome. (For doubts see L. Bouyer, "The Different Forms of Eucharistic Prayer and their Genealogy," Studia Patristica 8 (=TU 93) (1966), p. 164.) We do, however, know that there was a major liturgical upheaval in Rome just after the time of Hippolytus connected with the change of usage in the church from Greek to Latin. (See Marius Victorinus, adv. Arium ii.8 and Ambrosiaster, Quest. Veteris et No. Test. 109.21 (ed. Souter CSEL 50.268). The arguments are summarized by H. Chadwick in G. Dix, The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome (London: SPCK, 1968), p. h.)

[58] De Myst 9.52: "Shall not the word of Christ, which was able to make out of nothing that which was not, be able to change things which already are into what they were not? For it is not less to give a new nature to things than to change them."

[59] See De Sacr, IV.4.13,17, De Myst. 9.52 and De Fide IV.10.125.

nature and grace, which tend to oppose each other.[60]

It is somewhat strange that in Ambrose's treatment of the eucharist there is so little mention of the Spirit, especially when this is compared with his description of baptism.[61] There are slight indications of parallels with the Eastern first Epiclesis when Ambrose appears to open his eucharistic canon: "Make for us this offering approved, reasonable, acceptable."[62] But there are no clear indications of any references to the Spirit in his description of the eucharist. Probably the reason for this is to be found in his Trinitarian theology in which the persons coinhere in each other.[63] There is thus no reason for reference to the Spirit in the sacrament of the very body and blood of Christ. The situation would, therefore, be rather akin to

---

[60] "Let us not consider this to be what nature formed, but what the blessing consecrated: for the blessing has a greater power than nature, because nature itself is changed by the blessing" (De Myst 9.50).

[61] De Sacr. III.2.8, and De Spiritu Sancto I.6.76; see A.G.C.F. Atchley, On the Epiclesis of the Eucharist Liturgy and in the Consecration of the Font (Oxford: Alcuin, 1935), pp. 71ff, and McKenna, op. cit. pp. 62ffor discussion of other disputed texts.

[62] For a detailed study of this terminology see O. Casel, "Ein orientalisches Kultwort in abendländischer Umschmelzung," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft 11 (1931), 1-19. There is a variant reading: "approved" could be (ad)scriptam or ratam, as in the Roman Canon. Fac is a cultic word which is similar to the performative idea of the epiclesis. Casel shows that rationabilem corresponds to the eastern logikos, which is equivalent to pneumatikos.

[63] Ambrose was undoubtedly aware of developments in the East, especially with regard to the Arian and pneumatomachian controversies. See De Spiritu Sancto III.1.8: "So both the Father and the Spirit sent the Son; also, the Father and the Son sent the Spirit"; and III.4.28: "Therefore, the Father sanctifies, the Son also sanctifies, and the Holy Spirit sanctifies, but the sanctification is one, because the baptism is one, and the grace of the sacrament is one." Ambrose would appear to have read Basil's De Spiritu Sancto and there are some points of contact between Ambrose and Cyril of Jerusalem; see E.J. Yarnold, "Did St. Ambrose know the Mystagogic Catecheses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem?" Studia Patristica XII (=TU 115) (1975), 184-189.

the relative absence of mention of the Spirit during the ministry of Jesus.

In the New Testament one of the chief functions of language of the Spirit is to describe the universal presence and power of the risen, glorified Christ. The resurrection narratives can portray some dimensions of this risen Christ, but, almost necessarily, there is a need for the presence of Christ to be more universally conceived than is possible when he is manifested in local form (even if strangely). The lack of a pneumatology in eucharistic theology will result in a conception of the real presence which is likewise too locally conceived. The major problem will be the continuity between the earthly, the risen and the eucharistic body of Christ,[64] and this issue will be considered in physical terms leading to the language of transubstantiation.[65] With an adequate pneumatology theological tools are at hand to deal with this issue. For the whole Latin tradition, with Augustinianism as an important variant, the lack of a pneumatology in the eucharist forces attention upon the precise status of the elements after consecration, and the solution to the real presence is not given in theological terms, but in terms of adapted Aristotelian categories. This must always tend to reduce what is essentially personal, that is, the presence of the glorified Lord, to the impersonal.[66] When this happens it is impossible for the real presence to be the symbol of transformation since it is conceived of as static in itself.

---

[64] This is most graphically found in De Myst 7.36: "The powers of heaven were in doubt when they saw that flesh was ascending into heaven" This idea is supported through a literal interpretation of Is 63.1. But also see 9.53: "It is the true flesh of Christ which was crucified and buried. This is then truly the sacrament of his body."

[65] See P. Regan, "Pneumatological and Eschatological Aspects of Liturgical Celebration," Worship 51 (1977), pp. 335ff.

[66] See E. Schillebeeckx, Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God (London: Sheed and Ward, 1963), pp. 59ff.

Augustine seems to have been aware of this difficulty. Unfortunately it is not possible to attempt a detailed construction of Augustine's eucharistic prayer from his many references to the eucharist in his Commentary on John, his sermons and other writings.[67] Indications are found, however, that his eucharist included an Epiclesis invoking the Spirit, but that consecration was through the Words of Institution.[68] Augustine very skillfully portrays relationship in the eucharist between Christ and the Spirit as analogous to the relationship between Jesus and the Spirit before and after his resurrection. In this way he gives an "objective" foundation for the presence (as Jesus was present to his own time), which needs to become "subjective" through the operation of the Spirit.

The "objective" presence of Christ in the eucharist arises from the consecration through the Words of Institution, but Augustine does not follow Ambrose in his emphasis on the Word; instead he uses the Pauline concept of the body of Christ. The body of Christ refers to the actual person of Jesus, to his risen body and to the church.[69] This polyvalent symbol helps to provide a solution to the problem of defining the nature of the presence of Christ in the eucharist. The body of Christ concept is especially useful to Augustine since, as the church, the body of Christ is so closely associated with the Spirit in Pauline theology. Indeed, the church can be described as the incarnation of

---

[67] For much of what follows see K. Adam, Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin (Paderborn, 1908);for a useful collection of texts see Textus Eucharistici Selecti ed. H. Lang, *Florilegium Patristicum* 35 (1933); other relevant studies include E. Benz, Augustins Lehre von der Kirche (Wiesbaden, 1954); R.A. Markus, Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine (London: CUP, 1970).

[68] En Ps 1.1 in Ps 33.

[69] Esp Serm. 227.

the Spirit.[70] In the eucharist Augustine saw the means whereby Christ became really present in all three modes of his being with the intention of realizing his true union with the church through the power of the Spirit. In this way Augustine roots the eucharist in the action of Jesus at the Last Supper through the words of Jesus, but his understanding of consecration and his emphasis on the prayer for fruitful communion leave us with no doubt that the presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements has its goal in his perfect realisation of his presence in the church through the Spirit.

Augustine's pneumatology is very different to that of John Chrysostom, for instance, and arises out of his conception of the Holy Spirit as the bond of unity between the Father and the Son. The Spirit can almost be identified with charity and is the internal principle of life in the church. The church exists on two levels: as the "communio sacramentorum, which is the work of Christ, and (as) the societas sanctorum, which is the work of the Holy Spirit."[71] The Holy Spirit is the means, therefore, by which the work of Christ becomes real in the church by drawing all things into God. In this Augustine not only follows the biblical pattern, but develops insights forced upon him as a result of the the Donatist controversy. The Donatists could receive the form of the sacrament, but not its virtue, and even in the church Augustine felt bound to distinguish between a eucharistic presence independent of faith and the benefit

---

[70] See H. Mühlen, "Das Verhältnis zwischen Inkarnation und Kirche in den Aussagen des Vaticanum II," Theologie und Glaube 55 (1965), pp. 171-190.

[71] Y. Congar, I believe in the Holy Spirit vol 1, p. 80.

only available to faith, that is, through the Spirit.[72] This must be interpreted as a development of the prayer for fruitful communion as in the Epiclesis of Hippolytus.

The importance for Augustine of the operation of the Holy Spirit in the sacraments can be gathered from the way his strictly theological language exists in some tension with his strongly Platonic metaphysics.[73] Sacraments in general are defined as signs, which demonstrate, and in some sense cohere in, the reality to which they point, but Augustine infuses this timeless theory with a historical dimension by insisting on the New Testament theme of the kingdom of God.[74] The sacraments are not just signs of some spiritual reality, but are signs of the eschatological kingdom. This connection will lead to the sacraments being signs of the incarnation, but also signs of the church and of the eschaton, and, therefore, the sacraments are domains of the operation of the Holy Spirit.

Thus various tensions do exist in Augustine which, it would appear, he was reluctant to resolve; indeed, they are fundamental to his position. At times he speaks very forcibly of a real presence, in a way which could later be read in Ambrosian terms; at other times his more significatory language is to the fore with its complement in the prayer for true faith. This has led to both Thomas

---

[72] In Io. 26.11: "The sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the sacrament another.... Look to it, then, brethren, eat the heavenly bread spiritually, bring innocence to the altar." See also Ep 185.11.50; De Doctr. Christ. III.37.55; De Civ. Dei 21.25. In this Augustine was followed by many of his successors: for Gregory the Great see Geiselmann, Die Eucharistielehre, p. 44, who describes a real presence, but distinguishes between the sacramentum and the virtus sacramentum on reception, and Bede, Bk II.4 (Pl 94, 151): "We must always be aware that we can no longer find the body of the Lord on the earth...we experience in the eucharist the presence of his divinity".

[73] R. Prenter, "Metaphysics and Eschatology in the Sacramental Teaching of St. Augustine," Studia Theologica 1 (1948), 5-26.

[74] See Ep. 98.9, 138.7.

Aquinas and Calvin being able to use Augustine as an authority. However, as Augustine left the Donatist controversy behind and became more and more concerned with Pelagius the apparently deliberate ambiguity in his language, in which the Spirit has a role in stimulating fruitful communion, fades away to be replaced with much stronger descriptions of sacramental causality, which in turn lead to a closer identification of the earthly and the eucharistic Christ.[75] Baptism no longer enables faith but causes faith, and the eucharist actually imparts life.[76] In a similar way Jn 6:53 is stressed virtually to the exclusion of consideration of the role of faith in the sacrament. This is not worked out in nearly as much detail as the earlier position, but these later developments in Augustine obscure the subtlety of his earlier position and draw him more closely towards the Ambrosian position in which the distinction between the earthly and eucharistic Christ is minimized. Adam sums up the position:

> This assessment of the flesh as the sole source of life must naturally strengthen and deepen the belief in the true presence of Christ in the sacrament...and it paved the way for the identification of the historical with the eucharistic Christ.[77]

There never was, however, any doubt about the identification of the historical and the eucharistic Christ. The question is to the mode of presence in each case. Simply to assert the identity will always obscure the indisputable fact that he is not present in the same way in each case, nor will an assertion of presence by itself imply the dynamism and intention of this presence. The best way of maintaining a dynamic presence is by employing both christological and pneumatological language to describe the one mystery. The inner connection between the earthly Jesus,

---

[75] See Adam, op. cit. pp. 159f.

[76] See De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione 1.27; and Serm 57.7.

[77] op. cit. p. 159.

the risen Christ and the Spirit will ensure that the two forms of language mutually illuminate each other.

Augustine's subtle eucharistic theology, with its various overlapping sets of philosophical and theological language provides a means of describing the eucharist as conveying the real presence of Christ, but a presence like his historical presence which consisted of being and transformatory action, which in the church corresponds to the church as the body of Christ indwelt by the power of the Spirit. In order to convey the inner dependence of present day historical action upon the action of Jesus, the eucharist should continue to have at its centre the symbol of the earthly person, but the heart of the eucharist is not the "production" of this person as a static "thing", but of a transforming Lord whose action in the church is best described in pneumatological terms.

Later controversies struggle to express the subtelty of Augustine's position in terms of evolving philosophical sophistication. This is the subject of the following chapter.

Chapter 6

The Real Presence and the historical Jesus

The previous section has shown how the epiclesis is related to the words of institution through a pneumatology which stresses how the Spirit carries forward in the church the way the eternal enters into the historical in Jesus. Jesus is not, however, just an expression of the Spirit becoming historical, but, as the uniquely historical, he is the foundation and source of the work of the Spirit. This needs to find expression in the description of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist.

In the liturgical tradition the consecration of the elements has been related to various foci of the prayer. In the very early period probably the whole prayer was consecratory; at some stage the Sanctus may have been regarded in this way; at other times the Words of Institution and the Epiclesis, or both together, were seen as consecratory. The argument as to the relationship of the Words of Institution and the Epiclesis so far would suggest that consecration should be regarded as taking place through the whole prayer with the Words of Institution and the Epiclesis having special functions. Further, the prayer for fruitful communion, which is such an important element of the Epiclesis, suggests that the consecration is in some sense not complete until our lives are brought into proper conformity with the pattern of the eternal becoming historical in Jesus. The purpose of the eucharist is not simply to create a sacramental presence on the altar, but to impel the church in its task of consecrating the whole universe into its union with Christ. The classical distinction between the _sacramentum tantum_, the _res et sacramentum_, and the _res tantum_ expresses this well.[1] The _res et sacramentum_, that is, the real presence, is not an end in itself, and the goal of the eucharist (the _res tantum_) must

---

[1] See Thomas Aquinas, _Summa_ 3a. 73.6.

always be borne in mind in any closer definition of the means by which this goal is achieved.

Like all truly religious symbols the real presence is complex and evocative of a wide range of meaning and engagement, and, precisely because of this, it has been the centre of controversy. This essay suggests that a key to understanding the real presence is to regard it as a symbol of the way the eternal is becoming historical in the church in a manner similar to and derivative from the historicity of the death and resurrection of Jesus. For this to be the case the symbol will have to be related to two key foci, namely, to its origin in the words of Jesus at the Last Supper and to the transforming power of his resurrection mediated to the church through the Spirit. This will lead to the real presence being described in christological and pneumatological terms. The history of eucharistic debate about the real presence can be read as a story of how difficult it is to find the right balance between the two.

A discussion of the real presence should begin with a definition of presence. Presence consists of two elements: an ontic "being there", and a disclosure, a dynamic purpose, a "being for".[2] Such presence can be interpreted through the category of symbol: the "being there" is given meaning and comprehension by its symbolic form.[3] As in every sphere of life, this symbolic meaning is imparted by a complex process

---

[2] For similar thought see K. Rahner, "The Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," Theological Investigations 4, pp. 287-311.

[3] Rahner propounds an even more realistic view of symbols than is proposed here (see his "The Theology of the Symbol," Theological Investigations 4, pp. 221-252). It is difficult to see how the real presence can be symbolic in quite the same sense in which Rahner describes Being. It can, however, take on some of these characteristics of disclosure and self-realisation in a derivative sense from the symbolic meaning imported to them by Jesus and the church. The understanding of the real presence used here would accord more closely with the definition of a sign given by M. Heidegger, Being and Time (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), pp. 107ff., where things "ready-to-hand" become "present-to-hand" only by becoming signs.

of interaction between the person or object itself and the language used by human community to describe the person or object. By itself the "being there" is empty and devoid of meaning. Only by its being given meaning, by standing out with a purpose, that is, by becoming a symbol can objects or people be lifted out of the realm of simply "being there" to "being for".

We see this general theory at work in the life of Jesus himself, who is described as the Word become flesh (being there) but who still needs to be beheld or understood by faith (being for). Indeed, christology deduces the "being there" from the "being for". So also in the eucharist: "being there" is a deduction from the "being for". The ontic and the dynamic disclosure go hand in hand, with the dynamic meaning of the eucharist implying an ontic equivalent, but the two levels of being do not exist in the same way. Because we live in a symbolic universe of "being for", the level of "being there" is closed to us. Every statement about the "being there" has to be put in terms which already imply its "being for". We make deductions about the "being there" and regard it as the ground for "being for", but what it is in itself we know not. The attempt to move into a pure metaphysics ends in abstraction devoid of content. The closest one gets to this in eucharistic theology is in the doctrine of transubstantiation, in which a "being there" is asserted in language which rules out other possibilities, but which has little positive content of its own. The result is that, as in christology, so in eucharistic doctrine, the ontic reality is a deduction from the dynamic disclosure. Yet that something is really "there" remains of prime importance.

In many symbolic disclosures the "being there" of the referend is not important. To use a standard distinction, a symbol can simply be a sign. However, Christianity insists that the revelation of the eternal in Jesus was a true union of the eternal with the historical: it is a hypostatic union. In Jesus the eternal does not just use his person as

a tool, but is joined with his person to become a historical agent. It is this hypostatic union which is regarded as the grounds for our derivative union with the divine, that is, the further disclosure of the eternal in the historical and its union with us in the present by the Spirit. It is clear that there is a difference between the mode in which the eternal became historical in the earthly Jesus and the way in which this happens in the eucharist, and indeed in the way in which the eternal becomes historical in our action, but there is something common to all of these. Both the becoming "there" in the earthly Jesus and in the eucharist are symbols to us of the way the eternal becomes "there" in us, not just using us, but transforming us, so that we become in some small way the presence of the eternal in the present. Without this becoming in Jesus, symbolized in the becoming in the eucharist, our sanctification would have no basis; we ourselves would not be changed and we could not become actual historical agents in the world.

Thus, the content of the foundational symbol of Christianity, namely, the person of Jesus indicates that in any symbol of his presence there should be elements of "being there" expressed in the "being for". The whole eucharist, as the interpretive matrix defining the nature of the real presence, will contain elements which emphasize the "being there" more than others. The Words of Institution root the eucharist in its foundation in Jesus and will naturally be the central assertion of the "being there". It is quite possible for the eucharist to be a sign of the earthly Jesus without this "being there", but it would not be as effective a sign and it would imply that the "being there" of the eternal in Jesus is not foundational for all time.[4] The most effective way of maintaining this connection

---

[4] From this we can perceive the close connection between eucharistic theology and christology which emerged so strongly in the controversy between Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius, and also, and perhaps even more obviously, between Luther and Calvin (see below).

is through the belief that in some way the body of the earthly Jesus is present in the eucharist. Should this belief be questioned, the intimate connection between the eucharist and the earthly Jesus would be weakened.

Great care needs to be taken with the ontology of the symbol of the real presence. The real presence is itself a symbol and is not truly historical; it is only a step and an aid towards the historical, and as such is not a presence in the fullest sense of the word. The "being there" of Jesus is derived firstly from the symbolic connection with the Words of Institution, by which Jesus gives the elements their meaning, and secondly through the Anamnesis and Epiclesis, by which the church acknowledges the Words of Institution and adds its appropriation of the symbol. This "being there" cannot be identical to the "being there" of the eternal in the historical Jesus, yet within the symbolic realm it can still be important to maintain a "being there". The difference in the kinds of "being there" between the historical Jesus and the real presence is reflected in their different "being for". In Jesus the "being there" prompted immediate historical action in the person of Jesus, whereas in the eucharist the "being there" has its purpose in prompting our historical action.

To treat the issue of the status of the eucharistic elements under the title of the real presence is, therefore, potentially misleading, since it incorporates unexamined notions of both reality and presence. Traditionally the problem is discussed in almost physical terms, although the Aristotelian metaphysic used in the doctrine of transubstantiation is meant expressely to deny these connotations. An existential analysis begins from "being for" and will progress to the assertion of "being there", but it is important to maintain that the "being there" in a person must be different to the "being there" in a symbol, yet, because of the function of the symbol, an underlying continuity can be posited. This is nothing different to the standard statement that the real presence is "sacramental".

The "fact" of the real presence is maintained because in the eucharist the church encounters the totus Christus. Here is the earthly person, especially in his death on the cross; here is also the risen, glorified Lord transforming all through the power of the Spirit. The elements become signs of this fullness. The eucharist cannot be reduced to the elements, but they are essential and emphasize particular aspects of Christ's action in the church and world, especially Christ's abiding presence in and gift of himself to the church, and that this presence is directed towards a real union of the eternal with matter leading to its transformation.

The belief in the real presence is based on the utterance of Jesus himself: "This is my body... This is my blood."[5] Through these words Jesus identifies himself, especially in the act of sacrificial self-offering, with the elements. He gives himself, and whenever the faithful eat and drink his body and blood they receive of his life (Jn 6:51). The extent of the identification of the person of Jesus with the elements is quickly seen from the command to eat and to drink. It is not sufficient to gaze upon the elements, even with the eyes of faith. The physical eating and drinking is required in order that Jesus, identified with the material elements, can fill us, body and soul, with

---

[5] For detailed exegesis with details of the possible Aramaic original and the precise meaning of the "is" see J. Betz, Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter I.1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1955), pp. 15-58. See also K. Rahner, "The Word and the Eucharist," Theological Investigations 4, p. 283: "It is only because they permanently refer back to the words of consecration that the species of bread and wine constitute the sign which indicates and contains the presence of Christ."

his life.[6]

The implication of this was grasped by the tradition, namely, that the eucharistic presence must be identified with the earthly body of Jesus. The primary intention of this identification is the insistence on the paramount importance of the earthly Jesus as the fount of redemption. For Ambrose, who was the first so to identify the earthly and eucharistic Christs, there does not appear to be any problem with respect to the physical place of the earthly body in the eucharistic elements. Because the earthly body has been transformed by the resurrection it can become present anywhere and everywhere without losing its origin in the earthly Jesus. However, different conceptions of body result in severe problems and lead to questions as to the possibility of positing the presence of the earthly Jesus in the elements. The classic controversy about this point is that between Radbert and Ratramn.

Radbert's close association of the eucharist and the incarnation can be seen in the way he adapts Isidore of Seville's definition of a sacrament. Isidore's definition speaks of the divine power being present under a corporeal covering, and as effecting salvation secretly.[7] Radbert believed however "that it is not the power under the cover of the sacrament which works, but the visible act itself is

---

[6] There is ample evidence of the use of the eucharist to combat docetism in the early church, see D.E. Aune, "The Phenomenon of Early Christian "Anti-Sacramentalism"," in Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), pp. 204ff. For a different line of thought see R. Shepard, " The Eucharistic Presence and Reconciliation of Opposing Realities," The Heythrop Journal, 22 (1981), 123-134, who argues that the bread and wine belong to the intellectual realm and the body and blood to the symbolic/emotional realm. Their union in the eucharist offers "satisfaction for the different needs of these two realms of psychic experience."

[7] Etymologies VI.19.40 (PL 82, 255): Quae (ob/id) sacramenta dicuntur, quia sub tegumento corporalium rerum virtus divina secretius salutem (eorundem sacramentum) operatur unde et a secretis virtutis, vel a sacris sacramenta dicuntur.

active."[8] In order to justify this, Radbert draws an analogy with the incarnation:

> They are called sacraments either because they are secret in that in the visible act divinity inwardly accomplishes something secretly through the corporeal appearance, or from the sanctifying consecration, because the Holy Spirit, remaining in the body of Christ, latently accomplishes for the salvation of the faithful all these mystical sacraments under cover of things visible.[9]

Here Radbert shows his awareness of an intimate and abiding relationship between the physical body of Christ and the Holy Spirit. Just as the Holy Spirit derives from that body during his earthly life, so also in the eucharist the Holy Spirit comes from his risen body, present in the elements.[10] Similarly, the eucharistic consecration is likened to the conception of Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit.[11] The result is a "true flesh and blood" created in a manner analogous to the incarnate Jesus, but not flesh in quite the same way:

> Because it is not right to devour Christ with the teeth, he willed in the mystery that this bread and wine be created truly his flesh and blood through consecration by the power of the Holy Spirit, by daily creating it so that it might be mystically sacrificed for the life of the world; so that as from the Virgin through the Spirit true flesh is created without union of sex, so through, the same, out of the substance of bread and wine, the same body and blood of Christ may be mystically consecrated.[12]

---

[8] De Corpore et Sanguine Domini III.1 (PL 120, 1275); see J.R. Geiselmann, Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik (Paderborn, 1926), pp. 146ff.

[9] De Corp. et Sang. Dom. III.1.

[10] ibid. III.2: The birth of Christ, therefore, and all that dispensation of humanity, becomes, as it were, a great sacrament, because in the visible man the divine majesty inwardly for the sake of our consecration worked invisibly those things which come into being secretly by his power.

[11] ibid. III.4 and IV.1; also Ep. I ad Cor. (PL 117, 564).

[12] ibid. IV.1.

Parallel to the explanation through recourse to the Spirit Radbert describes the difference between the incarnate Jesus and his eucharistic presence: the latter is the figura of the former. Through this device he is able to maintain the identity yet dissimilarity of the two presences:

> This body and blood of Christ...in a mystery are true flesh and true blood since the creator so willed it....And, because he willed, he may remain in the figure of bread and wine. Yet these must be believed to be fully, after the consecration, nothing but Christ's flesh and blood...and, to put it in more miraculous terms, nothing different, of course, from what was born of Mary, suffered on the cross, and rose again from the tomb.[13]

This is spelt out even more explicitly:

> This which is outwardly sensed is, however, the figure or character, but wholly truth and no shadow, because intrinsically perceived, and for this reason nothing else henceforth than truth and the sacrament of his flesh is apparent.[14]

Radbert insists that the figura is the truth of what it covers, yet the element becomes such a figure not through some ontological change, but because the elements' relation to the truth has changed through the consecration: it is the truth, because it is intrinsically perceived. This is clear in a statement hinting at a more developed Aristotelian distinction. He states that the eucharistic change is "not exterior in the species, but interior, so that faith may approve it in the spirit."[15] As Geiselmann puts the matter: "Radbert is not interested in a metaphysical change, but only in the logical change." Or: "The elements become figurae through the change, which hides their inner content and mediates their knowledge."[16] There are two levels of language in Radbert: there is the strictly biblical language

---

[13] ibid. I.2.

[14] ibid. IV.2.

[15] ibid. I.5.

[16] op. cit. p. 168.

involving the Spirit, and there is his attempt to describe this more philosophically. The priority must be given to the former, and the latter seen to be an imperfect explanation of the theological truth. The more theological language insists on the identity of the earthly and eucharistic body, albeit mediated through the Spirit. When this is misunderstood, and interpreted in popular concrete terms one gets the popular myths of a physical eucharistic presence which have been interpolated into Radbert.[17] By regarding the eucharistic presence as the true body, but not physically, rather logically and through the Spirit and perceived through faith, Radbert is acknowledging the need for a distinction between the earthly person and the eucharistic presence but is placing the emphasis on the continuity between the two. Radbert is sure that the Spirit creates and comes from the body of Christ. The resultant eucharistic presence is real, but not physically so, and needs to be perceived through the Spirit. In this way Radbert maintains the underlying "being there" so important for a "being for" which is to be truly historical.

Ratramn's "answer" to Radbert is actually a reply to specific questions put to him by King Charles the Bald:[18] firstly, "whether that which in the church is received into the mouth of the faithful becomes the body and blood of Christ in a mystery or in truth;" secondly, "whether it is that body which was born of Mary, suffered, died, and was

---

[17] Often the eucharistic legends of XIVcentury have been used to interpret Radbert as maintaining a crass form of realism, but the stories such as that of the Jew who goes into convulsions and spits out the host have now been shown to be an interpolation into Radbert; cf. J.F. Fahey, The Eucharistic Teaching of Ratramn of Corbie (Illinois, 1951), p. 79, who quotes the research of W. Roach, "Eucharistic Tradition in the Perlesraus," Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, 59 (1939), 10-56.

[18] It would appear that the dispute was not without a political dimension. Radbert came from a family long at odds with King Charles, whereas Ratramn was in favour at court; see Fahey, op. cit. p. 9.

buried, and which, rising again and ascending into heaven, sits on the right hand of the Father."[19]

Ratramn sets out very clearly his strong opposition to Radbert's terminology. Indeed, one could almost say that Ratramn interprets almost every more technical term in the opposite sense to Radbert. Charles's question as to whether Christ's body was "in a mystery or in truth" immediately directed attention to Radbert's use of figura and veritas. Ratramn defines figura: "Figure means a kind of over-shadowing that reveals its intent under some sort of veil."[20] But it soon becomes clear that he means something rather different, when he describes the truth of a figure as its obvious visible manifestation: "Truth is representation of clear fact, not obscured by an shadowy images, but uttered in pure and open, and to say it more plainly, in natural meanings."[21] There can therefore be no doubt as to his answer to Charles: the eucharistic presence is a mystery and is not "in truth."[22]

While Ratramn cannot say that Christ's presence is "in truth", he still explains the operation of the sacrament through the dualism between visible and invisible:

> But that bread which through the ministry of the priest comes to be Christ's body exhibits one thing outwardly to human sense, and it proclaims another thing inwardly to the minds of the faithful.[23]

Ratramn is quite explicit that the change is a logical one:

> It is clear that the bread and wine are Christ's body and blood in a figurative sense. For as to outward appearance, the aspect of flesh is not recognized in that

---

[19] De Corp. et Sang. Dom. 2.

[20] ibid. 7.

[21] ibid. 8.

[22] Ratramn is not entirely consistent as his quote from the post-communion prayer of the Gelasian sacramentary shows (ibid. 88): Perficiant in nobis domine quesumus tua sacramenta quod continent, ut quae nunc specie gerimus rerum veritate capiamus.

[23] ibid. 9.

> bread, nor in that wine is the liquid blood shown, but after the mystical consecration they are no longer called bread and wine, but Christ's body and blood.[24]

The bread remains bread and the wine, wine: "The appearance of the creature which formerly existed is recognized to have remained."[25] And this must mean that: "The species and form of the creature, the visible things, whether it is the bread or wine, they have not changed in themselves...they exist as nothing else but that which they were before."[26] Yet there is a real change, but a change which can only be described as figurative: "Under cover of the corporeal bread and the corporeal wine Christ's spiritual body and spiritual blood do exist."[27]

For Ratramn this presence is real, but spiritual, and by spiritual he does not mean caused by the Spirit but as contrasted to physical. He is, thus, thinking in quasi-platonic terms with the resultant dualism between matter and form. Perhaps the closest Ratramn gets to resolving this dualism is through the utilization of the idea of the res: "What is seen exteriorly is not that thing (res), but the image of the thing; what is perceived and understood through the mind is the truth of the thing (res)."[28]

In such a framework the "real" will always tend towards being remote from matter, and the earthly body of Christ will give way to a spiritual presence in the church without the connection between the two being stressed. This leads to various new problems about the place and status of the risen body of Christ. After the Ascension any corporeal presence

---

[24] ibid. 10.

[25] ibid. 12.

[26] ibid. 14.

[27] ibid. 16.

[28] ibid. 77. As Fahey puts it (op. cit. p. 60): "When he (Ratramn) called the Eucharist a figure, he meant only that the reality of the Eucharist is not one that is perceptible with the bodily senses."

of the body of Christ is regarded as impossible; what is present is the spiritual power of the body of Christ. This theory tends to cut the eucharistic presence off from its origins in the earthly person of Jesus. The "being for" is cut loose from its "being there" and historical action will not be closely related to matter, but will tend to escape into the "spiritual".

This argument by Ratramn had enormous influence through the history of eucharistic debate. It is, for instance, a powerful factor in Calvin's thought. Ratramn felt that to say that the earthly and eucharistic bodies are identical implied that there must be a continuity between the corporeal body of Christ and the eucharistic presence, that is, that the eucharistic body is fleshly. In this Ratramn appears to have been influenced by his strong emphasis on the corporeality of the human person of Jesus, as in his explicit treatment of the birth of Jesus in his treatise De Nativitate Christi.[29] He quite rightly felt he had to fight for the uniqueness of the earthly person, and he, with many other writers, felt that Paschasius overstressed the identity of the historical and the eucharistic body.

But not even Radbert, with his strong identification of the two bodies, believed that the eucharistic presence was corporeal just as the incarnate Christ was. Rather Radbert stressed the sameness of the two bodies in order to safeguard the continuity between the incarnate Jesus, the heavenly Lord and the eucharistic presence, but he always recognizes the fact of the resurrection and the role of the Spirit in the eucharist. We find, therefore, in Radbert a similar pattern of thought as in Augustine. Both combine a christological reference with their pneumatology, so that the eucharist is closely connected with the historical action of Jesus, which, in turn, is dynamically perceived as continuing in the action of the Spirit in the church.

---

[29] PL 121, 81-102.

When one examines the controversy more closely, one discovers that there are very real dangers in not stressing the identity of the two bodies. For instance, in Rabanus Maurus we find:

> We do not receive, therefore, in the sacramental body the historical body, rather the sacraments are received from the historical body. We do not eat Christ himself but that which was in Christ.[30]

From here it is but a short step to the belief that the content of the sacrament is not personal, but virtually impersonal.[31] Some means needs to be found to safeguard this personal continuity.

Ratramn's rejection of the identity of the two bodies is motivated by his physical notion of truth with its corresponding dualism between physical and spiritual which is even applied to the presence of the risen Lord. All such thought fails to grapple with the difficulty of ascribing place to God. In this regard Radbert seems to have had the final word in the controversy. In his letter to Frudegard, which is really his reply to Ratramn, he tackles the issue of the Ascension. He adopts the Augustinian notion of ascendit descendens, and quotes Augustine:

> For our Lord Jesus Christ did not descend from the Father, so as to desert the Father, so also when he ascends from us he does not depart from us. For when he was about to ascend and be seated at the right hand of the Father he said to his disciples: Behold I am with you always even to the end of the age.[32]

Together with this argument we find a reference, similar to that of Augustine, to the tripartite division of the body of Christ: historical body, sacramental body and the church, which must be regarded as all the same body but seen from different perspectives:

---

[30] Rabanus to Eigil, PL 112, 1510f.

[31] See Geiselmann, op. cit. p. 239.

[32] Hom. de Quinta feria Paschae I, quoted in Geiselmann, op. cit. p. 248.

> The body of Christ is named in three ways in the holy scriptures; no doubt because his body is the universal church of Christ, where Christ is the head and all the elect are called members of it, and from these a body is gathered everyday into a perfect man in the measure of the fullness of Christ.[33]

The risen body of Christ should, therefore, be regarded as continuous with the earthly body, be capable of local realisation as in the eucharist, but not limited to spatial categories as Ratramn would insist. In this way the body of Christ exists in several modes, each of which is closely connected with the others, as the earthly body, as the risen body, as the church, and as the eucharistic body.

To sum up: in Ratramn we find a quite natural concern to do credit to the facts of experience; what we see, touch and taste is the "truth". The difficulty with Ratramn's solution is twofold: firstly, the physical elements fail to have any real significance; the operative principle is the spiritual _virtus_ or _res_. Too easily this position can degenerate into a spiritual communion in which the elements have little or no significance and which may result in a Christianity which fails to engage with the physical realities of the day, and is based upon a christology which separates the humanity and divinity of Christ. The result is evident in his pneumatology in which the Spirit is conceived of as simply non-material, instead of as deriving from the christological union and as God becoming involved in the material. Ratramn did not think like this, but it is no doubt significant that his work was amenable to a Zwinglian interpretation.[34]

---

[33] _ibid._ 7.1. Radbert's eucharistic realism is balanced by an equally realistic ecclesiology: "Since the church is the body of Christ, it is fed, in the eucharist by the body of Christ." See G.H. Tavard, "The Church as Eucharistic Communion in Medieval Theology, " in _Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History_, ed. F. Forrester Church and T. George (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), p. 99.

[34] Ratramn's work was condemned as Zwinglian, but the Zwinglians actually seemed to have avoided using Ratramn. His work became especially important in the English Reformation

Future controversies and debates return to the same problems. Both alternatives have their advantages and disadvantages. The Roman Catholic position follows Radbert and emphasizes the continuity between the historical Jesus and the eucharistic presence. This has the advantage of rooting the eucharist in its historical origins, but has the disadvantage of describing this presence in bodily form, as in the additions to Radbert's work, is open to a superstitious interpretation and will tend to isolate the eucharistic presence in the cultic sphere. Here the eternal becomes present but in a manner which is not truly historical, indeed it is ahistorical. The alternative, however, will fail to show the continuity between the historical person and the eucharistic Christ, and possibly will make both merely expressions of some divine, immaterial action, thus minimizing the importance of the Spirit engaging with the physical in order for historical transformation to take place.

The importance of the "being there" of the earthly body is also to be seen in the dispute between Lanfranc and Berengar, where the beginning of the metaphysical explanation of the nature of this "being there" was hammered out. We can see each of the protagonists struggling with the need to connect the eucharistic presence with the historical Jesus without falling into a confining and crass realism. Berengar does this through a clear distinction between the historical person and a figurative eucharistic presence, while Lanfranc develops the idea of a sacramental presence, which is the historical body in another mode of being. The result is that Berengar follows Ratramn in speaking of a spiritual presence while Lanfranc opposes this with the first description of what was to become transubstantiation.

---

through the advocacy of Peter Martyr; see J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, "Ratramn's Eucharistic Doctrine and its Influence in Sixteenth- Century England," Studies in Church History 2 (1965), 54-77.

Berengar repeatedly returns to his rejection of a corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament through reference to the Ascension,[35] and he believes that Lanfranc was maintaining a position which corrupted the incorruptible body of Christ.[36] Berengar understands Lanfranc to be proposing a doctrine involving a local place for the body of Christ[37] and the abolition of the underlying realities of the bread and wine and the generation of the body and blood of Christ.[38] For Berengar the ascended body of Christ is transcendent and cannot be in space nor can it change. Lanfranc is, therefore, maintaining that there are two bodies of Christ: one on the altar, the other in heaven.[39] Lanfranc raises up or calls down Christ's body.[40] All this is, of course, absurd, and is for Berengar perhaps the bottom line of his opposition to Lanfranc.

Lanfranc follows a similar line of argument to that put forward by Radbert in his opposition to Ratramn's interpretation of the Ascension. Against Berengar's charge that he makes parts of the body of Christ, he replies that: "We certainly eat and drink Christ who was sacrificed on the earth, (but) as he exists and lives wholly and always in

---

[35] E.g. D.S.C. pp. 77, 112. For the importance of Acts 3:21 to Berengar, see Beekenkamp, De Avondsmaalsleer, p. 22.

[36] Berengar ends his work with his own anathemas as his answer to the official oaths; among them is the following: Qui affirmant auferri per corruptionem subiecti ...consecrantur in sacrificio Christi subiecta panis et vini, contra veritatem locuntur doctrinae propheticae et apostolicae, contra veritatem doctrinae Christi (p. 166).

[37] D.S.C. pp. 21f; see Beekenkamp, op. cit. pp. 26-30.

[38] D.S.C. p. 43: Ita si absumitur per corruptionem subiecti in altari panis ut caro esse ibi incipiat per generationem subiecti, non sibi retinet, ut scribis, caro Christi modo esse incipiens per generationem subiecti nonnullas qualitates panis absumpti per corruptionem subiecti, quia corrupto subiecto quod in subiecto eo erat superesse quacumque ratione non potuit.

[39] D.S.C. p. 110.

[40] D.S.C. p. 43.

heaven at the right hand of the Father."[41] He supports this through reference to the way the once and for all sacrifice on the cross is present daily in the eucharist. Nor does Lanfranc believe that his theory implies a limited local presence, but he is not able to explain in detail how this is so. He is reduced to stating that the earthly body of Christ and the eucharistic body are one and the same, but in distinct modes.[42] The most complete statement of Lanfranc's position is the following:

> The material objects on the Lord's Table which God sanctifies through the priest are by the agency of God's power indefinable, wondrously, in a way beyond our understanding, converted to the body of Christ in their being (in essentiam), their outward appearance (reservatis ipsarum rerum speciebus) and certain other qualities remain unchanged, so that those who receive them are not shocked by the naked flesh and blood, and so that believers may receive the greater rewards of faith...What we receive is the very body which was born of the Virgin, and yet it is not. It is, in respect of its being and the characteristics and power of its true nature; it is not if you look at the outward appearance of the bread and the wine.[43]

Lanfranc is the first to grasp the idea that the sacramental reality is not just about a new principle of action, but about a new mode of being in which the remaining properties clearly are not to be judged by the way we subjectively experience them, but as the objective mode of being of the eucharistic realities.[44] This is the

---

[41] PL 150, 422B: Sic nempe in terris immolatum Christum manducamus et bibimus, ut in caelistibus ad dexteram Patris integer semper existat et vivus. For a similar statement see Hugh, PL 142, 1331A-B.

[42] PL 150, 415A: singula...distinctisque modis. Durand also points towards a third, sacramental, mode of existence, PL 149, 1385A.

[43] PL 150, 430B-C (the translation is from Gibson, "The Dispute..." p. 89.

[44] See Geiselmann, op. cit. p. 369.

language of transubstantiation, but Lanfranc's language "is still hesitant and experimental."[45]

We see in this impasse a fundamental difference of theological perspective between the two adversaries. Berengar regards the Ascension as marking a definite break in the divine economy: it divides the time of the incarnation from that of the Spirit and the church. For Lanfranc, however, the eucharist is interpreted as in some way analogous to the incarnation. This is not worked out with theological clarity by Lanfranc, yet it is an important element to his thought. In several places we find allusions to the incarnation loosely attached to the argument.[46] One feels that the argument is not strictly logical: it follows rather from a strong feeling that we must eat Christ's flesh itself, because our flesh needs to be sanctified. Durand especially develops the argument that Christ specifically took on flesh in order that we might be joined to his godhead through consuming that same flesh.[47] In this regard Lanfranc adduces Cyril of Alexandria and his criticism of Nestorius.[48] We seem, then, to have here different soteriologies: Berengar sees the sacrament as mainly cognitive and affecting our minds and souls, whereas

---

[45] See Gibson, "The Dispute..." p. 90.

[46] Thus in PL 150, 421B-C Lanfranc counters Berengar's criticism concerning the collapse in the distinction between sacramentum and res sacramenti: sacrificium...Ecclesiae duobus confici...visibile elementorum specie, et invisibili Domini Jesu Christi carne et sanguine, sacramento et re sacramenti; quae...est corpus Christi, sicut Christi persona, te quoque auctore, constat et conficitur Deo et homine, cum ipse Christus sit verus Deus, et verus homo, quia omnis res illarum rerum naturam et veritatem in se continet ex quibus conficitur. Also see 436A. This line of thought is specially developed in Hugh, PL 142, 1329C-1330C.

[47] PL 149, 1383B-C. See Macy, The Theologies of the Eucharist, p. 45.

[48] PL 150. 428B-D. Beekenkamp accepts that Berengar's position is parallel to that of Nestorius; see his De Avondmaalsleer, p. 33.

Lanfranc insists on the eucharist touching the whole person. This feeling in Lanfranc is stated as an axiom by Bruno of Kln:

> Spiritual grace can only be mediated through a material channel...(and) a purely spiritual form can only be received by angels, not be men.[49]

For Lanfranc, and Roman Catholic theology generally, the "material channel" for spiritual grace exists not simply in the bread and wine, but in their identification with the body of Christ, and in turn this eucharistic body has to be identified with the material, historical body of Jesus. Thus the source of grace in the hypostatic union is carried forward into the church through the presence of the body of Christ in the eucharist. In this progression the emphasis is placed upon the continuity of the physical body of Christ from historical person to the eucharist and the necessary qualifications of this tend to be minimized. The difficulty is that the resultant theology of transubstantiation fails to say much more than that the body of Christ is "there" and it introduces many new difficulties. The most authoritative explanation of the Tridentine decree is to be found in Paul VI's encyclical Mysterium Fidei:

> This presence is called "real" not to exclude the idea that the others (Christ's other modes of presence in his church) are "real" too, but rather to indicate presence par excellence, because it is substantial and through it Christ becomes present whole and entire, God and man.[50]

On the other hand, Berengar, and Reformed theology after him, does not deny that grace is dependent upon a "material channel" and that it has its origin in the historical person of Christ, but regards that presence as mediated to the

---

[49] PL 152, 1038B, which is quoted by MacDonald, op. cit. p. 367.

[50] Sec 39, The Paul Encyclicals. 1958-1981 ed C. Carlen (Wilmington: McGrath Publ, 1981), pp. 165-177.

church in symbolic form, or through the Spirit.[51] The former position will keep the check on the latter's tendency to separate mind from body, spiritual from material, while the latter will prevent the eucharistic presence from being defined in solely metaphysical categories and thus losing its theological meaning and dynamism. For the eucharist to model the historical action of Jesus both of these emphases need to be affirmed.

The controversies of the reformation reflect the tensions between these positions and reveal their different christological assumptions with greater clarity. Luther rejected transubstantiation as a piece of philosophical sophistry, but stood rocklike on his assertion of the real presence in the face of the symbolic interpretation of Zwingli and the spiritualism of Calvin, who were both very influenced by the argument, mediated to them through Ratramn and Cornelius Hoen of the Netherlands, that Christ's body should be situated in heaven after the Ascension, and that his presence in the eucharist can only thereafter be through the Spirit. Luther opposed the Swiss reformers because he saw them undermining the centrality of the incarnation and the cross. In the eucharist the principle of the incarnation must continue with the cross having central place:

> The glory of our God is precisely that for our sakes he comes down to the very depths, into human flesh, into the bread, into our mouth, our heart, our bosom; moreover, for our sakes he allows himself to be treated ingloriously on the cross and on the altar (I Cor 11:27), that some eat the bread in an unworthy manner.[52]

---

[51] On the attempt to reject transubstantiation, see the comment of K. Rahner: "(This is) an effort to confine the action of God to the purely divine sphere; it does not intervene to change anything where the things of the world are - the bread, morals, the grave and so on" ("The Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," Theological Investigations 4, p. 306).

[52] "That these words of Christ, "This is my Body," etc., still stand firm against the fanatics" (1527), LW 37, p. 72.

As to the precise way in which this happens, Luther insists that Christ's body is present, but in another mode:

> We do not say that Christ's body is present in the Supper in the same form in which he was given for us (in the incarnation)...but that it is the same body which was given for us, not in the same form or mode but in the same essence and nature.[53]

Luther's further definition of the real presence he himself regarded as tentative. In the face of the Reformed understanding of the body of Christ, Luther developed the theory of ubiquity, which was built on a subtle theory of presence. Bodies, Luther argued, are present in three different ways: 1) they can be circumscriptively or locally in a place, or 2) definitively or in an uncircumscribed manner, as angels or the risen body of Christ, or 3) they can be repletively present as God is present in all things. Christ's human, but risen body, can be present in the second or third manner, because of its union with the divine.[54] Luther's thought at this point depends on his reading of the doctrine of the communicatio idiomatum by which the qualities of the divine are attributed to the human in the person of Christ.[55] Luther maintained this in order to emphasize the reality of the hypostatic union: the flesh was not just used, but effectively united with the divine. The eucharistic presence is not directly equivalent to the hypostatic union, yet it is symbolic of it. For the eucharistic presence this means that

> since he is a man who is supernaturally one person with God, and apart from this man there is no God, it must follow that according to the third supernatural mode, he is and can be wherever God is and that everything is full of Christ through and through, even according to his humanity--not according to the first corporeal, circumscribed mode, but according to the supernatural, divine mode.[56]

---

[53] "Confession concerning Christ's Supper", LW 37, p. 195.

[54] "Confession concerning Christ's Supper," LW 37, pp. 215f.

[55] ibid. pp. 209ff.

[56] LW, p. 68.

Such a theory leaves a further question for Luther, namely, as to what is special about the eucharistic presence. The answer is returned that the eucharistic presence is tied to the promise of Christ.[57] This means that, for Luther, Christ's presence in the "being there" level of being is ubiquitous, but in the "being for" level it is different. The eucharistic presence is, therefore, a symbolic presence, but a symbolic presence in a particular way in that it emphasizes the continuity with the incarnation and the cross in a way which the Reformed theologians denied.

The difference between the eucharistic theology of Luther and Calvin lies in their christology, and particularly in their view of the humanity of Christ. For Calvin the flesh of Christ only has "power so great as to quicken us" by virtue of its union with the Word.[58] Calvin refused to allow the qualities of the divinity to be given to the humanity of Christ, as did Luther, and the result is that Calvin did not regard Christ's humanity as instrumental for salvation in the same way as did Luther. This means that Christ's body resides in heaven but his power can be universally exercised through the Spirit.[59] We have here a much less unified theology at the christological and pneumatological levels than in Luther; the Reformed theologians charge Luther with confusing the natures of Christ. The Swiss regard the Spirit as the power of the risen Lord but it is not so closely linked with the cross of Jesus with the result that salvation can be regarded more easily as escape from matter than the redemption of the material.

---

[57] "That these words of Christ....", LW 37, p. 68: "It is one thing if God is present, and another if he is present for you. He is there for you when he adds his Word and binds himself, saying, "Here you are to find me"."

[58] Institutes, IV.17.9.

[59] Institutes, IV.17.18.

This is reflected in Calvin's theory of the real presence in his insistence that unworthy communicants do not in fact receive the body of Christ. The reality of the sign and the sign itself are only joined by faith.[60] It is possible to over-emphasize the way such a view can undermine the traditional doctrine of sacramental efficacy, but it certainly does not relate the eucharist as effectively to the person of Jesus as does either Luther's or the Roman Catholic position, and this must render it not as effective as a symbol of the eternal becoming historical.

Modern Roman Catholic attempts at building bridges with the Reformed tradition have been exciting, even if they have not met with official approval. The translation of transubstantiation into transsignification, or trans-finalization, was a deliberate attempt to avoid the problems of a static, substantial presence, and to incorporate the important elements of Calvinism.[61] Transfinalization was particularly interesting in that it added an eschatological dimension to the definition of the real presence, implying that Christ's presence will only be "real" when his rule is established over all things, and that the eucharistic presence is a sign of that fullness. The refusal of the Catholic magisterium to allow further development of these lines of thought is a tragedy.[62] Other ecumenical discussions have tended to find lines of consensus instead of grappling

---

[60] "Mutual consent in regard to the Sacraments (1554), Calvin's Tracts, p. 215. For this see G.C. Berkouwer, The Sacraments (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), pp. 75ff.

[61] For instance, see J. Power, Eucharistic Theology (London, 1968); for a survey of the debates see P. Schoonenberg, "Transubstantiation: How far is this doctrine historically determined?" Concilium 3.4 (1967), 41-47; also E. Schillebeeckx, The Eucharist (London: Sheed & Ward, 1968), pp. 144ff.

[62] See Mysterium Fidei op.cit. For a contemporary defender of transubstantiation in the strict sense, see E. Gutwenger, "Substanz und Akzidenz in der Eucharistielehre," Zeitscrift für katholische Theologie 83 (1961), pp. 257-306, and his "Das Geheimnis der Gegenwart Christi in der Eucharistie," Zeitscrift für katholische Theologie 88 (1966), pp. 185-197.

with the issues in great depth.[63] As has been demonstrated here, close delimitation of the nature of the real presence leads one inexorably into metaphysics, and the church cannot expect consensus on such an issue when wide divergences in philosophical approaches exist.

This essay describes the real presence as a symbol at the centre of the eucharist. In order for this symbol to mediate the historicity of Jesus, it should be as closely tied to the earthly body of Jesus as possible, and, in order to emphasize the manner in which the eternal becomes historical and transforms matter itself, this presence should be described as real, given and abiding independent of faith, and even as evoking faith. This reality is given to the elements by the Words of Institution, on the one hand, and by the consecratory Epiclesis, on the other hand, and by this dual consecration the historical death of Christ is acknowledged and taken into the church by the Spirit. In this way the elements become the effective signs of the historical Jesus. The symbol is objective to the church because the church recognizes the action of Jesus in them, and it is objective to the individual to a further degree since the individual recognizes in them both the action of Jesus and the church. When the church, and individual Christians, pray for the gift of the Spirit for a fruitful communion there is a recognition that the goal of the sacrament is dependent upon the givenness of the historical Jesus mediated through the givenness of the eucharistic presence. The real presence is thus a further and central statement that the church has continuously to base its present historical action on the history of Jesus for the eternal to become present.

---

[63] See the good, but summary, statement by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, "Eucharistic Doctrine" in The Three Agreed Statements (London: SPCK, 1978), pp. 10-12.

Chapter 7

The eucharist today and tomorrow

Jesus is the perfect expression of humanity. Within the limitations and parameters of his own time and culture, he lived the eternal fully and completely. He lived joyfully and freely giving himself to his people and revealing to all time how a life of self-giving is the way to authentic individuality as well as the foundation of true community. This love led him inexorably into conflict with the dominant culture of his time, which eventually conspired to kill him. This conflict between the truly historical in Jesus and the ahistorical structures of his time is focussed on the cross and becomes the source of redemption and salvation in the resurrection. By proclaiming the resurrection the church affirms that the life of Jesus was not in vain, but that his manner of life is the ground of all wholeness in every age. The eternal, embodied in the truly historical action of Jesus, bursts apart the limitations of time, and becomes present whenever and wherever the cross and resurrection of Jesus is properly remembered.

The eucharist is one of the chief means by which the historical action of Jesus is remembered. The eucharist itself is a cultic remembrance of a historical person and an aid to our historical action. The eucharist is a powerful vehicle of the disturbing memory of Jesus precisely because it is capable of presenting his historical action as the eternal historically adapting the ahistorical, but, because the eucharist is itself an ahistorical medium, all too easily it suppresses the historical dimensions of Jesus' action. The church needs constantly to guard against this through careful and detailed exegesis of the gospels and by constant revision of the ahistorical dimensions of its eucharistic celebration. The theological content as well as the form of the eucharist will both unconsciously carry many of the ideological presumptions of wider society. The

critique of these by the church needs first to be modelled in the reform of the eucharist, so that the eucharist is experienced as a domain in which God's promised future is dawning.

The eucharist finds its fulfilment in the transformation of the world into the perfect community promised by God. It is not an end in itself, but always looks beyond towards the mission of the church in the world. It provides a pattern for this mission by constantly recalling the cross and resurrection of Jesus as the means whereby the eternal recasts the ahistorical through authentic historical action. The ahistorical form of the eucharist provides the temptation to regard the eucharist as an end in itself. By itself the eucharist is not a historical action. It is the breathing in of the church which brings new life and courage for its breathing out in the world.

At the centre of the eucharist is the identification of the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ. These become the focal point of the symbolic representation of the presence of Christ in the church. They recall, in the first instance, the action of Jesus at the Last Supper, which in turn is a parable of his whole life. He gave himself to give life to his people. The eucharist is a meal recalling the festal meals of Jesus, indicating our human dependence upon food as well as upon joyful fellowship and praise. Because of its nature as a meal the eucharist will always carry a critique of economic structures which create poverty and will call the church to work towards a society in which all people share the earth's bounty in order, not only to eat sufficient, but to develop their creative cultural potential.

This thesis has attempted to show that truly historical action needs to be an expression of eternal human value and that this will reform the ahistorical conditions of human life. The ahistorical contains good and bad elements which foster and hinder the expression of the eternal. By being itself an ahistorical form, the eucharist takes up

ahistorical elements from society and brings them into a situation of potential dialogue with the central core of Christianity, namely, the remembrance of the death and resurrection of Jesus. In order for this juxtaposition to be illuminating and lead to present historical action, the eucharist must itself be regarded as a dialogue. The traditional theory of exchange, in which I offer myself in the offertory and receive myself re-united with Christ and consecrated to his service in the communion, indicates how the eucharist is thought of as transformatory. This is not sufficient. The hermeneutic circle required of a genuine exposure of the present to the death and resurrection of Christ will only happen when the eucharist itself ceases almost always to be a formal affair. Only when the community is taught to bring the ahistorical elements of its eucharistic celebration into consciousness, that is, to be more critical of itself in the light of a developing exposure to the hermeneutic of the cross, will the eucharist be an aid to historical action. All too often the eucharist is perceived as a given, a rite to be performed, not as something to be created and to be explored. The givenness of the eucharist is one of the chief reasons it remains an ahistorical ritual cut off from genuine Christian action in the world.

In order to illuminate the implications of these observations the eucharist envisaged by this thesis can be compared with other modern attempts to dress the eucharist in modern clothes. The "secularisation" debate, begun in the sixties and now emerging with new force, has discussed worship only cursorily, and, increasingly, because of the non-receptiveness of the churches, discussion over the implications of secularisation for Christian worship has been conducted outside of the church.[1] This will, however,

---

[1] See P.M. van Buren, "The Tendency of our Age and the Reconception of Worship," in Worship and Secularization ed. W. Vos (Bussum: Paul Brand, 1970), pp. 3-9; and C. Davis, "Ghetto or Desert: Liturgy in a cultural dilemma," ibid. pp. 10-27.

not do. As D. Cupitt so ably demonstrates, the fundamental philosophical issues raised in the sixties were never resolved, and are now returning, like all repressions, into consciousness more stridently. The implications of secularism for worship have been discussed in terms of an attempt to express liturgy in modern cultural terms, in which the traditional eucharistic myth is simply transposed, but this fails to engage with the essence of secularism.[2] The most significant alteration involved in adapting traditional worship into a secular mode is the awareness that traditionally worship has rendered humankind passive before God, whereas in secular theology we are active agents in some senses creating the God we worship. This is very similar to the insight of this thesis that the truly historical creates the eternal in a manner unique to the moment, and that the eternal only becomes present through the historical.

Perhaps the most significant reflection on the implications of secularism for worship comes from J.G. Davies, who argues that the essence of the New Testament is frankly secular and that the division between the sacred and the secular only entered into Christianity in the late fourth century.[3] There is no doubt that the sense of awe to which Davies points entered the liturgical vocabulary at this point, but his attempt to secularize early Christianity is only partially successful. He is correct that Christianity claims the world for God and fights hard against dualism, but the worship of the risen Christ and the general apocalypticism of the New Testament must surely indicate that Davies's thesis cannot stand. New Testament

---

[2] The familiar plea for the Africanisation of the liturgy follows the same pattern of thought (see L. Pato, "Becoming an African Church," in Bounty in Bondage ed F. England & T.J.M. Paterson (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1989), pp. 159-176), but the rapid secularisation of African society will quickly render such problems archaic.

[3] J.G. Davies, Every Day God. Encountering the Holy in World and Worship (London: SCM, 1973), pp. 246ff.

worship was not secular as Davies would have it be: there was a divine world which acted upon our existence. Secularism is a new phenomenon, and the church's response to secularism cannot just involve a return to the past. As Davies rightly points out, renewal should involve something new. Davies would have been better served to argue that the tendency towards secularism in the New Testament should now be seized and developed into something which goes beyond traditional Christianity.

The problem Davies faces is how to incorporate the ritual and frankly worshipful elements of primitive religion and traditional Christianity into a purely secular milieu. He recognizes that ritual is important, indeed necessary to modern secular society, and that the secular world celebrates significant occasions in ritual form, but when it comes to his description of a modern eucharist it seems peculiarly barren.[4]

This thesis has deliberately not followed the presuppositions of the secularisation school of theology, and, by adopting a much more existential approach, avoids certain of its problems. Davies, for instance, while being aware of the importance of ritual in the modern world, ends by not presenting a eucharist which is a developed ritual. The reason for this would seem to be a reluctance to perceive that even modern secular society is bounded by the ahistorical just as much as any of its predecessors. There is simply no way that the ahistorical can be discarded. Advocates of radical secularism would be better served by attempting to isolate the myths of secularism and to develop eucharistic forms which would engage directly with these.

A similar problem is to be found in the description of a eucharist by D. Cupitt, for whom the eucharist becomes a kind of business meeting without any meaningful ritual or symbolic content, save that the bread symbolizes that the "gathered company is the risen Christ" and the formula "the

---

[4] ibid. pp. 344f.

blood of Christ...is taken to mean that the church must surrender her distinct identity and must dissolve herself into the common life of humanity".[5]

The difficulty with both of these attempts to model a future eucharist is that they do not pay sufficient attention to the way the eucharist, as a ritual action, should be involved in the critique of the ahistorical, that is, the present structures of society and their accompanying thought patterns and ideologies, in order to refashion the ahistorical in terms of God's promised future. The eucharistic gathering should be a deliberate act of social criticism of present structures and a presentation of an alternative. Both of these emphases are best represented in ritual form. Through the ritual the community will recognize the pervasiveness of the influence of society, that the structures of thought and behaviour which cause oppression enter deeply into the psyches of everyone in that society and that they need constantly to be brought into consciousness, faced and rejected, and that the new attitudes, based upon Jesus's own example, life, death and resurrection, are not quickly assumed, but likewise have to be placed before one, opted for, and struggled towards. The transformation from the old to the new involves much more than a moment of choice but the agonizing change of the whole person and that society. Since there will always be a tension between society and its potential for transformation, the individual glimpsing the new possibilities will always live the new in conflict not only with society, but in a sense within him or herself. The overtly historical in this process will only be the tip of the iceberg. We choose and act prompted by primitive shifts in attitude, and those actions then influence us and others in all sorts of ways. Too great a stress on historical action as the manifestation of the eternal will place the

---

[5] Radicals and the Future of the Church (London: SCM, 1989), pp. 170f.

mental health of individuals and community in great jeopardy. The transformation of the whole society needs to be mirrored and enacted repeatedly by that society so that the psychic depths of personality are slowly transformed.

Each community needs to engage in this task for itself in its own unique way. Nothing can substitute for the demands of celebrating the eucharist itself, for struggling towards finding the perfect expression of the eternal for that particular moment in that particular community. Nonetheless this thesis would suggest several important principles which should be applied in this task.

The eucharist must be seen to be part of the church's wider search for a historical expression of the eternal in its present ahistorical setting. Particularly important is the relationship between the eucharistic anamnesis and christology. Only through a constant reappraisal of who Jesus was and who he is today can the hermeneutic framework be established within which the eucharist operates providing its own contribution and integrating individuals and congregations into that interpretation of the death and resurrection of Jesus.

This means that there will have to be a much more meaningful interaction between the Word and the Sacrament. All too often our liturgical celebrations fall apart in the middle. There can be a powerful challenge presented in the sermon and carried through in the prayers, only for this to dissipate in the formality of the eucharistic canon. Many do learn the links that exist in the liturgy between the word and the sacrament. They are enabled to make the eucharistic offering a true offering of inner intention and they do find the breathing in and out of the eucharistic liturgy to be a source of great meaning and life, but all too often the subconscious message conveyed is that whatever challenges one faces there is always a possible place of retreat in the sacrament -- here is a religious holy place where life cannot penetrate. For the eucharistic anamnesis to be closely connected with the lived hermeneutics of the church,

the distinction between word and sacrament needs to be redrawn, so that the sacrament becomes the "enfleshed word", a way of enacting the particular challenge and response the hermeneutic process is presenting.[6]

What distinguishes the eucharist from other communal searchings after the truth is the symbolic union of the life of the congregation with Christ in the eucharistic elements and the congregation's act of communion with him in the reception of these elements. This is not a process of simply moving from interpretation to action; between interpretation and action is this communal gathering around and creating of the eucharist as itself a whole and complex symbol. The eucharist needs to be considered as much more than the elements themselves, but as the entire context, including buildings, seating, participation, movement, words spoken or sung. The entire liturgy becomes a symbol providing the setting for the more limited interpretation of the consecrated bread and wine. The formation of this symbolic community is fundamental to historical action, because it is the first response to the eternal and provides a model of evocative and driving force for the community's engagement with society.

If the church itself is not able to discern the implications of the eternal for its own historical action within its own life, what hope is there for a proclamation to the wider society? Luckily we do not have to be perfect to contribute towards the truth, but, if one is hoping to develop a prophetic praxis in society, it is important to foster that praxis at home first. The eucharist should therefore consciously be a domain of self-criticism and adaptation. The eucharist is often regarded as constituting the church; in order for this to be the case it should be

---

[6] This theme, familiar to Reformed theology, is analyzed by K. Rahner, "The Word and the Eucharist," TI 4, pp. 253-286. Rahner sees how "the word of God effectually renders the grace of God present"(p. 260), but the sacrament is the supreme and effective realization of the word of God (p. 265). "The sacrament is an efficacious word" (p. 267).

borne in mind that the church is ecclesia semper reformanda. The years of liturgical reform have created a climate in which the liturgy is not regarded as particularly sacred, yet, because of fear of abuse and the need for an expression of unity, its use is still governed by rubrics and priests depart from the norm at their own peril. A further loosening up of eucharistic possibilities needs to take place, but this places a great responsibility on the church to train its clergy as liturgists to use the resultant freedom creatively and responsibly.

Unfortunately there will be little agreement about what should be reformed or not. All sorts of suggestions will be put forward as how best to represent the eternal in the eucharist. Most parish priests have long since discovered that nothing provides more problems than asking for consensus on anything to do with the liturgical celebration. The result of this confusion is usually an autocratic decree, with perhaps the reluctant consent of the parish council. Very few realize that this very difficulty presents the greatest opportunity for communal discussion and learning about the nature of liturgy and the means of celebration. Working through these difficulties with a worshipping community can be the way of producing participation at very deep and meaningful levels. This will be especially important in cross-cultural settings, which will be increasingly common in the future, where unfulfilled expectations can lead to acute frustration.

In order for the eucharist to become a place in which the ahistorical constraints of the present are objectivized, the conflicts within the community need to be brought into the open.[7] These will often reflect the conflicts of the wider society and working through them in the church can become the basis for engagement of the church with society. The basis for a constructive historical response to these

---

[7] See F. England, "Symbolic Warfare. The battle for ownership of symbols in an Anglican community." Unpubl MA Thesis, University of Cape Town, 1987.

conflicts will be made upon reflection on the eternal as represented by elements within the Christian tradition and the dominant themes of the eucharist itself. The eucharist can, therefore, be thought of as a place in which various conflicts are objectivized, reflected on in terms of the Christian tradition, and then a response to these conflicts is modelled in order to aid action in the wider world. The eucharist should have three phases: objectification, that is bringing the ahistorical into consciousness; reflection, that is associating the present with the historical action of Jesus; and modelling a response, that is, moving towards the reformulation of the ahistorical as a means towards the new expression of the eternal in truly historical action.

Objectification

The greater lay participation in the eucharist, allowed for by recent liturgical revision, is still regarded along rather traditional and formal lines. The laity now read lessons, conduct the prayers, take up the gifts in the offertory procession, and serve at the altar. The really important parts of the liturgy, that is, the proclamation of the word and the presiding at the altar are still the domain of the clergy. The result of this is that the consciousness of the clergyperson is usually dominant. What he or she deems fit to be said is said. The whole affair is rigidly controlled. In such an environment laity do not usually participate meaningfully. This is fuelled by the pervading clericalism of the church. We should be learning from the wider political scene that effective participation is only possible where the community itself is given responsibility and the freedom to take the initiative.[8] The eucharist should be the place where as much of the community's consciousness as is possible is objectivized.

---

[8] This learning lies behind the development of basic Christian communities (see L. Boff, Ecclesiogenesis (London: Collins Liturgical, 1986) and J.B. Metz, The Emergent Church (London: SCM, 1981), pp. 82ff).

How can this be achieved? The first step will be the appropriation of the leading of the celebration by the community itself. Instead of dominating the assembly, clergy should be seen as presiding at and facilitating the meeting of the community. To be an effective liturgist will not simply entail the technicalities of reading and preaching, but will require expert leadership skills, the ability to solicit participation, and to guide the whole community in reflection and response. Similarly the community must be prepared for active participation.

Only through active participation in the liturgy can what happens in the eucharist be closely linked to the lives of individuals and community. This participation will consist of three elements: presentation, listening and critical questioning. Through this process the life experience of the congregation will be exposed in its existential structure.

The liturgist could from time to time invite particular groups, whose experience of life presents special challenges, to present their experience to the community, in order for the congregation to own that experience, to reflect upon it, and to model some response. For this to be effective it would require careful preparation and the use of role plays, acting, modern visual and audio equipment. Why are we so squeamish about using modern media in church? However, such presentation by itself fails to achieve any degree of objectivity. The dimensions of suffering and joy in the presentation need to be subject to analysis as to their causes in the individual, social, political, and economic levels, before the ahistorical structures which inhere in the situation become apparent.

Such presentation and criticism is not possible in the eucharist as it is structured today. In our present eucharistic practice the movement is from the reading of scripture, through reflection on this into the prayers and eucharistic canon, all with a minimum of participation. The model of contextualisation employed is of application and

passivity: one applies the traditional answers to new situations. This fails to account for the way new situations themselves demand a reformulation of the tradition. A thoroughly contextual eucharist needs to begin from "life" and to move from this towards reflection, not the other way around. A more historical approach will present to the congregation a "slice of life" as the basis for reflection and response. Participants should be asked to engage with this "reality" at various levels, the emotive, the cognitive, the critical and the practical, so that the experience is, as far as possible, educative and life transforming.[9]

For this to take place the atmosphere should be of a workshop, in which what takes place is largely experimental and tentative, where formulations are never final, and where all grope towards the truth with an attitude of expectant listening. One of the chief functions of the liturgist will be that of referee preventing any group from dominating others. We should be moving towards the more chaotic, but more creative, kind of worship, of which we catch glimpses in the New Testament.[10]

Reflection

Already within the process of objectification elements of reflection will be found. However a deliberate shift is necessary in order for the experience exposed through the sharing to interact with the Christian tradition. Perhaps those making the presentation could be asked what elements in scripture seem to them to be important in their own

---

[9] The liturgy needs to become an educational event using elements of the educational theory of P. Freire. For the background see his Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972), and for the integration of Freire into Christian educational theory see T.H. Groome, Christian Religious Education (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980).

[10] Paul's concern with the Corinthians was to create some kind of order in their worship without quenching the work of the Spirit; see I Cor 12:7-10 and 14:26.

reflection on their experience. The liturgist should be a resource person who can help the community in discovering points of contact between their experience and that of their extended community of faith. The role of the liturgist as the bearer of tradition will be critical at this point. The good ahistorical elements of the tradition which pertain to the situation should be presented as possible bearers of the eternal. Little should be done, however, in terms of traditional sermonizing. The community should, rather, be directed towards sources and be enabled to engage with these itself.

If an experience of life has been validly presented, there will always be a core of conflict and suffering within it, which will be capable of identification with the suffering Christ. From this recognition thanksgiving and the potential for transformation will arise. True eucharistia will be thanksgiving not simply for what Christ did for me long ago, but for his presence with me where I am now. What will distinguish the eucharistic process from hermeneutics in general will be a close identification of the exposed experience with the dying and rising Lord and then the attempt to dramatize this in symbolic form. The reflection will, therefore, be a search for an appropriate christology, and a development out of the eucharistic anamnesis. The implications of the truly historical action of Jesus for our time will become apparent.

The ahistorical framework of the eucharist provides the interpretative context for this act of discernment of Christ's presence in human experience, but the very act of discernment should at least be capable of reforming this framework. It is only through conflict and a measure of alienation that the full extent of the ahistorical elements can become apparent to consciousness. Three examples are given.

The experience of attempting to participate in worship organized by people of a different class than one's own immediately illustrates how subtly and sometimes how

invidiously one's place in life is communicated through the environment of worship. The awareness that someone is alienated by the richness of the vestments, for instance, should lead the community to reflect on how best to embody in its eucharistic worship the poverty of Christ, and the way the eucharist should balance the kingly reign of Christ with his servanthood.

The oppression of women in society at large is presently reflected by the male priesthood. The inability of many churches to grasp the implications of feminism for theology and church government is an indication of the difficulty of objectivizing the ahistorical. All sorts of defences are presented to resist the eroding of male privilege. The result is a fundamental distortion of the image of God in humankind presented by the church and especially by its liturgical structures. At the heart of resistance to ordaining women is a false christology, and perhaps the only way to overcome the hardness of heart behind this opposition is for women who are deeply hurt by it to continue to share the experience of finding the suffering of Christ in their pain. The church's response to feminism needs to be incorporated into its liturgical structures.[11]

In South Africa (as elsewhere) racism is deeply entrenched, and can be found subliminally in everyone. The eucharistic assembly should be conscious of this and find ways of expressing the horror of racism and the overcoming of it through the reconciling power of Christ. Unfortunately we all consider ourselves immune to racism. We only become aware of its presence in us when faced with the alienation people of other races experience in our community. The New Testament church itself had to wrestle with the implications of the universal love of Jesus for its own racism. The inclusion of the Gentiles into the church continues to have

---

[11] For the struggle to achieve this in the CPSA see T.J. M. Paterson, "The Ordination of Women: A Contribution to the Debate within the CPSA," Journal of Theology for Southern Africa 66 (1989), pp. 21-33.

direct meaning for us today. The presentation of a transformed society in the liturgy will be of enormous benefit to participants wrestling with racism inside and outside the church.

Modelling a Response

The first stage of a response to the discovery of the suffering Christ at the centre of a lived experience will be the modelling of this in the eucharist itself. The objectification of experience and reflection on it needs to be designed so that it is reflexive back on to the way the community perceives and organizes itself. In this way the ahistorical form of the eucharist will be reformed. From such a reflexive centre each sharing of life can be organized as a celebration of life's union with Christ. Symbols of the reflected-on experience can be designed in order to facilitate transformation. By this much more is meant here than objects of art or words; the whole eucharistic experience should be considered to be a large and complex symbol which draws participants into its mystery and provides numerous points of contact evoking depths of meaning not immediately apparent. In this way individuals and different groups in the liturgical assembly can contribute and draw insight from the one experience. The assembly, understood as a symbol, will also model the vision of the community for the wider society and will provide the points of contact through which my life in the world can gain meaning and purpose. For the symbols to have this transforming effect the community (and individuals within it) have to own the activity, and how best to do this than to create it?

Such symbol creation is a gift which needs to be stimulated. Simple participation in the eucharist is already a contribution towards the creation of the eucharistic symbol, but individuals will have special gifts to offer to enrich the gathering. Traditionally artists of various kinds have offered their services for the building of churches or

the beautification of worship. So, for instance, the medieval cathedrals are massive monuments to the way the church conceived of her place in the world. Some modern architecture and art attempts to deepen the church's present understanding of itself, of which Coventry Cathedral is a good example. Music, sewing, dancing, and a host of other activities can all enrich the community's worship and should be brought into the wider hermeneutic process of trying to make the eucharist a more appropriate ahistorical expression of the eternal becoming historical.

The use of such art forms will be important in expressing levels of human experience not reducible to language. Pain, hope, joy, are all best expressed in art, poetry or music. Such media are also capable of producing shifts in consciousness in the community and individuals which will lead to true thanksgiving and transformation. All the time the liturgist and the church community needs to be aware that they must attempt to communicate the message of Christ's death and resurrection as the hope of transformation at levels of human experience not immediately accessible to rational speech. The process of symbol creation will become numinous when hidden attitudes are transformed, when beauty is glimpsed in a drab life, when a person dogged by failure finds a creative spark within her, when suspicion gives way to trust.

One of the difficulties all ritual has to face is that it loses its power once participants become self-conscious. Most present day liturgy has the feeling of being a amateur performance with a reluctant audience. If the traditional format is retained in which there is a move from word to sacrament (and there is a lot to be said for this), then the formalization of the reflected experience has to take place in an almost spontaneous, but at the same time deliberately formal, way.

There would seem to be little reason for excluding the reframing of the eucharistic prayer itself in order to express the particular focus achieved by the community.

Indeed, part of the process of reflection and response could be the production of such appropriate prayers. If clergy are trained in facilitating this process, this could be very meaningful. There seems little reason for regarding the eucharistic prayer as more holy and sacrosanct than the sermon.[12]

* * * * *

Such a process will, of course, be time consuming and demanding, and could not be exhaustively concluded in any conceivable time allotted. Therefore, each eucharistic gathering should be thought of as a continuation of the previous experience and not as a discrete event. Perhaps the model of a TV serial is useful: each episode is usually almost comprehensible in itself, but full understanding and appreciation only comes through constant exposure.

These suggestions can be applied in various ways to existing eucharistic communities. For instance, even in the traditional formal eucharist with its readings, sermon, prayers and canon, an awareness of the need to move through the process indicated will lead to a far more meaningful and historically engaged liturgy. A good deal of the lay participation can be done behind the scenes by bible study groups and fed into the assembly unobtrusively. Even in the sermon a preacher can partially move the congregation through this process without altering the format of the eucharist. This will however not fully engage the congregation and will not mobilize them in forming their own eucharistic symbol.

There will be a difference between smaller and larger groups in the level of personal interaction possible. In

---

[12] See the discussion of the prayers of Huub Oosterhuis by J.B. Ryan, "Eucharistic Prayers for Contemporary Men and Women," Studia Liturgica 11 (1976), pp. 186-206, and also the cautionary note about the aptitude of clergy for the creation of eucharistic prayers and their possible training for this task by L. Weil, "Eucharistic Prayers for Contemporary Men and Women; a comment," ibid. pp. 214f. See also Appendix A for two more prayers, the one more traditional than the other.

small groups the emphasis can be on the individual's historical response to the eternal. The bigger the group the higher the level of formality, but also the greater the resources for rich symbol creation. Here the emphasis will be on the transformation of the ahistorical form of the eucharist in order to stimulate individual historical response and in order to express the communal dimension of human existence. Skilful liturgy will be a balance between the need for individual participation and corporate formality. Different occasions lend themselves to one or the other, but if the underlying hermeneutic dynamic is operating in the wider church both the small house church and the cathedral high mass will be enriched.

Appendix

A Eucharistic Prayer in traditional language

This prayer was written by the author to illustrate what a eucharistic prayer could look like avoiding the Sanctus in the middle and with a more direct missiological impetus. It has been previously published in "A Liturgy for Liberation" Bounty in Bondage, ed F. England & T.J.M. Paterson (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1989), pp. 68f:

(Sursum Corda)

Blessed are you, O Lord, our God, for you have created all things through your Word and filled them with your goodness. We praise you for sustaining all things in being and directing them for your glory. We praise you for our creation in your image, for the joys and responsibilities of sharing your rule over the world. Above all we praise you for the blessing of knowing you in your Son, Jesus, our Lord and Saviour.

We thank you for his action in our creation, preservation and redemption, for his becoming a person like us, for his ministry of word and deed, for the gift of himself on the cross, by which he vanquished sin, evil and death, and won new life for us through the resurrection.

We thank you that on the night in which he was betrayed he took bread, broke it and blessed you, and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body". And after supper he took the cup and said, "This is my blood, the blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many".

And so holy Father, through your infinite grace we present before you the sacrifice of your Son, and in union with him we proclaim with joy his victory, and in this holy meal we partake of his new life won for all.

Grant, O Lord, that all may indeed be gathered into your kingdom. Pour your Holy Spirit upon us that our union with Christ may be complete; unite us together with the whole church and empower us in the service of the gospel, so that we may hasten that day when Christ shall be all in all, and when we shall be united with, in and through Christ with all the saints and the choirs of heaven, singing,

Holy, Holy, Holy Lord
God of power and might
Heaven and earth are full of your glory
Glory be to you, O Lord most high. Amen.

A Eucharistic Prayer of Liberation

This prayer was written by the Revd Michael Worsnip, an Anglican priest and lecturer at the Federal Theological Seminary, Pietermaritzburg. This prayer has been the subject of considerable controversy, not least for its use of Coca Cola instead of wine.

Prayer at the offertory:

Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation, through your goodness, we are able to bring this Coca Cola to share. Made by the workers of this country who see little of the profits which it generates, it reminds us of all sorts of things, like exploitation, American Imperialism, junk food, but also of parties and fun and community. Make it now become for us the cup of salvation.

After the Sursum Corda

God, it is much more than our duty, it is part of our struggle that we should try always to offer thanks to you for showing us the Way through Jesus and through the courage of the heroes of our struggle, right through history.

Of course, Jesus showed us the path to freedom very clearly in the way that he was prepared to listen to people and be moved with anger and pity for them in their oppression and to side with the downtrodden and marginalised. He showed us the way of defiance by his refusal to cooperate with Pilate. He rejected the methods of co-option used by the state by dismissing Herod as "a fox". He claimed for himself a higher authority than the state and prophesied the end of unjust rule.

But most important of all, he established a community which committed itself to sharing, common life and justice for all. For that community and for that ideal, he was prepared to be arrested and tried and to undergo the horrors of capital punishment and die.

But his death was not the end. Victory is inevitable. And so we join with each other and with the poor and suffering all over the world as we sing to you our song of hope and freedom:

Sanctus

Yes, our loving Father and Mother, we sing these songs because we trust you to help us in our struggle for justice and peace. And as we do so we remember Jesus our liberator who on the night that he was informed on and betrayed by Judas, one of his own community, took bread, like we take this bread; he thanked you for food and said to his friends: "Eat this, and think of it as my body". And then he took the cup of wine as we take this Coke, and once again he thanked you, and said to his friends "Drink this in memory of me. It is like my blood spilled for you."

In gratitude we tell of this extraordinary event:

Acclamation

With these small offerings of bread and drink, we your people join together with everyone who has gone before us: people like James Calata, Albert Luthuli, Lillian Ngoyi, Robbie Waterwitch, Colene Williams, Ruth First and countless

others, praying for the end of oppression and the beginning of true freedom.

Strengthen your church as it struggles for justice and peace. Strengthen ....(bishops), and all others in need of support. Be with those who are in detention and in exile and especially with those who mourn their dead today.

We ask that as we wait for and strive for the freedom ahead, we may become better and better people able to give ourselves to each other more and more.

With him and in him and through him, together with each other, starting again in hope from now, for ever and ever. Amen.

Bibliography

I. Reference works

Brightman, F.E. Liturgies Eastern and Western vol 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1896)

Carlen, C. (ed.) The Papal Encyclicals (Wilmington: McGrath Publ, 1981).

Charles, R.H. The Apocrypha and Pseudipigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913).

Charlesworth, J.H.(ed) The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (London: DLT, 1983).

Denzinger, H. & Schnmetzer, A. Enchiridion Symbolorum. Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fide et Morum 36th ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1976).

Eliade, M. (ed) Encyclopedia of Religion (New York: Macmillan, 1987).

Flannery, A. (ed) Vatican Council II. The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1975).

Hänggi, A. & Pahl, I. (ed) Prex Eucharistica. Textus e variis Liturgiis Antiquioribus Selecti (Fribourg: Univ. of Fribourg, 1968).

Jasper. R.C.D. & Cuming G.J. Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed (London: SPCK, 1975).

Kittel, G. (ed.) Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976).

Lampe, G. (ed.) A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961)

McDonald, W.J. (ed) New Catholic Encyclopedia (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Univ of America, 1967).

Quasten, J. Patrology vol 2 (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1953).

Rahner, K. (ed) Sacramentum Mundi (London: Burns & Oates, 1968).

Rauschen, G. Monumenta Eucharistiae et Liturgica Vetustissima. *Florilegium Patristicum* 7. (Bonn: Univ of Bonn, 1909).

II. Authors from the early church to the reformation

Acts of Judas Thomas the Apostle, ed. A.F.J. Klijn. *Supplement to Novum Testamentum* 5 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962).

Alger of Lige — De Sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Domini. *Patrologia Latina* 180, 743-860.

Ambrose — De Mysteriis. *Patroligia Latina* 16, 389-410; or *Florilegium Patristicum* 7, 73-91; or ed. B. Botte (Paris: du Cerf, 1949).

_____ — De Sacramentis. Patrologia Latina 16, 417-462; or ed. H. Chadwick (London: SPCK, 1960); or *Florilegium Patristicum* 7, 92-131; or ed. B. Botte (Paris: du Cerf, 1949); tr. E.J. Yarnold, The Awe-Inspiring Rites of Initiation. Baptismal Homilies of the Fourth Century (Slough: St Paul Publ, 1971).

_____ — De Fide. tr H. De Romestin. *Select Library of Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers* 2nd Series 10 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).

_____ — De Spiritu Sancto and De Incarnationis Dominicae sacramento. tr. R.J. Deferrari. *The Fathers of the Church* 44. (Washington DC.: Catholic Univ of America, 1963).

Aquinas, Thomas — Liber de Veritate Catholicae Fide contra errores Infidelium seu summa contra Gentiles. edd. C. Pero, D.P. Marc, D.P. Caramello (Rome, 1961).

_____ — Scriptum super Sententiis Magistri Petri Lombardi IV, ed. M.F. Moos (Paris, 1947).

_____ — Summa Theologiae IIIa, 1-10, 60-end (Oxford: Blackfriars, 1974-).

Athanasius — Epistolae ad Serapionem. *Patrologia Graeca* 26, 529ff.

Augustine — Enarrationes in Ps 3. ed. A.C. Coxe. *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* 8 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956).

_____ — City of God. tr. H. Bettenson, ed. D. Knowles (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).

_____ De Trinitate III. tr. M. Dods. *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* 3 Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956).

_____ Textus Eucharistici Selecti. ed. H. Lang. *Florilegium Patristicum* 35 (Bonn: Univ of Bonn, 1933).

_____ Writings in connection with the Donatist Controversy. tr. J.R. King. *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956).

_____ De Baptismo Libri Septem. ed. M. Petschenig. *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* 51 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1908).

_____ Homilies on the Gospel according to St. John. ed. E.B. Pusey (Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1848); tr. P Schaff. *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* 7 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956).

Basil the Great De Spiritu Sancto. ed. B. Pruche. *Sources Christiennes* 17. 2nd ed. (Paris: du Cerf, 1966).

_____ Epp. 188, 199. *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* 2nd Series 8 (Oxford: James Parker & Co, 1895).

Berengar De Sacra Coena. ed. W.H. Beekenkamp (The Hague, 1941).

_____ Epistola ad Ascelinum. *Patrologia Latina* 150, 66-69.

Cabasilas, N.A. Commentary on the Divine Liturgy. tr. J.M. Hussey & P.A. McNulty (London: SPCK, 1978).

Calvin, J. Calvin's Tracts. Treatises on the Sacraments Vol II. tr. H. Beveridge (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1849).

_____ The Institutes of the Christian Religion. ed. J.T. McNeill, tr. F.L. Battles. *Library of Cbristian Classics* 21 (London: SCM, 1960).

Constitutiones Apostolorum ed. F.X. Funk. (Paderborn, 1895).

Chrysostom, J. Baptismal Homily II. ed. E.J. Yarnold, The Awe-Inspiring Rites of Initiation.

	Baptismal Homilies of the Fourth Century (Slough: St Paul Publ, 1971).
_____	Ad Caesarium Monachum. *Patrologia Graeca* 52, 758.
Cyprian	Epistolae. ed. G. Hartel. *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum* 3.1-3 (Vienna: C. Gerold, 1868); tr. R.E. Wallis. *Ante Nicene Christian Library* 8.1-2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1870).
Cyril of Alexandria	Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. ed. E.B. Pusey (Oxford: Clarendon, 1872).
_____	Adversus Nestorium. tr E.B. Pusey. *Library of Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church* (Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1881).
Cyril of Jerusalem	Lectures on the Christian Sacraments. ed. F.L. Cross (London: SPCK, 1951).
Dêr-Balizeh	An Early Euchologium. The Dêr-Balizeh Papyrus Enlarged and Re-edited. *Bibliothque du Museon* 23. ed. C.H. Roberts and Dom B. Capelle (Louvain, 1949).
De Rebaptismate	Reliquiae Sacrae vol 5, 283-328. ed. M.J. Routh (Oxford: OUP, 1848); tr. R.E. Wallis. *Ante Nicene Christian Library* 13, 401-428 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1869).
Didache	Apostolic Fathers. ed. J.B. Lightfoot (London: Macmillan, 1891), pp. 217-225.
Durand	De Corpore et Sanguine Domini. *Patrologia Latina* 149, 1375-1424.
Firmilian	Ad Cyprianum contra Epistulam Stephani. ed. M.J. Routh. *Scriptorum Ecclesia*, Opuscula vol 1 (Oxford: OUP, 1840).
Gregory Nazianzen	Orations. tr. C.G. Browne. *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* 7 (Oxford: James Parker, 1894).
Gregory of Nyssa	Orations. tr. W. Moore. *Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* 5 (Oxford: James Parker, 1893).
Guitmund of Aversa	De Corpore et Sanguine Christi Veritate in Eucharistia. *Patrologia Latina* 149, 1427-1494.

Hippolytus — The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome. ed. G. Dix, reissued with corrections, preface and bibliography by H. Chadwick (London: SPCK, 1968).

Hugh of St. Victor — De Sacramentis. *Patrologia Latina* 176,

_____ — Summa Sententiarum IV-VI. *Patrologia Latina* 176, 118-154.

Hugo Ligonensis — De Corpore et Sanguine Christi contra Berengarium. *Patrologia Latina* 142, 1325-1334.

Ignatius of Antioch — Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief. ed. W. Bauer and H. Paulsen. *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* 18. (Tübingen, 1985).

Irenaeus — Adversus Haereses. ed. W. W. Harvey. 2 vols. (Cambridge: CUP, 1857); tr. A. Roberts. *Ante Nicene Christian Library* 5.1-2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1869).

Isidore of Seville — Etymologiarum VI. *Patrologia Latina* 82, 255ff.

Justin Martyr — The First Apology of Justin Martyr. *Patrologiae Graeca* 6. tr. J. Kaye (London: Griffith, Farren, Okeden & Welsh, n.d.).

_____ — The Dialogue with Trypho. tr. A. Roberts. *Ante Nicene Christian Library* 2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1870).

Lanfranc — De Corpore et Sanguine Domini adversus Berengarium. *Patrologia Latina* 150, 407ff.

Luther, M. — Luther's Works. vols 35-38. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1960-).

Melito of Sardis — On Pascha and Fragments. ed. S.G. Hall. *Oxford Early Christian Texts*. (Oxford, 1979).

Paschasius Radbertus — De Corpore et Sanguine Domini. *Patrologia Latina* 120, 1267ff; selections tr. G.E. McCracken. *Library of Christian Classics* 9 (London: SCM, 1957).

_____ — Epistola ad Frudegardum. *Patrologia Latina* 120, 1351-1366.

Peter Lombard — Sentences Bk IV. *Patrologia Latina* 192, 839ff.

Ratramnus — De Corpore et Sanguine Domini. ed. J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink (Amsterdam, 1974); tr. G.E. McCracken. *Library of Christian Classics* 9 (London: SCM, 1957).

Serapion of Thmuis — "The Sacramentary of Serapion of Thmuis," ed. F.E. Brightman, *Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (1899), 104ff.

Tertullian — Tertullian's Homily on Baptism. ed. E. Evans (London: SPCK, 1964).

_____ — Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation. ed. E. Evans (London: SPCK, 1956).

_____ — Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection. ed. E. Evans (London: SPCK, 1960).

Theodore of Mopsuestia — Commentary on the Lord's Prayer, on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. ed. A. Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies* VI (1933).

Wyclif, John — On the Eucharist. *Advocates of Reform. From Wyclif to Erasmus*. ed. M. Spinka. *Library of Christian Classics* 14 (London: SCM, 1953).

Zwingli — On Baptism and On the Lord's Prayer. *Zwingli and Bullinger*. ed. G.W. Bromiley. Library of Christian Classics 24 (London: SCM, 1953).

III. Modern works

Aalen, S. — "Das Abendmahl als Opfermahl im Neuen Testament," Novum Testamentum 6 (1963), 128-152.

Adam, K. — Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin (Paderborn, 1908).

Albertine, R. — "Problem of the (Double) Epiclesis in the New Roman Eucharistic Prayers," Ephemerides Liturgicae 91 (1977), 193-202.

Allchin, A.M. — "The Eucharistic Offering," Studia Liturgica 1 (1962), 101-114.

Althaus, P. Die Theologie Martin Luthers (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1962).

Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue The Dublin Agreed Statement 1984 (London: SPCK, 1984).

Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, "Eucharistic Doctrine", The Three Agreed Statements (London: SPCK, 1978).

Ashby, G.W.E.C. Sacrifice (London: SCM, 1988).

Atchley, A.G.C.F. On the Epiclesis of the Eucharist Liturgy and in the Consecration of the Font. *Alcuin Club Collection* 31. (Oxford: OUP, 1935).

Audet, J.-P. "Literary Forms and Contents of a Normal Eucharistia in the First Century," The Gospels Reconsidered (Reprint from Studia Evangelica International Conference on the Four Gospels in 1957) (Oxford: Blackwell, 1960), pp. 16-35.

Aulén, G. Christus Victor (London: SPCK, 1934).

_____ Eucharist and Sacrifice (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1958).

Aune, D. E. The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in Early Christianity. *Supplement to Novum Testamentum* 28. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972).

_____ "The Phenomenon of Early Christian Anti-sacramentalism," Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature (Festschrift A.P. Wikgren) *Supplement to Novum Testamentum* 33. (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), pp. 194-214.

------ "The presence of God in the Community: The Eucharist in its Early Christian Cultic Context," Scottish Journal of Theology 29 (1976), pp. 451-459.

Baillie, D.M. The Theology of the Sacraments and other papers (London: Faber & Faber, 1957).

Bakhuizen van den Brink, J.N. "Ratramn's Eucharistic Doctrine and its Influence in Sixteenth Century England," Studies in Church History 2 (1965), pp. 54-77.

Balasuriya, T. The Eucharist and Human Liberation (London: SCM, 1977).

Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1984).

Barbour, R.S. Myths, Models and Paradigms (London: SCM, 1974).

Bardsley, A.J. "The Testimony of Ignatius and Polycarp to the Writings of St. John," Journal of Theological Studies 14 (1913), pp. 207-220.

Barnard, L.W. Justin Martyr (Cambridge: CUP, 1967).

Barr, J. Biblical Words for Time (London: SCM, 1962).

Barrett, C.K. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition (London: SPCK, 1947).

Barth, K. Church Dogmatics (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936-69).

_____ "Luther's Doctrine of the Eucharist: its Basis and Purpose," Theology and Church (London: SCM, 1962).

Bartsch, H.-W. (ed) Kerygma and Myth vol 2. (London: SPCK, 1962).

Bates, W.H. "The Background of Apollinaris's Eucharistic Teaching," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 12 (1961), pp. 139-154.

Baumstark, A. Comparative Liturgy rev. B. Botte, ed. F.L. Cross (London: Mowbray, 1958).

Beekenkamp, W.H. De Avondmaalsleer van Berengarius van Tours (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1941).

Behm, J. " θύω , θυσία, θυσιαστήριον," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 3, pp. 180-190.

Bell, C. "Ritual, change, and Changing Rituals," Worship 63 (1989), pp. 31-41.

Bellah, R.N. Beyond Belief. Essays on Religion in a Post- Traditional World (New York, 1970).

_____ The Broken Covenant. American Civil Religion in Time of Trial (New York, 1975).

Benson, E.W. Cyprian (London: Macmillan, 1897).

Benz, E. Augustins Lehre von der Kirche (Wiesbaden, 1954).

Berger, P.L. & Luckman, T. The Social Construction of Reality (New York: Doubleday, 1966).

Berger, P.L. A Rumour of Angels (New York: Doubleday, 1969).

_____ The Social Reality of Religion (London: Faber, 1969).

Berger, T. "Liturgy - a forgotten subject matter of Theology?" Studia Liturgica 17 (1987), pp. 10-18.

Berkouwer, G.C. The Sacraments (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969).

_____ The Second Vatican Council and the New Catholicism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965).

Bernas, C. "Eucharist (Biblical Data)," New Catholic Encyclopedia 5, pp. 594ff.

Betz, J. Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter I.1 and II.1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1955 and 1961).

_____ "Die Euchariste in der Didache," Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft 11 (1969), pp. 10-39.

Bobrinkoy, B. "Worship and the Ascension of Christ," Studia Liturgica 2 (1963), pp. 100-123.

Boelens, W. "Eucharistic Developments in the Evangelical Church," Concilium 3.4 (1967), pp. 48-56.

Boff, L. Ecclesiogenesis (London: Collins Liturgical, 1986).

Bonheoffer, D. Creation and Fall (New York: Macmillan, 1978).

_____ Letters and Papers from Prison (London: SCM, 3rd rev ed, 1967).

Bonner, G. St. Augustine of Hippo (London: SCM, 1963).

Bornkamm, G. "Die eucharistische Rede im Johannes-Evangelium," Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 47 (1956), pp. 161-169.

_____ "Lord's Supper and Church in Paul," Early Christian Experience (London: SCM, 1969), pp. 123-160.

Bourdillon, M.F.C. and Fortes, M. (edd.) Sacrifice (London: Academic Press, 1980.

Bouyer, L. "The Different Forms of Eucharistic Prayer and their Genealogy," Studia Patristica 8 (1966), pp. 156-170.

_____ Eucharist (Indiana: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1968).

_____ Life and Liturgy (London: Sheed & Ward, 1956).

_____ Rite and Man. The Sense of the Sacral and Christian Liturgy (London: Burns & Oates, 1963).

_____ The Word, Church and Sacraments in Protestantism and Catholicism (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1961).

Breisach, E. "Historiography: An Overview," Encyclopedia of Religion (New York: MacMillan, 1987) vol 6, pp. 370-383.

Brightman, F.E. "The Sacramentary of Serapion of Thmuis," Journal of Theological Studies 1 (1899), pp. 88-113.

Brilioth, Y. Eucharistic Faith and Practice: Evangelical and Catholic (London: SPCK, 1953).

Brinkman, B.R. "On Sacramental Man: I. Language Patterning," The Heythrop Journal 13 (1972), pp. 371-401.

_____ "For an Aesthetic of Sacramentology: A Retrospective," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 107 (1985), pp. 341-364.

Bro, B. "Man and the Sacraments: The Anthropological Substructure of the Christian Sacraments," Concilium 1.4 (1968), pp. 18-26.

Brock, S. — The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition. *The Syrian Churches Series* 9, 1979.

Brown, P. — Augustine of Hippo (London: Faber & Faber, 1967).

Brown, Raymond E. — "The Eucharist and Baptism in John," New Testament Essays (Milwaukee: Bruce Publ, 1965), pp. 77-95.

_____ — The Gospel According to John (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971).

_____ — "The Johannine Sacramentary," New Testament Essays (Milwaukee: Bruce Publ, 1965), pp. 51-76.

Bryant, C. — Jung and the Christian Way (London: DLT, 1983).

Bultmann, R. — The Gospel of John (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971).

_____ — The History of the Synoptic Tradition (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972).

Burleson, B.W. — "John Mbiti as Anti-Historian of Theology," Africa Theological Journal 16 (1987), pp. .

Butterfield, H. — Christianity and History (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1949).

Casanas, J. — "The Task of Making God Exist," in P. Richard (ed), The Idols of Death and the God of Life (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1983), pp. 113-149.

Casel, O. — "Das Mysteriengedachtnis des Meßliturgie im Lichte der Tradition," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft 6 (1926), pp. 113-204.

_____ — "Ein orientalisches Kultwort in abendlandischer Umschmelzung," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft 11 (1931), pp. 1-19.

_____ — "Mysteriengegenwart," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft 8 (1928), pp. 145-224.

_____ — The Mystery of Christian Worship (London: DLT, 1962).

_____	"Neue Beitrage zur Epiklesenfrage," Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft 4 (1924), pp. 169-178.
Casserley, J.V.L.	Toward a Theology of History (London: Mowbray, 1965).
Cassirer, E.	An Essay on Man (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1944).
Cawte, J.	"Karl Rahner's Conception of God's Self-communication to Man," The Heythrop Journal 25 (1984), pp. 260-71.
Cazelles, H.	"The Bible and Liturgical Time: Eschatology and Anamnesis," Studia Liturgica 14 (1982), pp. 23-33.
Chadwick, H.	"Eucharist and Christology in the Nestorian Controversy," Journal of Theological Studies ns 2 (1951), pp. 145-164.
Chenu, M.-D.	Nature, Man, and Society in the Twelfth Century (Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press, 1968).
Childs, B.S.	Memory and Tradition in Israel (London: SCM, 1962).
_____	Myth and Reality in the Old Testament (London: SCM, 1960).
Clark, N.S.	An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments (London: SCM, 1956).
_____	"Spirit Christology in the Light of Eucharistic Theology," The Heythrop Journal 23 (1982), pp. 270-284.
Clarke, F.	Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation (London: DLT, 1960).
Clements, R.E.	God and Temple (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965).
_____	"The Meaning of Ritual Acts in Israelite Religion," in Eucharistic Theology: Then and Now. *SPCK Theological Collections* 9 (London: SPCK, 1968).
Cochrane, A.C.	Reformed Confessions of the 16th Century (London: SCM, 1966).
Cochrane, J.	Servants of Power (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1987).

Codrington, H.W. "The Heavenly Altar and the Epiclesis in Egypt," Journal of Theological Studies 39 (1938), pp. 141-150.

Collingwood, R.G. The Idea of History (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946).

Congar, Yves M.-J. I Believe in the Holy Spirit 3 vols. (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983).

Congar, Yves M.-J. "The Idea of Major or Principal Sacraments," Concilium 1.4 (1968), pp. 12-17.

_____ The Mystery of the Church (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1960).

_____ Tradition and Traditions. (London: Burns & Oates, 1966).

Connolly, R.H. "The Eucharistic Prayer of Hippolytus," Journal of Theological Studies 39 (1938), pp. 350-69.

Conzelmann, H. I Corinthians (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

_____ John (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

Corwin, V. "The Church and the Sacraments," in St. Ignatius and Christianity in Antioch (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1960), pp. 189-217.

Cox, Harvey The Feast of Fools (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1969).

Crehan, J.H. "Eucharistic Epiclesis: New Evidence and a New Theory," Theological Studies 41 (1980), pp. 698-712.

Crichton, J.D. Christian Celebration: The Sacraments (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1973).

Cullmann, O. Baptism in the New Testament. *Studies in Biblical Theology* 1 (London: SCM, 1950).

_____ Christ and Time (London: SCM, 1951).

_____ Early Christian Worship. *Studies in Biblical Theology* 10 (London: SCM, 1953).

_____ "The Meaning of the Lord's Supper in Primitive Christianity," in Essays on the Lord's Supper. *Ecumenical Studies in Worship* 1 (London: SCM, 1958), pp. 5-23.

_____ Salvation in History (London: SCM, 1967).

Cuming, G.J. "Egyptian Elements in the Jerusalem Liturgy," Journal of Theological Studies ns 25 (1974), pp. 117-24.

Cumpsty, J. "Bounty in Bondage," in Bounty in Bondage. Essays on South African Anglicanism, ed. F. England & T.J.M. Paterson (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1989), pp. 191-211.

Cupitt, D. The Long Legged Fly (London: SCM, 1987).

_____ The New Christian Ethics (London: SCM, 1988).

_____ Radicals and the Future of the Church (London: SCM, 1989).

Dagenais, J.J. "The Scientific Study of Myth and Ritual: A Lost Cause," The Human Context 6 (1974), pp. 586-620.

Daly, J. The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice (London: DLT, 1978).

Danielou, J. The Bible and the Liturgy (Indiana: Univ of Notre Dame Press, 1956).

Davies, J.G. Every Day God. Encountering the Holy in World and Worship (London: SCM, 1973).

Davis, C. "Ghetto or Desert: Liturgy in a cultural dilemma," in Worship and Secularization ed. W. Vos (Bussum: Paul Brand, 1970), pp. 10-27.

_____ "Understanding the Real Presence," in The Word in History, ed. T. P. Burke (London, 1968), pp. 154-178.

De Chardin, T The Hymn of the Universe (London: Collins Fontana, 1970).

De Gruchy, J. Ministry in Context and Crisis (London: Collins, 1987).

Delling, G. "kairos", Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 3, pp. 455ff.

D'Eypernon, T. The Blessed Trinity and the Sacraments (Dublin: Clonmore & Reynolds, 1961).

Dibelius, M. From Tradition to Gospel (London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1934).

_____ "Die Mahl-Gebete der Didache," Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 37 (1938), pp. 32-41.

Dillistone, F.W. "The Anti-Donatist Writings," in A Companion to the Study of St. Augustine, ed. R.W. Battenhouse. (Oxford: OUP, 1955).

_____ Christianity and Symbolism (London: Collins, 1955).

_____ "The Functions of Symbols in Religious Experience," in Myth and Symbol. *SPCK Theological Collections* 7 (London: SPCK, 1966), pp. 1-14.

_____ "The Sociology of the Liturgy," in Christianity in its Social Context. *SPCK Theological Collections* 8 (London: SPCK, 1967), pp. 41-53.

_____ Traditional Symbols and the Contemporary World (London: Epworth, 1973).

_____ The Power of Symbols (London: SCM, 1986).

Dinesen, P. "Die Epiklese in Rahmen altkirchlicher Liturgies. Eine Studie über die eucharistiesche Epiklese," Studia Theologica 16 (1962), pp. 42-108.

Dittoe, J. T. "Sacramental Incorporation into the Mystical Body," The Thomist 9 (1946), pp. 469-514.

Dix, G. "The Origins of the Epiclesis," Theology 28 (1934), pp. 125-137.

_____ The Shape of the Liturgy (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1944).

Dodd, C.H. "The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 21 (1937), 129-56.

Douglas, M. Natural Symbols (London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1970).

Duffy, R. Real Presence. Worship, Sacraments, and Commitment (New York: Harper & Row, 1982).

Dulles, A. A Church to Believe in (New York: Crossroad, 1982).

_____ The Catholicity of the Church (Oxford: OUP, 1985).

_____ Models of the Church (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1976).

Dunn, J.D.G. Baptism in the Holy Spirit. *Studies in Biblical Theology* 2nd series 15 (London: SCM, 1970).

_____ Jesus and the Spirit (London: SCM, 1975).

_____ "John vi--A Eucharistic Discourse?" New Testament Studies 17 (1970/1), pp. 328-338.

Durkheim, E. The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1915).

Edwards, F. "Neo-Feminist Spirituality: An Evolutionary Perspective," Journal of Theology for Southern Africa 66 (1989), pp. 53-61.

Eichrodt, W. Ezekiel (London: SCM, 1970).

Eliade, M. Birth and Rebirth (New York: Harper, 1958).

_____ Myth and Reality (London: Harper & Row, 1964).

_____ Myths, Dreams and Mysteries (London: Harvill, 1960).

Empie, P.C. and Murphy, T.A. (edd.) Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue III (Minnesota: Augsberg, 1967).

England, F. "Symbolic Warfare. The battle for ownership of symbols in an Anglican community," unpubl MA thesis, University of Cape Town, 1987.

Fahey, J.F. The Eucharistic Teaching of Ratramn of Corbie (Illinois, Mundelein: St Mary of the Lake Seminary, 1951).

Faller, O. "Ambrosius, der Verfasser von de Sacramentis," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 64 (1940), pp. 1-14, 81-101.

Farrer, A.M. "The Eucharist in I Corinthians," in Eucharistic Theology: Then and Now, ed. R.E. Clements. *SPCK Theological Collections* 9 (London: SPCK, 1968).

Fawcett, T. The Symbolic Language of Religion (London: SCM, 1970).

Finkelstein, L. "The Birkat Ha-Mazon," The Jewish Quarterly Review 19 (1928/9), pp. 211-262.

Flanagan, K. "Turner on 'Operative Rituals': A Sociological Response," New Blackfriars 64 (1983), pp. 425-441.

Flemington, W.F. The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism (London: SPCK, 1964).

Forsyth, P.T. The Church and the Sacraments (London: Independent Press, 1947).

Fransen, P.F. "Faith and the Sacraments," The Aquinas Society of London. Aquinas Paper 31 (Oxford: Blackfriars, 1958).

Freire, P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).

Fromm, E. The Dogma of Christ and other essays on Religion, Psychology and Culture (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963).

_____ The Forgotten Language (London: Victor Gollancz, 1952).

Frostin, P. Liberation Theology in Tanzania and South Africa (Molmö: Lund Univ Press, 1988).

Fuller, R.H. "The Double Origin of the Eucharist," Biblical Research 8 (1963), pp. 60-72.

Furnish, V.P. II Corinthians (New York: Doubleday, 1984).

Gamber, K. "Ist Niceta von Remesiana der Verfasser von De Sacramentis," Ostkirchlichen Studien 7 (1958), pp. 153-172.

Garrison, J. The Darkness of God: Theology after Hiroshima (London: SCM, 1982).

Gavin, F. — The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments (London: SPCK, 1928).

Geiselmann, J.R. — Die Abendmahlslehre an der Wende der christliches Spätantike zum Frühmittelalter (München, 1933).

_____ — Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik (Paderborn, 1926).

Gelineau, J. — The Liturgy. Today and Tomorrow (London: DLT, 1978).

Gelpi, D.L. — Charism and Sacrament. A Theology of Christian Conversion (New York: Paulist Press, 1976).

Gerken, A. — "Dogmengeschichtliche Reflexion uber die heutige Wende in die Eucharistielehre," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 94 (1972), pp. 199-226.

Gessel, W. — Eucharistische Gemeinschaft bei Augustinus (Würzburg, 1966).

Gibbard, S.M. — "The Eucharist in the Ignatian Epistles," Studia Patristica 8,2 (1966), pp. 214-218.

Gibson, M. — "The Case of Berengar of Tours," Councils and Assemblies, ed. G.J. Cuming and D. Baker. *Studies in Church History* 7 (Cambridge: CUP, 1971), pp. 61-68.

_____ — "The Dispute with Berengar of Tours," Lanfranc of Bec (Oxford: OUP, 1978), pp. 63-96.

Goldman, R. — Religious Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964).

Goodenough, E.R. — The Theology of Justin Martyr (Jena: Walter Biedermann, 1923).

Gore, C. — "Transubstantiation and Nihilism," in Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation (London: John Murray, 1907), pp. 229-286.

Grainger, R. — The Language of the Rite (London: DLT, 1974).

Grass, H. — Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther und Calvin (Gütersloh, 1954).

Green, H. B. "The Eucharistic Presence: Change and/or Signification," The Downside Review 83 (1965), pp. 32-48.

Gregg, D. Anamnesis in the Eucharist (Bramcote: Grove Books, 1976).

Grillmeier, A. Christ in Christian Tradition vol 1 rev ed (London: Mawbrays, 1975).

Grisbrooke, W.J. "A Contemporary Liturgical Problem: The Divine Office and Public Worship, " Studia Liturgica 8 (1971/2), pp. 129-168, and 9 (1973), pp. 2-18 and 81-106.

Groome, T.H. Christian Religious Education (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1980).

Groot, J. "The Church as Sacrament of the World," Concilium 1.4 (1968), pp. 27-34.

Gutierrez, G. A Theology of Liberation (London: SCM, 1974).

Gutwenger, E. "Das Geheimnis der Gegenwart Christi in der Eucharistie," Zeitscrift für katholische Theologie 88 (1966), pp. 185-197.

_____ "Substanz und Akzidenz in der Eucharistielehre," Zeitscrift für katholische Theologie 83 (1961), pp. 257-306.

Hahn, F. "Die alttestamentlichen Motive in der urchristlichen Abendmahlsuberlieferung," Evangelische Theologie 27 (1967), pp. 337-374.

_____ "Zum Stand der Erforschung des urchristlichen Herrenmahls," Evangelische Theologie 35 (1975), pp. 553-563.

Hamer, J. The Church is a Communion (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1964).

Hanson, P.D. The Dawning of Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).

_____ The Diversity of Scripture (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).

Harvey, V.A. The Historian and the Believer (London: SCM, 1967).

Häring, H. and Nolte, J. (edd.) Diskussion um Hans Küng Die Kirche (Freiburg: Herder, 1971).

Häring, N.M. "Berengar's Definitions of Sacramentum and their Influence on Medieval Sacramentology," Medieval Studies 10 (1948), pp. 109-146.

——— "St. Augustine's Use of the Word Character," Medieval Studies 14 (1952), pp. 79-97.

——— "A Study in the Sacramentology of Alger of Lige," Medieval Studies 20 (1958), pp. 41-78.

Hastings, A. "The Sacramentality of the Church," Eastern Churches Quarterly 16 (1964), pp. 219-25.

Hebert, A.G. Liturgy and Society (London: Faber & Faber, 1935).

Hefele, C.J. A History of the Christian Councils from the Original Documents to the Close of the Council of Nicaea AD 325 2nd rev. ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1894).

Heidegger, M. Being and Time (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962).

Held, H.J. "Matthew as Interpretor of the Miracle Stories," in G. Bornkamm, et al (ed), Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew (London: SCM, 1963), pp. 165-299.

Hendrickx, H. The Miracle Stories of the Synoptic Gospels (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1987).

——— The Sermon on the Mount (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1984).

Hengel, M. Atonement (London: SCM, 1981).

——— Crucifixion (London: SCM, 1977).

Herbert, A.S. Worship in Ancient Israel. *Ecumenical Studies in Worship* 5 (London, 1959).

Hibbert, G. "Body, Soul and Sacrament," Bijdragen 24 (1963), pp. 59-78.

Hickling, C. "The Eucharist and Time," Theology 80 (1977), pp. 197-204.

Hicks, F.C.N. — The Fullness of Sacrifice (London: Macmillan, 1930).

Higgins, A.J.B. — The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (London: SCM, 1952).

Hill, M. — A Sociology of Religion (London: Heinemann, 1973).

Hitchcock, F.R.M. — "The Holy Communion in Ambrose of Milan," The Church Quarterly 140 (1945), pp. 127-153.

Hook, N. — "The Dominical Cup Saying," Theology 77 (1974), pp. 624-630.

Hooke, S.H. (ed.) — The Labyrinth (London: SPCK, 1935).

_____ — Myth and Ritual (Oxford: OUP, 1933).

Houlden, J.L. — "Sacrifice and the Eucharist," in Thinking about the Eucharist, Church of England Doctrine Commission (London: SCM, 1972), pp. 81-98.

Houssiau, A. — "The Rediscovery of the Liturgy by Sacramental Theology," Studia Liturgica 15 (1982/3), pp. 158-177.

Iersel, B. — "Some Biblical Roots of the Christian Sacrament," Concilium 1.4 (1968), pp. 4-11.

Illert, D. — "Die "vollkommenenen Sakramente" bei Ambrosius," Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 73 (1962), pp. 9-15.

James, E.O. — Myth and Ritual in the Ancient Near East (London: Thames & Hudson, 1958).

Jaspers, K. — "Myth and Religion," in Kerygma and Myth, ed H-W. Bartsch, vol 2 (London: SPCK, 1962), pp. 133-180.

Jedin, H. — A History of the Council of Trent vol 2. (London: Thomas Nelson, 1961).

Jeremias, J. — The Eucharistic Words of Jesus (London: SCM, 1966).

_____ — New Testament Theology (London: SCM, 1971).

_____ — The Parables of Jesus (London: SCM, 1972).

John of the Cross — Ascent of Mount Carmel tr E. Allison Peers (London: Burns & Oates, 1983).

Jones, C., Wainwright, G., and Yarnold, E.J. (edd.) The Study of Liturgy (London: SPCK, 1978).

Jorrissen, H. — Die Entfaltung der Transsubstantiations-lehre bis zum Beginn der Hochscholastik. (Münster/W., 1965).

Jung, C.G. — Modern Man in Search of a Soul (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, 1936).

_____ — Psychology and Religion. Collected Works vol 11 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958).

Jungmann, J.A. — The Early Liturgy to the Time of Gregory the Great (London: DLT, 1960).

_____ — The Eucharistic Prayer (London: DLT, 1956).

_____ — The Mass of the Roman Rite (New York: Benzinger, 1959).

Käsemann, E. — "The Pauline Doctrine of the Last Supper," Essays on New Testament Themes (London: SCM, 1964).

_____ — Romans (London: SCM, 1980).

Kavanagh, A. — On Liturgical Theology (New York: Pueblo, 1984).

Kee, A. — Constantine versus Christ (London: SCM, 1982).

Kelly, J.N.D. — Early Christian Doctrines 3rd ed. (London: A & C Black, 1965).

Kelsey, M. — Christo-Psychology (London: DLT, 1983).

Kent, J. — The Unacceptable Face. The Modern Church in the Eyes of the Historian (London: SCM, 1987).

Kierkegaard, K. — Concluding Unscientific Postscript (Princeton: Princeton Univ Press, 1968).

_____ — Fear and Trembling (London: OUP, 1946).

_____ — Philosophical Fragments (Princeton: Princeton Univ Press, 1985).

Kilmartin, E.J. "Eucharist (as sacrifice)," New Catholic Encyclopedia 5, pp. 109ff.

_____ "The Last Supper and the Earliest Eucharists of the Church," Concilium 10.4 (1968), pp. 19-31.

_____ "Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers," Theological Studies 35 (1974), 268-287.

Kilpatrick, G.D. "Anamnesis," Liturgical Review 5 (1975), pp. 35-40.

_____ "Eucharist as Sacrifice and Sacrament in the New Testament," in Neues Testament und Kirche. Feschrift für R. Schnackenburg. ed. J. Gnilka (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), pp. 429-433.

_____ The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy (Cambridge: CUP, 1983).

Klauser, T. "Der übergang der römischen Kirche von der griechischen zur latienischen Liturgiegesprache," Mischelleanea G. Mercati I, Studi e Testi 121 (Rome, 1946), pp. 467-482.

Köhler, W. Zwingli und Luther. Ihr Streit uber das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiosen Beziehungen vol 1 (Leipzig, 1924).

Köster, H. "Geschichte und Kultus im Johannes-evangelium und bei Ignatius von Antiochen," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 54 (1957), pp. 56-69.

Kretschmar, G. "Early Christian liturgy in the light of contemporary historical research," Studia Liturgica 16 (1986/7), pp. 31-53.

Kümmel, W.G. Promise and Fulfilment (London: SCM, 1957).

Küng, H. The Church (London: Search Press, 1967).

_____ "Editorial: The Debate on the Sacraments," Concilium 3.4 (1967), 3.

_____ The Living Church (London: Sheed & Ward, 1963).

_____ Structures of the Church (London: Burns & Oates, 1965).

Lake, F. Clinical Theology (London: DLT, 1966).

Langer, S.K. Philosophy in a New Key. A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art (Oxford: OUP, 1951).

Lash, N. His Presence in the World: A Study of Eucharistic Worship and Theology (London: Sheed & Ward, 1968).

——— Theology on the Way to Emmaus (London: SCM, 1986).

Lavery, H. Sacraments (London: DLT, 1982).

Leach, K. The Social God (London: Sheldon Press, 1981).

Leatt, J. Kneifel, T. & Nürnberger, K. (eds), Contending Ideologies in South Africa (Cape Town: David Philip, 1986).

Lee, R.S. Psychology and Worship (London: SCM, 1955).

Leeming, B. Principles of Sacramental Theology (London: Longmans, 1956).

Leenhardt, F.J. "This is my Body," in Essays on the Lord's Supper. *Ecumenical Studies in Worship* 1 (London: SCM, 1958), pp. 24-85.

Lies, L. "Trinitätsvergessenheit gegenwärtiger Sakramentstheologie?" Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 105 (1983), pp. 290-314, 415-429.

Lietzmann, H. Apollinaris von Laodicea und seine Schule (Tübingen, 1904).

——— Mass and Lord's Supper (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979).

Ligier, L. "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From The Last Supper to the Eucharist," Studia Liturgica 9 (1973), pp. 161-185.

Lindsay, T.M. A History of the Reformation vol 2 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1908).

Locher, G.W. "Discord among guests," Zwingli's Thought. New Perspectives (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981), pp. 303-339.

Lohmeyer, E. — The Lord's Prayer (London: Collins, 1965).

Lohse, B. — Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner (Gütersloh, 1953).

Lohse, E. — "Wort und Sakrament im Johannesevangelium," New Testament Studies 7 (1960/1), pp. 110-25.

MacDonald, A.J.M. — Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine (London: Longmans, 1930).

MacIntyre, A. — After Virtue (London: Duckworth, 1985).

Mackey, J.P. — Jesus. The Man and the Myth (London: SCM, 1979).

_____ — The Christian Experience of God as Trinity (London: SCM, 1983).

Macquarrie, J. — God-Talk (London: SCM, 1967).

_____ — Principles of Christian Theology (London: SCM, 1966).

_____ — Three Issues in Ethics (London: SCM, 1970).

Macy, G, — The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period (1080-1220) (Oxford: OUP, 1984).

Mahoney, J. — "The Church of the Holy Spirit in Aquinas," The Heythrop Journal 15 (1974), pp. 18-36.

Mannheim, K. — Ideology and Utopia (London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co, 1940).

Manson, T.W. — The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM, 1949).

Markus, R.A. — Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St. Augustine (London: CUP, 1970).

Marmion, M.F. — "Liturgy and the Present Crisis of Culture," Worship 62 (1988), pp. 98-123.

Marsh, J. — The Fulness of Time (London: Nisbet & Co, 1952).

Marshall, I.H. — Last Supper and Lord's Supper (Exeter: Paternoster, 1980).

Martelet, G. — The Risen Christ and the Eucharistic World (London: Collins, 1976).

Martimort, A.G., et al (ed) The Church at Prayer IV: The Liturgy and Time (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1986).

Martin, R.P. — Worship in the Early Church (London: Marshal, Morgan & Scott, 1974).

Martos, J. — Doors to the Sacred (London: SCM, 1981).

Marxsen, W. — "Der Ursprung des Abendmahls," Evangelische Theologie 12 (1952/3), pp. 293-303.

Mascall, E.L. — Corpus Christ. Essays on the Church and the Eucharist (London: Longmans, 1953).

Masure, E. — The Christian Sacrifice (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1944).

_____ — The Sacrifice of the Mystical Body (London: Burns & Oates, 1954).

Maurer, Ch. — Ignatius von Antiochen und das Johannes-evangelium (Zürich, 1949).

May, R. — Power and Innocence (London: Fontana, 1976).

Mbiti, J.S. — African Religions and Philosophy (London: Heinemann, 1969).

McCue, J.F. — "The Doctrine of Transubstantiation from Berengar through Trent: The Point at Issue," Harvard Theological Review 61 (1968), pp. 385-430.

_____ — "Luther and Roman Catholicism on the Mass as Sacrifice," in Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue III, ed. P.C. Empie and T. Austin Murphy (Minnesota: Augsberg, 1967), pp. 45-74.

McFague, S. — Models of God. Theology for an Ecological, Nuclear Age (London: SCM, 1987).

McIntire, C.T. — "History: Christian Views," Encyclopedia of Religion (New York: Macmillan, 1987) vol 6, pp. 394-399.

McKenna, J.H. — Eucharist and Holy Spirit. The Eucharistic Epiclesis in 20th Century

Theology. *Alcuin Club Collections* 57 (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1975).

McNicholl, A.J. "Sacramental Signification", The Thomist 10 (1947), pp. 334-348.

Mersch, E. The Theology of the Mystical Body (New York: Herder, 1952).

_____ The Whole Christ (London: Dobson, 1938).

Metz, J.B. The Emergent Church (London: SCM, 1981).

_____ Faith in History and Society: Towards a Practical Fundamental Theology (London: Burns & Oates, 1980).

_____ Theology of the World (London: Burns & Oates, 1969).

Meyendorff, J. "Notes on the Orthodox Understanding of the Eucharist," Concilium 3.4 (1967), pp. 27-30.

Meyer, B. "Calvin's Eucharistic Doctrine: 1536-39," Journal of Ecumenical Studies 4 (1967), pp. 47-65.

Meyer, H.B. "Time and the Liturgy. Anthropological Notes on Liturgical Time," Studia Liturgica 14 (1982), pp. 4-22.

Moe, O. "Das Abendmahl im Hebräerbrief? Zur Auslegung von Hebr. 13,9-16," Studia Theologica 4 (1951-2), pp. 102-108.

Mofokeng, T.A. "Following the Trail of Suffering: Black theological Perspectives, Past and Present," Journal of Black Theology in South Africa 1 (1987), pp. 21-34 .

Moloney, R. "The Notion of Substance in Psychology: An Examination of Some Current Views," The Heythrop Journal 16 (1975), pp. 36-50.

Moltmann, J. The Church in the Power of the Spirit (London: SCM, 1977).

_____ The Crucified God (London: SCM, 1974).

_____ God in Creation. An Ecological Doctrine of Creation (London: SCM, 1986).

_____ The Theology of Hope (London: SCM, 1967).

_____ The Trinity and the Kingdom of God (London: SCM, 1981).

Mühlen, H. Der Heilige Geist als Person (Munster/W., 1963).

_____ "Das Verhältnis zwischen Inkarnation und Kirche in den Aussagen des Vaticanum II," Theologie und Glaube 55 (1965), pp. 171-190.

_____ "Die Kirche als die geschichtliche Erscheinung des übergeschichtliches Geistes Christi," Theologie und Glaube 55 (1965), pp. 270-289.

Nock, A.D. "Hellenistic Mysteries and Christian Sacraments," Mnemosyne series 4, vol 5 (1952), pp. 177-214.

_____ "Liturgical Notes," Journal of Theological Studies 30 (1929), pp. 381-395.

Nolan, A. God in South Africa (Cape Town: David Philip, 1988).

Novak, M. "The Free Churches and the Roman Church. The Conception of the Church in Anabaptism and in Roman Catholicism: Past and Present," Journal of Ecumenical Studies 2 (1965), pp. 426-447.

O'Donovan, L.J. (ed.) "A Changing Ecclesiology in a Changing Church: A Symposium on development in the Ecclesiology of Karl Rahner," Theological Studies 38 (1977), pp. 736-752.

Oesterley, W.O.E. The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925).

_____ Sacrifices in Ancient Israel (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1937).

O'Grady, C. The Church in Catholic Theology: Dialogue with Karl Barth (Dublin: Chapman, 1969).

Otto, R. The Idea of the Holy (London: OUP, 1931).

Oulton, J.E.L. Holy Communion and Holy Spirit (London: SPCK, 1951).

Oyer, J.S. Lutheran Reformers Against Anabaptists (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964).

Pannenberg, W. "Das Abendmahl--Sakrament der Einheit," Ethik und Ekklesiologie (Göttingen, 1977), pp. 286-292.

_____ Jesus-God and Man (London: SCM, 1968).

_____ "Die Problematik der Abendmahlslehre aus evangelische Sicht," Ethik und Ekklesiologie (Göttingen, 1977), pp. 293-317.

_____(ed.) Revelation as History (London: Sheed & Ward, 1969).

Paterson, T.J.M. "The Logos, Trinity and Incarnation in Early Greek Apologetics," unpubl MA Thesis, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, 1977).

_____ "A Liturgy for Liberation," in Bounty in Bondage ed. F.England & T.J.M. Paterson (Johanesburg: Ravan, 1989), pp. 53-74.

_____ "The Ordination of women: A Contribution to the Debate within the CPSA," Journal of Theology for Southern Africa 66 (1989), pp. 21-33.

Pato, L. "Becoming an African Church," in Bounty in Bondage ed F.England & T.J.M. Paterson (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1989), pp. 159-176.

Paxton, N. "The Liberating Eucharist," New Blackfriars 64 (1983), pp. 180-187.

Peacocke, A.R. "Matter in the Theological and Scientific Perspectives--A Sacramental View," in Thinking about the Eucharist, Church of England Doctrine Commission (London: SCM, 1972), pp. 14-37.

Peires, J.B. The Dead will Arise (Johannesburg: Ravan, 1989).

Pelikan, J. The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300). The Christian Tradition vol 3 (Chicago, 1974).

Pendegast, R.J. "The Sacramental Universe," The Heythrop Journal 6 (1965), pp. 310-320.

Perler, O. "Logos und Eucharistie nach Justinus I Apol c.66," Divus Thomas 18 (1940), pp. 296-316.

Perrin, N. — The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus (London: SCM, 1963).

Pesch, R. — Das Abendmahl und das Jesu Todesverdändnis (Freibug im Breisgau: Herder, 1978).

Pitt, W.E. — "The Anamnesis and Institution Narrative in the Liturgy of Apostolic Constitutions Book VIII," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 9 (1958), pp. 1-7.

Plooij, J. — Die Mysterienlehre Odo Casel's (Neustadt an der Aisch, 1968).

Pollard, R.E. — Johannine Christology and the Early Church (Cambridge: CUP, 1970).

Powers, J. — Eucharistic Theology (London: Burns & Oates, 1968).

Prenter, R. — "Metaphysics and Eschatology in the Sacramental Teaching of St. Augustine," Studia Theologica 1 (1948), pp. 5-26.

_____ — Spiritus Creator (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1953).

Przewozny, B. — Church as the Sacrament of the Unity of all Mankind in Lumen Gentium and Gaudium et Spes and in Semmelroth, Schillebeeckx and Rahner (Rome, 1979).

Pusey, E.B. — The Doctrine of the Real Presence (Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1855).

_____ — The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ (Oxford: J.H. Parker, 1869).

Quick, O.C. — The Christian Sacraments (London: Collins, 1964).

Rahner, K. — The Church and the Sacraments (London: Burns & Oates, 1963).

_____ — "Concerning the Relationship between Nature and Grace," Theological Investigations 1 (London, DLT, 1961), pp. 297-317.

_____ — "Considerations on the Active Role of the Person in the Sacramental Event," Theological Investigations 14, pp. 161-184.

_____ "The Development of Dogma," TI 1, pp. 39-77.

_____ The Dynamic Element in the Church (London: Burns & Oates, 1964).

_____ "The Eucharist and Suffering," TI 3. pp. 161-170.

_____ Foundations of Christian Faith. An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity (London: DLT, 1978).

_____ "Introductory Observations on Thomas Aquinas' Theology of the Sacraments in General," TI 14, pp. 149-160.

_____ "The Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper," TI 4, pp. 287-311.

_____ "The Theology of the Symbol," TI 4, pp. 221-252.

_____ The Trinity (London: Burns & Oates, 1970).

_____ "What is a Sacrament?" TI 14, pp. 135-148.

_____ "The Word and the Eucharist," TI 4, pp. 253-286.

Ramsay, I.T. Religious Language (London: SCM, 1957).

Ratcliff, E.C. Liturgical Studies, ed. A.H. Couratin and D.H. Tripp (London: SPCK, 1976).

Ratzinger, J. "Is the Eucharist a Sacrifice?" Concilium 3.4 (1967), pp. 35-40.

Regan, P. "Pneumatological and Eschatological Aspects of Liturgical Celebration," Worship 51 (1977), pp. 332-50.

Richard, L. "The Word and the Sacraments: An Ecumenical Approach to the Sacraments," Journal of Ecumenical Studies 2 (1965), pp. 234-250.

Richard, P. "Biblical Theology of Confrontation with Idols," The Idols of Death and the God of Life (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1983), pp. 3-25.

Richardson, C.C. The Christianity of Ignatius of Antioch (New York: Columbia Univ Press, 1935).

———— "The So-called Epiclesis in Hippolytus," Harvard Theological Review 40 (1947), pp. 101-8.

Richardson, R.D. "A Further Inquiry into Eucharistic Origins with Special Reference to New Testament Problems," in H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), pp. 220-702.

Richter, G. "Zur Formgeschichte und literarischen Einheit von Joh 6.31-58," Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 60 (1969), pp. 21-55.

Ricoeur, P. "Myth and History," Encyclopedia of Religion vol 10 (New York: Macmillan, 1987), pp. 273-282.

Rilliet, J. Zwingli. Third Man of the Reformation (London: Lutterworth, 1964).

Roberts, R.H. "Karl Barth's Doctrine of Time: Its Nature and Implications," in S.W. Sykes (ed), Karl Barth. Studies in his Theological Method (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), pp. 88-146.

Robinson, J.A.T. The Human Face of God (London: SCM, 1973).

Rogers, E.F. Peter Lombard and the Sacramental System (New York: Columbia Univ Press, 1917).

Rosato, P.J. The Spirit as Lord. The Pneumatology of Karl Barth (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1981).

Rowley, H.H. "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," in From Moses to Qumran (London: Lutterworth, 1963), pp. 67-107.

Ruffini, E. "Character as a Concrete Manifestation of the Sacraments in Relation to the Church," Concilium 1.4 (1968), pp. 52-58.

Ryan, J.B. "Eucharistic Prayers for Contemporary Men and Women," Studia Liturgica 11 (1976), pp. 186-206.

Sasse, H. This is My Body. Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar (Minneapolis: Augsberg, 1959).

Scheffczyk, L. "Eucharistic Sacrifice," Sacramentum Mundi ed. K. Rahner (London: Burns & Oates, 1968) II, pp. 273-275.

_____ "Jesus Christus-Ursakrament der Erlösung," in Christusbegegnung in den Sakramenten, ed. H. Luthe (Kevelaer, 1981), pp. 11-61.

_____ "Die Kirche--das Ganzsakrament Jesu Christi," ibid. pp. 65-120.

_____ "Die materialle Welt im Lichte der Eucharistie," in Aktuelle Fragen zur Eucharistie, ed. M. Schmaus (München, 1960).

Schillebeeckx, E. Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God (London: Sheed & Ward, 1963).

_____ The Church with a Human Face (London: SCM, 1985).

_____ The Eucharist (London: Sheed & Ward, 1968).

_____ Christ. The Christian Experience in the Modern World (London: SCM, 1980).

_____ Jesus. An Experiment in Christology (New York: Crossroad Publ, 1986).

Schlette, H.R. "Die Eucharistielehre Hugos von St. Viktor," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 81 (1959), pp. 67-100, 163-210.

Schmaus, M. "Christus, Kirche und Eucharistie," in Aktuelle Fragen zur Eucharistie (München, 1960. pp. 53-71.

_____ Dogma 4: The Church: its Origin and Structure (London: Sheed & Ward, 1972).

_____ Dogma 5: The Church as Sacrament (London: Sheed & Ward, 1975).

Schmemann, A. Introduction to Liturgical theology (London: Faith Press, 1966).

_____ The World as Sacrament (London: DLT, 1966).

Schmidt, K.L. "ekklesia," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 3, pp. 506ff.

Schmitz, J. "Zum Autor der Schrift "De Sacramentis"," Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 91 (1969), pp. 59-69.

Schnackenburg, R. The Gospel According to John (London: Burns & Oates, 1979).

Schneider, T. "Die neuere katholische Diskussion uber die Eucharistie," Evangelische Theologie 35 (1975), pp. 497-524.

Schoonenberg, P. "Transubstantiation: How far is this Doctrine Historically Determined?" Concilium 3.4 (1967), pp. 41-47.

Schreiter, R. Constructing Local Theologies (London: SCM, 1985).

Schürmann, H. "Jesus' Words in the Light of His Actions at the Last Supper," Concilium 10.4 (1968), pp. 61-67.

Schweizer, E. "Das Abendmahl einer Vergenwärtigung des Todes Jesu oder ein eschatologisches Freudenmahl," Theologische Zeitschrift 2 (1946), pp. 81-101.

_____ "Das Herrenmahl im Neuen Testament," Theologische Literaturzeitung 79 (1954), pp. 577-592.

_____ "Das johanneische Zeugnis vom Herrenmahl," Evangelische Theologie (1952/3), pp. 341-363.

_____ "σάρξ," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 7, pp. 138-140.

Segundo, J.L. Faith and Ideologies (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1984).

_____ The historical Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1985).

_____ The Liberation of Theology (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1976).

_____ The Sacraments Today (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1974).

Semmelroth, O. Church and Sacrament (Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 1965).

Shepard, R. "The Eucharistic Presence and Reconciliation of Opposing Realities," The Heythrop Journal 22 (1981), pp. 123-134.

Smulders, P. "Sacramenten en Kerk. Kerkelijk recht-Kultus-Pneuma," Bijdragen 17 (1956), pp. 391-418.

_____ "Die sakramental kirchliche Struktur der christlichen Gnade," Bijdragen 18 (1957), pp. 333-341.

Snaith, N.H. The Jewish New Year Festival (London: SPCK, 1947).

Sobrino, J. Christology at the Crossroads (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1978).

_____ "The Epiphany of the God of Life in Jesus of Nazareth," in P. Richard (ed), The Idols of Death and the God of Life (Maryknoll, NY.: Orbis, 1983), pp. 66-102.

Southern, R.W. "Lanfranc of Bec and Berengar of Tours," Studies in Mediéval History. Presented to F.M. Powicke, ed. R.W. Hunt et al. (Oxford: OUP, 1948), pp. 27-48.

Spinks, B.D. "The Consecratory Epiklesis in the Anaphora of St. James," Studia Liturgica 11 (1976), pp. 19-38.

Srawley, J.H. The Early History of the Liturgy (Cambridge: CUP, 1949).

Stanley, D. "Ecumenically Significant Aspects of the New Testament: Eucharist Doctrine," Concilium 3.4 (1967), pp. 23-26.

Stein, M. Jung's Treatment of Christianity (Wilmette, Illinois: Chiron Publ, 1985).

Stibbs, A.M. Sacraments, Sacrifice and Eucharist (London: Tyndale Press, 1961).

Stone, D. A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist (London: Longmans, 1909).

Struckmann, A. Die Eucharistielehre des heiligen Cyrill von Alexandrien (Paderborn, 1910).

Talley, T. "The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development," in Liturgy Reshaped, ed. Kenneth Stevenson (London: SPCK, 1982), pp. 48-64.

_____ "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church according to Recent Research:

Results and Reflections," Studia Liturgica 11 (1976), pp. 138-158.

_____ "Liturgical Time in the ancient Church: The State of Research," Studia Liturgica 14 (1982), pp. 34-51.

Tappeiner, D.A. "Sacramental Causality in Aquinas and Rahner: Some Critical Thoughts," Scottish Journal of Theology 28 (1975), pp. 243-257.

Tavard, G.H. "The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreed Statements and their Reception," Theological Studies 41 (1980), pp. 74-97.

_____ "The Church as Eucharistic Communion in Medieval Theology," Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History. *Studies in the History of Christian Thought* 19. ed. F. Forrester Church and T. George (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), pp. 92-103.

_____ "The Function of the Minister in the Eucharistic Celebration: An Ecumenical Approach," Journal of Ecumenical Studies 4 (1967), pp. 629-649.

_____ Holy Writ or Holy Church? The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation (London: Burns & Oates, 1959).

Taylor, J.V. The Go-Between God (London: SCM, 1972).

Taylor, M.C. Deconstructing theology (New York: Crossroad, 1982).

Taylor, M.C. (ed) Deconstruction in Context (Chicago: Chicago Univ. Press, 1986).

Taylor, V. The Gospel according to St. Mark (London: Macmillan, 1963).

Teresa of Avila The Life of Saint Teresa tr J.M. Cohen (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1957).

Teselle, E. Augustine the Theologian (London, 1970).

Theissen, G. The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1983).

Thurian, M. The Eucharistic Memorial. *Ecumenical Studies in Worship* 7 (London: Lutterworth, 1960).

Tillard, J.M.R. — The Eucharist. Pasch of God's People (New York, 1967).

Tillich, P. — The Shaking of the Foundations (London: SCM, 1949).

_____ — Theology of Culture (New York: OUP, 1959).

Tödt, H.E. — The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition (London: SCM, 1965).

Torrance, T.F. — Conflict and Agreement in the Church (London: Lutterworth, 1959).

_____ — Theology in Reconciliation (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1975).

Toynbee, A. — An Historian's Approach to Religion (Oxford: OUP, 1956).

Tripole, M.R. — "Ecclesiological Developments in Moltmann's Theology of Hope," Theological Studies 34 (1973), pp. 19-35.

Trocmé, E. — The Passion as Liturgy (London: SCM, 1983).

Turner, D. — "Sacrament and Ideology," New Blackfriars 64 (1983), pp. 171-180.

Turner, V.W. — The Ritual Process (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969).

Vaillancourt, R. — Toward a Renewal of Sacramental Theology (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1979).

Vagaggini, C. — The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform (Staten Island: Alba House, 1967).

_____ — Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1976).

Van Beeck, F.J. — "Towards an Ecumenical Understanding of the Sacraments," Journal of Ecumenical Studies 3 (1966), pp. 36-56.

Van Buren, P.M. — "The Tendency of our Age and the Reconception of Worship," in Worship and Secularization ed. W.Vos (Bussum: Paul Brand, 1970), pp. 3-9.

Van Gennep, A. — The Rites of Passage (Chicago: Univ of Chicago, 1961).

Van Roo, W.A. "Reflections on Karl Rahner's Kirche und Sakramente," Gregorianum 44 (1963), pp. 465-500.

------ Man the Symbolizer (Rome, 1981).

Vass, G. A Theologian in Search of a Philosophy. Understanding Karl Rahner (London: Sheed & Ward, 1985).

Vaux, R. de Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice (Cardiff: Univ. of Wales, 1964).

Verbeek, H. "De sacramentele structuur van de Eucharistie," Bijdragen 20 (1959), pp. 345-354.

Vööbus, A. Liturgical Traditions in the Didache (Stockholm, 1968).

Von Allmen, J.J. "The Continuity of the Church according to Reformed Teaching," Journal of Ecumenical Studies 1 (1964), pp. 424-444.

_____ "Worship and the Holy Spirit," Studia Liturgica 2 (1963), pp. 124-135.

Von Balthasar, H.U. A Theology of History (London: Sheed & Ward, 1963).

Von Rad, G. Old Testament Theology (London: SCM, 1975).

Vonier, A. A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist (London: Burns & Oates, 1925).

Vorgrimmler, H. (ed.) Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II (London: Burns & Oates, 1967).

Vos, W. (ed.) Worship and Secularization (Bussum: Paul Brand, 1970).

Wainwright, G. "Christian Worship and Western Culture," Studia Liturgica 12 (1977), pp. 20-33.

_____ Doxology (London: Epworth, 1980).

_____ Eucharist and Eschatology (London: Epworth, 1971).

_____ "Eucharist and/as Ethics", Worship 62 (1988), pp. 123-137.

Wainwright, G. (ed) Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry. A Liturgical Appraisal of the Lima Text

(Rotterdam: Liturgical Ecumenical Center Trust, 1986).

Warren, M. "The Worshipping Assembly: Possible Zone of Cultural Contestation," Worship 63 (1989), pp. 2-16.

Weier, R. "Die Notwendigkeit der Sakraments," Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift 92 (1983), pp. 184-190.

Weil, L. "Eucharistic Prayers for Contemporary Men and Women; a comment," Studia Liturgica 11 (1976), pp. 214f.

_____ Sacraments and Liturgy (Oxford: Mowbray, 1983).

Weiss, K. "φέρω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 9, pp. 56-87.

Wenham, D. The Rediscovery of Jesus' Eschatological Discourse (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984).

Westermann, C. Creation (London: SPCK, 1974).

_____ Isaiah 40-66 (London: SCM, 1969).

Wilckens, U. "Der eucharistische Abschnitt der johanneischen Rede vom Lebensbrot (Joh 6, 51c- 58)," Neues Testament und Kirche. Festschrift fr R. Schnackenberg. ed. K. Gnilka (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), pp. 220-248.

Wiles, M.F. "Myth in Theology," in The Myth of God Incarnate, ed F.H. Hick (London: SCM, 1977), pp. 148-166.

_____ "The Theological Legacy of St. Cyprian," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 14 (1963), pp. 139-145.

Williamson, R. "The Eucharist and the Epistle to the Hebrews," New Testament Studies 21 (1974), pp. 300-12.

Willis, G.G. St. Augustine and the Donatist Controversy (London: SPCK, 1950).

Wilson, B. Contemporary Transformations of Religion (Oxford: OUP, 1976).

_____ Religion in Sociological Perspective (Oxford: OUP, 1982).

Wilson, M. — Religion and the Transformation of Society (Cambridge: CUP, 1971).

Wong, J.H.P. — "Karl Rahner's Christology of Symbol and three Models of Christology," The Heythrop Journal 27 (1986), pp. 1-25.

Wordsworth, J. — Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-Book (London, 1923).

Yarnold, E.J. — "Baptism and Pagan Mysteries in the Fourth Century," The Heythrop Journal 13 (1972), pp. 247-67.

——— "The Ceremonies of Initiation in the De Sacramentis and De Mysteriis of St. Ambrose," Studia Patristica X (1970), pp. 453-463.

——— "Did St. Ambrose know the Mystagogic Catecheses of St. Cyril of Jerusalem?" Studia Patristica XII (1975), pp. 184-189.

——— "Initiation: Sacrament and Experience," in Liturgy Reshaped. Festchrift for G. Cuming. ed. K. Stevenson. (London: SPCK, 1982), pp. 17-31.

——— The Second Gift. A Study of Grace (Slough: St Paul Publ, 1974).

Young, F.M. — The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom (Philadelphia, 1979).

Zehnle, R. — "The Salvific Character of Jesus' Death in Lucan Soteriology," Theological Studies 30 (1969), pp. 420-44.