

THE RESURRECTION AND  
EARLY EUCHARISTIC LITURGY

(An investigation into the influence of the  
Resurrection of Jesus Christ on the  
eucharistic liturgy of the early Christian  
Church

by

Vivian W. Harris, B.A. (Rhodes)

Thesis submitted in part-fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of

BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

At Rhodes University, Grahamstown  
South Africa.

- PREFACE -

The Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is absolutely central to the Christian faith, and its influence, in many directions, is felt throughout the Christian Church. Despite this, this most important part of our faith has not received from theologians the attention that is its due. The fact that this thesis is based upon the Resurrection is due largely to the Rev. Professor Dr. W.D. Maxwell, who guided me in this study, and I must record my gratitude to him, not only for his guidance but also for the emphasis he has placed on the Resurrection - an emphasis he has taught many others besides myself.

My thanks must be expressed, too, to Mrs. Y. Mulders who typed and duplicated this work.

Finally, a word of appreciation to the congregation I am privileged to serve, who have so patiently borne with me in this work.

All quotations from the Scriptures are made from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, unless otherwise stated. In the last section of this thesis, dealing with Three Early Liturgies, I have assumed that the reader will have a copy of these liturgies before him as he reads.

V. W. H.

Methodist Manse,  
BRAKPAN.  
October, 1960.

- CONTENTS -

	<u>Page</u>
1. THE ORIGINS OF THE EUCHARIST	1
2. THE NEW TESTAMENT REFLECTS EARLY EUCHARISTIC LITURGY	9
3. THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT FOR EVIDENCE OF RESURRECTION INFLUENCE IN EUCHARISTIC LITURGY:	11
a. The Gospel according to John	11
b. The Synoptic Gospels	23
c. The Acts of the Apostles	27
d. The New Testament Epistles:	30
i. The Lord's Prayer	30
ii. Abba, Father	31
iii. I Cor. 5 : 6-8, 13	32
iv. I Cor. 10 - 11	33
v. I Cor. 11 : 20 - 29	34
vi. The title "Lord"	37
vii. Prayer "through Jesus Christ"	39
viii. The "Amen"	39
ix. The Kiss of Peace	39
x. Creeds in the Eucharist	40
xi. "Anathema"	41
xii. "Maranatha"	41
xiii. The Eucharist as a Covenant	42
xiv. Position assumed during Prayer	42
xv. The Cup of Blessing	42
e. The Epistle to the Hebrews:	44
i. The new Covenant	44
ii. Christ's Sacrifice	44
iii. The Lord's Day	45
iv. Christ's heavenly Priesthood	46
f. The Revelation to John	49
4. THREE EARLY LITURGIES:	
a. The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles	54
b. Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-Book	60
c. The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus	69
5. CONCLUSION.	
6. BIBLIOGRAPHY.	

THE ORIGINS OF THE EUCHARIST.

The Christian Church has always found the origin of the Eucharist to be the Last Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ with His disciples. So firmly rooted has this idea of the origin of the Eucharist become that it is commonly referred to as "The Lord's Supper" - a title with obvious reference to the Last Supper. J.H. Srawley says, "The fact that Jesus suffered at the Paschal season, that He had the Passover in mind at the Supper (Luke 22 : 15) and that He had come to be thought of as 'our Passover' (I Cor. 5 : 7) would naturally lead to the conception of the solemn memorial of His death as a Christian Passover, and this influence may have affected the Synoptists' account of the actual setting of the Supper".<sup>1</sup>

This tradition has persisted until the present, so that it is now generally accepted that the origin of the Eucharist is the Jewish Passover. If this is true, then the Eucharist is associated chiefly with the sacrifice and death of Jesus Christ, and there are only tenuous and indirect connections with the Resurrection of the Lord. In that case, the subject of this study would need to be abandoned. If, however, there is proof that the Eucharist is closely related to the Resurrection of Jesus Christ in origin, then it is natural to look for the influence of the Resurrection on eucharistic liturgy.

To regard the Last Supper as the only origin of the Eucharist has two serious drawbacks. In the first place, it stresses the fact that the Eucharist is a memorial of the death of Christ - "as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes"<sup>2</sup> - but tends to neglect the fact that it is, in at least as great a measure, a memorial and celebration of His Resurrection. In the second place, it does not do justice to all of the facts concerning the origin of the Eucharist. Let us examine the Last Supper as an origin of the Eucharist, and then proceed to consider suggestions that have been made concerning other origins.

The Synoptic Gospels indicate that the Last Supper was a Passover meal. "The disciples did as Jesus had directed them, and they prepared the passover. When it was evening, He sat at table with the twelve disciples".<sup>3</sup> A.J.B. Higgins,

---

1. J.H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, pp. 2f.

2. I Cor. 11 : 26.

3. Matt. 26 : 19 - 20.

in his book, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*, says, "In this book the Last Supper of Jesus with His disciples is held to have been a Passover meal".<sup>1</sup> F.J. Leenhardt, writing in the second part of the book, *Essays on the Lord's Supper*, says, "a few hours before His separation from them, Jesus partook of the traditional Passover meal with His disciples".<sup>2</sup>

In spite of the body of opinion that these two writers represent, and in spite of the Synoptic tradition, it can be conclusively shown that the Last Supper was not a Passover meal. Professor W.D. Maxwell says, "Until recently, the traditional view was that the Last Supper was the Passover, celebrated by our Lord with His disciples for the last time on the night of His betrayal. But the evidence has been re-examined, and another view has been put forward, and is now commonly accepted as more nearly explaining the facts".<sup>3</sup> This point of view is found also in H. Lietzmann who states "The view is almost universally adopted that the rite of the Christian Lord's Supper has its source and prototype in that of the Jewish Passover; also that the last meal of Jesus at which the institution took place was a Passover meal. Both suppositions are false".<sup>4</sup>

The argument advanced by H. Lietzmann is this: "The Passover meal has the following characteristics: (1) A lamb is eaten. - At the Lord's Supper there is no lamb. (2) The Midrash on the Exodus from Egypt and the wanderings in the desert is recited. - This is not the case at the Lord's Supper. (3) Only unleavened bread is eaten. - At the Lord's Supper leavened bread is eaten. (4) It is obligatory to drink four cups. - At the Lord's Supper there is only one cup. Thus at the Lord's Supper all the characteristic features of the Passover are lacking".<sup>5</sup>

Professor Maxwell's argument includes these points, but he adds this: "If the Passover had begun on 'the night on which He was betrayed', our Lord could not have been tried and executed that day, for it was against the law of the Jews to hold a trial or execution during the Passover. But the Last Supper took place, according to Jewish reckoning, on the

---

1. A.J.B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*, p. 13.

2. O. Cullmann & F.J. Leenhardt, *Essays on the Lord's Supper*, p. 39.

3. W.D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship*, p. 5.

4. H. Lietzmann, *Mass and the Lord's Supper (Eng. trans.)* p. 172.

5. *ibidem*.

same day as the trials and crucifixion. This alone is really sufficient to prove that it was a pre-Passover meal that our Lord shared with His disciples, and not the Passover proper; although, being closely associated with the Passover as a normal part of its celebration, it is not unnatural to find it called the 'Passover' in the narratives: it would be clear enough to a Jewish reader what was meant".<sup>1</sup>

If one accepts that the Last Supper was not a Passover meal, then what was it? If we are later to trace the development of the Eucharist from the Last Supper it is necessary to know what it was. There are two suggestions to be considered.

According to Professor Maxwell, "The Last Supper is held to derive from a simple repast shared weekly by small groups of male Jews, very often by a rabbi and his disciples. This meal was known as the Kiddûsh".<sup>2</sup> To summarise part of his argument in favour of the above suggestion, he says, "the Kiddûsh was always observed by a group of male friends", "ordinary leavened bread (artos) was always used at the Kiddûsh", "at the Kiddûsh there was only one cup". Furthermore, "The Kiddûsh was observed weekly", and "at the Kiddûsh water was mixed with the wine in the ordinary eastern fashion".<sup>3</sup> The similarity between these features of the Kiddûsh and the Lord's Supper as practised by the Christian Church hardly needs to be indicated. He concludes with the words, "These points, taken separately and together, demonstrate conclusively that the Last Supper derives from the Kiddûsh".<sup>4</sup>

A different theory is advanced by H. Lietzmann. Speaking of the Lord's Supper, he states, "The Supper is not the continuation of the daily 'table-fellowship' of the disciples with their Lord, but is connected only with a single one of such meals, and that the last. It is this meal, and this alone, that is repeated by the community".<sup>5</sup> He dismisses the Kiddûsh-theory by saying that the Lord's Supper lacks what is especially characteristic of the Kiddûsh, namely the Sabbath prayer and the wine-blessing connected with it, at the moment when the Sabbath begins. This seems to be unsatisfactory as a reason for disposing of the Kiddûsh-theory. Having disposed of that, he then has to suggest something else, and puts in its place

---

1. opt. cit. p. 6.

2. opt. cit. p. 2.

3. opt. cit. pp. 6f.

4. opt. cit. p. 7.

5. opt. cit. p. 205.

what is really a very vague suggestion, with little to support it.

The single argument of J. Srawley concerning the Kiddûsh-theory seems to be far more formidable. He says, "The Kiddûsh immediately preceded the Passover, and would be held on the Friday evening, not twenty-four hours earlier. Theories of an anticipated Kiddush have been suggested but lack verification".<sup>1</sup> Professor Maxwell has, however, dealt with this point, and his reply might be the answer also to the objection raised by H. Lietzmann. It is stated by Professor Maxwell, "It is almost certain that our Lord and His disciples were accustomed to partake of this meal of fellowship on the eve of every Sabbath AND FESTIVAL".<sup>2</sup> (my emphasis). If one adds to these arguments the thought that Christ probably knew what the next day would hold for Him, then the suggestion that His was indeed another Kiddûsh becomes a most likely theory.

Thus far we have considered the Last Supper as if it was the only origin of the Eucharist, while earlier it was intimated that there was more than one origin for the rite.

What has been said so far has taken no account of a most significant feature of the Eucharist that is exposed in the Acts of the Apostles. Oscar Cullmann observes, "It is an essential characteristic of this meal that, as Acts 2 : 46 has it, 'exuberant joy' prevailed amongst them".<sup>3</sup> This is certainly a conservative enough translation of the word 'agalliasis'. The same writer, in the first part of the book, *Essays on the Lord's Supper*, says, "The term agalliasis denotes a strong manifestation of joy, an overflowing joy, which seems to be incompatible with a recalling of the Last Supper and with the words that Jesus uttered on that occasion".<sup>4</sup> And again, "These recollections in effect were rather of the kind to awaken feelings of nostalgia".<sup>5</sup> This is true enough, and one feels that Luke could not have had the Eucharist, as the commemoration of the Last Supper, in mind when he wrote the description quoted above. Lietzmann is quite sure that this is so, and claims that the Eucharist as a remembrance of Christ's death, with the solemn note that would be inseparable from such an interpretation, was introduced for the first time by Paul.

---

1. opt. cit. p. 3.

2. opt. cit. p. 6.

3. O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, p. 15.

4. opt. cit. p. 9.

5. ibidem. p. 8.

Assuming this to be so, and Cullmann does so, we must note what Cullmann says, referring to Lietzmann. We writes, "In the final pages of his work he raises a question, which ought indeed to be asked: 'If the Eucharist celebrated by the Christian community before St. Paul had nothing to do with the Last Supper, what was its origin?' To this question, Lietzmann summarily replies with the bald assertion that there is no text which can provide any clue".<sup>1</sup>

It is at this stage in the argument that a most significant contribution is made by Lietzmann. He suggests that different origins lie behind the two different meals - the Eucharist, as described in the Acts, and the Lord's Supper, as delineated by Paul. The Pauline version, we have seen, can be traced back to the Last Supper. What is to be said about the meal characterised by "exuberant joy"?

Lietzmann had this suggestion to make. He says, "The first disciples in Jerusalem formed themselves into a community when they learned that the Lord was indeed alive and had not been holden by death. And as it had been in the happy days of their journeys through Galilee, so it came to be again: as a Jewish Chaburah they gathered round the Master for the common meal. The old 'table-fellowship' (koinōnia) which had begun in the time of the historic Jesus was continued with the risen Lord".<sup>2</sup> If this is the origin of the meal, where is the "exuberant joy"? The answer he gives is, "Soon, the community fervently believed, He would come again in the clouds of heaven, like Daniel's Son of man, and set up the Messianic Kingdom on earth. This belief made them joyful; the meal was celebrated 'with gladness'; and in answer to the 'Maranatha', the 'Come, Lord Jesus', of their leader, the company at table hailed the longed-for Lord with glad hosannas".<sup>3</sup>

In, Essays on the Lord's Supper, O Cullmann comments critically, "It seems to me that there are grounds for seeking a more precise solution and one too which is based upon the Biblical text".<sup>4</sup> This is fair criticism, because the alternative suggested by Cullmann in the same work is very attractive indeed, although a little startling, whereas the solution advanced by Lietzmann is vague and without scriptural basis.

---

1. opt. cit. p. 7.

2. opt. cit. p. 204.

3. ibidem.

4. opt. cit. p. 7.

Cullmann's theory of the second origin of the Eucharist is this: "There is only one group of meals, the recollection of which could fully justify this overflowing joy: those which the first Christians took together immediately after the death of Jesus, meals during which Christ suddenly appeared to them - estē en mesō autōn - and, under their very eyes, ate some fish with them".<sup>1</sup> This suggestion seems eminently sound, doing justice to the facts as we know them, and having the added merit of scriptural backing. There does not seem to be any rival to this theory as an explanation of the origin of the earliest Eucharistic practice of the Christian Church. "The joy manifested by the early Christians during the 'breaking of bread' has its source, not in the fact that the assembled disciples eat the body and drink the blood of their crucified Master, but in the consciousness they have of eating WITH the RISEN Christ, really present in their midst, as He was on Easter Day".<sup>2</sup>

The significance of this idea for the purposes of this study is not difficult to see. It is summarised in these words from O. Cullmann, "It therefore appears likely that the idea of the Resurrection of Christ was associated, in the minds of the disciples, with the recollection of one or more meals taken with their Master during the period from Easter to Pentecost. And when later these same disciples met to eat together, the recollection of the other meals during which the Risen One appeared to them for the first time must naturally have been very vivid to them. We can now understand why the Christian community in the Apostolic Age celebrated its meals 'with joy'. THE CERTAINTY OF THE RESURRECTION was the essential religious motive of the primitive Lord's Supper. The experience of the presence of the Risen One in the midst of the assembly of the faithful was repeated - under a less material form, it is true - each time the community was united for the common meal. This experience was identical with that of Easter, and the first disciples must have considered these cultic meals as the direct continuation of those in which the disciples had participated immediately after the death of the Lord. When they assembled 'to break bread', they knew that the Risen One would reveal His presence in a manner less visible but not less real than previously".<sup>3</sup>

This means that the Lord's Supper, as observed by the primitive community, was a meal with Resurrection connotations, and that this was the only meaning, to all intents and purposes, of the Lord's Supper as originally observed by the Church. The connection between this rite and the Last Supper

---

1. ibidem p. 8.

2. ibidem p. 16.

3. opt. cat. p. 12.

was made later, possibly by Paul. "There is no reason to suppose that St. Paul had any INTENTION of replacing the eucharistic ideas of the primitive community by others. His aim was only to COMPLETE them by connecting them with the Last Supper and with Jesus' death".<sup>1</sup> "But in the sequel, the new elements introduced by St. Paul were so exclusively emphasised that the connexion with the Eucharist of the early Christians' 'breaking bread' was lost".<sup>2</sup>

Since it is the intention of this study to examine the influence the Resurrection had on the Eucharistic liturgy of the early Church, this placing of the Resurrection as the first significance of the Eucharist is most important.

Reverting now to the other origin of the Eucharist as we know it to-day, and accepting the suggestion of Professor Maxwell and others that the Last Supper was a Kiddush and not a Passover meal, we must yet recognise that there are many similarities with the Passover. These similarities have been strong enough to impress themselves on the Synoptists and on the Christian Church from Pauline days until now. So, where connections are found between the Passover and the Eucharist, we will not dismiss these but exploit them in seeking to interpret the meaning of the Eucharist.

Referring to the two origins of the Eucharist, Cullmann says, "Lietzmann's merit has been to demonstrate by his researches how great must have been the distinction between them, since these two were able for a considerable period to preserve their original characters in the later liturgies".<sup>3</sup>

This fact will indicate our field of study and it will proceed along the lines indicated by Lietzmann following the progression from the first Resurrection meal on the one hand and the Last Supper on the other, as far as the first recorded eucharistic liturgies available. These two liturgical families are delineated by Lietzmann as a result of his research as outlined in "Mass and Lord's Supper", and are summarised by R.D. Richardson in the introduction to the book which classifies them "into two main types - an early Egyptian and a 'Western', Sarapion being the main representative of the first and Hippolytus of the second. Each of these two types he traces to its ultimate characteristic source, Sarapion's

---

1. O. Cullmann, Essays on the Lord's Supper, p. 17.

2. ibidem. p. 22.

3. ibidem. p. 6.

in Didache ix-x and Hippolytus' in I Corinthians x-xi. Finally, behind Didache he claims to show the 'Breaking of Bread' of the first disciples with the Risen Lord - which continued the table-fellowship of Jesus' chaburah in His lifetime; and behind I Corinthians xi the last such fellowship-supper only - whose re-enactment as a different kind of rite he attributes to St. Paul".<sup>1</sup> The reason for proceeding no further than the two liturgies of Sarapion and Hippolytus is that, as Lietzmann says, "Our investigations have established that the abundant liturgies can all be traced to two primitive forms, the Hippolytan-Roman and the Egyptian".<sup>2</sup>

---

1. opt. cit. p. xii f.

2. opt. cit. p. 142.

THE NEW TESTAMENT REFLECTS EARLY EUCHARISTIC LITURGY.

It is customarily thought that the only connection between the Eucharistic practice of the early Church and the New Testament is that the New Testament provides the theological basis for the Eucharist. While this is true, it is not the only link between the New Testament and the Eucharist.

Within the New Testament, there are several references to the worship of the early Church - far more than appear at first sight, as will be seen later. Cullmann shows that an essential part of the worship of the early Church is the "breaking of bread". "In the Book of Acts (2 : 42 & 46, 20 : 7) instruction, preaching, prayer and breaking of bread are mentioned, and mentioned in such a way as clearly to show that these elements were, from the beginning, the foundation of all the worship life of the Christian community".<sup>1</sup> So where we find evidence of the worship of the early Church we will be entitled to look, within such evidence, for signs of eucharistic liturgy.

In examining the liturgical practice revealed in the New Testament, it is possible to discern development within the Church's eucharist. This raises the question, how far are we justified in looking for any set pattern of liturgical practice in the New Testament? Obviously, if we are dealing with a situation where each congregation is able to celebrate the Eucharist with complete freedom as to order, there is little value to be attached to any reference to the liturgy in the New Testament.

In the earliest days of the Church, worship was largely free expression of the Spirit, or what has been called "charismatic worship". We remember the practice in the early Church of speaking with tongues, as proof of this "charismatic worship". But this sort of worship seems to have disappeared soon, for we find that the practice of speaking with tongues was not wholly approved of as early as in the days of Paul, "In church I would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue".<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, it is asking too much of any body such as the early Christian Church to expect that, in the space of time represented by the New Testament, worship had become completely fixed and uniform. Yet there is sufficient form in the eucharistic liturgy revealed in the New Testament

---

1. Early Christian Worship, p. 12.

2. I Cor. 14 : 19.

to enable us to trace a definite liturgical pattern. J.H. Srawley says, "The fuller and more formal language of St. Paul may indicate that the account of the Last Supper was already acquiring in oral tradition a stereotyped form".<sup>1</sup> Since the eucharist was so closely connected with the Last Supper, this probably means that the same can be said of the liturgy of the eucharist. "Such language (as is found in the Apostolic writings) supplied Christian devotion with a means of expressing its own highest conceptions when engaged in public worship, and helped to create a liturgical phraseology, which in time became stereotyped and found a permanent place in the written liturgies of the Church".<sup>2</sup>

We will, therefore, turn to the New Testament and find there traces of the earliest eucharistic liturgies, and will use these traces in our search for resurrection influence on eucharistic liturgy.

---

1. The Early History of the Liturgy, p. 10.

2. *ibid.* pp. 16f.

THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT FOR EVIDENCE OF RESURRECTION  
INFLUENCE IN EUCHARISTIC LITURGY.

Having set out the ground we intend to cover, and the reasons for our decisions, and having indicated that we are justified in examining the New Testament for signs of the eucharistic liturgy used by the early Christian Church, we now proceed to examine the New Testament in some detail, studying only those passages that reveal eucharistic liturgy, and seeking to find what influence the Resurrection of Jesus Christ had on such liturgy.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN

We commence our examination with the Gospel according to John, for special reasons. In *Early Christian Worship* we read, "The Gospel of John is outstandingly valuable as a source for the question of the early Christian service of worship".<sup>1</sup> In the same work Cullmann states, "There can be traced in the Gospel of John a distinct line of thought connecting with the service of worship".<sup>2</sup> Furthermore he says, "The Gospel of John regards it as one of its chief concerns to set forth the connexion between the contemporary Christian worship and the historical life of Jesus".<sup>3</sup>

Within this framework of worship, it is necessary to find that the eucharist is included. The question about the eucharist in John is both asked and answered by Higgins when he says, "Some have suggested that the fourth evangelist is anti-sacramentalist, or at least is not interested in sacraments as of primary importance in the life of the Church. A recent advocate of this view is R. Bultmann, who in his commentary represents the evangelist as the best negative in his attitude to the sacraments. This position seems to me quite untenable. The Fourth Gospel is, on the contrary, the most sacramentalist of all the New Testament writings and this chapter will show that it assigns a vital role to the Eucharist".<sup>4</sup> This point of view is not new but receives considerable support from the "ancient Church". This is called to our attention by Cullmann when he says, "The exegesis of the ancient Church recognises to a considerable degree our Gospel's interest in the liturgy, and the Church Fathers and early Christian art also bear witness to it. In this latter, not only are individual scenes from our Gospel used as illustrations of the sacraments, but throughout the

---

1. O.Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, pp. 7f.

2. *ibid.* p. 37.

3. *ibid.*

4. A.J.B. Higgin's, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*,

middle ages the tradition persisted of representing John the evangelist himself with the communion cup".<sup>1</sup>

Of course it is immediately observed that in the Gospel according to John there is no formal record of the institution of the eucharist. It is well known, though, that it is the practice of John to teach by means of selected narratives and to leave the reader to find the reason behind his choice.

In choosing these narratives, John must have been influenced by some factors, and, when he is striving to convey truth about the eucharist, he must certainly have been affected by what he knew of the central act of worship of the Church of his day. So, as we find the steady insistence on the Resurrection that is written into John's Gospel, we will need to interpret it as a reflection of what John found in the eucharistic liturgy of the early Church.

It is as well to note that the Gospel according to John was written late enough to have allowed the liturgy of the Church to have assumed some form and order. The Interpreters' Bible states, "It is increasingly difficult to accept a date much later than the end of the first century for the publication of the Gospel".<sup>2</sup> Naturally, the writer of those words would not accept, either, a date much earlier than 100 A.D.

In studying the Gospel, we will not go outside those passages that are specifically eucharistic, and we will examine only those that reveal the influence of the Resurrection.

The marriage-feast at Cana in Galilee, John 2 : 1 - 11, is the first passage that claims attention. There are two points of interest, the first being the mention of the Jewish rites of purification in v. 6: we will return to this later. The other point of interest is Jesus' statement, "My hour is not yet come".<sup>3</sup> Reference to the coming hour is made in several places in John. What does he mean by it? It seems that it can be identified with the hour of His glorification, as we read in the Gospel, "Jesus answered them, 'The hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified'".<sup>4</sup>

Cullmann states, "The glorification of Jesus coincides in John's Gospel with His death".<sup>5</sup> I would disagree with this for the following reasons. Death is not the sort of event that one associates with glorifying: it stands for defeat

---

1. opt. cit. p. 59.

2. Interpreters' Bible, Vol VIII, p. 442.

3. John 2 : 4

4. John 12 : 23

5. opt. cit. p. 66.

and loss, but not for glory. On the other hand, the Resurrection of Jesus Christ is very easily associated with glory. This is true glorification - to be raised from the dead. Furthermore, it is well to be reminded that death and resurrection for Christ are inseparably bound together. To indentify Christ's glorification solely with His death therefore seems to be an error. The Interpreters' Bible, commenting on John 12 : 23, quoted previously, says, "Glorification (doxasthēnai) just as exaltation (hupsothēnai) refers to death as the condition for rising again and heavenly triumph".<sup>1</sup> In the commentary on Acts 3 : 13, the same commentary says, "The servant was glorified first by the sign just performed in His name, but chiefly through the Resurrection".<sup>2</sup>

The interpretation given above to "glorification" is borne out by the Gospel according to John where the words are found, "As yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified".<sup>3</sup> We know that the Holy Spirit was not given until after the Resurrection, for it was after He had risen that "He breathed on them, and said to them, 'Receive the Holy Spirit'".<sup>4</sup>

Whatever else is said about this passage, it must therefore be put into the context of the Resurrection, because of the words of Jesus about His hour.

An analogy is drawn between this passage and the passage in which Jesus is asked to go to Judea by His brothers in John 7 : 1 - 10. The parallels Cullmann sees are the fact that urging is common to both - in the feast at Cana it is His mother who urges Him, while in chapter 7 it is His brothers. In both cases He refuses to satisfy their request, and in both cases gives as His reason that His "hour is not yet come". Yet in both narratives He secretly fulfils their request. The reason for linking these two narratives is to show that they both refer to worship, and to combine the significant element in both so as to bring out the Resurrection significance.

In both of these passages there is reference to water in connection with the Jewish rites of purification. This is the feature that is important as the contribution of these narratives to the eucharist of the early Church. The water of purification is here associated with the glorification of Christ, which, as we saw, means His resurrection. In Jewish worship, forgiveness was believed to be accomplished

---

1. opt. cit. p. 662

2. opt. cit. Vol. IX, p. 58.

3. John 7 : 39.

4. John 20 : 22.

by the water of purification: in the central act of Christian Worship, forgiveness is being associated with the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. We are being told that the Resurrection of Christ is inseparably part of His saving work. Furthermore, at the marriage feast, the water of purification is changed into the wine of Jesus' blood - this being the feature that indicated the Eucharistic flavour of the narratives - and so we have the Jewish purification replaced by the death and Resurrection of Christ, for the two cannot be separated. "The full redemptive work of Christ is seen not merely in His sacrifice on the Cross, but also in His Resurrection and Ascension whereby He has proclaimed an eternal forgiveness, and opened the way to the presence of the Father".<sup>1</sup>

The clearing of the Temple (John 2 : 12 - 22) is the next section to be examined. Whereas the previous two sections, discussed above, deal with the means of forgiveness and, in the context of the Eucharist, relate this to the Resurrection of Christ, this section concerns the centre or worship.

The centre of Jewish worship was the Temple. In the narrative of the clearing of the Temple, "Jesus' words about destroying and raising the Temple (v. 19) are a reference to His own body crucified and raised from the dead on the third day".<sup>2</sup> Instead of Temple-centred worship, there is to be Christ-centred worship, and it is not to be the Christ as He is with His disciples at the time, but it is to be the risen Christ. The new Temple will be the one that is broken down and, after three days, built again.

All of this is applied by John to the Eucharist, for he introduces the narrative with the words, "The Passover of the Jews was at hand".<sup>3</sup> So this section of the Gospel contributes the teaching, concerning the Eucharist, that it must be centred in Christ as He is risen after His crucifixion. Just what this means can only be understood as we refer to Paul.

Still speaking of this passage, Cullmann says, "The conception of the community as the body of Christ, a conception which has such deep theological significance for Paul, is also certainly implied, so that the connexion Temple - community - body of Christ is readily explicable".<sup>4</sup>

- 
1. J.-F. Bill, The Fact and Meaning of the Resurrection - A Study in Emphases, p. 31.
  2. Early Christian Worship, p. 72.
  3. John 2 : 13.
  4. opt. cit. p. 73.

Since John deliberately allows his words to have two, or even three meanings, it is argued that talk of the reconstruction of the Temple could apply with equal force to the Jewish temple, or to the temple which is Christ's body, or to the temple which is the community of believers.

If we interpret the rebuilding of the Temple as meaning the Resurrection of Christ, then the significance is that Christian worship centres in the Risen Lord, as has been stated above. If, however, we follow the suggestion made by Cullmann following Paul, and the two interpretations are not mutually exclusive, then it means this: not only is the temple to be identified with Christ, but it is also identified with the Christian community. "We are the temple of the living God".<sup>1</sup> That is to say, the worshipping community is identified with the Christ. What could give a better indication of the presence of the risen Christ in the Eucharist!

This passage therefore teaches the very important doctrine of the presence of Christ in the midst of the Church at the Eucharist - He must be there because He is part of the Church. If He is at the Eucharist, He certainly cannot still be dead, but must be risen. Remove the Resurrection and you must remove this vital aspect of Eucharistic belief.

Logically, the next portion of the Gospel according to John that should be studied is the pronouncement of Christ on the subject of the Sabbath, after healing the paralysed man at the pool Bethesda. I propose, however, to defer consideration of the passage, and of the whole subject of the day of worship, until we deal with the letter to the Hebrews.

We now consider the narrative of the feeding of the multitude, John 6 : 1 - 13, 26 - 65. Before considering this section of John, it is necessary for us to note the very great importance of the passage for our purposes. Cullmann, for instance, says, "The long speech which Jesus makes in John's Gospel, after the miracle of feeding the multitude about the meaning of this miracle, has, since ancient times, been considered by most exegetes a discourse on the Eucharist".<sup>2</sup> Not only is this so, but it is generally regarded as the central statement on the Eucharist in a Gospel that deals largely with this subject. When this is added to the persistent mention of Resurrection in this passage, then it is not difficult to realise that this passage is of the utmost importance in this study.

---

1. II Cor. 6 : 16.

2. opt. cit. p. 93.

To support the idea that this passage deals with the Eucharist, we have the parenthetical statement at the beginning of the narrative, "Now the Passover, the feast of the Jews, was at hand".<sup>1</sup> And in the discourse of Christ that follows His action there is mention of the two elements of the Eucharist, "My flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed".<sup>2</sup>

It is worth noticing that, in the narrative of the miracle, there is mention of bread and fish, "There is a lad here who has five barley loaves and two fish".<sup>3</sup> This brings to mind the suggestion that was made by Cullmann and that was discussed in the first section of this thesis about the origin of the Eucharist. It finds its echo later in the Gospel, when the risen Christ is meeting with His disciples on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias. "When they got out on land, they saw a charcoal fire there, with fish lying on it, and bread".<sup>4</sup> If this incident on the shore is an origin of the Eucharist, then we have here a further link between this passage and the Eucharist.

In John 6 : 11, which tells how Christ distributed the bread and fish, we have language which is clearly eucharistic, "Jesus then took the loaves, and when He had given thanks, He distributed/to <sup>them</sup> those who were seated; so also the fish, as much as they wanted".<sup>5</sup> In fact the word that is commonly used to describe the sacrament comes from this passage: having given thanks - (eucharistēsas).

Thus far we have established the connection of this portion of the Gospel with the Eucharist. The link with the Resurrection will be emphasised in consideration of the passage in greater detail. Let it be noted, though, that our consideration will reveal two major contributions made to eucharistic practice and belief. These are the stress on the eschatological significance of the sacrament, and the emphasis placed on anti-docetic teaching.

The eschatological note is struck in the words about manna in the wilderness. We are reminded by Cullmann, "In Jewish eschatology manna is an element which belongs to the Messianic Age. It is expected that the manna miracle will take place in a more permanent form at the end of time."<sup>6</sup>

- 
1. John 6 : 4
  2. John 6 : 55
  3. John 6 : 9
  4. John 21 : 9
  5. John 6 : 11
  6. opt. cit. p. 96.

The eschatological element is important because it tells us that if there is to be a feast in the hereafter Christ must be risen to share in that feast with us.

If the eschatological reference involves the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, then it must also involve the resurrection of humans. John makes frequent mention of the resurrection of humans that will be accomplished by Christ, "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day".<sup>1</sup> The argument is that if Christ needs to be risen to participate in the eschatological feast, then His people also must rise in order to be there. The thought that believers will be raised serves to strengthen the emphasis on Christ's Resurrection, for the impression is conveyed that it is He, the risen Lord, who will give this gift to those who believe. Christ says, "Yet a little while, and the world will see me no more, but you will see me; because I live, you will live also".<sup>2</sup> Cullmann expresses it in these words, "It is the body of the RISEN Christ, which is present in the Lord's Supper. He raises us up to life here and now and therein lies the promise of our resurrection".<sup>3</sup> Verse 33 of this chapter of the Gospel emphasises that Christ was present in times past, and that He will <sup>be</sup> present in the future, giving life as the risen Christ. "The true bread is that which comes down from heaven, and gives life to the world".<sup>4</sup>

This eschatological element in the passage we are considering is once again stressed in the request of the disciples, "Lord, give us this bread always (pantote)".<sup>5</sup> Cullmann has this to say about it, "This gift should not be restricted to the single act of the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand nor indeed to the historical incarnation at all, but after Christ's death, too, this bread should continue to be given: 'evermore', not as the Jews meant it, but rather as Jesus did and as He expresses it in His answer: 'I am the bread of life' (v. 35). Since HE is the bread of life He will never be withdrawn from His own".<sup>6</sup>

As a last <sup>witness to the</sup> eschatological contribution made by this passage to eucharistic doctrine, we have the thought that the Eucharist is a spiritual food. As it represents the resurrected Christ it is not like the manna of the wilderness which

---

1. John 6 : 54.

2. John 14 : 19.

3. opt. cit. p. 97.

4. John 6 : 33

5. John 6: 34.

6. O. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 96.

sustained the body only. This food is spiritual, and will impart the gift of resurrection.

The second contribution this passage makes to the Eucharist, is its anti-docetism. The first intimation we have of this is in verse 51 where Christ uses the present tense, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven".<sup>1</sup> The bread came down from heaven in the past, but Christ continues to be this bread. There is no sense in which He ceases to be this bread of life; He is perpetually present. The verse therefore speaks of the actual presence of Christ at the Eucharist.

In verses 52 - 57 of the sixth chapter we have Jesus using an expression that is so emphatic that it offends some who hear Him. Throughout these verses He is speaking of the eating of His body, but instead of the customary words *esthiō* for eat, and *sōma* for body, He uses words which permit no misunderstanding, *trōgō*, which means gnaw or chew, and *sarx*, which means flesh or meat.

Again, the purpose is to illustrate that it was indeed the crucified Christ who was present at the Eucharist. We can, however, take the matter further than this because we are moving in the atmosphere of the Resurrection. As the presence of Christ is emphasised, to combat the docetic heresy, and to prove that it was indeed a present Christ who suffered and died, so, certainly, the intention is to show that the risen Christ was equally present and real, especially at the Eucharist.

This emphasis on the presence of Christ, especially in the way it is done, offends some of the disciples and they commence leaving. The way in which He answers their offence is to point to the ascension, "Do you take offence at this? Then what if you were to see the Son of man ascending where He was before?".<sup>2</sup> The ascension is thus intended to explain the presence of Christ at the Eucharist. But we cannot speak of the ascension without speaking of the Resurrection. Again, the fact that Christ is really present at the Eucharist - a fact that is not to be doubted - is closely coupled with the fact of His Resurrection. Without the Resurrection, there is no presence in the Eucharist.

This most important section of the Gospel according to John therefore adds to our knowledge of the sacrament by indicating the eschatological connotation of the Eucharist, and by stressing the presence of Christ at the Eucharist. Both of

---

1. John 6 : 51.

2. John 6 : 61 - 62.

these features of the Eucharist point directly to the Resurrection, for it is only in the risen Christ that they have any meaning.

We now proceed to the consideration of the narrative of the washing of the disciples' feet, John 13 : 1 - 20. This passage does have links with the sacrament of baptism because of the element of washing, but it is also eucharistic because of the proximity to the Passover and the Last Supper.

Once again there are two chief contributions here made to the Eucharist. The first of these is the element of fellowship, or, as Cullmann puts it, "Here in the foreground stands the thought of the FELLOWSHIP OF LOVE".<sup>1</sup> The verse that summarises the thought is, "If I the your Lord and Teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet".<sup>2</sup> Jesus Christ puts Himself into fellowship with His disciples, and He demands that, as a consequence, they have fellowship with each other, the fellowship of love.

These thoughts, uttered in a context of the Eucharist, mean that the sacrament is one of fellowship with the present Christ and that, as a result, it is also a sacrament of fellowship of disciples with each other, through the present Christ. Now Christ, as we have already seen, can only be present at the Eucharist as He has risen from the dead. Therefore, the thought of the fellowship present in the Eucharist is based on the fact of the Resurrection.

The second contribution this passage makes is through its mention of forgiveness, which is the meaning of the washing. An element of the Eucharist is forgiveness. It has been shown that the soteriological work of Christ is not complete without the Resurrection, for without it the Cross is a defeat, not a triumph over the forces of evil. Thus we may say that this element of forgiveness that is to be associated with the Eucharist is not to be considered unless one sees the Resurrection as part of Christ's forgiving work. As forgiveness is repeated at each Eucharist, it is associated with the Resurrection, by which the washing of the soul was completed.

Exactly the same two elements - fellowship and forgiveness - are to be found in the fifteenth chapter, where Christ speaks of the vine and its branches. The element of fellowship of the disciples with Christ is conveyed by the metaphor of the vine and the branches, while the idea of forgiveness

---

1. opt. cit. p. 107.

2. John 13 : 14.

is found in the words, "If a man does not abide in me, he is cast forth as a branch and withers; and the branches are gathered, thrown into the fire and burned".<sup>1</sup>

This subject of the fellowship of love will have to be returned to when the Kiss of Peace is discussed later.

In the Gospel according to John 14 : 1 - 6, we have the stirring words of Christ concerning mansions in the life to come. The significance of these words is that the Eucharist embraces the offer of Christ to give life to His disciples. This passage teaches us that it is a sacrament of life. The promises are based entirely on the Resurrection of Christ, for what else can these words refer to but the Resurrection, "When I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, that where I am you may be also".<sup>2</sup> Jesus' insistence that He is the life loses all its value unless we know that these are not the words of a man who is going to die and not rise. The claim begins to appear foolish unless the one who makes it is able to conquer death, as Jesus did in His Resurrection.

So, because, at the Last Supper and in the context of the Eucharist suggested by that Supper, Christ promises life, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper carries with it, as long as it is to be celebrated by believers, the promise of life.

When He has spoken to the disciples on this subject, He then makes to them this promise, "If you ask anything in my name, I will do it".<sup>3</sup> With this brief passage, chapter 14, verses 12 - 14, we must consider the whole of chapter 17. Naturally, space does not permit a full consideration of that chapter, but in broad outline it covers the same ground as the verse quoted above. Christ promises that in the future He will satisfy prayers offered in His name. It is not as though prayers offered in His name will have a particular value, but that He Himself will answer these prayers. In short, He will be risen, so as to be able to answer these intercessions - "I will do it".

Chapter 17, generally known as Christ's high-priestly prayer, is a foretaste of this activity of the risen Lord. In that chapter He prays on behalf of His own, making special intercession for them. The risen Lord will likewise be hearing the prayers of the people and interceding on their behalf.

- 
1. John 15 : 6.
  2. John 14 : 3.
  3. John 14 : 14.

This is to be regarded as part of the Eucharist as it was known by John. In the Eucharist, when we pray, we have the assurance that our prayers are heard by Christ and commended by Him for answering. Where we do not pray as we ought, or where we cannot pray, He prays for us.

He will also pray for the gift of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit, when He comes to us, will remind us of Christ - "He will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you".<sup>1</sup> - and because the Spirit is alive, we can assume that Christ will be alive too, alive from the dead, risen.

The prayer for the Holy Spirit has become a part of the eucharistic liturgy of the Church, introduced, no doubt, in this passage. It would be a grave error indeed if we were to go so far in separating the Spirit and Christ that we came to see no connection between them. On the contrary, if the Holy Spirit is present in the Eucharist, then we must believe that Christ is there, and, as has been said before, if Christ is present, He must be risen, not dead. The epiclesis of the Christian Church is in itself a witness to the Resurrection of Christ, and this witness is ratified in heaven, we are promised, because the Holy Spirit will come to those who follow in the tradition of the Last Supper. "I will send Him to you,"<sup>2</sup> said Christ, and this is not the act of a dead being, but of a risen Christ.

John also adds the thought that the Eucharist is a sacrament of committal - committal to obedience - and this in the atmosphere of the Resurrection of Christ. He says, "If a man loves me, he will keep my word".<sup>3</sup> He continues, "My Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him".<sup>4</sup> This cannot refer to the appearances of Christ after the Resurrection but before the ascension. It must be said of the eternally risen Christ. The point John makes here is that, because Christ is risen He is able to command our obedience, and if we do obey Him He will make His place with us and prove to be eternally present. Those who make the Eucharist their pledge of obedience to Christ, will know the presence of the risen Lord in the sacrament, while the very fact that He is risen is the authority of His demand.

---

1. John 14 : 26.

2. John 16 : 7.

3. John 14 : 23

4. John 14 : 23

The last contribution that John makes to our understanding of the Eucharist, as it was celebrated by the Christian Church of his day, is to show us that this is a sacrament of joy. This topic has been discussed earlier in the argument about the origins of the eucharist, but we have here a tradition that is, to some extent, independent of that of the Acts. In chapter 16 : 20 - 24 Christ reminds the disciples repeatedly of the joy that will be theirs - "You have sorrow now, but I will see you again and your hearts will rejoice".<sup>1</sup> This is such an accurate description of what happened in the experience of the disciples before and after the Resurrection that we may be certain it applies to that event. The joy of the disciples is associated with the Resurrection of Christ. Insofar as the Eucharist is a sacrament of joy, it finds its origin in the Resurrection of Christ, for how can a memorial of a dead Lord be a service characterised by joy?

Finally we have something that is not teaching about eucharistic liturgy, but is rather a very broad hint. It is recorded by John, as a fact of history that, "One of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear, and at once there came out blood and water".<sup>2</sup> A most penetrating commentary is made by Cullmann on this verse. He says, "Scarcely is the historical Jesus dead - His body still hangs upon the Cross - when He shows in what form He will from now on be present upon earth, in the sacraments, in Baptism and Lord's Supper, and we know from chapter 6 that this presence is just as real as the humanity of the historical Jesus was real, just as real as the water and blood from His wounds were real".<sup>3</sup>

Stemming from this incident, we must expect the Lord to be present in the Eucharist, even as He will be present in Baptism, but we reiterate that He cannot be so present unless He be risen.

In all the elements mentioned above we find John systematically setting forth for us the Eucharist as he found it in his day, but repeatedly we have been obliged to notice how the elements mentioned by John have found their origin and validity in the Resurrection of the Lord of the Eucharist.

---

1. John 16 : 22

2. John 19 : 34

3. opt cit. p. 115.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

In Studying the Synoptic Gospels for evidence of the eucharistic liturgy of their time, and particularly for signs of the influence of the Resurrection on such liturgy, we must not expect to find the same liturgical and eucharistic interest on the part of the evangelists as we found in the Gospel according to John. The Synoptists were concerned to set forth, chronologically, the events of Christ's life, while John, as we saw, had other purposes when he wrote. The passages that will be of interest to us in the Synoptic Gospels are the passages dealing with the Last Supper, because, unlike John who has no formal words of institution of the Eucharist, the Synoptists centre their teaching on the subject in these pericopes. Furthermore, we will not duplicate what has already been said, arising from the 4th Gospel, but will deal with what is distinctive, or with outstanding confirmation of what we have found in John.

It is generally accepted that, in the account of the Last Supper, Matthew is dependent upon Mark. The differences between the two accounts are so few, and of so little importance that we will not study Matthew separately. Higgins says, "Matthew's narrative of the Last Supper can quickly be disposed of, as it is merely an expanded and more liturgical form of Mark's account".<sup>1</sup> There is one phrase that Matthew includes in his narrative, and which is missing from Mark, and the very fact that it is found only in Matthew adds to its value. We are not chiefly interested in the "pure" text, but are looking rather for reflections of the influence of early eucharistic liturgy in the Gospels. It seems that where any specific addition is made to what is a set form, it must be made as a result of outside influence, and that is likely to be the influence of the usages of the Church of the day.

Mark and Luke both quote Christ as saying, "I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God".<sup>2</sup> This is not said in grief, but in joy as an anticipation of what is to come, as Higgins says, "The emphasis is not on the sorrow of parting, but on the joyful expectation of the renewal of fellowship in the Kingdom of God".<sup>3</sup> So this farewell verse confirms

---

1. A.J.B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the N.T., p. 24.

2. Mark 14 : 25

3. opt. cit. p. 47.

much of what we have seen already as being characteristic of the Eucharist.

A completely new contribution to the understanding of the early Eucharist is made by both Mark and Luke when they report Christ as saying of the cup, "This is my blood of the covenant,"<sup>1</sup> (which is how Mark records the words) or "This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood"<sup>2</sup> (which is a later addition to the original Western text in Luke). In the Old Testament the blood of the covenant is the blood of circumcision, with all that the circumcision-covenant meant. Here we are dealing with a new covenant, and it is not certain exactly what is meant by it. Whatever it means, it is a new feature in the Eucharist.

There is mention in Jeremiah 31 : 31 - 34 ("I will be their God, and they shall be my people") of a new covenant, but it does not explain the reference, merely indicating that there is a covenant between God and Israel that they will belong to each other. This is too vague to be of much value in explaining what Christ could have meant.

Since the Synoptists place the Last Supper in the context of the Passover, it seems reasonable to expect that there is a link with the blood of the Passover. If this is so, then the blood of the covenant has soteriological meaning. The one respect in which Matthew makes an important departure from the narrative in Mark is that he adds to these words about the "blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many" the phrase, "For the forgiveness of sins".<sup>3</sup> This would support the contention that the blood of the covenant is associated with the saving work of Christ. If this is so, then we can see here the resurrection-influence that must be found wherever the saving work of Christ is mentioned, for that work is not complete without the Resurrection.

A different hypothesis is advanced by Clark when, commenting on this covenant he says, "This covenantal emphasis points at once to the idea of 'the people of God'".<sup>4</sup> This would mean that the Eucharist is a means of uniting Christ and His disciples as well as a means of uniting the disciples with one another. In both cases this is reconciliation, firstly of God with man, and secondly of man with man. However we interpret the work of reconciliation, it requires the Resurrection to bring the work of reconciliation to its

---

1. Mark 14 : 24.

2. Luke 22 : 20.

3. Matt. 26 : 28.

4. N. Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments,

consummation.

Again Clark speaks of this covenant, this time to offer a further suggestion. He says, "The New Covenant is established with an eschatological reference".<sup>1</sup> If we adopt this suggestion, it means that the covenant is an agreement on behalf of Christ to meet with His disciples in an eschatological fellowship. As has been noted before, if Christ is to fulfil this sort of promise, then He must be risen. A dead Christ is not able to meet with His disciples in the future.

There is one other method of finding what Christ meant by this covenant and that is to see what actually did happen in the future. It is a fact of history and of our own experience that every time Christian believers call on Christ in this covenant, He is present with them. It could, therefore, be argued from experience, that this covenant is a covenant of presence, Christ covenanting to be present with His disciples in the Eucharist. Enough has been said about this for us to realise that His presence is possible only if He is the risen Christ.

It is just possible that all of these thoughts were in the mind of Christ when He uttered these words. It seems, however, that whichever of these interpretations of the word covenant we adopt, we will be breathing the atmosphere of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Considering Christ's injunction about the cup in the Lukan narrative of the Last Supper, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves,"<sup>2</sup> we are reminded of the idea of the unity of the disciples, as achieved in the Eucharist. They drink of one cup, thereby signifying their unity one with the other. This unity, again, is part of the reconciling work of Christ - that work being incomplete unless we include the Resurrection in it.

Reverting to the later addition to the Lukan text, we find there the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me".<sup>3</sup> In attempting to understand these words, we must appreciate the word remembrance. Speaking of the Jew's attitude to and interpretation of the word, as instanced by Paul, Leenhardt says, "Remembrance was not for him mental recollection, an evocative thought. Remembrance was for Him the restoration

---

1. Ibid. p. 69.

2. Luke 22 : 17.

3. Luke 22 : 19

of a past situation which has for the moment disappeared  
To remember is to make present and actual".<sup>1</sup>

If we are to regard remembrance as making something present whereas it happened in the past, then we must ask, what is it that is made present and real? It can either be the presence of Christ, or the re-enactment of the meal preceding His death. If it is the latter, then there seems to be very little point to remembering what is a very sombre event, unless Christ rose from the dead. If He did rise from the dead, then surely what will be remembered will be not so much the sombre occasion as the joy of His presence in that meal. The remembrance of Christ would then mean that in the Eucharist the presence of Christ - the risen Christ - would be made actual in the same way that He was present in the Last Supper. The Eucharist as an act of remembrance is therefore an interpretation that is entirely dependent upon the Resurrection of Christ for its validity.

To summarise the special contributions made by the Synoptic Gospels is to point to the emphasis on the covenant instituted in the Last Supper, and to the meaning of the order to remember Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist, recognising that both of these contributions involve belief in the Resurrection of Christ and, as they represented elements in the early Church's Eucharist must have been included in the liturgy because of faith in the Resurrection.

---

1. O. Cullmann & F.J. Leenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper, p. 61.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

The Acts of the Apostles reflects the life of the early Church and thus will give indications of the eucharistic practice of the Church.

The first passage in the book that is widely accepted as having a eucharistic reference is the 4th verse of the first chapter, which speaks of Jesus' "staying with them", as the R.S.V. translates the Greek. The original word is sunalizemenos, which means taking salt with, or, as the R.S.V. margin translates it, eating with. This is to say that Jesus had a meal with His disciples after His Resurrection. The verse is, in my opinion, not strictly eucharistic, because it is not connected with the worship of the Church. This is simply a meal that Jesus and His disciples shared and, although the Eucharist is a meal shared by Christ and men, it is more than that; it is also an act of worship.

There are three pericopes that are of significance for this study and of these we consider first Acts 2 : 42 - 46. This is an account of life in the early Christian community and we are told that the disciples devoted themselves, inter alia, to the breaking of bread. This phrase, "breaking of bread" has distinct eucharistic meaning. Higgins says of the expression, "There can be little doubt that the Eucharist is meant,"<sup>1</sup> and also, "It was the earliest name for the Eucharist".<sup>2</sup>

At first it is not certain whether "breaking of bread" refers to the practice instituted by Christ at the Last Supper as a memorial of His death and Crucifixion, or whether it refers to the post-resurrection appearances of Christ when He ate with them. The phrase, "with glad and generous hearts",<sup>3</sup> puts the matter beyond doubt, because "glad" is the word used to translate agalliasei - a poor translation it seems. Liddell and Scott translate agalliasis as "exceeding great joy".<sup>4</sup> As argued on pages 4 and 5 of this work, this very fact links this account of the Lord's Supper with His Resurrection, for, only as the Lord's Supper is related to the Resurrection is there any real link with joy. So here we see the connection between the Eucharist and the Resurrection illustrated in the life and practice of the early Church, and effecting the celebration of the Sacrament, not so much by way of changing its

- 
1. A.J.B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the N.T., p. 56.
  2. ibidem.
  3. Acts. 2 : 46.
  4. Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, ad hoc.

liturgy, because there probably was none yet, but by changing the very spirit in which the meal was held.

The second passage that contributes to our knowledge of the Eucharist as celebrated by the early Church is Acts. 10 : 39 - 43. This is part of the speech delivered by Peter during his visit to Cornelius. In this speech he makes mention of the Resurrection of Christ in the words, "They put Him to death by hanging Him on a tree; but God raised Him on the third day and made Him manifest".<sup>1</sup> Immediately following this in the speech, and therefore closely linked with it, are three statements that we must consider. The first of these is that Christ was manifested "to us who were chosen by God as witnesses, who ate and drank with Him after He rose from the dead".<sup>2</sup>

This statement does two things. In the first place it puts this pericope within the context of the Eucharist and thus we may interpret what follows immediately as being also connected with the Eucharist. Secondly, it confirms that there is a connection between the Eucharist and the Resurrection.

The second statement in this speech linked with the mention of the Resurrection, and linked also with this verse on the Lord's Supper, is, "He commanded us to preach to the people, and to testify that He is the one ordained by God to be judge of the living and the dead".<sup>3</sup> The three verses in this speech so far considered, the one referring to the Resurrection, the one referring to the Eucharist, and this one mentioning judgement, are conservative. Now judgement in the Bible most often has an eschatological reference. If this function of judge is to be exercised by Christ, He must be the risen Christ, so we can confirm the association of the Resurrection with judgement and, by extension, can once again find confirmation of the association of the Resurrection with the Eucharist. Peter is saying that the Eucharist is linked with the Resurrection, and, while his mind is occupied with the thought, he strengthens our conviction that this is indeed what is behind his words by speaking of judgement, which also depends on the Resurrection for its application as a work of Christ. This mention of judgement, therefore, made in the same breath as the mention of the Eucharist, is linked with the Resurrection, not only by virtue of its proximity to Peter's statement on the Resurrection, but also by virtue of its requirement that it is only a risen Christ who will judge.

---

1. Acts. 10 : 39 - 40.

2. Acts. 10 : 41.

3. Acts. 10 : 42.

The third statement made in this pericope in the context of the Resurrection and the Eucharist is, "Every one who believes in Him receives forgiveness of sins through His name".<sup>1</sup> Peter associated forgiveness with the Eucharist, and we have seen before that this is a proper association, because the Eucharist does have a forgiving significance. Peter also associates forgiveness with the Resurrection, and this too has been noted before, so we are able to conclude that where there is mention of forgiveness in the Eucharist, we are moving in the realm of the Resurrection. This has been found to be true earlier; here it is confirmed by Peter's juxtaposition of the ideas.

One more reference is found, in Acts, to the Eucharist, with Resurrection implication. This is in the words, "On the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread.....".<sup>2</sup> The significant words are "on the first day of the week". The consideration of these words, like those in John 5 relating the healing of the man at the pool Bethesda, will be left until we study the letter to the Hebrews.

The Acts of the Apostles, therefore, gives us three glimpses of how the early Christian Church's Eucharist was influenced by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. These are found in the spirit of joy in which the Eucharist was celebrated, in the eschatological significance of calling Jesus the judge, which thought is linked with the Eucharist, and in connecting forgiveness of sins with the Eucharist.

---

1. Acts. 10 : 43.

2. Acts. 20 : 7.

THE NEW TESTAMENT EPISTLES.

In the epistles of the New Testament, whether written by Paul or not, there are numerous references to the Resurrection which are not within the context of eucharistic liturgy. There is also liturgical matter, sometimes eucharistic, but which has no reference to the Resurrection. Both of these classes of material have been ignored, for they fall outside the scope of this study.

Many of the epistles, and of these the Pauline epistles particularly, have a special liturgical reference because of the place they occupied in the regular service of worship. It is to be borne in mind, too, that it was normal practice in the early Church to regard the Eucharist as an essential part of the regular worship of God. Cullmann puts the matter well in saying, "The presence of so much that is liturgical here in the Pauline Epistles connects almost certainly with the fact that the Apostle, while writing his letters, had in mind the community assembled for worship. He knows that his letters are read out there, and therefore he adds to them already the liturgical formulae. Lietzmann has rightly pointed out that the closing formulae of the Pauline epistles correspond to the liturgical phrases which we find at the beginning of the old liturgy for the Lord's Supper (see especially I Cor. 16 : 21 ff). The reason for that is that Paul knows that the Lord's Supper will follow immediately after the reading of his letter".<sup>1</sup> This means that the doxologies that are found at the end, usually, of many of the letters, although sometimes in the body of the letter, are most probably connected with eucharistic liturgy.

The Lord's Prayer:

This leads us to consider the doxology that is added to the Lord's Prayer, for it is suggested that the doxology was added because the prayer was used in the Eucharist. Cullmann says, "At an early date the Lord's Prayer appears to have been said in the service, as is clearly indicated by the addition of the Doxology shortly afterwards (Didache 8), which represents the liturgical echo of the congregation, so to speak, to the prayer taught by Jesus".<sup>2</sup> in a footnote to this remark, he adds, "E. Lohmeyer also, *Das Vaterunser*, 1946, p. 173, suspects that the Lord's Prayer was originally said at the celebration of the Meal and for that reason a formula of praise is added".<sup>3</sup>

---

1. O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, p. 24.

2. *ibid.* p. 13.

3. *ibidem.*

The doxology is found in Matthew only, and, in the R.S.V., it is relegated to the margin with the note, "Other authorities, some ancient, add, in some form, 'For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever, Amen'". The very fact that the doxology is found only in Matthew would lend weight to the argument that it is a later addition. This means that it was most probably not added by Christ but appended by another. Now if it was added by another, what was the inspiration that lay behind it? The Interpreters' Bible asks the question and answers it thus, "Why should a small and persecuted church add such a climax of praise to a prayer taught them by One from Galilee? Christ had died - on a Cross. Was this 'deliverance from evil'? This the coming of the 'kingdom'? But Christ rose: the river disappearing into the sand came back again into the sun. So the doxology of the Lord's Prayer is the church's praise for His risen power".<sup>1</sup> This is well said.

Placing Cullmann's comment on the doxology beside that of the Interpreters' Bible, we see that this doxology, used in the Eucharist, was inspired by the Resurrection of Christ. Here the eucharistic liturgy gives another indication representing the fact that it is a celebration of the Resurrection of the Lord. It is not that this doxology has been put into the liturgy and has exercised an influence on it. The truth is that this paean of praise has been generated within the Eucharist as a spontaneous expression of the belief in the Resurrection that was always a feature of the Meal. We have here proof of the influence of the Resurrection upon the eucharistic liturgy of the early Church.

Abba, Father:

The Lord's Prayer has been considered here, and not in the section dealing with the Synoptic Gospels, because there is probably a connection between it and the formula, "Abba, Father," found in Romans 8 : 15 and Galatians 4 : 6, as well as Mark 14 : 36 where it is used in Christ's prayer in the Garden. "Abba" is the Aramaic form of Father, and the possible connection between the formula in question and the Lord's Prayer becomes more likely when one remembers the strong body of opinion in favour of the theory that there is an Aramaic origin to the Gospels - that therefore the Lord's Prayer would have been in Aramaic - the possible connection becomes stronger.

---

1. Interpreters' Bible, Vol. VII, p. 315.

Cullmann says, "The fact that in Galatians 4 : 6 and Romans 8 : 15 all prayer is designated as a 'saying Abba' seems also to connect with the liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer (Our Father)".<sup>1</sup>

The formula "Abba, Father" could then be considered to be part of the eucharistic liturgy, and to be representative of the use of the Lord's Prayer. We saw above that the Lord's Prayer has had added to it the doxology that placed it within the sphere of the Resurrection. We may therefore conclude that "Abba, Father" is a fragment of the liturgy revealing the link between the early Eucharist and the Resurrection of Christ.

The remainder of the New Testament will be considered in this order: first I Corinthians 5 : 6 - 18, 13, then I Corinthians chapters 10 and 11, followed by a study of various topics which, being introduced in the New Testament, show signs of belonging to the liturgy of the Eucharist, and further reveal the influence of the Resurrection. All sections of the New Testament relevant to our purpose will be included in these topics, with the exception of the Letter to the Hebrews, and, of course, the Revelation of John both of which will be studied later.

I Corinthians 5 : 6 - 8, 13:

In this passage Paul deals with a case of incest that has been reported to him. He rules that the offending person should be excluded from the society. In these verses he speaks about keeping "the festival" (v. 8), he mentions that "Christ, our paschal lamb has been sacrificed," (v. 7), and he commands the Church "not even to eat with such a one". (v. 11). Taking these verses together, the likelihood is that Paul is speaking here about the Church's observance of the Eucharist. His attitude is that no one may be admitted to the Eucharist unless he is pure - "Drive out the wicked person from among you". (v. 13).

The logical conclusion of this ought to be that no one dare partake of the Lord's Supper, because all have sinned. If this injunction were all that is to be said on the subject, then the result would indeed be that none may attend the Eucharist. In this case, though, we are dealing with an offender who appears to be unrepentant, for his sin is put in the present tense - he is still doing it despite the disapproval of Christians. The ruling does leave a way open for those who are repentant. Thus we have the act of forgiveness

---

1. opt. cit. p. 13.

involved in the Eucharist.

Now the forgiving and saving work of Christ cannot be regarded complete without the Resurrection, which therefore becomes part of the means by which we may partake of the Lord's Supper. By his advice, affecting eucharistic practice, Paul interprets the Eucharist of those days as being inseparably linked with forgiveness, which in turn is integrally one with the Resurrection.

I Corinthians 10 - 11:

In chapter 10 the verses that are chiefly of value to us here are verses 14, and 16 - 21. Speaking particularly of this passage, Cullmann says, "The thought that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper a communion with the RISEN Christ takes place, lies beneath all the Pauline utterances on the Lord's Supper".<sup>1</sup>

These verses form part of a passage in which Paul deals with the question of pagan worship, which, it seems, was being indulged in by Christians. The particular form that this worship appears to have taken is that the worshippers shared meals that were part of the pagan cultus.

The argument Paul advances is interesting in that it throws light on the Christian Eucharist of his day. He claims that if people eat the food of idols they are identified with the idols and, he implies, they are then united with the idols. If this is so then it can be applied also to the meal which is sacred to Christians and he says, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?".<sup>2</sup> The sense of this is that when Christians eat of the meal that is Christ's, they are united with Him.

There is considerable controversy over the word *koinōnia*, which is translated participation in the R.S.V. It is not generally agreed just how far the participation in Christ goes, and just what it means, but we are relatively safe in concluding that it is merely a union with Christ, since to take a more literal view of the word will add nothing to our argument at this point.

In the phrase, "participation in the body of Christ," Paul uses the word *sōma* for body. In this context this probably means the physical body in the usual sense, but Paul also uses the word to mean the body which is the Church - "Now you

---

1. opt. cit. p. 98.

2. I Cor. 10 : 16.

are the body of Christ"<sup>1</sup> - so that we might be justified in deducing that Paul means participation, not only in the body of Christ, but also in the body of believers. There is support for this point of view in the passage we are considering, for Paul says, "Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the same loaf".<sup>2</sup>

The particular aspects of the Eucharist that this passage would illuminate, therefore, would be those of fellowship with Christ in the meal, and fellowship with fellow-Christians.

Referring to the idea of the Eucharist bringing about fellowship with Christ, we must recognise that this idea is a sure token of belief in the Resurrection of Christ. "Here Christ unites Himself with His community as crucified and risen and makes it in this way one with Himself, actually builds it up as His body".<sup>3</sup> Fellowship with Christ in the Eucharist entails the presence of the RISEN Christ in the Eucharist, and this aspect of the Eucharist could not be acceptable without the Resurrection.

The same can be said of the uniting of believers in the Eucharist. The unifying work can be accomplished only by a risen, living Christ. Only as we recognise a completed work of reconciliation, completed, that is, by the rising again of the crucified, can we accept the possibility of the reconciliation of the believers.

I Corinthians 11 : 20 - 29.

In this passage Paul corrects certain abuses that have arisen in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. It appears that some of the Christians attending the Eucharist were getting more than enough to eat while others were hungry and yet others were getting drunk - "In eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal, and one is hungry and another is drunk".<sup>4</sup> Paul therefore sets forth what ought to be, and in so doing gives us his account of the institution of the Lord's Supper. It has been suggested that, because of the over-emphasis of the joyous nature of the feast, as it is revealed here, Paul goes to the other extreme and stresses, more than he otherwise would, the sombre side of the feast, making it a remembrance of Christ's death.

---

1. I Cor. 12 : 27.

2. I Cor. 10 : 17.

3. opt. cit. p. 34.

4. I Cor. 11 : 21

In verse 20 the term "Lord's Supper" is introduced for the first time. The emphasis is on the word "Lord's". The idea in Paul's mind is that the supper does not belong to the participants and they did not spread the feast. It belongs to the Lord, who spread the feast, AND ATTENDS IT. Therefore the participants are not entitled to do with the feast as they wish. They must obey the ordinances laid down by the Lord, which Paul then proceeds to outline.

It is, incidentally, probably from this time that the Agape was separated from the Lord's Supper, so that the latter became a symbolic meal, rather than an actual feast.

In verse 23, "For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you", Paul declares a Eucharist which is a proclamation of "the Lord's death until He comes". The question of what Paul means by the words, "I received from the Lord," is discussed at some length by A.J.B. Higgins.<sup>1</sup> He comes to the conclusion that it means simply the handing on of the tradition he was taught, which tradition had its source in the Lord - "Apo tou Kuriou can mean a direct receiving from the Lord, without it being necessary to think of a vision or of excluding middle members through whom the Lord Himself imparts the paradosis".<sup>2</sup> He quotes an impressive list of authorities in support of this view.

One of the few who interpret the clause differently is H. Lietzmann, who claims that what is meant is that Paul was inspired by the Lord, and that he received from Him, by direct revelation, this tradition of the Eucharist.

Whether we accept Lietzmann's hypothesis, or that of Cullmann in the Scottish Journal of Theology, which Higgins quotes with approval, there is some explanation needed for the fact that Paul introduces a type of Eucharist that was evidently not practised hitherto in the early Church. And whether we accept a direct revelation, or one that is mediated by humans, we must acknowledge the Lord behind the inspiration that Paul has. This is stated by Higgins, "'The Lord' here is not only the historical Jesus as the chronological source of the tradition, but the exalted Lord behind the transmission of the tradition, who works IN it".<sup>3</sup> It is the risen Christ

---

1. A.J.B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the N.T., pp. 25 - 28.

2. *ibid.* p. 28.

3. *ibidem.*

who imparts the tradition and, such is the impact of the Resurrection that, even in proposing a Eucharist that has, as its hall-mark, a memorial of the death of Christ, Paul reveals the influence of the Risen Christ.

In verses 24 - 26, which contain Paul's account of the words of institution, there are aspects of the Lord's Supper that we must examine, and the first of these is the element of remembrance contained in the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me". The meaning of this word has been previously dealt with in this work on pages 25 - 26. It is necessary only to recall that the essence of the meaning of the word remembrance is "re-member", make present. Christ is regarded by Paul as being made contemporaneous in the Eucharist - the Risen Christ is invoked.

The next aspect of the Eucharist is the frequency with which it should be celebrated. "As often as you drink it", in verse 25, and "as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup", in verse 26, could apply to an annual feast, but it is not likely that these words would be used about a meal that was to be held once a year only. It is far more likely that they refer to a more frequent observance. The importance of this is that it tends to deny the Passover connection (the Passover was observed once a year only) and to place the Eucharist in the context of the post-Resurrection epiphanies, thus emphasising Cullmann's theory as outlined in the first section of this work. This would lend to the Eucharist a stronger Resurrection flavour than if we shared the meal once a year only, and that at Passover time.

Verse 26 furthermore contains the words, "You proclaim the Lord's death". These words are part of an addition to the tradition contained in the Synoptists. This addition could have a link with the Resurrection, because, as Higgins says, quoting M. Barth, "Christ's death is preached, not His dying re-enacted".<sup>1</sup> That the death of Christ is preached in the Eucharist implies that the work generally associated with His death is preached. We have noted earlier that the Resurrection is indivisibly part of the work accomplished in the death.

This same verse concludes with the words, "until He comes". This is clearly a reference to the Parousia with its eschatological connotation. There is to be a future meal with the Risen Christ. But it is well to remember that this does not exclude the present fellowship. The Christian Church has never believed that the fellowship with Christ that it seeks is to be delayed until the end. Thus Cullmann says, "This 'coming'

---

1. opt. cit. p. 53, quoting M. Barth, *Das Abendmahl: Passamahl Bundesmahl, und Messiasmahl*, 1945, pp. 17, 19.

of Him that is dead is not only eschatological; it is also actual".<sup>1</sup> So, though accepting that the eschatological element is an asset to us in our search for Resurrection influence in the Eucharist, we must keep it within the framework of the total faith of the Christian, not allowing it to overshadow the belief in the present Christ.

In verses 27 - 29 Paul is advising the people that no man ought to partake of the sacrament unless he is clean, thus repeating what he said in chapter 5. It is not part of our object to discuss the doctrine apparently taught here by Paul that physical suffering is a punishment of this unworthy participation, although it is quite clear that Paul recognises that there is a spiritual consequence for such participation. Therefore he commands that none should partake of the Supper unless he is repentant of his sins. He makes no mention of forgiveness prior to the sacrament but goes only as far as repentance. A contrite attitude is a condition of participation - "Let a man examine himself". This, one presumes, implies a subsequent forgiveness that is to take place in the sacrament. If this is so, we can reiterate the fact that this forgiveness, part of the sacrament, bears with it a reminder of the Resurrection without which there would be no triumph over sin.

#### The title 'Lord!'

"Christ is the word usually employed to interpret the Hebrew Messiah, but the word "Lord" may also be used for this purpose. In fact, in Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels we read, "'Lord' is an addition by the Evangelist, to interpret 'Christ' to Gentile Christians".<sup>2</sup> The eschatological connections of the word "Messiah" are well known, and we must regard the title "Lord" as having the same references. This eschatological significance inevitably implies the Resurrection.

"Lord" is, furthermore, the title used by people of New Testament days to describe the status of a deity with regard to a servant. It has been taken into Christian usage, and now indicates a Christ who demands worship from a position of sovereignty. That this requires a living, active, en-

---

1. O. Cullmann & F.J. Leenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper, p. 19.

2. J. Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Vol. II, p. 55.

throned Christ, who is in a position to exact such worship, and that therefore the term "Lord" presupposes the Resurrection, goes without saying.

Referring again to the article in the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, we find there a discussion on the use of the word "Lord" which contains these words, "Three of the instances in John, which are found in the early part of the Gospel, are plainly editorial additions (4:1; 6:23; 11:2). The remaining instances are found in the last two chapters of the Gospel, and in passages which are peculiar to it. They deal with the risen life of Jesus, and were written at a time when the higher conceptions of His personality gave a deeper significance to the title, and when its confessional meaning was universally known".<sup>1</sup> In this comment we have an opinion in favour of the link between the title "Lord" and the Resurrection, and we have support for the contention that it was used liturgically, for confessional use must have been included in the liturgy of the Church.

In the Interpreters' Bible the commentary on the "kenosis" pericope in Philippians chapter 2 contains this thought, "Here at last he reveals the new name which is above all others. Christ, by way of His humiliation has won His place as universal Lord".<sup>2</sup> If Christ has won the title by His humiliation, then we must assert that He is able to occupy the place only because of His Resurrection. Again the word "Lord" is found to have its roots in the Resurrection. Let it be noted, as well, that verses 10 and 11 of Philippians 2 have a strong liturgical flavour to them. It seems that the title was indeed used in the Eucharist, and that, as it was so used, it bore the message of the Resurrection.

Much the same can be said of Romans 10 : 9 - 10, where a confession or creed is outlined. This creed contains two thoughts, and the two that are selected are significant. The first is that "Jesus is Lord" and the second is that "God raised Him from the dead".

Finally, in II Timothy 4 : 18, part of the "first" ending to the epistle, we have the expression of faith that "The Lord will rescue me from every evil and save me for His heavenly kingdom". Once again in connection with the title "Lord" we note the triumphant and victorious reference to a risen and glorious Christ in whom one can trust for PRESENT protection. If this epistle was used in worship as part of

---

1. *ibid.* p. 56.

2. *opt. cit.* Vol. XI. p. 51.

the Eucharist, then this verse would naturally have been the end of the letter, not the 4 verses which follow, for they are personal greetings. Thus it would be this verse which would usher in the sacrament, and thus the liturgical connection of this verse is established.

Prayer "through Jesus Christ":

This formula is found repeatedly in the New Testament, often in the conclusions to epistles which are acknowledged to have eucharistic significance. Prayer is offered to God through Christ, who acts as high-priest. The expression of this idea is first found in the Gospel according to John, about which Cullmann is able to say, "The whole worship emphasis of the farewell discourses is seen clearly also in the stress laid on the necessity of 'prayer in Christ's name'. This has its basis there in the high-priestly act of love which institutes the Eucharist and which finds its deepest eucharistic expression in Jesus' prayer, chapter 17".<sup>1</sup> The picture, which we will see again during our study of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is that of Jesus Christ, seated at the right hand of the Father, and making intercession for us as our high-priest. That it is necessary for Him to be risen to exercise this function serves to underline the importance of the Resurrection, and to stress the influence the Resurrection has had on the Eucharist, which would naturally make its intercessions through Jesus Christ.

The "Amen":

This certainly had its place in the eucharistic liturgy of the early Church (I Cor. 14 : 16; II Cor. 1 : 19 - 20), having been taken over from Jewish worship. It does not, of course, find its origin in the Resurrection, but the basic thought in the Amen is the faithfulness of God<sup>2</sup> and this would certainly not have been accepted by the Christians had Christ not been raised from the dead.

The Kiss of Peace:

It is not certain whether the Kiss of Peace was a peculiarity of the Eucharist in the earliest days of the Church, but it became so before long. Srawley states that in early times it was found in other services beside the Eucharist<sup>3</sup>. Cullmann makes no mention of this, but gives us an excellent exposition of its meaning. He says, "The Liturgical custom of the 'Holy Kiss' .... signifies that before the meal a complete brotherhood should be established, in order that the

---

1. Early Christian Worship, pp. 113f.

2. II Cor. 1 : 18.

3. J.H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, p. 15.

Lord, for whose coming prayers are made, may really appear among His people".<sup>1</sup>

We return to the thought that there is a "fellowship of love" at the Eucharist. The Kiss is a token of the fellowship enjoyed in the sacrament. That this may be so, there has to be reconciliation of man to man such as can only be accomplished in Jesus Christ. Furthermore, the fellowship expressed by the Kiss is an absolute prerequisite of the Eucharist because the Kiss, in all early liturgies, occupies an early place in the service, coming before the administration of the elements. In fact the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics says, "This kiss seems to have been given at the beginning of the offertory, between the washing of hands and the SURSUM CORDA. But, later, the kiss was in close connexion with the Communion". This is demonstrated, for example, in the Church Order of Hippolytus.<sup>2</sup> This takes us back to I Cor. 5 and 11 where forgiveness is a condition of the Eucharist.

Both meanings of the Kiss of Peace, the thought of the "Fellowship of Love" and the thought of prior forgiveness for sins that affect our fellow-men, entail the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

#### Creeds in the Eucharist:

In the New Testament epistles, there are several creeds that appear to have been used in the Eucharist. In some cases there are only fragments of these creeds represented in the letters, but they stand out quite clearly for what they are. "If you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised Him from the dead, you will be saved,"<sup>3</sup> "Jesus is Lord"<sup>4</sup>, "Every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father,"<sup>5</sup> together with what appear to be quite full creeds of faith in I Timothy 3 : 16 and Timothy 2 : 11 - 13, are all examples of these creeds.

Cullmann says, "We may assume with certainty that CONFESSION FORMULAE were recited in the early Christian service of worship".<sup>6</sup> Now each of the examples quoted above has a clear reference to the Resurrection of Christ. We can deduce that

---

1. opt. cit. p. 20.

2. W.D. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, p. 23.

3. Romans 10 ; 9.

4. I Cor. 12 : 3.

5. Philippians 2: 11.

6. Early Christian Worship, p. 22.

the Resurrection influenced the liturgy of the Eucharist also by forcing its way into the confessions of faith that seem to have been part of the liturgy. In fact, we can go to the extent of assuming that these confessions were required of communicants before they were admitted to the meal. So important was the Resurrection that it found some place in even the briefest of these creeds.

"Anathema":

This word is found in I Cor. 16 : 22, and is once again an echo of the sentiment Paul expresses in the 5th chapter of that book when he says, "Drive out the wicked person from among you".<sup>1</sup> Coming, as it does, in the liturgical conclusion to the letter, this word demonstrates the essential nature of forgiveness before the Eucharist and therefore includes, by implication, a reference to the Resurrection which is part of the work of forgiveness.

"Maranatha":

It does not seem to be possible to come to any agreement as to whether this word is an imperative (Come, O Lord) or an indicative (the Lord comes). Opinion seems to be equally divided in favour of each. My own view is that it would be far more in character with the rest of the Eucharist, of which this word is definitely a part, if it were part of a prayer, and therefore the imperative. The word is to be found in I Cor. 16 : 22 and Rev. 22 : 20, although there seem to be clear references to it in I Cor. 11 : 26 and I Thess. 5 : 23.

In the MARANATHA prayer, we come right down to the specifically Christian element in early liturgical prayer, an element which connects closely with the fact that the day of the Christian service of worship is the day of Christ's resurrection".<sup>2</sup> It is the prayer that is made to the risen Christ, pleading for His presence in the regular observance of the sacrament - a prayer that could not be made but for His Resurrection. It looks back to the first meals of this nature that the disciples shared with the Lord, and it looks forward to the eschatological meal that is to be enjoyed with Him in glory.<sup>3</sup> The word seems to be surrounded with ecstasy such could be engendered only by faith in the glorious triumph of the Risen Christ.

---

1. I Cor. 5 : 13.

2. Early Christian Worship, p. 13.

3. *ibid*, p. 16.

The Eucharist as a Covenant:

In Romans 9 : 4; 11 : 27; I Cor. 11 : 25; II Cor. 3 : 6ff; Galatians 3 : 15ff and Ephesians 2 : 12 we have connection established between the Eucharist and a covenant. What this covenant is has been discussed already on pages 24 and 25 of this work. It remains only to underline here what was said there and to point out that the idea contained in the Gospels according to Matthew and Mark is here confirmed.

Position assumed during prayer:

J. H. Srawley says, "Tertullian alludes to the rule of the Church which forbade the practice of kneeling in worship on Sundays and during the period between Easter and Pentecost".<sup>1</sup> This is important because the times he mentions are connected with the Resurrection. Prof. Maxwell states that, "The attitude of prayer was standing (Phil. 1 : 27; Eph. 6 : 14; I Tim. 2 : 8)".<sup>2</sup> If this is so, and standing was the position assumed during prayer, then we have here, too, a sign of the influence of the Resurrection. So much prayer was said kneeling that there must be a good reason for this change in custom, and the reason is probably that in services and seasons that were most strongly reminiscent of the Resurrection the kneeling posture was unsuitable because it denoted humility, gravity and a sense of grief. Standing would indicate rising from the earth, a more joyous sense in the act of prayer, and would therefore signify the joy contained in belief in the Resurrection. It is most likely that the standing attitude in prayer was directly connected with the Resurrection.

The Cup of Blessing:

This description of the eucharistic cup is found in I Cor. 10<sup>as</sup> : 16. The idea that lies behind this description is that one partakes of the cup, so one partakes of the benefits or blessings of the cup. These blessings include that of resurrection, even as Christ rose from the dead - "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day".<sup>3</sup> This definition of the cup therefore is to be associated with the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Throughout the epistles of the New Testament, as far as we have examined them, there are references to the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and these are found in such profusion in those parts of the epistles that reflect eucharistic liturgy that we can affirm without any doubt that the Resurrection played a

---

1. J.H. Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 125.

2. *opt.cit.* p. 5.

3. John 6 : 54.

dominant part in the shaping of the early liturgy of the Christian Church.

It remains now, in the study of the New Testament, to examine the letter to the Hebrews, and the book of the Revelation.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

Even the casual reader of this book will be struck with the interest it displays in liturgy. Evelyn Underhill refers to it as being "of great significance for an understanding of the early worship".<sup>1</sup> We will find that there are four chief contributions that it makes to this study: its teachings on the new covenant, the sacrifice of Christ, the Lord's Day, and the heavenly priesthood of Christ. We will consider these in turn.

The new covenant (Heb. 8 : 6 - 13):

This portion of the Epistle must be connected with the Synoptic Gospels and their introduction of the "New covenant" into the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper. At the head of the discussion on the new covenant, the writer of this letter introduces the glorified Christ - Heb. 8 : 6. In dealing with the Synoptic account of the institution, we discussed the meaning of the covenant. Here we have the last word in the covenantal aspect of the Eucharist.

Now the words from Jeremiah 31 : 34, quoted in this Epistle, assume their full significance - "I will be merciful toward their iniquities, and I will remember their sins no more".<sup>2</sup> Through Jesus Christ this covenant of forgiveness is ratified. The Eucharist becomes, in this aspect of the sacrament, a meal involving a covenant of forgiveness, through the Christ who is now Risen, and therefore alive and active for our entry into the "eternal inheritance". All of this comes about through His sacrifice - a concept that we have encountered earlier, particularly in Paul and in that tradition of the Eucharist/<sup>which</sup> connects the sacrament with the Pass-over.

Christ's sacrifice:

In the Old Testament, the idea behind sacrifice was that the life of the animal was given to God. This life was symbolised by the blood in Jewish thought. So that the life may not be used for any other purpose, the blood was spilt. That the animal died in the process was quite incidental.

In Hebrews, we have a sacrifice that was completely "dedicated" in the shedding of His blood (9:25 - 28). But Christ went further. He lived again, and His continuing life is also dedicated to the work of the Father. This is not only a sacrifice of a death, it is a sacrifice of a life. Although the life was fully given on the Cross, it was not consumed,

---

1. E. Underhill, Worship, p. 231.

2. Hebrews 8 : 12.

but it continued again at the Resurrection. In a sense, therefore, though this life was given "once", it is also given "for all time", availing for all time, continually. So the Eucharist becomes a means of coming into contact with this sacrifice, not repeating the sacrifice that was made in history, but using again and again the power that is in the sacrifice of the living Christ.

The Lord's Day:

In I Cor. 16 : 2, there is an apparent connection between the "first day of the week" and worship. This is quite explicitly linked with the Eucharist in Acts 20 : 7 - "On the first day of the week, when we were gathered together to break bread". Despite the fact that the Sabbath was occasionally used by Christians as their holy day in the earliest days, it seems that we have revealed here a pattern of worship in which Sunday was used.

What was the reason for this deliberate departure from the observance of the Sabbath in direct contradiction of the commandment? That it was a deliberate departure is conveyed by the words of Christ on the occasion of the healing of the man at the pool Bethesda, in John 5. He denies that the sabbath is a day of rest for Him and for the Father - they are still busy in the work of re-creation.<sup>1</sup>

We must note, too, that Sunday came to be known as "the Lord's day".<sup>2</sup>

The early Christians observed the first day of the week as the Lord's Day because it was the day on which Christ rose. This day also commemorated the first breakfast the disciples had with the Risen Christ. After His ascension they would remember this day each week, they would regard it with a special reverence, and would celebrate it with the joy they knew when they first discovered He was risen.

In seeking, as far as they could, to recapture the joy of the day of the Resurrection, the disciples would try to repeat the acts that had first been done on that day. So the Eucharist became identified especially with Sunday, and that implies that virtually all early Christian worship happened on the Lord's Day, for the Eucharist was the centre of the worship. In thus associating the Eucharist with the Lord's Day, it became eternally associated with the Resurrection.

It should be remembered that daybreak, the hour when He first discovered Himself to them was the usual hour of worship for the early Christians.<sup>3</sup> This serves to strengthen

---

1. John 5 : 17.

2. Rev. 1 : 10.

3. W.D. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, p. 4.

the link between the Resurrection and the Lord's Day.

The difference between the Sabbath and the Lord's Day is that the Sabbath was instituted as a holy day to commemorate the creation of the world. Hebrews connects the Sabbath with the day of rest, which is what Sabbath means. But, says the letter to the Hebrews, God must envisage a new rest because, although He has entered into His sabbath rest, He speaks of a rest to come.<sup>1</sup> Thus there must be a new sort of Sabbath; which means that there must be a new creation, a new dispensation.

This new creation is the new life that Christ enjoyed because of the Resurrection, and which He holds out to those who believe in Him. It is a Resurrection-life which is commemorated in the Lord's Day, a creation that is of greater importance to the Christian than the first creation.

Also entailed in this new creation is a new covenant, which has already been discussed.

Being the Lord's Day, the Sunday has an eschatological significance, continually pointing towards the heavenly feast with the Risen Christ, of which the Eucharist is the earthly counterpart.

Finally, as Christ teaches in John 5, worship is to be centred in Him, not centred in the Sabbath.<sup>2</sup>

The Lord's Day, as the day of the Christians' worship, replaces the Sabbath because the Resurrection, in instituting a new covenant and creation, replaces the first creation as the most significant day in time. The difference is between the Creation and the Resurrection, between the old covenant of law and the new covenant of forgiveness, between the old dispensation of death and the new dispensation of life.

#### Christ's heavenly priesthood:

After His Resurrection and Ascension, and only because He both rose again and ascended, Jesus Christ was seated at the right hand of God.<sup>3</sup> From this position, which is obviously a figurative way of speaking, He exercises His function of high-priest. However one interprets the expression "sat down at the right hand of God"<sup>4</sup>, it does certainly mean that Christ is alive and active at the moment, and therefore the Resurrection is a

1. Hebrews 4 : 3, 8 - 9.

2. O. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 117.

3. Hebrews 1 : 3.

4. Heb. 10 : 12.

definite part of Christ's high priesthood.

Not all of the activities of Christ as High-priest are relevant here, but two of them, His intercession on our behalf for our sins, and His mediation of our petitions, both indicate a necessarily continuing existence, such as is only to be considered if the Resurrection took place. This feature is even more strongly illustrated in His capacity of "fore-runner".<sup>1</sup> As fore-runner He has gone before us into the heavenly places, thereby preparing a place for us and ensuring that we may follow. This very act of going before is part of the train of events starting with His Crucifixion and passing via the Resurrection and Ascension to His existence in heaven. As High-priest, Christ's functions are based on the fact of the Resurrection.

Christ holds His priesthood permanently and the argument by the writer to the Hebrews on this point indicates the Resurrection again as closely connected with this work of Christ. We read, that He has become a priest, "not according to a legal requirement concerning bodily descent, but by the power of an indestructible life,"<sup>2</sup> and "He holds His priesthood permanently, because He continues for ever".<sup>3</sup> No words like these could ever have been written had Christ not risen from the dead, for His indestructibility is seen in His Resurrection.

The effect the doctrine of Christ as the High-priest has had on Christian worship is most profound. Every intercession, and not least those offered in the Eucharist, is now made "through Jesus Christ". All prayer is now centred in Jesus Christ, and this includes repentance, which involves prayer of confession and prayer for forgiveness. Worship, too, in order to reach the Father, needs to be offered to Him through Christ, for we are that unworthy that our sins have made a separation between us and our God.<sup>4</sup> Insofar as intercession, forgiveness or worship are contained in eucharistic liturgy, they include, either explicitly or implicitly, the thought of the high-priesthood of Christ, and this in turn derives from His Resurrection.

The Letter to the Hebrews is the revelation of a discovery in worship, in which a man has suddenly seen all the old

---

1. Heb. 6 : 19.

2. Heb. 7 : 16.

3. Heb. 7.: 24.

4. Isaiah 59 : 1 - 2.

ritual assume a fuller, new meaning. The factor that has changed the Old Testament liturgy and given it this new meaning, is the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. As the Risen Lord He is the new temple, the giver of a new sort of rest and the means by which our religion finds its home in the heart of God. The writer takes the old liturgy of the Temple, and transmutes it into the new Liturgy of the Eucharist, only He introduces this great new feature that causes the difference - the Risen Christ.

THE REVELATION TO JOHN.

This book stands in a unique position for our study, for it makes such frequent references to worship. Cullmann says, "The whole Book of Revelation from the greeting of grace and peace in chapter 1 : 4 to the closing prayer: Come Lord Jesus, in chapter 22 : 20, and the benediction in the last verse, is full of allusions to the liturgical usages of the early community".<sup>1</sup> The book was written in the atmosphere of the Lord's Day, and this serves to emphasise the liturgical interest it portrays. The writer states, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day,"<sup>2</sup> and he then proceeds to write the book. It is scarcely necessary to call to mind the very close connection between the Lord's Day and the early Eucharist, for this was then, and still is, the day for the sacrament. "We can well imagine John on that Sunday morning in his island exile thinking of the Sunday worship and the Eucharistic liturgy of his home Church, perhaps at Ephesus, for snatches of that liturgy keep breaking into his descriptions."<sup>3</sup> The book, then, is clearly of especial liturgical interest.

Besides interest in the liturgy, this book reveals interest in the Resurrection. One reads, for example, such words as, "Fear not, I am the first and the last, and the living one: I died, and behold I am alive for evermore,"<sup>4</sup> and "The words of the first and the last, who died and came to life".<sup>5</sup> To quote T.F. Torrance again, he says, "Christian apocalyptic pivots upon the fact that already in the heart of this present age the resurrection has taken place, and the new wine of the Kingdom of God is already breaking the old wine-skins. The emphasis in Christian apocalyptic is therefore upon the resurrection, the new age about to be revealed."<sup>6</sup>

Much of the ground that has already been covered in this work, is traversed again in the Book of the Revelation, and these aspects of the effect of the Resurrection upon the liturgy of the Eucharist will not be examined again in detail. This is not to minimise the place they occupy in this Book.

Three features of the Book of the Revelation that have previously been considered are, first of all, the rule of

---

1. O.Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 7.

2. Rev. 1 : 10.

3. T.F. Torrance, Liturgy and Apocalypse, (Article in "Church Service Society Annual No. 24) p. 10.

4. Rev. 1 : 17 - 18.

5. Rev. 2 : 8.

6. opt. cit. p. 5.

Jesus Christ, secondly the conception of Christ as the paschal Lamb, and thirdly Christ's heavenly priesthood. The Book gives a dominant position to the thought that Christ will rule over all. This is stated in numerous places in the Book, for instance in the statement of the "loud voices in heaven, saying, 'The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever'".<sup>1</sup> As has been observed before, the rule of Christ is only possible because of His Resurrection, and the idea of Christ as King is re-inforced by the thought that He has reigned over sin and death in His Resurrection.

In Rev. 5 : 6 we read, "I saw a Lamb standing, as though it had been slain". The Lamb, in the Book of the Revelation, represents Jesus Christ, and the picture of Him, slain, calls to mind the words, "Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed".<sup>2</sup> What was previously said concerning the sacrifice of Christ as our Passover, applies here, and was surely in the mind of the writer of this book.

With regard to the heavenly priesthood of Christ, "As in the Epistle to the Hebrews, so in the Apocalypse, there is the closest relation between the Eucharistic worship of the Church on earth and the eternal intercession of Christ at the right hand of God where all the angels as liturgical spirits join in praise and thanksgiving".<sup>3</sup> Once again we see the Risen Christ seated at the right hand of the Father and interceding on our behalf.

Apart from these three contributions to the evidence accumulated already, there are two other aspects that merit our attention.

One must consider separately Rev. 3 : 20, "Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any one hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in to him and eat with him, and he with me". This verse obviously establishes a link between the Eucharist and the presence of Jesus Christ at the sacrament. "It is very probable that Rev. 3:20 witnesses to the belief that as in the first post-resurrection days so now Christ condescends to be present with His own when they assemble to break bread".<sup>4</sup> "I will eat with him", or "sup with him" as the A.V. translates *deipnēsō*, is a distinct reference to the Eucharist. The verse proclaims that as we share in this sacrament, Christ is present, and it makes this as a statement on His behalf.

---

1. Rev. 11 : 15.

2. I Cor. 5 : 7.

3. T.F. Torrance, *opt. cit.*, p. 13.

4. A.J.B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*, p. 62.

T.F. Torrance links this with the Resurrection in these words, "The Risen Lord here and now knocks upon the door of the waiting Church in order to sup with them and they with Him, just as He came upon the disciples on the first Easter in the midst of their meal in the Upper Room. That gives us the very essence of the Eucharistic liturgy of the Apostolic Church, - it is the miraculous, eschatological event, the place in which the Lord of glory breaks into the midst, interrupts us, and creates room and space for His saving operation among us. The essence of Christian liturgy is therefore the celebration of the Resurrection, such liturgical action that room is left for the Advent of the Ascended Christ".<sup>1</sup> This statement needs no amplification.

The mention of the eschatological nature of the event is supported by O. Cullmann, who says that this verse emphasises the "close link uniting the experience of the cultic presence of the Risen One during the meals with the expectation of eschatological union with the Lord when He returns for the Messianic Banquet. Here again, union with Christ is conceived under the form of a meal taken with Him. This statement in Revelation is clearly eschatological".<sup>2</sup> We are reminded of the link between the eschatological belief and the Resurrection of Christ, who must be risen to partake of the eschatological feast.

It seems that the early Church had this verse in mind, or at least shared the thoughts that are expressed in this verse, when they used the "Marana tha!" - "Come, Lord Jesus!"<sup>3</sup> That these very words (erchou Kurie Iesou) are to be found in the Book of the Revelation further strengthens our statement that Rev. 3 : 20 is an indication of the belief of the early Church in the presence of the Risen Christ at the Eucharist.

The other aspect of the Apocalypse that merits our attention is the frequent use of the word "Glory" or its cognates. The word is found, for instance, in early Christian songs, such as are found in the Apocalypse, 5 : 9, 5 : 12, 5 : 13, 19 : 1 - 2, 19 : 6.<sup>4</sup> These songs probably found place in the early Eucharist.

---

1. opt. cit. pp. 9f.

2. O. Cullmann & F.J. Leenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper, p. 13.

3. Rev. 22 : 20.

4. O. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p. 21.

In Old Testament days, "glory" was regarded as being both present, and eschatological. What the word meant is explained in these words, "The 'glory of God' is, in effect, the term used to express that which men can APPREHEND, originally by sight, of the presence of God on earth".<sup>1</sup>

This same apprehension by sight, or visibility of God, as His glory, is expressed in the New Testament in the person of Jesus Christ, in whom God became visible to His people. It must be remembered, too, that, as we regard glory as being eschatological, what we mean is that it is Messianic, and the Messianic is always associated with the Kingdom of God.

In the association of the Messianic with the glory of God, we must note that the Kingdom is not only an eschatological event, but it is also present. In the New Testament it was often regarded as being instituted at the Resurrection, or as a consequence of it. The Kingdom and the Church of Christ are sometimes equated and the Church was not founded at Pentecost, it was founded in the Resurrection, because Christ is the head of the Church and Pentecost had no effect upon Him. Thus we may say that, as the glory of Christ, or of God, is associated with the Kingdom, so it is associated with the Resurrection, which, at least in one sense, is to be identified with the Kingdom.

In identifying the glory of God with Jesus Christ as the visible manifestation of it, we are reminded that Christ showed forth the glory of God and His own glory supremely in the Resurrection. Christ and God are glorified in the Resurrection. "The entire Passion of Jesus is presented to us as His 'glorification' (Jn. 17 : 1): He goes to the cross not as a helpless martyr to His agony, but as a victorious king to His crowning. In the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, the utter glory of God is revealed".<sup>2</sup> Were it not for Christ's death, the strength of God and of Christ would never have been tested in the sight of men, and were it not for the Resurrection, the victory over death and sin would never have been shown forth - the glory would never have been revealed.

So the word "glory" is associated with the Resurrection and introduces the thought that we would never fully have

---

1. Edited A. Richardson, A. Theological Word Book of the Bible, p. 175.

2. Ibid. p. 176.

known the glory of God (in fact we would have known very little of it) had Christ not passed through death and Resurrection. In the Book of the Revelation, and particularly in these "songs", we have the glory of God as seen in Christ, and the glory of Christ Himself both reminding us constantly of the great glory of the Resurrection. Glory is ascribed to Christ - the Lamb that was slain. But for the Resurrection, the glorious triumph over sin and death, glory could not be ascribed to the slain Lamb.

What has been said here about the glory of Christ applies also to the doxologies in the Epistles of the New Testament in passages such as Romans 16 : 27; Ephesians 1 : 12, 14; and Philippians 2 : 11; 4 : 19.

The Apocalypse bears witness to the Resurrection of Jesus Christ in its several references to the living Lord and to His glory. But the Book also places this witness in the context of the liturgy the early Church used as its Eucharist.

### THREE EARLY LITURGIES.

Having completed the study of the New Testament for traces of the influence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ on the liturgy of the Eucharist, we now turn our attention to the earliest liturgies of the Church, the choice of the liturgies being those suggested by H. Lietzmann, namely Didache ix-x, Sarapion's Liturgy and that of Hippolytus. The reasons for these choices, apart from the reason of date, are outlined on page 7 of this work.

### THE TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

Chapters 9 and 10 of the Didache are often regarded as containing eucharistic liturgy. Their date is generally regarded as being earlier than either the Liturgy of Hippolytus or that of Sarapion. J. Srawley says, "It has been maintained that the work is an imaginative reconstruction of early Church life written in the latter part of the second century, or even early in the third century",<sup>1</sup> whereas W.D. Maxwell says, "The Didache, though its exact date is uncertain, is generally believed to describe worship in Jewish Christian circles in the Sub-Apostolic Age".<sup>2</sup> The same writer states that the Didache is to be dated about A.D. 130-140.<sup>3</sup>

The impression that chapters 9 and 10 refer to the Eucharist is by no means without contradiction. Higgins claims, "In 9, 10 : 1 - 5, we have to do with the agape or common fellowship meal which is followed by the Eucharist proper, for the words in 10 : 6 really only fit the introduction of a Eucharist, and not its conclusion".<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, Lietzmann states, "It must first be established that all these passages in Didache actually refer to the eucharistic celebration of the Supper. This is unquestionable by reason of the expression chosen throughout, and it is also confirmed by the position of the section in the whole".<sup>5</sup> Prof. Maxwell is probably nearest the truth when he says, "It is an example of the combined Eucharist and Agape".<sup>6</sup>

We will regard the words in chapters 9 and 10 as being

- 
1. J. Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 18.
  2. W.D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship*, p. 9.
  3. *ibid.* p. 7.
  4. A.J.B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the N.T.*, p. 38.
  5. H. Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper*, p. 189.
  6. *opt. cit.* p. 9.

associated either directly or indirectly with the Eucharist. Together with these two chapters we will examine 14 : 1 which indicates the day of the week for the Eucharist.

The prayer said "over the cup" commences with the words, "We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant".<sup>1</sup> The phrase "the holy vine of David" is commented on by Lietzmann, "the expression is connected, as Harnack perceived, with Psalm 80 : 9 - 20".<sup>2</sup> He continues by saying that he is unable to say what allegorical interpretation the compiler of the liturgy gives to this expression, apart from the fact that in it God is given thanks for having revealed the Messianic significance of the passage. This is surely all the clue that is needed for the interpretation of the phrase. In Psalm 80 we read the words, "Have regard for this vine, the stock which Thy right hand planted. They have burned it with fire, they have cut it down".<sup>3</sup> Now if we place alongside this the words from Isaiah, "There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots,"<sup>4</sup> the Resurrection implication becomes clear.

The phrase, "holy vine of David" comes from a Messianic Psalm. That Psalm contains the thought that this vine - the Messiah - has been burned and cut down. The Old Testament in about the 8th century (and the Interpreters' Bible says about this Psalm "It must presumably be dated not later than the eighth century. Both in the ninth and eighth centuries there were numerous occasions when such an appeal as this might very appropriately have been uttered"<sup>5</sup>) cherished the thought that there would be a revival or restoration of the fortunes of the Messiah. In New Testament language we would use the word Resurrection; and this is exactly the implication in this phrase in the prayer. The "holy vine of David" in the Old Testament knew destruction, but that destruction was followed by restoration. Jesus Christ, similarly, knew death which was followed by Resurrection. This is surely the thought that was in the compiler's mind when he included this reference in the prayer.

This reference to the Resurrection is repeated in the prayer to be said "over the broken bread". "We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus Thy servant".<sup>6</sup> Had there

---

1. Didache 9 : 2.

2. opt. cit. p. 190.

3. Psalm 80 : 14 - 16.

4. Isaiah 11 : 1.

5. Interpreters' Bible, Vo. IV., p. 431.

6. Didache 9 : 3.

been no Resurrection, there would have been no reference to the gifts received through Christ; there would only have been an incomplete ministry ending in calamity. Especially would there have been no reference to the gift of life, because that, particularly, is given to us by virtue of the Resurrection of Christ.

We now come to that prayer, which is the best-known part of the Didache. "As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains and has been gathered together and made one, so may Thy Church be gathered from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom".<sup>1</sup>

The literal meaning of this prayer is, of course, that particles of bread should be united into the bread used in the Eucharist, but this would hardly justify including it in the liturgy. The chief value of the prayer is the request for the uniting of the Church. The prayer would, therefore, correspond to the Kiss of Peace or the reconciling work of Christ, both of which stress the unifying work of Christ. The unifying work of Christ is associated with His Resurrection and this gives us an unmistakable connection between this prayer and the Resurrection. The prayer is, furthermore, strongly reminiscent of Christ's command to His disciples at the miracle of the feeding of the multitude - "Gather up the fragments left over, that nothing may be lost".<sup>2</sup> Those words were uttered in connection with the miracle that gives us the clearest teaching on the Eucharist in John. It was observed in our study of that book how closely the 6th chapter was connected with the Resurrection. If the link between this prayer in the Didache and John 6 is valid, then we have support for our conclusion that this prayer has Resurrection references.

There is a further possible allusion to the Resurrection in this prayer. The idea of the gathering together of the broken bread could be a veiled reference to the Resurrection of the dead body of Christ. This becomes all the more likely when we remember that the bread is representative of Christ. If there is mention of the completed fact of the uniting of the broken bread of the Eucharist, and if Christ is usually implied by the bread, then the words, "As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains, and has been gathered together and made one" could refer to the Resurrection of Christ.

---

1. Didache 9 : 4.

2. John 6 : 12.

The use of the metaphor of broken bread as a reference to the Resurrection is even more marked when one encounters exactly the same sentiments in a later prayer for the Church: "gather it that Thou hast sanctified from the four winds of heaven into Thy kingdom which Thou hast prepared for it".<sup>1</sup> In this prayer the metaphor of broken bread is not used, and as a consequence one feels that in the prayer in which it is introduced it is there with a specific significance.

After the Eucharist ("when you have been filled"<sup>2</sup>) thanks is given again. Whereas previously thanks was given to God for life and knowledge, now thanks is given for knowledge, faith and immortality. The addition of faith does not have any meaning for our purpose, but the substitution of immortality for life serves to strengthen the Resurrection-influence here that we found earlier. The Resurrection is the means and the assurance of immortality for those who believe.

This thought is repeated a little later where thanks is given to God for "eternal life through Jesus Thy servant".<sup>3</sup>

Part of this prayer of thanks is thanksgiving that "Thou hast given spiritual meat and drink, and eternal life through Jesus Thy servant".<sup>4</sup> This echoes the words of Christ as reported in the 6th chapter of John, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any one eats of this bread, he will live for ever".<sup>5</sup> The very fact that mention of this spiritual food is made in connection with mention of eternal life strengthens the thought that we have here a connection with the Resurrection. This spiritual food is a participation in the Risen Christ, and will therefore serve to raise up those who eat of it.

The little eucharistic liturgy that is set out in these two chapters of the Didache draws to a close with the words, "May grace come, and this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David. If any one be holy, let him come; if any one be not, let him repent. Maranatha. Amen".<sup>6</sup>

It is significant that in the Coptic version of this prayer, the word "grace" is replaced by "the Lord". Whether this version is accepted or not makes little difference, because in the Greek version the word "grace" is obviously

---

1. Didache 10 : 5.

2. Didache 10 : 1.

3. Didache 10 : 3.

4. ibidem.

5. John 6 : 50.

6. Didache 10 : 6.

intended to mean Christ. Lietzmann, in a footnote to his writing on this passage says, "xaris is probably to be understood as an ancient analogue to logos, i.e. as a term for the Lord".<sup>1</sup>

Lietzmann also makes the interesting suggestion that the prayer is a dialogue between the celebrant and the people. He sets it forth in this way:-

Celebrant: May Grace come, and this world pass away.

People : Hosanna to the God of David.

Celebrant: If any one be holy, let him come; if any one be not, let him repent. Maranatha.

People : Amen.<sup>2</sup>

He goes on to say that this short responsory indicates the meaning of the whole ceremony. "The Church is longing for the end of the world and the parousia of the Lord; as the Church of the sinless 'saints' she is celebrating 'breaking of bread' at which the Lord is present".<sup>3</sup>

If this is the indication of the sense of the ceremony, then the whole ceremony must be entirely based on the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, because there is no parousia without the Resurrection. There would be no hope of a parousia of a dead Lord. Furthermore, as Lietzmann says, the Church is celebrating this "breaking of bread" at which the Lord is present. The Lord, present at the Eucharist, is the risen Lord. He was regarded in this light since the earliest days of the Christian Church - the Lord of the Resurrection, present with His Church, but especially present in the Eucharist, the solemn tryst.

Regarding the Maranatha, the same writer has this to say, "The mysterious maranatha has here a two-fold significance: it is a pleading for the parousia = erchou Kurie Iēsou - as Rev. 22 : 20 interprets it - and at the same time a proclamation of the (sacramental, spiritual) parousia at the Church's celebration = ho Kurios ēlthen, as the Coptic text translates it".<sup>4</sup>

The use of Maranatha as a prayer for the parousia has been noted earlier, as has the latter significance, but it is necessary to stress again that if there has already occurred a "sacramental, spiritual parousia" at the Eucharist, as is indicated by the Coptic use of the aorist tense, then the

---

1. Mass and Lord's Supper, p. 193, note.

2. ibidem. p. 193.

3. ibidem.

4. opt. cit. p. 193.

Resurrection must underlie this Eucharist fully as much as it did the earliest observances of the Lord's Supper. It is inspiring to note that this exclamation could have been not only a prayer but a cry of faith, indicating belief in the presence of the risen Christ.

The words, "If any one be holy, let him come; if any one be not, let him repent,"<sup>1</sup> and the words in 9 : 5 are to be placed side by side for consideration. Cullmann says, "Thus we find that, preceding the prayer which leads up to the Maranatha there is pronounced the command, 'Let none eat or drink of your Eucharist except those who have been baptised in the Lord's name. For concerning this did the Lord say 'give not that which is holy to the dogs''. In chapter 14 : 1 we learn further that a CONFESSION OF SINS must precede the eating of the meal and that none who has a quarrel with a brother may come to the table until he be reconciled. The closing verses of I Cor., where Paul purposely uses fragments of the oldest eucharistic liturgy, confirm that in this command, which connects with Matt. 5 : 23 - the logion concerning reconciliation before the sacrifice - we are dealing with a fixed practice. In the Pauline passage an analogous command precedes the Maranatha; 'if any man loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema'".<sup>2</sup> As we saw in I Cor. 5 and other places in the New Testament, there is, from the earliest days of the Eucharist, the stipulation that forgiveness must precede participation in the sacrament. It has already been noted, in the study of I Cor. 5 for example, that Christ's Resurrection is inseparably part of His soteriological work. Here, in the Didache liturgy, we have this emphasis repeated.

Chapter 14, the chapter that gives the day of the week on which the Lord's Supper is to be celebrated, orders that the Eucharist should be celebrated "every Lord's day".<sup>3</sup> Enough has been said earlier about the significance of the Lord's day to make it adequate merely to refer to that part of this work. It is sufficient to underline the fact that "the Lord's day" is purely a feature of belief in the Resurrection of Christ.

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, therefore, follows the tradition of the first Resurrection-breakfast of Christ with His disciples in placing emphasis on the importance of the Resurrection, not so much in formal words as in the way in which it reveals the influence of the Resurrection on the eucharistic liturgy in chapters 9 - 10.

---

1. Didache 10 : 6.

2. O. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, pp. 19f.

3. Didache 14 : 1.

BISHOP SARAPION'S PRAYER BOOK.

The collections of prayers which "came quite into our hands in the first weeks of the year 1899", and which is known as Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book, is closely studied by John Wordsworth, late Bishop of Salisbury, in his book "Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book". Concerning the collection of prayers, Wordsworth says, "It is clearly Egyptian, and of about the middle of the fourth century, and there seems no sufficient reason to doubt that it is, in the whole or in part, the Prayer-book compiled or composed by Sarapion, Bishop of Thmuis, the friend and contemporary of St. Antony and St. Athanasius . . . . . I incline to a date 350 - 356".<sup>1</sup>

The reason for identifying the collection of prayers with Bishop Sarapion is because, "the name Sarapion is found in the entries before the first and fifteenth prayers in the first of which he is called 'Bishop Sarapion', in the second 'Sarapion, Bishop of Thmuis'".<sup>2</sup> It seems reasonable, therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to accept Sarapion as either compiler or author of these prayers.

In assessing the value of the Prayer Book as a reliable and early representative of early eucharistic liturgy, there is some divergence of opinion. Arthur Linton states, "The Sacramentary of Sarapion of Thmuis (known since 1899) was evidently a local variation of the Alexandrian use, and dates from about 350. There is no reason for thinking that its use ever extended beyond Thmuis".<sup>3</sup> Duchesne questions the value of the pro-anaphoral prayers 19 - 30 saying, "I do not believe that these twelve formularies represent the official or ordinary ORDO LITURGICUS of the Church of Thmuis, but they are all of a nature applicable to a non-liturgical service, or to a liturgical service before the ANAPHORA, or prayer of sacrifice".<sup>4</sup> He offers no argument in support of this conclusion but merely adds in a footnote on the same page, "In this I differ from the Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. Wordsworth, who has published the 'Prayer-book' of Sarapion in English with a learned commentary".<sup>5</sup> He passes no comment on the canon.

- 
1. John Wordsworth, Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book, pp. 8 & 13.
  2. *ibid.* p. 10.
  3. A. Linton, Twenty-five Consecration Prayers, p. 8.
  4. L. Duchesne, Christian Worship, p. 79.
  5. *ibidem.*

On the other hand we have a strong body of opinion in favour of the value of the liturgy. Prof. Maxwell says of the canon of the liturgy, "It represents Egyptian use about the middle of the third century, and the influence of the Didache or common parent rite can be detected . . . . . This prayer is a valuable example, discovered less than fifty years ago, of the type of consecration prayer which existed before the liturgy was fixed".<sup>1</sup> Srawley calls it, "the most important discovery of recent times for the knowledge of the early liturgy in Egypt".<sup>2</sup> E.O. James calls it, "the earliest extant Liturgy",<sup>3</sup> and "the most complete liturgical document prior to the 7th century".<sup>4</sup> Cullmann says, "As Lietzmann has shown, the ancient Liturgies of the Mass can be traced back to two main 'primitive types': the liturgy of St. Hippolytus and the ancient Egyptian liturgy of which the model may be found in Sarapion".<sup>5</sup> Wordsworth refers to the Prayer-book as "a Liturgical document of first-rate importance".<sup>6</sup>

The weight of opinion is in favour of regarding these prayers as reliable, early representatives of the eucharistic liturgy in Egypt.

In studying these Prayers, notice must be taken of the fact that not all of the Prayers are specifically eucharistic. Wordsworth divides the thirty Prayers into six groups or sections. The Prayers fall quite naturally into these sections. Of the six groups, only two have definite eucharistic connections. Wordsworth says that section one, consisting of Prayers 1 - 6, forms a "Eucharistic Anaphora, containing the second half of the Liturgy, usually called the Anaphora, and including blessing of oil and water".<sup>7</sup> Section Six, Prayers 19 - 30, are "Proanaphoral Prayers to be said before no. 1. There is a rubric at the end of no. 30. 'All these Prayers are performed before the Offertory Prayer', if we may so render *pro tēs euchēs tou prosphorou*".<sup>8</sup>

Of the thirty Prayers, therefore, only numbers 19 - 30 and 1 - 6 will be examined, and they will be examined in that order, since it seems reasonable to study the proanaphoral Prayers before the anaphoral Prayers.

---

1. W.D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship*, p. 19.

2. J. Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*, p. 50.

3. E.O. James, *Christian Myth and Ritual*, p. 129.

4. *ibidem* p. 131.

5. O. Cullmann & F. Leenhardt, *Essays on the Lord's Supper*, p. 5.

6. *opt. cit.*

7. *opt. cit.* p. 23.

8. *ibidem*.

"The Pro-anaphoral portion here given may be divided into three sub-sections, viz. I. Prayers of the Catechumens (19-21); II. Prayers of the Faithful (22-27); III. Benedictions (28-30)".<sup>1</sup>

Prayer 19. The rubric of this prayer, "First Prayer of the Lord's Day" (kuriakēs) immediately places us on Resurrection ground.

This prayer, in common with all the other prayers, is offered "through Thy only-begotten Jesus Christ in holy Spirit, through whom to Thee (is) the glory and the strength both now and to all the ages of the ages". Noteworthy features of this formula are these: (a). The Prayer is offered through Jesus Christ, our high-priest. The link between Christ's heavenly priesthood and the Resurrection has been discussed in the study of the Letter to the Hebrews".<sup>2</sup> Since Christ was crucified and is now alive and active on our behalf, He must have risen from the dead. (b). Glory is ascribed through Christ "both now and to all the ages of the ages". "Glory and the Resurrection" has been discussed earlier - in the study of the Apocalypse - but besides any link that exists here between the mention of glory and the fact of the Resurrection, the eternal nature of Christ is evident in these words. Since "Jesus Christ was publicly portrayed as crucified"<sup>3</sup> the only reason why we can speak of Him as eternal is that He must have risen. In a sense it is true of Christ's nature that He is eternal, but it is equally true that He is mortal, for He was "crucified, dead and buried", to use the emphatic words of the Apostles' Creed. Because He was dead, and is now regarded as eternal by human beings (the aspect of Him that we saw was the mortal aspect) He must therefore have risen from the dead, for the writer of these words to have stated that He is eternal.

Prayer 20. Christ is referred to as *alēthinon charaktēra* - the living and true expression of God. If He is an accurate reflection of the nature of God, will He not also be immortal? This would lead us away from the idea of the Resurrection, however, for such a Christ could not be held to have died. The very next clause, on the other hand, bears reference to His saving work on the Cross, and restores emphasis on His death. If reference to Christ and His work as "the help of the race of men" has relation to His death, so does it have

---

1. *ibidem.* p. 33.

2. pp. 39, 46f of this work.

3. Galatians 3 : 1.

relation to His Resurrection, for without that there would be no completion of that work. In fact, we should not have regarded the work as successfully done if Christ had not been raised from the dead.

The Prayer that He should visit them - "let the Lord Jesus visit them, let Him speak in the understandings of all, and predispose their hearts to faith; may He Himself draw their souls to Thee, O God of Compassions" - is in itself testimony to faith in the Resurrection. This is the whole burden of the prayer. Remove this petition and all that remains is the ascription of praise to God in the first sentence of the prayer, and the closing formula which itself has a strong Resurrection flavour, as has been stated of prayer 19.

It is not quite clear what the Prayer means by "create a people even in this City, create a genuine flock", but there is at least a strong possibility that the author of these words had in mind the Resurrection to a new life which those who believe share with Christ, who was Himself so resurrected. The word "create" conveys this impression, pointing to something new, and, since a "people" cannot be called into being as a group without first being risen with Christ, this must refer to their Resurrection, and thus to His.

Prayer 21. There is an interesting reference in this prayer to a conflict between Christ and Satan such as would be thought of as taking place at the Crucifixion of Christ and during His descent into Hades. God is praised as He "who through Thy only-begotten has brought Satan to nought and hast loosed his devices and released those who were bound by him". The ascription of praise to God because of the victory of Christ over Satan is praise for the Resurrection of Christ from the dead, for had He not so been raised He would have lost this conflict with the powers of evil and death.

The phrase "the washing of regeneration" is used in this prayer, and is a quotation from Titus 3 : 15. The word "washing" as equivalent to baptism occurs only once elsewhere in the New Testament (Eph. 5 : 26) but it is none the less strongly reminiscent of Paul's passage on baptism and Resurrection in Romans 6. This same passage refers also to newness of life which would be paralleled by the word "regeneration" in the phrase in question. The whole concept conveyed by the phrase could be adequately explained by the word "resurrection" as used in association with the Resurrection of Christ by Paul in Romans 6.

The word "regeneration" in the other place where it is found in the New Testament (Matt. 19 : 28) has around it the atmosphere of a new world which is to replace the old. Where it is applied to the individual, as it is in Titus and in this prayer, it obviously can only be so interpreted as it entails the death and Resurrection, with Christ, of the person. The phrase "washing of regeneration" pivots on the Resurrection of Christ. Without that Resurrection, it has no meaning.

Prayer 24. This is a prayer concerning the Church and it places great emphasis on cleanness, and as a consequence Bishop Wordsworth says in a footnote, "This prayer, in which the importance of cleanness is seven times emphasised, seems to be naturally connected with some form of ablution, followed by the kiss of peace". If this is true, then remarks made about the kiss of peace on page 39 of this study associating it with and basing it on the Resurrection of Christ apply here.

Bishop Wordsworth's suggestion that this prayer would be followed by the kiss of peace is supported by the practice of following a form of ablution with the kiss of peace. As he points out, in the Liturgy of the Coptic Jacobites and in the Liturgy of the Abyssinian Jacobites, the ablution either forms part of the kiss of peace, or immediately precedes it. That the prayer we are considering is associated with some form of ablution seems to be quite certain.

The ideas of forgiveness (spiritual washing) and of the kiss of peace both have Resurrection connotations, as has been seen on pages 32 and 39 of this work.

Prayer 25. In this prayer there is a petition on behalf of the Deacons that they may "give attendance to the holy body and the holy blood". Too much should not be read into this reference because it is a prayer normal for those who are about to participate in the sacrament. It is simply a prayer that they may do properly the part that is to be theirs in the forthcoming service.

Prayer 26. Although this prayer contains a specific reference to the High-priestly work of the Risen Christ in the words, "to Thee the uncreated Father through the only-begotten do we bend the knee," yet there is a far more interesting reference in the petition, "blot out the bond that is against us". This is an obvious quotation from Colossians 2, where we read "And you ..... God made alive together with him, ..... having cancelled the bond which stood against us with its legal demands".<sup>1</sup> Here the significance is that God, raising Jesus from the dead, raised us with Him, thereby cancelling the bond against us. This petition deri-

1. Colossians 2 : 13 - 14.

ves all of its significance from the Resurrection of Christ, and the whole of the prayer seems cast in the frame of the Resurrection.

Prayer 29. The reference to the Resurrection of Christ in this prayer is contained in the words, "May ..... the hand of the only-begotten, that hath destroyed all evil things and confirmed and established all holy things, be stretched out over the heads of this people". We believe that Christ, in His Resurrection, overcame the powers of evil and it is to this fact that this passage in the prayer refers.

The anaphoral prayers.

In the preface to the Offertory Prayer of Bishop Sarapion, we read an intercession for reconciliation - an activity that is usually regarded as being closely connected with the Resurrection of Christ - but the intercession is directed purely to God the Father. The Son is specifically excluded, because the Father is stated to reconcile and to draw men to Himself "through the advent of Thy beloved Son".<sup>1</sup> So it is not possible to read into this a reference to the Resurrection of Christ.

The same remark applies to a later section of this Preface, in which mention is made of His being "far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come". There follows an elevated passage in which glory is ascribed to God, but the text makes it plain that there is no reference to Jesus Christ, but specifically to God the Father. "May the Lord Jesus speak in us and holy Spirit, and hymn Thee through us. For Thou art 'far above all rule, etc.'"<sup>2</sup>

Despite the apparent lack of connection between this section and the Resurrection, it is to be noted that in Ephesians we have the words, "He raised Him from the dead and made Him sit at His right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule and authority and power and dominion, and above every name that is named, not only in this age but also in that which is to come".<sup>3</sup> The words quoted in the prayer-book are clearly from this passage, and therefore come from the context of the Resurrection. In view of the comments in the previous paragraph above, it does not appear possible to say any more than this.

---

1. opt. cit. p. 61.

2. ibidem.

3. Ephesians 1 : 20 - 21.

It is noteworthy that in these anaphoral prayers there is an almost complete absence of praise to Jesus Christ. This is more noticeable than in the Proanaphora, because it is at this stage in the Eucharist that one expects particular reference to be made to Jesus Christ, and praise to be offered to Him; these are, however, lacking. Generally Christ is mentioned in two respects only - one is as He through whom these prayers are offered, and the other is as His name and life are incidental to the words of institution of the Lord's Supper. Lietzmann says, "The eucharistic prayer itself, is singularly philosophical and mystical, without any allusion to the gospel of salvation either of the Old or New Testament".<sup>1</sup> This could be owing to the Jewish prototype that possibly lies behind this liturgy.

Despite this prima facie impression there is, of course, a strong, Christian element in the liturgy. Associated with the words of institution we find frequent mention of sacrifice. The prayer says, "Fill also this sacrifice with Thy power and Thy participation; for to Thee have we offered this living sacrifice, this bloodless oblation. To Thee have we offered this bread the likeness of the body of the only-begotten". Strangely enough, the sacrifice is not Christ's sacrifice, nor a re-enactment of it, because it is quite clearly stated that the sacrificial element lies in the offering of the bread and the wine - "We also making the likeness of the death have offered the bread ..... we have also offered the cup". This represents a particularly limited approach to the Eucharist. It does, however, have the significance that immediately after the words of institution they are interpreted as an intercession for reconciliation with God and the unity of the Church. Here we are on familiar ground for what Sarapion has done is to take the whole eucharistic act and regard it as representative of the sacrifice of Christ, having the same consequences, and having the same concomitants - particularly the Resurrection, which is such an essential part of the reconciling and unifying work of God in Christ.

A thought that is borrowed directly from the Didache is reproduced in this prayer - "as this bread had been scattered on the top of the mountains and gathered together came to be one, so also gather Thy holy Church out of every nation". What has been said in the study of the Didache as applying to this passage is valid here as indicating the influence the Resurrection of Jesus Christ has had on this prayer.

So, even though the Resurrection is not explicitly written into these words, yet it is implicit all through the

---

1. opt. cit. p. 153.

prayer which gives such an important place to the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist.

In the Eucliclesis, again at first sight, it seems that all that has been said about the sacrificial interpretation of the oblation and words of institution is contradicted, because the Eucliclesis prays that "Thy holy Word come upon this bread that the bread may become body of the Word, and upon this cup that the cup may become blood of the Truth. This sounds like transubstantiation.

It is unusual to make the Word the object of the Eucliclesis - usually the Holy Spirit is invoked - and it is not at all certain that "the Word" as used here, and Jesus Christ are identical. It would appear that the use of "the Word" in this prayer is not what is usually meant by the Logos. Sarcapion speaks of "the body of the Word" and "blood of the Truth". Although Jesus Christ is known as both Word and Truth, yet the tenor of this prayer seems to be philosophical rather than soteriological and the two titles, Word and Truth, seem to have more relation to abstracts than to the personality of Christ. This is borne out by the later petition in the same prayer that all may receive a medicine "for the strengthening of all advancement and virtue," as the consequence of communicating. Furthermore God is referred to as "God of truth".

It would appear, therefore, that we may dismiss any idea of a doctrine<sup>of</sup>/transubstantiation in this prayer and confirm the sort of sacrificial emphasis that is to be found associated with the Words of Institution.

In the Intercession for the Departed, a place in which one would expect to find definite influence of the Resurrection, there is no direct reference to it. Instead, we have an allusion to John 14. The Prayer says, "Give to them a place and a mansion in Thy kingdom". In John the words, "In my Father's house are many rooms (mansions); if it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you?"<sup>1</sup> are spoken in close association with the Resurrection - "I will come again and take you to myself".<sup>2</sup> This thought must surely have been the inspiration for these words in the intercession for the departed.

Bishop Wordsworth suggests that the rubric "After the prayer the fraction and in the fraction a prayer" might refer to the Lord's Prayer. If it does, we would here again have a

---

1. John 14 : 2.

2. John 14 : 3.

suggestion of the Resurrection; but this is the second rubric in the Anaphora, the first having been the simple statement, "Offertory Prayer of Bishop Sarapion". So it is natural to expect that the prayer referred to is the Offertory Prayer that has immediately preceded the rubric. It seems unnecessary to suggest that the Lord's Prayer comes here, when the natural meaning of the words would refer to the Offertory Prayer.

The rather disturbing philosophical note referred to earlier is sounded again in the "Post Communion Prayer" as Wordsworth calls it. The prayer is uttered "Make us to have a part with the body and the blood through Thy only-begotten Son". If "of" had been used instead of "through" we should have had a definite connection with the saving work of Jesus Christ. As it is, He seems merely to be the one with whom the circumstances of God's saving work are associated. But all of this is completely different in the next prayer "concerning the oils and waters that are offered". The tone is so different that one feels certain that this prayer is from another hand. Whoever wrote it, it still represents this early stage of the development of eucharistic liturgy.

The prayer states "we name the name of Him who suffered, who was crucified, and rose again, and who sitteth on the right hand of the uncreated". Here we have plain reference to the Resurrection and session on the right hand of God, and this in the only clear reference we are to find in Sarapion's liturgy. It is not necessary to draw out the significance of Christ's High-priestly activity. That has already been done on pages 46f of this work to which reference should be made here.

So, in Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book, we find that there is clear reference to the Resurrection, and there are parts that reveal plainly the influence of the Resurrection on the writer of the Liturgy, but, contrary to expectations, these references are to be found chiefly in the Pro-anaphora.

THE APOSTOLIC TRADITION OF HIPPOLYTUS.

"The 'Apostolic Tradition' of Hippolytus forms the nucleus of the Eighth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions".<sup>1</sup> Srawley says of it that it is "a document of supreme importance for the history of the liturgy before the fourth century. Its latest editor assigns to it a date c. A.D. 215. Though written by one who became head of a sect in violent opposition to the Roman bishop, it may fairly represent the local tradition of the early Greek-speaking Church of Rome".<sup>2</sup> Lietzmann says, "In Hippolytus there is still preserved to us the more ancient, purely Christian type of eucharistic prayer, which contained neither the Hellenistic-Jewish doxology of God and of His works and deeds for Israel, nor the sanctus, but was confined to the thanksgiving for redemption through Christ".<sup>3</sup> As we have already seen in the first chapter of this thesis, Lietzmann regards this liturgy as being in the tradition of the Eucharist that is found in I Cor. 10 - 11.

The day of the week used for the service. The eucharistic liturgy in the Apostolic Tradition is itself part of the service for the consecration of a bishop. In the introductory rubric to the service these words appear: "Conveniet populum una cum praesbyterio et his qui praesentes fuerint episcopi, die dominica". Since the significance and meaning of the choice of Sunday (the Lord's day) as the Christians' holy day has been discussed earlier in this work on page 45, it is necessary merely to indicate here that by setting the day for the service as "die dominica" the service is given an immediate connection with the Resurrection.

Christ is not regarded as absent. If Christ has not risen, then He is absent from the Eucharist, being dead. He is regarded as being alive at the time of the service and for ever more, and His presence is such that He is called upon to be the mediator of the worship and prayers of the Church. (His work as High-priest was examined on pages 46f of this thesis and the connection with the Resurrection that was indicated there applies here). This belief in His living presence at the Eucharist could only follow His Resurrection. As evidence of faith in Christ's presence we read these words at the end of the Invocation: "Per puerum tuum Iesum Christum, per quem tibi gloria et honor, patri et filio cum sancto spiritu, in sancta ecclesia tua et nunc et in saecula saeculorum. Amen". Similarly, we have the words "Gratias tibi

---

1. L. Duchesne, Christian Worship, p. 57.

2. J. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, p. 67.

3. H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, pp. 135f.

referimus, Deus, per dilectum puerum tuum Iesum Christum", at the beginning of the Consecration. That prayer is offered and glory ascribed through Jesus Christ is proof of faith in His living; that He lives after the Cross is proof of His Resurrection.<sup>1</sup>

In fact the presence of Christ is invoked in the Greeting - "The Lord be with you all". Unless He were risen, the Church would not be able to use this prayer.

Thanks is offered for His death. If the early Christians did not believe in the Resurrection, they would have regarded Christ's death as a very sombre and sad subject. But exactly the opposite is so in this liturgy. We find them giving thanks for His death even as they give thanks for His life. In the Consecration, we read "We give Thee thanks, O Lord, in Thy beloved Son Jesus Christ ..... who was delivered of His own will to the passion". The reason for this thanksgiving for His death is because it is associated with His Resurrection. The liturgy continues, "that He might destroy death and burst the bonds of Satan and trample on hades and lead forth the saints and establish a covenant and make known His Resurrection". Christ has triumphed over the forces of evil and death and this triumph has been possible only by virtue of His Resurrection. By rising from the dead, He demonstrated His victory. We have considered earlier how the thought of Christ's establishment of a covenant is connected with the Resurrection.<sup>2</sup> Here we have a further reference to this covenant, and therefore a reference to the Resurrection.

The joyful nature of the feast. At the very beginning of this work, and at numerous points in it, emphasis has been placed on the joyful nature of the Eucharist. In fact, it is an essential part of the interpretation of the Eucharist to recognise the very strong element of joy that was included in its origin. This joy is because of the Resurrection of Christ.

In this liturgy, there are evidences of this joy's being part of the Eucharist. For instance the liturgy proper commences with the *Sursum Corda* - lift up your hearts - which is an invitation to people to rejoice. This sets the tone for the whole liturgy and the note of joy is apparent throughout.

The element of remembrance. This liturgy places great emphasis on the memorial aspect of the Eucharist in the early part of the liturgy. Note how the liturgy stresses the memorial of the death and Resurrection of Christ. "Those celebra-

---

1. p. 39 of this work.

2. p. 42 of this work.

ting the rite now declare that they are mindful of His death and Resurrection - which two conceptions state the principal content of the memorial as the formula introductory to the account of the institution clearly declares by the words *inathanaton lusē* at the beginning and *kai anastasin phanerōsē* at the end".<sup>1</sup> Lietzmann also says, "In Hippolytus, we have a liturgy grouped round the recitation of the narrative of the institution, celebrating the Lord's Supper as a memorial of His death and Resurrection and only in a second act regarding this celebration as a sacrifice and a sacrificial meal".<sup>2</sup>

The fact that there is so much emphasis on the memorial aspect does not make this a liturgy of the past; exactly the opposite is so. Clark says, "For us 'remembrance' means the recapturing of the 'memory' of an event, a transportation in thought back to the moment of its occurrence. There is the almost inevitable suggestion of the mental recollection of something or someone in fact absent. But for biblical thought the Greek *anamnēsis* and the Hebrew *zēkher* have the sense of recalling or representing before God an event in the past so that it becomes living, powerful and operative. . . . . Similarly we must interpret the command at the last supper. Henceforth when the disciples 'do this' it will be for the bringing of Christ Crucified out of the past into the present".<sup>3</sup> The same writer also speaks of the need for interpreting the words of institution in a more literal way. He says, "The emphasis must be on the other half of the sentence - 'for the re-calling of me'.<sup>4</sup>

So, in these early days, we must interpret the anamnesis as being not merely a statement of a past event but a confession of faith in a present Christ, who could be so only if He were risen.

The sacrificial emphasis. The quotation from Lietzmann, page 159, given above, indicates that the chief aspect of the liturgy is memorial. In fact, however, the liturgy places as much stress on the sacrificial aspect in the second half of the liturgy, where reference is made, for instance, to "the oblation of this church" and where the Invocation contains the words, "we offer Thee this bread and cup".

This sacrificial element, however, is further evidence of the influence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. The eucharistic liturgy of Hippolytus is certainly a sacrificial meal, because it contains what Lietzmann regards as the essential signs of sacrifice, "One sacrifices something to God by laying it upon the table or raising it heavenward and saying

---

1. H. Lietzmann p. 143.

2. *ibid.* p. 159.

3. N. Clark, *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments*

4. *ibid.* p. 60.

a prayer over it".<sup>1</sup>

But if this is a sacrificial meal, we must be careful here, as with the memorial aspect, not to read modern thoughts into ancient practices. The sacrificial element does not place the emphasis on the past, but, again as Lietzmann says, "Just as the heathen, by partaking of their sacrificial meal, enter into a mysterious communion with their gods, so do we with the risen Lord".<sup>2</sup> So the sacrificial element repeats the emphasis of the memorial - a witness to the presence of the Risen Christ.

Holiness to holy ones. It has been observed earlier that the sacrament should be given only to those who have previously repented and been forgiven.<sup>3</sup> We noted that this was linked with the Resurrection because Christ's saving work is linked with His Resurrection. The thought that only the "saints" should partake of the Eucharist is conveyed in the words of the Bishop immediately before the communicating of the people - "Holiness to holy ones" - and the rubric that follows shortly afterwards - "The people shall come in for the salvation of their souls, in order that their sin may be remitted".

So, in spite of the fact that this liturgy has its roots in I Cor. 10 - 11 with its emphasis on sacrifice and in the Last Supper with its Passover flavour, we find that there is yet evidence of the influence of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

---

1. opt. cit. p. 151.

2. ibid. p. 147.

3. page 32 of this work.

CONCLUSION.

We have seen how the Resurrection of Jesus Christ has made its mark on the liturgy of the Eucharist of the early Christian Church, starting with the Gospel of John, continuing with the Synoptists, the Acts of the Apostles, the remainder of the New Testament and finally three of the earliest Christian liturgies. There have been direct references to the Resurrection, portions have been inserted into liturgies specifically to include a celebration of the Resurrection, it has decided the characteristic mood of the Eucharist, it has affected the interpretation placed on the Eucharist by the early Church and governed the words and acts of the people, and it has dictated the focus of all prayer and praise. In short, the Resurrection of Christ, essential for Christian faith as Christ's triumph over sin and death, as the means of Christ's presence here and in heaven, and as the establishment of the new dispensation, is shown to hold a similarly important place in the eucharistic liturgy of the early Christian Church.

If anything is to be said about the Eucharist of modern days, it is to deplore the neglect of the Resurrection in the celebration of this sacrament and to desire a return by the Church - laity and clergy - to the earliest type of Eucharist, where the key-note was joy - joy in the realisation of the presence of the Risen Christ. "Christians will not re-discover the spirit of the first believers except on condition of assembling for the Lord's Supper in the joyful expectation of eating with Christ while they eat with their brethren, and of recalling once more that the Lord's Supper in the Church was a feast of the Resurrection".<sup>1</sup>

---

1. O. Cullmann & F.J. Lenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper, p. 23.

- BIBLIOGRAPHY -

CHAPTER ONE:

J.H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, CAMBRIDGE, 1957.

A.J.B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 6) S.C.M. PRESS, 1954.

O. Cullmann & F.J. Leenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper (Ecumenical Studies in Worship - No. 1) LUTTERWORTH PRESS.

W.D. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.

H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper - A Study in the History of the Liturgy (Translated by Dorothea H.G. Reeve) LEIDEN. E.J. BRILL

O. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 10) S.C.M. PRESS 1954.

CHAPTER TWO:

O. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 10) S.C.M. PRESS, 1954.

J.H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, CAMBRIDGE, 1957.

CHAPTER THREE:

O. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 10) S.C.M. PRESS, 1954.

A.J.B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 6) S.C.M. PRESS, 1954.

N. Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 17) S.C.M. PRESS, 1956.

O. Cullmann & F.J. Leenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper (Ecumenical Studies in Worship - No. 1) LUTTERWORTH PRESS.

J.H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, CAMBRIDGE, 1957.

W.D. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.

T.F. Torrance, Liturgy and Apocalypse (Article in "Church Service Society Annual" No. 24) May, 1954.

CHAPTER FOUR:

J.H. Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, CAMBRIDGE, 1957.

W.D. Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.

A.J.B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 6) S.C.M. PRESS, 1954.

H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper - A Study in the History of the Liturgy (Translated by Dorothea H.G. Reeve) LEIDEN. E.J. BRILL

O. Cullmann, Early Christian Worship (Studies in Biblical

- BIBLIOGRAPHY -

Theology No. 10) S.C.M. PRESS, 1954.

Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book (with introduction, notes and indices by John Wordsworth) S.P.C.K. 1923.

L. Duchesne, Christian Worship: Its Origin and evolution S.P.C.K. 1956.

O. Cullmann & F.J. Leenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper (Ecumenical Studies in Worship - No. 1) LUTTERWORTH PRESS.

N. Clark, An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 17) S.C.M. PRESS, 1956.

CONCLUSION:

O. Cullmann & F.J. Leenhardt, Essays on the Lord's Supper (Ecumenical Studies in Worship - No. 1) LUTTERWORTH PRESS.

OTHER WORKS REFERRED TO:

J. - F. Bill, The Fact and Meaning of the Resurrection - A Study in Emphases (B.D. Thesis submitted at Rhodes University, 1958).

The Interpreters' Bible, Abingdon Press.

Edited J. Hastings, The Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, T. & T. CLARK.

E. Underhill, Worship, NISBET.

Edited A. Richardson, Theological Word Book of the Bible S.C.M. PRESS.

Twenty-five Consecration Prayers (with notes and introduction by A. Linton) S.P.C.K. 1944.

E.O. James, Christian Myth and Ritual.

GENERAL READING:

W. Milligan, The Resurrection of our Lord, MACMILLAN & CO. 1913.

H.A. Williams, Jesus and the Resurrection, LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., 1951.

W.D. Maxwell, The Resurrection: Its Significance and Relevance, (Inaugural Lecture at Rhodes University, 1958).