

Durham E-Theses

Symbol or reality?: Eucharistic doctrine in the first four centuries

Philip J. Cunningham

How to cite:

Cunningham, Philip J. (1985) *Symbol or reality?: Eucharistic doctrine in the first four centuries*. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/7242/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

S Y M B O L O R R E A L I T Y ?

Eucharistic Doctrine in the First Four Centuries

- a thesis submitted for the
degree of Master of Arts
by
Philip J. Cunningham B.A.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.



-9. OCT. 1985

Thesis
1985/CUN

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Introduction p. 1-3
Table of Dates p. 4

Part I: The Evidence of St. Paul
& the Gospel Writers

St. Paul p. 5
1 Cor. 11, 17-34 p. 16
Anamnesis p. 19
The New Covenant in Christ's Blood p. 36
'This is my Body' p. 40
1 Cor. 10, 1-5 and 16-22 p. 40
'And all ate the spiritual food' p. 45
Summary p. 49

St. Mark p. 50
Mk. 14, 17-26 p. 50
The Dating of the Last Supper p. 50
Differences of Wording between Mark
and Paul p. 51
Mark's understanding of the Eucharist p. 54
'Take ye: this is my body' p. 58
'This is my blood of the covenant...'
'...which is shed for many' p. 64
The Feeding Narratives in Mark p. 67
1 Cor. 11, 23-25; Mk. 8, 6-8;
14, 22-24 - a comparison p. 67
Summary p. 73

St. Luke p. 74
Textual Problems p. 74
Luke's Teaching on the Last/Lord's
Supper p. 82
The Meal at Emmaus p. 84
The Meal on board Ship (Acts 27, 33-36) p. 89
Luke's account of meals in the Ministry
and Teaching of Jesus p. 91
The Lord's Prayer p. 94
Summary p. 94

St. John p. 95
Why did John write his Gospel? p. 96
Water into Wine; Jn. 2, 1-11 p. 101
The Bread of Life Discourse p. 110
Why does John not include an
Institution Narrative? p. 114
The 'hour' and the 'sign' p. 117

Excursus:
Did Jesus intend the Last Supper to
be a Eucharist? p. 118

Part II: The Fathers

<u>Clement of Rome</u>	p. 121
<u>Ignatius of Antioch</u>	p. 124
i. The unity of the eucharistic assembly	p. 125
ii. The reality of the eucharistic gifts and its effects	p. 127
iii. The Christian's sacrifice	p. 131
<u>Justin Martyr</u>	p. 134
'The food which has been eucharistized'	p. 135
'Sacrifice'	p. 138
<u>Irenaeus</u>	p. 141
i. 'The communion and unity of flesh and spirit'	p. 141
ii. 'The new oblation of the new covenant'	p. 145
iii. 'Jesus Christ our Lord who.... consummates all things in himself.'	p. 149
<u>Tertullian</u>	p. 151
<u>Clement of Alexandria</u>	p. 160
i. Allegory	p. 162
ii. The Logos	p. 165
'The sacrifice acceptable to God!...'	p. 166
<u>Origen</u>	p. 170
'The nourishing word of truth'	p. 171
'Sacrifice'	p. 181
<u>St. Cyprian of Carthage</u>	p. 184
<u>Cyril of Jerusalem</u>	p. 190
i. The lack of the Institution Narrative & the importance of the epiclesis	p. 191
ii. The objective reality of Christ's Eucharistic Presence	p. 197
iii. The Eucharistic Sacrifice	p. 201
iv. Does Cyril underplay eschatology?	p. 203

<u>St. Augustine</u>	p. 205
Ambrose	p. 207
The Doctrine of Augustine	p. 210
i. The Christian Sacrifice	p. 210
ii. Christian Unity in the Eucharist	p. 214
iii. Res sacramenti	p. 216

Part III: The Doctrine of the
Eucharist as shown
by the Liturgies

The OT Background	p. 222
The post-Exilic & Intertestamental Periods	p. 228
The Christian Liturgy	p. 234
<u>The Didache</u>	p. 240
'Our Lord, come!'	p. 249
'This broken bread... became one'	p. 252
<u>The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus</u>	
The Apostolic Tradition	p. 257
The Kiss of Peace	p. 259
The Offertory	p. 261
The Anaphora Prayer	p. 263
The Fraction and Communion	p. 267
<u>The Liturgy of Addai & Mari</u>	p. 269
<u>The Euchologion of Sarapion</u>	p. 276
<u>The Liturgy of St. James</u>	p. 291

Part IV: Where do we go from here?
- the Eucharist and modern
Ecumenical thought in the
light of the First Four
Centuries.

i. The Messianic Banquet	p. 299
ii. The Eucharistic Presence of Christ	p. 310
iii. The Eucharistic Sacrifice	p. 322
iv. Symbol & Reality	p. 330

<u>Bibliography</u>	p. 336
---------------------	--------

SYMBOL OR REALITY?
EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE IN THE FIRST FOUR CENTURIES

INTRODUCTION Why write on the Eucharist? First of all, because it is a central fact of Church life and a major area of concern in terms of the ecumenical dialogue. On a purely personal level it is to me a major element in my religious life, as it is to many thousands of others Sunday by Sunday throughout the year. Correct understanding of so central a rite seems vital. And correct understanding involves being prepared to go back to basics, to the New Testament and the Early Church, so as to see something of what was then made of the Eucharist. Hence this examination of some areas of eucharistic doctrine in the first four centuries.

Secondly, I have been much influenced by C.F.D. Moule's⁽¹⁾ suggestion (in connection with Christology) that there are 'false assumptions' behind a good deal of the contemporary approach to many of the central doctrines of the New Testament - and thence of the Christian Faith. Moule singles out for particular criticism the approach to doctrinal development that he calls 'evolutionary' i.e. to see it as a kind of linear development moving further and further away from a 'simple' beginning. Moule suggests instead that the process was rather to be styled 'developmental' i.e. a growth from 'immaturity to maturity', gradually drawing out and articulating what was already there implicitly from the start. This enables us to say that at an early level there can be profound interpretations - which can later be replaced by less profound ones. This suggestion seems to me to have wider application than the area of Christology, and in particular to be helpful in that of Eucharistic Doctrine, since on a 'developmental' approach we need not be concerned about the discovery of false trails and blind alleys at both early and late stages along the road.

(1) C.F.D. Moule, The Origin of Christology, C.U.P. 1977



A third reason for attempting this study was a dissatisfaction with much that is found in the more mundane approaches to Eucharistic Doctrine centring on the 'Real Presence' or 'Transubstantiation' or 'Virtualism'. Discussion, particularly in local ecumenical circles, still seems all too often to be ossified in the rows of the 16th century. I was concerned to see if, by going back to the beginning of the Tradition, a fresher approach could be revealed. It has. It seems to me that the early writers often see in the Eucharist a creative tension between the Symbol and the Reality; between the broken bread and poured out wine and the act of Salvation wrought by Christ on the Cross. But also we see in the development of some of the early writers on the Eucharist what I argue to have been a false trail, namely too close an identification of Symbol with Reality, so that the concept of Symbol was lost. This did not mean that the Church of the Fathers was mistaken about the basics of Eucharist and Salvation. Much less does it mean that the Eucharist was in any way undervalued - on the contrary, as an end in itself it perhaps came to be overvalued. But a false trail was laid - perhaps even as early as the NT period - and eventually was, for some long time, to dominate.

As work progressed it became clear that any attempt to deal exhaustively with all available texts was doomed to failure simply because of the vast quantity of material. Rather than giving a too brief and confusing general survey, perhaps doing even less justice to the intricacies involved than I have in fact succeeded in doing, it seemed better to examine some fundamental texts in some greater detail.

The evidence of the NT is assumed to be primary and normative for my purpose. In consequence relatively greater space has been devoted to it than to the more substantial evidence of the Fathers and Liturgies. The

NT evidence in comparison with that of the Fathers is rather sparse and sketchy. But that makes it the harder to assess, especially in view of the enormous output of scholarly criticism. The NT doctrine of the Eucharist has to be extrapolated carefully and critically from the text in contrast to the Patristic understanding which is often more specific and adequately documented. The NT is the basis for all later Christian thought - and should be the point of unity for the divided churches in their quest for reunion. Any Christian theology which fails to measure itself against a critical understanding of the NT is surely doomed to failure.

The very quantity of existing material concerning early eucharistic thought raises the question: why so much? The question is rhetorical. The early Church lived eucharistically. For the Church of the first four centuries the Eucharist was no mere 'service' or religious rite. It was a microcosm of the mystery of the transfigured life lived in Christ by means of the grace available to all by means of the Lord's redeeming work. The Eucharist was seen as the eschatological moment, the timeless time, when the Crucified and Risen Christ is present to His people so that they may become what they already are, the Body of Christ. The Eucharist is both the proclamation and the experience of Heilsgeschichte; it is where we experience the covenant call of God the Father to be his holy people, his priests; it is where we live out the redemptive experience of Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost and Parousia. This thesis is an attempt to unpack this paragraph.

DATING

The following table should serve as a guide for the approximate dates assumed in this thesis. (1)

THE FIRST CENTURY

Paul
Mark
Luke
John (I assume the traditional dating of late 1st century)
Didache (I discuss the date of this document in its own section)
Clement of Rome (First letter 96/7)

THE SECOND CENTURY

Ignatius of Antioch (c.98-117)
Justin Martyr (martyred c.165)
Irenaeus (c.177-202)
Tertullian (c.197-220; lapsed to Montanism c.207)
Clement of Alexandria (fl.c.200)

THE THIRD CENTURY

<u>Writers</u>	<u>Liturgy</u>
Origen (teaching c.220-253)	The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus (before 237?)
Cyprian (Bishop 246-258)	The Liturgy of Addai and Mari

THE FOURTH CENTURY

<u>Writers</u>	<u>Liturgy</u>
Cyril of Jerusalem (Bishop 348-386)	The Euchologion of Sarapion (340-360?)
Augustine (354-430)	Liturgy of St. James (c.400)

(1) This dating largely follows that of M. Wiles, The Christian Fathers; Hodder and Staughton, 1966

PART I

THE EVIDENCE OF ST. PAUL

AND

THE GOSPEL WRITERS

SAINT PAUL'S TEACHING ON THE EUCHARIST

We consider the thought of Paul first since in terms of a written tradition his remarks on the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. 11 are chronologically earlier than the accounts of the Institution Narratives in the Synoptic Gospels.⁽¹⁾

Paul introduces his version of the Institution Narrative with these words:

"For I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you." - 1 Cor. 11.23

Two questions are raised:

- (i) Where and when did Paul receive the tradition of the Eucharist?
- (ii) Why does he refer to the Institution Narrative at this point in the Epistle?

Davies,⁽²⁾ with some reservations, argues that Pauline terminology corresponds to Rabbinic usage, and hence that in 1 Cor. 11.23, Paul is referring to a tradition received from the Christian community after his conversion. Davies bases this argument on the parallel usage of *παράλαμβανεν* and *παράδοσεν* compared with the Rabbinic terms qibbel and masar. If Davies is correct in this, then Paul's tradition of the Institution Narrative was in some sense 'accepted teaching' in the early Church (i.e. before Paul wrote 1 Cor) and secondly (again on a parallel with Rabbinic usage) we should not expect Paul to quote 'ipsissima verba' but the essence of the original as mediated through the tradition and consequent interpretation.⁽³⁾

(1) This is not of course to pre-judge the whole question of the earliest form of the Institution Narrative, nor to suggest that Paul's teaching represents the earliest understanding of the Eucharist.

(2) W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, S.P.C.K., 1970 pp. 248ff.

(3) *ibid.* p.249 Davies adds the caveat that 'qibbel' implies the direct reception of specific words. "It is only by blurring the obvious sense of *παράλαμβανω* that we can make it refer to the indirect reception of tradition." I believe that Davies' thesis receives support from the very structure of Paul's argument in 1 Cor.

Bornkamm provides support for Davies' argument: "Paradosis is therefore certainly to be understood as the tradition passed on in the congregation, inconceivable without a chain of tradition in which Paul also includes himself as a member. If we ask when and where Paul received this tradition we must certainly think of the time of his stay in Antioch, before he began his mission."⁽¹⁾

Stöger further argues that the language of the Institution Narrative in 1 Cor. is uncharacteristic of Paul; that the form of the 'words of consecration' as evidenced by 1 Cor. (c.49/50 A.D.?) were probably received by Paul at Antioch in c.40 A.D.; and that Paul could then have compared his account with that of the usage of the Jerusalem Church when on his visit there (Gal. 1.18., Acts 9.27, 11.30., Gal. 2.1-10). In addition the cup words of the Pauline/Lucan account may indicate Semitic influence, thus suggesting a possible date as early as A.D.30. However, as Stöger himself notes:

"Any attempt to get behind the words of consecration as they have been handed down to us, and to arrive at the original form which Jesus himself used when he spoke them, can only be in the nature of a reconstruction and can never be based on verifiable historical knowledge."⁽²⁾

It may be helpful at this point to examine briefly Paul's argument in 1 Cor. 15. In 1 Cor. 15, as in chapter 11,

(1) G. Bornkamm; Early Christian Experience, SCM Press Ltd. 1969 pp 130f. Kilmartin; The Eucharist and the Primitive Church, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965, also supports this suggesting that Paul may have received his knowledge of the Eucharist either at Jerusalem or Antioch. This depends on a date of about 31 for Paul's visit to Jerusalem - and if that were correct would push the oral tradition back to a very early date indeed.

(2) For all this paragraph v. Baur, art., 'Eucharist', Enc. of Bib. Theol.

Paul is referring to a tradition which is being handed on and (most importantly in terms of the whole form of argument in the Epistle) he refers to that tradition as being one which the Corinthians have ALREADY received:

"Now I make known unto you brethren, the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye received, wherein also ye stand."

- 1 Cor. 15.1

Professor Barrett notes that, as in the case of 1 Cor. 11.23., the Rabbinic usage of the terms masar and gibbel lie behind 1 Cor. 15.1ff. ⁽¹⁾ In 1 Cor. 15 Paul proceeds to give an account of the primitive kerygma, introducing each short statement with a "ὅτι -recitative":

"That (ὅτι) Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures,
that (ὅτι) he was buried,
that (ὅτι) he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures,
that (ὅτι) he appeared to Cephas."

- 1 Cor. 15.3-5

When we remember that the main force of Paul's argument in 1 Cor. 15 is that the Corinthians have ALREADY been given the traditions of the Church (from which some now seem in danger of falling away), then it seems likely that in 1 Cor. 15 we have a kind of primitive catechism, a set amount of 'Rabbinic-type teaching' to be learnt in the 'catechumenate'. Jeremias notes:

"...we cannot say that the kerygma is a translation from a Semitic original in its present wording. It must have taken the shape it has now in a Greek-speaking environment. Yet it cannot have originated there. With Paul's closing assertion, 1 Cor. 15.11, that his kerygma was identical with that of the first apostles..... it is a safe conclusion that the core of the kerygma

(1) C.K. Barrett, Jesus and the Gospel Tradition, S.P.C.K., 1967, p. 1ff.

"was not formulated by Paul, but comes from the Aramaic speaking earliest community."⁽¹⁾

Is it possible to use much the same arguments for the Institution Narrative in 1 Cor. 11? Again there is a "ὄρα -recitative" (v.23), and there is explicit reference to the tradition which Paul has received and has in turn passed on to the Corinthians. The whole argument rests on the fact that Paul is calling the Corinthian Church back to a standard of worship from which it is in danger of falling away. Paul is specifically not introducing new teaching to the Corinthians - either in chapter 11 or in chapter 10 where he rebukes the Corinthians for taking part in the worship of idols. Rather he is quoting already known traditions and passages, in an attempt so to move the Corinthians that they return to their former and more correct Eucharistic practices.

1 Cor. 8-10 are concerned with the ethical, moral and theological difficulties raised for the Corinthian Church by those of its members who are either actually sharing in pagan sacrifice (albeit without intending to honour the pagan gods) or are at least eating food that they full well know has first been offered to idols in sacrificial acts. Chapters 12-14 deal with those difficulties raised by the presence and practices of 'charismatic' Christians within the church body. Chapter 11 then, comes in the middle of a quite lengthy section concerned with the life and conduct of the Church. It is no surprise that Chapter 11 continues this theme and concerns the problems raised by those who are breaking away from the traditions of the Church as previously handed on by Paul. Such people - whether ladies who refuse to cover their heads, or those causing some scandal at the Lord's Supper - are in danger of causing schism within the Corinthian Church.

(1) J. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words of Jesus, SCM Press Ltd. 1966, p.103

Paul has the same basic method of dealing with all these problems: he appeals to the tradition. That is, he appeals to the practice, belief and form of worship which the Corinthians have been accustomed to use in former times and which in many cases were passed on to the first Christians at Corinth by Paul himself and thus form the norm, customs and common kerygma of the Church. For example, in 1 Cor. 10.16ff. Paul argues that a Christian cannot share in pagan sacrifice - and the basis of his argument rests on an appeal to an understanding of the Lord's Supper which he presumably confidently feels will be regarded as an accepted standard.

John Robinson⁽¹⁾ supports the hypothesis that Paul in 1 Cor. makes reference to 'traditional' beliefs and practice. Robinson compares the greetings at 1 Cor. 16, 20-24, with the following passage from the Didache:

"Let grace come, and let this world pass away.
Hosanna to the God of David. If any is holy
let him come: if any is not holy, let him
repent. Maranatha. Amen."

Robinson suggests that this passage may originally have been set out in a form of liturgical "versicles and responses". He writes:

"This exchange of versicles and responses comes at the end of the prayer 'after you are satisfied'. The probability is that the reference is to the Agape and that the dialogue forms the introduction to the Eucharist proper....Maranatha (if, as seems likely, it is an imperative - 'our Lord come' - rather than a perfect indicative) is then a prayer to Christ to stand among his own in his Parousia (anticipated in the real presence of the Eucharist)."⁽²⁾

(1) J.A.T. Robinson, The Earliest Liturgical Sequence? J.T.S., NS, IV (1953) p.38-41

(2) Robinson op.cit. p.39 for the suggested form of the liturgical versicles and responses see below on Didache p.248

Robinson goes on to suggest that this passage from the Didache and 1 Cor. 16.22 show sufficient parallels to give grounds for thinking that Paul is here using a liturgical sequence of a similar nature - and consequently, one that is already in use in the Corinthian Church. Paul envisages that his letter will be read out to the assembled Church at some form of the synaxis as a prelude either to the Eucharist itself or (as Robinson prefers) to the Agape-meal.

On Maranatha Cullman notes:

"The fact that this prayer is handed down by Paul untranslated and that it continued in that original form until the time of the composition of the Didache shows the extraordinarily important role which this oldest liturgical prayer of the early Christian community must have played. The Didache had handed down to us other eucharistic prayers which have almost word for word parallels in Judaism. In the Maranatha prayer on the other hand, 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."⁽¹⁾

(1) Cullman, Early Christian Worship, Studies in Bib. Theol., First Series, 10, SCM Press Ltd., 1969, p.13. The main difficulty with Cullman's argument is that he would seem not to allow for the possibility that the Didache is a brilliant anachronistic fraud. However, even if this were so, his point about the use of Maranatha, as in 1 Cor., would still stand. This would enable a firm connection to be made between the epistle as a whole and the probable place of its being read, namely in the eucharistic assembly. In turn this would suggest that Paul's comments on the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. 11 would not only have a retrospective reference to a tradition first given by Paul to the Corinthian Church, but would also themselves be read in the context of that very eucharistic assembly about which Paul is so concerned. In connection with this point it may further be noted that Robinson maintained that many of the epistles and - especially - Revelation show evidence similar to that found in 1 Cor. of having originally formed part of what we may call the 'ministry of the word' in the synaxis e.g. Rev.22.17-21.

Wainwright also maintains that 'the association of Maranatha with the eucharistic liturgy in the primitive Church' may be regarded as 'fairly established' and comments:

'There is every likelihood that when this prayer was uttered in the liturgical assembly at Corinth it had a double reference: it prayed for both the final parousia and also the Lord's immediate coming to His people in the eucharist. Little is changed, however, if we take Maranatha as a present perfect: it is then an acclamation of the presence of the one who is still to come and yet who promised His presence to the two or three gathered in His name: The Lord is here! it is either an acclamation of the presence of the Lord who has been in the assembly through the service of the word and who will continue to be there in the Eucharist, or else... a prayer for the eucharistic presence of Christ as at least a partial anticipation of the parousia.'⁽¹⁾

If this be correct we may agree with Kilmartin when he writes:

'The Sitz im Leben of the accounts of the institution is the primitive liturgy.'⁽²⁾

The common identification of several other passages (e.g. Phil.2.5-11; Col.1 18ff) as 'liturgical sequence' point to such a conclusion, as does the continuing use of Hebrew in a predominantly Greek speaking, possibly Gentile, Church. We may think of the use of hosanna, hallelujah and amen. The survival of such words suggests that they were at the very earliest period a fixed part of a conservative liturgical use. This means both that it is next to impossible to hope to rediscover the ipsissima verba of Christ in the Upper Room, and, on the contrary, it also gives us good grounds for confidence in the tradition as reflecting the words and mind of the very earliest traditions, and perhaps of Christ himself. As Robinson writes:

(1) Wainwright, op.cit., p.69f.

(2) Kilmartin, op.cit., p.29

"The fact that Paul can quote a formula with which he can assume, without explanation, that his audience is familiar, indicates that fixed eucharistic forms were in use at Corinth within twenty-five years of the Resurrection."⁽¹⁾

So far an attempt has been made to show that Paul's references to the eucharist in 1 Cor. are not new teaching emanating from the inspired originality of the Apostle, but rather accepted parts of the 'tradition'. It is necessary to show this since many writers have preferred the view that Paul virtually invented the Eucharist as we know it; or perhaps that the provenance of the Eucharist is to be sought not in the Upper Room, but rather in the influence of the Hellenistic mystery-cults on early Gentile Christianity. This approach was itself in marked reaction to an earlier uncritical approach which interpreted 1 Cor. 11.23 as evidence of a 'special revelation' to Paul. On this Kilmartin writes:

"Today scholars prefer to interpret Paul's words as a reference to the exalted Lord who instructs through the Church. Consequently, they understand Paul to be speaking of a revelation which Christ gave at the Last Supper and which the Church preserves in her teaching."⁽²⁾

It was however to precisely such an interpretation as Kilmartin's that the liberal critics and other more radical scholars objected. In this connection reference must be made to Lietzmann's theory of the 'two Eucharists'. Lietzmann's hypothesis was that there were originally two forms of the Lord's Supper: (a) a simple commemorative meal of Palestinian origin coming from Jesus himself through the first apostles and stemming primarily from the post-Resurrection meals of Jesus with his followers; and (b) a far more complex sacrificial rite of Hellenistic origin

(1) J.A.T. Robinson, op.cit., p.41

(2) Kilmartin, op.cit., p.22

emphases on particular parts of the original tradition as given to him at Antioch. But this need only represent necessary emphasis of particular teaching, and need not necessarily suggest distortion, much less invention. It is probable that in a predominantly Gentile/Hellenistic environment Paul made use of the day to day thought forms of his environment to express the better his doctrine to his readers and listeners. But this need not suggest that we have in the doctrine and tradition of Paul concerning the Last/Lord's Supper a deliberate personal invention. This seems particularly unlikely in view of the internal evidence of 1 Cor. Paul is writing to the Corinthian Church to recall its members to their original understanding and practice. If Paul's teaching had varied from Peter's then the already faction ridden Corinthians would have made much of the discrepancies - and Paul would have failed in his purpose of writing to them. Furthermore, Wainwright comments that the notion of the new covenant, present in Paul's account of the cup-words, is in any case incompatible with Lietzmann's theory. True the Eucharist was a meal of post-Resurrection joy - as Lietzmann rightly stressed - but that joy was possible precisely because of the new covenant established in the blood of Jesus. Thus Lietzmann's distinction vanishes. (1)

In reply to Kasemann's contention that the background to Paul's understanding of the Eucharist is to be found in the Hellenistic cult-meals, may be cited Rawlinson's argument that the phrase "the Body of Christ" does not first come to be applied to the Church, in line with the supposed Hellenistic Archetypal Man mythology, but rather, the phrase comes first from the Jewish background of the Lord's Supper and then comes to be applied by extension to those who share in the sacramental body i.e. the Church. (2)

(1) Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology, London, Epworth Press, 1971, p.41

(2) Rawlinson, art. Corpus Christi, in Mysterium Christi ed. Bell and Deissmann, Longmans, 1930, pp.225ff.

Further support for seeking the background to the Eucharist in a Jewish rather than a Hellenistic provenance is provided by Filson's study, The NT against its Environment⁽¹⁾ in which he argues forcibly that the NT should be interpreted in terms of Judaism and more particularly in terms of Pharisaism. At the same time, as Filson himself argues, it has to be recognised that the Church lived in a thoroughly Hellenistic environment and consequently was forced, if only for the sake of adequate communication, to use the terminology of its environment. Some writers, such as John, attempted to bridge the gap between the two cultures. Paul himself may at times have been prepared to use Hellenistic terminology - but the background of that remained essentially Hebraic. Filson believes that Paul received the 'tradition' after his conversion in the mid-30's and that his teaching was and remained in essential agreement with the Jerusalem apostles. Kelly writes:

"In contradiction to the view that St. Paul was a daring doctrinal innovator, virtually the inventor of Catholic theology, all the evidence goes to prove that he had a healthy regard for the objective body of teaching authoritatively handed down in the Church."⁽²⁾

How does all this help to interpret Paul's doctrine of the Eucharist?

1) It is important to remember that Paul was not writing 'doctrine' in 1 Cor. or in any other of his epistles. Rather he was seeking to deal with problems in the Churches in his care as they arose. Paul's genius and originality consists in the fact that such pragmatic arguments arise out of his central doctrine of Christ as Saviour and Lord. It is nonetheless obvious that his doctrine as we have it in the epistles - be it his doctrine of

(1) F. Filson, The NT against its environment, SNTh.3, SCM Press 1950.

(2) Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, p.10. In support of this statement he cites 1 Cor. 11.23., 1 Cor. 15.3., and 2 Thess. 2.15

the Eucharist or nearly any other - has to be discovered where it lies implicit in the course of a pragmatic argument. Thus it may at best be misleading to say that we can speak of Paul's doctrine of the Eucharist - rather, we can at best hope to discover that doctrine in as far as it is given in the epistles.

2) If what has been argued so far, concerning the Jewish background to the Eucharist in Paul's thought is correct, then the interpretation of the tradition is to be found within the context of Judaism and the OT rather than that of Hellenism and the mystery religions.

It is now possible to make an examination of the various eucharistic references in 1 Cor., beginning with Paul's account of the Institution Narrative.

1 Cor. 11. 17-34

Why did Paul include this account of the Institution of the Lord's Supper in his epistle? In 1 Cor. there are several references to the Eucharist. The first (possible) reference, to be examined in greater detail later, is Paul's view of Christ as the Passover (1 Cor. 5. 6ff.) This reference arises as an analogy in the main argument at that point in the epistle:

"A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump"(5.6)

Paul argues that in the same way as leaven leavens the dough, so a fornicator can harm the whole Church and should be removed (5.7) As Christians we should seek to imitate Christ, who is our Passover sacrifice (5.7) Hence this passage, eucharistic or not, is primarily practical in purpose.

The next eucharistic reference is in chapter 10 which contains two allusions to the Eucharist. The first of these (10. 1-5) refers to Christ as the spiritual rock in

the desert wanderings. The second (10. 16-18) speaks of the eucharistic cup and bread as the blood and body of Christ. Both of these discourses occur in the context of a discourse on ethics and Christian behaviour, in particular dealing with the problems caused by members of the Christian fellowship sharing in the pagan cult-meals (10.18ff).

In view of Paul's pragmatic approach to doctrine it comes as no surprise that his inclusion of the Institution Narrative arises from a very practical reason. The Corinthians have met for their Eucharist in a state of division (11.18). These divisions may be both doctrinal (such as those referred to at the start of the letter - 1.12ff.) and also social, though here the social concern seems to predominate since the immediate cause of the division is food and drink - the lack of it for some and an excess for others. Some of the Corinthians are getting drunk while others remain hungry (v.21). It is in this context that Paul recites the Institution Narrative which he received from (ἀπο) the Lord (v.23), and which he had at the first passed on to the Corinthians (ὅ και παρεδωκα ὑμῖν). Clearly Paul's aim was to recall the Corinthians to a standard of eucharistic doctrine and observance from which they had departed. Because of their divisions, the Corinthians are accused by Paul of 'eating the bread and drinking the cup unworthily' (v.27); they are not 'discerning the body' (v.29) and, apparently as a consequence, some are ill and some have died (v.30). The only remedy for this state of affairs is to do away with the divisions, both theological and social (vv.33f).

The main thrust of Paul's argument comes in v. 26f:
"For (γὰρ) as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord."

Paul has just given his account of the institution of the Lord's Supper (vv.23-25). These words, introduced by *γάρ*, follow immediately. *γάρ* can only sensibly be used to introduce some reason or explanation for what has gone before. Thus in v.26 it shows that in the subsequent verses Paul is summarizing the purpose and meaning of the Lord's Supper narrative as he understands it. Consequently it would seem that Paul interprets the Lord's Supper primarily in terms of the Lord's death. The taking and breaking of the bread, the words over the bread and the cup, all lead up to the *γάρ* of v.26. In eating and drinking we proclaim the Lord's death 'till he come'.

Clearly such a proclamation of the Lord's death has links with the word *ἀναμνησις* which is used by Paul over both the bread and the cup (vv.24f) and which immediately precedes the *γάρ* of v.26. The link between the proclamation of the Lord's death and Paul's use of *ἀναμνησις* becomes yet clearer if v. 26 is seen as a parallel to the preceding two verses:

vv. 24f:

"..... this do in remembrance (*ἀναμνησιν*) of me
..... this do, as oft as ye drink it, in
remembrance (*ἀναμνησιν*) of me"

cp. v. 26:

"For as often as ye eat this bread or drink the
cup...."

The repetition of phrases here is sufficient to show that while the argument is moving on, there is a close connection in Paul's mind, between the anamnesis made over the bread and the cup, and the proclamation of the Lord's death until he come. It is therefore necessary now to make a detailed investigation into the meaning of *ἀναμνησις*.

ANAMNESIS

Professor Jones' article on ἀνάμνησις in the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. 11.25⁽¹⁾ remains an important starting point in a discussion of the meaning of anamnesis, particularly in the Pauline context. He cites Bedale and Jeremias as examples of writers who have interpreted ἀνάμνησις as having a 'Godward reference':

"Whereas μνημοσύνη is sometimes used to signify a memorial which is a reminder to God, and sometimes one which is to serve as a reminder to men, the word ἀνάμνησις on each occasion of its use in the LXX has exclusively a 'Godward reference'".⁽²⁾

Richardson summarizes the interpretation of anamnesis as a 'Godward reference':

'God's remembrance of someone is always active for mercy or for judgement; it is never a neutral memory, like a mere idea in the mind. To remember someone, in biblical language, means to be gracious unto him (cf. Lk. 23.42, "Jesus remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom", Ps. 72.2 etc.) unless it is his misdeeds which are remembered, in which case the consequences are dire (e.g. Pss. 25.7; 79.8 etc.) Indeed Jeremias says that εἰς ἀνάμνησιν and εἰς μνημοσύνην like their Aramaic equivalents normally in LXX and in pre-Christian Judaism refer to God's remembering in this sense, and not to man's; hence he concludes that εἰς τὴν ἔμνην ἀνάμνησιν in 1 Cor. 11.24f. and Lk. 22.19 must mean that, when the community comes together for the breaking of bread, God is being sought to 'remember his Messiah', just as in an old Passover prayer which beseeches God for 'the remembrance of the Messiah'. God is,

(1) D.R. Jones, ἀνάμνησις in the LXX and in the interpretation of 1 Cor. 11.25, JTS vol. VI 1955, pp 183-191

(2) Bedale, The Eucharistic Sacrifice, Theology, lvi. No. 398, 1953

as it were, being 'memorialized' to remember his Messiah by bringing about his Kingdom in the Parousia; the Eucharist, we may say, is a kind of dramatization of the prayer 'Thy Kingdom come'".⁽¹⁾

It is this 'Godward reference' interpretation which Professor Jones criticizes in his article:

"..... the liturgical, godward meaning, is not inherent in any of the instances of the word ἀνάμνησις in the LXX"⁽²⁾

He examines the various uses of ἀνάμνησις in LXX e.g. Lev. 24.7 where it is used to translate azkarah.

The azkarah is that part of the offering which is burnt in order that the whole may be sanctified and, according to Jones, the LXX has misunderstood the idiom and here translated azkarah by ἀνάμνησις whereas elsewhere μνησεν υνυον is used to translate azkarah. This confusion is presumably sufficient to invalidate the idea that for the Jewish Christian the merest mention of anamnesis would make the rite of azkarah spring to mind complete with its necessary suggestion of 'putting God in remembrance'. Professor Jones draws particular attention to the fact that the idea of remembering sin is common in the OT (e.g. Gen. 49.9; Pss. 24.7; 102.14; Ezek. 33.16) and that forgiveness is that state in which sins are no longer remembered (ps.24:17). Indeed Jeremiah says that the New Covenant (N.B. Paul's reference to the cup of the New Covenant) will include a situation where sin will be remembered no more (Jer. 31.34). Jones concludes:

".....the use of the word ἀνάμνησις in the LXX involves too many ambiguities to provide authority for any particular interpretation of NT passages."⁽³⁾

(1) A. Richardson, Theology of the NT, p.368

(2) D.R. Jones, *op.cit.*

(3) Jones, *art.cit.*

At this point it is worth summarizing the work of another OT scholar in his work on 'Memory and Tradition in Israel'⁽¹⁾ Childs finds two basic meanings of the Hebrew root zkr:

(a) in the qal it means 'to remember' - and so raises the whole question of the Hebrew psychology of memory:

(b) in the hiphil it means 'to utter' and may have a cultic or juridical connection.

The word 'remember' in Hebrew usage is more inclusive than in English and with a wider semantic range. 'To remember' often bears a meaning which we would describe as characterizing an action. Childs finds no significant difference in this between Homeric Greek usage and Hebrew usage. On the other hand, Plato and Aristotle strongly influenced the understanding of the concept of memory so that:

"Memory depends on the retention of a sense stimulation after the object producing it has ceased to have an effect. Again, as in Plato, the act of remembering has been separated from external action, and confined to a psychological experience in relation to a neutral image."⁽²⁾

Childs continues:

"The result of this study confirms Barr's contention that the issue is a semantic one and does not involve differing categories of thought. There is no real dichotomy between Greek and Hebrew mentality in respect to memory."⁽³⁾

Turning to a form-critical analysis of OT passages using zkr Childs distinguishes two main uses: (a) God remembers and (b) man/Israel remembers.

(1) Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, SBT. No.37, SCM Press.

(2) *ibid.* p.27

(3) *ibid.* p.28

"There can be no dichotomy between God's thought and action..... God's remembering always implies his movement towards the object of his memory The essence of God's remembering lies in his acting toward someone because of a previous commitment."(1)

But:

"....the verb when used with Israel as its subject denotes a basic human psychological function: to recall a past event!"(2)

Childs then argues that from this basic usage of 'remember' with man/Israel as subject, there developed a special theological, and in particular cultic, use in which

"Memory has a critical function of properly relating the present with the past."(3)

This usage means that:

"Israel in every generation remembers and so shares in the same redemptive time."(4)

"Israel's redemptive history continues in her memory as the past events of redeemed time call forth a new response and age again experienced."(5)

Professor Jones argues that anamnesis should be interpreted in this second 'backward reference' understanding, thus suggesting that *ἀνάμνησις* means "A call to remembrance". In support of this he cites Ex. 12.14:

"And this day shall be unto you for a memorial (LXX: *καίσετε ἡμέρα ὑμῖν αὐτή μνημόσυνον*) and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations."

This verse would seem to be a clear example where 'remembrance' refers to man as subject since the Israelites are commanded to remember the Passover and to keep it as a feast. Jones cites Mk. 14.9 as an

(1) Childs, *ibid.*, p.34

(2) *ibid.* p.47

(3) *ibid.* p.53

(4) *ibid.* p.54

(5) *ibid.* p.63

example of this same approach in the NT:

"And verily I say unto you, wheresoever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of her for a memorial of her (εἰς μνημόσυνον αἰτίας)." "

The context of this verse must surely point to a 'manward reference' for the 'remembering'. In view of all this Jones concludes that the anamnesis made in the Eucharist is a proclamation of Christ's saving work to men, just as the gospel 'shall be preached throughout the whole world'.

"To remember him in the sign of his redemptive death is not simply the opposite of forgetting. A true ἀνάμνησις is the appropriation of his death and endless life and all the benefits thereof."⁽¹⁾

Professor Jones' article has not escaped criticism.

Hickling makes this comment:

"(Jones) asserts that the eucharist, like the paschal remembering, would be no mere mental act. It "would represent the Lord's person and make his sacrifice operative in the lives of those who believed and obeyed" (p.188), but he does so on the basis of an analysis of ancient Hebrew thought processes by Federsen, of a kind shown to be largely without foundation by Barr's 'Semantics of Biblical Language' (London, 1961) and it surely remains to be shown that 'memorial', in its biblical context, carries these overtones of what might be called revivification"⁽²⁾

It has already been noted above however that Childs reaches a position on this point that is substantially similar to Professor Jones' view, although Childs bases his work on Barr rather than on Federsen.

(1) Jones, art.cit.

(2) Hickling, Liturgical Review, May 1975., p.26

A different criticism is made by Alan Richardson:

"It is perhaps a pity that the author (Prof. Jones) does not entertain the possibility that a phrase such as εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν may contain not merely one meaning but several meanings and several reminiscences and overtones of different biblical themes and passages."⁽¹⁾

In 1975 G.D. Kilpatrick reviewed the evidence and re-assessed the meaning of ἀνάμνησις. He began by examining the work of Dom Gregory Dix and Jeremias. Dix⁽²⁾ favoured an interpretation of anamnesis as meaning 're-presentation'. Kilpatrick disallows this interpretation claiming that no support can be found for it.⁽³⁾

Jeremias began his study of anamnesis by remarking that whether or not the words 'Do this in remembrance of me' (1 Cor. 11.24f) were the ipsissima verba of Jesus, the early Church clearly acted as if they were:

"....the early community, apparently from the very beginning, met regularly for common meals and so continued the daily table fellowship of Jesus with his disciples. The question naturally arises as to whether in this the Church was obeying the command of Jesus to repeat the rite, or whether it is not much more likely that the mealtimes themselves gave rise to the command, which was then read back onto the lips of Jesus"⁽⁴⁾

Jeremias considers the command of repetition and remembrance in the light first of the Hellenistic funeral meals of the ancient classical world, and secondly of Palestinian memorial formulae. Lietzmann concluded that the words 'Do this in remembrance of me' have clear analogies with the funeral meals of Hellenism. In this case the Last Supper:

(1) A. Richardson, op.cit., f.n.p.368

(2) G. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, Dacre Press 1945 p.245

(3) G.D. Kilpatrick, Anamnesis, Liturgical Review, May 1975, pp. 35-40.

(4) Jeremias, op.cit., p.237

"assumes the character of a 'meal of remembrance' for one departed, and thereby ranks distinctly as a type of the religious meals that were customary everywhere in the Graeco-Roman world."⁽¹⁾

Thus in Lietzmann's view,

"the formula 'in remembrance' would be an indication that the Lord's Supper, under Hellenistic influences, was completely transformed: from the daily repeated table fellowship with Jesus (ancient Palestinian form of the Lord's Supper) it became, under the influence of Hellenistic meals in memory of the dead, the festival in commemoration of the dead (Pauline form of the Lord's Supper)!"⁽²⁾

It has already been suggested above that Lietzmann's "Two Supper" theory is untenable as it stands. Jeremias rejects his interpretation of anamnesis on the following grounds:

(1) In many of the texts, most important for establishing Lietzmann's theory, the word *μνημεν* or *ἀναμνησιν* has to be supplied.

(2) The construction *εἰς ἀναμνησιν* is completely absent from any of the inscriptions, the nearest equivalent being *εἰς μνημεν* which occurs only twice and has no reference to a memorial meal.

(3) Not in one of the five instances of an endowment *εἰς μνημεν* or *μνημεν* is a memorial meal explicitly mentioned. 'It is only in the Latin inscriptions that we find repeatedly in connection with the institution of memorial meals, the construction in memoria, ad memoria, ob memoria, of the actual person or another.'⁽³⁾

(1) Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, p.182, cited Jeremias, *op.cit.*, p.239

(2) Jeremias, *op.cit.*, p.239

(3) *ibid.*

(4) the Cultic commemorative meals were not celebrated, as Leitzmann erroneously supposed, on the anniversary of the death of the departed, but as a rule were 'annual birthday celebrations',⁽¹⁾ and increasingly became mere secular excuses for a banquet.

Jeremias' own interpretation of ἀνάμνησις may be summarized as follows:

(1) The formula εἰς ἀνάμνησιν (and its equivalents εἰς μνημόσυνον, in memoriam, and the Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents) is found several times in the OT, was used frequently in the Judaism of NT times, and is found with 'extraordinary frequency' in late Judaism.⁽²⁾

(2) in LXX usage, and NT Judaism, the most common usage of εἰς ἀνάμνησιν is with God as subject.⁽³⁾

(3) εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, understood as having a Godward-reference, always has a two-fold significance:

- (a) that something is brought before God, and
- (b) that God may remember - either in mercy or in punishment - and such remembrance is never mere remembrance, but always 'an effecting and creating event'.⁽⁴⁾

On the basis of anamnesis having a 'Godward reference' Jeremias interprets 1 Cor. 11.24 as being a prayer that God may remember Jesus. Jeremias takes τοῦτο as referring to the breaking of the bread and ἐμὴν as an objective genitive⁽⁵⁾ and so the phrase means:

(1) *ibid.*, p.242

(2) *ibid.*, p.246 For a summary of the evidence concerning the use of εἰς ἀνάμνησιν (and //s) in OT, NT and later Judaism, *op.cit.*, pp.244-246v. Jeremias,

(3) For evidence v. Jeremias, *op.cit.*, p.246ff.

(4) One example of this must suffice. Numbers 5.15 reads: '...for it is a meal offering of jealousy, a meal offering of memorial (θυσία μνημόσυνου), bringing iniquity to remembrance (ἀναμνησκουσα ἁμαρτίαν)'. Jeremias takes this as meaning: 'The sin itself is "re-called" before God by means of the sin-offering, is represented before him, the past thus becoming present before God'. Jeremias, *op.cit.*p.248.

(5) *ibid.* p.251 and f.n.

".....'that I may be remembered'....The only question is: Who should remember Jesus? The usual interpretation, according to which it is the disciples who should remember, is strange. Was Jesus afraid that the disciples would forget him? But this is not the only possible interpretation, indeed it is not even the most obvious In the OT and Palestinian memorial formulae it is almost always God who remembers. In accordance with this the command for repetition may be translated 'This do, that God may remember me'.⁽¹⁾

Jeremias' interpretation of anamnesis ends up by being very close to that of Dix - except that the former places a greater emphasis on the eschatological nature of the Lord's Supper. Dix argues⁽²⁾ that the liberals of the 19th century who rejected the command of remembrance and repetition as unhistorical, were missing the whole point of the command. They were not commands to ensure the repetition of the rite - since such a repetition was the one thing which could already be assured, whether Jesus gave a command or not⁽³⁾. Rather by his commands Jesus gave the already existing rite a new interpretation in terms of his own sacrificial death, so that by means of repetition of the rite God could be 'memorialized' i.e. through the eucharistic action we re-present or plead before God the Lord's atoning death. Jeremias makes substantially the same point:

(1) *ibid.*

(2) Dix., *op.cit.*, p.67

(3) Dix., *op.cit.*, p.58: 'What our Lord did at the Last Supper, then, was not to establish any new rite. He attached to the two corporate acts which were sure to be done when his disciples met in the future - the only two things which He could be sure they would do together regularly in any case - a quite new meaning which had a special connection with His own impending death.'

"...the death of the Lord is not proclaimed at every celebration of the meal as a past event but as an eschatological event, as the beginning of the New Covenant. The proclamation of the death of Jesus is not therefore intended to call to the remembrance of the community the event of the Passion; rather this proclamation expresses the vicarious death of Jesus as the beginning of the salvation time and prays for the coming of the consummation. As often as the death of the Lord is proclaimed at the Lord's Supper, and the maranatha rises upwards, God is reminded of the unfulfilled climax of the work of salvation, until (the goal is reached that) he comes."⁽¹⁾

Kilpatrick questions such an interpretation of anamnesis and suggests that Jeremias does not seem to consider sufficiently that the command of anamnesis may possibly be secondary material. Instead Kilpatrick argues that anamnesis can have only a manward-reference - and can refer only to Christ's death (and not as in later liturgy to the major events of the Ministry, Passion and even to the Parousia⁽²⁾). Thus Kilpatrick argues on the basis of *καταγγελλετε* (1 Cor. 11.26) that Paul interprets *ἀναμνησις* as 'proclamation'. Hence *τοῦτο ποιεε* means 'Do this to proclaim my death'.

"The evidence of Christian liturgy in the ancient Church suggests that in marked contrast to the Latin canon and most liturgies of the sixteenth and subsequent centuries this proclamation of the death of Jesus forms the core of the Eucharistic prayer."⁽³⁾

(1) Jeremias, *op.cit.*, p.253.

(2) Kilpatrick criticises Jeremias' future interpretation of anamnesis as contradicting the nature of the Eucharist as a vehicle for God's present activity. Wainwright (*op.cit.* p.66) rightly (I believe) reminds us that while we may draw distinctions in the activity of God between present and future we are not allowed to oppose them one to the other.

(3) Kilpatrick *op.cit.*

Such stress on the proclamation of the death of Jesus is certainly Pauline, at least as far as the evidence in 1 Cor. takes us. But is it quite fair to Paul? As we said above, Paul is not writing theology - he is dealing pragmatically with a particular problem. If we compare the situation of the agape meal/Eucharist at Corinth with that in the Didache (in which no reference to Christ's death is made) is it not possible (especially in light of the Two Suppers theory) to suggest that Paul in 1 Cor. 11.26 is laying especial stress on the proclamation of the atoning death of Christ so as to make the point that the Corinthian 'fellowship-meal' is missing the whole point of what it is meant to signify and symbolise i.e. the fellowship meal of the forgiven people of God united in the New Covenant by Christ's blood. In other words, at a time when words in liturgy were essentially unfixed, passages such as the Didache take the death of Christ for granted as the background and root cause of Eucharist. Paul in 1 Cor., in much the same way, takes for granted the results of the atoning death of Christ (Resurrection, eternal life, Parousis) but places the whole Eucharist meal into a balanced practical and theological perspective, founded on the central fact of the saving death of Christ. The main difficulties raised by Kilpatrick's interpretation of anamnesis would seem to be:

- (1) It rests on an interpretation of a semi-technical word meaning 'to proclaim a religious or theological message'. But, as Kilpatrick himself admits, there are no unequivocal examples for such a use.
- (2) It seems hard to draw any clear distinction between the various interpretations of anamnesis put forward respectively by Dix, Jeremias and Kilpatrick. The basic question still seems to receive uncertain answers: to whom is the 'remembering' addressed? Kilpatrick's attempt to give it solely a manward reference seems

too flimsy to be maintained without further evidence.

This criticism does not however rule out a manward reference. On the contrary the work of Jones and Kilpatrick suggests that there is good grounds for accepting a manward reference as one strand in the correct interpretation of anamnesis. As Jones points out the use of anamnesis at Mk. 14.9 seems to point particularly strongly to a manward reference.

Kasemann⁽¹⁾ would substantially go along with Kilpatrick's interpretation, and himself makes much of Mk. 14.9 as having a 'manward reference'. He too interprets ἀνάμνησις with reference to καταγγελεῖν and suggests that part of the difficulty is caused by the translation of ἀνάμνησις as 'remembrance' which he sees as too weak. He compares the use of ἀνάμνησις in Paul's Institution Narrative with the use of ἀνάμνησις as the 'memorial' made during the recitation of the Passover haggadah.

"When the primitive Church inferred from the command to repeat the actions (and especially from the concluding words) the necessity of adding the so-called Anamnesis to the Words of Institution, it also gave expression to a conception of ἀνάμνησις which saw it as complete only when it issued in a confession of faith."⁽²⁾

In support of this interpretation Kasemann notes that LXX Ps. 110.3f uses ἐξομολογησῖς and μνησὶν ποιεῖν as parallel terms. Nonetheless I think that the same criticism of Kasemann's interpretation may be made as for that of Kilpatrick and Jones, namely that the evidence for interpreting anamnesis solely with a manward reference is too slim for complete confidence.

It becomes necessary to bring this examination of the interpretation to a close, and to attempt to draw

(1) Kasemann op.cit.

(2) ibid.

some conclusions on which we may base our own understanding of the term, as it relates to Paul and to the early Church. The discussion has centred around two polarities:

- (1) Anamnesis as bearing a 'Godward reference' i.e. in the Eucharist God is 'reminded' of the saving work of Christ.
- (2) Anamnesis as bearing a 'Manward reference' i.e. the Eucharist is a proclamation to man of the saving work of Christ.

Stated baldly in this way the discussion seems to take on a new dimension, for surely neither understanding is adequate on its own in terms of theology, psychology or semantics.

If Jeremias (and others such as Otto Casel and Max Thurian) really mean to suggest that the Church's role in the Eucharist is the 'remind God' of his Messiah in the sense of adopting a mediatory role, then Professor Jones is surely correct to sound the alarm! The Mystery of Redemption celebrated in the Eucharist is nothing if not the celebration of God's gracious movement in Christ towards sinful man. In this sense the anamnesis in the Eucharist is a proclamation to man of the atonement wrought in Christ.

On the other hand, the Eucharist is not the proclamation of a dead Jesus. It is, in Paul's own term, a proclamation of 'Christ's death until he comes'. It is the proclamation of the Risen Christ whose Parousia is looked for by his faithful people. So in this sense it becomes also a prayer to God, a 'remembrance' to God, that 'His Kingdom may come'. And so, through the anamnesis, the Eucharist is a foretaste of the Parousia, it is an eschatological event in which

'Every generation remembers and so shares
in the same redemptive time'.⁽¹⁾

so that the saving work of Christ is re-presented and becomes here and now operative⁽²⁾ or, as Kilmartin writes:

(1) Childs, op.cit., p.54

(2) Dix, op.cit., p.51

"The redemptive activity unfolded in an historical event of the past is rendered present here and now in a sacramental manner of existence."⁽¹⁾

It is only through the sacrifice of Christ, of which in the Eucharist we make anamnesis and proclamation, that we have access to the Father. It is through the Sacrifice of Christ our High Priest that the New Covenant is established. So in the eucharistic anamnesis the Church offers itself through Christ to the Father. Thus there is no danger of the Church being seen as holding some kind of mediating position between Christ and the Father, rather the whole point is that Christ is the One Mediator between God and Man. Thus we seek to hold together both Godward and Manward references when interpreting the anamnesis. Support for this comes from von Rad who writes:

'...it was Israel's belief that Jahweh's turning towards her in salvation was not exhausted in historical deeds and in the gracious guidance of individual lives, but that in the sacrificial cult too he had ordained an instrument which opened up to her a continuous relationship with him.'⁽²⁾

If for a moment we forget scholarly argument and ask 'What is in the mind of a devout Christian - ancient or modern - during the 'remembrance' of Christ made in the Eucharist?!, is it not possible to argue that the answer would be given in terms recognisable as containing both a Manward and a Godward reference? Firstly, Christ's life and death are recalled, and we become aware also of all that Christ our Saviour has done for us. This is clearly a manward reference. But then we are led on by feelings of thankfulness and trust to pray to the Father - and our prayer is made 'through Christ' of whom memorial is being made. Thus our 'intercession is made 'through'

(1) Kilmartin op.cit., p.54

(2) G.von Rad, Old Testament Theology, vol I (trans.D.M.G. Stalker), Oliver and Boyd, p.260

the sacrifice of Christ made once for all upon the cross - this sacrifice, of which we are making anamnesis, is our only ground of approach through Christ to the Father. Thus anamnesis has for us also a 'Godward' reference. Thus do we have 'good news' to proclaim to the world.

Whiteley comments:

'...εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν means that God is to remember the Messiah: or that Christians are to remember the Messiah: in either case the object is that the Messiah should be vitally active in the midst of the congregation, and that the purpose for which he was raised up by God should be accomplished.'⁽¹⁾

It seems to me that this approach to anamnesis has links also with the theme of symbol and reality. The 'manward-reference' of anamnesis, the proclamation of the Gospel, is in fact a symbol of the reality of salvation. Without a commitment of faith both by preacher and hearer the proclamation of the gospel is at best 'mere history', a record of past events which can have little or no relevance to today. Once the commitment of faith is made then the symbol becomes reality. The mere words of the proclamation become a vehicle of saving truth whereby, through the atoning work of Christ men are brought into a right relationship with the Father.

This discussion of anamnesis shows that Paul's thought about the Eucharist in 1 Cor. centred on the death of Christ, of which the Eucharist was a memorial to both God and Man, and in this sense formed part of the appropriation of the benefits of the Atonement wrought in Christ. The Eucharist is a proclamation to man and a 'memorializing' to God.

'There is an all-important distinction between offering a sacrifice and pleading a sacrifice... We do make the memorial which our Lord willed

(1) D.E.H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul, Blackwell, 1964, p.179.

us to make in the sight of God, for his sacrifice is our right of access to the Father. But "Do this" does not mean: "Offer this" nor does anamnesis mean a memorial offering to God. We cannot offer Christ, but we must be united with him in his death and resurrection....'(1)

THE CHRISTIAN PASSOVER?

Clearly the 'memorial' made in the Lord's Supper could well have links with the Passover memorial in that for Judaism the Passover was just such a memorial as was raised to God and man. Did Paul then believe the Last Supper to have been a Passover meal? And does the Passover play a role in his understanding of the Lord's Supper?

In 1 Cor. 11, Paul shows no sign of dating the Last Supper as a Passover. The only hint of chronology is that given in v.23:

"in the night in which he was betrayed."

This looks very much like 'liturgical writing' and, as Kasemann comments (2) is 'somewhat threadbare' as 'a purely historical reminiscence'. Indeed, in line with his interpretation of the Last Supper as a 'formulation of sacred law', Kasemann sees v.23 first as a solemn naming of Christ as the authority on which the eucharistic action is based, and second, as a formula defining the chronological legality of the Eucharist i.e. v. 23 ('in the night in which he was betrayed') forms the terminus a quo and v. 26('until he comes') as the terminus ad quem. This seems helpful and firmly establishes the eschatological nature of the Pauline Lord's Supper. But does this remove the possibility of having Passover nuances as well? It was the night on which the Messiah would come. It was the night on which anamnesis of the saving work of God was made -

(1) D.E.W. Harrison, *Common Prayer in the Church of England*, S.P.C.K. 1969., p.75

(2) Kasemann, *op.cit.*

and through the anamnesis, all the people of Israel down the ages shared eschatologically in God's act of rescue for his people. For the Jewish Qahal the saving moment of which anamnesis was made was the liberation from Egypt. For the Christian ecclesia anamnesis is made of Christ the Paschal Lamb.

Paul makes clear reference to the Passover sacrifice of Christ in 1 Cor. 5.7:

'For our Passover also has been sacrificed, even Christ.'

But is it correct to link this with Paul's doctrine of the Lord's Supper? Paul sees Christ as the Passover lamb which has been offered for us - but this sacrifice looks to the crucifixion and not to the Last Supper⁽¹⁾. 1 Cor. 5.7 sees the crucifixion as the true Christian Passover. Higgins⁽²⁾ notes that 1 Cor. 5.6-8 does not refer to the Eucharist as the Christian counterpart of the Passover, but rather describes the whole of the Christian life as a festival which must be celebrated with purity of conduct. At the same time Higgins argues that the identification of Christ with the Paschal Lamb (cp. Jn. 19.36; Pet. 1.19; Rev. 5.6) probably goes back to Christ's identification of himself with the Passover Lamb at the Last Supper, and hence is after all capable of bearing eucharistic reference. Further, the reference in 1 Cor. 15.20 to Christ as the 'first fruits' may be additional evidence for the identification of Christ with the Passover, and the Passover with the eucharistic understanding of Paul. In 1 Cor. 15.20 there may be an allusion to the offering of the 'first fruits' of a sheaf of barley on Nisan 16, the first day of the feast of unleavened bread (cp. Mk. 14.12). In addition it may be noted that Paul's primary understanding of the eucharistic

(1) It would seem that Paul may support the Johannine dating of the crucifixion, or, perhaps even more importantly, may share a Johannine understanding of the crucifixion by which Jesus is seen as the true Passover lamb offered for us.

(2) Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the NT., ch.6

anamnesis is in terms of the death of Christ. Thus it may well be correct to see the Lord's Supper as representing the Christian Passover.

THE NEW COVENANT IN CHRIST'S BLOOD

If there is a link in Paul's thought between the Passover and the Lord's Supper it rests, I think, on the concept of the New Covenant in Christ:

'This cup is the new covenant in my blood'

(1 Cor. 11.25)

Paul sees the Lord's Supper as establishing the New Covenant (δικαθικη), a covenant, which like the old covenant at Sinai, is made in blood (αιματι). The reference to δικαθικη is rich in OT allusions. First there is the Sinaitic covenant (Ex. 24) where Moses took the blood of the victims and sprinkled it over the people. The LXX version of Moses' words reads:

ἵδου τὸ αἷμα τῆς δικαθικῆς (Ex. 24.8)

This has clear parallels with the cup words as recorded by Paul.

Millard has argued that there are some echoes of the ancient covenant scheme in 1 Cor. This takes the shape: preamble, historical prologue, stipulations, blessings and curses - and 'all covenants were largely concerned with the conduct of the subject party'⁽¹⁾ This ethical aspect of the covenant is represented in 1 Cor. by the instructions and admonitions concerning Christian behaviour.

'The Lord's Supper stressed the covenant standing of the disciple of Jesus. Perhaps especial weight lies on the Judas connotation of the words "in the night in which he was betrayed" (11.23) in the light of the Corinthians' lax behaviour there and possible incurrance of guilt (11.27). In ancient times the obligated party laid his hands upon

(1) Millard, Covenant and Communion in 1. Cor.

the sacrificial victim, identifying his fate with that of the animal should he break his oathWhile many major aspects of Jesus' death cannot be compared with the ancient covenant forms, this one may, and Paul undoubtedly had it in mind at this juncture, as commentators point out, referring principally to Ex. 24 and the Passover.'⁽¹⁾

The main difficulties with this are that the Passover Lamb of Ex. 12 (cp. 1 Cor. 5.7) is not the same as the Sinaitic Covenant sacrifice, nor was the Passover Lamb understood to be expiatory. On the other hand Paul would seem to have had the Passover in mind at 1 Cor. 5.7, and the Sinai covenant in mind at 1 Cor. 11.25. It seems possible that he had in fact, at least in his own mind, made some sort of synthesis between the two, around the Lord's Supper. What is to be made of this?

It is possible perhaps to argue that later Judaism saw the whole Passover-Exodus event as the foundation of the Sinaitic Covenant, just as the NT writers and commentators see the Crucifixion-Resurrection-Parousia as one 'event' in establishing the new covenant in Christ. In support of this interpretation we may point to Ps. 136 which sees the whole work of God from creation, through Passover and Exodus and on to the settlement of Israel as one mighty act of God - the heilsgechichte for which we are to give thanks to God, 'for his mercy endureth for ever.' Another example of this unitive approach may be found in Ps. 105. Paul's words in 1 Cor. 10 seem to point towards a similar understanding when he links the rites of baptism and Eucharist with the exodus and the wilderness wanderings:

'.... our fathers were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did

(1) Millard, *ibid.* p.244

all eat the same spiritual drink for they drank of a spiritual rock that followed them: and the rock was Christ.'

- 1 Cor. 10, 1-4

It would surely have been impossible for a Jew to have written such a passage without some thought of the Passover and Sinai covenant in the background? Hence it seems correct to conclude that the Passover forms one strand in Paul's interpretation of the Lord's Supper as the means of sharing in the New Covenant wrought in Christ's blood. But this is not the only influence upon Paul's interpretation.

'The symbolism of the bread and wine come directly from the Jewish Passover ceremony, whether the Last Supper itself was or was not a Passover meal But we must be on our guard against interpreting either the Last Supper or the Christian Eucharist exclusively in terms of the Passover'.⁽¹⁾

The fact is that the phrase 'the new covenant' does not merely recall the Sinai covenant; it also reminds us of the 'new covenant' of Jer., 31.31-34, a covenant

'not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers on the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt..'

but a covenant made

'in their inward parts, and in their hearts', a covenant by which the Lord will forgive iniquity and remember sin no more. This suggests that in the Lord's Supper, the proclamation of the death of the Lord, Paul also sees a proclamation of the forgiveness of sin, a forgiveness wrought by the shedding of Christ's blood ('the new covenant in my blood') and hence the source of the new and risen life of the Christian, now with a new ethical law, one that is written 'in the heart'.

(1) Richardson, op.cit.

In the exodus covenant (Ex. 24.3-8) Moses sprinkled blood both on the altar and on the people, thus signifying that God and man were joined in a covenant relation brought about by the shedding of blood. Thus the main emphasis of the 'covenant-blood' was neither expiatory nor propitiatory, but, if the term be allowed, 'sacramental', i.e. significant of the concrete relationship established in the covenant between God and his people. Hence Paul sees the New Covenant as significant of the new relationship between God and man brought about by the death of Christ and symbolised by the eucharistic bread and wine - the body and blood of Christ.

The Passover blood then was a 'memorial of a covenant relationship conceived of as already in existence' and 'designed to recall this relationship and thereby make it effective.'⁽¹⁾ Through the Passover, salvation was brought to Israel, just as through Christ our New Passover (1 Cor.5.7) salvation comes to the new Israel. (Gal. 6.16). Through Christ's death proclaimed anew in the life of the Church, and particularly by the worshipping community at the Lord's Supper ('until he comes'), God establishes a new relationship of forgiveness (Eph. 1.7; Rom. 5.9) and peace (Col.1.20; Eph. 2.13, 17; c.p. Rom. 5.9)

'St. Paul clearly believed that just as a positive relationship with God was established by the Mosaic covenant, and as this relationship was maintained by the worship of Judaism, so the new relationship with God, made possible through the work of Christ, and accepted by each individual in faith-baptism, was confirmed and maintained in the Lord's Supper.'⁽²⁾

Thus we discover that for Paul the Lord's Supper is a tangible declaration of the gospel, a visible, sacramental demonstration of the good news that:

(1) Whiteley, op.cit., p.140 - and see pp.139ff generally for this paragraph.

(2) ibid. p.183

'God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.'

- Rom. 5.8. (1)

This is the great reality demonstrated by the symbol of Eucharist.

'THIS IS MY BODY....'

We must now go on to enquire precisely what Paul understood by the words 'This is my body which is for you' and the New Covenant 'in my blood' (11.24f.). Also, what does he mean by 'discerning not the body' (v. 29)? Here we must bear in mind that any suggestion of drinking blood would, because of most strict prohibition in the Law, have been quite abhorrent to any Jew (quite apart from any possible cannibalistic overtones). And yet Paul speaks of the bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ, and (v.26) he goes on to speak of eating the bread and drinking the cup. What does he understand by the bread and cup words? The first step is to examine 1 Cor. 10. 1-5 and 16 - 22.

1 Cor. 10, 1-5 and 16-22.

Paul's purpose in writing to the Corinthians is mainly practical and here he is dealing with the problem of meat offered to idols (v. 20). This problem has first been raised in Ch. 8, but there was interrupted by an excursus on Paul's apostleship which serves as an example to the stronger brethren not to 'stand on their rights'. (2)

Paul's argument in Ch. 10 may be summarized as follows:

The Israelites received their counterpart to baptism:

(1) Lietzmann's point that Paul places especial (renewed in the face of the problems at Corinth?) emphasis on the death of Christ is thus substantiated without assuming his 'Two Suppers' theory. V. Taylor writes 'What Paul did was to lay renewed emphasis on the remembrance of the death of Christ, which was already present, but which at Corinth was in danger of being forgotten' (V. Taylor, Expository Times, Vol LXIII, no 12 (2) V. Taylor, *ibid.* Sept. 1952)

in the crossing of the sea (1 Cor. 10. 1f)⁽¹⁾, and of the Eucharist in the rock from which they drank - which rock being Christ - and the meat in the wilderness which they ate (v.3f.)⁽²⁾ However these sacramental antetypes were no guarantee of final salvation (10.5); so, just as the Israelites fell in the wilderness, so can the Christian fall from grace (10. 5, 9). Hence, reception of the sacraments is not in itself a final guarantee of salvation. He who received the sacraments must still obey God's Law (10. 6-13). This applies particularly to the problems of Christians wishing to eat meat that has been offered to idols (10.24ff.). Paul maintains that the Christian cannot share in both pagan and Christian meals:

'Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils' (10. 21)

Paul's objections thus rest on his understanding of the nature of the Lord's Supper and what is received therein, namely the body and blood of the Lord.

1 Cor. 10.16 refers to the cup and the bread as providing a sharing (*κοινωνία*) in the blood and the body of Christ. Verse 17 develops this thought:

'Seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread'.

Christians in receiving the body, not only have a *κοινωνία* in the body but actually, in some way, are that body (cp. Ro.12.5). Kasemann⁽³⁾ argues that in this passage Paul is giving his own interpretation of the tradition i.e. in Ch. 11 Paul recalls the Corinthians to the fons et origo of the rite of the Lord's Supper, but in Ch. 10 he is developing and explaining that tradition.

A closer examination of 10.16f. makes Kasemann's hypothesis seem most probable. Here Paul tries to prove

(1) cp. Ex.13. 21; 14. 21f; Ps.105. 39; Wisc. 10.17; 19. 7.

(2) cp. Ex.17. 6., Num.20. 2-13.

(3) Kasemann cp.cit.

to the Corinthians that they should not eat meat offered to idols. So, in typical Pauline style, he asks them a rhetorical question:

'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion (κοινωνία) of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion (κοινωνία) of the body of Christ?'

These must be 'questions expecting the answer "yes"' since otherwise they would lose all point in Paul's argument. But from this point on Paul no longer asks questions, but now develops his argument from the common ground assumed in 10.16. Paul can apparently assume that the Corinthians hold firmly that in some sense the cup and bread of the Eucharist provide a κοινωνία in the blood and body of Christ; he goes on to argue that we ARE the body of Christ and that therefore it is inappropriate (to say the least) for Christians to share in any way in good offered to idols, which, although countless Christians put no faith in them, are nevertheless worshipped at these meals when, their worshippers believe, some sort of 'sharing' occurs between idol and idolator (vv.18ff). Thus from the eucharistic κοινωνία of the body of Christ stems the concept that Christians are the body of Christ.⁽¹⁾ Those who participate (κοινωνία) in the blood of Christ appropriate for themselves the benefits of Christ's sacrificial death (Rom.3. 25; 5. 9); they have communion with Christ who is dead and risen, because they are ready to share his suffering. We may compare Rom. 8.17: 'we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him', and we may remember that in the New Covenant in Christ's blood sins are no more remembered

(1) This is why, according to Kasemann, Paul uses a sequence of cup-bread, blood-body in this passage. Hence it is not to be interpreted as evidence for an early rite in which the more usual liturgical bread-cup sequence was reversed, but here is mentioned in this unusual order simply so that Paul can the more easily make the point - from the one loaf - that from the eucharistic koinonia Christians are the body of Christ. All the same, the evidence of texts such as the Lukan Western text and the Didache, where also is the order cup-bread, may suggest that the order was not fixed at a very primitive stage.

(Jer. 31.34). Thus in 10. 1-5 Paul links Baptism and Eucharist, and, by means of the Rabbinic tradition, gives them an OT background⁽¹⁾, thus being able to pursue his main theme that Christians are the body of Christ (10.17).

What then does Paul mean by the phrase 'the body of Christ'? Whiteley⁽²⁾ summarizes Paul's use of the phrase under four heads:

- 1) the body of the man Jesus in his earthly life (Gal.6. 17)
- 2) the resurrection body of Christ (1 Cor.15.44)
- 3) the Church (Col.1. 24, 28; 2. 19; Eph.1. 23; 5. 30; Rom.12. 4f.; 1 Cor.6. 15, 10. 17; 12. 22-27)
- 4) the eucharistic body (1 Cor.10. 16f; 11. 24; 27, 29).

Paul uses the word *σῶμα* in 72 places, and 64 of these have the Hebraic sense of 'the whole man'.⁽³⁾ Hook makes the point that Paul would appear quite deliberately to have chosen the word *σῶμα* in preference to *σῶψ* when referring both to the eucharistic food and to the Church as the body of Christ.⁽⁴⁾ He believes this to have been because *σῶψ* in LXX usage would appear to have had very 'earthy' overtones i.e. to have represented 'body' considered as that which is set against God, rather than as part of the divine and good creation. In this respect we note Dalman's suggestion that the Aramaic lying behind *σῶμα* may have been guph rather than bisri (Heb. basar) since

(1) Higgins for example refers to Ex.17. 6; Num.21. 16; 20. 7ff, and several Targums, e.g. Pseudo-Jonathan, Sukkah3.11.

(2) Whiteley, op.cit., p.197.

(3) F.J. Taylor, art., Body, TWBE.: 'In the first place the word signifies the natural body of man (Prov.5. 11; Dan.4.33; 1 Cor.15. 44) constituted by the creative act of God (Gen.1. 2) adapted to the conditions of earthly life (1 Cor.12.12; 15. 38), and therefore as bearing the sign-manual of divine handiwork, not to be despised as in some way inferior to the soul or a hindrance to the higher life of man. On the contrary, for Heb. thought (unlike Ek. - Gnosticism was a Gk. not a Heb. heresy) the body was to be revered (1 Cor.6. 15-19; cf. Jn. 2. 21). For this reason it was possible to use the word with the meaning of self, person, personality, or whole man; and indeed neither Heb. nor Gk. had words to express these concepts.'

(4) N. Hook, The Eucharist in the NT, Epworth Press, 1964, p.67f.

bisri (? = σαρξ) indicated man considered in his earthly aspect rather than as part of God's creation, while guph (? = σωμα)

'.... is used of a person in contrast to his possessions or of an animal in contrast to its fleshly parts, or, of a person in contrast to his representative.'⁽¹⁾

On this basis Hook notes:

'If then the Greek σωμα is understood in terms of Hebrew thought, the dominical word will mean 'This represents my self' in which case the eating of the bread within the context of the new rite is the instrumental sign of Christ's presence. This links up with the old rite, for just as the eating of the food in that context of remembrance had meant a consciousness of the presence of God, so the eating of the bread in this new context would mean a consciousness of the presence of Christ.'⁽²⁾

Apart from the clear eucharistic references in 1 Cor., Paul's main use of the phrase 'the body' occurs in 1 Cor. 12. Here he is dealing with the problem of spiritual gifts and the divisions which they (among other reasons) seem to have caused in the Church at Corinth (cp. 1 Cor. 1. 10ff). Paul uses the metaphor of a human body (12. 12.) of which each member has need of all the other members (12. 14-26). There should be no divisions in the body of Christ, which is what all Christians are (v. 27). We enter this body through baptism:

'For in one spirit we were all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit.'^(v. 13)

This phrase, 'καὶ πάντες ἐν πνεύματι ἐκοινοῦμεν' (12. 13) may be compared with 10.4: 'καὶ πάντες τοῦ αὐτοῦ πνευματικὸν ἐπιποιοῦμεν'. It is also noteworthy that both Chs. 10 and 12 are concerned with divisions among Christians at Corinth, both base their appeal on the sacramental experience of the Corinthians, (10. 1-5, 16; cp. 12. 13), both refer to the body of Christ

(1) Hook, *ibid.* p.69

(2) *ibid.*, p.68

(10. 16f., cp. 11. 23, 27). It may be possible then that the phrase 'the body of Christ' in Ch. 12 contains a reference to the eucharistic body of Christ as well as being a metaphor for the Church as the body of Christ. Rawlinson ⁽¹⁾ argues that it was the phrase 'the body of Christ' used with reference to the Eucharist and to the koinonia experienced by the Christians then, which in turn gave rise to the use of the metaphor 'the body of Christ' as used of the Church. It does seem that Paul makes a link between the body of Christ in the Eucharist and the Church as the body of Christ, and this link is the 'πνεῦμα' (10. 4; 12. 13) given to Church members in the twin sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist. Thus the gift of the eucharistic 'body' is a κοινωνία in the very person of Christ, a κοινωνία in the πνεῦμα of Christ. Hence an understanding of πνευματικός as used in 1 Cor. 10. 1-5 should throw further light on Paul's understanding of the nature of the eucharistic gift.

'AND ALL ATE THE SPIRITUAL FOOD'

'Πνευματικός' is the adjective from the noun 'πνεῦμα' which is the LXX equivalent for 'ruach'. 'Ruach' started with the basic meaning of 'wind' (1 Kgs. 18. 45; Ps. 103. 16; Jer. 4. 11). Later, possibly under Stoic influence, it came to refer to the vital 'stuff' of existence, and hence to God, thought of as the source of all life (Gen. 6. 17; Job. 34. 14f; 2 Thess. 2. 8; Jb. 2. 26; Rev. 11. 11; 13. 15). In particular the 'πνεῦμα' of God came to refer to God in himself considered as the Creator and fount of dynamic activity. ⁽²⁾ We may perhaps draw a parallel between this latter use of 'πνεῦμα' and the use of 'σῶμα' (=σῶμα) to refer to the 'essential self' of Christ.

Paul sees the Christian as living in the age of the Spirit:

'But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit,
if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.'

- Rom. 8. 9.

(1) Rawlinson, op.cit., cp. also Kilmartin, op.cit. p.83

(2) For further refs. v. Johnson, art. Spirit, TWBE

In the eschatological time between Resurrection and Parousia, the Spirit is bestowed on those who repent and believe (Gal.3. 2; Rom.1. 16; 3. 1-6; 5. 1,5; 8. 2, 9, 11). The Spirit is given through the Risen Christ (2 Cor.3. 17). All Christians are in the Spirit (Rom.8. 9). Commenting on the phrase 'ἐν πνεύματι' (Rom.8. 9) Moulton states that while it is tempting to translate ἐν here as 'belonging to/with' (cp. the use of 'ἐν' in the Johannine epistles) the meaning is far more profound. 'ἐν' here refers to a 'state in which the believer moves' and may best be translated as 'in the sphere of'.⁽¹⁾ Thus the Christian, in the sphere of the Spirit, lives eschatologically. He lives in this world, but through Baptism by which he enters the state of being 'ἐν πνεύματι' the Christian has also already entered in some sense the life of the Age to Come. For Paul this is no Platonist 'idea' (though clearly capable of later neo-Platonist development) but an ontological reality.

Hence the phrases 'πνευματικὸν βρῶμα' and 'πνευματικὸν ποτὸν' (1 Cor.10. 3f) have the meaning of food and drink which effect an incorporation into the Age to Come through the Spirit mediated through the Risen Christ.⁽²⁾ Hence when in 1 Cor.10. 1-5 Paul refers to 'spiritual food and drink' the food is real food - but it is the food of the Age to Come. Through the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper we are assured of our participation in the New Covenant relationship which has been brought about by the sacrifice of Christ. At the Lord's Supper we are fed by the Risen Christ on his 'πνεῦμα' and he is eschatologically present with us.

From this it is possible to say that when Paul uses the phrase 'the body of Christ' in relation to the Eucharist

(1) Moulton, Grammar of NT Greek, Vol. III, Syntax

(2) Support for such an interpretation may perhaps be found in 2 Cor.13. 13, where Paul speaks of the 'Communion of the Holy Ghost', 'ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος'.

he is speaking neither purely metaphorically nor purely literally, but, relying on his understanding of 'πνευμα', is making a statement which is at once both ontological and eschatological, and can only be true in the Age of the Spirit - in which, at the Lord's Supper, we are present.⁽¹⁾ The phrase 'the body of Christ' in fact partakes of the nature of 'realized eschatology', in which the 'end' is both 'now' and 'not yet'.⁽²⁾ The body of Christ is that spiritual (yet totally real) reality into which we enter by Baptism, and in which we are sustained by Eucharist, and yet into which we have not yet entered fully by reason of our sinfulness and because the end is not yet. As so often, Paul shows us that 'the best is yet to be'.⁽³⁾

Such an interpretation of 'the body of Christ' shows that for Paul the eucharistic bread and wine were the vehicles of the Spirit. They are the means whereby we are assured that we are in the 'body of Christ'. The spiritual reality of the Lord's Supper is the gift of 'πνευμα' which is given by the symbols of bread and wine used in ἀναμνησις of the crucified, risen and present Lord. As Paul experienced this spiritual reality, he realized also the true depths of the sinfulness of the divisions within the one Christian body at Corinth. This would seem to be the meaning of 1 Cor. 11. 27:

'Whoever shall eat the bread and drink the cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.'

(1) cp. A. Cole, The Body of Christ, Christian Foundations 3, Hodder and Stoughton, 1964, where he argues, against Robinson and Mascall, that the body of Christ is a metaphor, being primarily an image of the Church referring to our common dependence on Christ and interdependence on one another. I think Cole is probably correct but my point here is that the 'eucharistic body of Christ' is not mere metaphor.

(2) Here may be compared the teaching in Colossians where we read that those who are raised with Christ are in fact those who are already in Christ now in this life, 'for ye died and your life is hid with Christ in God (Co. 3. 3v. also 2. 11-15, 3. 1-4, 3. 5-4. 6). Whether Colossians is a Pauline or not need not concern us here, but such an approach would seem to fit in with his teaching, if we have understood it, as contained in the genuine Paulines.

(3) Whiteley, op.cit., pp. 191ff.

This verse is explained by v.29: he drinks unworthily who does not discern the body. Various interpretations of these words have been offered, but the most likely one, in view of Paul's great practical concern over the divisions at Corinth and the whole setting of the Institution Narrative within the framework of Paul's criticism of these divisions, is that 'not discerning the body' (v.29) means 'eating and drinking the eucharistic food while in a state of division and disunity'. 11. 27, 29 also shows that Paul had no magical view of the Eucharist. The bread and wine of the Lord's Supper are the means of sharing in the New Covenant wrought through the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ; they are the vehicles of the Spirit whereby we are incorporated into the body of Christ. Such is their purpose - but mere reception in no way guarantees our salvation (11. 30), any more than the OT antetypes guaranteed the salvation of the Israelites (10. 1-13). We are called upon to 'discern the body' - to make an ethical response in thanksgiving for the sacrifice of Christ. There is no magical guarantee here.

It has been suggested however that 11.30 may suggest just such a magical view of the eucharistic food:

'For this cause (i.e. failure to discern the body) many among you are weak and sickly, and not a few asleep.'

In view of 10. 1-5 it seems unlikely that Paul is here suggesting a magical 'curse' brought about by unworthy reception of the Eucharist. Rather it is better to see, with Kasemann, that by eating and drinking unworthily the Corinthians have incurred the Judgement of God, which, as Whiteley notes⁽¹⁾ would naturally in the first century be interpreted in terms of illness and death. Perhaps what Paul is saying here is that the Corinthian Christians,

(1) Whiteley, op.cit., p.185.

who expect to be 'alive' in Christ in fact find themselves sick and dead - and no wonder, since they have failed to obey the ethical imperative that is the necessary concomitant of the New Covenant. Kilmartin writes:

'The fate of sinful Israel should serve as a lesson. Just as it was not enough for the Israelites to receive the spiritual food and drink provided by Yahweh and Christ, so it is not enough for the Corinthians to receive the sacraments. They are not magical instruments, but a gift which involves a task: living life conformed to the Law of God.'⁽¹⁾

SUMMARY

Paul teaches the following concerning the Lord's Supper:

- 1) The Lord's Supper is the anamnesis of Christ's saving work - it is a proclamation of the gospel of Christ.
- 2) Through the anamnesis of Christ made in the Eucharist we are able to receive our share in the salvation won for us by Christ.
- 3) The Lord's Supper is the eschatological celebration at which we are present with Christ and united in Him.
- 4) The Eucharist is the Christian Passover-Covenant. Our *κοινωνία* in and with Christ implies ethical demands, so that we preserve and build up the Christian fellowship.
- 5) The eucharistic food and drink are the pneumatological vehicles of the body and blood of Christ i.e. (v. point 2) we receive through faith the assurance of the gift of salvation, we receive the benefits won for us by Christ on the Cross.⁽²⁾

(1) Kilmartin, op.cit., p.76

(2) In the last section of this thesis, when examining the question of the interpretation of the *ἐπικλήσις*, I shall return to a discussion of the relationship between the work of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist. v.pp. 311ff.

Finally, with reference to the concept of a 'developmental' approach to Eucharistic doctrine, we may note that Paul in 1 Cor. places great stress on the death of Christ whereas it is possible (on the comparison of the Didache) that other interpretations placed emphasis on the Resurrection. This does not support the Two Suppers theory but it does suggest that at a very early stage the Church had different emphasis of eucharistic interpretation.

ST. MARK'S TEACHING ON THE EUCHARIST

Mark. 14. 17-26

This passage is Mark's account of the Institution Narrative. Our first task is to note the important differences between the account of the Institution as given by Paul and that of Mark.

1) The dating of the Last Supper

Mark clearly indicates that he believes the Last Supper to have been a Passover Meal, whereas Paul does not make so definite an identification. That Mark thinks the Last Supper was a Passover meal is evidenced by 14. 1f, 12, 16, 17, with their references to 'the feast of the Passover and unleavened bread', 'the feast', 'the first day of unleavened bread when they sacrifice the Passover', 'Where wilt thou that we go and made ready that thou mayest eat the Passover', 'where shall I eat the Passover with my disciples?', 'and when it was evening' (the Passover meal being essentially one that was eaten at night). Such evidence would seem clearly to indicate a Passover dating for the Last Supper in Mark. However, there is some evidence that Mark may have misunderstood his sources.

Mk. 14. 1f. states that 'the feast of the Passover and unleavened bread' was to take place 'after two days'. The first phrase is in itself somewhat confusing in that the 'feast of the Passover' (το πασχα) and 'the feast of unleavened bread' (τα ἄζυμα) were, originally at least, separate, and although by Jesus' time they were celebrated

almost concurrently, even so Mark's reference to 'the feast' (singular) does imply some misunderstanding.

More important are the words of the chief priests and the scribes:

'Not during the feast lest haply there be a tumult of the people' (v. 2)

Such a phrase is perfectly intelligible. The popular support Jesus had received during the Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem would be quite enough to make the priests fear a riot. But is not this exactly what they risked if Mark's dating is accepted? Far from NCT arresting him during the feast, it would seem that they arrested Jesus on the very Passover night (evening of Nisan 15) and crucified him on the first day of unleavened bread (Nisan 15). How does this accord with the words of 14.2?

Jeremias⁽¹⁾ defends Mark's chronology by arguing that 'εὐχρη' should not be translated as 'feast', but, (according to the usage of Jn. 7. 11, LXX Ps. 73(74).4) as 'festal assembly' or 'festal crowd'. It must be said however, that if Jeremias' suggestion be correct then 14.2 can no longer be seen as giving a precise chronological reference in its use of 'εὐχρη'. Nineham⁽²⁾ suggests that 14. 1f. contains sufficient confusion of understanding to suggest that Mark's sources did not necessarily maintain Markan chronology, and hence that originally there may not have been an identification of the Last Supper with the Passover Meal.

Finally, it is noteworthy that, despite Mark's apparently definite (if inaccurate) dating of the Last Supper as a Passover, he would seem to have made little if any use of the identification, either in his account of the Supper or in any interpretation thereof.

2) Differences of wording between Mark and Paul

There are several verbal differences between Mark 14. 22-25 and 1 Cor. 11. 23-26.

(1) Jeremias, op.cit., p.71.

(2) D.E. Nineham, Saint Mark, Pelican NT Commentaries, 1969

These may be summarized:

a) Mk. 14.22 clearly places the Institution Narrative in the context of a meal:

'and as they were eating'. Paul has no such introduction, though he does note that Jesus took the cup 'after supper'. This may perhaps indicate that, in this respect at least, Paul's account represents an earlier form of the tradition than Mark's, since, according to Dix ⁽¹⁾ the order for a formal Jewish meal was:

'relishes (cp. 14. 20), grace (εὐλογεῖν Mk. 14. 22; εὐχαριστεῖν 1 Cor. 11. 23), taking of bread (λαβὼν ἄρτον Mk. 14. 22; ἔλαβεν ἄρτον 1 Cor. 11. 23), breaking of bread (ἔκλασεν Mk. 14. 22; 1 Cor. 11. 24) and distribution (ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς Mk. 14. 22).

After this comes the meal proper, each course being accompanied with its own blessing. At the end of the meal, the diners wash their hands (as they had also done earlier after the 'relishes', and then came a 'benediction' (εὐχαριστεῖν Mk. 14. 23) over a special cup of wine (ποτηριον Mk. 14. 23; 1 Cor. 11. 25) which, after the president had sipped from it, was handed to all (ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς Mk. 14. 23).

Paul's note concerning 'taking the cup after supper' would fit in well with such a scheme, and may well indicate that in Paul's day the original order had not been entirely obliterated. Dix sees here an original seven-fold action (taking bread, giving thanks, breaking, distribution together with words of interpretation, taking of cup, giving thanks, distribution together with words of interpretation). This original seven-fold scheme was, as early as Paul, on the way to being streamlined into the

(1) Dix op.cit. He believes the Last Supper to have been a haburah meal, though such an identification (much disputed) makes no difference to the accuracy of his description of the order of the meal, even if it were a Passover meal, or (as Dix himself is prepared to suggest) a 'formal religious' meal.

classical liturgical four-fold shape (offertory of bread and wine together, thanksgiving over bread and wine together, breaking of bread, distribution of bread and wine together). This streamlining was made possible by the removal of the meal between the bread and the cup. It is in the reference to the cup 'after supper' that Paul may represent a stage nearer the primitive form, while Mark represents a more 'liturgical' account. (1)

b) Mk.14.22 uses εὐλογεῖν over the bread; 1 Cor.11.24 uses εὐχαριστεῖν . In v.23 Mark uses εὐχαριστεῖν . In itself this is a minor variation since both words can be used as equivalents, both being translations of the Hebrew 'berakah' ('blessing'). (2) It is of interest to note, however, that Audet, on the basis of an examination of the form of Jewish berakoth, believes that each benediction (i.e., in the setting of the Last Supper, the 'giving of thanks' over the bread and the cup) would have contained an anamnesis of the 'mirabilia Dei'.

c) Mark's account of the Institution Narrative does not contain any reference to the interpretative words included (added on?) by Paul at 1 Cor.11. 26.

d) Paul's account has no reference to Jesus' avowal of abstinence in Mk.14. 25.

e) The bread and cup words

The most important differences between Mark and Paul come in the actual bread and cup words:

(1) Jeremias, however, argues that Mk.'s account of the Last Supper is in fact the more primitive. Kilmartin (op.cit.p.30) however, suggests that Mk.14. 18,22 show signs that the Institution Narrative in Mk. was separate from the present pericope and shows 'liturgical influence'. Dix (op.cit.p.133) also makes the point that 'the liturgical tradition of the local Churches reacted on the text of the scriptures'. Again we are reminded that 'the Sitz im Leben of the accounts of the institution is the primitive liturgy' (Kilmartin, op.cit.p.29)

(2) On εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν v. J.P. Audet, The Literary Forms and Contents of a Normal Eucharist, The Gospels Reconsidered, Blackwell, 1960. Dix notes the terms were used 'apparently indifferently'.

Bread words: 1 Cor.11. 24: This is my body which is
for you: this do in remembrance of me.
Mk.14. 22: Take ye: this is my body.

Cup words: 1 Cor.11. 25: This cup is the new
covenant in my blood: this do, as
oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.
Mk.14. 24: This is my blood of the
covenant, which is shed for many.

The main differences may be noted:

- i) In Mk. there is a total absence of reference to
'Do this in my anamnesis'.
- ii) Mk. has no equivalent for 'for you' (*ὑπερ ὑμῶν*)
in his version of the bread word.
- iii) Paul's form of the cup words would seem to refer
to the cup itself as 'the new covenant in my blood';
Mark would seem to refer to the wine as 'my blood
of the new covenant'.
- iv) Paul would seem to have no equivalent for 'poured
out for many' (*ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπερ πολλῶν*) which
Mark includes with the cup words.

MARK'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE EUCHARIST

It has already been noted that, unlike Paul, Mark notes on several occasions that the setting of the Last Supper was a Passover Meal. Whether this is historical or not seems to remain something of an open question, though the weight of most critical scholarship appears to have decided that it most probably was a Passover Meal, or at least a Meal, on or about the Passover Festival, and hence with Passover overtones. The question of Mark's historical accuracy need not concern us here since the fact is that, right or wrong, Mark clearly wished to identify the Last Supper as a Passover Meal. Hook notes:

'The Passover was the most deeply cherished and widely popular of all the sacrifices. A composite rite, with a very long history behind it, it expressed the very closely knit fellowship of the

people of God, and at the same time was a powerful instrument in creating it. But it was primarily a sacrifice, and expressive of sacrificial ideas which Christ could use in reference to Himself.'⁽¹⁾

And Howard Marshall writes:

'The continued offering of sacrifice year by year was an integral part of the feast, and its significance must not be overlooked. The Passover sacrifice was the only form of sacrifice in which the worshipper was personally involved in the slaying of the animal. The original Passover sacrifice at the time of the departure from Egypt was regarded as having redemptive significance. Although the yearly Passover sacrifice did not have all the characteristics of an offering made to atone for sin, nevertheless it was a sacrifice, and thus a means of communion with God. At the same time it is probable that all sacrifices contained some element of atonement for sin, and it is unlikely that the Passover sacrifice was thought of any differently. Hence in Jewish thought the Passover sacrifice was one of the means through which God displayed his mercy to his people.'⁽²⁾

But the Passover was also, and in some ways more importantly, a covenant feast, celebrating the deliverance from Egypt and thus forming the basis of the Sinaitic covenant. In celebrating the Passover Festival each participant shared in the original Passover-Covenant experience. Hook quotes Leenhardt:

(1) Hook, op.cit. p.35f.

(2) I.H. Marshall, Last Supper and Lord's Supper, Paternoster Press, 1980, p.77.

'It is not enough to say that the food evoked historical events and recalled the memory. The paschal ritual had an intention more profound and more realistic. It aspired to associate the guests at the feast to the realities which it signified. By the worship the redemption was not only taught in an impressive way as some event belonging to the past; it was much rather made actual like an event in which each guest was taking part. Each one was put into the presence of a redemption of which he was himself the object and the beneficiary. Each one knew, not only what God had done once upon a time for his fathers, but also what God was doing for him' (1)

Furthermore, the Passover in the time of Jesus had gained an added dimension: that of Messianic expectation. A midrash on Ps. 118 (used in the Passover rite) celebrates the coming of the Messiah.⁽²⁾ There was general belief that the Messiah would come on Passover night.

Clearly a great deal of the understanding and interpretation of the Passover undergirds an approach to the Lord's Supper such as that of Paul. For example there are the themes of atonement, forgiveness, communion, anamnesis and eschatology. We may not, however, use Passover categories to interpret Mark's understanding of the Last/Lord's Supper - at least not on a one to one basis of equivalent identity. For although he clearly believed the Last Supper to have been a Passover meal, Mark would appear to make no actual use of the Passover themes in his account of the Last Supper. Nineham⁽³⁾ believes that the early Church had little interest in the Passover background to the Eucharist, and, to a

(1) Hook, op.cit., p.44, citing Leenhardt, Le Sacrement de la Sainte Cène, p.17

(2) Marshall, op.cit., p.78

(3) Nineham, op.cit., p.380

great extent, regarded the tradition of the Institution Narrative as the 'title deeds' of the Eucharist, i.e. the basis but not the sole interpretative influence. This seems hardly surprising in what was, by A.D. 70, a predominantly Gentile community to whom the Passover would have meant little or nothing. If we assume that Mark was written in Rome under the influence (to a greater or lesser degree) of Peter's reminiscences, then it becomes possible to understand some of the contradictions raised so far. In some areas, Mark retains a more primitive account of the Last Supper than Paul - because one of his 'sources' was Peter who was there! But Mark's account also reveals strong liturgical influence - because Mark is a member of the worshipping Christian community at Rome, and so naturally interprets the Last Supper account in terms of the current Lord's Supper practice. On the other hand Paul's account is in fact more liturgically stylized than Mark's (because Paul was not present at the Last Supper, unlike Peter) but at the same time Paul retains Passover overtones, structures and interpretation, because he is firmly Jewish and so naturally interprets in Passover terms what he knows to have been a Passover meal. In other words Mark's account retains references to the Passover - because of the historical setting - but little or no Passover interpretative matter - because of the dominant Gentile approach of the Roman Church by 70. Paul's account contains little direct Passover material - because he is recalling a mainly Gentile Church to its tradition of (already) stylized liturgical worship - but does contain a good deal of Passover theology - because Paul is a Jewish Rabbi.

Thus in an apparently minor divergence between Mark and Paul we can find classic evidence for a developmental eucharistic doctrine. Neither Paul nor Mark can be said to be 'wrong' in their interpretations. Indeed concepts of right and wrong are irrelevant. Both are setting out

to interpret the tradition - which is there implicitly from the start - so as to make it possible for their readers to appreciate the great reality of the eucharistic symbol.

It would seem then that any attempt to understand Mark's own doctrine of the Lord's Supper must begin, not with the Passover background, which for Mark would seem to have been very much in the background, but rather with the bread- and cup- words, which, as has been seen, are not identical with Paul's.

'Take ye: this is my body'

Jeremias notes ⁽¹⁾ that 'take' (*λαβετε*) suggests that Mark saw the words of interpretation as referring not to any action of Jesus (i.e. breaking the bread) but to the bread itself. If the words of interpretation referred to some action such as breaking the bread, then it would mean that Mark understood the words of Jesus at the Last Supper, and his actions connected with the bread, to have been some sort of 'acted parable' with reference to the crucifixion. If on the other hand, Jeremias is correct in saying that such an interpretation is unlikely and that the bread-words refer to the bread itself, then this means that Mark believes that in the Lord's Supper the actual bread was referred to as the *'σωμα'* of Jesus.

As we saw when looking at Paul, there are various possibilities for a translation of *σωμα* into Hebrew or Aramaic. Dalman argued that *σωμα* should be translated by guph, which in OT usage designates a corpse, but in later post-biblical Hebrew and Aramaic could have the sense of 'me/myself'. Jeremias rejects this and prefers either basar (Heb.) or bisra (Aram.). Jeremias also notes that in the Johannine tradition (Jn.6. 51), the word used is not *σωμα* but *σαρξ* ('flesh') which is precisely the meaning of basar/bisra. The greatest

(1) Jeremias, op.cit., p.220

difficulty here is that a quite literal understanding of $\sigma\mu\mu\alpha$ / $\sigma\alpha\rho\zeta$ as 'flesh' would seem to imply something verging on cannibalism, which, horrendous in itself, would have been absolutely unthinkable in the Jewish tradition with its strictures against eating blood. Cranfield⁽¹⁾ consequently would favour gupi which he interprets as 'me'/'myself' rather than the cruder 'body'. He argues that since the bread and the cup words would at the Last Supper have been separated by the meal proper there would originally have been no need to take the words 'body'/'blood' as strict correlative, but, before the 'parallelism' of liturgical influence got to work, 'body(=me)/blood' would have been preferred to 'flesh/blood'. Wainwright notes:

'Two broad tendencies are apparent in modern exegesis. The one takes $\sigma\mu\mu\alpha$ (or $\sigma\alpha\rho\zeta$) and $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ as a correlative pair referring directly to the person of Jesus.... often with the thought that the two terms together suggest Jesus as given in sacrifice. The other tendency is to stress the word spoken at the delivery of the bread (This is my body) as indicating that the bread is the sign of Christ's presence (His body in that sense) whereas the word at the cup (and here the Pauline and Lucan form is obviously preferred: This cup is the new covenant) is taken as the sign of the new covenant (which was of course grounded in Christ's blood).... the field is left open for everything between the most crudely realistic and the most anaemically merely-symbolic interpretation.'⁽²⁾

Wainwright himself prefers what he calls 'extension of personality'. To explain this he draws an analogy between certain OT theophanies, where it is not clear

(1) Cranfield, St. Mark, ad.loc.

(2) Wainwright, op.cit., p.109

whether it is YHWH or his 'angel' who is speaking, and the nature of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

'Within this conceptual pattern the eucharistic elements both are and are not Christ Himself' (1)

All these commentators agree, by varying routes, that Mark interpreted the bread-words as a reference to the abiding presence of Christ with his disciples, and as Christ's sacred promise that at the celebration of the Lord's Supper He Himself would be present in the midst. It is however, possible to go further than this and to show that Mark interpreted the Lord's Supper as a demonstration/explanation of the death of the Lord - and as a means for the Christian to share in the benefits of that death. The parallel of *σῶμα / σαρξ* and *αἷμα* is probably best interpreted in terms of the two component parts of sacrifice. OT examples of this are common, e.g.:

'For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls.' (Lev.17. 11)

Here LXX uses the terms '*σῶμα*' and '*αἷμα*'. (2) It may be concluded therefore that the terms 'body/flesh' and 'blood' would naturally have overtones of sacrifice.

Jeremias (3) interprets the idea of the sacrificial element contained in the Last Supper words almost exclusively in terms of the Passover Lamb. No doubt this is a possibility, but the main difficulty with this interpretation is that there can nowhere be found clear and unambiguous evidence that such an interpretation of the Passover Lamb was in fact ever made. What may be said, however, is that Mark understood the death of Jesus as a sacrifice. This is evidenced by Mk.10. 45: *λυτρον ἕντι πολλῶν* with which may be compared the phrase found in Mark's cup-words:

(1) *ibid.* On this whole section v. Jeremias, *op.cit.*, pp.198-201.

(2) Other examples are Gen.9. 4; Lev.17. 14; Dt.12. 23; Ezek.39. 17-19

(3) Jeremias *op.cit.*, p.225f.

το ἐκχυννομενον ὑπερ πολλων (14.24). The parallel seems to suggest that Mark saw the nature of the eucharistic gift as a means of sharing in the benefits of the offering Christ made of himself on the cross i.e. receiving the gift of freedom when the ransom (λυτρον) has been paid. In this sense we find ourselves very close to Paul's idea of the Lord's Supper as the sign of the New Covenant made in the blood of Christ (cp. Mk.14. 24) and celebrated in the Eucharist which is the Christian Passover. At the same time it must be said that the Lord's Supper cannot have been interpreted solely, or even mainly, in terms of the Christian Passover - if for no other reason than it was celebrated weekly from the earliest period, whereas under Passover influence it would have been an annual event.⁽¹⁾ But this need not stop the symbolism and interpretation of the Lord's Supper from arising out of Paschal theology. Vincent Taylor⁽²⁾ suggests that while the Last Supper itself may not have been a Passover meal there is much to be said for Theo Freiss's suggestion that nevertheless the Last Supper had Paschal significance and character. Nonetheless Mark himself seems to have made little use of clear Paschal symbolism. His main point is that the basis of the covenant is the death of Christ - and the Eucharist is the divinely appointed means of sharing in the death of Christ which was 'for many'.

Daly⁽³⁾ argues that the Passover did have the connotation of an atoning or expiatory sacrifice. The evidence seems weak - and in any case Mark seems to have made no use of the idea. Daly contributes more important thought with his remarks about the early Christian use of the Akedah (Gen.22. 9ff).⁽⁴⁾ Again it seems probable that Daly overstates his case, and he himself has to note:

(1) v. Richardson, op.cit., p.371.

(2) V. Taylor, Expc. Times, Vol.63. No.12, Oct.51 - Sept.52.

(3) R.J. Daly, The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, Darton, Longmann & Todd Ltd., 1978.

(4) ibid., p.38f.

'That the akedah does not play a more obvious role than it does in NT soteriology is something of a puzzle. Perhaps it was largely taken for granted - or even seen as being too Jewish for Christian use.'

Even so it is just possible that Daly provides one particular useful piece of interpretation for the understanding of the salvific Christ-event and hence for Mark's understanding of the Lord's Supper. At Mk.1. 11 we read:

'Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased.' (1)

May it be correct to see here an allusion to God's words to Abraham at Gen.22. 12?:

'...seeing that thou hast not with-held thy son, thine only son, from me.'

In the Rabbinic interpretation of the Akedah it was seen as the one sacrifice in which the victim himself (Isaac) gave his consent, and freely offered himself as a sacrifice. Might there be a parallel between this interpretation of the Akedah as a 'moral sacrifice' and the words of Jesus at Mk.10. 45 which, as has already been noted, would seem to Mark to have been understood as a parallel and interpretation of the cup-words at 10. 24. We must not build too much on this but Richardson writes:

'There is no reason whatever to doubt that Jesus himself had taught this interpretation of his own death, or indeed that he had deliberately gone to Jerusalem for the feast of the Passover because he had come to think of himself as 'the Lamb' which God had provided for sacrifice. Hence when he said "This is my Body", "This is my blood", he meant "I am the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world"...Jesus regarded his death as the sacrifice by which a new and better covenant was ratified between God and the New Israel' (2)

(1) cp. also Mk.9 7 (and //s in both cases)

(2) A. Richardson, op.cit., p.371

Thus Mark may have seen the Eucharist as the means of sharing in the body and blood of the (paschal?) Lamb who died for the sin of the world.

'This is my blood of the covenant' (Mk.14. 24)

The meaning of *διαθήκη* has already been discussed quite fully when dealing with Paul. Mark calls to mind the Sinai covenant of Ex.24, but probably not the 'new covenant' of Jeremiah, since any reading of 'new' covenant should almost certainly be rejected as assimilation to 1 Cor.11. 25. Thus, just as in the Sinai covenant Moses sprinkled some of the blood on the people (Ex.24. 8) as a sign and means of their participation in the covenant, so Mark sees the 'blood of the covenant' in the Lord's Supper as a means given by Jesus for participation in the Christian covenant through the blood shed 'for many'. As Richardson writes:

'The Synoptic accounts (like the Pauline) bear clear witness to the fact that Jesus thought of his death as being the sacrificial act by which a covenant was ratified between God and a new Israel, just as the old covenant was ratified in the blood of the sacrificed animals on Sinai.'⁽¹⁾

The point is thus firmly established that Mark saw the Eucharist as the means of participation in the sacrificial death of Christ, and hence in the benefits wrought by that death, namely atonement and resurrection. It is thus possible to maintain that although Mark has different emphases from Paul, and although he omits any reference to the anamnesis, the basic understanding of both is the same.

At this point however it is worth noting that Mark's phrase '*το αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης*' is not only very harsh Greek, it is also impossible to retranslate as it stands into Aramaic.⁽²⁾ This raises two possibilities:

(1) A. Richardson, op.cit., p.230

(2) Nineham, op.cit., ad.loc., and Jeremiah op.cit.p.193. According to Jeremiah in Heb. and Aramaic 'a noun with a pronominal suffix can generally tolerate no genitive after itself'.

- 1) either all references to the covenant in the Last Supper are secondary and interpretative
- 2) or the form 'ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἐμοῦ αἵματι' (1 Cor. 11. 25) must be defended as being more primitive than Mark's form since Paul's form CAN be retranslated into Aramaic.⁽¹⁾

On this point Marshall writes:

'Since all our sources contain the covenant idea and since there is no good reason for denying that Jesus could have used it, we are justified in regarding it as an integral part of the saying'.⁽²⁾

Marshall is prepared to recognise the Markan form of the cup-words as secondary. This seems correct and is probably best explained as a liturgical development towards a closer parallelism between the bread and cup words. This is most important in terms of subsequent development of doctrine since, as Jeremias points out,⁽³⁾ already in Mark we may be able to see the process at work which led to an unsubtle and un-Jewish identification between 'bread/body' and 'wine/blood' - an oversimplification which the Pauline form of words would not allow. Hence we find in Mark a possible source for the development of a doctrinal 'false trail.'

'...which is shed for many' (Mk. 14. 24)

These words are present in the Markan but not the Pauline accounts. As has been seen they show that Mark understood the Lord's Supper as a participation in the sacrifice of Christ. Jeremias⁽⁴⁾ notes that LXX uses 'ἐκχεῖν αἷμα' to refer to sacrifice. The words 'for many' ('ὑπὲρ πολλῶν') may have reference to LXX Is. 53. 12:

'καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνεκεν'

though the wording is not sufficiently close to push this

(1) Jeremias suggests that the form 'my covenant blood' (dam beriti, Heb., adam keyami, Aram.) may underlie both forms - v.op.cit., p.195

(2) Marshall, op.cit., p.91

(3) Jeremias, op.cit., p.220

(4) Jeremias, op.cit., p.222f.n.5 and p.226

very far. Suffice to say that if (as seems likely) the early Church interpreted Jesus' work in terms of the Suffering Servant (whatever Jesus' self-understanding may have been), then Mark may have understood the cup-words similarly.

There is some dispute about the time reference of the cup-words. Richardson⁽¹⁾ suggests that ἐκχυνόμενον means that the wine has already been poured out 'for the enacted parable of the Last Supper proleptically sets forth the redemptive death of Christ'. Cranfield, on the other hand, arguing from Hebrew and Aramaic usages, suggests that ἐκχυνόμενον is a present participle with a future sense - in other words Jesus refers to his blood that will be shed for many on the cross.⁽²⁾ Viewed from the perspective of the celebration of the Lord's Supper at Rome c.70 AD the difference seems slight. Mark sees the wine as being the means of participation in the sacrificial death of Christ who (at the time of the Last Supper) was going to his FUTURE death and who now (at the time of the Lord's Supper) has ALREADY shed his blood for us once and for all on the cross, and NOW allows us to share in the fruits of the victory.

Two further points of some importance are to be made. First Mark notes that 'they all drank of it' (14. 23b) - and then WHILE THEY WERE DRINKING Jesus gave the words of interpretation. This, it seems to me, means that our interpretation so far has been correct. Namely that originally the bread and cup words were not meant to be interpreted as an identification of the bread and wine as body and blood but the action as a whole was meant to be the means whereby we share in the benefits of the death of Christ. ALL who share in the Lord's Supper can share in Christ's victory.

Secondly at 14.25 Mark includes 'an avowal of abstinence':

(1) A. Richardson, op.cit., p.370

(2) Cranfield, op.cit., ad.loc.

'Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.'

These words have clear affinities with the Jewish picture of the final state of blessedness as being the 'Messianic Banquet'.⁽¹⁾ Cranfield notes:

'The formula is, as regards its negative significance, that of a Nazirite vow. By making it Jesus consecrates Himself for the imminent sacrificial offering of His life.'⁽²⁾

Lk.22. 16 gives a variant tradition of the saying in a different position in relation to the meal. This variation suggests that the saying originally circulated more or less independently. Luke would seem to suggest that Jesus himself did not participate in the bread and the cup of the Last Supper. Mark, on the other hand, by placing the saying after the Supper would seem to refer the verse back to the wine of the Supper, the wine in which Jesus HAS shared with his disciples. Thus Mark interprets the verse as meaning that Jesus has consecrated himself by offering his very self to the disciples in the Supper, and now goes out to fulfil that offering on the cross. Thus in the very action of the Last Supper as presented by Mark we find the theme of symbol and reality. Christ offers himself to the uncomprehending disciples in this act of breaking bread and pouring wine. Then he goes out to turn the symbol into reality.

Furthermore we are to see the Lord's Supper, on Mark's understanding, as a Sacred Banquet - a Messianic Banquet - in which the disciples (worshippers) share a meal with their Lord. It is important to note the tremendous eschatological urgency of this verse. Mark begins the ministry of Jesus with the words:

(1) E.G.: Is.25., 6; 1 Enoch 62. 14; Baruch 29. 5ff; Mt.8. 11; Lk.14. 15; Rev.19. 9.

(2) Cranfield, ad.loc.

'The time is fulfilled and the Kingdom
of God is at hand.' (Mk.1. 15)

This is Jesus' message, he comes to bring in the kingdom. Now in the context of the Last/Lord's Supper Mark leads us back to the theme of the Kingdom. Thus the Lord's Supper is the means whereby we share with Christ in the Kingdom, and we commit ourselves to joining in the work of building up the Kingdom.

The Feeding Narratives in Mark

Mark's hint at the Messianic Banquet in 14. 25 leads us to the accounts of the Feeding Narratives. The Last Supper is probably not the only passage in Mark where his account has been influenced by his understanding of the Lord's Supper (or is it that the account influences his understanding of the Lord's Supper?). Mark has two accounts of the Feeding of the Multitude, which should almost certainly be interpreted as of eucharistic significance, for whatever their original sitz im leben the early Church would seem to have interpreted them in terms of the Messianic Banquet and as of probable significance for the Eucharist. C.H. Dodd⁽¹⁾ has shown that the second account (Mk.8. 6-8) has important parallels both with Mark's own account of the Last Supper and with the Pauline account.

1 Cor.11. 23-25; Mk.8. 6-8; 14. 22-24 - a comparison

The main similarities and differences between these three texts may be summarized as follows:

- 1) All three texts use the same Greek verb for 'he took' (ἐλάβον ; ἔλαβον), and all three use the same word for 'bread' (ἄρτον ; ἄρτον ; ἄρτους).
- 2) Both 1 Cor. and Mk.8 use εὐχαριστεῖν for 'giving thanks'; Mk.14. 22 uses εὐλογεῖν ('to bless').

(1) C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, CUP, 1965, p.200

- 3) All three use *ἐλάσεν* , 'he broke'.
- 4) Both Markan texts refer to Jesus giving the bread to the recipients; Paul makes no specific reference but assumes such a distribution.
- 5) Both the Pauline and Markan accounts of the Institution Narrative include interpretative bread and cup words. There are no such interpretative words in the account of the feeding of the multitude in Mk.8.
- 6) The Markan and Pauline Last Supper accounts refer to a cup as the second element in the Meal; Mark 8 has no reference to a cup but refers to 'a few fish'.
- 7) Paul has no reference to a second separate 'thanksgiving'/'blessing' over the cup. (In Paul's account the intervening meal has been omitted under liturgical influence) Mark includes a second 'thanksgiving' over the cup (14. 23) and 'the few fish' (8. 7). It is of especial interest to note that in the second blessing in the Last Supper narrative Mark uses *εὐχαριστέω* (first he used *ἐλόγειν*) but this order is reversed in Mk.8. 6f. (cp. note 2 above).
- 8) As with note 5, Paul has no reference to the distribution of the cup; Mk.8.8 however reads 'and they did eat and were filled', and 14. 23 reads 'and they all drank of it'. This observation would seem to increase the likelihood of a deliberate parallel intended between the Markan passages.
- 9) Mk.8, for obvious reasons, has nothing corresponding to the cup words.

It may thus be seen that the main difference between the account in Mk.8 of the Feeding of the Multitude and the

Markan and Pauline Last Supper accounts is (apart from obvious differences in setting and edible content) the absence of any form of 'words of interpretation' in Mk.8. On the other hand there is quite a close agreement of wording and order between the two Markan passages. It seems fair to take the account of the Feeding of the Multitude as being intended as a parallel to the Last Supper account, and so as a 'type' or paradigm of the Lord's Supper. This may be made more certain if it is right to notice the seven-fold shape of the Lord's Supper in both Markan passages.

Similar parallels may be found between Mark's Last Supper account and the Feeding of the Multitude in 6. 30-52. The main points are as follows:

- 1) Both the Last Supper and the Feeding of the Five Thousand take place in the evening. (6. 35; 14. 17)
- 2) Both meals take place with the participants 'reclining' or 'sitting'. (6. 39f; 14. 18)
- 3) In the Feeding of the Five Thousand it is possible to discover a four-fold Eucharistic shape which Dix would distinguish as the more liturgically developed form: Mk.6. 41: 'he took.... he blessed....and brake... he gave'.
- 4) Both the Feeding Narratives end with a note that all who received were 'filled' (Mk.6. 42; 8. 8) - cp. 'and they all drank of it' (14. 23)?

The cumulative evidence would seem to suggest quite strongly that Mark means his readers to find a eucharistic significance in his accounts of the Feedings of the Multitudes. As Taylor notes:

'Mark has conformed the vocabulary of this passage (i.e. the Feeding of the Multitude) to that of the Supper in the belief that in some sense the fellowship meal in the

wilderness was an anticipation of the Eucharist.⁽¹⁾

It may further be noted that there are sufficient parallels between the Feeding of the Five Thousand in Mk.6 and that of the Four Thousand in Mk.8 to suggest that they are twin accounts of what, at the pre-canonical stage, were independent versions of the same tradition.⁽²⁾ This allows the suggestion that the Feeding miracles were already in use in the pre-Markan tradition as a teaching source to be used in the proclamation of the word either during the Eucharist itself or in teaching the catechumens. This would help to account for their similarity of expression. Mark and the other evangelists would have been not so much innovating as continuing a traditional form of interpretation of the Eucharist.⁽³⁾

What then was Mark trying to say about the Eucharist in his use of the accounts of the Feedings of the Multitudes? Nineham⁽⁴⁾ draws attention to the fact that neither account ends with the usual note of amazement that is normal in Mark's accounts of the miraculous (e.g. 7. 37). Indeed, the disciples fail to understand (6. 52 cp.8. 15-21). It is this failure to understand that gives the clue for interpreting the passages.

'They understood not concerning the loaves, but their heart was hardened'. (6. 52)

'And he said unto them, Do ye not yet understand?' (8. 21)

Mark is writing from the standpoint of the Church after the resurrection. The first step in understanding what the early Church meant in its use of the Feeding Miracles is to remember that they would have found their first sitz im leben as part of the 'proclamation' at the weekly Sunday (Day of Resurrection) Eucharist. Jungmann writes:

(1) V. Taylor, St. Mark, ad. loc.

(2) Thus Dodd op.cit., p.200

(3) Wainwright, op.cit., p.36

(4) Nineham, op.cit., ad.loc.

'One point to note is that the Evangelists who otherwise never indicate the day of the week on which an event took place (unless they are calling attention to a dispute about the sabbath) nevertheless remark with particular care that the Lord's Resurrection took place on the 'first day of the week in prima sabbati'From these indications, we have to conclude that already in the fifties, at least in the Pauline communities, Sunday was observed, if not as the only day, then at least as the principal day, on which the breaking of bread that is the Christian worship, took place.'⁽¹⁾

The link between Resurrection, Eucharist and Feeding Miracles is made stronger by the words of Mk.8. 2; 'they continue with me now THREE DAYS' which may be compared with 8. 31: '....the Son of man must suffer many things and AFTER THREE DAYS rise again'. Is this mere coincidence, or is it a subtle and beautifully written theology? I incline to the latter.

Finding accounts of the Feeding of the Multitude in his sources, Mark uses them to make the point that just as the Crucified and Risen Christ feeds the Church in the Eucharist NOW, so did he feed the Church in embryo during his earthly life. The Man Jesus of Nazareth is one and the same as the Lord of the Church who feeds his people both then and now. Thus Mark's purpose is both eucharistic and Christological. The main difference between the period of the Ministry and the period of Christ as Lord of the Church, is that THEN even the disciples did not understand, whereas NOW, although it remains true that many may 'see' and yet not 'perceive' (Mk.4. 12), even so, the true disciple, the worshipper at the Lord's Supper does understand. In other words, just as many during the period of Jesus' ministry saw

(1) Jungmann, The Early Liturgy, Darton Longman & Todd 1960, p. 19f.

him merely as a 'wonder-worker' and so failed to understand (Mk.8. 11-21), so now, for those without understanding the Lord's Supper remains a rather meagre meal - but for those who do understand it is a meal shared with the Crucified and Risen Lord.⁽¹⁾

Mark's use of the Feeding Miracles goes yet further. By placing the Feeding Miracles in a desert setting (6. 31; 34; 8.4) Mark takes his eucharistic teaching back even further than the earthly life of Jesus, and interprets the Feeding Miracles (and hence the Eucharist) as being parallels with the OT accounts of God feeding the people of Israel during the Exodus wanderings. Compare the following:

'At even ye shall eat flesh and in the morning ye shall be filled with bread'. - Ex.16. 12

cp.: 'And when the day was now far spent, his disciples came unto him and said, The place is desert and the day is now far spent' (Mk.6. 35)⁽²⁾

It is also possible to see a parallel with the ministry of the prophet Elisha (2 Kgs.4. 42-44); when Elisha feeds the people with loaves of barley his servant doubts whether it will feed 'a hundred men' but the food supply proves sufficient. Thus Mark by use of OT typology shows us the eternal Christ who has fed his people down the ages. We may compare Paul's Rabbinic interpretation of the rock in the wilderness as being Christ, and the Johannine gospel: 'In the beginning was the Word'. Thus both Paul and Mark see the Lord's Supper as being the proclamation of the whole Heilsgeschichte - past, present and future - summed up in the Risen Christ.

Equally both see the Eucharist as an eschatological meal. One major 'development' of doctrine, however, occurs in Mark's use of the Feeding Miracles as symbolic of the Eucharist and of the Messianic Banquet. Here we have an element in the tradition about which Paul makes no comment.

(1) W. Marxsen, The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, pp.138ff sees the Resurrection as an interpretation of faith which means 'still he comes today'.

(2) Cp. also Ex.16. 32 with Mk.6 42 and Num.11. 4 with Mk.8. 4.

Two minor points remain. First, commenting on Mk.6. 39 Cranfield makes the intriguing suggestion that *στυπασια* may have represented the Aramaic haburta (Heb. haburah). This is only conjectural but is of interest in view of repeated scholarly attempts to identify the Last Supper as a haburah meal. Secondly a note must be made concerning the symbolism of the fish (*ἰχθῦς*) Mk.6. 38 in the accounts of the Feeding Miracles. The simplest suggestion is of course that the fish is mentioned because that is what the crowds ate. But it must be remembered that the fish was early a secret Christian sign, and apparently early representations of the Eucharist often make use of bread and fish rather than wine. Most likely these uses arise from the Feeding Miracles. It is just possible however that Mark may have had in mind Num.11. 5:

'We remember the fish which we did eat in Egypt.'
As has been seen, it is probably correct to see an allusion to the Exodus wanderings in Mark's account of the Feedings. It is just possible that *ἰχθῦς* is another such allusion. Perhaps Mark wishes us to understand that those who were fed by Jesus before the Crucifixion/Resurrection were, like those who ate fish in Egypt, still under sin/the Old Covenant, and hence were unable to perceive the truth about the loaves - which is only fully revealed to those who receive the benefits of the New Covenant wrought in Christ's blood and mediated through the Lord's Supper.

Summary

St. Mark's doctrine of the Eucharist contains no contradiction to that of Paul. Mark shares with Paul that the Eucharist is the means of sharing in the benefits of the death of the Messiah who 'gave his life as a ransom for many'. But Mark also looks back to the ministry of Christ and we find a development of doctrine in terms of the Messianic Banquet. We note also that Mark may have paved the way - albeit unwittingly - for a false trail in interpreting the cup words.

St. Luke's Teaching on the Eucharist
The Textual Problems

Any examination of Luke's eucharistic theology must begin with a consideration of the problems raised by the textual difficulties of the Lucan Institution Narrative in 22. 15-20. This difficulty is the 'bête noire' of all 'Western non-interpolations' i.e. D alone of all the Greek MSS (and some of the old Latin versions) does not include vv.19b and 20. This is especially noteworthy since D normally inflates the text rather than the reverse.

Further difficulty is raised by the order cup-bread (short text); cup-bread-cup (long text). This finds some apparent support in Didache 9 where there is also the order cup-bread. Presumably because of this unusual order two of the old Latin versions (b and e) and the old Syriac version actually reverse the order to the more usual bread-cup - thus bringing it into liturgical normality.

Three questions arise:

- 1) Which of the texts - long or short - is to be preferred?
- 2) Whichever the preferred text, can the emergence of the alternative text be adequately accounted for?
- 3) What is to be made of the unusual cup-bread (-cup) order?

Jeremias favours the long text as the more original.⁽¹⁾

By careful examination he argues that the short text is attested solely by one branch of the Western text.⁽²⁾

Hence he writes:

'To hold the Short Text as original would be to accept the most extreme improbability for it would be to assume that an identical addition to the text of Luke (22. 19a-20) had been introduced into every text of the manuscripts with the exception of D,a,b,d,e, ff,i,l,syr cur sin!'⁽³⁾

(1) Jeremias op,cit. pp.138-159

(2) ibid. pp.139-144

(3) ibid. p.144

Jeremias then examines all the other major passages in Luke where D has omissions⁽¹⁾; of the eighteen passages Jeremias finds in favour of the longer text on eleven occasions and accounts for the emergence of the others as 'harmonising reconstructions'.⁽²⁾

On the other hand Jeremias is prepared to admit that there are weighty arguments in favour of the short text, in particular the two basic maxims of textual criticism:

- 1) the shorter text is older
- 2) the more difficult reading is to be preferred.

There is little doubt that Lk.22. 15-19a complies with both these criteria. Further there is no difficulty in finding a possible provenance for vv.19b-20 - namely 1 Cor.11. 24f which (allowing for some slight editorial 'polishing') is identical to the disputed part of the long text. From this standpoint the long text would seem to be a compilation of Paul and Mark. This in turn would argue against the originality of the long text since:

'Nowhere do we find in him (Luke) a literary borrowing from Paul, or even only the most insignificant indications that he knew the Pauline letters.'⁽³⁾

There is also the question of style. Luke is not a clumsy writer and yet 22. 20b reads:

Τὸντο το ποτηριον ἡ καλη διαθυγη ἐν τῷ κίματι μου
το ὑπερ ὑμων ἐκφυνομενον

Two points are to be noted:

- 1) the phrase το ὑπερ ὑμων ἐκφυνομενον is widely separated from το ποτηριον to which it relates; this may perhaps indicate a later addition.

(1) i.e. Lk.5. 39; 7. 7a; 7. 33; 10. 41f; 11. 35f; 12. 19; 12. 21; 12. 39; 19. 25; 21. 30; 24. 6; 24. 12; 24. 21; 24. 36; 24. 40; 24. 50; 24. 51; 24. 52.

(2) Jeremias, op.cit., pp.145-152. As an example: 19. 25. Here the // verse is missing at Mt.25. 14-30. Jeremias finds that on this hypothesis only two passages (24. 36; 24. 40) have to be left 'in suspenso'.

(3) Jeremias op.cit.,pp.155f. For this para.v.pp.152-156.

2) τὸ ὑπερ ἕμων ἐκχυννόμενον while clearly referring to the shed blood (not the cup) is not in the dative (to agree with τῷ αἵματι) but in the nominative - thus referring grammatically to the cup. This may be accounted for by a suggestion of Dibelius⁽¹⁾ that lying behind the present text of Luke is Mk.14.24/Mt.26.28 where τὸ αἶμα is in the nominative and τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον agrees with it. Cumulatively this seems to suggest that 22. 19-20 does not stem from Lk. and that in fact the short text is to be preferred.⁽²⁾

In his commentary on Luke, J.M. Creed⁽³⁾ supports the originality of the short text. All the textual variations can be explained

'as attempts to bring the text of D etc. into line with the other gospels and Paul.'

Creed also makes some interesting comments on the short text. These may be summarised:

- 1) Mark's Institution Narrative assumes a Passover setting, but contains no distinct use of Passover details. Luke seeks to stress the Passover nature of the meal by adding a cup and grace before the breadword (v.19a) thus restoring something of the original order.
- 2) 'The dominant idea in the Lucan account is that Jesus celebrates the chief rite of the old dispensation for the last time, looking forward to its consummation in the kingdom of God (vv.16, 18, 30).'
- 3) Lk.22. 18 is so close to Mk.14. 25 that it may be assumed to have arisen from Mark.

(1) Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, p.209., n.1

(2) Jeremias, op.cit., p.155

(3) J.M. Creed, The Gospel according to St. Luke, Macmillan, 1969, (first pub. 1930), pp.263ff.

4) Luke's short text omits all references to the blood *το ὑπερ ἡμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* (cp. Mk.14.24) and also excludes the words *το ὑπερ ἡμῶν δδομένον* in relation to the bread. It is noteworthy that Luke also omits any reference to Mk.10. 45 (*λυτρον ἅτι πολλῶν*). This may suggest that sacrificial language was 'not entirely congenial to Luke himself' and that therefore the shorter text is to be preferred as omitting such a reference.⁽¹⁾

The main difficulty with this argument is that it is almost circular, the main independent evidence being the omission of any reference // to Mk.10.45. In any case this may well say more for the tendencies of the Western Redactor than for Luke.

Macdonald⁽²⁾ finds in favour of the short text: 'Clearly the passage runs much more smoothly if these words be omitted. And further, if they be omitted, the Third Gospel would contain no account of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, and it would be easier to understand why in the allusions to the 'breaking of the bread' throughout the Lucan writings (both the Gospel and the Acts) there is no hint of any connection between this fellowship meal and the Last Supper.'⁽³⁾

A more recent commentator⁽⁴⁾ comes down very cautiously in favour of the short text:

'Where there is so much room for difference of opinion dogmatism is out of the question, but this much may be said by way of simplification and summary. The shorter text is probably

(1) For this summary v. Creed op.cit., p.265.

(2) Macdonald, The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion, Heffer & Sons Ltd., 1930, p.9f.

(3) It might be of course, that Luke did not distinguish 'the fellowship meal' from the Lord's Supper!

(4) G.B. Caird, St. Luke, Pelican NT Commentaries, Penguin 1963.

what Luke wrote. He used as his main source the L tradition, which had preserved a collection of sayings spoken by Jesus in the upper room, but never incorporated in any form of Eucharistic liturgy. These sayings treated the supper as a Passover, celebrated by Jesus and his disciples as an anticipation of the great feast of the kingdom, in which the Passover theme of redemption from bondage would receive its final fulfilment.'⁽¹⁾

Caird's criteria for supporting the short text are substantially those which have been outlined above. It is worth noting that, along with Creed, Caird finds support for the short text in the peculiar soteriology of Luke. He argues that Luke omitted reference to any sacrificial interpretation

'for believing, as he did, that God's saving act was the whole of Jesus' life of service and self-giving, and that the Cross was simply the pre-ordained price of friendship with the out-cast, he naturally felt little interest in sayings which appeared to concentrate the whole of God's redemption in the Cross.'⁽²⁾

At this point it is worth turning to the summary of Schurmann's three volume work on the Lucan Last Supper narrative provided by Hook.⁽³⁾ Schurmann's conclusions are:

- 1) the statistical, linguistic and structural characteristics of Lk.22. 15-18 combine to suggest that it is an edited version of a non-Marcan source.
 - 2) 1 Cor.11. 23ff. is in itself an edited version of a pre-Pauline liturgical source.
- It is possible then that Luke is not drawing

(1) *ibid.* p.238

(2) *ibid.*

(3) H. Schurmann, Quellenkritische Untersuchung des Lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes, Munster, 1953-7, cited N.Hook, *op.cit.*, pp.62ff.

on the Pauline account, but rather on the pre-Pauline 'original' account.⁽¹⁾

3) Luke interprets the death of Christ in terms of Is.53 rather than Ex.24. This may obviously affect his approach to the interpretation of the Lord's Supper.

4) It is unlikely that bisri is the Aramaic lying behind $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$

Jeremias finally comes down in favour of the long text, on the grounds that this is a liturgical text and therefore the older.⁽²⁾ This is substantially the same point as 2) in the summary of Schurmann's work. The liturgical hypothesis would account for the peculiarities of style which we have noted. They in fact are not 'Lucan' at all, but a liturgical formula which Luke is citing. This explanation also allows us to interpret Luke's soteriology in terms of the whole incarnation-ministry-resurrection event (v. point 3) above). In view of Luke peculiar soteriology, his emphasis in his Last Supper narrative falls not on the bread and cup words themselves but on vv. 15-18 which represent Luke's own material, whereas the bread and cup words are common to the liturgical tradition - which may represent the liturgical tradition of Luke's Syrian home Church.⁽³⁾

(1) Briloth, op.cit., p.9 also suggests that Lk.22. 14-19b represents an account independent of either Mark or Paul.

(2) Jeremias op.cit., p.155.

(3) *ibid.* p.156. As a very tentative suggestion it may be noted that the Old Syriac version bears evidence of the short text. If Jeremias' 'liturgical text hypothesis' is correct is it possible to suggest the following reconstruction to account for the short text in D?:

(a) 'Both Old Syriac versions are to be regarded as expanded Short Texts' (Jeremias p.144)

(b) 'The Short Text is attested solely by one branch of the Western Text' (*ibid.*p.144), i.e., according to Jeremias the Old Syriac reading arises from D.

(c) But Westcott and Hort note (NT.p.550):

(i) 'The Western Text is not to be thought of as a single rescension complete from the first'.

(ii) Codex Bezae was written in the 6th century.

(iii) An imperfect Old Syriac version of the gospels is assigned to the 5th century, and there must have been earlier rescensions.

(d) Putting all this together, is it possible that the short text has arisen from the Syrian/Syriac community (i.e. where Luke wrote his gospel) where it was well known in the local Christian communities that 'their' evangelist placed the greatest emphasis on 22. 15-18; or, that 22. 15-18 represents a form of proto-Luke which has been preserved in the Western text through the Syriac (rather than the reverse) though ultimately Luke wrote a further rescension containing the traditional liturgical material.

R.D. Richardson ⁽¹⁾ has criticised Jeremias' 'liturgical text hypothesis' and also the suggestion that the short text arose as part of the disciplina arcani. Richardson suggests that a liturgical text could not have reached so rigidly fixed a form so early as to account for the long text of Luke. The arcane discipline was meant to protect the mystery lying beneath the words themselves - but the words themselves were not part of the mystery, and so did not need protection. There does seem to be some force in this latter argument, particularly since none of the other accounts seek to conceal the words of institution. The argument that there could not so early be a fixed liturgy does seem rather weak. All commentators are agreed that the Passion Narratives as a whole became fixed in their form in the tradition very early in their transmission, precisely because of their liturgical use. Also liturgists comment on the natural conservatism of worshippers.⁽²⁾ If Luke is correctly dated between 70 and 96⁽³⁾ this would seem to provide ample time for a liturgical tradition as basic as the Institution Narrative to achieve some considerable degree of fixity.⁽⁴⁾

It is now necessary to draw some tentative conclusions:

- 1) The weightiest argument against the originality of the short text would seem

(1) R.D. Richardson, The Gospels Reconsidered, Blackwell, 1960, p.122.

(2) i.e. 'Baumstark's Law'.

(3) Creed, op.cit., intro. p.xxiif.

(4) There remains one intriguing suggestion to account for the short text arising from the long text. A.C. Clark, The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts, 1914, pp77ff, notes that in both D and ver-syr there are 152 uncial letters omitted. These 152 uncials would represent one column of text. So he suggests that the original MS copied by both D and vet-syr had omitted one column (i.e. vv.17-18).

to be the difficulty of accounting for the overwhelming MSS evidence in favour of the long text.

2) At the same time Luke's peculiar soteriology would seem to suggest that the greatest weight in exegesis should in fact fall on 22. 15-18, (i.e. the short text).

3) If we accept the long text as original we have the difficult (though paschal?) order cup-bread-cup. Kilmartin⁽¹⁾ suggests that this order could itself account for the short text: 'Such a mutilation would be understandable in a post-apostolic community which recognised the eucharistic colouring associated with the cup of vv.17-18 and wished to avoid having two eucharistic cups in the one account.'⁽²⁾

On the whole then it seems best to prefer the long text, but in any case if point 2) be correct then in fact the textual problem need not prove crucial to an understanding of Luke's position on the Eucharist.

LUKE'S TEACHING ON THE LAST/LORD'S SUPPER

We may begin with the problem of the cup-bread (-cup) order as evidenced by the long text. Some have seen here a parallel with 1 Cor.10. 16f., but this is inadmissible since, as has been seen, Paul inverts the normal bread-cup order so as to be best able to make a point about the unity of the body arising from the one loaf. In any case Paul bears clear witness to the usual bread-cup order in his Institution Narrative.

(1) Kilmartin, op.cit., p.26

(2) This explanation seems very similar to my own tentative suggestion (fn. p.79)

A better comparison with the Lukan order is provided by Didache 9, but here there rages considerable argument as to whether Did. 9 represents a Eucharist at all, but rather may be an agape before the Eucharist proper.⁽¹⁾ Srawley⁽²⁾ points out that in any case Didache may well be an imaginative reconstruction of early Church life written in the late 2nd century or even early 3rd century. Thus it would be most unsound to argue that the cup-bread order was a normal part of the eucharistic tradition. In fact the long text order cup-bread-cup can well be accounted for by the Passover meal order where there is a cup of wine before the main meal, with the relishes. In other words, by retaining the preliminary cup Luke sets the Last Supper firmly within the Passover framework.

One of the Lukan themes is that of the 'exodus'. In the story of the Transfiguration (9.30f) Moses and Elijah speak with Jesus of the coming 'exodus' which Jesus is to accomplish at Jerusalem. Luke was a gentile writing for gentiles. It therefore seems most likely that by setting the Last Supper in the Passover setting Luke wishes to refer us not to the Paschal meal of later Judaism, but to the original Passover meal in Egypt when God saved his people through the blood of the Passover Lamb.

This interpretation seems to be reinforced by the avowal of abstinence associated with the first (Paschal) cup in 22. 15-18. Matthew Black⁽³⁾ holds that 22. 16 taken with vv.29f indicates that Luke regards the Passover as prophetic of the Messianic Kingdom in which

(1) Dix, op.cit., p.91

(2) Srawley, Early History of the Liturgy, p.18

(3) M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd. edn., Oxford, 1967, p.230.

it will find its perfect fulfilment. Also C.K. Barrett notes⁽¹⁾ that there is some evidence for a Jewish belief, based on Ex. 12. 42 that the Messiah would come on Passover night. Thus 22.16:

'I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God.'

may be understood to mean 'I will not eat again of the Passover until the true Passover is perfected in the Kingdom of God', i.e. it is a reference to the Messianic Feast.⁽²⁾ Perhaps Luke sees the Lord's Supper as a foretaste of the Messianic Feast? Wainwright⁽³⁾ points out that Luke takes the avowal of abstinence in Mk. 14. 25, doubles it (vv. 16, 18) and so provides both an eschatological bread saying and an eschatological cup saying - both sayings being placed BEFORE the Institution Narrative. Thus Luke sees Jesus as fulfilling (and so ending) the old rite of Passover and inaugurating the new eschatological rite of the Lord's Supper, the Messianic Feast, at which we receive the benefits of the exodus achieved by Christ. These points are developed elsewhere in Luke's gospel and Acts - thus further enhancing Luke's approach to soteriology.

The Meal at Emmaus

Apart from the Last Supper narrative, the loci classici for understanding Luke's doctrine of the Lord's Supper appear to be the account of the Emmaus walk and Meal (Lk. 24. 13-35) and the account of the meal on ship (Acts 27. 33-38). Both passages contain the classic four-fold shape: taking of bread/thanksgiving/breaking/and giving. Both contain the phrase 'breaking of bread' which is used in the earlier part of the gospel in connection with the Feeding of the Multitude (9. 12-17), certain parables (e.g. 14. 15ff), and the Last Supper itself.

(1) C.K. Barrett, Jesus and the Gospel Tradition, p.48

(2) M. Black, *op.cit.*, p.235.

(3) Wainwright, *op.cit.*, p.39.

In Acts the phrase 'breaking of bread' is used of communal meals of the Church gathered for worship (Acts 2. 46; 20. 7,11). In particular it must be noted that Lk.24. 35 has the pregnant phrase 'he was known to them in the breaking of bread.'

There can be little doubt that Luke meant his readers to understand the account of the walk to Emmaus and the meal there as a passage capable of a developed eucharistic interpretation. Not only is the phrase 'break bread' twice repeated (vv. 30, 35), but also there is the four-fold eucharistic shape - and in addition the account of the walk itself (vv. 13-27) may be understood as a synaxis before the anaphora (vv. 28-35).⁽¹⁾ Another suggestion that this passage is to be interpreted eucharistically may be given by v. 29:

Ἔμεινον μεθ' ἡμῶν ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπεραν ἔστιν καὶ κεκλήκεν ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα'
which provides a link both with the evening meal of the Last Supper and (cp. 9. 12: Ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλυεῖν) with the account of the Feeding of the Multitude. Finally it is to be noted that the entire Emmaus account is set within a Resurrection framework. At 24. 36 the Risen Christ on the first Easter Day appears to his disciples and eats with them. As at John 21. 12ff and also in the accounts of the Feedings of the Multitudes (e.g. Mk.6. 38) the food which the Risen Christ shares with his disciples is fish (Lk.24. 42). Thus the Christ of the Emmaus Road who expounds the Scriptures is the Risen Lord who is one and the same as the Man Jesus. The Christ of the Eucharist is known to his disciples as the Risen Lord.

While there is no need to discredit the account of the meal at Emmaus as pure 'fiction' invented by Luke to make a point⁽²⁾ - Richardson indeed suggests that a story of two disciples meeting the Risen Christ may have been an ancient element in the common tradition⁽³⁾ - nonetheless

(1) Thus Wainwright, op.cit., p.38.

(2) Creed, op.cit.ad loc.: 'There seems to be no good reason why the story should not be founded on fact.'

(3) A. Richardson, op.cit., p.195.

it seems fairly clear that the story as we now have it is essentially a creation of Luke written up for his own theological purpose. It may be compared with the Johannine account (21. 1-14) of a post-Resurrection appearance which also bears marks of having been conformed to a clear theological and didactic purpose. Richardson comments:

'They are doubtless founded upon fact, but the stories as we have them have been made into such superb parables, charged with profound theological teaching, that we cannot tell what could have been their original form.'⁽¹⁾

What then is revealed of Luke's understanding of the Eucharist in this story? V. 26 lies at its heart:

'Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and enter into his glory?'⁽²⁾

Luke's understanding of the Eucharist is bound up with his soteriology. The position of this verse makes that plain. Luke's soteriology does not rest solely upon the Crucifixion, but upon the whole Heilsgeschichte of incarnation, ministry, passion, resurrection and ascension of Christ.⁽³⁾ Indeed, here in 24. 13-35 this understanding is pushed back one stage further since the

(1) A. Richardson, op.cit., p.194f.

(2) It is of interest in this connection to note Luke's use of two sayings in Ch.24, taken from Mark but with 'Son of Man' replaced by 'Christ':

(a) A saying concerning the necessity of Christ's sufferings: Mk.8. 31: *δει τον υιον του ανθρωπου πολλα παθειν*

Lk. 24. 26: *ουχι παντα εδει παθειν τον Χριστον*

(b) A saying concerning the scriptural warrant for this:

Mk.9. 12: *και πως γεγραπται επι του υιον του ανθρωπου ινα πολλα παθη και εξουδενηθη;*

Lk.24. 46: *ουτως γεγραπται παθειν τον Χριστον*

Mark presents these as pre-crucifixion sayings. Assuming this to be their original Sitz then we can see Luke making both a point concerning soteriology (the whole life, death and resurrection of Christ - and indeed the OT history - is the Heilsgeschichte) and also a point concerning the eucharistic anamnesis (we remember the whole salvation history

which is present eschatologically in the breaking of bread).

(3) This represents the more traditional approach to the interpretation of Lukan soteriology. Morna Hooker however (In his own Image? in What about the NT? ed. Evans & Hickling, SCM, 1975) suggests that Luke's apparent omission of Mk.10. 45 (and hence the omission of a theologia crucis) may be due not to a deliberate deviation by Luke from the Markan text, but to Luke choosing to follow a non-Markan source. 'As in Mark, the themes of honour, lowliness, service, sharing the suffering of Jesus, and the central role of his lonely death..... are all present'. (p.33)

Christ of the Emmaus road interprets the Scriptures (OT) as referring to himself. Further, in the other 'direction' the Christ who is part of the eternal plan of God is the same Christ who is known ($\epsilon\gamma\upsilon\omega\sigma\theta\eta$ - v.35) to his Church in the Lord's Supper by the breaking of bread. Thus for Luke the Eucharist is the place par excellence where we come to know Christ. We know Christ in the Word of God.⁽¹⁾ The gathered community meet Christ - the pre-existent Christ - in the reading of the Scriptures and their exegesis and in their proclamation as the kerygma at the synaxis. The Risen Christ is also known in the breaking of bread for Christ is the One who is always to come - in the history of Israel, in the Ministry of Jesus, in the Church. Thus Luke sees the Eucharist as the eschatological in-breaking of the eternal Christ. As Marxsen writes:

'The coming Lord, whose coming is expected in the end-time, anticipates this coming at his supper. There the one who is to come is experienced as the one who is present, vanishes from the eyes of his disciples... and is once more the one who is to come.'⁽²⁾

The Scriptures, their exegesis, the gathered community, the breaking of bread, are all symbols conveying the reality of the saving Christ-event.

(1) It may be noted that John uses the verb $\gamma\upsilon\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$ of the relationship between Christ and the Father, and Christ and the believer. In Hebrew thought 'Knowledge... was not knowledge of abstract principles, or of a reality conceived of as beyond phenomena. Reality was what happens; and knowledge means apprehension of that. Knowledge of God meant, not thought about an eternal Being, or Principle transcending man and the world, but recognition of, and obedience to, one who acted purposefully in the world.' (E.C. Blackman, art., Knowledge, TWBB). Many commentators have noticed the parallels between Luke and John. While Luke has nothing specifically equivalent to the Johannine prologue (or are the Lukan Infancy Narratives meant to supply this?) it seems hard to escape the conclusion that Luke's emphasis on 'Scripture', exodus' and 'glory' point us in a similar direction to John's thought.

(2) W. Marxsen: The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth', p.160.

The Meal on board Ship: Acts 27. 33-36

This passage too may show signs of being meant to be interpreted eucharistically.

'He took bread, and giving thanks to God in the presence of all he broke it and began to eat' (v.35).

In the light of Luke's close connection between the Eucharist and the theme of salvation it is interesting that immediately before this we read:

τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας
ὑπαρχεῖ (v.34).

Yet few commentators will allow that this passage is eucharistic, mainly because of the presence in the boat of (presumably) non-Christian gentiles.

F.F. Bruce,⁽¹⁾ takes the verb ἐνχαριστεῖν in v.35 as being the equivalent to a Jewish grace before eating. So no doubt it was - but this in no way automatically means that it can have no eucharistic reference since the very concept of the verb (with its background in berakah) is of blessing/thanksgiving. But Bruce cites Kelly:

'It is the object of the Eucharist which gives it its character: and this is quite out of place here.'⁽²⁾

It is hard to resist the thought that ecclesiastical niceties have had more influence on this comment than has objective exegesis! An earlier conservative commentator makes two most revealing remarks:

'... the very words with which he (Luke) describes the apostle's action recall at once the picture of the Lord breaking bread before his apostles on his last evening.'⁽³⁾

But Rackham's dogmatic and ecclesiastical predilections would not allow him to draw the logical conclusion:

(1) F.F. Bruce, Acts, ad loc.

(2) ibid.

(3) R.B. Rackham, The Acts of the Apostles, Westminster Commentaries, Methuen, 1912, p.477.

'It is difficult to believe that this is what we should call a celebration of the Holy Eucharist',⁽¹⁾

'It is not likely that S. Paul would have celebrated the holy mysteries before a company of unbelievers; nor is the condition of a ship tossing in a heavy sea favourable for the solemnities of religious worship'!!⁽²⁾

Against such conservative interpretations it may be noticed:

1) that Jeremias believes the phrase 'Breaking of bread' to be a terminus technicus for the Eucharist.⁽³⁾

2) that this passage would almost certainly be siezed upon by commentators as being of eucharistic import were it not for preconceived ideas (and anachronistic ecclesiastical ones at that) of the nature and setting of 'proper' eucharistic worship.

The eucharistic overtones of Acts 27.34ff are I think fairly clear - that is to say that Luke intended it to be seen as conveying some teaching on the Lord's Supper, whatever the historical accuracy of the event. The passage fits in with Luke's purpose in Luke-Acts. He is writing for a gentile readership. This in itself may well account for Luke's emphasis on the whole saving life and Ministry of Christ, and on the 'glory' of Christ, rather than on atonement and crucifixion. The Emmaus Meal story has already shown us that Luke sees the Eucharist as a means of our receiving a share in the salvation brought about through Jesus. Lk. 14. 23 ('Go out to the highways and hedges and compel people to come in, that my house may be

(1) Rackham, op.cit., p.477

(2) *ibid.* p.490

(3) Wainwright, op.cit., p.170, n.131., and v. Jeremias, Eucharistic Words, pp.120ff.

filled') together with such passages as Acts 10. 1-48, indicate that Luke was also primarily concerned with the Gentile Mission. What more natural but that Luke should wish to demonstrate clearly that salvation is freely offered to all the gentiles, and that the means of this grace is the Eucharist - as here done for gentiles in time of great danger by the Apostle to the Gentiles (Rom. 1. 13, Acts 13.2)?⁽¹⁾

Luke's accounts of meals in the Ministry and Teaching of Jesus

Luke tells us that Jesus often spoke of the Kingdom of God in terms of feeding and feasting. Some examples are:

1. 53: He has filled the hungry with good things.
6. 21: Blessed are you that hunger now for you shall be satisfied.
11. 5-13: The parable of the importunate friend.
12. 1: Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees.
14. 7-11: The marriage feast.
14. 13f: But when you give a feast, invite the maimed, the lame, the blind...You will be repaid at the resurrection of the just.
14. 16-24: The parable of the Great Banquet - this is introduced by v. 15: Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the Kingdom of God. Dodd comments that in the interest of the Church at a later date, Luke has duplicated the episode of the last minute invitations. 'It is probable as most commentators hold that Luke has here in view the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles.'⁽²⁾

(1) I have floated this interpretation of the meal on board ship to several patient people - none of whom have been convinced! Doubtless they are correct. Nonetheless I still find the evidence cumulative and convincing - certainly good enough to argue that Luke was, albeit sub-consciously, interpreting this passage both eucharistically and therefore soteriologically. In terms of the theological importance of the passage the historical event is perhaps relatively unimportant? I am not seeking to suggest that historically Paul celebrated Pontifical High Mass on board a wrecked ship!

(2) C.H. Dodd, Parables of the Kingdom, p.93f.

22. 29f: 'I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.'

Luke also stresses that Jesus partakes of meals with sinners and other outcasts:

5. 33 (Cp. Mk. 2. 18ff; Mt. 9.14f.) - this indicates that Jesus had regular joyous meals with his disciples. Mk. 6. 31 ('they had no leisure even to eat') and Lk. 24. 31 also indicate that throughout the Ministry Jesus and his disciples regularly ate meals together - and that these meals often had a greater significance than the satisfaction of mere bodily hunger.

5. 29-32 (Mk. 2.15-17) 7. 34 (Mt. 11.19) 15.1f, 19.1-10: all these passages show Jesus eating with outcasts. The purpose of these passages in Luke is summarized by 19. 9: 'Today salvation has come to this house'. Luke sees the offer of salvation as being open to all - and this offer is made in the context of eating with Jesus. At the same time Lk.13. 23-30 warns against the interpretation that the mere fact of eating is a guarantee of salvation ('we ate and drank in your presence', v.26; 'Depart from me', v.27). This same passage also stresses that salvation is offered to the Gentiles: 'And men will come from east and west, and from north and south, and sit at table in the kingdom of God'(13. 29).

Luke clearly invests the account of the Feeding of the Multitude with eucharistic significance (9. 11-17). In v.16 is the fourfold eucharistic action: 'And taking.... he blessed (εὐλόγησεν) ..and broke and gave them.' Caird⁽¹⁾ comments that the Great Banquet may be seen as the symbol of the Messianic Age (cp. Is. 25.6-8). As Luke tells the

(1) Caird, op.cit., p.126ff.

story it is now a miracle, but possibly it may originally have been an impressive piece of prophetic symbolism. Creed⁽¹⁾ compares the Feeding of the Multitude with the Last Supper and the Emmaus Meal and comments that 'the similarity will not be accidental'. It is noteworthy that Luke follows the account of the Feeding of the Multitude with a prediction of the Passion - thus again linking the themes of Messianic Banquet, salvation and Eucharist. Further, Boobyer⁽²⁾ has argued that the accounts of the Feeding Miracles are meant to indicate the extension of Messianic Salvation to the Gentiles - also a favourite Lukan theme and one he links closely with the Eucharist.

It would seem that Luke believes that the teaching of Jesus in terms of 'Meals in the Kingdom', and his actions are of a piece. The meals taken with sinners etc. are acts of prophetic symbolism, indicating the eschatological inbreaking of the kingdom in the person of Jesus. von Rad⁽³⁾ notes that the acts called 'prophetic symbolism'

'are not to be regarded simply as symbols intended to bring out the meaning of oral preaching'

but rather they are signs which

'not only signify a datum, but actually embody it as well'.

This is of great importance in relation to the Eucharist since here, in the concept of prophetic symbolism, there is a concept of the presence of Christ in/at the Eucharist which is the prefigurement of the Messianic Banquet.

(1) Creed, op.cit., on 9. 10-17.

(2) G.H. Boobyer, The Miracle of the Loaves and the Gentiles in St. Mark's Gospel, in Scottish Journal of Theology 6 (1953) pp. 77-87.

(3) G. von Rad, The Message of the Prophets, SCM Press Ltd., 1968, p.74

The Lord's Prayer

τον ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου
ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν (Lk.11. 13; cp.Mt. 6.11)

Lohmeyer⁽¹⁾ argues that this petition has an eschatological significance with possible reference to the meals of the Ministry and overtones of 'communion' with God.

'This bread is not the bread of the Church's sacrament, nor is it even the bread of the primitive Christian Lord's Supper, nor is this communion as yet the later Church or even the primitive Christian ecclesia' and yet it is

'the eschatological communion of the children of God who today eat "our bread", their Father's gift, as they will soon eat it at their Father's house.'

so, again, here are the Lukan themes of eschatological feasting, divine feeding, and a broad offer of salvation.

SUMMARY

Luke's approach to the Eucharist/Lord's Supper is subtly different from what we have found in Mark or Paul. Luke's main points are as follows:

- 1) The Eucharist is by no means seen as a formal 'religious service'; it is the exciting act of the eschatological Christ.
- 2) Christ comes to all - Jew and Gentile, rich and poor - even to non-Christian soldiers in great danger on a sinking ship! The bread and the wine are the signs of his presence.
- 3) In the Eucharist Christ offers the joy of salvation to those who receive the bread and wine and so share in a Meal with Christ himself. We eat with Christ in the foretaste of the Messianic Banquet; through the Eucharist we know Christ, the pre-existent and Risen-Ascended

(1) E. Lohmeyer, The Lord's Prayer, Collins, 1965, pp.134-59

Christ, who brings salvation to his people from before all time and to all ages.

Thus in Luke we find a development - but a development entirely legitimate, in that it stems from the very ministry of Christ. The ministry - and indeed its OT prefiguration - the crucifixion, resurrection and giving of the Holy Spirit in Pentecost, are all seen as the symbols or vehicles of salvation, a salvation which is offered to all in the eucharistic symbols of bread and wine.

ST. JOHN'S TEACHING ON THE EUCHARIST

'On the sacramental doctrine of the Fourth Gospel two extreme views have been put forward. R. Bultmann's commentary presupposes without argument that the Gospel, as we now have it, has been through the hands of one or more redactors, to whom we owe all the sacramental references (The Gospel of John, E.T. Blackwell, 1971, p.11) O. Cullmann, on the other hand, sees sacraments everywhere; John's main concern is 'to set forth the line from the life of Jesus to the Christ of the community, in such a way as to demonstrate their identity. Because the Christ of the community is present in a special way in the sacraments, this line leads us in many, even if not in all the narratives, to the sacraments.' (Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, p.117). On Bultmann's view, we would have nothing to say; on Cullmann's we could never stop.'⁽¹⁾

This warning by C.P.M. Jones well summarizes the problem faced by those who would attempt to unravel the eucharistic doctrine of the Fourth Gospel (hereafter referred to as

(1) Ed. Jones, Wainwright & Yarnold, The Study of Liturgy, SPCK, 1978, p.164

John without prejudice to the question of authorship). But the problem is even more complicated. Not only is there the question as to whether John has or has not a doctrine of the Eucharist (and if so at what point and date in presumed redactions it should be placed) but, assuming one there is a major problem of its interpretation. For some Protestant theologians John presents difficulties in that his apparent eucharistic language has either to be interpreted as being purely metaphorical (indeed almost 'explained away'), or to be seen as it were as the first step towards the 'Catholic Doctrine' leading to Medieval Rome by way of the excesses of the early Fathers. On the other hand embarrassment can occur from John for more conservative Catholic writers, since not only does he apparently leave out any reference to the Institution Narrative in his account of the Last Supper but also spoils the whole effect of the discourse in Jn.6 by ending

'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the
flesh profiteth nothing' (6.63)

- thus knocking on the head any serious attempt to interpret John as a supporter of the (popular understanding of the) doctrine of Transubstantiation.

In view of these difficulties it is proposed in this section to approach John as openly as possible and to interpret his writing in the order in which we now have it. Consequently we shall first try to answer the question as to why John wrote his gospel. This should serve as a background for the interpretation of those passages where there may be eucharistic doctrine.

Why did John write his Gospel?:

'Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book; but these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye may have life in his name.' (20.30f.)

In their turn commentators have interpreted John's purpose. These interpretations fall into three main groups:

- 1) John wrote for non-Christians, in a somewhat 'academic' way so that Christianity might be presented as a rational religion (e.g. Dodd, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel).⁽¹⁾
- 2) John wrote for those who were already Christians - and who knew the basis of the Synoptic tradition - so as to enable them to deepen their faith and understanding. He attempted to expound and deepen the Synoptic tradition so that readers could then go back to the Synoptics as it were for the first time with a deeper and truer insight. Cullmann would fall into this interpretative approach as he wishes to show that the historic Jesus is one and the same as the Christ of the Church and that the Church's sacraments come directly from Jesus. This approach would seem to make life easiest for those who seek to define John's approach to the Eucharist since on this basis we may assume, for example, the Institution Narrative as a background to the Johannine Last Supper and so interpret accordingly.⁽²⁾
- 3) It is also possible to define John's purpose as being to write polemic against Jewish attacks on the Messiahship of Christ.

In an interesting essay⁽³⁾ W.C. van Unnik criticises all three of these approaches on the basis that they none

(1) This would assume the reading: $\pi\omega\tau\epsilon\nu\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon$

(2) This would assume the reading $\pi\omega\tau\epsilon\nu\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon$ - supported by \mathcal{X} , B and Θ

(3) W.C. van Unnik, The Purpose of St. John's Gospel in The Gospels Reconsidered, Blackwell, 1960 pp.167-197

of them take seriously enough John's own express purpose in writing as at 20.30f, namely to declare that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God and to stir up belief in him. van Unnik declares that the purpose of John 'was to bring the visitors of a synagogue in the diaspora (Jews and Godfearers) to believe in Jesus as the Messiah of Israel'.⁽¹⁾ He argues that John must have been writing for a Jewish (or pro-Jewish) audience, since otherwise his stress on Jesus as the Christ in the full meaning of Messiah (1.41; 4.25) would have been meaningless since the term Christ itself rapidly became merely a proper name within the Hellenist Church. Additional evidence in favour of this hypothesis is provided by John's use of the title 'the king of the Jews' (what use would this have served when writing to a mainly gentile audience?); by John's stress on Jesus the Christ as being the fulfilment of Moses and Law and the prophets (1.46); and by John regularly showing that Jesus fulfilled Messianic expectation (11.51f; 12.16). Finally van Unnik suggests that elements in John that are foreign to Judaism, and so are usually explained as providing a Hellenistic or Gnostic background for John, may in fact be accounted for by reference to the diaspora. This might well support Irenaeus' tradition that the Fourth Gospel originated in Asia Minor at Ephesus.

It seems to me that van Unnik does a good job of interpreting 20.30f - and after all this is the avowed purpose of John's writing in the text as we now have it. There does however seem to be less discrepancy between his approach and the approach summarized at 2) above, then there may at first appear. It would seem possible to argue that John is concerned to write a Messianic apology to the Jewish Diaspora - but that apology is necessary, precisely because the Diaspora has already heard at least part of what we now call the Synoptic tradition, and has rejected it because they

(1) van Unnik, *ibid.* p.175

reject the Man Jesus as being identified with the Messiah. Thus John may be seen as concerned both to provide apologetic and polemic to the Diaspora and also to expound and develop the ('Synoptic') tradition, the main parts of which are assumed to be known by his audience already - even if they have failed to understand them. It is this approach to John that we shall adopt here.

In fact this approach would seem to make for a good many difficulties in interpreting John's approach to the Eucharist. If the Gospel is intended for a (mainly) Jewish audience then the 'bread of life' discourse in Ch.6 takes on new dimensions. As John himself makes quite clear, any attempt to suggest to the Jews that they should eat the body (and blood?) of a human would have been met with more than a natural horror and repugnance. Yet this appears to be what is being said in Ch.6 and indeed John would appear to make the whole issue even more complicated by using $\sigmaφς$ rather than $\sigmaωμα$ and so apparently forcing us to take note of the issue.⁽¹⁾

Hook writes:

'.... the Fourth Gospel.... unlike the other Gospels, records no account of the Institution of the Eucharist, but does provide teaching about it. Here we read of 'eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking his blood.' The separate terms 'body' and 'blood' have become the hendiadys 'flesh and blood'. Here quite a different doctrine (as compared with Paul and the Synoptics) would appear to be suggested, where the bread and wine become not merely conventional signs, but signs which in some sense, are identified with what is signified.'⁽²⁾

(1) We noted above (p.43) that Paul nearly always prefers $\sigmaωμα$ (especially 1 Cor. 11.24) precisely because it is easier for the term not to smack of cannibalism.

(2) Hook, op.cit., p.88; I do not think I would agree with Hook's understanding of Paul!

It is now possible to begin an examination of those passages where it may be possible to find evidence for John's doctrine of the Eucharist. But at once there is yet another problem. Which passages are germane to this purpose? In the absence of any Institution Narrative where are we to begin? W.F. Howard may give us some clues in quoting this passage from von Hügel:

'The Church and the sacraments, still predominantly implicit in the Synoptists and the subjects of costly conflict and organisation in the Pauline writings, here underlie, as already fully operative facts, practically the entire profound work. The great dialogue with Nicodemus concerns baptism; the great discourse in the synagogue at Capernaum, the Holy Eucharist - in both cases the strict need of these sacraments. And from the side of the dead Jesus flow blood and water, as these two great sacraments flow from the everliving Christ; while at the cross's foot He leaves His seamless coat, symbol of the Church's indivisible unity.'⁽¹⁾

To some this may seem more like mysticism than exegesis, and van Unnik's interpretation would give us grounds for accepting von Hügel's statements with considerable caution, but it does suggest that, in line with many commentators, we may if we wish look at ANY Johannine passage - they are all eucharistic! (or are they?), and von Hügel also raises the question that seems to be most important to remember when attempting to understand John: to what extent does John think that he is deliberately writing theologically/allegorically/mystically, and to what extent does he think he is writing 'history as it happened'?

(1) W.F. Howard: The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism & Interpretation, 1931

Water into Wine: John 2. 1-11

Of this story H.J. Richards asks:

'Isn't it unreal to find a reference to something as recondite as the Christian Eucharist in a story as simple as this? But isn't it unreal to imagine that a story about wine and crucifixion, written and read by people for whom the Eucharist was a fact of their daily lives, could fail to have this reference?'⁽¹⁾

It is in fact quite possible that John was writing for people for whom the Eucharist was not a fact of their daily lives. So it is not quite so immediately obvious that 2. 1-11 does have immediate and automatic significance in terms of the Eucharist - though it may contain indirect references to the Eucharist. Indeed Lohse⁽²⁾ denies that 2. 1-11 has sacramental reference to the Eucharist.

Cullmann, however, argues that the passage is of direct eucharistic significance.⁽³⁾ He begins by noting that the thought of v.4 (My hour has not yet come) has parallels with other passages such as 7.6 (My time is not yet come), 7.30 (His hour was not yet come) and 8.20; 12.23; 13.1; 17.1. The last three of these are particularly interesting since they suggest that the 'hour' has come - in the Passover-Crucifixion event. At Jn.17.1, where in the Synoptic tradition we would expect the Institution Narrative, we read: 'Father the hour is come! Glorify thy Son'.

Another important Johannine theme is that of 'glory'. The Son glorifies the Father, and is Himself glorified in the Crucifixion (3.1; 12.23; 27, 28, 32; 17.1). For John 'glory' = 'Crucifixion-Resurrection' (Needless to say this statement short circuits a great deal of discussion!) It is consonant with John's understanding of 'glory' that at

(1) H.J. Richards, The Miracles of Jesus - what really happened?, Collins/Fontana, 1975.

(2) E. Lohse, Miracles in the Fourth Gospel, in What about the NT?, p.68 and fn.13

(3) Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, pp.66-71.



the very moment of the Crucifixion, Pilate, who already has discussed the nature of kingship with Jesus (18.33-38), orders to be fixed to the cross the title:

'Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews'

- (19.19)

Thus contained in John's twin themes of 'the Hour' and 'glory' we find a summary of John's apologetic concerning the Messiahship of Jesus. Jesus is the Messiah, who comes to glorify the Father by reigning from the Cross and being vindicated in the Resurrection. For our purposes it is particularly noteworthy that these important themes occur in the Last Supper narrative - and also here in 2. 1-11. This must suggest that it may be correct to find in 2. 1-11 insight into the significance of the Eucharist - even if we remain sceptical as to whether it is to be interpreted as of principally eucharistic significance.

This approach seems strengthened by 2.1: 'and the third day'. This seems almost definitely to be a Johannine pointer to the Resurrection. John Marsh notes:

'The phrase 'on the third day' is admirably suited to provide both a backward and a forward reference. It clearly points back to the series of stories about the disciples, and beyond them to the first occasion when John bore witness to Jesus as the Lamb of God....It points forward quite as clearly to the end of his narrative when 'on the third day' as every Christian account of the Resurrection affirmed, Jesus was finally manifested in his deathconquering glory'⁽¹⁾

It is in the context of the Resurrection - the hour that in Cana had 'not yet come' - that we are to read Jesus' apparent refusal to his mother. Cullmann notes:

'....the refusal was directed against the fact that the mother saw the changing of

(1) Marsh, St. John, Pelican NT commentaries, p.143

the water into wine as a self-sufficient miracle, while Jesus saw in it a pointer to a far greater miracle which he could not yet fulfil since "the hour for it is not yet come".⁽¹⁾

Is it possible to detect in this note of 'not yet' the sense of 'prophetic symbolism' which we have used earlier to interpret Jesus' Last Supper actions? At Cana the 'hour' is 'not yet' and so Jesus is able only to perform a 'lesser miracle', one which pales into insignificance in comparison with the 'glory' of the Resurrection. In the same way, in the Synoptic accounts of the Last Supper Jesus foreshadows his death (and resurrection?) in the action of breaking bread and pouring wine. These actions are 'not yet' the reality of salvation which will be wrought on the Cross. But they point to that reality - and in this sense are the body and blood of Christ. After the 'true miracle' of the Crucifixion/Resurrection event, we are able to share in that event through the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper. In a sense this too is 'not yet' the ultimate fulfilment of Salvation, though it is a guarantee of that salvation. Is it possible that John, in as much as he is here speaking of the Lord's Supper, is seeking to explore the times ('hour') of 'not yet' which speak to us of the 'hour' of our salvation?

If in the last paragraph I am on anything like the right track, then it seems to me that John might be suggesting that there are twin polarities of 'reality' for the Christian: first, the 'hour' of 'glory' that is the Crucifixion/Resurrection event,(and we may add, the giving of the Holy Paraclete) on which the whole salvation experience of the Christian is based; second the final fulfilment of the 'hour' in the Messianic Banquet (here foreshadowed in the Cana wedding feast).

(1) Cullmann, op.cit., p.67

Hence we live in the time in between these realities and hence the Eucharist is a 'foreshadowing' (as it were) of both.

We must pursue the theme of the Messianic Banquet. It has already been seen that in the Synoptic Gospels there are frequent allusions to the Kingdom of God in terms of future feasting and banquets. It has been shown that Luke (who would seem to have some affinity with John - cp. their use of 'glory') sees the Eucharist as being the fulfilment and also the proclamation of the teaching and deeds of Jesus in relation to the Messianic Banquet. In Jn. 2. 1-11 we find the first 'sign' set in the context of a Marriage Feast.

One of the recurring themes of the Messianic Banquet is that of great joy. Westcott notes that there is a Jewish saying, 'Without wine there is no joy'.⁽¹⁾ Several OT passages speak of the joy of wine:

'When that day comes the mountains will run with new wine and the hills flow with milk

and the river beds of Judah will run with water' (Joel 4. 18).

'The days are coming now -
it is the Lord who speaks -
when harvest will follow directly after ploughing,
the treading of grapes after sowing,
when the mountains will run with new wine
and the hills all flow with it.' (Amos 9.13)

And Psalm 104.5:

'And wine that maketh glad the heart of man
.... And bread that strengtheneth man's heart.'

(1) Westcott, St. John, p.36

These passages use the symbolism of wine to speak of the joys of the coming Messianic Age.

H.J. Richards notes⁽¹⁾ that there is a reference to the Messianic Age in the Apocalypse of Baruch which refers to each vine having a thousand branches, each branch a thousand clusters, each cluster a thousand grapes, and each grape will produce 120 gallons of wine. Is the coincidence of this figure with Jn.2.6 mere coincidence, or a firm indicator by John that he intends the Wedding Feast to be interpreted in terms of the Messianic Banquet? The Wedding Feast is a prefigurement of the Messianic Banquet - which is brought about in Jesus through the Cross and Resurrection. Thus the 'sign' of the Wedding Feast points to the 'hour' of 'glory' in which all who are 'in Christ' (Jn,14.20) are able to share because of Christ's corporate personality.⁽²⁾

Hoskyns writes:

'The Christ is the dispenser of the life of God, the author and giver of eternal life, which He offers to the world through His death and through the mission of his disciples. This is the fulfilment of Judaism, of which the miracle of Cana is a sign.'⁽³⁾

And Marsh comments:

'Such an interpretation involves the reader in taking the wine....as a symbol of the Christian eucharist!.'⁽⁴⁾

To which I would wish to reply: yes and no! I feel forced to make so perverse a statement because I feel that John is not making a comment in 2. 1-11 about the Eucharist as such - or rather that he is making a very profound comment, namely that the Eucharist itself is

(1) H.J. Richards, op.cit., p.35

(2) For a discussion on this v. C.F.D. Moule, The Origin of Christology, CUP, 1977, pp.47-96

(3) Hoskyns: The Fourth Gospel, p.190f.

(4) Marsh: St. John, p.147

a 'sign' and should be understood as such. The Eucharist is the symbol used during the time when the 'hour of glory' is 'not yet' by the people of God who look forward to the 'hour of glory' in reality.

The feeding of the multitude; Jesus walks on the sea; the discourse on the bread of life: John 6.

It seems best to take this chapter as one complete whole, rather than seeing vv.16-21 as being an intrusion into the narrative. There are numerous points of contact between John's account of the events and that of Mark. After Mark's account of the Feeding of the Multitude (Mk.6 35-44) he, like John, also includes the account of Jesus walking on the sea (Mk.6. 47-53; Jn.6. 16-21) and (according to Dodd⁽¹⁾) it is also possible to see a parallel between the discourse in John (6. 66-71) and the dialogues in Mark (8. 27-30). It has already been shown that it is probably correct to interpret Mark's account of the Feeding of the Multitude as being of importance for his understanding of the Eucharist. So, in view of the parallels which we have noted in the order of John and Mark it is not surprising that John also gives his main eucharistic teaching in this passage.

Dodd makes the point⁽²⁾ that in both of Mark's accounts of the Feeding of the Multitude, he follows the accounts by a departure from the scene by boat. But neither Mk.6 nor 8 give any reason to account for this sudden departure. John does give a reason at 6. 15; the people were coming to make Jesus king. At this time there was intense Messianic expectation - and this expectation included the belief that the Messiah would feed his people. The crowds seize on the idea that Jesus is the Messiah - but they misinterpret his Messiahship in terms of political and material gain.

(1) Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, p.196

(2) ibid., p.199

Thus at the heart of what is usually (and I think rightly) interpreted as John's central reference to eucharistic understanding we find also a clear reference to John's main point in writing his gospel: to demonstrate that Jesus is the true Messiah of Israel, and to show what that Messiahship (properly interpreted) involves. The point is that, in the act of trying to make Jesus king, the people clearly demonstrate that they have entirely misconstrued the nature of Jesus' Messiahship. They have done so because they have also entirely misunderstood and missed the point of the Feeding Miracle. As with the 'sign' at Cana, John is concerned with misunderstandings. This theme of misinterpretation is picked up again in the later discourse - when the Jews and even the disciples so misunderstand Jesus (6.41, 52, 60) that 'many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him'(6.66). They misunderstand the discourse, because they interpret it too literally and at the same time fail to grasp the greater reality lying behind the words of Jesus, just as earlier they misunderstand the Feeding Miracle, because they fail to see the greater miracle lying behind it. Is John suggesting that the Eucharist is capable of being similarly misunderstood on a too naively literal level which fails to grasp the greater realities lying behind it? This must be examined in a little more detail.

There are no major differences in the accounts of the Feeding of the Multitude (6. 1-14) between John and the Synoptists. John sets the scene on a mountain (v.3) which may be a hint that Jesus is the fulfilment of Moses. There was expectation that the 'second Moses' would bring down manna:

'What did the first redeemer? He brought down
the manna,

And the last redeemer will bring down the manna.'

- Rabba. Eccles 1.9. ⁽¹⁾

(1) Kilmartin, op.cit. p.97 reminds us that the coming of the Messiah was expected as Passover. Also, liturgically Joshua 5, with its reference to the last of the old manna (Josh.5.10ff), was read in Passover week, and rabbinic tradition suggested that the 'new manna' was to remain in the heavenly place until the Messiah's coming in Nisan.

Mark makes this same point by setting his account in the desert.

John then notes that the Passover was near (v.4). Hoskyns writes:

'...at that very time, the priests were preparing to kill the lambs, and the Jews were assembling their families to eat unleavened bread and the flesh of an unblemished lamb, to commemorate their past deliverance from Egypt, to acknowledge the power and mercy of God, and to be reminded of their peculiarity as His chosen people.'⁽¹⁾

Thus John is enabled to make several points. First, and perhaps most importantly, the link between the Feeding of the Multitude and the discourse is the theme of Jesus as the true Passover Lamb - although the people fail to understand this. The reference to the Passover in v. 4 is picked up in the discourse by a reference to the true manna (v.31) which leads on to the discourse on the 'bread of life' which is the 'flesh' of Jesus given 'for the life of the world'(v.51). Thus Jn.6 looks back to previous references to the Lamb of God (1. 29, 36) and looks ahead to 19. 36:

'For these things came to pass, that the scripture might be fulfilled. A bone of him shall not be broken'.

John dates the crucifixion so that Jesus dies at the moment when the Passover lambs are being slaughtered in the Temple (19.31). Thus Jesus is the true Passover Lamb. The bread of the Feeding of the Multitude points forward to the 'greater miracle': the self-offering of Jesus on the cross as the true bread offered for the life of the world (6.51). In the Last Supper narrative, at the point where in the Synoptic tradition we should expect the Institution Narrative we have instead the account of the washing of the disciples' feet (13. 1-12) followed by the 'Farewell discourses'.

(1) Hoskyns, op.cit., p.281

Again John picks up the theme of Jesus' self-offering:

'Ye call me Master and Lord: and ye say well; for so I am. If I then, the Lord and the Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet'(13.13f)

'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends'(15.13).

'and for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth'(17.19).

We note also that John holds closely together the self-offering of Jesus and the offering of themselves that is necessary if the disciples are to share in the 'glory' of Christ. This theme is worked out most fully in the discourse on the 'True Vine'(ch.15).

Is it possible that John is saying something here about the nature of the Eucharist - but in a deliberately round about way, so as to tie in the themes of the Lamb of God, the bread of life, the Messiahship of Jesus, the Passover, the Last Supper, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the self-offering of Jesus and the consequent self-offering of the disciples - all within a constant theme of 'misunderstanding'? In other words I suggest that John is concerned that many of the most important themes of Christian belief and discipleship - including the Eucharist - are in danger of being misunderstood by his audience, just as the Feeding Miracle and the Bread of Life discourse were misunderstood by the people. John's point about the Eucharist is, I think, that it is a 'sign', just as the Feeding Miracle was a sign. A sign that looks back to the greater reality on which Christian salvation rests, Jesus the true Passover Lamb who offered himself once and for all for the life of the world. And also the Eucharist is a sign that looks forward - to the greater miracle of the Messianic Banquet, foreshadowed in the Feeding Miracle,

and then again in the Eucharist itself.

What misunderstanding of the Eucharist was John concerned about? Perhaps we shall find out a little more when we look at the details of the Bread of Life discourse itself. But already I think we can point to two. Firstly, the people fail to grasp the meaning of the Feeding Miracle because they fail to see it as pointing to the 'greater miracle'. Is John trying to suggest that there is a danger of concentrating too exclusively on the Eucharist as a guarantee of salvation and so in fact failing to observe the 'greater miracle' of which the Eucharist is but a sign? Secondly, the stress we have observed John making on the necessary self-offering of the DISCIPLES seems to me to indicate that (as in the earlier situation at Corinth) he is concerned that it is all too easy to so concentrate on the eucharistic gift (even if properly understood as pointing to the greater miracle of Crucifixion-Resurrection) as to miss the concomitant of that gift of Christ to his people, namely our gift of ourselves, in thanks, to Him.

Flesh and blood; faith and spirit - the meaning of the bread of life discourse.

When we look at the Bread of Life discourse it at once becomes obvious that there would seem to be a considerable dichotomy between vv. 53ff where the reader is told that it is necessary to eat the flesh of Jesus and to drink his blood, and the first and last sections of the discourse (vv. 26-40 and 62ff) where we are told that the work of the Christian 'is to believe on him whom God hath sent' (v.29) and that 'it is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing'(v. 63). Indeed, John seems quite deliberately to heighten this dichotomy. In v.50f, the first mention of 'eating' the flesh of Christ, the verb used is the most usual one, 'φάγετε'. The Jews question - not unnaturally - how a man can give his flesh to be eaten, and Jesus replies that those who

wish to have eternal life must eat his flesh and drink his blood. In view of John's purpose in writing to (we presume here) a diaspora Jewish audience (though the point holds whatever the audience) it seems scarcely possible that he could so stress the matter. Not only so but John accentuates the effect by changing the verb from *φάγειν* to *τρώγειν*. This seems an impossibly crude literalism. *τρώγειν* means 'to munch', 'to eat in such a way as to be heard', 'to chew'. Last, but not least, John seems to avoid using the (acceptable?) word *σῶμα* and instead uses the much more difficult *σὰρξ*. Thus in the 'bread of life discourse' John points us firmly towards the 'great miracle', namely that *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο* (Jn. 1.14). The incarnation is the great offence - and the Eucharist is the symbol of that great offence!

As Cullmann comments 'the material side of this sacrament is here exaggerated almost to the point of giving offence'.⁽¹⁾ Indeed to the Jews it gives grave offence and even some of the disciples 'went back and walked no more with him'(v.66).

Yet at the same time we have the words of v.63:

'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life.'

Hook⁽²⁾ summarizes the three main approaches that commentators have taken over this dichotomy presented by John:

1) vv.62f are the governing verses. They represent John's own view and make quite clear that all crude literalism with regard to the Eucharist is to be avoided. This seems to give little explanation of the apparently deliberate literalism of vv.53ff.

(1) Cullmann, op.cit., p.99

(2) Hook, op.cit., pp.96-99.

2) The language is that of the Hellenistic Mystery cults which John is concerned to combat. In opposition to the dread of the 'flesh' that was present in the Mysteries, John stresses that 'the Word became Flesh' and uses the most literal language possible of the Eucharist. This view seems to take too little account of vv.62ff and in any case Barrett has probably rightly scotched this argument when he notes that the use of Hellenistic language does not necessarily mean that a Hellenistic approach was either being adopted or attacked.⁽¹⁾ In any case on the view that John was written (in at least one recension) for a Jewish audience in the diaspora, this view becomes untenable.

3) The third view is that there is no real, but only an apparent, conflict between vv.53ff and v.63. Commenting on *ἄρτον* Hoskyns Notes:

'The word is used of eating corn or cereals, not usually of eating meat. In v.58 and xxi.18 its object is 'bread'. The choice of the word here therefore serves a double purpose. It emphasizes a real physical eating (cp. Mt xxiv.38) and appropriately points the unmistakable reference to the Eucharist'.⁽²⁾

Exactly! John is concerned to point to the Eucharist here - but he is concerned to rectify a possible serious misunderstanding. The Eucharist is the 'sign' of the flesh and blood of Christ. By eating the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper we are given assurance of the share we have in the salvation won for us through Christ's sacrifice of his body and blood. But the eucharistic meal remains

(1) Barrett, *op.cit.*, p.30f

(2) Hoskyns, *op.cit.*, p.299

the 'sign' of that grace. It is not literally the body and blood of Christ. The verb *τροφω* points to the Eucharist - but it points to the bread of the Eucharist, not to cannibalism. Macdonald⁽¹⁾ suggests that John may have had in mind here the problems caused by (Gentile?) Christians who were moving towards a grossly physical and magical view of the Eucharist. John wishes to clear up this misunderstanding and move to an interpretation of the Eucharist as a meeting between Christ, the Incarnate Word of God, and the soul. I think I would wish to suggest that Macdonald's interpretation here is slightly too narrow and individualistic, but it is right in essentials.

It must be noted that the discourse begins (v.26) by disclaiming the importance of the physical nature of the earlier Feeding Miracle. The fact of physical feeding is relatively unimportant in comparison with the necessity of spiritual feeding (v. 27). Those who wish to serve God need to do but one thing: 'believe in him whom he hath sent'.(v.29) The real heavenly food which gives eternal sustenance is the true manna sent by God (v.32) and this true manna is Jesus himself (v.35). He will give himself for the life of all men (v.51) and all who believe will have eternal life (vv. 35, 53)

Kilmartin⁽²⁾ notes that it was common Midrashic method to contrast two meanings of the same word or phrase to bring out a deeper (third?) meaning. In 6. 32-59, John may be making a Midrashic comment based on Ps.78. 24:

'And he rained down manna upon them to eat
And gave them of the corn of heaven.'

John develops this (according to Kilmartin) by using two meanings for 'manna': 1) the word of revelation; 2) the incarnate Son of God. Kilmartin writes:

(1) Macdonald, op.cit., p.34
(2) Kilmartin, op.cit., pp.100ff.

'In Jewish speculation, the manna of the Messianic Kingdom is identified with the manna of the desert. The NT writers, however, understand the manna of the desert only as a type of divine blessing reserved for the Messianic age. In Jn.6. 16-47 it is portrayed as a type of the Word of God and in Jn.6. 54-59 and 1 Cor.10. 3 as a type of the Eucharist.'

So here John points to the presence of Christ in that foretaste of the Messianic Banquet which is also the 'sign' of the Cross, the Eucharist. In a way parallel, but subtly different from Luke in his story of the Emmaus road and Meal, John makes the point that in the Eucharist Christ is present both as Word and Sign - either, alone are mere misunderstandings.

Thus John sets the gift of the Eucharist - which is the assurance of the gift of eternal life through the body and blood of Christ offered on the Cross - in the context of the necessity of right understanding/faith. Eating and drinking at the Eucharist no more guarantees salvation than did eating and drinking the manna in the wilderness guarantee life for the Jews (v.49); or sharing in the 'sign' of the Eucharist, the Last Supper, guarantee salvation for Judas (v.71 cp.13. 26ff). But at the same time the eucharistic gift is objective reality. In the Eucharist, rightly understood, we eat and drink the flesh and blood of Christ, not in any crude anthropophagic sense, but in that we truly receive the life of Christ who died for us.

Why does John not include an Institution Narrative?

We are still left, I think, slightly puzzled as to whether it is really correct to interpret atleast one strand in John's thought as being of eucharistic significance - particularly in view of his (apparently deliberate)

omission of the Institution Narrative. A move towards solving the puzzle is to try to understand why John makes this serious omission. C.K. Barrett writes:

'It is certain that John was more rather than less interested in the eucharist than the synoptists; he gives indirect teaching on the subject at some length. But because he was concerned to root the sacrament as observed by the Church in the total sacramental fact of the incarnation, he was unwilling to attach it to a particular moment and a particular action'.⁽¹⁾

So it would seem that we have been on the right lines in interpreting the Eucharist (for John) as a 'sign' with reference both back and forward to the 'greater miracles' of Salvation and Final Consummation. W.F. Howard makes a complementary point, and offers an alternative explanation as to the cause of the nature of the eucharistic 'misunderstanding' which John is concerned to combat:

'It is possible that his reaction from the more tense apocalyptic expectation of the primitive Church is partly responsible for his severance of the eucharistic teaching from the Last Supper. It is also possible that, in recording the allegory of the True Vine, and the long discourse upon the fellowship of the disciples with their Lord and with one another, he did not wish to identify this communion with any external rite.'⁽²⁾

And here some words of Hoskyns deserve quoting at length:

'The discourse (of Jn.6) is not a 'Eucharistic Discourse' if by that title is meant that the Evangelist has presented his readers with a reflection upon or a preachment about the Eucharistic practices, beliefs, and experiences

(1) C.K. Barrett, St. John, London SPCK, 1965, p.42

(2) W.F. Howard, op.cit., p.208.

of Christians at the beginning of the second century or earlier. Nor did he intend to set forth a prophetic and comprehensive direction by Jesus concerning the future eucharistic worship of the Church. Still less is the discourse 'anti-Eucharistic' or 'anti-Sacramental' if by the use of these ugly words is to be understood that the Evangelist has purposely set the teaching of Jesus over against His actions, and digestion of His words over against a participation in a mystical communal act. The sustained and primary purpose of the Evangelist is to declare the true meaning of an episode that stood importantly in the Christian Tradition of the words and actions of Jesus. He was aware that the Feeding of the Five Thousand raised and solved more questions than could easily be detected in the form in which the story was normally told. In order that his readers may apprehend the episode, he places them midway between it and the occasion when, at the meal on the eve of His crucifixion, Jesus declared to His disciples alone the meaning of His life; that is to say, he set them midway between the apparent satisfaction provided by the partaking of food and drink, illustrated by the Feeding of the Five Thousand and the giving of the manna and the passover meal of the Jews, and the occasion when every kind of material and historical and psychological satisfaction is shown to be illusory, and when room is made thereby for the final satisfaction provided by the reverse and spiritual action of God which was

the theme of the teaching of Jesus and the meaning of his life and death.⁽¹⁾

It seems to me that this approach to John's interpretation of the Eucharist receives final confirmation when we remember one last aspect of Jn.6 - Jesus walking on the water (6. 16-21). Dodd would seem to sum up the point of this pericope, situated as it is between the account of the Feeding of the Multitude and the Bread of Life discourse:

'It is the recognition of Jesus, unexpectedly present to the disciples in their need, that is the true centre of the story'.⁽²⁾

Again it is a 'sign' that the Risen Christ (this passage is often interpreted as a 'misplaced Resurrection Narrative'⁽³⁾) comes to his disciples in their hour of need. The Eucharist is the 'sign' where we meet Him.

'The hour' and the 'sign' - John's Eucharist.

I think I can best summarize this interpretation of John's Eucharistic understanding in a form of diagram.

All through the 'life' of Jesus/Christ runs the central fact of Salvation and Consummation which was enacted historically in the Crucifixion and Resurrection (though the Final Consummation - the Messianic Banquet - remains to be enacted and has itself so far only been in 'sign' e.g. the Last Supper).

We may represent the components of Salvation and Consummation thus:

Cross = +
Resurrection = "R"
Final Consummation = MB

Then John presents the Salvation Final Consummation event as a series of events centring round the central figure of Christ. Always there are two polarities of reality: the historical Cross-Resurrection event, and the future

(1) Hoskyns, op.cit., p.288

(2) Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, p.198

(3) Whether it is or not makes no difference here.

Consummation. Both these polarities are themselves subsumed within the corporate, incarnate Christ.

Thus we have:

<u>'Time'/'Sign'/'Symbol'</u>	<u>'Reality'</u>
The pre-existent Word	+ "R" MB
The incarnate Ministry	+ "R" MB
Last Supper	+ "R" MB
Crucifixion & Resurrection = (sign and reality are one)	+ "R" (MB)
Church/Eucharist	+ "R" MB
Final Consummation = (sign and reality are one)	(+ "R") MB

Thus in St. John we find yet another strand in the development of Eucharistic doctrine, not in contradiction to Paul or the Synoptics, but a legitimate development based on the central fact of the Christian Gospel: that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, the Word made flesh. The Eucharist is the symbol whereby we receive life by feeding on the bread of life. John sees this as the supreme moment of eschatological inbreaking. The 'hour' that is 'not yet' is present in symbol as a foretaste of 'glory'. Thus in John we come to what may almost be seen as an 'ultimate' development of one strand of eucharistic understanding: that symbol and reality are both quite separate and yet totally at one. When we receive the Eucharist symbols in faith we believe 'and believing we may have life in his name'.

EXCURSUS: Did Jesus intend the Last Supper to be a Eucharist?

It will have been noticed that I have made no explicit attempt to write about the whole question of, Jesus' own understanding of the Last Supper. This is deliberate. Part of the reason is that I believe the twin traditions of the Last Supper accounts and the Liturgical Lord's Supper accounts have become so intermingled so early on -

because of the influence of the Liturgy on the Tradition and vice versa - that it is not possible with any confidence now to distinguish the two separately. In any case I am not sure that question is of vital importance. Under the influence of the earlier liberal critics the question 'Did Jesus intend the Last Supper to become a 'sacrament' and to be continued by the Church?', was much debated. Any doubtful or negative answer was greeted with dismay by the more conservative as striking at the very roots of the continued existence of the Church. But in fact the question as stated is wrongly formed. Lying behind it is the more fundamental one: 'Did Jesus found a Church?' The answer to that must appear dubious to any who cannot go along with the 'Primitive Catholicity' school of NT and Church History interpretation. But then this too is strictly speaking a 'non-question' as Frensdorff points out:

'The question whether Jesus sought to found an ecclesia is not properly stated. Israel was already an ecclesia, a 'congregation of the faithful' and 'people of God' among whom, however, were individuals set apart to carry out particular functions, such as Levites and rabbis. The decisive step taken by Jesus was to identify his own followers as the true Israel.....'

In which case our question becomes: 'Did the Christ intend His people to receive the fruits of atonement and resurrection?' Clearly the answer is 'Yes'. Therefore the Church, the Body of Christ, the Company of the Redeemed, was entirely right to perform the New Passover Meal of Anamnesis on the 'eighth day', the day of Resurrection, the day of the New Creation wrought in Christ.

Any question that asks for knowledge of the inner thought of Jesus is doomed to failure. We simply do not know the inner psychology of Jesus. What we do know - and

what is really more important - is what the early Church made of the figure of Jesus who is also the Christ of faith. Nor need this mean that Christology (and hence Eucharistic theology) are separated from the Man Jesus. As Moule has shown, a very convincing argument can be made out that the sole origin of Christology is Jesus the Christ. Bible and Eucharist form part of the continuum of the Community of Faith. Together they are the Tradition concerning the declaration of the Heilsgeschichte. As the Church meets around Word and Sacrament it makes anamnesis of the Jesus who is the Christ - not merely looking back to the historical Jesus of Nazareth, but proclaiming also the pre-existent, present, eternal, eschatological Christ who wrought salvation for us on the Cross.

PART II

CLEMENT OF ROME

Some forty or fifty years after Paul had written to the Church in Corinth beseeching them not to be factious, Clement of Rome wrote again for the same purpose. His epistle, a somewhat rambling document, centres on the theme of humility, a virtue which several of the Corinthian Christians seemed conspicuously to have lacked. Further developing some of Paul's earlier concerns Clement is particularly concerned to deal with the question of Church Order. Apparently some of the elders have been ejected from their rightful liturgical functions. Such actions, says Clement, cannot agree with Christian humility and the unity of the Body of Christ.

Such eucharistic understanding as Clement reveals in this letter is of course implicit. Indeed it seems arguable that Clement would not have had too much to say anyway in this area, since he would not seem to have possessed a speculative theological mind, but rather to have had a typical Roman desire for order, discipline and organisation. As Bettenson comments, I Clement shows

"the emergence of the characteristic Roman Christianity. Here we find no ecstasies, no miraculous 'gifts of the Spirit', no demonology, no pre-occupation with an imminent 'Second Coming'....One would assume that he had small interest in theological speculation; rather he is concerned with the organisation of the Christian community, its ministry and its liturgy."⁽¹⁾

I Clement's main eucharistic understanding is that the Eucharist is the Christian sacrifice. In chapter 41 he draws a parallel between the OT priests and levites on the one hand and the Christian ministry on the other.

(1) Bettenson, Early Christian Fathers, p.2f.

'In the same way, my brothers, when we offer our own Eucharist to God each one of us should keep to his own degree... The continual daily sacrifices, peace-offerings, sin-offerings and trespass-offerings are by no means offered in every place, brothers, but at the altar in front of the Temple... Take note from this, my brothers, that since we ourselves have been given so much fuller knowledge, the peril that we are in is correspondingly graver.'

- I Clem.4.1.(1)

Here Clement is making the point that just as Jewish sacrifices were offered in one place so the Corinthian Church should not be divided. His argument assumes that the Eucharist is the Christian equivalent of the Jewish sacrifices. There are several passages which support this:

'Jesus Christ the High Priest by whom our gifts are offered.' - ch. 36.

'The High Priest (Bishop?), for example, has his own proper services assigned to him, the priesthood has its own station, there are particular ministries laid down for the Levites (deacons?), and the layman is bound by regulations affecting the laity. In the same way my brothers, when we offer our own Eucharist to God, each one of us should keep to his own degree.' - ch. 40f.

It would seem that Clement regards each of the liturgical 'orders' (Bishop?/presbyter, deacon, layman) as having their own special function in offering the Christian sacrifice through Christ, the Heavenly High Priest. Such an 'institutionalising' of the concept of Christian sacrifice within the life of the Church at so early a date would seem to be unique to Clement.⁽²⁾

(1) Staniforth, Early Christian Writing, p.44 from whom all quotations.

(2) Daly, Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, p.85

We must be careful not to push this concept further than Clement himself. For we must remember that Clement is not primarily concerned here with the concept of the Eucharist as Christian sacrifice, but rather with the need for good order within the Eucharistic assembly. It is for this purpose that (as seen above in ch.41) he reformulates the popular quotation of Malachi 1.11 which Clement interprets not as a prophecy of the new Christian rite of Eucharistic sacrifice unrestricted by time and place, but as a means of countering 'anti-institutional abuses'. (1)

In view of this it must be asked whether Clement would in fact have wished to be associated at all with the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice? The only answer we can give is that we do not know, the evidence being insufficient and ambiguous. However, in view of ch. 36 where Clement does seem quite unequivocally to regard Jesus as 'the High Priest by whom our gifts are offered' it does seem fair to say that, whatever view Clement may have held of the Eucharist as the Christian sacrifice, there can have been no room for him to regard the Eucharist as in any sense a repetition of Calvary. Rather, in line with the thought of Ep.Heb. (itself of possible Roman origin?) Clement sees the orderly, corporate worship of the Church as being linked with the eternal offering of Christ, the 'High Priest and Guardian of our souls', who offers Himself to the Father, and through whom we 'offer up our praises'. Thus the Eucharist is a symbol - as the OT sacrifices are a symbol of the Christian sacrifice, so the eucharistic sacrifice is a symbol of the one heavenly sacrifice.

(1) Daly op.cit., p.86

IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH

Ignatius represents the Syrian Church of the late first or early second century. The main themes emerging from his letters, written on his way to martyrdom, are:

- (i) the necessity for authoritative (episcopal) hierarchy;
- (ii) his intense hatred of heresy and schism - in particular in the letters he is concerned to oppose docetism and a group of what may have been 'christianised Essenes'⁽¹⁾;
- (iii) an almost pathological emphasis on the glory of martyrdom.

Since these are his main concerns, it comes as no surprise that Ignatius' understanding of the Eucharist remains implicit and never explicit within these letters.

Furthermore, such teaching on the Eucharist as is contained in the letters naturally falls within the context of the same three areas of his main concern:

- (i) it is vital that within each Church there is but one eucharistic assembly presided over by one bishop/elder.
- (ii) Ignatius lays great stress on the reality of the eucharistic gift, and also on the reality of its effects. This stress is clearly part of his opposition to docetism.
- (iii) it may just be possible that Ignatius sees his coming martyrdom in terms of the Church's offering of the eucharistic sacrifice. With somewhat greater certainty it may be argued that he understands the eucharistic assembly as in some way offering a sacrifice.

It is proposed to investigate Ignatius' eucharistic understanding under each of these three heads.

(1) Staniforth: Early Christian Writings. p.70

(i) The unity of the eucharistic assembly

'Make certain therefore that you all observe one common eucharist; for there is but one Body of our Lord Jesus Christ and but one cup of union with His blood and one single altar of sacrifice - even as there is but one bishop with his clergy and my own fellow servitors, the deacons.'

- Ep. Philad.4.

'The sole Eucharist you should consider valid is one that is celebrated by the bishop himself, or by some person authorized by him.' - Ep. Smyrneans 8.

For Ignatius the Eucharist is the sign of the unity of the people of God - a unity that is already accomplished through the saving work of God who sent his Son to be a sacrifice for us. (Eph. 1.1) In the background of all Ignatius' thought lies the theme of soteriology. The people of God have been made one through the death of Christ and so they make Eucharist - hence it follows that there must only, can only, be one Eucharistic assembly. It is not that the Eucharist makes us one, but that we celebrate our already existent unity in the Eucharist. Here we look straight back to the Pauline concept of koinonia (1 Cor.10.16f). It will be seen later that writers such as Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine virtually turn this understanding on its head and see the Eucharist not as expressive of unity, but as creating unity.⁽¹⁾ By and large the Western Church has followed Augustine in this matter rather than St. Paul and Ignatius. For Ignatius the Eucharist is thanksgiving for our unity in Christ. 'Unity with the Bishop is made both the focus and the guarantee of its own unity in Christ'.⁽²⁾

Within the context of unity as resting on the fact of our salvation, Ignatius sees the Bishop as representing God the Father in the Eucharist:

(1) Wainwright. op.cit. p.116

(2) Liturgy p.299

'Let the bishop preside in the place of God, and his clergy in the place of the apostolic conclave, and let my special friends the deacons be entrusted with the service of Jesus Christ.'

- Ep. Magnesians 6.

Here Ignatius reveals an interesting typology. The bishop is the 'type' of God the Father, the deacons are the 'type' of Christ - but the presbyters are not (as we might expect) the 'type' of the Holy Spirit, but rather (because of their teaching function?) they are the 'type' of the apostles. At once we see in this typology a reference to Ignatius' concern with soteriology. In terms of the Eucharist such typology shows that he sees the Eucharist as being part of the continuation of the 'Heilsgeschichte'. God the Father (the bishop) continues to offer the 'medicine of immortality' (Ep.Eph.13) through his Son (the deacons), the Suffering Servant, and the Church makes proclamation (anamnesis?) of this in the Eucharist (i.e. the presbyteral teaching function). Indeed it is noteworthy that the dreaded phrase 'the medicine of immortality' occurs in a soteriological context when Ignatius writes of 'God's design for the New Man, Jesus Christ'. It is because the Eucharist is the means of receiving the salvation that is offered by God, that Ignatius stresses the importance both of the unity of the eucharistic community and the need for recognising the authority of the bishop.

Dix takes us one step further when he writes:

'It was at the ecclesia....alone that a Christian could fulfil his personal liturgy, that divinely given personal part in the corporate act of the Church, the Eucharist, which expressed before God the vital being of the Church and each of its members.'⁽¹⁾

(1) Dix. op.cit.. p.21

In other words Ignatius sees the Eucharist as a means not only of remembering the mighty acts of God in salvation, but of re-presenting them in such a way that each individual Christian may take his active part both in receiving the fruits of that salvation and in sharing it with the world.

Before we leave this point we must, however, enter a caveat. When Ignatius writes as he does of the unity of the Eucharist centring around the bishop who is as God in the eucharistic community, is he giving evidence of the state of thought as it popularly existed in Syria in the early second century, or is he writing in would-be ideal terms as to what he thinks ought to be the popular view? Bauer writes thus:

'Of course there is the possibility that Ignatius' group actually represented the majority in certain cities. However, in view of Ignatius' frantic concern (i.e. to plead the importance of the monarchical episcopate) it hardly seems likely that this was the general rule'.⁽¹⁾

Of course, this does not alter the importance of Ignatius' understanding of the Eucharist, but we must beware of assuming that all members of even his own Church agreed with him, or yet even understood his thought - the Church does not change down the years!

(ii) The reality of the eucharistic gifts and its effects.

Speaking of the docetists Ignatius writes:

'They even absent themselves from the Eucharist and the public prayers, because they will not admit that the Eucharist is the self-same body of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins and which the Father in his goodness raised up again.'

- Ep. Smyrn. 7.

(1) W. Bauer. Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity. N.T. Library S.C.M. Press. 1972. p.63

Once again Ignatius places his eucharistic thought firmly within the context of soteriology - or rather his eucharistic thought quite naturally arises from the great stress which he places on salvation. Kelly ⁽¹⁾ notes that whereas most of the apostolic Fathers placed a relatively minor stress on the atoning value of Christ's death Ignatius is an exception:

'...for his insistence on the union, indeed virtual identification, of the Christian with Christ illustrates the importance he attached to the sacred manhood.'

Ignatius is determined to oppose the docetists and in consequence he stresses the reality of the eucharistic gift:

'the Eucharist is the self-same body of our Saviour Jesus Christ.' - Ep.Smyrn. 7.

'observe one common Eucharist; for there is but one Body of our Lord Jesus Christ and but one cup of union with his Blood.'

- Ep.Philad. 4.

Kelly notes:

'Clearly he intends this realism to be taken strictly, for he makes it the basis of his argument against the Docetist's denial of the reality of Christ's body' ⁽²⁾

and Dix writes:

'It was as obvious to the senses in the first or second centuries as it is today that from offertory to communion these gifts retain their physical qualities, all the experienced reality of bread and wine. Yet no language could be more uncompromising than that of the second century writers.....about 'discerning the Lord's body' - as to the fact that what is received in communion is the body and blood of Christ. There is no hesitation,

(1) Kelly, op.cit., p.165f.

(2) Kelly, op.cit., p.197

no qualification..... It is as though the metaphysical questions about the correlation of bread and wine with Body and Blood which have so troubled the mind of the Christian West since the ninth century simply did not exist for these writers.'⁽¹⁾

All this is no doubt so, but at the same time it does not appear necessary to assume without more ado that second century writers such as Ignatius adopted a simplistic form of fundamentalist literalism. It is surely possible to stress the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist - and to use that 'true' presence as a basis for the argument against the docetists - without at the same time having to fall into line with nineteenth century views on transubstantiation, (though several writers have accused Ignatius of precisely this because of his use of the phrase 'the medicine of immortality'). There are in fact several phrases in Ignatius' letters which indicate that while he believes wholeheartedly that Christ is truly present to His people in the Eucharist, nonetheless his beliefs are far more subtle than some have given him credit. As examples we may quote from the letters to the Romans and the Trallians:

'...for my drink I crave that Blood of His which is love imperishable.' - Ep.Romans 7.

'....take a fresh grip on your faith (the very flesh of the Lord) and your love (the life-blood of Jesus Christ).'

- Ep.Trall. 8.

Gore's comment here is very apt:⁽²⁾

'Ignatius of all men was most penetrated with the sense of a union of Christ with His church 'both in the flesh and in the spirit'.'

(1) Dix. op.cit., p.244

(2) Gore. Body of Christ, p.293

In these phrases from Romans and Trallians Ignatius seems to be saying that the Eucharist is a means of partaking of the reality of salvation, a means of re-presenting (anamnesis) the Heilsgeschichte. through the bread and wine of Eucharist which is (to faith) the flesh and blood of Christ. The Eucharist is a means of receiving eternal life, which gift is the reason Christ gave himself on the cross:

'...share in the one common breaking of bread - the medicine of immortality and the sovereign remedy by which we escape death and live in Jesus Christ for evermore.'

- Ep.Eph. 20.2

The phrase 'the medicine of immortality' (*φάρμακον ἀθανασίας*) has often been seen as evidence that Ignatius views the Eucharist in a quasi-magical way. This is unfair. Certainly his language is picturesque and certainly he intends it to be understood as indicating the 'real presence' of Christ. but there would seem to be nothing here that needs must indicate that Ignatius holds an ex opere operato view of the sacrament. The Eucharist is a means of sharing proleptically in the eschatological banquet through faith and love (Ep.Trall. 8) - the means being the body and blood of Christ given for our salvation. Wainwright⁽¹⁾ notes that Ignatius' phrase has been turned into a 'swear-word' by German protestant scholars, but it is in fact dependent:

'on the biblical use of healing from disease as a figure of salvation from sin ... and on the equally biblical notions that the wages of sin is death but that Christ gives life to those who feed on his flesh and blood.'

An earlier evangelical writer comments on:

φάρμακον ἀθανασίας : Clearly Ignatius has in mind the language of the 4th Gospel; which he embodies in his more vivid terminology. not as a means of introducing

(1) Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology. p.43

the notion of the real presence into the Eucharist, but in the spiritual manner of St. John, where the 'word' or teaching is symbolized under the terms 'bread', 'flesh', 'blood'.⁽¹⁾

(iii) The Christian's Sacrifice.

As Ignatius journeys on his way to martyrdom he speaks of himself as:

'God's wheat, ground fine by the lions'
teeth to be made purest bread for Christ.'

- Ep.Rom. 4.

He asks that no obstacles - however well meaning - be put in the way of his martyrdom. A little later he repeats:

'pray let none of you lend him (i.e. the world's prince) any assistance (to weaken Ignatius' resolve) but take my part instead for it is the part of God....

I am fain for the bread of God, even the flesh of Jesus Christ,.... and for my drink I crave that Blood of His which is love imperishable.'

- Ep.Rom. 7.

It seems right to conclude from these passages that Ignatius interprets his martyrdom in terms of eucharistic imagery. The martyr for Christ is to be the bread offered to Christ. Just as in the Eucharist the offered bread is used by Christ as a vehicle for the gift of salvation in His flesh and blood, so the martyr offered to Christ in the arena is used by Christ to be a 'convincing Christian':

'It is not that I want merely to be called a Christian, but actually to be one. Yes, if I prove to be one then I can have the name. Then, too, I shall be a convincing Christian only when the world sees me no more.'

- Ep.Rom. 3.

(1) Macdonald, Evangelical Doctrine, p.48

Ignatius sees his martyrdom as being a sacrifice that will bring benefit to the Church:

'I give my life as a sacrifice (poor as it is) for those who are obedient to the bishop, the presbyters and the deacons.'

- Ep.Polycarp. 6

So then, just as Ignatius interprets his martyrdom in terms of the Eucharist, so it seems right to conclude that he interprets the Eucharist in terms of sacrifice. The Eucharist is for Ignatius the means of the Christian sharing in the sacrifice of Christ.

Several passages in the letters speak of the Church as an altar or place of sacrifice and both the individual Christian and the Church are seen as the Temple of God where sacrifice is offered:

'Deaf as stones you were; yes stones for the Father's Temple, stones trimmed ready for God to build with, hoisted up by the derrick of Jesus Christ (the Cross) with the Holy Spirit for a cable; your faith being the winch that draws you to God, up the ramp of love.'

- Ep.Eph. 9.1

'To be inside the sanctuary (*θεοσυστηριον* - i.e. to be a member of the sacrificial community) is to be clean; to be outside it, unclean.'

- Trall. 7.2

'There is but one body of our Lord Jesus Christ; and but one cup of union with His Blood, and one single altar of sacrifice.'

- Ep.Phil. 4

'...the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins and which, in his goodness, the Father raised.'

- Ep.Smyrn. 7

Taken together these passages reveal a richness of thought concerning both the Eucharist and the Church. Both are

set firmly within the context of that salvation wrought by God through the death and resurrection of Christ. The Eucharist is the means whereby the faithful Christian participates eschatologically in the salvation offered to him in Christ. The Church is the body of faithful believers sharing eucharistically in Christ's work of salvation by faith. The Church is sustained in this faith by the work of the Holy Spirit. By means of faith and through the Eucharist we both join proleptically in the sacrifice of Christ and share in the fruits of that sacrifice. Hence the Church is an eschatological sacrificial community. In the Eucharist the Church offers sacrifice in Thanksgiving - that sacrifice is the body of faithful believers - just as the martyr offers himself and so shares in the sacrifice of Christ. Ignatius presents the picture of the Christian offering himself upon the altar to share in the sacrificial work of Christ at the same time as, through the Holy Spirit, he receives faith in the Cross of Christ so as to be able to offer himself to God sustained by the love of Christ that is the flesh and blood of the Eucharist.

We may attempt a summary thus:

For Ignatius the Eucharist is the divinely appointed means whereby the whole body of believers as one share together in thanksgiving and representation of the saving work of Christ, who is eschatologically truly present by means of the bread and wine, and to whom we offer ourselves as sacrifice.

JUSTIN MARTYR

Justin's understanding of the Eucharist, as revealed in the two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho, is very much part and parcel of the general tenor of his theology as contained in those writings. He developed the neo-Platonic concept (the *λογος σπρηματικός*) as his main understanding of Christology and of the Incarnation. This also is linked to Justin's soteriology though⁽¹⁾ he sees the Incarnation as 'primarily didactic',⁽²⁾ and his thought in this area is 'shot through with ambiguity'.⁽³⁾ Secondly, (though perhaps of primary importance to Justin in view of the aims and purpose of his apologetic) Justin sought to exonerate Christians from charges against them - particularly that of 'atheism'. i.e. not sacrificing to pagan idols.⁽⁴⁾ He counters this by arguing that only Christians offer the true sacrifice of the Thanksgiving. It is in the course of this argument that Justin gives us the two accounts of the Eucharist (I Apol. 65 and 67) which together constitute 'the fullest known description of the second century rite.'⁽⁵⁾

Arising from these two main concerns come Justin's most important and original contributions to Eucharistic theology:

- 1) the drawing of an analogy between the work of the Logos in the Incarnation and the divine act of the Eucharist.
- and 2) a special stress on the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist and its effects upon the communicant.

We shall now attempt to draw out these themes by taking some of the most important words and phrases that Justin uses when writing on the Eucharist.

(1) Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, p.168
(2) *ibid.*, p.169
(3) *ibid.*, p.168
(4) Cross, Early Christian Fathers, p.49
(5) *ibid.*, p.50

'The food which has been eucharistized'

Several commentators⁽¹⁾ maintain that Justin speaks clearly of a 'change' in the eucharistic species in 1 Apol.66.2:

'We do not receive these as common bread or drink. But just as our Saviour Jesus Christ was made flesh through the Word (*δια λόγου Θεου*) of God and had both flesh and blood for our salvation so also we have been taught that the food which has been eucharistized by the word of prayer from him (*δι' εὐχῆς λόγου του παρ' αὐτου*) (that food which by process of assimilation nourishes our flesh and blood) is the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Jesus.'⁽²⁾

Here Justin links the Eucharist with the twin themes of the role of the logos in the Incarnation and soteriology.

Halliburton writes:

'The argument roughly speaking is that as human nature was transformed by its union with the Word (through the action of the Spirit) so the Eucharistic elements are transformed in order that we too may be transformed and saved from incorruption.'⁽³⁾

There are two phrases in this passage from the First Apology that need to be examined very carefully. The first is *δι' εὐχῆς λόγου του παρ' αὐτου*. Wainwright suggests⁽⁴⁾ that this phrase links back through such passages as 1 Tim.4 3-5⁽⁵⁾ to the berakoth formulae in which thanksgiving ('blessing') was made to God for the gift of food and drink. If this is correct then *δι' εὐχῆς λόγου του παρ' αὐτου* refers both to

(1) E.G. Kelly, op.cit.. p.198

(2) cited Kelly op.cit.. p.198

(3) Liturgy, p.207

(4) Wainwright. Eucharist and Eschatology, p.189

(5) 'For everything created by God is good and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving (*μετὰ εὐχαριστίας*); for then it is consecrated by the word of God and prayer (*δι' λόγου Θεου καὶ ἐντυξέως*).' Whether this is really capable of bearing an eucharistic interpretation seems to be rather doubtful - but the argument would still hold good since it depends on the berakoth formulae.

the words spoken by Christ over the bread and wine at the Last Supper and also (as would accord with the Logos doctrine of the second-century Apologists) to the creative role of the Word of God in the Eucharist. Hence the true 'celebrant' at the Eucharist is Christ the Word of God who first spoke the words repeated now over the bread and cup and who also is the Word by which bread and wine become vehicles of His body and blood.

Not all writers would see δι' εὐχῆς λογου του παρ' αὐτου as being a reference to a 'logos-eucharist'. Srawley, for example, writes that they are more likely to depend for their interpretation on Justin's stress on 'thanksgiving' and so to refer to Christ 'giving thanks' at the Last Supper.⁽¹⁾ Certainly Justin follows the passage which we have already quoted with an immediate reference to the Last Supper:

'For the apostles in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, thus handed down what was commanded them: that Jesus, taking bread and having given thanks, said, "Do this for my memorial, this is my body"; and likewise taking the cup and giving thanks he said, "This is my blood"; and gave it to them alone.'⁽²⁾

At the same time there does seem to be a strong argument in favour of Wainwright's interpretation, namely that it accords well with Justin's more general Logos theology. Perhaps McKenna's warning is apposite:

'....it is difficult to consider the arguments offered in favour of any of the theories as absolutely conclusive.'⁽³⁾

The next phrase, 'that food which by process of assimilation (change?) nourishes our flesh and blood (ἐξ ἧς αἷμα και σαρκες κατα μεταβολην τρεφονται ἡμων)' is also fascinating. Does Justin really suggest a change

(1) Srawley, op.cit.. p.32ff.

(2) cited. Early Christian Fathers, Library of Christian Classics, p.286

(3) McKenna. Eucharist and Holy Spirit, p.51

in the eucharistic elements? The answer, unless one wishes to be unduly perverse, must be yes, but it is surely here that Justin's analogy between the role of the Logos in the Incarnation and the role of the Logos in the Eucharist must be thought through carefully.

Justin's purpose in using a Logos-Christology is to attempt to combat the twin dangers both of patripassianism and of docetism. He wishes to say that Jesus, the Word made flesh, was both God, in as much as he was the Logos of God in the flesh, and at the same time also a real man who suffered and died for the redemption of mankind. Justin is struggling through the use of the Logos concept to hold together the fact of Man and God being one in Christ. He sees a parallel with the Eucharist - where he wishes to say that the elements are at one and the same time both the Body and Blood of Christ and also the bread and wine of Thanksgiving. Hence in terms of the Eucharist Justin would not seem to want to say that the eucharistized bread and wine in any sense 'disappear'. This is not the force of *μεταβολήν*. On the contrary the bread and wine are present as real food for our flesh and blood. But at the same time Justin wants to stress that the Logos/Christ is also present as food in the Eucharist, just as Jesus promised in the Last Supper to which Justin refers us.⁽¹⁾ As a background for this we may refer to the concept of anamnesis and to the Jewish formula of berakah. The primitive understanding of anamnesis, as was seen earlier, may well have included the idea of 're-calling' or 're-presenting' before God and man the Heilsgeschichte that is the Christ-event.

(1) Macdonald. Evangelical Doctrine. p.52. suggests that Justin does not teach a 'change' in the elements in a metabolist sense, but rather that after prayer it is the flesh and blood of Christ in that the Risen Christ is perceived by faith as being truly present for us.

Dix writes:

'It is for this reason that Justin and Hippolytus and later writers after them speak so directly and vividly of the Eucharist in the present bestowing on the communicants those effects of redemption - immortality, eternal life, forgiveness of sins, deliverance from the power of the devil and so on - which we usually attribute to the sacrifice of Christ viewed as a single historical event in the past. One has only to examine their unfamiliar language closely to recognise how completely they identify the offering of the Eucharist by the Church with the offering of Himself by our Lord, not by way of repetition, but as a 're-presentation' (anamnesis) of the same offering by the Church 'which is His body'.⁽¹⁾

Also Halliburton draws our attention to the Jewish berakoth formulae which also gave thanks for the mighty acts of God in Creation and redemption:

'The purpose of such thanksgivings ... is not only to render due return of gratitude from the creature to the Creator, but also to ask for a continued blessing and a continuing redemption'.⁽²⁾

One last point. If this argument be correct then, linking in the closely related theme of salvation, Justin may well have seen the 'change' (μεταβολή) of the Eucharist not only in the elements which through the action of the Logos becomes the vehicles of the redemptive work of Christ, but also in the lives of the communicants, the Church, the Body of Christ, who are fed on the 'eucharistized food'. This argument may seem to have greater cogency when it is considered together with Justin's theme of sacrifice to which we now turn.

(1) Dix. Shape. p.161f.

(2) Halliburton. art. The Patristic Theology of the Eucharist, Liturgy. p.204

'Sacrifice'

'So God bears witness in advance that he is well pleased with all the sacrifices in his name, which Jesus the Christ handed down to be done, namely in the Eucharist of the bread and the cup....' - Trypho. 117.1. (1)

Daly (2) writes of Justin that he was:

'the first Christian writer to treat sacrifice as a theological question.'

Certainly Justin lays immense stress on the Eucharist as being the Christian sacrifice as opposed to the sacrifices both of Judaism and paganism and the cults (in particular Mithraism - 1 Apol. 66.4). He saw the cultic sacrifices as being diabolical imitations of the true Christian sacrifice. On the other hand the Jewish sacrificial system is seen by Justin as being the type of the sacrifice of the Christian Eucharist (Trypho. 41.1): he quotes Mal. 1.11 and identifies the eucharistic bread and cup with the pure sacrifice foretold by Malachi (Trypho.41.2f.). It is also just possible that Justin may have understood the words of the Institution as being suggestive of sacrificial interpretation:

... the Eucharist. which our Lord Jesus Christ handed down to us to do (offer?) for the remembrance of the suffering which he suffered for those who are cleansed in their souls... (Trypho 44.1)

On this Kelly comments:

'Justin is feeling his way to the conception of the Eucharist as the offering of the Saviour's passion.' (3)

At the same time however it must be remembered that in the Dialogue with Trypho just after the identification of the Eucharist as being the Christian sacrifice, Justin continues:

(1) cited PEER p.18

(2) Daly. The origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice: p.87

(3) Kelly. Early Christian Doctrines. p.197

'Now I myself also say that prayers and thanksgivings made by worthy men are the only sacrifices that are perfect and well-pleasing to God.'

So what does Justin mean when he refers to the Eucharist as the Christian sacrifice?

We have already noted that Justin sees the Christian Eucharist as being a fulfilment of the type of OT sacrifice (Trypho 41.1). But this is combined with a strong anti-Jewish polemic in which he condemns the Jewish sacrificial system as being idolatrous (1 Apol. 62.1; 2 Apol. 5 3-4). Presumably this suggests that we are to resist seeking Justin's understanding of the Eucharist as sacrifice in terms of a victim being slain on an altar by a priest. Indeed Justin specifically condemns the offering of material sacrifices to a spiritual God:

'We see that God provides all things, and we do not suppose that he stands in the need of the material offerings of men. But we are taught, and believe with conviction, that he accepts only those who imitate those virtues of the divine character such as moderation, righteousness and love of man.' - 1 Apol. 10.1⁽¹⁾

We have already noted that Justin sees a considerable didactic element in his view of the saving work of Christ. So it seems likely that here, in the back of Justin's mind, is the idea that men can 'imitate those virtues of the divine character' such as he lists. through the saving, atoning and sacrificial work of Christ.⁽²⁾ It is the sacrificial work of Christ that is at the very heart of the Thanksgiving memorial (1 Apol. 66.2). Christ is the fulfilment of all sacrifice - and especially the Passover:

(1) Cp. also 1 Apol. 13.1; Trypho 10.3.

(2) See Trypho 22.1; 40.4; 41.1; 111.3-4; 112. 1f.

'The mystery then of the Lamb which God enjoined to be sacrificed as the Passover was the type of Christ with whose blood, in proportion to their faith in him, they anoint their houses.... and that lamb which was commanded to be wholly roasted was a symbol of the suffering of the cross which Christ would undergo.' - Trypho 40.1f.

In response to the sacrifice of Christ offered for us, and in thanksgiving for that sacrifice, we in turn offer ourselves as sacrifice to Christ:

'We are not atheists, for we worship the Creator of the universe (while asserting, according to our instructions that he needs no blood, nor libations, nor incense) with the word of prayer and thanksgiving... expressing our thanks to him for our creation, for all means of health praying that through faith in him we may be born again in incorruption.' - 1 Apol.13

'Now, that prayers and giving thanks, when offered by worthy men, are the only perfect and pleasing sacrifices to God I also admit. For such sacrifices are what Christians alone have undertaken to offer; and they do this in the remembrance effected by their solid and liquid food whereby the suffering endured by the Son of God is brought to mind.' - Trypho 11.1-3⁽¹⁾

The key words here are 'in remembrance'. Again we note the concept of anamnesis. In the Eucharist Justin sees us as offering a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for the atoning work of Christ; further, as we make anamnesis of the sacrifice of Christ, so we plead that sacrifice, not in any sense as a repetition of Calvary but as a re-presenting

(1) cited Daly, op.cit., p.89

of the whole atoning work. In turn through the bread and wine of Eucharist we are able to receive the benefits of that atoning work of Christ of which we make anamnesis. Consequently we offer ourselves as sacrifice in thanksgiving for our redemption. and so we are 'changed' - which is the fruit of that redemption. Wainwright comments that Justin sees the Eucharist as a sacrifice:

'at least in so far as it recalls before God with thanksgiving that one sacrifice and prays for the continuing benefits of that sacrifice to be granted now.'⁽¹⁾

Thus in his use of OT typology Justin enables us to see that both OT and Eucharist are 'symbols' of the reality of the sacrifice of Christ - a sacrifice which is present for us as we make anamnesis of his death.

IRENÆUS

The main thrusts of Irenaeus' theology as represented by the *Adversus Haereses* and the *Epideixis* seem to have been:

- 1) a carefully thought out refutation of gnosticism
- 2) a reliance on 'the plain and obvious pronouncements of Holy Scripture'⁽²⁾ handed down from the apostolic age
- 3) an original view of salvation in which God comes (becomes) to man so that man may become God. This is usually referred to as 'recapitulation'.

Irenaeus' Eucharistic theology both arises from these concerns and expresses them.

i) 'the communion and unity of flesh and spirit'

The *Adversus Haereses* is, as its title suggests, mainly concerned to combat the heresy of gnosticism and

(1) Wainwright, *op.cit.*, p.67

(2) Lietzmann. History of the Early Church. Vol.II. p.208

in particular Valentinianism. As part of the argument Irenaeus stresses the reality of the Incarnation, of the Resurrection, and of the Eucharist. Christ truly became flesh, that we might be taken up into Him. Christ's Eucharistic presence is so materially real to Irenaeus, and so taken for granted by him, that he argues from the reality of the Eucharistic presence to the reality of bodily resurrection:

'For as the bread which comes from the earth receives the invocation of God
(προσλαμβάνεις την ἐπίκλησιν του Θεου)
and then it is no longer common bread but Eucharist, consists of two things, an earthly and a heavenly; so our bodies, after partaking of the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the eternal resurrection.'
- A.H. 4. 18.5. (1)

Here Irenaeus shows an Antiochene tendency, namely to stress the bodily aspect of the Eucharist, identifying the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine considered as physical food. and enriching our bodies with eternal life. (2) This clearly relates to his teaching of 'recapitulation'.

'If the flesh is not to be saved, then the Lord did not redeem us by his blood nor is the 'cup of blessing the partaking of his blood', nor is the 'bread which we break the partaking of his body'.... the drink he declared to be his own blood; and by this he enriches our blood; and the bread, which comes from his creation, he affirmed to be his own body; and by this he nourishes our bodies. Whenever then the cup that man mixes and the bread that man makes receive the word of God,

(1) cited. Bettenson. Early Christian Fathers. p.96

(2) v. Gore. Body of Christ. p.62f.

the 'Eucharist becomes the body of Christ, and by these elements the substance of our flesh receives nourishment and sustenance. How then can they allege that flesh is incapable of the gift of God, which is eternal life, seeing that the flesh is fed on the flesh and blood of the Lord and is a member of him?' - A.H. 5.2.3⁽¹⁾

Irenaeus can confidently appeal to the reality of Christ's Eucharistic presence not least because, as he tells us (A.H. 1.13.2). the Valentinians had their own rite corresponding to the catholic Eucharist. In the gnostic 'eucharist' thanksgiving was made over a cup of wine mixed with water and. at the word of invocation, one of the gnostic aeons, Charis, 'distils her blood into the cup'.⁽²⁾ But gnosticism had a strong spiritualising tendency, and so Irenaeus stresses the reality of Christ's presence in the catholic Eucharist. At the same time he also stresses the continuing reality of the bread and the wine. The Eucharist

'consists of two things. an earthly and a heavenly'. - A.H. 4.18.4

Gore comments on these words:

'Irenaeus thus instinctively emphasizes the permanent reality of the natural elements, as he would emphasize the reality of Christ's natural manhood; though in each case, in one manner or another, the natural thing is used as an instrument or vehicle of what is supernatural, spiritual and divine, and in view of this higher use to which it is put it may be said to be changed.'⁽³⁾

The eucharistic bread and wine become the vehicles of the spiritual sustenance; the body of the Man Jesus becomes

(1) cited Bettenson. *op.cit.*, p.97

(2) Srawley. *Early Liturgy*. p.39

(3) Gore. *op.cit.*. p.112

the means of salvation and the heavenly sacrifice. Because of his anti-gnostic teaching Irenaeus lays a new emphasis on the 'offering' of the bread and wine as being part of the action of the Eucharist and also a part of the salvific nature of the sacrament. Jungmann writes:

'Thus is revealed a marked change in the concept of the Eucharist in consequence of the need of defense against the teachings of the gnosis. Nothing is changed with regard to the basic dogma, but a new aspect is stressed and emphasized - for practical devotion as well as also for practical worship. It cannot be accidental that precisely since this time, namely just since the end of the second century, the first traces appear of bringing offerings to the altar.'⁽¹⁾

We shall examine Irenaeus' teaching on the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist in a moment, here it is important to understand that any such teaching arises, as far as Irenaeus is concerned, from the dual stress on the reality of Christ's manhood (and hence of the Christ-presence in the Eucharist) and the reality of the salvation-event brought about by the offering of that Manhood and re-presented by means of the anamnesis made over the bread and wine. Irenaeus sees the reality of the Eucharist (bread, wine/body, blood) as denying any kind of gnosticising eschatology in which man's salvation consists in the release of the soul from the body.⁽²⁾ Rather through the Eucharist the body is given 'the medicine of life' (A.H. 3.10.1). The salvation of the Christian depends on the reality of Christ and on the reality of the Christ-presence in the Eucharist:

'The gnostics claim the bread is the body of Christ; the blood is the cup in His

(1) Jungmann. The Early Liturgy. p.116

(2) Wainwright. Eucharist and Eschatology. p.149

blood. How? - if the Christ is not the Son of the Creator of the world?' - A.H.17.4-6
Thus we discover in Irenaeus a new development of doctrine - but one that is clearly at one with the NT doctrine. Anti-
gnostic apologetic demands the development, but it stems from the primary data of Incarnation and salvation. The twin polarities of symbol and reality are held firmly together.

'The new oblation of the new covenant' (A.H. 4.17.5)

'By 'knowledge of the truth' we mean: the teaching of the Apostles.... the reading of the scriptures without falsification. and consistent and careful exposition of them' - A.H. 4.33.8⁽¹⁾

Thus does Irenaeus hold together both tradition and scripture (i.e. OT) as being necessary for catholic truth. It comes as no surprise then that in common with other of the Fathers such as Justin Martyr. Irenaeus sees the Eucharist in terms of OT typology. He speaks of the Eucharist as 'the first fruits of his gifts in the New Testament' (A.H.4.17.4) and almost as a matter of course quotes Malachi 1.11 as evidence for the justification of the Christian sacrifice replacing the Jewish. He also quotes Hosea 6.6 and comments:

'...it is clear that what God required of them for their salvation was not sacrifices and holocausts, but faith, obedience and righteousness.' - A.H. 4.17.4⁽²⁾

(1) cited Bettenson op.cit. p.89

(2) cited ibid. p.95. Does this in fact suggest that Irenaeus does not intend to have any sacrificial interpretation of the Eucharist? Certainly this text is capable of such interpretation. Jungmann (op.cit.p.45ff) reminds us that fierce controversy raged in Germany over this very point at the beginning of this century. Several scholars then maintained that the Church of the first two centuries did not understand the Eucharist in real sacrificial terms: e.g. Justin: 'Prayers and thanksgivings performed by worthy men are the only perfect sacrifices pleasing to God.' (Trypho 117); Minicius Felix (late c.2nd). 'Do you think that we hide the object of our

worship because we have no shrines and altars? What image am I to contrive of God. since logical reasoning tells you that man himself is an image of God? What temple am I to build for Him, since this whole world, fashioned by His hand, cannot behold Him? Am I to confine so vast and majestic a power to one little shrine. while I, mere man, live in a larger place? Are our mind and our heart not better places to be dedicated to Him?' (Octavius 32): Athenagoras: 'God has no need of blood-oblations and libations. nor of the smell of flowers and of incense. because He Himself is the perfect perfume without want or blemish.' (Legatio 13). Because of suchlike texts Wieland suggested that before Irenaeus no kind of sacrifice was known to the Church other than the prayer of thanksgiving. Dorch however pointed out that other writers before Irenaeus also saw the Eucharist as a fulfilment of Mal. 1. 11 (and Didache refers to Eucharist as *ἄρτος*). Jungmann suggests that thanksgiving forms the basis of the Eucharist - but we can offer gifts to God in gratitude; further the Christian sacrifice is spiritual and inward and the stress falls on the attitude of the heart rather than on the outward rite. The difference in stress in Irenaeus should be seen as just that - a new emphasis rather than a new doctrine. As has already been seen this emphasis arises from Irenaeus' concern to stress the reality of the Salvation-Eucharist event - and hence the reality of the sacrifice.

Irenaeus also applies Lk.21 4 to the offertory in the Eucharist:

'the Church casts all her life into the treasury of God.' - A.H.4.18.2⁽¹⁾

He maintains that it is not God who has need of sacrifices but man (A.H. 3.12.11; 4.17.4). The OT sacrifices were ordained for man's benefit. and the Christian sacrifice of the Eucharist is ordained so that, like the widow in Lk.21. 4, the Church may serve God properly:

'And he also counselled his disciples to offer to God the first fruits of his creatures, not because he needed these gifts, but so that they should not be unfruitful nor unthankful.' - A.H. 4.17.4⁽²⁾

Thus Irenaeus regards the Eucharist as a 'thank-offering' to God in acknowledgement of the Creator's bounty.⁽³⁾

The Eucharist is a parallel to the Jewish sacrificial system - but importantly different too. Only the Church offers the 'pure oblation'. Nevertheless the two forms of sacrifice represent a real continuity:⁽⁴⁾

'There are oblations there (Jewish) and oblations here: sacrifices among the chosen people, sacrifices in the Church. Only the kind of sacrifice is changed. for now sacrifice is offered not by servants but by sons.' - A.H. 4.18.2⁽⁵⁾

Here it would appear that Irenaeus differs in his approach to, say, Justin, who sees the Jewish sacrifices as being

(1) cited Dix op.cit.. p.117

(2) cited Bettenson op.cit.. p.95

(3) Dix op.cit.. p.114. Dix notes that Irenaeus regards the death of Christ as a sacrifice typified by the sacrifice of Isaac (A.H.4.5.4.) but he never links this with Eucharistic typology. Dix suggests that this is deliberate on Irenaeus' part. since he wishes to re-stress the idea of Eucharist as 'offering' (v.Dix p.116). Does this not also suggest that Irenaeus avoids any suggestion of Christ being 'offered' in the Eucharist? Rather we offer thanks through him because of his offering.

(4) Daly. Christian Sacrifice. p.92

(5) cited Bettenson op.cit.. p.95

typological of the Eucharist, but in no way the same. However, it must be remembered that Irenaeus wishes to condemn gnosticism and so he needs to stress the continuity between the OT and the Church. In fact Irenaeus does suggest a major difference between the OT sacrificial system and the sacrifice offered in the Eucharist. The Christian sacrifice is that of praise and thanksgiving:

'We make then our offerings to him not as if he stood in need of anything. but giving thanks to his sovereignty and sanctifying his creation.'

- A.H. 4.18-6

At the same time however, there are some phrases, surviving in the Latin text only, which suggest propitiatory sacrifice and greatly influenced later Western developments:

'propitians pro hominibus Deum' - A.H.4.16

'putantes propitiari Deum' - A.H.4.29.1

'quod offerentes propitiantibus Deum'

- A.H.4.29.2. (1)

Bearing in mind, however, the main thrust of Irenaeus' teaching, namely that the sacrifice of the Eucharist consists in the offering (and especially the self-offering) of thanks by the Church, do these texts really suggest anything more than a re-presentation of the salvation-event in the Eucharist as the anamnesis? Thanksgiving is offered in the Eucharist precisely because of the saving work of Christ. The eucharistic bread and wine, offered in thanksgiving to the Creator, become the means of salvation. (2) Here the themes of soteriology and thanksgiving intermingle. Christ's sacrifice as 'remembered' in the Eucharist is central to Irenaeus' soteriology. Christ is the second Adam through whom we have been reconciled (A.H. 5.16.3). Thus Irenaeus uses the OT as the typology to develop and link the themes of soteriology, Christology and Eucharist. The link for all three is 'his tremendous vision of Christ as the Second Adam' (3) who redeemed us with His blood (A.H.5.1.1) and through whom the Church, in thanksgiving for redemption

(1) Daly, op.cit., p.97

(2) v. Daly, op.cit. p.97

(3) Kelly op.cit. p.147

and new creation, offers 'the new oblation of the new covenant'. (A.H. 4.17.5)

'Jesus Christ our Lord who....consummates all things in himself' (A.H. 3.16.6)

Irenaeus sees the purpose of the Incarnation as being the 'recapitulation' (consummation) of all things in Christ. He takes the theme of 'recapitulation' (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσις*) from Ephesians 1.10 and uses it as a theme to link the events of Christ's saving work and the salvation offered by the Church through the Sacraments.

The world was created through God the Father by means of the Word. God shows his love for creation in that he grants to us free will; but this leads to sin and death and thus destroys God's plan. Christ, the true God-man, came into the world to restore fallen creation. He did this by being so obedient to God that the devil was overwhelmed. Being true flesh and blood, and also true God, Christ united the created order with God and became the True Man. All creation was summarized in his person (*ἀνακεφαλαιώσις*). Through the sacraments the Church hands on the means of salvation. 'the medicine of life' (A.H.3.19.1) and thus unites us to the God-head in the eschatological Eucharist when the saving work of Christ is re-presented in the anamnesis.

Just as Christ took flesh and blood from the created order, so He takes bread and wine in the Eucharist (A.H.14.18.5) as the means whereby we may receive redemption.

Thus he united man with God and brought about a communion between them, for we would otherwise have been unable to share in incorruptibility if he had not come to us....Because we are all connected with the first formation of Adam and were bound to death through disobedience, it was just and necessary that the bonds of death be

loosed by him who was made man for us....

Thus did our Lord take up the same first formation (sc. as Adam) in his incarnation.

in order that he might offer it up in his struggle on behalf of his forefathers. and thus overcome through Adam what had stricken us through Adam.' - Epideixis 31⁽¹⁾

'...the drink, which is part of his creation, he declared to be his own blood.... and the bread, which comes from his creation, he affirmed to be his own body.' - A.H.5.2.3⁽²⁾

The Eucharistic bread and wine are, through the work of the Word of God the means of sharing in ἀνακεφαλαιώσις. Irenaeus sees this as coming about through the work of the Logos in the ἐπίκλησις :

'the bread receives the invocation of God, and then it is no longer common bread but Eucharist.' - A.H. 4.18.5⁽³⁾

McKenna gives this definition of 'epiclesis':

'....one of the prayers of the canon in which the priest asks God to send his Word or his Holy Spirit upon the elements to transform them into the body and blood of Christ and to produce the effects of communion in the faithful.'⁽⁴⁾

McKenna continues:

'From the writings of St. Irenaeus it is clear why the Logos is called down upon the eucharistic sacrifice....This Logos epiclesis is apparently related to the Eucharist as a sacrament, in sensu strictu,

(1) cited Daly op.cit. p.93f

(2) cited Bettenson op.cit.p.97

(3) ibid. p.96

(4) McKenna op.cit.p.99 - quoting Cabrol. In view of what has been written here and earlier I think I should disagree with the word 'transform'.

and must be viewed above all else as the connecting link between the eucharistic offering and the eucharistic food.'⁽¹⁾

The offering of thanksgiving for the work of Christ becomes through the Logos the means of ἀνακεφαλαιωσις.

Irenaeus sees the Eucharist as the means whereby the work of the Son and the Spirit - the 'hands' of the Father (A.H. 5.1.3) - is made present for all men. His thought represents 'the beginning of a formal eucharistic theology as opposed to sheet statements of belief.'⁽²⁾ As such they represent a necessary development of eucharistic doctrine.

TERTULLIAN

This 'brilliant, exasperating, sarcastic and intolerant'⁽³⁾ genius of a theologian opens the third century of Christian thought on the Eucharist by, typically, providing a major, and apparently almost intractable, problem of interpretation. The problem is not caused by Tertullian breaking any new ground, for in fact Tertullian's understanding of the Eucharist is broadly in agreement with the lines of thought laid down by Justin and Irenaeus.¹ Rather does Tertullian present us a problem in that he juxtaposes two apparently contrasting, not to say opposed, lines of thought about the nature of the Eucharistic body of Christ, literal and figurative. Thus Tertullian develops the line of thought which we have discovered in such NT writers as Paul and John, namely the symbol and reality of the Eucharist.

Tertullian's first approach is an apparently literalistic interpretation. He frequently writes about 'the Lord's body' (de orat, 19; de idol. 17) and stresses the reality of the eucharistic presence. He says that the converted pagan 'feeds on the richness of the Lord's

(1) McKenna *ibid.* p.131 - quoting deJong, der ursprüngliche Sinn, p.37

(2) Dix *op.cit.*, p.245

(3) H. Chadwick, The Early Church, p.91

body, that is, on the Eucharist' (de pud.9)⁽¹⁾:

'the flesh feeds on Christ's body and blood so that the soul may be filled with God.' (de res.carn. 8)⁽²⁾

'The bread which He took and gave to His disciples He made His own very body by saying 'This is my body'.' (Adv.Marc.4.40)⁽³⁾

'(the faithful grieve) that a Christian should touch the Lord's body with hands which have supplied bodies for demons....what wickedness! The Jews laid hands on Christ but once; these men offer violence to his body every day' (de Idol.7)⁽⁴⁾

Kelly writes:

'The realism of his theology comes to light in the argument based on the intimate relation of body and soul, that just as in baptism the body is washed with water, so in the Eucharist 'the flesh feeds on Christ's body and blood so that the soul may be filled with God'.

Clearly his assumption is that the Saviour's body and blood are as real as the baptismal water.'⁽⁵⁾

The second strand of Tertullian's thought is the apparent opposite of this realism. As has already been seen in earlier writers it was possible for the pre-Nicene Fathers to believe firmly in the reality of Christ's eucharistic presence, and at the same time, to insist that the bread and wine of the Eucharist remained bread and wine. The metaphysical difficulties simply do not receive an answer - indeed were they really raised? It is

(1) cited Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, p.211. Gore speaks of Tertullian as 'a very powerful but unfair arguer!' - Prestige, Life of Charles Gore, p.69

(2) Kelly, ibid.

(3) cited Dix, Shape, p.115

(4) cited Bettenson, Fathers, p.148

(5) Kelly, ibid.

precisely this area of metaphysical speculation that Tertullian raises by juxtaposing an almost extreme view of the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist together with what appears to be a symbolic interpretation.

For example, he appears to speak of the 'flesh' of Christ (as in John 6) as being almost purely an intellectual concept which we 'eat' with our understanding:

'He makes the word of his discourse to be the giver of life, because that word is spirit and life; he says the same of his flesh, because 'the Word became flesh'. Therefore for the sake of obtaining life we must hunger for the word, devour it with our hearing, chew it over with our intellect, digest it with our faith.' - de Res.carn.37⁽¹⁾

Even more pointedly, Tertullian uses the words 'figura' and 'repraesentat' of the Eucharist:

He took the bread and distributed it to the disciples, making it his own body by saying 'This is my body'; that is, the figura of my body.' - Adv.Marc.4.40⁽²⁾

'Bread, by which he represents (repraesentat) his very own body.' - Adv.Marc.1.14⁽³⁾

What does Tertullian mean by using 'figura' and 'repraesentat' in this way? On 'figura' (symbol) most commentators quote Harnack:

'What we nowadays understand by 'symbol' is a thing which is not that which it represents; at that time 'symbol' denoted a thing which in some kind of way really is what it signifies.'⁽⁴⁾

Darwell Stone⁽⁵⁾ notes that Tertullian uses 'caro figuratus'

(1) Bettenson. Fathers, p.149

(2) ibid.

(3) ibid.

(4) Harnack, History of Dogma, ii, 144, cited Stone, Doctrine of the Eucharist. p.30

(5) Stone op.cit., p.30

of the Incarnation⁽¹⁾ to denote not only the appearance, but also the reality of the flesh of the Incarnate Christ. Indeed, in view of his bitter attacks on gnosticism,⁽²⁾ it would be surprising if Tertullian wishes by use of 'figura' to suggest any unreality in connection with the sacramental presence of Christ. But in that case, why use 'figura' and 'repraesentat'?

It may be that we should be helped to understand Tertullian's use of 'figura' by considering a modern writer on the meaning of 'symbol'. Macquarrie⁽³⁾ first points out how our change in thought patterns have affected our understanding of 'symbol'.

'In myth itself the symbol and that which is symbolized have not yet been clearly distinguished. As soon as we recognise a symbol, we have taken a step back from myth and emerged from a purely mythological way of thinking and talking.'⁽⁴⁾

For a symbol to be more than a mere convention there has to be some kind of 'analogia entis' between the symbol and what is symbolized, so that the symbol becomes an intrinsic symbol, i.e. 'Being manifests itself in being'.⁽⁵⁾ Here MacQuarrie refers to the Incarnation where 'person' becomes the supreme 'symbol' of Being i.e. God is manifest and present in and through Christ.⁽⁶⁾

It is interesting that a modern theologian refers to the Incarnation as the 'supreme symbol' when it is noted that one of the main thrusts of Tertullian's theology is a powerful assertion of the reality of the Incarnation. Could it be that Tertullian was aware of the 'metaphysical difficulties' (if we may use the anachronism) raised by

(1) Apol.21, cp. Adv.Marc. 4.21

(2) e.g. deCarn. Christi - where Tertullian so vigorously defends the reality of the flesh and blood of Christ that he is prepared partly to deny the virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

(3) J. MacQuarrie, Principles of Christian Theology. p.122ff.

(4) *ibid.*, p.122

(5) MacQuarrie, *op.cit.* p.130

(6) *ibid.* p.131

wishing both to stress the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist and also the continuing reality of the bread and wine? It is not so much, as Harnack's definition of 'figura' would suggest, that Tertullian is working within the framework of true 'mythology' i.e. he cannot distinguish between the symbol and the reality of the Eucharist. On the contrary, he is well aware of both the realities in the Eucharist - the presence of Christ and the bread and wine. Tertullian is aware that the 'analogia entis' between bread/wine and body/blood rests in the fact that we are fed by them physically and spiritually. Equally is he aware that in the strict physical sense there is no 'analogia entis' - we feed literally and physically on bread and wine, the same cannot be said for body and blood. This is why Tertullian writes as he does in de Res. Carn.37 that the way to feed on the 'Word made flesh' is to 'devour it with our hearing, chew it over with our intellect, digest it with our faith.' Hence he speaks of the 'figura' of Christ's body in the Eucharist. This does not mean that he in any way wishes to deny the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist - on the contrary, as we saw at first, he lays great stress on that reality - but rather he seeks to hold together the twin realities of body/blood, bread/wine. As Dix comments:

'...the use of such language should not mislead us into supposing that it betokens any change of doctrine from the naive realism of the earlier period; it is only a first attempt at the formation of a technical terminology by the pioneers of scientific theology.'⁽¹⁾

(1) Dix, Shape, p.245. For this paragraph we may refer to Kelly op.cit.p.212: 'All that his language really suggests is that, while accepting the equation of the elements with the body and blood, he remains conscious of the sacramental

distinction between them. In fact he is trying, with the aid of the concept of 'figura', to rationalize to himself the apparent contradiction between (a) the dogma that the elements are now Christ's body and blood, and (b) the empirical fact that for sensation they remain bread and wine.' When Macdonald (Evangelical Doctrine p.60) states that in a 'figura': 'the figure and the actuality which it represents are never present together' he is talking nonsense. Such language pushes the concept of symbol and reality to a logical absurdity by refusing to take note of the eschatological import of the anamnesis. If 'figure' and 'actuality' are 'never present together' then there is no real Eucharistic presence of Christ and no true appropriation of the benefits of salvation in the Eucharist. The epicletic character of the Eucharist ensures that while the bread and wine remain bread and wine they are also, as perceived through the eyes of faith, the vehicles of a greater reality. We may add that Harnack's definition seems to us to be highly speculative (how do we know what Tertullian or anyone else thought? - without critically examining what he wrote, rather than making a priori assumptions) and rather insulting to a man such as Tertullian.

A similar interpretation may be given for Tertullian's use of 'repraesentat'. The most likely translation would seem to be 're-presents', 'presents again', or (with Stone) 'to make present that which has been unseen or has passed out of sight.'⁽¹⁾ Stone notes that an examination of Tertullian's use of 'repraesentare' and its cognates, reveals that in more than half the cases he uses it to refer to an actual presence, but in the rest it refers to an anticipatory or mental representation.⁽²⁾ For example Tertullian uses 'repraesentatio' of the manifestation of the Kingdom of God in the future (de Cor.15; de Orat. 5); of the manifestation of God in material things in the OT (Adv.Marc. 10); of the appearing of Christ to the disciples (Adv.Marc. 25); of the presence of the bodies of men at the judgement seat (Adv. Marc. 5.12; de Carn.res.14.17) of the future full and perfect realisation of God by the Christian soul in contrast to the partial and imperfect understanding of God by faith in this life (de Carn res.23)⁽³⁾ Stone would wish to understand all these uses as pointing to an actual presence. This would seem correct - but at the same time, bearing in mind Tertullian's most careful use of language⁽⁴⁾ - the force of 're-praesentare' may mean more than merely 'to make present'. It may be that the force should fall on the prefix and thus mean 'to present again'. This would seem to have clear affinities to the early understanding of anamnesis, and also to do full justice to Tertullian's awareness of the tension between 'appearance' and 'reality' as has been seen in his use of 'figura'. As Kelly notes:

'.... while accepting the equation of the elements, with the body and blood, he remains conscious of the sacramental distinction between them.'⁽⁵⁾

(1) Stone, op.cit., p.32

(2) *ibid.*

(3) I am reminded of the suggested relationship in John's Gospel between the concept of sign and reality, worked out for the whole scheme of salvation.(p.117)

(4) Writing on Tertullian Vincent of Lerins remarks: 'Quot paene verba tot sententiae.' - *Commonitorium* c.18, cited Cross, *Fathers*, p.136

(5) Kelly, op.cit., p.136

Perhaps this is best shown by this passage from Adv. Marc. 1.14:

'Even up to the present time (sc. the Lord) has not disdained the water which is the Creator's work, by which He washes His own people, or the oil whereby He anoints them, or the mixture of milk and honey with which He feeds them as infants, or the bread by which he makes present (repraesentat) His very body, requiring even in His own Sacraments the beggarly elements of the Creator.'⁽¹⁾

In this passage, referring in turn to each of the sacraments, Tertullian points to the material reality of each sacrament as a necessary part of that sacrament. Thus Tertullian attempts to hold together both the material and the spiritual elements of the sacraments, by speaking of the manifestation of God through the material elements as being a natural extension of God's work as Creator. Tertullian provides his own commentary on this in this passage on the nature of the Incarnation:

'Therefore the Word was in flesh; but we must ask how the Word 'was made flesh' whether by transformation into flesh or by being clothed therewith. The latter, surely. We must believe that God's eternal nature precludes change or transformation. Transformation involves the destruction of what originally existed: what is transformed ceases to be what it was and begins to be something else. But God does not cease to be nor can he be other than what he is: and the Word is God and 'the Word of the Lord remains for ever,' that is it continues in the same

(1) cited Stone, *ibid.* p.32

form... And the proper quality of each substance remains so intact that the spirit carried out in him his own activities'. - Adv.Prax.27⁽¹⁾

Elsewhere Tertullian develops the point that the two parts of the sacrament are a necessary part of salvation:

'In fact when the soul is admitted to God's company it is the flesh which makes that admission possible. The flesh indeed is washed that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed (sc.with the cross) that the soul too may be fortified; the flesh is shadowed by the imposition of hands that the soul also may be enlightened by the Spirit; the flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ that the soul may be nourished on God.' - de Res. carn.8⁽²⁾

So Tertullian's concern about the distinction of spiritual and material in the Eucharist is no mere speculation of metaphysics. It is a vital concern with the question of how we share in the salvation wrought by Christ. In this light, precisely because the Eucharist is both bread and body, both wine and blood, it is of central importance to the Christian life, and is to be held in the greatest reverence. It is 'sanctum' - the holy thing (de Spectac.25); no drop of wine must be allowed to fall to the ground (de Cor.3) Faced with the threat of persecution, Tertullian urges his fellow Christians to continue to meet to do the Eucharist:

(1) cited Bettenson, op.cit., p.123f.

(2) ibid. p.144

'But how shall we meet you ask, how shall we celebrate the Lord's solemnities? ...If you cannot meet by day there is always the night.' - de Fug. in persec. 14⁽¹⁾

Let these words, on baptism but well fitting to his doctrine of the Eucharist, form a final comment on Tertullian's thought:

'It seems to men incredible that eternal life should be won in this matter... We also marvel, but we marvel because we believe.' - de Bapt. 2⁽²⁾

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

The question raised by Tertullian concerning the relationship between the physical nature of the eucharistic elements and the spiritual gift which they impart, was also raised, and developed more fully, though in rather a different direction, by Clement of Alexandria. Tertullian tries to hold together the traditional realism of the earlier fathers with a more developed symbolic approach to the nature of Christ in the Eucharist. Clement appears almost to have ignored the 'realism' and to have concentrated almost solely on an 'allegorical' approach. This is not surprising in view of a general Alexandrian tendency to mysticism, and especially in view of Clement's emphasis on his theology on the work of the Logos.

Chadwick⁽³⁾ remarks that the very nature of Clement's view of theology suggests a reality transcending the verbal symbol. We have seen that Tertullian, in some way, was seeking to do exactly that by his use of the concepts of 'figura' and 'repraesentat', and indeed, some

(1) cited Dix, op.cit., p.152

(2) cited Bettenson ibid. p.143

(3) H. Chadwick, The Early Church, p.95

earlier fathers, such as Irenaeus, show an awareness of the problem. Clement, however, with his indebtedness to Philo and to 'the truth loving Plato' is able to develop a 'metaphysic' far beyond anything that we have yet met in the West.

Although Bevan can speak of Clement as 'a warm-hearted rambling man with large but somewhat woolly mind',⁽¹⁾ this is not altogether fair. In fact, Clement's works, diffuse as they are, still reveal an overall pattern of thought. Clement sees Christian teaching and belief as the 'true Gnosticism'. He traces the work of redemption in the Christ/Logos as beginning with Creation and leading up to deification. Chadwick describes Clement's view of the 'true gnostic' Christian life as:

'an ascent from faith through knowledge to the beatific vision beyond this life, when the redeemed are one with God in a 'deification' symbolized by the Holy of Holies in the Mosaic tabernacle.'⁽²⁾

Clement himself writes:

'This is the function of the gnostic who has been made perfect: to have converse with God through the great high priest, and who is being made like the Lord, as far as possible, in the whole service of God which tends to the salvation of men.' - Strom.7.3.⁽³⁾

Or again:

(Christ to the soul) 'I am thy nourisher giving myself as bread, whereof he that tastes shall never more have experience of death, and daily giving Myself for the drink of immortality.' - Quis.div. 29⁽⁴⁾

(1) E. Bevan, Christianity, 1932, p.76; cited Bettenson Early Christian Fathers, p.17

(2) Chadwick, op.cit., p.97

(3) cited Daly, The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, p.117

(4) cited; Dix, Shape of the Liturgy, p.169

As this last passage shows, Clement's teaching on the Eucharist is found in the context of the true gnostic salvation. Srawley, in explaining why Clement gives very few liturgical references, writes that Clement:

'is more concerned with prayer as an expression of the inner converse of the heart with God than its public expression in worship.'⁽¹⁾

It is this 'expression of the inner converse of the heart with God' which Clement seeks to explore in his 'allegorical' understanding of the Eucharist.

In the Paedagogos Clement writes:

'The Holy Ghost uses flesh as a picture (ἀλληγορεῖ) for us.... Blood signifies (ὀμιλεῖται) for us the Word, for as rich blood the Word has been poured into our life.' - Paed.1.6.43⁽²⁾

This short passage reveals two of Clement's main thrusts in his approach to the Eucharist:

- i) all apparent reality is allegorical/symbolic, i.e. is used as the means for conveying a greater spiritual reality.
- ii) the Logos is seen as central to the eucharistic act.

i) Allegory

Daly notes:

'Clement often seems to treat the Bible as a symbolic poem rather than as the object of careful exegesis.'⁽³⁾

As an example of this he cites Clement's allegorical interpretation of Leviticus 1.6:⁽⁴⁾

'The Gnostic soul must be consecrated to the light, stripped of the coverings of matter,

(1) Srawley, Early History of the Liturgy, p.41

(2) cited, Stone, *op.cit.*, p.25

(3) Daly, *op.cit.*, p.113

(4) Lev. 1.6: 'and he shall flay the burnt offering and cut it into pieces.'

separated from the frivolousness of the
body and of all the passions.' - Strom.5.11⁽¹⁾

Clement treats the Eucharist to a similar allegorical
interpretation:

'The Lord expressed this by means of
symbols in the Gospel according to John⁽²⁾
when He said 'Eat My flesh and drink My
blood' depicting (ἀλλήγορω) plainly the
drinkable character of faith and the promise
by means of which the Church, as a human
being consisting of many members, is
refreshed and grows and is welded together
and compacted of both, of faith as the body
and of hope as the soul, as also the Lord
of flesh and blood.' - Paed.1.6.38

Here we see Clement's concern with the true gnosticism.
The true gnostic gains salvation through faith in the flesh
and blood of the Lord. Further, the Eucharist is
constitutive of the Body of Christ (here the Church) because
the Body of Christ (in the Eucharist) feeds the Church.⁽³⁾
Clement develops his view of the Eucharist as the source
of the unity of the Church in Paed.1.6 where he interprets
1 Cor. 12.13 ('all were made to drink of one Spirit') as
having Eucharistic reference.

Gore⁽⁴⁾ suggests that the Alexandrians were tempted
to 'explain away' the body/flesh of Christ in the Eucharist
as being word/spirit; and, according to Gore, Clement
shows a tendency to distinguish between the incarnational
(i.e. 'real') body of Christ as contrasted with the
Eucharistic (i.e. 'spiritual') body. This does not seem
entirely fair. Clement is certainly trying to 'explain'
but this need not mean 'explain away'. There seems little
doubt of the 'realism' in this passage:

(1) cited Daly op.cit. p.113

(2) N.B. How Clement - along with most of the allegorisers
refers back to St. John's gospel, where the two poles of
literalism and allegory are held in tension as 'sign' and
reality.

(3) cp. also Quis div.? 29.5 - cited p.161

(4) Gore, Body of Christ, pp.59ff.

"Eat ye My flesh". He says, "and drink ye My blood." This suitable food the Lord supplies to us and offers flesh and pours out blood; and the little children lack nothing that their growth needs.'

- Paed.1.6.43⁽¹⁾

At the same time Clement does speak of the Eucharist as 'allegory' and of the Eucharistic wine as 'the mystic symbol(συμβολον) of holy blood.' (Paed.2.2.29) Why? Mainly, it would seem, because, as with Tertullian, Clement is aware of the problems raised by referring to bread and wine as body and blood - problems both of acceptability (is this cannibalism?) and of metaphysics. How can this be true? Clement answers that it is true allegorically/symbolically. In other words he does not wish in any way to 'explain away' the presence of Christ the Logos in the Eucharist; on the contrary the Eucharistic presence of Christ is the means of 'communion' with the Logos, which is the true gnosticism. Rather Clement seeks to say that all 'earthly' reality is but symbolic of a greater 'heavenly' reality - and in this neo-Platonist sense, Christ is present as the 'spiritual' (and hence 'greater') reality) in the Eucharistic bread and wine.

The same point applies to Gore's suggestion that Clement distinguishes between the 'incarnational' and the 'eucharistic' body of Christ. There is, of course, a sense in which this is true. Witness Paed.2.2.19:

'The blood of the Lord is two-fold. In one sense it is fleshly, that by which we have been redeemed from corruption; in another sense it is spiritual, that by which we have been anointed.'⁽²⁾

Here Clement is not seeking to say that the blood of Christ in the Eucharist is totally other than the blood of Christ

(1) cited Stone, op.cit., p.37f.

(2) ibid., p.25

shed for us on the Cross. On the contrary, he would wish to draw a close link between Calvary and Eucharist. The Eucharist is the means of receiving the gift of immortality won for us by the death of Christ. The Eucharist is the means of true gnosticism. What Clement is seeking to do in Paed. 2.2.19 when he speaks of the 'two-fold' nature of the blood of the Lord, is to extend the perspective both of salvation and of the Eucharist. Christ is our high-priest (Paed.2.8) through whom we, the Body of Christ, offer the sacrifice of the Eucharist, so that we may become the Body of Christ. The High Priestly Christ offering sacrifice at the true altar in heaven is one and the same as the Incarnate Christ offering himself for us on the Cross, but - again the metaphysical difficulties raise their heads - there is clearly a sense in which the nature of the Body of the Incarnate Christ is not the same as the nature of the Body of the Risen Christ. The NT Resurrection appearances, and our own Eucharistic experience show this. So what Clement seeks to do is to treat the question eschatologically. In the Eucharist, Christ the High Priest, our Risen Lord, gives to us his body and blood which are the symbols of his gift of immortality.

The Logos

'...the mingling of both - of the drink and of the Word is called Eucharist.'

- Paed. 2.20⁽¹⁾

In several passages Clement links his doctrine of the Logos with the Eucharist thus seeing the Eucharist as a parallel (type, symbol, allegory?) to the Incarnation. As the Logos took flesh in Christ, so the Logos mingles with the bread and wine so that the true gnostic may be sanctified in body and soul. Again, we note a close link in the doctrine of the Eucharist between Incarnation

(1) Stone, op.cit., p.25

and Redemption. Other examples may be cited:

'for as rich blood the Word has been poured
into our life.' - Paed.1.6.43⁽¹⁾

'The food is the mystic contemplation; for
the flesh and blood of the Word are the
comprehension of the divine power and
essence.... For the eating and drinking
of the divine Word is the knowledge of
the divine essence.' - Strom.5.10.167⁽²⁾

It is noteworthy, however that as Srawley points
out,⁽³⁾ Clement gives little information about the liturgy.
Hence there is no indication in Clement of a Logos-
epiclesis, or any other suggestion of invocation of the
Logos, though, according to the evidence of Serapion,
the liturgy of C.4th Egypt did include such an invocation.
Did the earlier Church in Alexandria have a logos-epiclesis?
Or, as Wainwright seems to suggest,⁽⁴⁾ did the earlier
Egyptian/Alexandrian Church as represented by Clement, think
of the Eucharist as being consecrated through the words of
institution spoken by the Word (Logos) of God? Either way
we again are led to interpret the Eucharist eschatologically
as Clement's thought moves out by means of the concept of
the Logos in the eucharistic elements to the eschatological
sacrifice of Christ the true High Priest who offers his body
to the Father and who gives his body to the true gnostic
who worships at the earthly altar which is a type of that in
heaven.

'The sacrifice acceptable to God'....

...iis...'Unswerving separation of the body
and its passions.' - Strom.7.6.30⁽⁵⁾

In his teaching on the Eucharist as sacrifice
Clement links the themes of the true salvation of the real
gnostic and the ethical imperative. Consequently:

(1) Stone, op.cit., p.25

(2) ibid.: p.26

(3) Srawley, op.cit., p.41

(4) Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology, p.189

(5) cited Stone, op.cit., p.44

'More often than not....what seems a firm reference to the eucharist dissolves into an allegory of the true gnostic's knowledge.'⁽¹⁾

An example may be quoted from Strom.7.6.31f.:

'If the Deity, being by nature exempt from all need, rejoices to be honoured we have good reason for honouring God by prayer and for sending up to the most righteous Word this sacrifice, the best and holiest of sacrifices, when joined with righteousness, venerating Him through whom we receive our knowledge, through Him glorifying Him whom we have learnt to know. At any rate our altar here on earth is the congregation of those who are devoted to the prayers, having as it were one common voice and one mind.... The Church's sacrifice is speech rising like incense from holy souls, while every thought of the heart is laid open to God along with the sacrifice....The truly hallowed altar is the righteous soul and incense from it is the prayer of holiness.'⁽²⁾

Several important points emerge from this passage:

- 1) Again we note the emphasis on the Logos. The sacrifice is offered through the Word to God.
- 2) We are able to offer the sacrifice because the Word has given us true knowledge.
- 3) The earthly altar is made up from the individual gnostics. Daly notes:
'In developing this theme he brings the theology of Christian sacrifice to a new level of ecclesiological fulness

(1) Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, p.213

(2) cited Stone op.cit. p.44

far beyond what it had in any of the earlier Christian writings.'⁽¹⁾

4) Consequent on this thought Clement sees the true sacrifice of the Christian as being himself offered through the Word: 'All his life is a holy festival. His sacrifices consist of prayers and praises and the reading of Scriptures.'

- Strom.7.7.49⁽²⁾

All of these ideas of course, link to Clement's concept of the sacrifice of Christ, the true High Priest. Clement develops the OT typology in terms of Christ as the Christian Passover (Strom.5.10f.) and sees the sacrifice of Isaac as being the type of the sacrifice of Christ:

'He is Isaac... who is a type of the Lord, a child as a son. For he was the son of Abraham, as Christ was the Son of God; and a sacrifice like the Lord.'

- Paed.1.5⁽³⁾

Daly believes that the liturgical Sitz im Leben of the Akedah was the Passover⁽⁴⁾ - and so it may also be right to link this passage to the Eucharist. Certainly⁽⁵⁾ Clement knew the Ep.Heb., and like the Epistle he develops the OT imagery as a type for the Christian gnosis. Christ is the sacrifice bound upon the altar - but he is also the High Priest:

'If then we say that the lord, the great high-priest, offers to God the incense of sweet fragrance, let us not imagine

(1) Daly, op.cit., p.121

(2) cited Stone, op.cit., p.45

(3) Daly, p.114

(4) *ibid.*, p.49

(5) The Ep. Heb. shows marked Alexandrian and Platonic influence, and Eusebius tells us that Clement knew the Epistle - H.E. 6.14.1

that this is a sacrifice and sweet fragrance of incense, but let us understand it to mean that the Lord lays the acceptable offering of love, the spiritual fragrance on the altar.' - Paed.2.8⁽¹⁾

This 'acceptable offering of love' clearly means Christ's death on the cross, being re-presented in the Eucharist:

'We glorify him who gave himself in sacrifice for us, we also sacrifice ourselves.' - Strom.7.3⁽²⁾

Again we note Clement's view of the Eucharist as having a two-way reference. Christ the Word offers Himself to the Father for us, and gives Himself to us; we in turn offer ourselves to Him through His sacrifice on the Cross. Thus does Clement see type and ante-type merge. The OT high-priest, the type of Christ the true high priest (who is central to all understanding of Christian sacrifice) is also the type of the true gnostic Christian - and all three flow one into the other.⁽³⁾ Commenting on Lev.16.23f Clement writes:

'One way I think of taking off and putting on the (high-priestly) robe takes place when the Lord descends into the region of sense. Another way takes place when he who through him has believed, takes off and puts on as the apostle intimated the consecrated stole.⁽⁴⁾ Thence, after the image of the Lord, the worthiest were chosen from the sacred tribes to be high priests.' - Stro. 5.6⁽⁵⁾

Thus do we come full circle to Clement's stress on the Eucharist as being the means of the true gnostic's 'deification'. Maurice Wiles writes:

(1) cited Daly, *ibid.* p.49
(2) *ibid.*
(3) *ibid.* p.115
(4) A ref. to Eph.6. 13-17
(5) Daly *op.cit.*, p.115f

'For the Alexandrians in particular (Christ) was not so much the individual pioneer as the representative God-man, the one who by his very being made possible the divinisation of human nature.'⁽¹⁾

Communion with Christ the Logos through the Eucharistic bread and wine is the most intimate union of the true gnostic with his Lord.

"Taste and see that the Lord is Christ"⁽²⁾ it is said; for so He imparts of Himself to those who partake of such food in a more spiritual manner, when now the soul nourishes itself, as says the truth-loving Plato. For the eating and drinking of the divine Word is the knowledge of the divine essence.' - Stro.5.10.67⁽³⁾

ORIGEN

The speculative symbolic theology which we found first in the West as a developed form in the thought of Tertullian, and then, in a more Platonic form, in the East as evidenced by Clement of Alexandria, reached what we may perhaps style as its first 'climax' in the writings of Origen. At once we may note that Origen was devoted to the Fourth Gospel and indeed, that his Tome on that gospel was the longest of his commentaries extending to some thirty-two books.⁽⁴⁾ Later generations were to fight shy of many of Origen's teachings, and even one of his chief preservers, Rufinus of Aquileia, was guilty of altering several of Origen's more speculative passages so as not to offend the susceptibilities of a narrower minded and more conservative orthodoxy. Perhaps this later reaction

(1) M. Wiles, The Christian Fathers, p.123

(2) Ps. 24 - reading Χριστος for Χρηστος

(3) cited Stone, op.cit., p.26

(4) F.L. Cross, Early Christian Fathers, p.126

was almost inevitable. Certainly, even today, Origen's thought can still have the possibility of shocking us out of an unthinking and accepting orthodoxy into what may sometimes be a more vigorous, though more uncomfortable, discipleship.

It seems almost a necessary concomitant of Origen's stress on allegory that he would appear to have given relatively little emphasis to the Eucharist.⁽¹⁾ This is not to say that there is no eucharistic doctrine in Origen's writings. On the contrary, a great deal of his vast output⁽²⁾ has direct relevance to the interpretation of the Eucharist. But his overriding stress on the importance of allegory does, perhaps, go some way to account for the fact that in many passages it cannot be claimed with any great certainty whether Origen is actually writing about the Eucharist or not - and if he is, whether or not he finds the Eucharist at all important in his scheme of Christian doctrine. Again we note the parallel with the Fourth Gospel. Often Origen is writing on the Eucharist and does find it important - but at the same time his allegorical approach often disguises the fact; it is not surprising that he has acquired his detractors.

'The nourishing word of truth'

Origen's approach to the Eucharist lies in the mainstream interpretation of the anamnesis, stemming from the NT, seen as the key to the Eucharist in terms of eschatology:

'Consecration gives to the sacramental elements the effectiveness of the word or teaching of Christ, which gives life. They now symbolise the teaching and produce a dynamic effect on the soul of the recipient.'

- C.Cels.viii.33

(1) See for example, Daly op.cit., p.127

(2) Chadwick, The Early Church, p.109, cites Jerome thus: 'Who could ever read all that Origen wrote?' - lesser students echo these sentiments!

'We drink this blood when we receive His words in which life exists.'

- in Numb.Hom.xvii.9

The Eucharist is the celebration of the 'inbreaking' of the saving Christ, the Word of life. For Origen the key to any true understanding of the Christian Gospel - indeed the true understanding of the Christian doctrine of man and the World - rests in eschatology.⁽¹⁾ All life, all creation, all Biblical writings, all sacraments are symbols of the only true reality that is God. What Chadwick writes about Origen in general terms may serve also to help us understand his approach to the Eucharist:

'Origen was convinced that the symbols of early Christian eschatology.... were not to be rejected merely because literalistic believers understood them in a crude and prosaic way. It was, he thought, the opposite error of Gnosticism to reinterpret all these symbols to refer exclusively to inward psychological experience here and now. Origen himself had much inner sympathy with this view ... But he wanted to find a way of interpreting the symbols in a sense 'worthy of the divine greatness' which maintained the essential meaning of the Church's tradition. His quest for a via media may often have ended in a rather confused use of language, and in the eyes of the orthodox his re-interpretations sounded alarmingly heretical.'⁽²⁾

In other words Origen stood in that stream of thought stemming from NY writers such as Paul and John, who resolutely held together both symbol and reality.

(1) See Daly op.cit., p.125

(2) Chadwick, op.cit., p.106

The symbol was never mere symbol - never a psychological experience dependent on subjective emotionalism - but more was it ever more than symbol, the symbol of a reality.

Origen's system of thought rests on three levels of interpretation: the literal, the moral, and the spiritual.⁽¹⁾ These correspond to the three divisions of mankind: the unenlightened pagan, the ordinary simple Christian and the advanced Christian. It is to this last group that Origen addresses most of his writings and by so doing virtually suggests that any 'literal' understanding - be it of the saving work of Christ or of his presence in the Eucharist - is to be relegated to such an obscurity as almost to be ignored. For example, he writes thus about Christ's work of salvation:

'Happy are they who no longer need the Son of God as a physician who heals the sick, or as a shepherd, nor as redemption but as wisdom and as word and as righteousness.'
- in John.1.20.124⁽²⁾

But Origen does not entirely reject the literal understanding of the Eucharist. Whatever else he may suggest, he clearly thinks that Christ is present in the act of communion:

'You who are wont to take part in the divine mysteries know how carefully and reverently you guard the body of the Lord when you receive it, lest the least crumb of it should fall to the ground, lest anything should be lost of the hallowed gift.'
- Hom.in Exod.13.3⁽³⁾

But here Origen is clearly speaking to the 'simple' Christian; for the 'advanced' he has this to say:

(1) Prestige, Fathers and Heretics, p.55ff

(2) cited Kelly, op.cit., p.187

(3) cited Bettenson, Early Christian Fathers, p.249

'Let the bread and the cup be understood by the more simple according to the common acceptation of the Eucharist, but by those who have learnt to hear more deeply according to the more divine promise, even that of the nourishing word of truth.'

- in John.22.24.16⁽¹⁾

Thus Origen sees the eucharistic gift as being the Word nourishing the soul:

'Now we are said to drink the blood of Christ not only in the way of sacraments but also when we receive his words, in which life consists.' - Hom.in Num. 16.9⁽²⁾

'That bread which God the Word proclaims as his body is the word which nourishes our souls....That drink which God the Word proclaims as his blood is the word which "so wonderfully refreshes and inebriates"... For the body and blood of God the Word can be nothing else than the word which nourishes and the word which "makes glad the heart".'

- in Matt.comm.85⁽³⁾

In this way Origen interprets the eucharistic gift in terms of his Logos-Christology and so links with the Eucharist the themes of incarnation and redemption:

'We believe that the very Logos of the Father, the Wisdom of God himself, was enclosed within the limits of that man who appeared in Judea; nay more, that God's wisdom entered a woman's womb, was born as an infant and wailed like crying children.'

- de Princ.2.6.2.⁽⁴⁾

(1) cited Stone, op.cit., p.28

(2) Bettenson, Early Christian Fathers, p.250

(3) Bettenson, ibid. p.250

(4) Kelly, Early Christian Doctrine, p.154

'....the Word who became flesh and the true food; which whoso eateth shall certainly live for ever, no bad man being able to eat it. For if it were possible for a man while he remains bad to eat the Word who was made flesh and the living bread, it would not have been written that "he that eateth this bread shall live for ever".'

- in Matt.11.14⁽¹⁾

Kelly notes:

'A host of passages suggest that for him Christ's body and blood signify, in a deeper and more spiritual sense, His teaching, the ineffable truth which He reveals and which nourishes and sustains the soul.'⁽²⁾

In this mode of interpretation Origen writes:

'So also the bread is the word of Christ, made of that corn of wheat which falling into the ground yields much fruit. For not that visible bread which He held in His hands did God the Word call His body, but the word in the mystery of which that bread was broken. Nor did he call that visible drink His blood, but the word in the mystery of which that drink was to be poured out.' - in Matt.comm.85⁽³⁾

Gore, rightly tracing such an interpretation back to the Fourth Gospel,⁽⁴⁾ criticises Origen for misinterpreting John and making the Evangelist's stress on flesh and blood unintelligible. This seems unfair of Gore, and perhaps

(1) Gore, op.cit., p.145

(2) Kelly, Early Christian Creeds, p.214

(3) cited Stone, op.cit., p.27f

(4) Gore, op.cit., p.290

reveals more of Gore's interpretation of John than of Origen's shortcomings. It would seem to me that Origen holds together the fruitful 'Johannine tension' - that there is a real gift of Christ in the Eucharist, but none the less the 'body' and 'blood' *are* symbols of the greater and only true reality of incarnation and redemption. It seems to me that one of the older evangelical commentators⁽¹⁾ was right to remind us that Origen was not accused of any eucharistic heresy (though he was to be accused of just about every other heresy!). Macdonald suggests that this was because Origen's symbolic approach to the Eucharist was regarded and recognised as embodying ancient tradition - even though the later purely literal/'realist' approach was eventually to hold the field.

At the risk of putting words into Origen's mouth it may be helpful to try a summary of how Origen approached the whole question of symbol and reality. It would seem to have run something as follows:

'If you are happy with a literal understanding of the Eucharist as being the reception of the body and blood of Christ under the forms of bread and wine then I do not wish to upset your faith. But remember that it is by faith that you receive. You place your faith in Christ - not in bread and wine. Christ is the true reality of the Eucharist. The true gift of the Eucharist is the spiritual nourishment provided by Christ, our redeemer and saviour. On the other hand, if you find the metaphysical difficulties raised by referring to bread and wine as body and blood to be very difficult, then remember that it is part of the tradition of interpretation that the Eucharist is the *symbol* of a greater reality. We may interpret the Eucharist by

(1) Macdonald, op.cit., p.62

reference to the work of the Logos. Just as the Logos became flesh in the Lord Jesus, so the Logos enters the soul of the faithful Christian through the symbol of the eucharistised bread and wine. This is no mere magic or superstition. The Eucharist demands both faith and understanding (as much as we are capable of) if we are to receive aright. Christians must study the Word of God in the Scriptures, just as much as feed on the Word in the Eucharist. Only by doing both can we hope to offer the true Christian sacrifice; ourselves as acceptable to God the Father through the offering of Christ on the cross.'

In case it should be objected that the last paragraph puts words into Origen's mouth, perhaps the following passage from his commentary on Matthew should be cited:

'Why then did He not say, This is the bread of the new covenant, as He said, This is the blood of the new covenant? Because the bread is the word of righteousness, by eating which souls are nourished while the drink is the word of the knowledge of Christ according to the mystery of His birth and passion. Since therefore the covenant of God is set for us in the blood of the passion of Christ, so that believing the Son of God to have been born and to have suffered according to the flesh we may be saved not in righteousness, in which alone without faith in the passion of Christ there could not be salvation...'

- in Matt.comm.85⁽¹⁾

(1) We may compare these words of Origen with the following of Eusebius of Caesarea who closely echoes Origen's thought when he puts these words into the mouth of Christ at the Last Supper: 'You must not think that the flesh in which I am clothed is the flesh of which I speak, and which you have to eat, nor are you to think that I order you to drink this material and corporal blood, for you know that My words are spirit and life.'

We shall turn to Origen's teaching on sacrifice and the closely related theme of soteriology in a moment. First, let us pick up the point concerning his eschatological approach to the Eucharist. Such an understanding is implicit in the passage just cited from his commentary from Matthew. It is part and parcel of his whole emphasis on an allegorical interpretation and also on the role of the Logos. The Logos is the timeless word of God, present in Creation, present in Christ, present in the Age to Come, present in the eternal offering of Christ the High Priest, present in the eucharistic celebration. In this context Daly suggests that Origen draws on the 'metahistorical, triple dimension of the Passover'. In other words, Origen recognises that the Eucharist/Passover is timeless, having reference to present, past and future. Thus Christian worship and Christian sacrifice (and, in view of his allegorising method, we may say the whole OT cultic system) are but a pattern of the true worship in the Age to Come. (1)

Perhaps the nearest Origen comes to writing directly about the Eucharist in eschatological terms is in a passage, commenting on the Lord's Prayer, concerning the true meaning of *ἐπιουσιος* :

'Someone will say that *ἐπιουσιος* is formed from *ἐπιεναι* so that we are instructed to pray that God will anticipate (*προλαβων*) and grant us already the bread belonging to the age to come, so that what is to be given as it were tomorrow should be given to us today, 'today' being understood of the present age and 'tomorrow' of the age to come.'

- de orat.27(2)

In fact Origen interprets *ἐπιουσιος* as meaning 'suited to our "logical" nature' and as being a prayer

(1) Daly, op.cit., p.125

(2) cited Wainwright, op.cit., p.32

that we might be fed by the Logos; he specifically denies that the petition has any reference to the Eucharist. This in itself however suggests two important strands in Origen's approach to the Eucharist: (i) that he was well aware that the Eucharist was an eschatological symbol - the bread belonging to the age to come, and (ii) that his denial of eucharistic reference implies that he did not consider the Eucharist as being of greater importance than the reality for which it stands, i.e. the feeding of our souls by the Logos.

The following passage does, I think, clearly show that Origen's attempt at interpreting the nature and presence of the eucharistic gift in terms of the Logos was shot through with a firm eschatological understanding of the Eucharist:

'If these things are interpreted with reference to the greatness of the mystery, you will find that that memorial effects an immense propitiation. And if you have regard to that memorial of which the Lord says, 'Do this for a memorial of me', you will find that this is the only memorial which makes God propitious to men.'

- Hom.in Levit.13.3⁽¹⁾

In this passage Origen takes up the anamnesis concept and so links the Eucharist to the shewbread of the OT and also to the propitiation set forth through faith in the blood of Christ. Hence, through the eternal Logos the Eucharist is the link of past, present and future. In Christ 'heavenly things in exchange for earthly'⁽²⁾ are given us. The bread and wine are sanctified through 'the Word of God and prayer'.⁽³⁾ The bread becomes 'on account of the prayer a certain holy body which sanctifies those who use it with right purpose'.⁽⁴⁾

(1) cited Bettenson, op.cit., p.251

(2) In Luc. hom.39

(3) In Matt.11.14 Srawley (op.cit.p.44) understands 'the Word' here to be personal and so to refer to the Logos rather than to the consecration prayer.

(4) c.Cels.8.33

The previous sentence from Origen's 'contra Celsum' brings out the ethical connection which Origen makes between the eucharistic symbol and its right reception as reality:

'But if, understanding that word of Jesus, Henceforth I will no longer drink of the fruit of this vine until the day when I drink it new in the kingdom of heaven, we wish to be found one day among those who drink with Jesus, then let us take this warning to heart: You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons.'

- Exhort.ad mart.40⁽¹⁾

And again:

'thus even in respect of the bread of the Lord the advantage to the receiver depends on his partaking of the bread with a pure mind and a clear conscience.'

- Comm.in Matt.11.14⁽²⁾

We have been examining Origen's approach to the Eucharist in terms of his doctrine of the Logos and his symbolic/allegorical theology. I would wish to suggest that he was almost the last representative in the period under review (as always of course with Augustine as the exception) of the great line of symbolic-eschatological interpretation of the eucharist, in which the anamnesis was interpreted in what I understand to be its primitive NT sense of a 'breaking through' of the barrier between God and man by means of a symbol of the reality of the work of Christ. Once this approach became unpopular and virtually fell into abeyance greater emphasis came to be placed on the reality of the Eucharist gift (interpreted in literal terms) rather than on the Eucharist being the

(1) cited Wainwright op.cit., p.45

(2) cited Bettenson, op.cit., p.249

'anamnesis', the 'foretaste' of the Messianic Banquet in which Christ is present as Word, as 'community' (the Body of Christ) and as sacrament, making his people holy through the once and for all sacrifice of Calvary.

Sacrifice

This brings us to an examination of Origen's understanding of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. We have already noted that he closely links the death of Christ and the ethical response of thanksgiving made by the Christian. It is precisely so that we may have a 'pure mind and a clear conscience' that Christ died:

'We have peace with God but it is through our Lord Jesus Christ who reconciled us to God through the sacrifice of his blood.... Christ came that he might destroy the enmities and make peace, and reconcile us to God when we were separated because of the barrier of wickedness which we set up by sinning.'

-Comm.in Ep.ad Rom.4.8⁽¹⁾

As has been seen above, Origen by means of the concept of anamnesis, links the action of the Eucharist with the sacrifice of Christ offered 'as a propitiation through faith in his blood.'⁽²⁾ Kelly notes that Origen is 'the first of the Fathers to treat this aspect of the Lord's work in full detail.'⁽³⁾ And Daly writes:

'Origen's main concern seems to be how the Church and its members, and indeed the whole world, share in the sacrifice of Christ.'⁽⁴⁾

We note for instance this passage from Origen's homily on Leviticus:

(1) *ibid.* p.226
(2) *Hom. in Lev.* 9.1
(3) Kelly, *op.cit.*, p.186
(4) Daly, *op.cit.*, p.124

'...the blood of Jesus was not only shed at Jerusalem, where there was an altar... and the tabernacle...., but also sprinkled on the altar above, the 'altar in heaven'.'

- Hom.in Lev.1.3

And again from his commentary on St. John:

'Christ is a great high priest who has offered himself as the sacrifice once offered not only on behalf of men but also for every rational being.'

- in.Johan.1.40.35

Such passages use a typically Alexandrian typological approach to the OT, which is taken as the antetype of that which is to come, as the earthly figure of the heavenly. All this is of a piece with Origen's eschatological approach to the Eucharist. Such an approach leads at times to Origen coming perilously near to denying anything more than the merely symbolic to the Eucharist, since he is so concerned to place great emphasis on the Eucharist as the means of being fed by the Word of God. In a parallel way, Origen's teaching on the nature of Christian sacrifice has little direct contact with the Eucharist - but at the same time it seems impossible to escape the fact that Origen would seem to have been much influenced in this respect (as would be natural) by the liturgical action of the Eucharist.

In this mood Origen writes not of the Church offering a type of the sacrifice of Christ, but of the individual offering a sacrifice on the altar of his heart.

'You have then a priesthood because you are a priestly nation and therefore you ought to offer to God the sacrifice of praise, the sacrifice of prayers, the sacrifice of pity, the sacrifice of chastity, the sacrifice of righteousness, the sacrifice of holiness.' - in.Lev.Homm.9.1

Daly comments:

'To look through Origen's work for the idea of the Eucharist as sacrifice - let alone something more specific like 'sacrifice of the Mass' - is to bypass his central thought and concentrate on something he obviously did not find relevant enough to command much of his attention.... foremost in his mind was apparently not a liturgical rite of the Church, but rather the internal liturgy of the Christian heart and spirit by which a person offers oneself and all one's prayers, works, and thoughts through Jesus Christ to God the Father.'⁽¹⁾

Thus Origen represents the Eucharist as being both the means of sharing in the salvation won by Christ for us, and also the ethical response of thanksgiving for His work. This is well summarised by Origen himself commenting on his beloved Fourth Gospel:

'He who keeps the feast with Jesus is above in the great upper room, the upper room swept clean, the upper room garnished and made ready. If you go up with Him that you may keep the feast of the Passover, He gives to you the cup of the new covenant, He gives to you also the bread of blessing, He bestows His own body and His own blood.'

- in Johan.18.13

(1) Daly, op.cit., p.127

ST. CYPRIAN OF CARTHAGE

Cyprian's chief contribution to eucharistic doctrine was to clarify the connection between the sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the Eucharist:

'If our Lord and God Jesus Christ is Himself the High Priest of God the Father and offered Himself as a sacrifice to the Father and demanded this to be done as a memorial of Himself, certainly that priest truly performs his office in the place of Christ who imitates that which Christ did, and then offers in the Church to God the Father a real and complete sacrifice when he begins to offer as he sees Christ Himself offered.'

- Ep.63.14⁽¹⁾

This development of the sacrificial doctrine of the Eucharist springs from the liturgical development of the offertory procession. Cyprian at one point rebukes a rich lady who comes to Eucharist without an offering and hence feeds off the offerings of the poor.⁽²⁾ He clearly links the offertory not, as in earlier writers, with 'the offering of the firstfruits' but with 'sacrifice' - for the lady is accused of coming 'without a sacrifice'.⁽³⁾

Wiles suggests that the sacrificial understanding of the Eucharist developed from the earlier concept of the Eucharist as a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and also a material offering of bread and wine, 'the first fruits'. But it must also be remembered that the Eucharist was offered to make anamnesis of the death (and resurrection, ascension and second coming) of Christ. Furthermore the earliest writers identify the elements of bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ. Hence a syllogism may be drawn to explain the development from 'offertory' to 'sacrifice':

(1) cited Stone, op.cit.

(2) de op. et eleem.c.15

(3) v. Srawley op.cit., p.127

- 1) The bread and wine are an offering of the firstfruits in thanksgiving to God the Creator.
- 2) The bread and wine are also identified as the body and blood of Christ.
- 3) Therefore in the Eucharist, under the forms of bread and wine we 'offer' thanksgiving through the body and blood of Christ, the ground of our Eucharist, and so may speak (loosely?) of 'offering the body and blood'.

'For if we should offer wine alone, then the blood of Christ begins to be separated from us; but if it be water alone, then the people begin to be separated from Him; but when both are mingled then it is a spiritual and heavenly sacrament.'

- Ep.63.13⁽¹⁾

Commenting on this passage Gore writes:

'...it is the teaching of the fathers that in the Eucharist we are offered in and with Christ, and only so can we offer Christ. Writer after writer follows St. Cyprian in seeing this principle symbolized in the fact that the bread and the wine, which are to become Christ's body and blood, are made up of many grains or berries brought into one; or again in the fact that water is added to the wine to represent the addition of the people to Christ in the sacrament.'

Seeing Christ as the High Priest, Cyprian speaks of him as Melchizedek:

(1) Gore, Body of Christ, p.205

'Our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the very same thing as Melchizedek, that is bread and wine, namely His body and blood.'

- Ep. 63.2

This would suggest the picture of Christ as the President of the Eucharist offering the Church's offering as His own. Interestingly the parallel between Christ and Melchizedek is taken up by later writers such as Ambrose, and is also in the Roman canon. Srawley writes:

'The comparison may have been commonplace in early Christian thought in the West and so have found its way into the liturgy.'⁽¹⁾

While it seems probably correct to trace the development of the understanding of eucharistic sacrifice to the parallel development of the offertory in the eucharistic action, there is also another and more immediate cause. The fullest view of Cyprian's sacrificial teaching is found in Ep. 63. This letter was written to refute the Aquarians i.e. those who celebrated with water eucharists. Cyprian declares such Eucharists to be invalid because the wine is a type of the blood of Christ:

'Nor can His blood, by which we have been redeemed or quickened, be seen to be in the cup, when wine which is shown (ostendetur) to be the blood of Christ, is absent from the cup.' - Ep. 63.2

'in vino vero ostendi sanguinem Christi.'

‡ Ep. 63.13

'Mention is made of wine (sc. in the OT) that by wine may be understood the blood

(1) Srawley, op.cit., p.130

of the Lord, and that what was afterwards manifested in the Lord's cup might be foretold in the predictions of the prophets.' - Ep. 63.7

The key thought in Ep.63 is that the Eucharist should exactly reproduce Christ's actions and intention at the Last Supper.⁽¹⁾ At the Last Supper Christ offered himself proleptically in the bread and the wine, thus, making anamnesis of the sacrifice on the Cross so the Church in the Eucharist offers the sacrifice of Christ to the Father. In this way Cyprian regards the Eucharist as having objective efficacy - it can, for example be offered for the dead.⁽²⁾

All this rests firmly on a concept of anamnesis:

'Since we make mention of His passion in all our sacrifices, for the passion is the Lord's sacrifice which we offer, we ought to do nothing else than what He did (sc. at the Last Supper). - Ep. 63.17

But it must be asked whether such a concept of anamnesis is the same eschatological base as the NT? Cyprian 'repeats history'. The NT moves into the Risen Christ.

Cyprian's stress on making memorial of the passion is so pronounced as to allow Dix to wonder whether there was a tendency in Africa to make memorial of the passion only and not, as in Rome, of the passion and resurrection.⁽³⁾

(1) Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, p.125

(2) v. Ep.1.2; 12.2; 29.3

(3) Dix, *op.cit.*, p.556f.n. Beckwith also has an interesting speculation that Cranmer's liturgy with its heavy emphasis on the death of Christ, may have been influenced by Cranmer's knowledge of Cyprian (R.T.Beckwith, art., Thomas Cranmer and the Prayer Book, Liturgy, p.72ff.). If this is the case it must also be noted that Cranmer went out of his way to avoid any suggestion of sacrificial language. He 'certainly knew enough for us to be sure that if he had made the worship of the early church a model for close imitation he could have got much nearer to it than he did. His omission of sacrificial language in regard to the elements from the communion service, though he knew it to be universal, is a case in point.' As far as Cyprian is concerned, however, it still seems to me that he is not guilty of any idea of the Eucharist being a repetition of Calvary (as Beckwith seems to suggest). Cyprian cannot be held responsible for later misuse in an age when understanding of anamnesis/eschatology had disappeared.

Or is it that Cyprian was in advance of his time - as Srawley suggests?⁽¹⁾ Brilioth⁽²⁾ seems to see Cyprian as the precursor of the worst of the Medieval excesses of the 'Sacrifice of the Mass':

'Cyprian is the earliest writer who expresses this view of the sacrifice in his distinction between the oblatio offered by the faithful and the sacrificium hallowed by the operation of the Holy Spirit. Yet he does not fully develop the idea, and he does not treat the sacrifice as having any independent value of its own; "the passion of the Lord is the sacrifice which we offer.".... a dangerous step has now been taken towards the assimilation of the pagan idea of sacrifice.'

And yet does not Brilioth himself point out the firm safeguard that Cyprian holds up as a standard? Namely that the eucharistic sacrifice is the sacrifice of the Cross in as much as the Eucharist is the anamnesis of the passion. Our prayers at the Eucharist - as on every other occasion - are only offered through that Sacrifice made once for all. Perhaps Frere⁽³⁾ clears the confusion when he suggests that the changes such as Cyprian makes are not fundamental ones of doctrine, but rather ones of terminology. Usually he avoids transliterated Greek terms and prefers to find Latin equivalents. Thus he avoids Eucharistia and normally prefers sacrificium together with the verb celebrare. This last term itself points to the eschatological nature of Cyprian's thought. 'To celebrate', at least until it became a technical term as in the later Medieval

(1) Srawley op.cit., p.129

(2) Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic, SPCK, 1961, p.46

(3) Frere, The Anaphora, SPCK, 1938, p.39

West, would surely seem inappropriate of a pleading of the death of Christ? But it would seem entirely right for the anamnesis of the death and resurrection of Christ - an anamnesis through which prayer was offered through the sacrifice of the Cross in the power of the Risen Christ. On the other hand, this enhancement of the sacrificial language no doubt leads to a greater stress on the anamnesis as being a memorial of the death of Christ. Hicks writes:

'Cyprian applies the obvious words to that which was already familiar; indeed, the words had already been used by Tertullian as in the East by Origen; and Cyprian's responsibility, if it can be so called, or his achievement, is merely the clarifying and the fixing, in what thenceforward became accepted terms, of what had always been implicit in idea, and had already been tentatively expressed in language.'⁽¹⁾

Hicks further comments that there is nothing wrong - indeed, as has already been said, it is a perfectly natural Christian instinct - to plead the sacrifice of the Cross, when making anamnesis of the salvific work of Christ. The later Medieval abuse of the propitiatory nature of the Mass are quite other than the thought of Cyprian.⁽²⁾

To sum up. Cyprian identifies the Eucharistic sacrifice as being the anamnesis of Calvary. Thus the Eucharist could be offered for the dead and for the forgiveness of sins:

'...the memory of the old man is thrown off; the former worldly conversation is forgotten, and the sad and sorrowful heart that was oppressed by the weight of sins is set free by the joy of divine favour.' - Ep. 63.11

(1) F.C.N. Hicks, The Fulness of Sacrifice, Macmillan & Co., 1938, p.286f.

(2) *ibid.*, p.301. See also Wainwright *op.cit.*, p.91

The Eucharist is the eschatological meal:

'And how shall we drink new wine of the fruit of the vine, with Christ in the Father's Kingdom, if in the sacrifice of God the Father and of Christ, we do not offer wine and mix the cup of the Lord in accordance with Dominical tradition?' - Ep.63.9

Thus Cyprian does not suggest that in the Eucharist the Church becomes some sort of intermediary between Christ and the Father, pleading Christ's sacrifice. Rather he suggests that in the Eucharist the Church offers the eternal sacrifice of Calvary through Christ the High Priest, who Himself is presiding at the Eucharist offering the Sacrifice of the Cross on behalf of the world.

'When Christ suffered for us and offered his sacrifice, we were in Him - inasmuch as He was bearing our sins.' - Ep. 63.13

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM

As we come to examine the eucharistic doctrine of Cyril of Jerusalem we move to a teacher whose doctrine was much more fully developed than any we have so far met. So fully developed indeed as to suggest to many commentators that Cyril was in advance, rather than typical, of his time. Cross⁽¹⁾ suggests that Cyril's high sacramental teaching was the immediate cause of C.17th Protestant doubts about the genuineness of the Mystagogical Catecheses. Some of these doubts have raised their heads again in more recent years, but on the whole it would seem that scholarly opinion for the most part supports the authenticity of the Mystagogical Catecheses as having been delivered originally by Cyril himself, though possibly later also used by Cyril's successor John.⁽²⁾ In any case, for our purposes we need not worry too

(1) Cross, Lectures on the Christian Sacraments, p.xxxvi.

(2) ibid. p.xxxix.

much about the authorship of the Mystagogical Catecheses, sufficient to say that they provide a notable C.4th development of eucharistic doctrine.

The main areas of development in the Mystagogical Catecheses are:

- 1) the absence of the Institution Narrative and the stress on the epiclesis in the anaphora.
 - 2) the stress on the objective reality of Christ's presence in the eucharistic bread and wine, and the consequent awe in which the sacrament is held.
 - 3) the further development of the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice.
 - 4) a stress on the historical re-enactment of redemption rather than on the eschatological nature of the Eucharist.
- Each of these areas will be examined in turn.

1) The lack of the Institution Narrative and the importance of the epiclesis.

In Myst. Cat.5 Cyril gives an account of the eucharistic rite to the newly baptized. In this account he speaks of the anaphora, beginning with the priest's words:

'Let us give thanks to the Lord'

and the responses

'It is meet and right.'⁽¹⁾

The prayer then gives praise to God the Creator leading up to the hymn of the Seraphim:

'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of Sabaoth.'⁽²⁾

At this point we would expect the anaphora to lead into the Institution Narrative; but it is missing. Instead we read:

'Then having sanctified ourselves by these spiritual hymns we call upon the merciful God to send forth His Holy Spirit upon the gifts lying before Him; that He may make

(1) Myst.Cat. 5.5

(2) Myst.Cat. 5.6

the bread the Body of Christ; for whatsoever the Holy Ghost has touched, is sanctified and changed.'

- Myst.Cat. 5.7

The prayer then moves on to intercession:

'for the common peace of the Church, for the tranquillity of the world' - and so on.'

This raises several questions. In the rite Cyril is describing, was there no Institution Narrative? - or does Cyril assume its presence, but, here at any rate, omit to comment on it? If there is no Institution Narrative does this mean that Cyril saw the Epiclesis as 'the moment of consecration', or is such a suggestion an anachronism?

Srawley and Frere⁽¹⁾ both suggest that the reason for the apparent omission of the Institution Narrative at this point is because Cyril has already expounded it in Myst.Cat.4. Certainly, Myst.Cat. 4 is based on Paul's account of the Institution in 1 Cor.11.23ff which Cyril quotes in full. Dix however argues that the omission of the Institution Narrative is evidence that the Jerusalem rite had no Institution Narrative in the anaphora. He suggests that Cyril is a very 'faithful summarizer' and that if he is deliberately omitting part of the rite he uses the phrase *μετα ταυτα* 'rather than (as at Myst. Cat. 5.7) *εἰτα* '. Dix writes:

'I find it difficult to assume that in this one case by 'next' Cyril means 'After a great part of the prayer has been said.' And if he

(1) Srawley op.cit., p.76; Frere, op.cit. p.69; Brilioth op.cit. p.41 f.n., dismisses Wetter's hypothesis that the Institution Narrative formed no part of the earlier liturgies. The argument used by Wetter is part of the same line of argument used by Lietzmann, namely that the purest form of the 'eucharist' was the agape - which had no necessary reference to the Last Supper; it has been suggested earlier that this hypothesis is somewhat tendentious.

did mean that, why associate the invocation so closely with the sanctus....? He is going through the contents of the prayer for the benefit of those who have just attended the Eucharist for the first time in their lives, for whom such skipping about would be quite unnecessarily confusing.'⁽¹⁾

The importance of this discussion for our purposes rests on the question as to whether the Myst. Cat. represents a commentary on the whole of the eucharistic prayer as known to Cyril or only on selected portions. If the former there were some surprisingly innovatory ideas in C.4th Jerusalem! If the latter then great care is needed to avoid drawing rash conclusions about Cyril's theology.

At the end of this section on Cyril we shall be trying to give some account for such innovations/variations as are present in the C.4th Jerusalem rite. It will be suggested that such changes are caused by a new interest in the concrete historicity of the Christ-event, as opposed to the earlier eschatological approach to redemption. If this be correct then on the whole it seems better to agree with Frere and Srawley rather than Dix. Because Cyril has dealt with the Institution Narrative in Myst. Cat. 4 he does not feel the need to repeat himself. We may assume the presence of the Institution Narrative in the Jerusalem rite - and hence some element of anamnesis.

Institution Narrative or no, the rite now moved into the Epiclesis which McKenna calls:

'one of the most ancient and most complete witnesses to a so-called 'consecratory' Spirit epiclesis in the strict sense.'⁽²⁾

(1) Dix, *op.cit.*, p.198

(2) McKenna, Eucharist and Holy Spirit, p.54

There can be little doubt that Cyril understands the Eucharist as being a prayer for the consecration of the bread and wine by the descent of the Holy Spirit.

Several passages refer to a 'change' in the elements by the action of the Holy Spirit:

'For as the Bread and the Wine of the Eucharist before the invocation of the Adorable Trinity was simply bread and wine, while after the invocation the Bread becomes (γίνεται) the Body of Christ, and the Wine the Blood of Christ....'

- Myst.Cat. 1.7

'For as the Bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is mere bread no longer, but the Body of Christ...'

- Myst.Cat. 3.3

'For whatsoever the Holy Ghost has touched, is sanctified and changed (μεταβιβληται).'

- Myst.Cat. 5.7

From the NT period the Eucharist has always been regarded as a vehicle of the Holy Spirit. St. Paul speaks of πνευματικὸν βρωμα. Is Cyril suggesting anything radically different or new here? Cross writes:

'Earlier theology had tended to think of the eucharistic action as primarily the work of Christ; Cyril conceives it rather as the work of the whole Godhead, in which the part played by the Incarnate Christ is passive.'⁽¹⁾

Certainly earlier writers see the Eucharist as being primarily the action of Christ the High Priest, who, with his body the Church, pleads the virtue of the finished sacrifice of Calvary on the eternal and heavenly altar. It would appear that Cyril is subtly altering this to a concept of Christ the Divine Victim being offered by the Church through the Holy Spirit. Dix

(1) Cross, op.cit., p.xxxiii

notes that although Cyril was well acquainted with the concept of Christ as High Priest (Myst.Cat. 1.4; 10.4,16; 11.1) he never applies this concept to the Eucharist. He writes:

'from end to end of Cyril's account of liturgy and throughout his eucharistic teaching, Christ plays only a passive part in the Eucharist.'⁽¹⁾

If this is correct then certainly Cyril is witness to a major shift in eucharistic doctrine and one which seems substantially out of accord with the NT. Wainwright⁽²⁾ however points out that it is bad theology to play off one person of the Trinity against another. Myst.Cat.1.7 shows that Cyril regarded the consecratory change in the eucharistic elements as being the work of the 'adorable Trinity' - and in the context of the work of the Divine Redemption, of which the Eucharist makes anamnesis, then this is surely perfectly correct, in as much that the work of Redemption is performed by the whole Trinity. In this sense Cyril is not so very far, in intention at least, from the teaching of the Apostle Paul. On the other hand, and in contrast to the earlier concepts, Cyril sees Christ as adopting an almost passive role in the Eucharist (and in the work of redemption?). This probably reflects his increased emphasis on historical 're-enactment' and his consequential shift away from eschatology. Cyril sees the Holy Spirit as being the primary *Divinus* operating in the Eucharist so that the bread and wine may 'become' the body and blood of Christ.

We have already noticed when looking at the question of the Institution Narrative, that it is dangerous to argue from silence where Cyril is concerned. Nevertheless, he makes no mention of a 'communion-epiclesis', such as is present in the Roman and Syro-Byzantine rites. In other

(1) Dix, op.cit., p.278

(2) Wainwright, op.cit., p.96

words, whereas these latter rites include prayers that the communicants (as well as the elements) be filled with the Holy Spirit, Cyril only refers to a prayer that the Holy Spirit may descend upon the elements alone. It is for this reason that Kelly⁽¹⁾ calls Cyril 'the pioneer of the conversion doctrine'. Earlier writers and liturgies struggle by use of this double epiclesis to stress that in the Eucharist both elements and people are caught up eschatologically through the power of the Spirit into the presence of Christ, with whom, on whom, and by whom the Church is fed.

But is this not precisely what Cyril himself teaches?

'Therefore with fullest assurance let us partake as of the Body and Blood of Christ: for in the figure of Bread is given to thee His Body, and in the figure of Wine His Blood; that thou by partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ mightest be made of the same body and the same blood with Him. For thus we come to bear Christ in us (οὕτω γὰρ καὶ χριστοφεροι γινόμεθα).' -Myst.Cat. 4.3

The term *χριστοφερος* would seem to suggest that through the Eucharist we are present in Christ and Christ in us. But in fact this is not quite what the NT and the early fathers are saying. The term *χριστοφερος* must to some extent suggest the passivity of Christ - and it seems to be here that that criticism is justified rather than in Dix's criticism of the epiclesis. The passivity of Christ which we notice in Cyril's teaching on the Eucharist lies not in his attempt to explain how bread and wine can become body and blood (i.e. the action of the Holy Spirit in the epiclesis) but in passages which suggest that the

(1) Kelly, op.cit., p.441

Eucharist is more the action of the Church than of Christ. True there are passages which speak of Christ at work in the Eucharist:

'He once turned water into wine in Cana of Galilee at His own will, and is it incredible that He should have turned wine into blood?' - Myst.Cat. 4.2

But this contrasts with a passage such as the following which suggests that Cyril has moved some way from the concept of the eschatological Eucharist at which the president is Christ Our High Priest:

'in the same way we offer up Christ, sacrificed for our sins'. - Myst.Cat. 5.10

'it will be a very great advantage to the souls, for whom the supplication is put up, while that Holy and Most Aweful sacrifice is presented.' - Myst.Cat. 5.9

'Holy are the gifts presented since they have been visited by the Holy Ghost: holy are you also, having been vouchsafed the Holy Ghost; the holy things therefore correspond to the holy persons.'

- Myst.Cat. 5.19

It seems hard to escape the conclusion that Cyril does present a view of the Eucharist subtly different from earlier writers. No doubt this is partly a question of semantics, but it is nonetheless a real difference. One of the most important differences is Cyril's concept of the epiclesis as being a prayer for the change of the elements into the body and blood of Christ.

2) The objective reality of Christ's Eucharistic Presence.

Cyril's stress on the objective reality in the Eucharist arises from his understanding of the epiclesis. It is true that he can write of the bread and wine as

being 'figures' (τυποὶ) of Christ's body and blood (Myst.Cat. 4.3). Such figurative language is present in earlier writers, and suggests that they were seeking to explain how the eucharistic elements can, at one and the same time, be both bread and wine and body and blood. Some of these earlier writers seem to seek an answer in a 'dynamic eschatological' understanding of the Eucharist. Cyril however finds an answer in the epiclesis. Through the epiclesis invocation the bread and wine are changed by the action of the Holy Spirit. It would seem that his use of 'figure' merely takes cognisance of the outward appearance of the elements after the epiclesis. They seem to remain bread and wine. But Cyril specifically denies that this is in fact the case:

'Contemplate therefore the Bread and Wine not as bare elements, for they are, according to the Lord's declaration, Body and Blood of Christ; for though sense suggests this to thee, let faith stablish thee. Judge not the matter from taste, but from faith be fully assured without misgiving, that thou hast been vouchsafed the Body and Blood of Christ.'

- Myst.Cat. 4.6

'....being fully persuaded that what seems bread is not bread, though bread by taste, but the Body of Christ; and that what seems wine is not wine, though the taste will have it so, but the Blood of Christ.'

- Myst.Cat. 4.9

At the same time Cyril can write so as to suggest a 'symbolic' understanding:

'Trust not the decision to thy bodily palate; no but to faith unfaltering; for when we taste we are bidden to taste, not bread and wine, but the sign (ὑπερενπιον) of the Body and Blood of Christ.'

On this Wiles writes that Cyril is only making more explicit the earlier realistic language of previous writers. There is no question that earlier writers did teach that the elements were the Body and Blood of Christ; but they also stated that they were 'Types', 'figures' or 'symbols' of the presence of Christ. The point is that the earlier writers were struggling, however inadequately, to hold together both symbolism and reality. It is only when this attempt is made that the Eucharist can be seen as the Heavenly Banquet, the eschatological meal in which we feed both with and on Christ. Cyril would seem to have lost out on one side of the equation. Stone notes:

'It may fairly be said that the tendency (i.e. of Cyril) is to make the continued existence of the elements of but little importance.'⁽¹⁾

As has been noted, it is true that he uses, in some passages, the language of 'typology'. As well as the passage quoted above, Cyril uses *τυπος* of Joshua as being the type of Christ (Cat. 13.19) and of Christian baptism as being for us the 'type' of the Lord's passion (Myst. Cat. 2.4). But taken together these passages seem to suggest that Cyril uses '*τυπος*' to mean 'mystic equivalent' i.e. all external reality is as good as ignored or removed. The real and true way of understanding the figure of Joshua, for example, is, so far as Cyril is concerned, to regard Joshua, not as an historical figure who also foreshadowed the person of Christ, but as a mere cipher, as 'Christ in disguise' with no independent historical reality. The same may be said, mutatis mutandis, of his understanding of the presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements. No doubt

(1) Stone, op.cit., p.102

Cyril uses terms such as 'ἄρνες', partly because of their traditional usage and partly because he is aware of the apparent reality of the bread and wine remaining in the consecrated elements. But he does seem to go out of his way to make the point that the bread and wine are but appearance and that the reality is only the body and blood of Christ. Wiles is right to suggest that Cyril's new language 'is intended to give greater precision to the earlier language, not to correct it'⁽¹⁾ but Cyril's greater precision is applied not to the language of symbolism, which in his scheme nearly falls out of the picture, but to the language of realism, which is brought (one-sidedly) to the fore. The stress on the change of the elements wrought by the epiclesis brings about a change of perspective that stresses a greater 'objectivism'. The weight of OT and NT imagery would seem to fall on the transcendence of God who feeds his people; we 'eat before the Lord'. At the Last Supper Christ was clearly the host,⁽²⁾ but in Cyril's view, despite his desire for historical objectivity, this falls into the background, and, just possibly, a move begins towards the 'perils of localization'⁽³⁾ in which the celebration of the Eucharist and in particular the Epiclesis prayer smacks somewhat of a quasi-magical 'manipulation' of Christ who is seen as the passive victim.

As a consequence of his one-sided stress, Cyril gives the first evidence of the Sacrament itself being regarded with awe:

'Approaching, therefore, come not with thy wrists extended, or thy fingers open; but make thy left hand as if a throne for thy right which is on the eve of receiving the King.'

- Myst.Cat. 5.21

Christ is no longer pictured as the prevenient Host, present throughout the Eucharist in Word and Action. Rather He is

(1) Wiles, Christian Fathers, p.126f.

(2) v. Wainwright, op.cit., p.107f.

(3) Gore, op.cit., p.93

presented as the heavenly food and that alone. Cyril reminds the new communicants that they must be most careful not to lose a crumb of the bread:

'for what thou lovest is a loss to thee
as it were from one of thine own members.'

- Myst.Cat. 5.21

Such a development of the 'awefulness' of the Sacrament was linked to the C.4th. development of the disciplina arcani. These developments were, in origin and intention, at least partly praiseworthy. It was intended to ensure that the sacraments were rightly and reverently regarded as the means of receiving God's grace as part of Christ's continuing work of redemption. On the other hand it is also possible that the development of the disciplina arcani and the parallel development of regarding the elements of the Eucharist with 'awe' may have been developed for rather more base motives: namely, to arouse the curiosity of the catechumens and also to imitate the pagan mystery religions⁽¹⁾ - thus pandering to a recurring desire for an emotional and esoteric religion which can be almost the exact antipathy of the free grace given by God in Christ. As Gore points out,⁽²⁾ the monophysite tendency to absorb the human in the divine, so successfully rejected in the area of the Christological controversies, was allowed to prevail in the area of the doctrine of the sacramental presence and hence, eventually, to lead to the Tridentine definition of Transubstantiation.

3) The Eucharistic Sacrifice

'In the same way we, when we offer to Him our supplications for those who have fallen asleep, though they be sinners, weave no crown, but offer up Christ, sacrificed for our sins, propitiating our merciful God both for them and for ourselves.'

- Myst.Cat. 5.10

(1) Study of Liturgy, p.109

(2) Gore, *ibid.*, p.113f.

'Then, after the spiritual sacrifice is perfected, the Bloodless Service upon that Sacrifice of Propitiation, we entreat God for the common peace of the Church.... and in a word, for all who stand in need of succour we all supplicate and offer this Sacrifice.'

- Myst.Cat. 5.8

'...believing that it will be a very great advantage to the souls, for whom the supplication is put up, while that Holy and most Aweful Sacrifice is presented.'

- Myst.Cat. 5.9

These passages draw attention to two related concepts: the special efficacy of prayer in the presence of the consecrated elements, and the view of the Eucharist as a sacrifice by which we 'propitiate' (εἰλεομενος) God.

The doctrine of the Eucharist sacrifice is not new. As has been said, the renewed emphasis on sacrifice was brought about by the development of the offertory. Cyprian speaks of offering the body and blood of Christ. In this area Cyril is not an innovator. However he does seem to lay a greater emphasis than earlier writers on the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist - and especially on the value of intercession in the presence of the sacrament as being especially efficacious. In this respect Cyril does seem to give at least a new emphasis to the doctrine. Gone is any idea of a spiritual offering of the fruits of creation, gone (or very much underplayed) is the eschatological presence of Christ the Host. Rather we veer towards a localized presence of Christ in the Eucharist through whom we pray.

The lack of the Institution Narrative in Myst. Cat. 5, makes it impossible to know whether Cyril links his doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist more to

the Last Supper or to Calvary,⁽¹⁾ though the use of the word 'unbloody' does suggest that Cyril sees the Eucharist as being in some way a (mystical) repetition of Calvary. In Myst.Cat. 4 however, Cyril makes no reference to Calvary but to the Last Supper. The question must remain open.

4) Does Cyril underplay Eschatology?

There is no need to repeat the evidence but only to summarize:

- i) Cyril does not primarily see Christ as the High Priest or the active Host, but as the propitiatory Victim on whom we are fed.
- ii) Cyril would appear to replace what we may call a dynamic eschatological approach to Christ's presence in the Eucharist, by an explanation of 'change' (brought about by the action of the Holy Spirit in the epiclesis).
- iii) Christ is seen as the presence in the consecrated elements - to the virtual exclusion of the material elements.
- iv) Cyril sees the Eucharist as a sacrifice (possibly in repetition of Calvary?) which the Church offers to God. It is no longer primarily the action of Christ. It seems no longer to be the eschatological movement in which we receive, by faith, though objectively, the redemption eternally won for us by Christ on the Cross. There are some remnants of eschatological thought in Cyril's teaching:

'And so having it unveiled by a pure conscience, mayest thou behold as in a glass the glory of the Lord, and proceed from glory to glory in Christ Jesus Our Lord.'

- Myst.Cat. 4.9

This is however a partial counter-balance only to an overwhelming stress on the Eucharist as being an action of the Church in time, rather than being an eternal action of Christ breaking into time.

(1) Dix, op.cit., p.203

So we return to the original question: can some account be given for the developments of eucharistic doctrine represented in the Mystagogical Catecheses? I believe that such an answer can be given and that it can go a long way towards explaining the (unfortunate) inevitability of such a development.

The Church of the C.4th was faced by several new factors:

(i) the struggle against Arianism

(ii) the pressure of numbers caused by the decision of Constantine to adopt Christianity as the state religion. Doubtless many of the 'converts' were at best half-hearted!

(iii) consequent on Constantine's conversion came the major shift from doing the liturgy semi-secretly in private house-churches into the splendour of the large public basilicas. Ceremonial necessarily became more elaborate and triumphalist in tone - particularly in the East.

(iv) Thanks possibly to Eusebius there was a tremendous upsurge of devotion to the holy places, particularly in Palestine, and pilgrimages such as Etheria's became relatively common. In turn this led to the development of the Christian Liturgical Year with its emphasis on the 'historical re-enactment' of the life of Christ.

What were the effects of all this on the eucharistic doctrine of the period?

(a) a stress on the 'awefulness' of the sacrament in an attempt to counteract (i) and (ii) and as a consequence of (iii).

(b) a stress on the objective, rather than eschatological, presence of Christ as a result of (iv) - and hence a stress also on the Eucharist as being the 'historical re-enactment' of Calvary with Christ as Victim.

It would be entirely wrong to credit (or discredit!) Cyril with later Medieval developments of doctrine. What it is possible to argue is that within his particular evolution of eucharistic doctrine can be seen a serious flaw. The stress on the liturgical re-enactment of the Christ-event, and the 'monophysite' approach to the eucharistic gift, breaks down the finely balanced relationship between symbol and reality. Ultimately this is a denial of the Incarnation and fails to allow for the gift of present salvation.

ST. AUGUSTINE

It is almost impossible to summarise adequately Augustine's many-faceted doctrine of the Eucharist. Wiles writes:

'Few early authors write about the Eucharist with the same degree of profundity as Augustine; few are more difficult to tie down. With the most convinced realists he can say: 'That bread which you see on the altar, sanctified by the word of God, is Christ's body: That cup, or rather the contents of that cup, sanctified by the word of God, is Christ's blood.' But he can also say: 'Why make ready your teeth and your belly? believe and you have eaten!' In the conjunction of the two is the heart of the tradition of the Fathers.'⁽¹⁾

Kelly also points out how hard it is to tie Augustine down to a one-sided view:

'His thought about the eucharist, unsystematic and many-sided as it is, is tantalizingly difficult to assess.

(1) M. Wiles, The Christian Fathers, p.129

Some, like F. Loofs, have classified him as the exponent of a purely symbolical doctrine; while A. Harnack seized upon the Christian's incorporation into Christ's mystical body, the Church, as the core of his sacramental teaching. Others have attributed receptionist views to him. There are certainly passages in his writings which give a superficial justification to all these interpretations, but a balanced verdict must agree that he accepted the current realism.⁽¹⁾

No doubt Augustine did accept the current realism but we must ask: which one? Does he take the line of development which we have found in Cyril of Jerusalem, moving towards the concept of anamnesis as 'historical re-enactment' and thus resulting in a 'realism' that (as it were by accident) leads to a monophysite view of the sacrament? Or does Augustine look back to the earlier mainstream tradition which, while in no way seeking to avoid realism, indeed stressing the realism, at the same time holds that a true and deep understanding of the Eucharist must involve both symbol and reality. As Wiles says 'In the conjunction of the two is the heart of the tradition of the Fathers.' I shall argue that Augustine does indeed represent this mainstream tradition - but also that he develops it, giving it a new precision.

Augustine was a member of the Western Church in which, as Wiles reminds us,⁽²⁾ development of eucharistic doctrine marched at a slower, more conservative and less spectacular pace than in the East. It has until recently (I understand there is now renewed speculation on the point)

(1) J.N.D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrine, p.446

(2) Wiles, op.cit., p.126, 131.

been held that Augustine knew little Greek and was therefore relatively ignorant of Eastern doctrinal development. This may be so. Or it may be that he sought to adopt a via media between East and West, as it were interpreting each to the other. In either case it may well be best first to give a brief résumé of the eucharistic doctrine of Ambrose, who had so great an influence on Augustine, and who most certainly knew a great deal of the Eastern Fathers' teaching.

AMBROSE

Ambrose's De Mysteriis shows a highly developed doctrine concerning the conversion of the elements into the body and blood of Christ:

'Perhaps you will say, 'My bread is common (bread). But that bread is bread before the words of the sacrament; when consecration had been applied, from (being) bread it becomes the flesh of Christ. And by what words and whose sayings does consecration take place? The Lord Jesus's. For all the other things which are said in the earlier parts (of the service) (are said) by the Bishop (sacerdos): praise is offered to God, prayer is made for the people, for beings, for others; when the time comes for the venerated sacrament to be accomplished, the Bishop no longer uses his own words, but uses the words of Christ. So the word of Christ accomplishes this sacrament.'

De Sac. 4.14⁽¹⁾

A stress on reality indeed! But there is something else quite as important: Ambrose's stress on the Word of Christ as effecting the sacrament. Ambrose clearly sees the Lord Jesus as Host at the Eucharistic Banquet - and so takes us

(1) Peer, p.98

straight back to the eschatological approach found in the NT. Thus, when Ambrose is criticised for being 'innovative',⁽¹⁾ it is at best a half-truth. Ambrose clearly holds that the Risen Christ is the true 'celebrant' of the Eucharist - and thus in the final analysis the eucharistic elements of bread and wine must be symbolic of the Risen Christ who is both Host and food. This is in line with the evolution of thought we have traced from the NT. It is in this context that we should read the words:

'Before it is consecrated it is bread;
but when the words of Christ are added,
it is the body of Christ. Then hear the
words: "Take and eat from this all of
you, for this is my body."' - De Sac. 4.23⁽²⁾

And again:

'Before the blessing of the heavenly words
another nature (species) is named; after
the consecration the Body is denoted
(significatur).' - De Sac. 4.16⁽³⁾

Here we note particularly the continuing use of terms such as significatur and also figura:

'Make for us this offering approved,
reasonable, acceptable, because it is
the figure (figura) of the body and
blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

- De Sac. 4.21

Thus in the midst of a highly developed realism we have also a recognition of the symbolic, eschatological nature of the Eucharist.

We may compare Ambrose's teaching at Milan in the late 4th century with the Liturgy of St. Basil (also probably late 4th century) which is still in occasional use by the Orthodox Churches today:

(1) MacDonald: Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion, p.70

(2) PEER, p.99

(3) D. Stone, *op.cit.*, p.81

'And have set forth the likenesses (τὰ ἄντικτυπα) of the holy body and blood of your Christ, we pray and beseech you.... that your (all-)holy spirit may come upon us and upon these gifts set forth, and bless them and sanctify and make (ἁγιάσαι) this bread the precious body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ.'⁽¹⁾

Thus in the liturgies is found the symbolic and realistic language, which we have come to expect, held in fruitful reunion.

Thomson and Stawley⁽²⁾ suggested that Ambrose's use of the language of 'change' in the eucharistic elements derives from his knowledge of the Greek Fathers, and especially of Cyril of Jerusalem and Gregory of Nyssa, though Ambrose does not perhaps quite follow Cyril's thought in that Cyril places the stress of the consecration prayer on the epiclesis.⁽³⁾ Augustine may also show parallels with Cyril and Gregory in his catechetical lectures.

Ambrose, and, as we shall see, Augustine, both develop and deepen the concept of the sacrifice of the Eucharist. For both, Christ is the Christian sacrifice. In the Eucharist, anamnesis of Calvary is made - and the fruits of Christ's sacrifice are received. Ambrose sees the work of the Christian priest as being to offer sacrifice for the people. He links the concept of sacrifice not only to the death and passion of Christ but also to the resurrection and ascension:

'Now has the shadow of night and of Jewish darkness passed by, the day of the Church

(1) Peer, p.87.

(2) Thomson and Stawley[®] St. Ambrose on the Mysteries - translations of Christian Literature Series III, SPCK 1919, p.xxxiv.

(3) Thus Ambrose writes 'naturam convertere' and 'naturas mutare' which may be compared with Gregory's phraseology:

μεταστοιχείωσας τῶν φαινόμενων τὴν φύσιν

has come. Now we see what is good by means of symbol and we hold fast the good which is in the symbol. We have seen the High Priest coming to us; we have seen and heard Him offering His own blood for us: we priests, as we are able, follow, that we may sacrifice for the people, though weak in our deserts yet honourable in our sacrifice, because although Christ is not now seen to offer, yet He Himself is shown to offer among us, since His word consecrates the sacrifice which is offered, and He Himself indeed stands as an advocate for us with the Father; but now we see Him not; then we shall see, when the symbol has passed away and the reality has come.'

- De Sac. 3.4⁽¹⁾

This is not precisely the same language as the New Testament. It is an evolution of doctrine. But it surely remains in line with the New Testament doctrine? The true Host at the Messianic Banquet, foreshadowed by the Eucharist, is the Christ who offered Himself once for all on Calvary and who eternally now offers himself to his Church as we make the anamnesis of his saving work. Thus even near the close of the first four centuries, we find that same line of 'symbol and reality' which we first found in St. Paul.

THE DOCTRINE OF AUGUSTINE

(i) The Christian Sacrifice

Augustine sees the true Christian sacrifice as being the 'self' offered to God through union with the sacrifice of Christ. In 'De Civitate Dei' he comments on Ps. 51. 18f:

'Observe how he says that God does not want sacrifice, and how, in the same place, he shows that God does desire sacrifice... he desires the sacrifice of a broken heart... thus the true sacrifice is offered in every act which is designed to invite us to God in a holy fellowship.... This being so, it

(1) D. Stone, op.cit., p.119

immediately follows that the whole redeemed community, that is to say, the congregation and fellowship of the saints is offered to God as a universal sacrifice through the great Priest who offered himself in his suffering for us - so that we might be the body of so great a head - 'under' the form of a servant. For it was this form he offered, and in this form he was offered, because it is under this form that he is the Mediator, in this form he is the Priest, in this form he is the Sacrifice.'

- C.D. X. 5 & 6⁽¹⁾

Thus Augustine says to his catechumens:

'You are on the table, you are in the chalice.'

- C.D. X. 6 Serm.229

and also:

'If you have received well, you are that which you receive.'

- Serm. 227

Hicks writes:

'Augustine is in effect summarising what is to be found throughout the earlier literature. But nowhere is there a more complete view of what sacrifice means as applied to our Lord's work, or of what sharing in Christ's sacrifice means to Christians. The action of the sacrifice does not stop with this Death. It is heavenly as well as earthly. It is only consummated in communion; and alike in offering and communion it gives direction, purpose and meaning to the whole of human life; it is profoundly ethical.'⁽²⁾

For example, in relating the death of Monica in the Confessions (ix. 13), Augustine speaks of the Eucharist

(1) City of God, ed. D. Knowles p.380

(2) F.C.N. Hicks, The Fulness of Sacrifice, p.284

as the means of appropriating the salvation won for us by Christ on Calvary:

'All she wanted was that we should remember her at your altar, where she had been your servant day after day without fail. For she knew that at your altar we receive the holy Victim, who cancelled the decree made to our prejudice, and in whom we have triumphed over the enemy.... By strong ties of faith your handmaid had bound her soul to this sacrament of our redemption.'

The reference to 'faith' here may link us to Augustine's conviction that faith is a necessity when discerning the res sacramenti. We shall examine this a little further in (iii).

Augustine sets out his thought on Christian sacrifice in some detail in Book X of De Civitate Dei, part of which has already been cited. It is necessary to look at the relevant passages a little more fully. The Christian sacrifice is primarily the personal, ethical sacrifice of the Christian:

'When we lift up our hearts to him, our heart is his altar. We propitiate him by our priest, his only-begotten Son. We sacrifice blood-stained victims to him when we fight for truth 'as far as the shedding of blood'. We burn the sweetest incense for him when we are in his sight on fire with devout and holy love...We offer him, on the altar of the heart, the sacrifice of humility and praise, and the flame on the altar is the burning fire of charity.'

- C.D. X.3⁽¹⁾

(1) ed. D. Knowles, op.cit., p.119

Thus Christian sacrifice is a symbol of what God requires of us, a symbol which finds its typology in the OT culture and symbolises the love we should have for God and our neighbour.

'If in times gone by our ancestors offered other sacrifices to God, in the shape of animal victims (sacrifices which the people of God now read about but do not perform) we are to understand that the significance of those acts was precisely the same as that of those performed amongst us - the intention of which is that we may cleave to God and seek the good of our neighbour for the same end. Thus the visible sacrifice is the sacrament, the sacred sign, of the invisible sacrifice.'

- C.D. X.5⁽¹⁾

But Christian sacrifice - the eucharistic sacrifice - is not a matter of any subjective emotionalism. It is an objective fact - for we link our sacrifices (such as they are) to the one and only sacrifice that is any true sacrifice, namely the real sacrifice of Christ our High Priest:

'....the whole redeemed community ... is offered to God as a universal sacrifice through the great Priest who offered himself in his suffering for us....'

- C.D. X.6.⁽²⁾

'This is the sacrifice which the Church continually celebrates in the sacrament of the altar, a sacrament well-known to the faithful where it is shown to the Church that she herself is offered in the offering which she presents to God.'

- C.D. X.6.⁽³⁾

(1) *ibid.* p.377
(2) *ibid.* p.380
(3) *ibid.*

Thus when the Body of Christ (the Church) makes anamnesis of the sacrifice of Christ, it is Christ himself who in reality is both Priest and Sacrifice:

'...the true Mediator....receives the sacrifice "in the form of God" in union with the Father, with whom he is one God. And yet "in the form of the servant" he preferred to be himself the sacrifice than to receive it... Thus he is both the Priest himself making the offering, and the oblation. This is the reality, and he intended the daily sacrifice of the Church to be the sacramental symbol of this; for the Church, being the body of which he is the head, learns to offer itself through him.' - C.D. X.20⁽¹⁾

(ii) Christian unity in the Eucharist

Augustine's second major eucharistic doctrine is that of the Eucharist as 'the sacrament of unity'. Brilioth suggests that 'the idea of unity is more prominent in Augustine than in any other of the Fathers'.⁽²⁾ Examples have already been given such as Sermon 227 and C.D. X.20. In Sermon 272 Augustine writes:

'If you then are the body and members of Christ, your mystery is laid on the Table of the Lord, your mystery you receive. To that which you are you answer Amen and in answering you assent.'⁽³⁾

The Sermon then goes on to speak of unity: the many grains forming one loaf, and the many grapes making one wine. We are reminded of the prayer for unity in the Didache and Paul's thought in 1 Corinthians.

Augustine gives us a major discussion on eucharistic unity in De Civitate Dei, xxi, 25, where he argues that only

(1) *ibid.* p.400

(2) Y. Brilioth, *op.cit.*, p.33

(3) Cited D. Stone, *op.cit.*, p.94

those who are already in the Catholic unity can receive the benefit of salvation through the sacraments:

'...he who is in the unity of Christ's Body, that is the structure composed of Christians who are members of Christ, whose body the faithful habitually take when they communicate at the altar - such a man may be said in truth to eat the body of Christ and to drink Christ's blood. It follows that heretics and schismatics, being separated from the unity of this Body, are able to take the same sacrament; but it is not for their profit.... For it is obvious that they are not in that 'bond of peace' which is expressed in the sacrament.'⁽¹⁾

But Augustine will allow no ex opere operato view of the Eucharist and its benefits:

'...those people who continue to the end of their lives in the fellowship of the Catholic Church have no reason to feel secure, if their moral behaviour is disreputable and deserving of condemnationThose people cannot be said to eat Christ's body, since they are not to be reckoned among the members of Christ.... And he shows what it is to eat Christ's body and to drink his blood not just in the outward sacrament but in reality; it is to live in Christ so that Christ lives in the believer.'⁽²⁾

Thus eucharistic unity and eucharistic sacrifice are linked by the ethical imperative.

Augustine sees the Eucharist both as expressive of

(1) ed. D. Knowles, op.cit., p.1008

(2) ibid. p.1009f.

Catholic unity and also creative of that unity. This is a development on say the Didache or Ignatius who see the Eucharist as expressive of unity. This seems to be in line with Augustine's distinction between symbol (sacramentum) and reality (res sacramenti). The Eucharist is symbolic of the unity between Christians in Christ through faith and baptism; but it is also the means of sharing in the salvation won by Christ and thus creative of unity. In Sermon 57 Augustine says:

'For its effect....is unity, that having been made his body and having been made members of him, we may be what we receive.'

- Serm. 57.7

The concept of the creative unity of the Eucharist may in fact be traced back to Paul:

'For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body.... and were all made to drink of one Spirit.'

- 1 Cor. 12^{12f}

It must be remembered that in 1 Cor. 12^{12f} Paul is most probably referring most directly to baptism. Augustine however understands this passage with reference to the Eucharist and thus we may say that he sees the Eucharist both as signifying an already existing unity and as causative of a new and deeper unity.

(iii) Res sacramenti

Augustine's third contribution to Eucharistic doctrine is to draw the distinction between the visible elements of the sacrament and the invisible res sacramenti (or thing signified). In this he follows the traditional western stance as exemplified by Tertullian, Cyprian and others.

But Augustine's contribution was not only to continue the interpretation of the Eucharist in terms of symbol and reality, but also to give it a further and helpful precision. By so doing he was able to hold in check the evolution of doctrine in terms of 'historical re-enactment' which we have seen in a Father such as Cyril of Jerusalem. Gore suggests that Augustine's influence in this lasted in the west until the 9th century.⁽¹⁾

We may again cite from Sermon 272:

'That which you see is bread and the cup, which even your eyes declare to you; but as to that in which your faith demands instruction: the bread is the body of Christ, the cup is the blood of Christ... How is the bread His body? How is the cup, or that which the cup contains, His blood? Brethren, these things are called sacraments for this reason: that in them one thing is seen, another thing is understood. This which is seen has bodily appearance; that which is understood has spiritual fruit.'⁽²⁾

Concerning Augustine's division of the Eucharist into the sacramentum (visible sign) and the res sacramenti (signified reality) resulting in the virtus sacramenti (the effect of sacramental grace in the life of the believer), Wand writes:

'It is sometimes said that Augustine took an entirely subjective view of this method of the sacrament's working, holding that it is merely an outward signal of God's action upon the soul. But this will not bear investigation. To his mind the subjective effect was dependent upon an objective gift.... For the (virtus

(1) Gore, Body of Christ, p.115

(2) cited, D. Stone, op.cit., p.94

sacramenti) to be successfully appropriated,
faith is necessary.'⁽¹⁾

Broadly in line with Wand's comment, I would wish to suggest that Augustine's real contribution was not any 'subjectivism' but a definition of terminology evolving from the thought which we have traced from the NT. The Eucharist is a symbol of the objective reality of salvation. To perceive this reality, present eschatologically in the sacrament, demands faith; but this in no way affects the objectivity of the gift. Augustine writes:

'It was none the less the body of the Lord
and the blood of the Lord even to those to
whom the apostle said, He that eateth
unworthily eateth and drinketh judgement
to himself.' - de Bapt. c. Donat v.9⁽²⁾

Far from being subjective Augustine's division of the sacrament into sacramentum and res maintains the very objectivity which we have seen Cyril seeking to maintain by his stress on 'historical re-enactment'. Whereas Cyril's attempt, noble as it is, ultimately founders on the rock of monophysitism, Augustine maintains the objectivity of the sacrament by stressing both the continuing reality of the symbol and (as perceived by faith) the greater reality of the gift of salvation.

Thus on St. John's Gospel Augustine writes:

'We today receive visible food; but the
sacrament is one thing, the virtue of
the sacrament is another. How many there
are who receive from the altar and die,
who die through receiving.'

And again on Ps.99.5- 'Fall down before his footstool' -
Augustine writes:

'Christ took earth from earth because
flesh is of earth and from the flesh of
Mary He received flesh. And because He

(1) Wand, History of the Early Church, p.228f.

(2) cited Gore, op.cit., p.147

lived here in the flesh itself, and gave the flesh itself for us to eat for our salvation, and because no one eats that flesh without first adoring a way has been found in which such a footstool of the Lord may be adored and in which we not only do not sin if we adore, but should sin if we did not adore.'

- Ps. 98 Ennarr⁹ (1)

Fascinatingly we may compare Ambrose on the same passage:

'And so by 'footstool' is understood earth, but by earth the flesh of Christ which to this day we adore in the mysteries which the Apostles...adored in the Lord Jesus. For Christ is not divided, but is one; and when He is adored as the Son of God it is not denied that He was born of the Virgin.'

- De Spir.Sanc. 3.76ff⁽²⁾

Thus Ambrose and Augustine both see the Eucharist as the divinely appointed means whereby we receive the benefits of the salvation won for us in Christ; and they draw a close analogy between Incarnation and Eucharist. Both are united in viewing the Eucharist as a Banquet (of unity) celebrated by the whole Church with Christ as Head; a Banquet in which we look forward with eager anticipation to the heavenly consummation which is foreshadowed in the eschatological Eucharist. Both are united in stressing that the Eucharist is the real symbol of a divine reality.

In his biography on Augustine (ch.10) Peter Brown comments, perhaps somewhat unfavourably, on Augustine's deeply rooted allegorical method:

'The idea of allegory has come to sum up a serious attitude to the limitations of the

(1) cited Stone op.cit., p.94

(2) ibid. p.108

human mind, and to the nature of the relationship between the philosopher and the objects of his thought. This was a distinctive relationship. The religious philosopher explored a spiritual world that was of its very nature 'ever more marvellous, ever more inaccessible.'....the mind must move from hint to hint, each discovery opening up yet further depths. The worst enemies of such inquiry, of course, were superficiality, the dead-weight of common-sense,No one could accuse Augustine of wanting to be superficial.'⁽¹⁾

So at the end of this brief examination of the eucharistic doctrine of some of the more important of the Fathers we seem to have two divergent approaches - both reached by 'legitimate' evolution from the most primitive period. One type, the 'realist-historical', is represented by Cyril of Jerusalem with his stress on 'historical-re-enactment'. In broad terms it was this type which was eventually to hold the field. The other type, the 'symbol and reality' approach, is represented by Augustine. This approach to the Eucharist in terms of symbol and reality can be traced back directly to the New Testament - although it was destined to fall out of favour for much of the Middle Ages.

Augustine himself never lost sight of the objective reality of the eucharistic gift:

'That bread which you see on the altar, consecrated by the word of God, is the Body of Christ. That chalice, or rather what the chalice holds, consecrated by the word of God, is the Blood of Christ.'

- Serm.227

(1) P. Brown, Augustine, p.260f.

But at the same time Augustine can present us with a most exciting passage in which he sets out the concept of the eucharistic symbol and reality in terms of eschatology and the anamnesis of the Heilsgeschichte. We are forcibly reminded of St. John:

'The flesh and blood of this sacrifice before Christ's coming was promised in victims that were types (i.e. OT sacrifices): in the passion of Christ it was rendered up in very reality: since Christ's ascension it is celebrated in the sacrament of memorial.'

- c. Faust xx.21

PART III



THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST AS SHOWN BY THE LITURGIES

We turn now to examine in a little more detail the Eucharistic understanding of the early Church as revealed by the Liturgy, both in word and action.

The early Christian Eucharist grew out of Judaism. Its roots lie in the worship and sacrificial understanding of the OT Qahal and the later Jewish synagogue. Therefore we shall first say a few words about these earlier precedents of the Eucharist, since they throw light on the understanding of the early Church as it met together for corporate worship in the Eucharist.

The OT Background

The heart of the OT message is God's call to Israel to be his holy people:

'Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.' - Ex. 19.5f

This call to priesthood is the essence of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel: Yahweh has rescued his people - therefore they are to be holy as he is holy. This is vividly set out in Ex. 19, which sets the pattern of liturgy. The people are called together by God's word (v. 3ff); they are reminded of His saving work (v. 4); the promise of the covenant is made (v. 5f); the people are called by the word of God and in thanksgiving for his salvation to make an ethical response (vv. 10-15); and then God himself descends on Sinai to be with his people (vv. 16 - end).

Later in the Josianic reform we find a similar pattern of liturgy as shown in 2 Kings 23. The people are gathered together (v. 1f) to hear the book of the

covenant (v. 2) and so to make an ethical response (v. 3ff). The primary response is to God's Word of Covenant; the Covenant is itself established on the historical act of God's saving work - of which remembrance is made; in thanksgiving the people are called to offer themselves in ethical response.

Rowley⁽¹⁾ reminds us that covenant and ethical response were at the heart of the OT system of sacrifice. Ultimately the whole basis of sacrifice rested on a response to the saving work of God - and was an ethical response to that work:

'...the ritual was believed to be effective only when it was the organ of the spirit.

It is true that many in Israel thought its efficacy lay in the due performance of the ritual act, and there were sacrifices which encouraged such a notion. But it is also true that the efficacy of the ritual act was believed to depend on its being the expression of the spirit of the offerer.'⁽²⁾

One of the earliest liturgies, Deut. 26, 1-11,⁽³⁾ links the themes of anamnesis and covenant with sacrifice made in response to the saving and creating work of God:

'And now, behold, I have brought the first of the fruit of the ground which thou O Lord hast given me.....and thou shalt rejoice in all the good which the Lord thy God hath given unto thee....' - Deut. 26.10f.

The two forms of OT sacrifice which most concern us here are the 'holocaust' and the 'peace/shared offering'. We need not examine their liturgical forms, but rather their inner meaning. The holocaust expressed homage to God, and was performed to win his favour by a costly gift⁽⁴⁾:

(1) Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel, ch. 4.

(2) *ibid.* p.113

(3) Henton-Davies, art, Peake's commentary: 'This is a very early law, so early that it probably ante-dates the laws of tithing.'

(4) Rowley, *op.cit.*, p.120

'...it is a burnt offering, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord.'

- Lev. 1.13

The holocaust was relatively rare in the earlier OT period⁽¹⁾ but, under the influence of the centralisation of the cultus, and the growth of the public sacrificial system, it later became more frequent than the peace-offering.

The peace-offering of shelamim (cp. shalom) was primarily performed for the maintenance or the restoration of good relations with God.⁽²⁾ The offering was shared between God, the priest and the worshippers⁽³⁾ but,

'it is probably too crude and one-sided an interpretation to say that the worshippers were sharing a common meal with the deity.'⁽⁴⁾

Rather the peace-offering was a solemn meal before the Lord:

'But unto the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come: And thither shall ye bring your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, and your tithes, and the heave offering of your hand, and your vows, and the firstlings of your herd and of your flock: And there ye shall eat before the Lord your God, and ye shall rejoice in all that ye put your hand unto, ye and your households, wherein the Lord thy God hath blessed thee.'

- Deut. 12 5-7

Again, in this passage, it is possible to notice a pattern of the prevenient word of God calling together his assembly, and the responsive offering of sacrifice in thanksgiving for all that God has done.

In Ex. 24 the peace-offering is closely linked with the concept of the covenant. Here we can discern the pattern:

-
- (1) Rowley, op.cit., p.119
(2) ibid., p.122
(3) ibid., p.52
(4) ibid., p.125, citing J. Barr

God's call to Moses and the elders, summoning them to assemble as the community representatives for worship (v. 1f); the offering of sacrifice, and the sprinkling of blood on the altar (v. 5f); the reading of the covenant, consequent agreement of the people to the covenant, and the sprinkling of them with blood (v. 7f); and finally, the manifestation of God in his glory (v.10) ending with the words:

'and they beheld God, and did eat and drink'.(v.11)

The peace offering was the oldest of the Hebrew sacrificial forms and its primary and original purpose was communion with the deity - as v.11 reads:

'they beheld God and did eat and drink.'⁽¹⁾ The peace-offering is firmly linked with praise and thanksgiving as a response to the whole creative and saving work of God⁽²⁾ and as a renewal of the covenant.

Gradually the holocaust became more important than the peace-offering. This represents a shift of major importance in Israel's whole concept of God and of our approach to Him. The idea of sacrifice changes from being a joyful thanksgiving meal eaten before the Lord of Majesty, to being a rite of propitiation towards a terrifying and angry God, far removed from normal intercourse with man.⁽³⁾ In itself this is not wrong, since from the earliest times man has been aware of God as holy and himself as utterly sinful in comparison with God. It is right and necessary that the Liturgy should express reverential fear and penitence towards the transcendent and holy God. The OT stresses this time and again. On the other hand the holy and transcendent God is at once the immanent God who intervenes in history to save his people. Thus, in terms of the OT liturgy, both peace-offering and holocaust have

(1) Hicks, The Fulness of Sacrifice, p.20

(2) ibid., Hicks notes that Philo and Aquila both use εὐχάριστια to describe the peace-offering.

(3) ibid., p.40f.

a rightful place in our approach to God. When one is emphasized at the expense of the other our theology is thrown out of joint. Worse still an overemphasis on propitiation can lead to the idea of 'keeping God happy' i.e. 'I have offered a sacrifice therefore God MUST answer my prayer.' This virtually ignores the prevenient Word of God, shows scant consideration or appreciation of his saving work, and either disregards the necessity of an ethical response of thanksgiving or turns such a response into a false doctrine of salvation by works.

Evidence for something of this sort happening to the worship of Israel is afforded by the criticisms of the cult offered by 7th and 8th century prophets:

'Come to Bethel and transgress, to Gilgal, and multiply transgression; and bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes every three days.' - Amos 4.5

'I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies ... But let judgement roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.'

- Amos 5. 21,24

Amos and the other prophets who criticised the cult were probably not opposed to the cult as such, but to the cult as they found it to be because it no longer expressed the ethical nature of Yahwism.⁽¹⁾ Because of the centralization of the cult during the Deuteronomic reforms it was impossible for all to resort to one central shrine. Ultimately this may have assisted the development of the synagogue (the liturgy of which had a marked influence on the synaxis) but first it caused a less happy result.

(1) Clements, Prophecy and Covenant, p.95

As it became more difficult for the individual to share in the sacrificial act - whether because of the difficulties of travel, or the growing emphasis on correct performance by a professional priesthood - so it came about that the cultic acts became relatively hollow and meaningless to many. This is the relevance of those prophecies known as 'Malachi':

'A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master: if I then be a father where is mine honour? and if I be a master where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests that despise my name.' - Mal. 1.6

The steady advance of an approach to the concept of sacrifice which placed greater stress on the correct performance than on correct intention, taken together with the apparent failure of those prophecies of the restoration of Israel given by Isaiah and Jeremiah, had caused a crisis.⁽¹⁾ What was the value of the covenant if after all Yahweh was not going to act? There was a failure of expectancy, a crisis of faith, a lack of eschatological expectation. This reflected itself in the liturgy.

So far it has been argued that in all the great 'liturgical' accounts, such as the Sinai covenant, indeed in the whole 'salvation-history' as presented in the OT, a pattern of liturgy can be detected in which the living Word of God calls his people into community so that he can be present to them in immanent/transcendent glory.⁽²⁾ From the 8th century onwards, however, and increasingly after the return from Exile, the official cult would have appeared to have lost this earlier dynamic-eschatological approach to

(1) E.J. Kilmartin, The Eucharist in the Primitive Church, pp. 2ff.

(2) Whether such an interpretation is part of the original Sitz im Leben or has been 'read back' into the accounts by later (e.g. priestly) writers is irrelevant for our immediate concern, since here we are primarily interested in the understanding of the OT liturgy which formed the background to the liturgy of the early Church.

liturgy. Malachi, therefore, in a text often cited by the Christian Fathers, recalls the cult to such a dynamic-eschatology:

'For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense is offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts.'

- Mal.1.11

Malachi speaks of a new and universal sacrifice of the Messianic Age when the cult will not be restricted to Judaism but will be for all. We may compare this with Micah's prophecy:

'But in the latter days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and peoples shall flow unto it. And many nations shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths, for out of Zion shall go forth the Law, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem.'

- Micah 4.1f

And yet again we notice the pattern of God's prevenient word calling his people - though now a far wider people than just Israel - into community and demanding a consequent ethical response. Further we note the strong eschatological tone.

The post-Exilic and intertestamental Periods

So far then we have met an OT pattern of 'liturgy' which begins with God's call to his people, leads on to an establishment of the covenant, often linked with a 'communion meal' before the Lord, and culminates in an

ethical response of the people as they bind themselves to the covenant demands in thanksgiving for the saving work of God the memorial of which has been solemnly rehearsed at some point during the making of the covenant. In other words we may say that very often the covenant-ethical response is linked to what we may perhaps justifiably term an 'anamnesis' of God's creative and saving work. There seems some reason to suggest that at first such worship was expressive of immediate and direct contact between worshipped and worshipper, perhaps we may use the term 'dynamic eschatology' to describe this approach to worship. What I mean by the phrase 'dynamic eschatology' is an approach to worship whereby it is conceived that the worshipper stands presently as part of the historical salvation-history and also as sharing in the final consummation - or in OT terms, the 'Day of Yahweh'. In other words in 'dynamic eschatological worship' past present and future is available to the worshipper in such a way as to ^{make him} feel that he shares at once in all three. This is clearly the case for example at Ex. 24 and the subsequent renewal of the covenant and thanksgiving for the same envisaged in Dt. 26.⁽¹⁾ Gradually however it seems that 'dynamic eschatological worship' turned into a much more static cultic ritual which failed to meet the religious needs of the worshippers. Hence the criticisms offered by the 7th and 8th century prophets, who themselves discovered a new-found emphasis on the Day of Yahweh - the inbreaking of the eschaton into history, seen not as an interruption or destruction of history, so much as a fulfilment when the New Covenant will be established:

(1) G.W. Anderson, art, Hebrew Religion, The OT and Modern Study, OUP 1961, p.304ff, reminds us of the considerable debate concerning the origins and definitions of OT eschatology. It seems useful to quote his conclusion: '..whereas it has often been argued that Jewish eschatology owes much to late borrowing from foreign, chiefly Persian, sources, there is a strong contemporary tendency to trace it back to patterns which were widespread in the ancient east and were mediated to Israel at an early period through the cult.' (p.306)

'behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah... I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.' - Jer.31 31, 33

In addition, the traumatic experience of the Exile inevitably, in the absence of a central sacrificial cult, caused a move away from the cult of sacrifice to the worship of the synagogue. It is very difficult to trace the origin of synagogue worship but it most probably started in Babylon among the exiles meeting to renew and sustain their faith⁽¹⁾ whence, with the Restoration, synagogue worship was established in Israel and, by the NT period, throughout the diaspora. To some extent its growth appears to have coincided with a decline in the frequency, perhaps even in the popularity, of sacrificial worship in the Temple.⁽²⁾ Perhaps the principal reason for the decline in the popularity of the sacrificial cult was a deep-felt need for a more personal communion/contact with God, for a dynamic-eschatological approach to worship, in which the individual worshipper felt (a) that he himself had a personal part to play, and (b) that through the act of worship he could in some way experience for himself the great themes and events of the salvation-history. Bouyer writes:

'Here is the reason also for the increasing decline in the importance of the temple worship, even when it had finally been restored; Israel could no longer realise in any existing sacrifice its hope for the new and lasting covenant. True, this eschatological expectation did express itself in ritual, but it was not the ritual of the

(1) Rowley, *op.cit.*, p.221

(2) L. Bouyer, Life and Liturgy, p.26

old community.... It was rather the ritual of those small pious communities in which the 'remnant' of Israel was preparing itself for the last phase of the kingdom and the judgement to come.'⁽¹⁾

The rituals mentioned by Bouyer point us to the haburah meals of which Dix made so much, and also to the cultic meals at Qumran. We shall glance at these shortly, but first it is necessary to say a word or two concerning the liturgy of the synagogue.

The synagogue's primary role was not in fact worship, but instruction in the Law.⁽²⁾ The people were called together by the Shema and there followed readings from the Law and the Prophets, possibly a homily, and then prayers and blessings.

'....it was essentially and fundamentally the organ of spiritual worship, the united outpouring of the spirit before God in prayer, the united attention to the Word of God and the united acceptance of the claims of faith.'⁽³⁾

Even in so brief a summary, we note again the recurring pattern of liturgy: the prevenient Word of God, the anamnesis of his mighty acts - here made as part of the readings, and an ethical response of thanksgiving.

The haburah or kiddush meals were often linked in terms of readings and participants to synagogue worship - though they took place mainly in private houses. These were meals of private groups meeting for social friendship and support as well as religious encouragement. Perhaps it is appropriate to see in this a parallel with

(1) Bouyer, op.cit., p.26f.

(2) Rowley, op.cit., p.229

(3) *ibid.*, p.240

the original aims and objectives of the 'peace-offerings'? The text of the Blessings at these meals made thanksgiving for the mighty acts of God:

'Blessed are you, Lord our God, King of the universe, for you nourish us and the whole world with goodness grace kindness and mercy.'⁽¹⁾

The 'crisis of nerve' in Judaism caused by the failure of the Temple cult led to the formation of several schismatic (and sometimes heretic) movements which sought to re-discover the true dynamic of liturgy. Chief of these was the Qumran community. Their documents are of particular interest since they give evidence of a sacred community meal. The text for the Meal is in the Messianic Rule.⁽²⁾ The setting for the Qumran community meal is strongly eschatological:

'This is the rule for all the congregation of Israel in the last days.' (M.R.I.)

Also, as in much of the Qumran literature, stress is placed on the Covenant which is read to the congregation when they have been called together:

(1) Text in Peer, p.9. Some scholars doubt the authenticity of the haburah meals. To all intents and purposes, if they are historical, they seem to have been much the same in structure and intent as the (apparently more acceptable) sabbath kiddush meals. Here we need not be concerned with the vexed question as to whether the Last Supper was a haburah meal. Dix (Shape pp.50ff) who argued strongly for such an identification - was (in the light of recent scholarship) almost certainly wrong - and yet it is possible that the substance of his thesis, that the Lord's Supper was one of a series of established semi-official fellowship meals, remains substantially intact. (cp. Shape p.50 fn.) It is also worth here drawing attention to these words of Deiss on 'thanksgiving'/'blessing': 'Blessing is a basic attitude in Yahwism. The epiphany of God's love, which flashes forth in creation and human history, is answered by man's thanks and praise. Yahweh speaks by fashioning marvels, and man replies by blessing the God of those marvels. When God's love floods over Israel's life...what can believers do but joyfully welcome this tenderness..., then bless and give thanks?'-Deiss, It's the Lord's Supper, Collins, 1980, p.48.

(2) G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, pp.118-121.

'When they come they shall summon them all ... and they shall read into their (ears) the precepts of the Covenant and shall expound to them all their statutes.' (M.R.I.)
The Messiah⁽¹⁾ himself summons the people who sit before him and eat a common meal:

'And (when) they shall gather for the common (table), to eat and (to drink) new wine.... let no man extend his hand over the first-fruits of bread and wine before the Priest (i.e. Messiah?); for (it is he) who shall bless the first-fruits of bread and wine, and shall be the first (to extend) his hand over the bread. Thereafter, the Messiah of Israel shall extend his hand over the bread, (and) all the Congregation of the Community (shall utter a) blessing.'

This has marked parallels with the Messianic Banquet and was probably an anticipation of it.⁽²⁾ Again the same pattern emerges: the calling together of the community by the Word of God, the renewal/establishment of the Covenant, the joyful meal with the Messiah and the response of cultic purity. Further, it is to be noted that there would seem to be an absence of instructions in the Community Rule concerning sacrifice. It seems possible that

'they may have dispensed with the ideo of sacrificial worship altogether, in the conviction that the praises of pious dedicated lips constituted an adequate sacrifice to the Creator.'⁽³⁾

Clearly, in interpreting this evidence it would be foolhardy to suggest that the Qumran cultic meals were in any way the origin of the Eucharist. This would be quite outside the limits of the evidence. They are cited here as evidence not

(1) i.e. the Priest-Messiah. The Messiah of Israel would appear to be subservient to him in this text.

(2) Kilmartin, op.cit., p.9

(3) R.K. Harrison, The Scrolls of Christianity, p.33

for the origin of the Eucharist, but for the general milieu out of which the Christian Eucharist developed. It seems to me that the Eucharist was part of a general, and by the 1st century a fairly well established, movement of dissatisfaction with the traditional and priestly Temple-cult. The impetus behind the Christian Eucharist was part of the general eschatological expectation common to this movement. Furthermore, consciously or unconsciously, the general movement, of which the Christian response was at first but a part, would seem to have been looking back to the earlier and more primitive (and more basic) forms of liturgy which took the classic shape: the call of the Word of God, an act of thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption, a renewal of the covenant, a joyful meal before the Lord, and an ethical response. In our examination of the NT evidence for the earliest interpretations of the Eucharist we found just such a pattern. The one startlingly new, indeed original, aspect of the Christian Eucharist when compared with such 'common cousins' as the haburah meals and the Qumran meals, is the symbolism of redemption and unity in Christ⁽¹⁾ made during the words of interpretation: 'This is my body, This is my blood'.

The Christian Liturgy

Christian eucharistic worship stems from the Jewish synagogue⁽²⁾ and perhaps also from the more or less schismatic groups which, in the period of the emergence of the early Church, were breaking away from traditional (Temple) Judaism so as to attempt to respond adequately to the Word of God, and to prepare for the coming of the Messiah at the close of the Age.

We have already noticed passages such as the Walk to Emmaus in Luke 24 where it may be possible to trace a primitive Christian Liturgy in which the prevenient

(1) Kilmartin, op.cit., p.9

(2) Duchesne, p.46f.

Word of God and its exposition leads up to the coming/ recognition of the Present Christ in the breaking of the bread. It may be possible that this brief glance at the background to the Eucharist throws further light on St. John's account of the Last Supper, in which no Institution Narrative appears. We have noted two formative aspects of the eucharistic background: the Covenant Meal/Fellowship Meal and the startling originality of the Words of Interpretation. Perhaps to some extent the combination of these two resulted in a 'Liturgical tension' for the early Church. A tension between on the one hand a Covenant Meal that looked back to the Sinaitic Covenant i.e. a meal eaten WITH the Messiah when 'they beheld God and did eat and drink'⁽¹⁾; and on the other hand the redemptive aspect of the Words of Interpretation stressing the unity between Christ and his people in so strong a way as to suggest an identification of the bread and wine with Christ's body and blood, i.e. no longer a meal WITH, but a meal ON/IN Christ. Both aspects can in fact be seen to have common roots in the 'communion-offerings' of the OT. Perhaps it is right to suggest that St. John attempts to hold these two aspects in creative synthesis by his doctrine of the mutual coinherence of Christ and the believer - the most clear and moving statement of which occurs precisely at that point in the Last Supper account where we should expect the Institution Narrative:

'Abide in me and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so neither can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches.' - Jn. 154f.

(1) Of course the Covenant interpretation of the Eucharist was influenced also by Jeremiah's theme of the New Covenant, and perhaps by Qumran.

Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe in me through their word; that they may all be one; even as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be in us... that they may be one even as we are one.' - Jn. 17.20ff.

It may perhaps be that we are meant to interpret the whole of John 13-20 in terms of a commentary/theology arising out of the first century liturgy. In this context it is noteworthy that the whole action - the teaching of Christ in the last discourses, the high priestly prayer of self-dedication, Christ's Passion, Death and Resurrection, and the exsufflation of the Holy Spirit - is seen as the action of Christ on behalf of the Christian community. Is this another layer in John's approach to the Eucharist; that the Eucharist is not something done by the Church but, understood correctly, is something done by Christ for his Church?⁽¹⁾

The whole setting and simple ceremonial⁽²⁾ of the most primitive eucharistic Liturgy, as evidenced by the NT and the Didache, suggests that ~~the main~~ weight of earliest interpretation fell on the concept of the Eucharist as the Heavenly Banquet, the foretaste of Heaven. The local family of Christians gather together in a house to meet round a table, to break bread, to make anamnesis of the saving work of Christ - the prevenient Word which has called them into the Body of the Redeemed - and to meet with the Risen Lord, 'known in the breaking of bread'. Prayer is offered through Christ, the present Host and Food, to the Father in the power of the Holy Spirit for the people of God and the World. What is most striking is the simplicity of it all. The Eucharist was essentially a family meal eaten with Christ who is the Head of His people. It is not a cult-rite, part of an established religious order. It is

(1) Liturgy, p.166

(2) See Liturgy, pp. 432-492; Shape, pp.48-140; Duchesne, pp. 46-50

an underground movement, breaking away from formalism to meet the present Risen Lord. But at the same time the understanding of the movement is sufficiently large to allow the first Christians not to cut themselves off from their roots. They are essentially the New Israel. Even later at its most Hellenistic, the Church as a whole never entirely forgets its OT roots. The Eucharist is a celebration of the whole Heilsgeschichte - from Creation to Parousia. The OT Covenant is fulfilled in the anamnesis of the New Covenant made in Christ's blood. Thus is there a tension between 'radical breakaway movement' and 'traditional Judaism'.

There is another tension. The Eucharist is essentially a simple meal with the Risen Christ. But the words of interpretation, and the eucharistic theology of the NT, are unanimous: the bread and wine are more than mere symbols. Christ is known in the breaking of bread. St. John stresses that Christ is the 'true bread' and 'true vine':

'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man
and drink his blood, ye have not life in
yourselves.' - Jn. 6.53

St. Paul and the Synoptists make much the same point. The Eucharist is not merely a memorial meal; the Heavenly Banquet is not merely a meal with Christ - it is in some sense a meal in which Christ is both Host and Food. It is the guarantee of salvation:

'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my
blood hath eternal life; and I will raise
him up at the last day.' - Jn. 6.54.

The Eucharist is a response of the Christian family to the Salvation of God proclaimed through His Word; it is the New Covenant sealed in the Blood of Christ; it is the Christian Sacrifice, the ethical sacrifice of the self made possible only through the Saving Work of Christ;

it is where Christ is known down through the ages in the breaking of bread.

Thus we identify tensions within the primitive Eucharist: a tension between a dynamic eschatology and a more formal cult-rite; and the tension between a simple meal with the Risen Lord as Host and a profound salvation-experience of Christ as the Christian's Victim and Food. It is my contention that while these tensions are held in balance there can be a rich and fruitful eucharistic theology which reaches the central core and innermost meaning of the Judaeo-Christian Liturgical Tradition. Throw one of these aspects out of balance however, and the theology of the Eucharist necessarily suffers. The history of Eucharistic interpretation is perhaps a history of action, reaction and counter-action between these various emphases.

Even in the NT period, as evidenced by 1 Cor., we see the action of the Eucharist changing. Paul, for pragmatic and pastoral reasons, begins to break the link between 'meal proper' and Eucharist, so that the meal becomes a purely formal element and the real 'eating and drinking' is done at home (1 Cor. 11.22) - presumably in isolation from the gathered Christian Community. Jungmann writes:

'The great change which occurred in the liturgical practice, the greatest perhaps in the whole course of the history of the Mass, was the abandonment of the meal as a setting for the Mass. With the gradual enrichment of the prayer of thanksgiving, and, at the same time, the continual growth of the convert communities which became too large for a domestic table-gathering, the

supper character of the Christian assembly
could and did disappear....⁽¹⁾

Doubtless the change was inevitable, but the theology changed with it. Firstly with the abandonment of the meal the eucharistic bread and wine became the sole focus of attention. This led to a greater concentration on the Eucharist presence in the bread and wine - at the expense of the the concept of the gathered community as the Body of Christ. Secondly, the demise of the meal-proper, meant that the cultic element of the Eucharist was stressed so that instead of being interpreted as a meal of salvation eaten with the Risen Christ to Whom we make an ethical response of love, thanksgiving and self-sacrifice, the Eucharist itself could, unless great care were taken, be interpreted as the Christian sacrifice. In other words it became possible to interpret the eucharistic bread and wine as the main elements in the Christian sacrifice, rather than a personal sacrifice of the individuals making up the Body of Christ. Thirdly, the Church began to see itself not as the redeemed plebs sancta dei, called out of the world in response to the Saving Word of God; but rather as the Curator of a cult rite - in which but few were privileged (or even wanted) to take full part. Doubtless other factors, good and bad, influenced all this, such as the growth of devotional awe in which the Sacred Species were held, and the conversion of Constantine. But the root cause of these changes was an imbalance in eucharistic doctrine.

We may end this section with a passage from Peter Brown in which he vividly paints a picture of the Church at Hippo at the end of our period. The contrast with the NT strikes us vividly:

(1) Jungmann, Early Liturgy, p.37f.

'In Augustine's Church.... the dedicated virgins would have been screened by a balustrade of pure white marble: the congregation plainly wanted to see such a visible talisman of sanctity safely placed **between** themselves and the raised benches of their 'holy' bishops and clergy. But at the other end, there stood another group, the solid, immovable mass of the paenitentes, the 'penitents', who had been excluded from communion by the rigorous penitential discipline of the African Church. They showed no inclination to submit themselves again to the high demands of the Christian life.'⁽¹⁾

- however much Augustine might plead with them to do so (Serm. 232.8)!

The reasons for such a state of affairs are many and various - and some no doubt originated from the best of motives. But the end result is a virtual demise of the concept of the Eucharist as the corporate response of the Body of Christ to the anamnesis of the Heilsgeschichte. Small wonder that Augustine pleads for the realisation that the body of believers is the body of Christ:

'If you then are the body and members of Christ, your mystery is laid on the Table of the Lord, your mystery you receive.'

We must turn to examine some of the Liturgies in a little more detail..

THE DIDACHE

The first problem we must face is that of dating which would seem still to be a vexed question among scholars. The problem resolves itself into a question:

(1) P. Brown, Augustine of Hippo, Faber & Faber 1969, p.249

is the Didache the genuine, primitive Church Order which it purports to be? Earlier scholars⁽¹⁾ argued for the priority of the Epistle of Barnabas and therefore for a relatively late date for the Didache. On this view, the evidence provided by the Didache concerning the liturgical practice and eucharistic understanding of the late 1st or early 2nd century would be worthless, since the Didache would be merely a historical fake, written with the deliberate inclusion of archaisms, so as to buttress some schismatic sect such as Montanism.

This older view was challenged in 1958 by Audet, who argued that the Didache was a genuinely primitive Church Order to be ascribed a date as early as perhaps AD60.⁽²⁾ Supporters of this view would argue that the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas use a common source for material such as the 'Two Ways' passages. It is this latter view, that the Didache is a primitive Church Order of the mid- to late- 1st century which seems now to hold majority support and will be adopted here.⁽³⁾

The Didache circulated mainly in Syria and Egypt and probably originated in the former.⁽⁴⁾ The primitive Christology of the Didache would suit Syria and Antioch better than Egypt and Alexandria. Interestingly Didache

(1) e.g. J.A. Robinson, *JTS* xiii (1912), pp.339-356.

(2) J.P. Audet, La Didache, Instruction des Apotres, Etudes Bibliques, Paris 1958.

(3) '...the situation regarding Church order presupposed in the Didache makes it hard to find any plausible niche for it in early Christian history other than the period between about 70 and 110. It may be odd there, but it is much odder anywhere else.' - H. Chadwick, The Early Church, Penguin, 1967

(4) Did. 9.4: 'As this broken bread, once dispersed over the hills was brought together and became one loaf..' Such a passage suits the geography of Syria better than that of Egypt. See also, Streeter, The Primitive Church, p.279

would seem to quote St. Matthew's Gospel⁽¹⁾ which was held in high regard in Antioch and Syria.⁽²⁾ So it is a reasonable hypothesis that Didache was written in about 60 in Syria.

This leads us to a knottier question: does the Didache give us any information about the Eucharist? Several scholars, notably Dix⁽³⁾ have argued that Did. 9 and 10 do not in fact refer to a celebration of the Eucharist but instead to an agape meal. What is the evidence for this?

(i) In Did. 9 and 10 the cup precedes the bread:
'About the thanksgiving: give thanks thus:
first about the cup...and about the broken
bread....' - Did. 9.1ff⁽⁴⁾

(ii) The blessings which follow the cup and the bread are not blessings of the bread and wine - that is they cannot be interpreted as any form of epiclesis - but in fact they are blessings in the more primitive Judaistic form of 'thanksgivings' to God:

'We give thanks to you our Father, for the holy vine of your child David, which you have made known to us through your child Jesus; glory be to you for evermore.' - Did. 9.2

'We give thanks to you our Father, for the life and knowledge which you have made known to us through your child Jesus; glory to you for evermore.' - Did. 10.3

(iii) Did. 9 and 10 make no reference either to the Last Supper not to the Passion. Dix writes:

'The Didache knows and quotes the gospel of Matthew. It is surely incredible that the

(1) See for example Did. 7.1f; 9.3-4; 11.7; 13.1; 14.2; 16; and also Streeter, The Four Gospels, pp.507-511.

(2) Ignatius of Antioch (Philad. 7.2) clearly regards Matthew as the gospel par excellence if not indeed the only gospel.

(3) G. Dix, The Shape, pp.48(n), 91

(4) Peer, P.14

author could have ignored the close connections of the eucharist proper with the passion established in Mt.xxvi.'⁽¹⁾

(iv) Dix sees the prohibition on the non-baptised from eating the 'eucharist' (Did. 9.5) as being insufficient if referring to a 'proper eucharist' but quite satisfactory if referring merely to an agape. The prohibition in question reads: 'But let no one eat or drink of your eucharist (εὐχαριστίας) but those who have been baptised in the name of the Lord. For about this also (καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου) the Lord has said, "Do not give what is holy to the dogs".'⁽²⁾

Dix reads this section with the stress falling on the word 'also'. In other words the prohibition refers not only to the Eucharist (which Dix thinks is not present in Did. 9 and 10) but is ALSO a prohibition concerning the agape (which Dix believes to be present)! This seems to me to place far too great an emphasis on the word 'καὶ'. I would prefer to understand the force of 'καὶ' in some sense as follows:

'(As is always the custom) do not allow the unbaptised to eat the eucharist. And (if you want a good scriptural reason for this custom) remember what our Lord said....'

While denying that Did. 9 and 10 are capable of eucharistic interpretation Dix is quite happy to see chapter 14 as referring to a Eucharist. This seems to be because of its reference to the Eucharist as a 'sacrifice' (θυσία) (14.3), and also the use of συναγεῖν⁽³⁾ which Dix believes to be a technical term for the 'gathering together' of the ecclesia.⁽⁴⁾

(1) Dix, op.cit., p.92

(2) Dix, ibid., p.92

(3) Did, 14.1: κατὰ κυριακὴν δε κυρίου συναχθέντες....

(4) Dix, ibid., p.91

If Dix is correct then all the Didache tells us of the Eucharist is that it was celebrated weekly (14.1), on the Lord's Day and that in some sense it was regarded as the Christian sacrifice, possibly in fulfilment of OT typology (14.3). On this interpretation Did. 9 and 10 refer to an agape meal which is quite separate from the Eucharist proper and is therefore presided over by laymen (i.e. the 'charismatists' (προφηταις) of Did. 10.7)). Indeed Dix suggests that the Didache was written as a guide for the laity in order to give them a basis for presiding at a fellowship meal if they were not gifted with prophecy. (1)

Not all Scholars agree with Dix. The use of εὐχαριστίας and εὐχαριστεῖν in Did. 9.1 and 10.1f., 4, at least raises the question as to whether Dix dismisses the possibility of Did. 9 and 10 being eucharistic in rather too cavalier a fashion. (2) Lietzmann, who argues for the 'Two Suppers' theory, sees eucharistic reference in Did. 9 and 10. That is he suggests that they refer to a celebration of the 'Lord's Supper' (pre-Pauline) with prayers based on the Jewish models of Blessings over Food. (3) He suggests that the low/primitive Christology of the Didache, which is without reference in the Liturgy of the Supper to the death, Resurrection or Ascension of Jesus, means that in Didache 9 and 10 we are dealing with an early, pre-Pauline (or without Pauline influence) Eucharist in which the main theme is that of sharing in the Messianic

(1) Dix, op.cit., p.93

(2) Dix argues, op.cit., p.92, that the use of the verb εὐχαριστεῖν proves nothing since writers such as Justin Martyr (Ap. 1.13, 4.66) and the App. Trad. of Hippolytus (26.13) use εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν indiscriminately to translate berakh. However, Mascall (art., Dict. of Christian theology, Eucharist, ed. A. Richardson) says that the term εὐχαριστία was a terminus technicus at least since the beginning of the C.2nd and possibly in the NT itself. On the interchangability of εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν Mascall writes 'the fact that in all the primitive liturgies the bread and wine are consecrated by a prayer of thanksgiving bears witness to the essentially Jewish origins of the Christian Eucharist.' This seems to support Lietzmann rather than Dix.

(3) Lietzmann, History of the Early Church, Lutterworth Press, 1961, VOL.I, p.205. For examples of Jewish Food Blessings see DEER, p.9.

Banquet with the Risen Lord. At the point when the Didache was written the 'agape' and the 'eucharist' had not yet been divided from each other as became the case under Pauline influence and also (again through lack of Pauline influence) there is no reference to the death of Christ since the Supper was still seen as essentially an eschatological fellowship meal with the Risen Lord. (1)

It has already been seen that it is difficult to support Lietzmann's hypothesis in toto, though it is important not to reject it entirely. In the case of the Didache Lietzmann does seem to do more justice to the text than does Dix. It is hard to escape the thought that Dix's ecclesiastical predilections play a not unimportant part in shaping his interpretation of Didache. On the other hand, the use of *εὐχαριστία* does suggest that Lietzmann's approach is more correct - but this need not imply that the Didache is evidence for a 'purer' or 'more primitive' doctrine of the Eucharist than that of Paul. At the same time it seems clear that the Didache does show different emphases than Paul. Also, taking Didache as a complete document, it seems incorrect on Lietzmann's part to maintain that Didache contains no reference at all to the death of Christ in the context of a 'eucharist' - the reference to 'sacrifice' in Did.14 is surely suggestive of some such context, however undefined.

It may in fact be possible to draw a parallel between the eucharistic understanding and approach of the Fourth Gospel and that of the Didache. Neither contain any account of the Institution Narrative. The emphasis of thanksgiving falls therefore not on the death of Christ alone, or even primarily, but on the whole saving work of Christ:

(1) Lietzmann, *op.cit.*, pp.124ff.

'We give thanks to you, our Father, for the holy vine (cp. Jn.15) of your child David, which you have made known to us through your child Jesus; glory to you for evermore.' - Did. 9.2

'You, Lord Almighty, created all things for the sake of your name and food and drink to men for their enjoyment, that they might give you thanks; but to us you have granted spiritual food and drink (cp. the themes in Jn.6) for eternal life through your child Jesus.' - Did. 10.3

The cup-bread order (with which we may compare the Western Text of Luke and 1 Cor. 10.16) may point in a slightly different direction, namely that the Didache does as Lietzmann suggests, look back to the Jewish order of the Passover meal. The greatest stress, however, falls, as in the NT, on the eschatological presence of the Risen Christ who feeds his people who have been brought together in Him 'from the ends of the earth into your Kingdom'(Did. 9.4). To deny this as having any eucharistic relevance seems to me to be very narrow. On the other hand to attempt to interpret it as a developed 'Catholic' Eucharist seems pointless.

It is important both when interpreting the Didache and the NT doctrine of the Eucharist for us to bear in mind its essentially Jewish nature and background. Lietzmann allows for this in his interpretation of the Didache. It should not surprise us that we find discrepancies such as the cup-bread order in the earlier accounts of the Eucharistic rite. Nor should we expect a uniform doctrinal emphasis. This is part of the concept which Moule calls the 'developmental' approach to the formation of doctrine and liturgy, and says much about the nature of 'Catholic' doctrine.

This is not monolithic and set down once and for all, but is in a constant state of 'development' - though the true essentials are always present.

The peculiarities of practice and doctrine found in the Didache can be accounted for in the very way in which early eucharistic worship developed. The speed of the apostolic journeys as evidenced in Acts, though doubtless inaccurate in detail, nonetheless bear witness both to the tremendous eschatological urgency under which the Apostles laboured (the gospel must be preached to all the nations before the Messiah comes) and also to the essential Jewishness of the first Christian communities. It would seem likely that Apostles such as Paul simply could not have moved to a town, converted a small number and then moved on, unless the essential structures of prayer, worship and pastoral care had in some way been set up. These were in fact present in the synagogues and their worship, and it is noteworthy that Luke makes Paul first visit the existing synagogue as a starting point for a new centre of mission. Many Christians would have continued to worship in the synagogue as well as in the Christian community, or to have adapted the synagogue forms of worship and prayer for specific Christian usage. Thus it is right to see the pattern of Jewish worship and thought lying behind the first accounts of the Lord's Supper in the NT and also here in the Didache.⁽¹⁾ This would help to account for the cup-bread order, which is the Jewish order of cup-bread-cup, and also, very importantly warns against interpreting the gift of the Eucharist in any too literal a way since any literal identity between bread and flesh or between wine and blood would have been entirely abhorrent in Jewish terms.

It seems likely that Did. 10.6 represents a
'liturgical dialogue':⁽²⁾

(1) See for example, Duchesne, Christian Worship, pp6ff., 46ff. and also Bouyer, Life and Liturgy, chs. 3, 8 and 9

(2) Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology, Epworth Press, 1971, p.68

'V.: May grace come and this world pass away.

R.: Amen. Hosanna to the God of David.

V.: If any be holy let him come; if any be
not let him repent.

R.: Maranatha. Amen.'

We have already seen when looking at Paul's eucharistic doctrine in 1 Cor. that this sequence with its strong eschatological stress may have served in the early Church to lead from the 'agape' into the 'eucharist'. But this need not mean that the two are quite distinct. The very fact that one leads into the other argues against making too sharp a distinction. The 'agape' in this sense need be seen only as the continuation of the 'meal setting' of the Passover/haburah/Lord's Supper. Did. 9 and 10 culminate in this sequence of prayer that the Risen Lord may come to be among his people. Then in Did. 10.7 and in chapters 11 to 13 there are a set of 'rubrics' concerning the prophets (who are to be allowed far greater liturgical freedom than any others who preside). These 'rubrics' interrupt the flow of the liturgy which resumes again in Ch. 14 with the 'Eucharist' proper.

The interpretation in the previous paragraph is broadly in line with Audet's suggestion that the 'liturgical sequence' marks the transition from a room in which the agape has been held into one where the Eucharist is about to be celebrated.⁽¹⁾ This may be correct. On the other hand it seems to me to be more in line with a straightforward interpretation of the text to see Chs. 9 and 10 as an account of the 'agape'/'thanksgiving' and to see Ch. 14 as being quite separate from this, as giving a brief account of the Sunday Eucharist. Whatever the case it seems to me that the plain use of the term *εὐχαριστεῖν* allows us to interpret Chs. 9 and 10 as having eucharistic reference - whether the later Church would have recognised it as a Eucharist or not is beside the point.

(1) Wainwright, op.cit., p.69

It seems useful here to make a brief comment on the question of terminology. Some of the argument between scholars and Church traditions would seem at least partly to rest on the question as to precisely what is meant by the term 'Eucharist'. In modern writers it is an umbrella term that can range in meaning between a Catholic Mass and the Reformed Lord's Supper. It seems to me that in the early period these distinctions are quite irrelevant, whereas it is precisely here that Lietzmann's insight into the 'primitive' Eucharist finds its place. The approach to the Eucharist is 'developmental' - we do not need to think of 'Two Suppers' only but of a multiplicity of approaches to the Lord's Supper all springing from a common Jewish background and all looking to the Last Supper or to the fellowship meals with Christ in the Gospels as their raison d'etre. Thus 'developing' from a common core, there were many approaches to the Eucharist, all in their different ways equally valid, all united around a common shared meal in which, in some way or another, anamnesis/thanks was made for the saving work of Christ and the Risen Lord was felt to be present with his people.

'Our Lord, come!'

We may now try to unravel a little more of what the Didache has to say about the 'Eucharist'. We must begin by noting the lack of any sort of 'definition' in the wording of the prayers concerning the nature of the eucharistic gifts. The bread and wine are spoken of as 'spiritual food and drink' (Did. 10.3) which are given to us 'for eternal life through you child Jesus'. The actual nature of the gifts remain undefined. Srawley believes that this lack of definition points to a very primitive understanding of the Eucharist in which the eschatological and the mystical are stressed.⁽²⁾

(1) D. Stone, A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, Vol. I. p.22

(2) Srawley, The Early History of the Liturgy, p.24

On the eschatological nature of the Didache Wainwright comments that the study of the Didache in the light of an eschatological understanding of the Eucharist 'opened the way for a recovery of the liturgical interpretation of the Aramaic expression maranatha'.⁽¹⁾ The dialogue of Did. 10.6 culminates with the prayer maranatha. It prepares the way as it were for the sacramental/symbolic coming of the Lord in the 'second part' of the Liturgy, the Lord's Supper. The Aramaic can be interpreted in two ways:

(1) marana tha = imperative = 'Come, Our Lord!'

(2) maran atha = perfect tense = 'Our Lord has come'.

Wainwright believes that the later Fathers missed the point of the eschatological connotation of the prayer in connection with the Eucharist, and interpreted it almost exclusively in the second way as a statement about the incarnation: 'Our Lord has come'. But in the context of its place in the Didache it may be better to take the first interpretation, either as a 'present perfect' (Our Lord has come and is now present' - in the Eucharist) or, in the light of Rev. 22.20, as an imperative. The imperative usage would give marana tha in Did. 10.6 a double reference, both to the eschatological coming of the Lord in the Eucharist and also to his final parousia, of which the Eucharist is the eschatological foretaste.

'If Maranatha belongs.... at the opening of the Eucharist liturgy proper, it is either an acclamation of the presence of the Lord who has been in the assembly through the service of the word and who will continue to be there in the Eucharist, or else.... a prayer for the eucharistic presence of Christ as at least a partial anticipation of the parousia.'⁽²⁾

(1) Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology, p.68

(2) ibid., p. 70

The eschatological stress of the Didache is further emphasised in Did. 14 where the 'breaking of bread' is appointed for 'the Lord's day of the Lord' (κατὰ κυριακῆν δε κυρίου). The Fathers interpreted the Lord's Day (i.e. Sunday, the Day of Resurrection) as the day on which fallen creation would be renewed. Hence, the Eucharist, celebrated on the Lord's Day is an anamnesis of the Resurrection of Christ:

'We give thanks to you holy Father,
for the knowledge and faith and immor-
tality which you have made known to us
through your child Jesus.' - Did. 10.2

The eschatological import of the concept of the 'Lord's Day' is made clear by Jungmann:

'Christ's passion and resurrection form...
week by week, the object of Christian
commemoration; for both together
constitute, in the eyes of the primitive
Church, the work of salvation.... The
primitive Church thought more (than we
do) in images; she added to the passion
and the battle also the victory of the
Lord.... For only in the resurrection
does what the Lord gained for us become
visible; the glorified body of the risen
Lord is the archetype, the pattern of the
new life which the risen Lord wanted to
bestow upon all. Hence the Church, though
not forgetting the passion of Christ, did
not make the day of Christ's passion the
weekly commemoration day, but the Sunday,
the day of victory and completion.'⁽¹⁾

This seems to me to be very much in line with what has been said above concerning the developmental approach to the doctrine of the Eucharist and the insights into that

(1) Jungmann, op.cit., p.24f.

development provided by Lietzmann. There is no stress in the Didache on the passion of Christ (though there is the reference to the Christian *θυσια*) precisely because in the particular development of which the Didache is evidence it was the Resurrection motif that took priority. The Eucharist/fellowship meal was seen as the anamnesis primarily of the Risen Lord, present with his people in fellowship and in unity, and coming (again) in the parousia of which the meal was an eschatological participation. Further, the Eucharist, on this line of development, is a foretaste of the New Creation in Christ. We may take the thought of Eusebius of Alexandria as guide:

'The memorial, therefore, of the Lord is the holy day which is called the Lord's Day... On the same day he gave to the world the first fruits of the resurrection. It was that same day, as we have said, that he also prescribed for the celebration of the memorial of the holy mysteries. This same day became to us therefore, the source of all goodness.' - Eusebius of Alexandria, Sermon 16.1

'This broken bread.... became one'.

In the early Syrian rite of the Didache the Lord is worshipped as present to his people, and as being the eschatological means by which God grants us eternal life, as the worshippers eat of the 'spiritual food'.

In Did. 9.2 Jesus is spoken of as the 'holy vine of your child David!'. As we noted earlier this can be paralleled in Jn. 15.1:

'I am the true vine and my Father is the vine dresser!.

The reference to Jesus as the Holy Vine gives a two-fold interpretation. First, it can be seen as a reference to the eucharistic presence of Christ in the cup. Second, (noting also a probable reference to Ps. 80)

it may be seen as referring to Christ's presence in the individual members of his Church - a unity which he brought about by his sacrifice. The branches of the vine (Church) are joined to the Father through Christ who is present as the centre of unity in the Eucharist. This interpretation seems consonant with the stress on unity in Did. 9.4, and also on the 'sacrifice' at Did. 14.2f.⁽¹⁾

The words over the bread also contain a reference to the gift of Christ in the eucharistic bread and to the unity of the Church which is brought about by that gift:

'We give thanks to you, our Father, for the life and knowledge which you have made known to us through your child Jesus; glory to you for evermore.

As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains and when brought together became one, so let your Church be brought together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom.'

- Did. 9.3f.

In 9.3 'the life' refers to the 'eternal life' for which thanks is given at 10.2. As with the cup-words in 9.2 there may again be a Johannine parallel to the 'bread of life' concerning which Jesus speaks in Jn. 6. Through Jesus, 'the bread of life', we are given 'knowledge' of the gift of eternal life. Kelly notes that an early concept of salvation was that of the imparting of true *γνώσις*, the *γνώσις* of Christ through whom we receive eternal life.⁽²⁾ It would be folly to suggest any direct connection between the Fourth Gospel and the Didache, but we do at least seem to be moving in the same approximate areas of thought. I see a particularly close parallel

(1) See on this: Staniforth, Early Christian Writings, p.236

(2) Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, p.163

between the two in the case of the lack of the 'Last Supper words' with reference to the Institution and the Passion. It does seem to me that both documents are attempting to lead us to view the 'Eucharist' in terms of eschatology, resurrection and symbol.

Wainwright maintains that the Didache has a different understanding of eucharistic unity as compared with the later understanding of writers such as Augustine. The later Fathers tended to understand the Eucharist as being expressive of an already existing unity. This is of course very much the traditional view of the Roman and Orthodox Churches in our own times. The Didache however lays emphasis on the creation of a new or deeper unity brought about through Christ in the Eucharist. We can link this to the idea of the 'new creation' which we found to be present in the prayer marana tha; on this interpretation the Eucharist 'is more important for what it makes of us than for what we make of it'.⁽¹⁾

McKenna wonders whether Did. 9.4 can be understood as a possible forerunner of the developed eucharistic prayer, but cautions:

'The texts are indeed striking, but the complexity of the question is likewise imposing.'⁽²⁾

What can be said with some confidence, however, is that several of the prayers in the Didache echo the Jewish berakoth.⁽³⁾ The Church never entirely forgot the true meaning of the berakoth as that of the gathering together in unity of the people of God around and in response to the shekinah. Such an understanding, linked as has been seen to an eschatological understanding of the nature of the

(1) Wainwright, *op.cit.*, pp.77, 142.

(2) McKenna, Eucharist and Holy Spirit, p.18

(3) See Liturgy, p.171

presence of Christ in the midst of his eucharistic people, seems clearly present in the Didache. Nor, if we are correct in our assumptions of date and provenance should it surprise us that the Didache reflects a Jewish/Christian understanding of the meal of fellowship. Again we may note some possible Johannine parallels - especially if we remember the traditional ascription of authorship, of provenance and date of the Fourth Gospel.

Deiss well summarizes the note of joy present in the Eucharist - and points out to us one of the main lessons that we today can learn from the Didache:

'Welling up from the Jewish soul turned Christian, this prayer brims over with praise and thanksgiving and fairly shouts its expectation of the Lord. On reading it, we can sense the joy, the blessing, the lyricism, too, of a community celebrating the Lord's Supper as it awaited his return - in a word, everything which so many centuries of rubrical habits have made us lose and which today's liturgy is trying to rediscover.'⁽¹⁾

(1) L. Deiss, op.cit., p.24f.

THE APOSTOLIC TRADITION OF HIPPOLYTUS

We turn now to examine the doctrine of the Eucharist as shown by the Liturgy of Hippolytus. Here we are to be concerned both with the words and the action of the Apostolic Tradition - in as far as we can be certain of either.⁽¹⁾ The importance of the AT is hard to over-stress. Cross writes:

'Assuming we are right in thinking the document to be genuinely Hippolytean, the information given... is of extraordinary interest. It tells us a large number of details on primitive Church life and liturgy at Rome in the early third century. Indeed it can be said to have revolutionised much in the conventional pictures of Church life whether 'Catholic' or 'Protestant'.⁽²⁾

It is necessary to examine briefly the theological position adopted by Hippolytus since (assuming the AT to be genuine) this throws some light on the interpretation of the Eucharistic doctrine assumed in the Tradition.

Hippolytus, 'though he was excommunicated from the orthodox Rome community and became the first of the anti-Popes, only a generation or two later:..... was held in high veneration and reckoned as a saint.'⁽³⁾ He was a

(1) One of the major difficulties in approaching the Apostolic Tradition is that the original Greek is largely lost and so has had to be reconstructed from the Latin, Coptic, Arabic and Ethiopic versions now extant. Some further check on such a reconstruction is to some extent provided by the descendants of the AT, the Apostolic Constitutions and the Testamentus Domini. In this thesis I follow the reconstructions provided by Dix and (for the anaphora) in PEER. This latter text follows the Latin text save for Ch. 10 where it follows the Sahidic Coptic version. Following Schwarz and Connolly I assume a date of c.215. For further brief notes on the history and reconstruction of the AT see Cross, Early Christian Fathers, p.94f; PEER p.21; Liturgy, p.57ff.

(2) Cross, Early Christian Fathers, p.96

(3) ibid., p.155.

disciple of Irenaeus. Hippolytus may have become Bishop of Rome - though a 4th century list of Bishops of Rome speak of him as a presbyter. He led the opposition to Callistus, both doctrinally and morally, during the Monarchian controversy. Hippolytus opposed the Sabellian position and also rejected Callistus' attempt to defend a moderate position whereby a real differentiation between Father and Son was recognised; the 'Father' being the name for the divine Spirit indwelling the 'Son' which was the body of Jesus.

Hippolytus himself recognised that it was vital to distinguish at least two distinct *προσωπα* in the Godhead: the Father and the Logos, but at the same time he considered it important to stress the essential unity of the Economic Trinity as being of the utmost necessity for Man's salvation. Callistus understood this position as sheer ditheism.

The other main contention between Hippolytus and Callistus was the difficulty of the correct penitential discipline. Hippolytus took a puritanical view over what he considered to be Callistus' concessions to moral laxity concerning the reconciliation of those guilty of post-baptismal sin, and over certain marriage regulations.

Much to the horror of Hippolytus, Callistus became Bishop of Rome in 217 and poor Hippolytus was banished to the mines of Sardinia. All was not lost, however, since it may well have been for his (schismatic?) congregation that Hippolytus wrote the Apostolic Tradition.⁽¹⁾

The Apostolic Tradition

For the purposes of this thesis, the main areas of interest in the AT are Ch.4, where an account is given of a Eucharist after the consecration of a Bishop (this as it stands contains no Liturgy of the Word); Ch.10, where Hippolytus gives some additional rubrics governing the Eucharist; and Ch.23 where we find Hippolytus' form for the Paschal Eucharist.

(1) On Hippolytus' life v. Wand, pp.84ff; Chadwick pp.87ff; Frend p.90f; Lietzmann Vol.II, pp.244ff.

Jungmann points out that 'what is really astonishing is that a text from such early times has come down to us at all'.⁽¹⁾ At the earliest periods it was not customary for there to be any fixed forms of liturgy - and especially was this true for the anaphora. Hippolytus himself bears witness to this in AT.10:

'It is not at all necessary for him to say the same words as we said above... but let each pray according to his ability... Only let his prayer be correct and orthodox.'

We may compare this with similar 'rubrics' both in the Didache⁽²⁾ and in Justin Martyr.⁽³⁾ But in this rubric of Hippolytus there is a new concern with 'orthodoxy', presumably as a reaction to his confrontation with Callistus. Indeed Hippolytus is much concerned to stress the 'apostolicity' of the true Church - the very name of his Order reveals this. Like his near contemporary Tertullian, Hippolytus realizes that the only safeguard against heresy was the authority provided by apostolicity.⁽⁴⁾ This stress would inevitably lead to a greater fixity of form and so to what may perhaps be seen as a certain loss of spontaneity in the great act of 'Thanksgiving' by the Church as she meets with her Lord in the Messianic Banquet.

As the AT stands now there is no fore-Mass or synaxis. Jungmann suggests that a rite resembling the Liturgy of the Word is contained in Hippolytus' instructions to the presbyters and deacons that they should assemble each morning for instruction and prayer with the Bishop.⁽⁵⁾ Jungmann

(1) Jungmann, *Early Liturgy*, p.64f.

(2) Didache 10.7: 'But allow the prophets to give thanks as much as they wish.'

(3) 1 Apol. 67.5: 'the president likewise offers prayers and thanksgivings to the best of his ability.'

(4) This does not seem to prevent Hippolytus from making several doctrinal statements peculiar to himself! e.g. 'your inseparable Word.'

(5) Jungmann *op.cit.*, p.66. The whole 'feel' of this part of the instructions does seem to have about it something of the early morning 'Cathedral Office'.

assumes that this would naturally contain a reading/ readings from Holy Scripture.⁽¹⁾ It may in fact be that Hippolytus omits any account of the synaxis either because in his account it is replaced by the consecration of the Bishop (as in Ch.4) or because he assumes its presence (? Chs. 10 and 23). As assumption of the presence of the Synaxis seems more likely in view of the earlier evidence provided by Justin⁽²⁾ who gives clear indication of a synaxis.

Synaxis or no synaxis, Hippolytus, as may be expected in view of his stress on the 'apostolic tradition', uses much Scriptural typology throughout the AT.⁽³⁾ We may link with this his stress on the Word of God (AT.4.5) which title can surely never totally be emptied of the idea of the Word of God spoken to men down the ages?

Nonetheless, since Hippolytus gives us no account of the Liturgy of the Word it would be presumptuous and pointless to write more here. It seems sufficient to make a cautious assumption that (in line with his Christology) Hippolytus sees the Church as being called together by the Word of God to make Eucharist for our redemption in Christ.

The Kiss of Peace

AT4 opens with the Kiss of Peace. This sign of fellowship and covenant can be traced back into the NT Church and is present in the OT as a sign of blessing and reconciliation. Isaac's blessing of Jacob begins with a kiss (Gen. 27.27). In the gospels a kiss symbolises repentance and reconciliation (Lk. 7.45f.); hence the true horror of Judas' betrayal (Lk. 22.48). St. Paul refers to 'the kiss' in a number of references (Rom. 16.6; 1Cor. 16.20; 2 Cor. 13.12; 1 Thess. 5.26). Lietzmann suggests that the reference to the kiss at the end of both the Corinthian Epistles may suggest that the kiss already signified either

(1) Jungmann, op.cit., p.107

(2) 1Apol. 65.1; 67.3.

(3) Liturgy, p.302

the end of the Liturgy of the Word or the beginning of the Liturgy of the Eucharist.⁽¹⁾ He also suggests that it may be correct to link the Liturgical Kiss to Mt.5.23f:

'first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.'

Justin sees the kiss as the preliminary to the offertory (1 Apol. 65.2), as does Hippolytus. In fact, as the texts now stand, both Justin and Hippolytus see the Kiss as a greeting of friendship and as a ceremony of acknowledgement and reception. Justin places the Kiss at that point where the newly baptised are first received by the Church. Hippolytus places the Kiss at the point of the reception of the newly consecrated Bishop. This seems to fit into the tradition of interpretation of the Kiss as briefly outlined: it is a sign of blessing, friendship, greeting and reconciliation.

The Didache lays great stress on the need for reconciliation before making Eucharist:

'But let none who has a quarrel with his companion join with you until they have been reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be defiled'. - Did. 14.2

On the evidence of most other liturgies we may assume that before the Kiss of Peace (i.e. after the presumed Liturgy of the Word) all those not in the Order of Laity have been excluded from the company of worshippers. The Church alone can offer the sacrifice of the Eucharist - and before she does so the individual members of the Body of Christ unite in corporate greeting, friendship and reconciliation as symbolised by the Kiss of Peace. Thus Hippolytus' liturgy conforms to the basic pattern of worship which we have found from OT times onwards: the call of the Word is followed by an ethical response on behalf of the worshippers.

(1) Lietzmann, History, Vol.I, p.151; Messe und Herrenmahl, p.229.

The Kiss of Peace speaks clearly that the Eucharist is one corporate action by the whole Church. The Eucharist is the meeting point with Christ - the source of our unity and reconciliation. It is the corporate offering of itself by the Church through Christ to the Father. Bishop, presbyters, deacons and laity are united in one liturgical action in order for Eucharist to be made. This is both symbolised and actualised by the Kiss of Peace at the very beginning of the Anaphora.

The Offertory

AT Ch.4 makes no mention of the laity offering the elements. We read only:

'Then the deacons shall present the offering to him (i.e. the Bishop); and he, laying his hands on it with all the presbytery, shall say, giving thanks....' - AT 4.2

Similarly at AT 23 we read:

'And then let the offering be brought up by the deacons to the Bishop.'

However, in the section on Baptism Hippolytus writes:

'Moreover those who are to be baptised shall not bring any other vessel, save that which each shall bring with him for the Eucharist. For it is right for everyone to bring this oblation (*προσφορά*) then.' - AT 20.10

Jungmann concludes:

'Hence at least in the Mass of Baptism, everyone brings an oblation with him for Mass. Whether this was true of other Masses it is hard to say, for evidence is lacking.'⁽¹⁾

It is just possible that Hippolytus represents the earliest point where a new emphasis is placed on the

(1) Jungmann, op.cit., p.67

liturgical action of 'offering'.⁽¹⁾ This new emphasis may have arisen in reply to gnosticism i.e. to stress the salvation of the material wrought in Christ (cp. Irenaeus A.H. 4.17.5).

Dix makes a good deal of the fact that the offertory is not a mere physical necessity in preparation for the eucharistic rite but 'is itself a ritual act with a significance of its own'.⁽²⁾ The offertory clearly shows the 'liturgy' which each order in the Church is to play in the corporate offering of the Eucharist: the communicant 'brings' (προσενεγκειν) the προσφορα; the deacon 'brings it up' (ἀναφέρειν) and the Bishop 'offers' (προσφέρειν) it.⁽³⁾ All members of the Church act together to make thanks to God.

It is to be noted that immediately after the offertory the bishop and presbyters lay hands on the gifts, before the bishop begins the prayer of the anaphora. It is just possible that to explain this action we are to look back to the OT ritual of sacrifice (e.g. Ex. 29.10) where the laying of hands on the sacrifice represented an identification between offerer and offered. If this is so, the meaning of the rite of the offertory is made yet clearer: the members of the Body of Christ offer themselves (as symbolised by the eucharistic elements) in thanksgiving to the Father. The people of God offer themselves through Christ their Saviour to the Father and unite their offering to that of the Sacrifice of Calvary so that they may become the Body of Christ. As Augustine was to write later:

'If you then are the body and members of Christ, your mystery is laid on the Table of the Lord, your mystery receive. To that which you are you answer Amen, and in answering you assent. Be a member of the Body of Christ that the Amen may be true.'

Augustine, Serm.cclxxii.

(1) Jungmann, op.cit. p.116

(2) Dix, Shape, p.110

(3) ibid. p.111, citing AT 9.11.

The interpretation in the last paragraph may be to push rather scanty information too far. Nevertheless we know from the evidence of Tertullian and Irenaeus that a new emphasis on the offertory had begun at approximately the period when Hippolytus was forming this liturgy, and we know also that this was to develop into the splendid Eastern ceremony of the Great Entrance. It seems at least possible therefore that Hippolytus does wish the rite of the offertory to be understood as symbolising an ethical response to the saving work of Christ, an act of self offering in thanksgiving for our salvation.

The Anaphora Prayer

Hippolytus' anaphora is strongly eschatological. The worshippers are at once made aware that the true setting of the Eucharist is in the Kingdom of God:

'The Lord be with you,
And with your spirit.
Up with your hearts,
We have them with the Lord.'

Again we note the theme of 'corporate thanksgiving' - the whole Body of Christ is caught up to the heavens where thanksgiving is made.

Thanksgiving is made:

'through your beloved child (ἀγαπητός υἱός / puerum)
Jesus Christ whom in the last times (ἐπ' ἔσχατος
ἡμερας / in ultimis temporibus) you sent to us as
saviour and redeemer and angel of your will.'⁽¹⁾

So thanksgiving is made through Christ, whom the Father sent and who is the inseparable Word, the agent of creation. The whole theme of the Heilsgeschichte is recalled: creation, incarnation, passion and resurrection. These salvation-themes are clearly linked to a practical soteriology:

(1) The Greek here and elsewhere follows the parallels as provided by Frere, op.cit., pp.49ff, based on the Apostolic Constitutions.

Christ suffered 'that he might release from suffering those who have believed in you... that he might destroy death and break the bonds of the devil and tread down hell.'

Hippolytus' eucharistic doctrine is so closely linked with his soteriology that the anaphora does not have a 'sanctus', but instead the thought of the Christus-Victor theme leads us straight into the Institution .

Narrative:

'And when he was betrayed to voluntary suffering that he might destroy death... he took bread and gave thanks likewise also the cup, saying when you do this you make my remembrance (ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΛΕΤΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΜΗΝ ΑΝΘΥΝΗΣΙΝ)'

The anamnesis of Christ is both a thanksgiving for the historical work of redemption and also a realisation that the Church is called to a sacrificial ethical response in gratitude for the salvation won in Christ who is now present in the eschatological sacrament:

'Remembering therefore his death and resurrection we offer to you the bread and the cup (ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΟΜΕΝ ΣΟΙ ... ΤΟΝ ἄρτον ... ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ / offerimus tibi panem et calicem) giving you thanks because you have held us worthy to stand before you and minister to you.'

Close examination of AT 8f. suggests that Hippolytus may have thought of the Eucharist 'as the means whereby Christ intended to bestow on us these benefits of His passion.'⁽²⁾ Looking at the passages cited above are we to interpret Hippolytus as suggesting either

a) that Christ went to his 'voluntary suffering' in order 'that he might destroy death'

(1) Dix, Shape, p.160

or b) that when Christ went to his 'voluntary suffering' he instituted the Eucharist in order that 'he might destroy death'?

The Latin text would bear either interpretation. Dix cites from Hippolytus' treatise 'On the Pascha' in favour of (b):

(communion is) 'the food which leads thee back to heaven, and delivers from the evil powers and frees from hard toil and bestows on thee a happy and blessed return to God.'

- v.2⁽¹⁾

Interpretation (b) would seem to fit in with Hippolytus' eschatological stress, and also with his known discipleship of Irenaeus whose theory of *ἀνακεφαλαιώσεις* I have examined elsewhere. If this is right then the Eucharist is, for Hippolytus, the divinely appointed means of appropriating to ourselves the benefits of the heilsgechichte.

Thus Hippolytus' thought would run like this:

The Incarnate Word came to offer Himself as Sacrifice so that we might receive salvation, which is made available to, and creates, the Body of Christ which is the whole company of the redeemed, in the Eucharist, where in thanksgiving the members of the Body offer themselves in ethical sacrifice through Christ.,

Daly writes:

'So strong is the connection between incarnation and sacrifice that we can call it the leitmotif of Hippolytus' theology of sacrifice.'⁽²⁾

Hippolytus' stress on the close relationship between incarnation-eucharist-redemption as three parts of the one act of God in Christ is further brought out in the epiclesis which follows the anamnesis:

(1) Dix, op.cit., p.160

(2) Daly, op.cit., p.98

'And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church (in oblationem/θυσίαν sanctae ecclesiae); that, gathering them into one, you would grant to all who partake of the holy things (to partake) for the fullness of the Holy Spirit.... that we may praise and glorify you through your child Jesus Christ....'(1)

This is not a 'consecratory' epiclesis. It is a prayer for the communicants - that they may be united with each other and with the Holy Spirit (?Christ⁽²⁾) so that praise may be offered through Christ to the Father.⁽³⁾

In every Eucharist the worshippers are caught up into the New Passover, the Heavenly Banquet. At the Paschal Eucharist the newly confirmed/admitted candidates are given, in addition to the normal Eucharistic species, milk and honey as a sign of:

'fulfilment of the promise which was made to (our) fathers...; in which also Christ gave his flesh through which those who believe are nourished....' - AT.23.2

All who share in the Eucharist

'partake of the holy things....in order that we may praise and glorify the Father.'

(1) So the text in PEER - but there are major textual problems at this point.

(2) The somewhat imprecise Trinitarian theology at this date allows the possibility that 'Holy Spirit' here may refer to the Logos rather than to the Third Person of the Trinity. Whatever the case, the essential meaning remains unchanged, but if Hippolytus does intend to refer to the Logos here then it would be possible to argue quite convincingly that at this stage Christ was still seen as playing an active rôle in the Eucharistic Liturgy rather than the more passive role accorded Him later when Trinitarian terminology achieved greater definition and the epiclesis was more fully developed.

(3) McKenna, op.cit., p.19f.

In this way Hippolytus' Liturgy holds together the themes of 'salvation and worship/glory'. Wainwright writes:

'.... it is only as we receive the glory of God that we are able to render Him glory.... When we recall the part played by the Spirit in the communication of divine glory according to II Cor.3⁽¹⁾, then this text from AT....suggests how a theology might be elaborated as the sacramental anticipation of a universe fully transfigured by the glory of God, receiving glory from Him, and rendering glory to Him.'⁽²⁾

The theme of 'eschatological glory' pervades the earliest approaches to the doctrine of the Eucharist. Because of the redemption won through Christ, the Church, in the power of the Holy Spirit, gives glory to the Father

'both now and to the ages of ages (εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων) Amen.'

- AT 4.13

The Fraction and Communion

There is no evidence in the Apostolic Tradition for the use of the Lord's Prayer at the end of the anaphora.⁽³⁾ So at AT 23 we pass straight to the fraction and the communion:

'And when he breaks the bread in distributing fragments to each, he shall say: The bread of heaven in Christ Jesus. And if there are not enough p̄esbyters, the deacons alsò shall hold the cups

(1) e.g. II Cor. 3.18: 'But we all, with unveiled face reflecting as in a mirror the glory of the Lord are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit.'

(2) Wainwright, op.cit., p.103

(3) The first precise evidence for such a positioning and use comes from the Catechetical Lectures of Cyril of Jerusalem.

(water, milk, wine) and they who receive shall taste of each thrice, he who gives it saying: In God the Father Almighty.'

- AT 23.5ff.

Hippolytus gives the first extant description of the fraction. Clearly the origin was purely practical, for the purpose of distribution, though as early as 1 Cor. 10.17, as was seen earlier, Paul interpreted the act as a symbol of the unity of the communicants. Hippolytus gives no interpretation of the fraction at AT 23.5 but we may perhaps link it with his peculiar form of the Institution Narrative at 4.9:

'he took bread and gave thanks to you, saying Take eat; this is my body which shall be broken for you. Likewise also the cup saying, This is my blood which is shed for you.'

The bread words here are not directly scriptural and may represent a move towards parallelism with the cup words. More importantly, as far as this thesis is concerned, the possible future tense ('which shall be broken for you') may suggest that Hippolytus did not think of the Last Supper as a Eucharist, but as a piece of prophetic symbolism looking forward to the actuality of Calvary on the next day and receiving its fulfilment in the Eucharistic assembly of the redeemed community which, having received glory from the Father through the Son, in turn glorified the Father. Hence the Eucharist makes anamnesis both of Calvary and of the Last Supper and also of the Resurrection. The Last Supper gave the means of partaking in Cross and Resurrection (i.e. salvation); the Eucharist is the anamnesis of the gift of that means. The communicant offers himself, in an act of ethical thanksgiving and sacrifice, to Christ the true sacrifice of our redemption, and so shares in the Messianic Banquet, 'The bread of heaven in Christ Jesus.'

THE LITURGY OF ADDAI AND MARI

Of the Liturgy of Addai and Mari Srawley writes:

'Though overlaid with some later elements it preserves ancient features which call for notice, and its evidence is the more important because it comes from a region which lay outside Greek-speaking Christendom and was not affected so early or to so great an extent as other regions in Eastern Christendom by the developments which were taking place in Greek-speaking lands during the fourth century.'⁽¹⁾

Dix makes a complementary point:

'Addai and Mari "helps to carry back the eucharistic tradition of the Church as a whole behind the divergence of Greek and Western Christianity generally from the oriental world to which the original Galilaean apostles had belonged."⁽²⁾

In fact controversy rages about the precise dating and the purest text of Addai and Mari. There seems little doubt that the text is corrupt (e.g. there is no main verb in the central paragraph of the anaphora) and various editors have suggested widely divergent emendations and additions. On the whole it is probably best to date this liturgy in the early- to mid- third century, but to bear in mind that embedded within it:

'is to be found the eucharistic prayer of the ancient Church of Edessa, whose position outside the Roman Empire ensured it relative detachment from developments in Greek-speaking Christendom, although it also contributed to its becoming schismatic and Nestorian.'⁽³⁾

(1) Srawley, *op.cit.* p.117

(2) Dix, Shape, p.178

(3) Liturgy, p.177. Duchesne, Christian Worship, p.70 stated that Addai and Mari was 'the normal liturgy of the Nestorians and the only one used by the Chaldean Uniates.'

At several points Addai and Mari seems nearer to the NT than to the theological speculation of the 3rd century, and this would seem to support an earlier rather than a later dating. On the other hand, the conservative nature of liturgy tends to mean that theological speculation outstrips the thought expressed in the liturgy which is naturally more in tune with the thought of the average worshipper. This conservative nature of the lex orandi means that we must be very careful when suggesting a date for a liturgy such as Addai and Mari, since it may well be later than parallel thought in the lex credendi may suggest. On the whole then it seems best to suggest that Addai and Mari may reflect the worshipping thought and 'doctrinè' of the average Christian (as opposed to a teacher) of the Church in E. Syria in the mid 3rd century.

We may begin by summarising the basic Eucharistic doctrine contained in Addai and Mari. Certain points will then need to be developed in greater detail.

- 1) The Eucharist is an offering of praise and thanksgiving to God (Trinity?/Jesus?) for his kindness in creating the world and saving man:

Priest: The offering is offered to God the Lord of all.

Answer: It is fitting and right.

Priest (privately): Worthy of glory from every mouth and thanksgiving from every tongue is the adorable and glorious name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. He created the world through his grace and its inhabitants through his kindness; he saved men through his mercy, and gave great grace to mortals.⁽¹⁾

(1) PEER, p.127

The prayer is then caught up in praise of God who is adored by 'myriads and myriads of angels' - and thus the prayer leads into the Sanctus.⁽¹⁾

- 2) In particular the Church meets in the Eucharist to give thanks to Christ for his work of redemption by his incarnation and resurrection. It is especially noteworthy that the Old Edessene anaphora may well have been addressed exclusively to God the Son. In this section of the prayer we meet the concept, met when examining the teaching of Irenaeus, of Christ restoring fallen humanity to true life with God:

'For you put on our human nature to give us life through your divine nature.... You our Lord and our God, conquered our enemies and made the lowliness of our weak nature to triumph through the abundant mercy of your grace.'⁽²⁾

- 3) The Eucharist is the appointed means of 'commemorating and celebrating' the 'passion death and resurrection'. This is possible through the action of the Holy Spirit who is asked to 'rest on this offering' so that it may bring into actuality the fruits of redemption and resurrection for which the anaphora has already given thanks. It is noticeable that there is no place in the anaphora for the Institution Narrative, although Dix sees an 'authoritative reference' to the event of the Last Supper in the words 'we.... who have received through tradition the form.'

This last point brings out the real thrust of the anaphora which is strongly eschatological. The Institution Narrative is not required because the Eucharist is no mere looking back to the past but a 'making present' of the eschatological Redeemer. In the same way, although there

(1) This is omitted by Dix in his reconstruction - v. Shape, p.180

(2) PEER, p.27

are references to the body and blood of Christ, and to the action of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and the wine, there seems to be no concept present in the anaphora of change in the elements. The bread and wine are the vehicles of receiving the body and blood of Christ the Redeemer eschatologically present to his people in the Eucharist.

Wainwright writes:

'We observe that in the oldest extant invocations of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine, those of the Apostolic Tradition and of Addai and Mari, it is not stated (though we may admit that their framers believed in some kind of identification between the consecrated elements and the body and blood of Christ) that the purpose of the coming of the Holy Spirit was to make the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ; rather the thought moves directly to the eschatologically oriented effects on the communicants.'⁽¹⁾

Interestingly both Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius (who were connected with the Church at Edessa and may even have influenced the later versions of Addai and Mari) develop the understanding of the connection between the invocation of the Holy Spirit and a 'change' in the elements. Theodore asks that the bread and wine may 'become' ('fiat') the body and blood. Nestorius goes even further and speaks of the Holy Spirit 'making (faciat)' the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and of the Father 'transforming (transmutant)' the bread and wine by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

(1) Wainwright, op.cit., p.108

A few details remain to be examined more fully.

(a) Dix⁽¹⁾ suggests that as it originally stood the whole anaphora was addressed to God the Son. This was not unusual, being the practice of several Egyptian and Ethiopic liturgies and many Syriac liturgies. Certainly Addai and Mari places great stress on the anaphora being essentially a prayer to and through Jesus. Again the eschatological element is pronounced and we may perhaps compare the concept of the Eucharist as being the Christian offering through Christ the High Priest.

If Dix is right then the phrase 'your Holy Spirit' in the epiclesis refers to the Spirit of Christ. This would again suggest a primitive doctrinal development. Richardson writes:

'With the doubtful exception of 2 Cor. 3.17 the NT never says the Christ is the Spirit of God. But after the Resurrection this distinction becomes blurred, and the NT writers do not attempt to distinguish between the operation of the Risen Christ and the operation of the Holy Spirit.'⁽²⁾

Some such doctrinal scheme would seem to be in operation in Addai and Mari. Srawley notes that several East Syrian writers, such as Ephraem, suggest at first sight that the content of the Eucharistic gift is the Holy Spirit. But

'it seems likely that in such cases 'the Spirit' is an old and traditional designation of the second person of the Trinity current in East Syria, and that Our Lord Himself is in the Eucharist designated 'the Spirit'.⁽³⁾

If this is true of Addai and Mari then it suggests:

'a very early conception indeed of the results of receiving holy communion,

(1) Dix, Shape, p.180

(2) Richardson, Introduction to the NT, p.121

(3) Srawley, op.cit., p.218

exactly in line with that concept of the whole eucharist as an anticipation of the second coming of our Lord which began to die out in most Churches before the end of the third century, or even earlier.⁽¹⁾

(b) Several writers suggest that it may be right to see a parallel between the words of the anaphora,

'we also Lord, your lowly, weak and miserable servants who have gathered and stand before you',

and Mt. 18.20:

'For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I am in the midst of them.'

There may also be a parallel with, or an allusion to Lk.21.36:

'But watch ye at every season, making supplication, that ye may prevail to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man.'

The eschatological stress of both passages, in particular the Lucan, accords well with the general tenor of Addai and Mari which sees the Eucharist as a foretaste of the heavenly Banquet:

'O ye that have been invited by the great purpose to the living marriage feast of the banquet of those in heaven and those on earth.'⁽²⁾

But there is also a stress on the future blessings of communion, as yet only partially fulfilled in the Eucharist:

(1) Dix, Shape, p.185.

(2) cited Wainwright, p.52

'Praise to thine holy name, O our Lord Jesus Christ, and worship to thy sovereignty at all times for ever. Amen. For thou art the living and life-giving bread which came down from heaven and giveth life to the whole world and they who eat of it die not and they who receive it are saved and pardoned in it and live for ever.'

We may conclude with these words of Dix:

'Addai and Mari is a eucharistic prayer which is concentrated solely upon the experience of the Eucharist, to the momentary ignoring of all other elements in Christian belief and thought. Maranatha!....., the ecstatic cry of the first pre-Pauline Aramaic speaking disciples, is the summary of what it has to say.'⁽¹⁾

(1) Dix, op.cit., p.186

THE EUCHOLOGION OF SARAPION

The Euchologion represents an Egyptian form of the Liturgy from about the mid-fourth century. Whether its ascription to Bishop Sarapion of Thmuis is correct must remain in some doubt because of some possible Arian phraseology. Here we shall examine mainly the anaphora and related prayers, noting particularly any differences of approach to the doctrine of the Eucharist as compared with that of the Apostolic Tradition.

The Euchologion contains little or no information concerning the 'Liturgy of the Word'/'Missa Catechumenorum'. This is not surprising since the Euchologion is a collection of prayers, rather than a complete liturgy - and the prayers would seem to assume a fore-Mass,⁽¹⁾ for example, there is a 'prayer after rising from the sermon'. There seems no reason to doubt that in Egypt the pattern of 'Word-ethical response', the same pattern as has been observed as the formation and ground of liturgy from the earliest period, still held good. Certainly the Egyptian Liturgy of St. Mark (c.450?), with which the Euchologion has several close parallels,⁽²⁾ shows us a liturgy with a developed liturgy of the Word and also a considerable emphasis on the rite of the offertory which by that later date had developed into the ceremony of the Great Entrance. If we are correct in assuming that St. Mark's Liturgy is in the mainstream of normal Egyptian liturgical development, then it seems safe to assume that the Euchologion would also have been preceded by a liturgy of the word.

As it now stands the anaphora begins straight away with:

'It is fitting and right to praise, to hymn
and to glorify you, the uncreated Father of

(1) Duchesne, Christian Worship, p.75f.

(2) Srawley, op.cit., p.50

the only-begotten Jesus Christ.'

Srawley and Frere⁽¹⁾ both consider that this presupposes some form of the 'Sursum corda'. The anaphora in the Liturgy of St. Mark begins in this way:

'The Lord be with all
And with your spirit
Up with your hearts
We have them with the Lord
Let us give thanks to the Lord
It is fitting and right.'⁽²⁾

If it is correct to assume that the Anaphora of Serapion would have been prefaced with some such similar phrases, then it would also be right to infer that the Eucharist in the mid-fourth century was still interpreted, to some extent at least, as the eschatological meal of thanksgiving and anamnesis. At the very start of the anaphora we are reminded that we stand in the presence of the Risen Christ, in the presence of God the Father himself, in heaven.

Serapion's anaphora opens with four sentences in praise of the Eternal Father:

'We praise you uncreated God....
We praise you who are known by the only-
begotten Son....
We praise you who know the Son and reveal
to the saints the glories about him...
We praise you unseen Father, provider of
immortality....'

The prayer shows hardly a trace here of thanksgiving for creation, incarnation, or passion - except, possibly, a brief reference to 'created' nature and the 'coming of your beloved Son.' This contrasts strongly with the

(1) Srawley, op.cit., p.52; Frere, Anaphora p.76; v. also Liturgy, p.199.

(2) PEER, p.43

prayer of the Apostolic Tradition. Dix thinks that the change between the two prayers has been brought about in Sarapion by the introduction of the Sanctus (absent in the Apostolic Tradition) which has caused the beginning of the anaphora to become a 'theological hymn'.⁽¹⁾

Strictly speaking this difference of approach between Hippolytus and Sarapion need make no difference in their understanding of the Eucharist. Praise and thanksgiving together formed a feature of the primitive Eucharist from its earliest developments, arising from its Jewish antecedents. But the nature of the theological language employed in the Euchologion does in fact suggest a subtle change of approach. Hippolytus uses warm and emotive language to express heartfelt praise and gratitude for the salvation won through incarnation and the whole of the Christ-redemption theme. The same note of warmth seems to be missing from Sarapion's language.

In Hippolytus the purpose of the incarnation is summed up in terms of personal redemption and sanctification:

'Fulfilling your will and gaining for you a holy people, he (Christ) stretched out his hands when he should suffer that he might release from suffering those who have believed in you.'

It is because of this deepfelt assurance of personal salvation, available to the Christian through the Eucharist, that the Church in the Apostolic Tradition gives thanks 'Through (the Father's) beloved child'.

All such warm and immanent (while yet deeply reverential) eschatological language is absent from the

(1) Dix, Shape, p.165

anaphora of the Euchologion. God is transcendent: 'unsearchable, ineffable, incomprehensible by all created being', who was made known 'by the only-begotten Son'. Sarapion seems to suggest that the only movement between God and man is that of man being enabled to come to God the Father through Christ:

'you reconcile yourself to all **and** draw all to yourself through the coming of your beloved Son.'

This is of course perfectly sound theology, but in comparison with Hippolytus it seems to leave the Father in a curiously aloof and remote position. The emphasis, perhaps we might even use the term 'emotion' or 'psychology', is different from that of Hippolytus where redemption is clearly a costly movement of God, the loving Father, to fallen man:

'...your beloved child Jesus Christ, whom in the last times you sent to us as Saviour and redeemer and angel of your will.'

Perhaps the differences are subtle - and a matter of technicality at that - but it seems to be sufficiently different to alter Sarapion's approach to the doctrine of the Eucharist. In the Apostolic Tradition the Eucharist is an eschatological meal in which Christ and his Church meet together as once Christ and his disciples sat together in community around a common table; Christ comes to man, the Risen Christ condescends to be with his people, man is raised by Christ to the Father. The whole feel of the Apostolic Tradition, while being deeply reverential and strongly eschatological, is essentially 'a homely, family meal'. In the Euchologion the feel is altogether different. In the Euchologion the Christian worshipper takes part not in a family meal but in a court ritual; the mighty King is praised by his subjects; the Church is summoned to give praise to the 'uncreated, unsearchable,

ineffable, incomprehensible God'. Note how the negatives pile up. This is Alexandrian phraseology - and there is, needless to say, nothing wrong with that! - but we must face the fact that it does seem to cause a shift in the approach to the Eucharist moving us towards a stately (perhaps baroque?) ritual of Byzantine type as evidenced by the Liturgy of St. Mark.

The predominant emotion in the Euchologion is that of transcendent awe in the presence of that Divinity who is totally 'other':

'Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth;
heaven and earth are full of your
glory.'

As the Euchologion echoes the trisagion of Isaiah 6 we are caught up into the Temple of the Heavenly Jerusalem.⁽¹⁾ Are we worthy to be there? Or, like Isaiah, do we feel entirely overcome by our own sense of unworthiness to stand in the face of such awe-ful holiness and purity?

Sarapion at once picks up this sense of unworthiness in the next part of the anaphora:

'We pray you make us living men;
Give us a spirit of Light that we may know
you the true God.
Give us holy Spirit, that we may be able
to speak and expound your unspeakable
mysteries.
May the Lord Jesus Christ speak in us, and
holy Spirit, and hymn you through us.'

Thus Sarapion stresses the transcendent holiness of God as contrasted with the utter unworthiness of the Christian worshipper. We can only 'speak the unspeakable' and 'hymn the Father' through the grace of Christ and the

(1) Dix, Shape. p.165, suggests that the use of the preface and Sanctus began in the Alexandrian Church c.230.

Holy Spirit. Indeed, of ourselves we cannot praise the Father, but we can be the 'mouth pieces', as it were, of Christ and the Holy Spirit speaking through us.

The Eucharist then is the time of praise and worship of the almighty and transcendent God. Through Christ, who speaks through his Church, we are enabled to join with the

'myriads of angels, archangels, thrones,
dominions, principalities and powers'

who in the Heavenly Jerusalem praise the Holy God. Only as Christ speaks through us are we enabled to join with the heavenly hosts to say:

'Holy, holy, holy, Lord of Sabaoth;
heaven and earth are full of your glory.'

The Eucharist of the Euchologion is an example of marvellous transcendent praise. The transcendent, almighty, ineffable, all-holy Father is praised by his fallen and earthly worshippers through the Son. It is right that there should be this stress on the transcendence of God - but, in comparison with the Apostolic Tradition, are we not right to long for a corresponding stress on the awe-ful immanence of God? Is it not the very heart of the Christian Gospel that the God who is the all-holy transcendent Father, worshipped by myriads of angels, humbles himself in the Son who is immanent among us in the incarnation and dies so that we may be raised? Perhaps we may say that, while Hippolytus and some of the earlier Liturgies may overstress the immanence of God, Sarapion would seem to have redressed the balance a little more than adequately?

Sarapion sees that it is only as we sing the praise of God that we become 'living men'. Is this slightly unusual phrase meant to link up with the next section of the anaphora?⁽¹⁾

(1) Dix, Shape p.166f.

'Full is heaven, full also is earth of
your excellent glory, Lord of the powers.
Fill also this sacrifice with your power
and your partaking; for to you have we
offered this living sacrifice, this
bloodless offering.'

We note especially the phrases 'this living sacrifice,
this bloodless offering'. Does this refer to the presence
of Christ in the elements before the recital of the Words
of Institution and the Epiclesis? This may just be correct
- especially if we compare the parallel passage in the
Liturgy of St. Mark:

'Full in truth are heaven and earth of
your holy glory through (the appearing
of) our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus
Christ: Fill, O God, this sacrifice
also with a blessing from you through
the descent of your (all-)holy Spirit.'

Earlier, in the Liturgy of St. Mark, the Bishop has said these
words:

'Receive O God, the thank-offerings of
those who offer the sacrifices, at your
(holy and) heavenly and intellectual altar
.... and those who offered the offerings
today; as you accepted the gifts of your
righteous Abel, the sacrifice of our
Father Abraham, (the incense of Zechariah,
the alms of Cornelius) and the widow's two
mites....'

There would seem to be little doubt from these Biblical
allusions that the Liturgy of St. Mark is referring to the
Eucharistic elements in the preliminary form of invocation
(cited above) before the first epiclesis. In which case
it seems likely that in the Euchologion the words 'this
living sacrifice, this bloodless offering' do in fact refer
to the bread and wine of the Eucharist. This becomes even

more likely if we take into account the development of the Grand Entrance in reference to which Theodore of Mopsuestia speaks of the elements (being presented in the Grand Entrance) as if already consecrated and goes on to work out an elaborate scheme stressing the historicisation of the rite. On this scheme of Theodore's the prothesis becomes the Crucifixion and the epiclesis represents the Resurrection.⁽¹⁾ This clearly shows that increasingly by the mid-fourth century emphasis was being placed more on the 'reality' of the eucharistic gift, sought for in the eucharistic elements, and less on the 'symbolism' of the broken bread and poured-out wine as the vehicles of meeting with the Risen and Crucified Christ. In other words one half of the Johannine tension between reality and symbol was in danger of being lost. This would result in the 'reality' of Christ being looked for solely in the Eucharistic elements.

I do not wish to suggest that Sarapion has moved as far as Theodore, but it does seem possible that the Euchologion refers to the eucharistic elements as 'this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering'.

The phrase 'the unbloody sacrifice' is first used by Cyril of Jerusalem (348), and, as I suggested above,⁽²⁾ he may have used the phrase as referring to a mystical repetition of Calvary. This may also be suggested by the language of the Euchologion which speaks of the

'likeness of the death (of Christ)' made through the 'offered bread' (N.B. the tense of *προσηγουμεν*) so that we may 'beseech you through this sacrifice'.

Is it possible that in these paragraphs Sarapion is historicising the anamnesis in a way similar to Theodore? Here, and not earlier in the anaphora, anamnesis is made

(1) Dix, op.cit., p.281ff.

(2) v. above p.190ff.

of the Incarnation, the Institution and the Passion, so that God may

'be reconciled to us all and be merciful.'

Is it possible that the approach to the Eucharist has undergone a change? No longer is it primarily an 'eschatological thanksgiving' when the Crucified and Risen Christ is present to his people to give them the benefits of his death, rather it is moving towards becoming an 'historical re-enactment' of the means whereby salvation has been achieved. There is nothing 'wrong' with either approach - provided we are aware just what is going on! Dix writes:

'As the Church came to feel at home in the world, so she became reconciled to time. The eschatological emphasis in the Eucharist inevitably faded. It ceased to be regarded primarily as a rite which manifested and secured the eternal consequences of redemption, a rite which by manifesting their true being as eternally 'redeemed' momentarily transported those who took part in it beyond the alien and hostile world of time into the Kingdom of God and the World to Come. Instead, the Eucharist came to be thought of primarily as the representation, the enactment before God, of the historical process of redemption, of the historical events of the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus by which redemption had been achieved.'⁽¹⁾

If the phrase 'this living sacrifice' suggests that in Sarapion we have evidence for an increased 'historicising' of the anamnesis, is it also mutually compatible to link it with the concept of the whole offering of the Church of itself to the Father through Christ? As was noted above, Dix thinks that it is possible. He links the phrase 'this

(1) Dix, Shape, p.305

living sacrifice' with the earlier request to 'make us living men'. Dix suggests that the phrases 'living sacrifice' and 'bloodless offering' refer to the praise just offered by the Church in the Sanctus.⁽¹⁾ But we have just suggested that these same phrases may suggest a reference to an interpretation of the anamnesis as an historical re-enactment. Are the two interpretations mutually incompatible?

The anaphora prayer asks that we may become 'living men', that we may be given a 'spirit of light', that we may be given 'holy Spirit', that the 'Lord Jesus Christ may speak in us' so that we can 'hymn' to the Father. This is the sacrifice of praise - 'the fruit of lips that acknowledge his name'(Heb. 13.15). But we remember also that in the Liturgy of St. Mark (which Sarapion closely parallels) the 'sacrifice' is also made up of the offering of the elements of bread and wine, which we offer in order to make anamnesis of our redemption in Christ and thus to receive the fruits of that redemption. Thus our 'sacrifice' - the offering of praise and the offering of the elements, as well as the act of anamnesis itself - can be made only through Christ. Both praise and elements represent our ethical response, our Eucharist, made in response to the redemption won by Christ. The elements represent the worshippers themselves - just as in the Jewish sacrificial system the sacrificed animal stood for the offering of the individual - they are the ethical offering. Thus there is no mutual incompatibility between seeing the 'living sacrifice', the 'bloodless offering' as referring both to the 'sacrifice of praise' and to the 'historical re-enactment' of the redemption won in Christ. We offer ourselves in praise to the Father through Christ; we offer ourselves by making anamnesis of our redemption so that all

(1) Dix, op.cit., p.166f.

who partake.... receive a medicine of life for the healing of every disease, and for the strengthening of all advancement and virtue.' - Euchologion, Epiclesis II.

The phrase, 'this living sacrifice' occurs in the first of the two epicleses. It is to these we must now turn.

'Full is heaven, full also is earth of your excellent glory Lord of the powers. Fill also this sacrifice with your power and your partaking; for to you have we offered this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering.'

It is characteristic of the Egyptian anaphora to pick up the word 'full' (πληρωσον) from the Sanctus and to develop it in this way. The Deir Balyzeh Papyrus (representing the C.6th/C.7th development from the Liturgy of St. Mark)⁽¹⁾ reads:

'Fill us also with glory from (you) and vouchsafe to send down your Holy Spirit upon these treasures (and) make the bread the body of our (Lord and) Saviour Jesus Christ, and the cup the blood....'⁽²⁾

In this later epiclesis God is asked to fill 'us' and also to send his Holy Spirit upon the elements. In the earlier first epiclesis of the Euchologion the prayer is that the elements only be filled 'with your power and your partaking' - unless that is we are correct in interpreting the 'living sacrifice, the bloodless offering' as referring to the elements which represent the ethical sacrifice of the worshippers, in which case we too are filled with the Holy Spirit. I believe this to be correct and to be along the general lines of the development of Eucharistic doctrine, but it must be admitted that as Epiclesis I in the Euchologion

(1) PEER, p.37

(2) *ibid.* p.40

reads it is not the most immediate interpretation, and is more likely to be understood solely in terms of the elements themselves (and exclusively?) being filled with the Holy Spirit. This is in line with the other strand of thought that we have already detected in Sarapion, namely the anamnesis interpreted in terms of 'historical re-enactment.'

The Second Epiclesis is striking in that it calls for the Logos to come upon the elements:

'O God of Truth, let your holy Word come on this bread that the bread may become (*γινεσθαι*) the body of the Word; and on this cup that the cup may become the blood of the Truth; and make all who partake to receive a medicine of life for the healing of every disease....'

McKenna notes this as:

'the only example to date of a clearcut, developed eucharistic epiclesis in the Eastern tradition calling for the Logos.'⁽¹⁾

Frere writes:

'Sarapion's invocation followed the usual lines of an explicit invocation to consecrate. But he was much imbued with the Logos theology.... in the Liturgy the appeal to God is for the intervention of the Word.... In this respect he was but extending the Logos doctrine of the Apologists...'⁽²⁾

By this Logos-epiclesis Sarapion suggests that he may have seen a parallel between the Incarnation and the Eucharist. Earlier in the anaphora he has spoken

(1) McKenna, *op.cit.*, p.29

(2) Frere, Anaphora, p.78

of the 'only-begotten Son' and the 'begotten Word'; in the first epiclesis (and immediate recitation of the Institution Narrative) he speaks of the 'likeness' (*ὁμοιωμα*) 'of the body of the only-begotten...the likeness of the holy body.' Now in the second epiclesis he speaks of the 'body of the Word'. Thus the Word is invoked so that the bread and wine may become (*γινωσθαι*) 'the body of the Word' and the 'blood of the Truth'. There is here another stress on the 'historicising' approach of Sarapion. Immediately after the recital of the Words of Institution the Euchologion goes on to pray for unity, the unity that is brought about by the death of Christ - the 'likeness' of whose body has been 'made' by the renewed action of the Logos:

'Therefore we also, making the likeness of the death, have offered the bread, and beseech you through this sacrifice: be reconciled to us all and be merciful, O God of truth. And as this bread was scattered over the mountains, and was gathered together and became one, so gather your holy Church out of every nation and every country and every city and village and house, and make one living catholic Church.'

The action of the Logos is to continue and to extend the act of redemption won in the incarnate Word.

The parallel between Incarnation and Eucharist was to lead to an important change of thought, especially when linked to the 4th and 5th century developments of terminology concerning the Holy Spirit. In earlier writers and liturgies the central active figure in the Eucharist is Christ the Word present to his people in the eschatological foretaste of the Messianic Banquet. Sarapion seems to have moved away from this somewhat towards seeing the Eucharist as a courtly ritual in praise of the transcendent Father; a ritual in which we make anamnesis of the Heilsgeschichte

not as an eternally present event, but primarily as a past event which is capable of being renewed. Later writers and liturgies consequently present Christ as the passive figure in the Eucharist - which is the renewal of the historical action of the Christ-event, made possible by the active power of the Holy Spirit. For Sarapion however, it is still the second person of the Trinity, the Logos, who is actively coming to his people.

Liturgy is generally conservative. Perhaps this is so with the Euchologion. It may be that Sarapion's own understanding of the relationship between the active role of the Spirit and the more passive role of Christ in the Eucharist is in fact being held in check by some form of Baumstark's law. We may compare the Euchologion with the thought of a near contemporary, Cyril of Jerusalem. Cyril, using the more precise Trinitarian terminology of the later 4th century also draws a firm parallel between the Incarnation and the Eucharist. Consequently he sees Christ assuming a passive role in the Eucharist. It is by the action of the Holy Spirit that Christ is present to his people in the Eucharist. In the Euchologion we can perhaps see the first stage in this development. Dix writes:

'The important thing to notice.... is that when the pre-Nicene Church thought and spoke of the Eucharist as an action, as something 'done', it conceived it primarily as an action of Christ Himself, perpetually offering through and in His Body the Church His 'flesh for the world'. It is the perpetuation in time by way of anamnesis of his eternally accepted and complete redeeming act.'⁽¹⁾

What was true of the pre-Nicene Church was well on the way to changing by the mid-4th century, and this is true for Sarapion in as much as liturgical conservatism will allow him to express it. Whatever some writers may suggest this

(1) Dix, op.cit., p.254

need not represent evidence of decline for the Church's spirituality, nor even necessarily a major and decisive alteration of NT thought. The spirituality of the Church in the 4th century was no less - the evidence for the devotion of the average layman is sufficient proof for that.⁽¹⁾ The awareness of the majesty and transcendence of God the Father was much greater than in previous generations. And herein lies the clue to interpret what has happened and why. No longer was the Eucharist a homely 'agape-Eucharist', a 'Messianic Banquet' held around the table in the triclinium of the house of some wealthy Christian. In the mid-4th century and onwards it was seen as an act of homage to the Almighty Trinity. But this had the effect of making God seem 'further away'. No longer was the Church constantly living in a fervour of immediate eschatological fulfilment; no longer did Church members see themselves living in the 'Age to Come - and not Yet'. Rather the Church now saw itself as living firmly in the world (though not of it - hence the growth of the eremitic movement) but, by the grace of God being enabled, in the Eucharist, to rise above the world and to praise the Father. The Church remembered the historic events of the Incarnation, Passion and Resurrection as past events. Earlier they had been seen as eternally present events in the anamnesis of the Heilsgeschichte. Thus Christ was seen as being eternally active - the active host at the Eucharist. In the later 4th century Christ, raised so far above this world in the transcendence of the Father is present as Host (hostia, victim); Christ takes on a passive role in the Eucharist and the active agent becomes the Holy Spirit.

So, through the Holy Spirit Christ comes to his people. Sarapion's prayer goes on to pray that the benefits of His presence may be given to those in need:

(1) We may think, for example, of the standards of discipline and devotion set by Hippolytus in the Apostolic Tradition (Jungmann, Early Liturgy, pp.52-73) and also of the standards set by Cyril of Jerusalem in his Catechesis. The 'Pilgrimage of Egeria' also shows how deep and fervent a spirituality there was at this period - and also provides us with further evidence for the growth of the 'historicising' process.

'make all who partake to receive a medicine
of life for the healing of every disease.'

We may compare this with Ignatius' phrase 'the medicine of
immortality'. The Eucharist is the entry to life in God -
the gateway to the eternal life in heaven.

Sarapion then offers prayer 'through the only-begotten,
in the Spirit', for the Church, for the departed, for those
who have 'offered the offerings.' The prayer ends with what
may have once been the response of the people,⁽¹⁾ and, as the
whole Church unites in response of thanksgiving we are made
aware yet again of the worship of the Transcendent Trinity:

'Through your only-begotten Son, Jesus
Christ, in the Holy Spirit; as it was
and is and shall be to generations of
generations and to all the ages of ages.

Amen.'

THE LITURGY OF ST. JAMES

The Liturgy of St. James comes to us in two versions
- the Greek and the Syriac. The Syriac is generally reckoned
to be the later version, made some time after 451, and having
a number of omissions and additions in comparison with the
Greek version.⁽²⁾ The Greek Liturgy of St. James has close
links with the Jerusalem Church and was adopted for use by
the Antiochene Church at some point between 397 and 431.⁽³⁾
The **strong** influence of the Jerusalem Church is particularly
striking and reminds us how influential a position Cyril -
and his doctrine - held in Christendom. Dix points out
that the Antiochene Church moved in a progressively more
Hellenistic direction away from the semitic-type liturgy
as represented by Addai and Mari⁽⁴⁾ and the Greek Liturgy of
St. James as we have it shows signs of being influenced by

(1) Srawley, op.cit., p.57. We may compare the doxology at
the end of the anaphora in the Liturgy of St. Mark.

(2) PEER, p.55

(3) Shape, p.176

(4) ibid., pp.176ff.

the Liturgy of St. Basil⁽¹⁾ which the Antiochene Church came ultimately to adopt.⁽²⁾

Duchesne⁽³⁾ gives us a reconstruction of a 'Syrian Liturgy' in general terms which broadly apply to the structure of the Liturgy of St. James. After introductory prayers and the 'Little Entrance' of the clergy, the lectors at once begin the readings which are interspersed with interpretative chants, alleluias and psalms. A priest or deacon then reads the gospel after which there is a sermon (or number of homilies). The catechumens, and others not fully initiated into the sacred mysteries are then dismissed and then the Faithful make their prayer using the Litany, led by a deacon. So far this is in almost direct imitation of the Synagogue service.⁽⁴⁾ Then, after the Kiss of Peace, comes the Great Entrance. The door-keepers are posted to keep out any who are not initiated. With much ceremonial the deacons bring the bread to the altar, spread a cloth and lay the bread upon it. According to the Testamentum Domini, a veil is spread so that the altar cannot be seen by the congregation.⁽⁵⁾ The Bishop washes his hands and vests in festal garments and then he and the priests draw near the altar for the eucharistic prayer. The point to notice is the great elaboration of the rite - and the implicit stress on the 'mysterium tremendum et fascinans' which is about to be enacted.

This approach cannot be criticised as lacking in faith, on the contrary the realism of the sacramental act is now so stressed that only the privileged few can witness the actual consecration. It may be that the more traditional view, that after 314 the Church's faith diminished and the eschatological expectation vanished, is only a half truth. Perhaps it may be nearer the mark to say that a different kind of faith and eschatology took over. In the late 4th century the action of the Eucharist stresses the divine transcendence so much as almost to ignore the divine immanence.

(1) PEER, p.55

(2) Shape, p.176

(3) Duchesne: Christian Worship, Origin & Evolution, pp.57ff.

(4) *ibid.*, p.59

(5) Liturgy, p.195

The eucharistic species, and the act of consecration, is so holy as to be hedged about with all sorts of safeguards. This does not show a lack of faith - but perhaps it witnesses to a demand for 'concreteness' and 'mystery' which suggests a need for the visible and tangible support for faith? Also, there is a sense in which stress of this kind on the divine transcendence is strongly eschatological - but is it the same understanding of eschatology as we see in the NT? It seems to me that whereas in the NT the eschatological understanding of the Eucharist suggests a dynamic movement between God and man by which man is brought into the new creation wrought by the Risen Christ; in the late 4th century we see a more static approach to the Eucharist in which it is seen as an ongoing part of re-creation, rather than as a moment in history when God breaks in anew, and for a moment or two man is privileged to worship with the angels.

The anaphora of St. James begins with a form of 2 Cor. 13.14 and then the usual versicles and responses lifting up the hearts and minds of the worshippers into the Trinity. There flows a hymn of praise to God 'the creator of all creation' who is 'hymned' by his creation, his Church and his angels. This leads into the Trisagion. After this the Bishop picks up the word 'holy' and stresses the transcendence of God the Holy Trinity:

'Holy you are, King of the ages.... holy too is your only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ... and holy too is your holy Spirit.'⁽¹⁾

This leads into a memorial of Creation, Fall, the Old Covenant, the New Covenant made in Christ who:

'when he was about to endure his voluntary (and life-giving) death (on the cross), the sinless for us sinners, in the night when

(1) PEER, p.57

he was betrayed (or rather handed himself over), for the life and salvation of the world, took bread in his holy, undefiled, blameless (and immortal) hands'.⁽¹⁾

Thus the Institution Narrative is firmly linked to the Passion and to Christ's saving work.

The Institution Narrative reveals certain idiosyncracies:

'Likewise after supper (he took) the cup, he mixed wine and water (he looked up to heaven and showed it to you, his God and Father; he gave thanks,) blessed, and sanctified it, (filled with the Holy Spirit) and gave it to his (holy and blessed) disciples....'

The theme of the cup being filled with the Holy Spirit (as here in the Syriac form of the anaphora) is picked up in the Epiclesis:

'Have mercy on us, Lord God... send upon us and upon these holy gifts set before your (all-)holy Spirit...'⁽²⁾

- and the prayer has as it were an 'anamnesis' of the Holy Spirit reminding us that the Spirit dwells in the Trinity, and was at work in the law and prophets, in the Baptism of Jesus and at Pentecost. Now the Father is asked to send the Spirit:

'(upon us and upon these holy gifts set before you) that he may come upon them....and make this bread the holy body of Christ and this cup the precious blood of Christ.'⁽³⁾

Thus the epiclesis of St. James contains a notion not present in the Apostolic Tradition or in Addai and Mari, namely: to make the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ. Brilioth⁽⁴⁾ suggests that:

'the "upon us" of the liturgy of St. James is not the only sign that the epiclesis

(1) PEER p.57 - Syriac liturgy in parentheses

(2) PEER p.58

(3) PEER p.59

(4) Brilioth: Eucharistic Faith and Practice, p.63

originally referred to the congregation
rather than to the elements.'

and he links this change of thought with the action of the
Liturgy e.g. the Great Entry accompanied by the cherubic
hymn 'Let all mortal flesh keep silence'.⁽¹⁾

The recitation of the Institution Narrative ends
with the words:

'Do this for my remembrance; for as often
as you eat this bread and drink this cup you
proclaim the death of the Son of Man (and
confess his resurrection) until he comes.'

And the people respond

'Your death, Lord, we proclaim and your
resurrection we confess.'⁽²⁾

This leads into the anamnesis which makes mention of Christ's
passion, death and resurrection and then continues to
'remember' the Parousia and Final Judgement. It is this
last thought that continues through the Epiclesis in which
the Father is asked to send the Holy Spirit 'upon us and
upon these holy gifts' so that

'they may become to all who partake of them
for forgiveness of sins and for eternal life,
for sanctification...for bringing forth good
works...until the consummation of the age'.⁽³⁾

Wainwright writes:

'...many liturgies make mention of the parousia
and of the final judgement at the end of the
Institution Narrative and in the anamnesis.
This same perspective is maintained when in
the second half of the epiclesis the Eastern
liturgies come to pray for the fruits of

(1) Dix, Shape p.286, points out that the ceremony of the Great
Entrance is lacking in the Syriac Liturgy of St. James 'a
sufficient indication that this conception of the Eucharist as
the anamnesis of the resurrection in particular was no part of
the original Syrian tradition.' This may be so, but it does not
alter the fact that as the history of St. James now stands, we
have both a shift of understanding concerning the epiclesis and
also a 'moment of consecration'.

(2) PEER p.58

(3) PEER p.59

communion. When prayer is made at this point that communion may be for the remission of sins, a present reference is no doubt intended; but that the present remission of sins does not exhaust the desired fruits of communion is made clear by the accompanying mention of non-condemnation (in the day of judgement), and of entry into the heavenly kingdom and eternal life.'⁽¹⁾

Now there can be no question that all this thought is eschatological. But is it the same form of eschatology as was found in the NT? I think not. Firstly, in St. James the thought of the Liturgy has moved to the concept of a particular point when the Holy Spirit fills the bread and wine and so makes the bread 'the holy body of Christ' and the cup 'the precious blood of Christ'. Thus Christ is passive and, as is shown also by the ceremony of the Great Entrance, Christ is no longer thought of as the Messiah presiding at the Messianic Banquet, rather he is now the Victim and the Eucharist is 'the offering of the holy and bloodless sacrifice.' Secondly, since the Eucharist is no longer seen as the Messianic Banquet, there is a subtle change in what we may call the 'time-scale' of the eschatological approach. In the 1st century Eucharist heaven and earth are united in Christ; the new creation has begun; the Eucharist is the foretaste of the Heavenly Banquet on earth. In the late 4th century the Eucharist is still the moment of unity between heaven and earth, but now the Church moves out of the world to heaven i.e. the Church is active and Christ is passive. This receives further support from the corresponding emphasis on the historical Christ as evidenced by Egeria's pilgrimage and the development of ceremonial such as the Great Entry. It is particularly noteworthy that Egeria's Pilgrimage was to the Jerusalem Church at about the same time as Antioch adopted the use of the Liturgy of St. James. Egeria

(1) Wainwright, 'Eucharist and Eschatology', p.84

records lovingly the ceremonial of Holy Week which, perhaps under the influence of Cyril, has now been developed so as to re-enact in as much detail as possible the events of Holy Week. Such a development of devotion, and its effect on the Eucharist, may well be a perfectly natural and proper occurrence. But it causes a major shift of theological approach - and yet one that can easily go unnoticed. In the earliest period which we have examined, the focal point of devotion (and hence of doctrine) in the Eucharist has been the Risen, Exalted and Living Christ present and active among his people. In the 4th century under the twin influences of the development of historical interest and the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, we find the emphasis falling on the historical Jesus who is now the passive Victim as the events of which we make anamnesis are, as it were, re-enacted in the words and actions of the Liturgy and the Church and Holy Spirit become the twin active agents - the Church offering bread and wine and the Holy Spirit 'filling it' to become the body and blood of Christ. This may be legitimate development - but it is still development. As Wainwright⁽¹⁾ points out, however, it only needed the Western Church to lose an adequate pneumatology, for this shift of emphasis to become something much more serious, namely a view of the Eucharist as being almost solely the action of the Church. It was against this view that the Reformers acted so violently. It cannot be stated too strongly that the 4th century liturgies do not fall into this error - but the latent possibility is there in embryo.

(1) Wainwright 'Eucharist & Eschatology', p.126f.

PART IV

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

2 The Eucharist and modern Ecumenical thought in the light of the First Four Centuries

In this final section it remains to draw out and bring together the main emergent themes of the first three parts. It seems to me that this can be done most usefully by linking the NT and patristic doctrines to recent ecumenical statements on the Eucharist. Thus modern statements may be placed in a more helpful context and the relevance of the NT and patristics may emerge more clearly.

As a basis for this comparison I shall take five major statements:⁽¹⁾

1. The ARCIC document, 'An agreed statement on Eucharistic Doctrine', 1971 (cited as ARCIC)
2. A joint Lutheran-Roman Catholic document: 'The Eucharist as Sacrifice', 1967 (cited as SACRIFICE)
3. A document published by the Protestant-Catholic Dombes Group: 'Towards a Common Eucharistic Faith?', 1982 (cited as LES DOMBES)
4. The 1971 statement of the Faith and Order Commission of the W.C.C. (cited as LOUVAIN)
5. A similar, but expanded W.C.C. statement of 1982 (cited as LIMA)

In each case, the working parties who produced these five documents have been concerned to examine the doctrine of the Eucharist in the light of modern Biblical criticism, modern patristic and liturgical study and also as part of the ongoing tradition of the Christian Churches. Their relevance to this thesis becomes obvious at once.

The most encouraging factor to emerge from these

(1) The first four of these documents are conveniently published together: Modern Eucharistic Agreement, SPCK 1973. The fifth, The Lima Statement, is contained in full in 'Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry,' BCC 1982

studies is that in each and every case an attempt to go 'back to the New Testament' and 'back to the Fathers' has produced a level of shared understanding and ecumenical commitment in the formerly vexed area of Eucharistic doctrine which would have been all but unimaginable only a few years ago.

In this final section then, I propose to examine the evidence from the first three sections of this thesis, linking and contrasting it to the five ecumenical statements, under four main headings:

- i. The Messianic Banquet
- ii. The Eucharistic Presence of Christ
- iii. The Eucharistic Sacrifice
- iv. Symbol and Reality

(i) The Messianic Banquet

In each of the three main sections of this thesis it has been seen that the primitive setting of the Eucharist was a fellowship meal. In the ministry of Jesus, according to Mark, there were frequent 'communal meals' which, as only natural in a Jewish setting, could be invested with the form and value of a 'religious fellowship meal.' I have much criticised Leitzmann's 'Two Supper' theory, but I have also sought to show that in one vitally important respect Leitzmann would seem to have been right: the Eucharist was first and foremost a fellowship meal shared with the Messiah, the Risen Christ, as Host. It is an eschatological fore-taste of the Messianic Banquet.

In 1 Corinthians we can see St. Paul making the move which separated 'agape' from 'Eucharist' (if the anachronism be allowed). But that this division of 'fellowship meal' and 'sacrament' had no immediate universal effect is shown clearly by the Didache. Nonetheless, such a separation was almost inevitable. Firstly, sheer practical necessity would demand that the growing Church of the 3rd and 4th centuries could share in only a token fellowship meal.

Secondly, as the Church grew away from its Jewish origins it inevitably lost touch with the Jewish culture of 'religious fellowship meals' and indeed with the whole concept of the Messianic Banquet. The result was that greater stress came to be placed on the 'sacramental' aspect of the Eucharist. In other words, the presence of Christ was sought primarily, if not solely, in the eucharistic bread and wine. Thus the earlier doctrine of a fellowship meal shared with Christ was dropped and the emphasis came to be placed on the meal in which Christ gives himself as food.

It seems to me most important that such a development of doctrine should be seen as a 'development' and not an 'alteration'. As far as we can tell from the documents we have examined the eucharistic food has always, from the most primitive period of the Church's life, been referred to as the Body and Blood of Christ. In this sense the doctrine of the 4th century Fathers is purely development and not innovative. At the same time the virtual demise of the concept of the Eucharist as Messianic Banquet leads to a somewhat one-sided emphasis on the 'historicity' of the eucharistic action. Many writers blame this on a lack of eschatological expectation by the 4th century Fathers. This is, at best, only part of the truth. No-one can read the writings of, say, Cyril of Jerusalem, without being aware that he is acutely conscious of the 'eschatological' inbreaking of Christ. But it is a different approach to eschatology - and ultimately a different emphasis on the nature of the presence of Christ.

In the early NT and patristic period Christ is found in the Eucharist both as food and also as Host. Christ presides at the fore-shadowing of the Messianic Banquet. Thus he is present throughout the liturgical action. In the later period we meet the whole concept of 'the moment of consecration'. It is in this sense

that the doctrine of the first four centuries has developed and its development is at least partly the result of an inevitable demise of the concept of the Eucharist as Messianic Banquet.

I repeat, however, development is not alteration. The later Fathers are not to be condemned. For, remarkably, despite the changed circumstances, the Eucharist continued to be seen in some ways as the eschatological meal eaten with the Risen Christ. A firm line can be traced from the NT, through the Didache, Ignatius and Origen, leading to Augustine in which the Eucharist is seen as an eschatological meal shared with Christ.

But the eschatology does change. Cyril of Jerusalem sees the Eucharist as part of the ritual of the heavenly court. The central and deeply honoured and revered figure, in fact plays but a passive role.

The ARCIC statement notes that in the Eucharist we receive:

'a foretaste of the kingdom to come...when we gather around the same table in this communal meal at the invitation of the same Lord... we are one in commitment not only to Christ and to one another, but also to the mission of the Church in the world.'⁽¹⁾

Thus ARCIC links the ethical response of the Christian to the Eucharist, seen as a communal meal eaten with Christ.

The LES DOMBES statement takes up the theme of the Messianic Banquet and links it to the doctrine of the Resurrection:

'The Eucharist is the sacramental meal, the new paschal meal of God's people with Christ, which Christ having loved his disciples unto the end gave them before his death that they may celebrate it in the light of the resurrection until his coming.'⁽²⁾

(1) M.E.A., p.27

(2) M.E.A., p.57

Here we note the themes of Lord's Supper, communal meal, resurrection and anamnesis being held in an eschatological framework. In a later passage LES DOMBES specifically speaks of the Eucharist in terms of the Heavenly/Messianic Banquet:

'It is a joyful anticipation of the heavenly banquet, when redemption shall be fully accomplished and all creation shall be delivered from bondage.'⁽¹⁾

Thus we are reminded of the Johannine 'twin polarities of reality'.⁽²⁾ The 'hour of glory' that is the one event (though separated in time) of crucifixion - resurrection - giving of the Holy Spirit, has come. In the eucharistic anamnesis we are present in that 'hour'. But equally, as St. John stresses, the hour is 'not yet' because here and now we live by the lesser symbols of bread and wine which, used in anamnesis of the 'hour of glory' become the eschatological vehicles/symbols by which we share in greater reality which, for us, in time, is yet to be.

Developing this line of thought LES DOMBES perceives a most valuable insight into the ecumenical nature of the Eucharist. It is 'the ecumenical meeting place' because it is 'the eschatological meeting place.'⁽³⁾ Thus, because it is the eschatological sacrament the Eucharist is also the sacrament of unity. We have discovered this theme - with differing emphases - in several of the Fathers and the Liturgies, notably in St. John's Gospel, the Didache and St. Augustine. We shall return to this theme of the Eucharist as the Sacrament of Unity a little later.

The LES DOMBES statement, then, sees the Eucharist as a meal celebrated by the Risen Christ with his disciples. We are reminded of the fellowship meals celebrated by Jesus

(1) M.E.A., p.62

(2) v. above p.117f.

(3) M.E.A., p.62

during his ministry. The evangelists refer several times to these and particularly to the great Feeding Miracles, the symbolising of the Messianic Banquet, which are written up in clearly eucharistic terms.⁽¹⁾ Naturally the statements do not refer directly to the Feeding Miracles. NT criticism and exposition is not an immediate part of their brief. But they do make much of the newly re-discovered theme of the Messianic Banquet. It is possible that the LIMA document does in fact have the Feeding Miracles in mind in this passage:

'The Eucharist is precious food for missionaries, bread and wine for pilgrims on their apostolic journey.'
- LIMA 4.26⁽²⁾

Here we are reminded of the OT typology lying behind the accounts of the Feeding Miracles. The Church is the New Israel and God Feeds his Church just as he fed the people of Israel in the desert. This is the common theme of the Feeding Miracles, the Messianic Banquet and the Eucharist. God leads his people into the Promised Land - and he feeds them on the way. In this context we note that the LIMA report picks up the point of the tradition of a weekly Eucharist celebrated on Sunday - the 'eighth day' of the Fathers, the day of Resurrection, the day of new creation:

'As the Eucharist celebrates the resurrection of Christ, it is appropriate that it should take place at least every Sunday.' - LIMA 4.31⁽³⁾

The LOUVAIN statement also sees the Eucharist as foretaste of the Messianic Banquet and links this to the theme of our ethical response made in thanksgiving:

'The Eucharist is the great thanksgiving to the Father for everything which he accomplished in creation and redemption, for everything which he accomplishes now in the Church and in the world in spite

(1) e.g. v. above pp.67ff, 91ff, 110ff.

(2) B.C.C. p.10

(3) B.C.C., p.18

of the sins of men, for everything that he will accomplish in bringing his kingdom to fulfilment. Thus the Eucharist is the benediction (berakah) by which the Church expresses its thankfulness to God for all his benefits.'⁽¹⁾

Perhaps here we may detect a rediscovery of a Lucan-soteriology: salvation is the whole life and work of Christ, the 'exodus' brought about in him; thus we do not make anamnesis solely of the Cross, but of the whole saving work of Christ. So LOUVAIN links closely the themes of anamnesis and thanksgiving. It then links these to our ethical response:

'Reconciled in the Eucharist, the members of the body of Christ are servants of reconciliation amongst men and witnesses of the joy of resurrection.... The Eucharist is also the feast of the continuing apostolic harvest, where the Church rejoices for the gifts received in the world and welcomes every man of good will.'⁽²⁾

This last point picks up a major theme of the Messianic Banquet concept as presented in the gospels: Christ's work is not only for the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' but for all men everywhere. The Apostles are to go out and to compel men to come in (Luke 14.23). The Eucharist is a sacrament of salvation for all men - not, that is, anything approaching universalism, but an offering of salvation to all. None are excluded - unless they wish to exclude themselves. We noticed this as a possible approach to the Eucharist when discussing the meal on board ship before the account of the shipwreck in Acts 27.

Wainwright comments:

(1) M.E.A., p.84

(2) M.E.A., p.87

'Knowing that God is inviting all men to the feasting in the final Kingdom, the church may be confident that it is the divine will that as many as possible should be brought to enjoy already the meal which is the sign of that feasting.'⁽¹⁾

Indeed Wainwright is prepared to interpret Luke 14.23 as a command to 'compel' all men to join in the eucharistic celebration - a completely 'open-table'! But we need to remember here that the theme of the Messianic Banquet contains not only the idea of a universal invitation, but also the idea of an 'exclusiveness'. The Lucan account of the Great Banquet (Luke 14, 15-24) assumes that those who have refused the invitation will be shut out and unable to taste of the Banquet (Luke 14.24). The Matthean parallel of the Wedding Feast (Matthew 22, 1-10) is immediately followed by the parable of the Wedding Garment (22, 11-14), where the man who is unprepared is thrown out of the company of feasters. Similarly we may think of the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins. (Matthew 25, 1-13).

In those texts which we have examined in this thesis there seems throughout the tradition to be a note of 'exclusiveness' to balance that of 'universal invitation'. There is the demand for holiness to balance the free offer of salvation. Our ethical response of thanksgiving is a necessary concomitant - though not a pre-condition - of the gift of grace in Christ. The whole background of the Old Testament covenant is at once both a gracious response on God's behalf to men and also a call to an ethical response of holy living in thanksgiving to God on behalf of men. From at least the 3rd century onwards the Church took every care to exclude even the catechumens from the sacramental rite itself. In 1 Corinthians Paul takes great care to point out that those who share in the New Covenant Meal are bound also to live by the ethical demands of that Covenant.

(1) Wainwright, op.cit., p.130

The rediscovery of the Messianic Banquet theme perhaps goes a good way towards rediscovering the more primitive eucharistic discipline as outlined above. True, the Messianic Banquet is for all - in that all are invited; but equally truly, only some will be prepared to make the necessary response of holiness and so share in the Banquet given by the Risen Christ. The 'exclusivity' of the Eucharist is a necessary discipline in that in the Eucharist the Church meets with her Risen Master:

'The eucharist is the feast at which the Church gives thanks to God... and joyfully celebrates and anticipates the coming of the Kingdom in Christ.' - LIMA 4.22⁽¹⁾

This reminds us of the primitive use of the prayer 'marana tha' used by Paul at the end of 1 Corinthians and in the Didache. In the Eucharist the Lord comes with his Kingdom in which we share the eschatological feast.

I do not believe we can overstress the importance of the rediscovery of the Eucharist as an eschatological meal shared with Christ, at which, as in the meal at Emmaus, indeed as in the Last Supper itself, Christ is the 'president'. It is Christ who breaks the bread and pours out the wine as a symbol of the reality of his broken body and shed blood.

Time and again in this study we have seen that the NT and the Fathers alike speak of the Eucharist in eschatological terms. At the beginning of this section I attempted a brief outline of what I called the 'development' of eschatological thought from the NT to the 4th century. It is necessary to pick this up again and take it a little further.

As I wrote earlier, it is a commonplace of patristic study to point out that the first four centuries witness a

(1) B.C.C., p. 10

demise of eschatological expectation. Doubtless this is true. But with regard to Eucharistic doctrine I believe we have evidence of something more subtle than a mere fading of eschatological hope. Hand in hand with the disappointment of such hopes in terms of the final parousia, came a contrary approach to the Eucharist; that of the reality of the eucharistic gift, a great sense of awe in the presence of the very present Crucified and Risen Lord. In the second section of this final part we shall examine the doctrine of the eucharistic presence. As a preface to that, and a conclusion to our study of the Messianic Banquet, it is perhaps possible to examine this evolution of eschatological hope a little further.

The NT and the Fathers of the first two centuries seem to work on a scheme that is still perhaps best described by Dodd's phrase: 'realised eschatology'. Or, in view of the criticism of Dodd, perhaps we may say 'partially realised eschatology'. On this schema the Christ event is in some sense the ²ἐσχάτον. The world order under the power of evil, is broken up and defeated - even if the evidence for that defeat is not always at once obvious. Consequently from the point of the inbreaking of the Incarnate Christ up until the second inbreaking of Christ in the Final Consummation when 'all things shall be put in subjection under his feet,' the world and the Messianic Age co-exist uneasily. The Church is the bridge between the two. Hence the Church is the New Israel, sharing in Christ's priesthood and so in his work of salvation. The eucharistic anamnesis is that moment when, in the midst of the world, the Church becomes fully aware that, in terms of greater reality, she lives already in the Messianic Age. Hence the Eucharist is the Messianic Banquet - or at least a foretaste of it. In this sense the Eucharist is the means of sharing in the glory of the Final Consummation.

By the 4th century we find a rather different eschatological perspective. The Christ event is seen as the great act of salvation (this has not changed one whit) but it is an act in history and not the end of history. The end will not come until the final in-breaking of Christ in the ²εσχατο² which is the Final Consummation. The Church is still seen very much as the priesthood of God, offering sacrifice to the Father for the world. By means of the anamnesis, the historical work of Christ is renewed and made available to the Christian people. Here is the major eschatological shift. Gone is the concept of anamnesis as the moment when the Church realizes she is present at the Messianic Banquet. The concept of the Messianic Banquet is almost unmentioned in later writers. Instead the anamnesis is the moment when the historical Christ is eschatologically present to his people.

As I wrote earlier, this represents development and not change. The basic concepts of eschatology, anamnesis and salvation remain unchanged. Whether we look at the 1st or the 4th century we are reminded of Child's words on anamnesis:

'Israel in every generation remembers and so shares in the same redemptive time.'

and

'Israel's redemptive history continues in her memory as the past events of redeemed time call forth a new response and are again experienced.'⁽¹⁾

This could be echoed by nearly any of the patristic writers. The change of eschatological hope is one of perspective rather than an abandonment. Thus Origen, in many ways the most thorough-going of the 'allegorisers',

(1) Childs, cited above v.p.14

sought to rescue the eschatological perspective of the Eucharist from the twin dangers of a crude literalism or a gnostic 'spiritualizing'!⁽¹⁾ On this basis he can refer to the worshipper as

'He who keeps the feast with Jesus....
above in the great upper room.'

- In John 18.13

By this phrase, at a time when the interpretation of the Eucharist in terms of the Messianic Banquet would seem to have fallen out of general use, Origen is able to give it new and rich life - but it is a development of thought and not in precisely the same context as the New Testament thought.

Finally, it is noteworthy that, rather in line with the development of thought which I have attempted to outline, the modern ecumenical documents would not seem to make a great deal of the Eucharist as Messianic Banquet in sensu strictu. In the earliest approach, emerging from the OT background and running through Paul and the Didache into the second century, there is a sense in which, as suggested by the typology of the Messianic Banquet, the Eucharist is seen as a sacred meal eaten with Christ.' It is the Easter meal, the meal shared with the Christ of the Emmaus Road and by the Lakeside in the early morning.

Clearly, and for good reason, the concept of the Eucharist as a meal shared with Christ is subsumed in the concept of the meal in which Christ is himself the Bread of Life. St. John - and his great disciple Origen - strive to hold both concepts together. I am not certain whether modern statements on the Eucharist manage to do justice to both. And it seems to me that this insight is important in terms of symbol and reality. Christ is truly present whether we see him as the Host at the meal, who breaks bread for us, or whether we see him as the eucharistic

(1) v. above pp.171 - 181.

food on which we feed. In fact it is necessary to hold both views if we are not to tip the balance against either symbol or reality - and so lose sight of the objective reality of the eucharistic gift. In fairness to the documents they do all stress that Christ is present in a multi-form way. Even more importantly all the documents stress that the Eucharist is the anamnesis of the whole Heilsgeschichte. Christ is present: both Crucified and Risen. Christ is present: both as Host and Victim. It is to the nature of the eucharistic presence of Christ that we now turn.

(ii) The Eucharistic Presence of Christ

'When his people are gathered at the eucharist to commemorate his saving acts for our redemption, Christ makes effective among us the eternal benefits of his victory.' - ARCIC 1.3⁽¹⁾

In common with the NT and patristic writers ARCIC sees the Eucharist as the means of receiving the eternal benefits of Christ's victory by means of the eucharistic anamnesis. Implicit within these words of the ARCIC statement is the two-fold interpretation of anamnesis as having both a God-ward and a man-ward reference.⁽²⁾ We, the gathered body of Christ, 'commemorate the saving acts of our redemption'. The Eucharist is a proclamation of the salvation-history. But it is more. God acts in Christ so that 'Christ makes effective among us the eternal benefits of his victory.' The eucharistic anamnesis has also a God-ward reference in that the Eucharist continues to be the divinely appointed means whereby salvation may be offered to men. Whether a God-ward reference for anamnesis implies that we plead the death of Christ before the Father we shall examine in the third section under 'Sacrifice'.

(1) M.E.A., p.26

(2) v. above pp.19ff. for a discussion of 'ἀνάμνησις'

The eucharistic anamnesis is the basis for any understanding of the eucharistic presence of Christ:

'The real presence of his body and blood can only be understood within the context of the redemptive activity whereby he gives himself, and in himself reconciliation, peace and life, to his own. On the one hand, the eucharistic gift springs out of the paschal mystery of Christ's death and resurrection, in which God's saving purpose has already been definitely realised. On the other hand, its purpose is to transmit the life of the crucified and risen Christ to his body the Church, so that its members may be more fully united with Christ and with one another.'

ARCIC III.6⁽¹⁾

The anamnesis rests on the historical tradition of the salvation-history and of the Eucharist. We remember the historical Christ now eschatologically present. Thus we see the force of Paul's words in 1 Cor. 11.23 and 15.1 which give us firm assurance that he knew his account of the Last/Lord's Supper stood firmly within the continuing historical tradition. It is this historicity which gives the eucharistic anamnesis its objectivity. We 'remember' the Christ of faith - but he is one and the same as the historical Jesus.

In line with the later developments of Fathers such as Clement of Alexandria and Ambrose, ARCIC links the eucharistic presence of Christ to the work of the Holy Spirit, through the *ἐκκλησίας*. The earliest discussion, which we noticed, of the eucharistic relationship between the work of Christ and that of the Holy Spirit, was in Justin Martyr's First Apology. He speaks not of a Christ-Spirit Eucharist

(1) M.E.A., p.28

but (possibly) of a Logos-Eucharist⁽¹⁾ and draws an analogy between both Incarnation and Eucharist and also Creation and Eucharist. Later Fathers were to abandon Logos-theology and to develop the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, but Justin's earlier thought already shows that there can be no real dichotomy between Christ and the Logos/Holy Spirit. We cannot drive a wedge between the persons of the Trinity. Thus, for example, Irenaeus,⁽²⁾ through use of a logos-epiclesis, links the symbol and reality of eucharistic offering and eucharistic food.

We shall pick up the theme of Christ, Spirit and epiclesis in a moment. First, here are the relevant words from ARCIC:

'Through this prayer of thanksgiving, a word of faith addressed to the Father, the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit, so that in communion we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood.'

- ARCIC III.10⁽³⁾

Here we are reminded of Paul's concept of the *πνευματικὸν βρῶμα*. In the Eucharist we have *κοινωνία* in the reality of Christ through the Holy Spirit as we partake of the 'spiritual symbols' of bread and wine.

The LIMA document makes much the same points as ARCIC:

'The eucharist is essentially the sacrament of the gift which God makes to us in Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit.'

- LIMA 3.2⁽⁴⁾

(1) v. above pp. 135ff.

(2) v. above p. 450f.

(3) M.E.A. p.29

(4) pp. above pp. 40ff.

'Christ himself with all that he has accomplished for us and for all creation is present in this anamnesis, granting us communion with himself.' - LIMA 3.6⁽¹⁾

The LIMA document stresses the importance of the work of the Holy Spirit - thus being in line with much of the 3rd and 4th century patristic and liturgical thought:

'The Spirit makes the crucified and risen Christ really present to us in the eucharistic meal, fulfilling the promise contained in the words of institution.'
- LIMA 3.15⁽²⁾

'The whole action of the eucharist has an 'epikletic' character because it depends upon the work of the Holy Spirit.'
- LIMA 3.16⁽³⁾

von Allmen reminds us that it is the presence of the epiclesis which removes any trace of "magic" from the concept of the eucharistic presence of Christ:

'The immediate context of the epiclesis is that of the presence of Christ in worship. And the Church, the assembly, is totally dependent on God for this presence.... it cannot be induced it can only be besought. Maranatha! The epiclesis serves as a reminder that the Church is essentially praying, and not reigning in the Eucharist. The epiclesis makes the assembly clearly dependent on its Maranatha.'⁽⁴⁾

LES DOMBES echoes these words:

'The memorial.... implies the invocation of the Spirit (epiclesis). Christ, in his heavenly intercession, asks the

(1) B.C.C., p.7

(2) B.C.C., p.17

(3) B.C.C., p.17

(4) summary and quotation by McKenna, op.cit. p.160

Father to send his Spirit to his children.
And so the Church, living in the new
Covenant, prays with confidence for the
Spirit, in order to be renewed and
sanctified by the bread of life, led
in truth and strengthened to fulfil its
mission in the world.' - LES DOMBES IV.13⁽¹⁾

And this statement goes on to point out that it is the work
of the Spirit which 'makes Christ really present to us,
gives him to us and enables us to perceive him.'

- LES DOMBES IV 14⁽²⁾

The LOUVAIN statement supports everything we have
already stated and then goes on to contribute something
concerning the 'moment of consecration' problem:

'The consecration cannot be limited to
a particular moment in the liturgy. Nor
is the location of the epiclesis in
relation to the words of institution of
decisive importance.... In the early
liturgies the 'prayer action' was
thought of as bringing about the reality
promised by Christ. A recovery of such
an understanding may help to overcome
our differences concerning a special
moment of consecration.' - LOUVAIN 4.⁽³⁾

Thus in the modern statements we find the same
tension between the work of Christ and that of the Holy
Spirit as we noticed in the primitive doctrine from Paul
onwards. Writers in the 1st and 2nd century were able
to make the same doctrinal points concerning the
eschatological nature of the Eucharist and the reality
of the eucharistic presence of Christ by means of the
Logos concept. Origen⁽⁴⁾ can still interpret the

(1) M.E.A., p.59

(2) M.E.A., p.59

(3) M.E.A., p.87f

(4) v. above pp. 171ff.

eucharistic presence of Christ in terms of his use of a Logos-Christology. The use of a Logos-Christology fell out of favour for good reason as part of the necessary development of Christian doctrine. But it had one great advantage: it neither reduced the eucharistic role of Christ to one of passivity nor yet did it set up an apparent (though false) tension between the respective eucharistic roles of Christ and the Holy Spirit. It is this latter difficulty that we find later Fathers and liturgies trying to resolve - and perhaps, in a way, it is with us still.

The tension between the roles of Christ and Holy Spirit becomes more pronounced as the period of our study progresses since the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was developed and refined. This was especially true in the East where the eucharistic epiclesis becomes the expression of the theology of the Holy Spirit.⁽¹⁾

In fact, as has been said, it is unnecessary to contrast the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit in any opposing or polarised way. They are not in tension but complement one another. This is the position of those Fathers who saw the Spirit as operative in the ministry of Christ from Incarnation to Resurrection and, using this as the typology/analogy, went on to interpret the eucharistic presence of Christ in terms of the work of the Holy Spirit. J. Betz terms this the 'eucharistic incarnation principle'.

In this context it is worth citing McKenna's summary of Bobrinoskoy's work:

'The life of the Church is a continuing Pentecost which was only begun nineteen hundred years ago. In her daily life and especially in the Eucharist, the

(1) v. McKenna op.cit., p.164f.

(2) McKenna op.cit., p.166

Church lives in an attitude of invocation and expectation of the Holy Spirit which characterizes the period after the Ascension. But she also lives in a posture of receiving the 'real presence' of the Holy Spirit which characterizes Pentecost. The epiclesisparallels the ten days between the Ascension and Pentecost during which the disciples.... joyfully awaited the Paraclete which Christ had promised them. Thus in the eucharistic epiclesis the Church joins Christ's priestly intercessions in heaven, praying to God to bestow his Spirit on the gifts and upon the faithful.'⁽¹⁾

Thus Bobrinoskoy, from the liturgical angle, argues for a reciprocity between the presence of Christ and the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist. This has parallels with the patristic analogy of Incarnation and Eucharist.

None of this discussion about the various eucharistic roles of Christ and the Holy Spirit should blind us to the clear fact that the Fathers and Liturgies of the first four centuries are unanimously convinced that Christ is truly, really and actually present to his people in the Eucharist. The modern statements also unambiguously support this:

'Communion with Christ in the eucharist presupposes his true presence, effectually signified by the bread and wine which, in this mystery, become his body and blood.'

- ARCIC III 6.⁽²⁾

(1) McKenna, op.cit., p.168

(2) M.E.A., p.28

'The elements are not mere signs; Christ's body and blood become really present and are really given. But they are really present and given in order that, receiving them, believers may be united in communion with Christ the Lord.'

- ARCIC III 9.⁽¹⁾

'We affirm that in the sacrament of the Lord's supper Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is present wholly and entirely in his body and blood, under the signs of bread and wine.'

- SACRIFICE II 1.b.⁽²⁾

'We accordingly confess unanimously the real, living and effective presence of Christ in this sacrament.'

- LES DOMBES V 17.⁽³⁾

'Christ himself with all he has accomplished for us and for all creation.... is present in this anamnesis....'

- LOUVAIN 3⁽⁴⁾

Like the Fathers, the modern statements are agreed that Christ is truly present in the Eucharist. The reality of the Eucharist is Christ. What does this mean?

When examining St. Mark's doctrine of the Eucharist we noted Wainwright's comment on the recent modern exegesis of *σῶμα* and *αἷμα* :

'..... the field is left open for everything between the most crudely realistic and the most anaemically merely-symbolic interpretation.'⁽⁵⁾

It seems to me that an approach to the Eucharist along the lines of the primitive concept of 'symbol and reality' as found in, say, Augustine, Origen and St. John, can avoid Wainwright's dichotomy. We can see that, physically, the eucharistic bread and wine are bread and wine and remain bread and wine. But this is only on the level of the symbolic. In reality, through faith, because the

(1) M.E.A., p.28f

(2) M.E.A., p.40

(3) M.E.A., p.59

(4) M.E.A., p.84 - this is repeated verbatim in LIMA 3.6

(5) v. above p.59

eucharistic symbols are used to make anamnesis of the heilsgechichte, so, by the operation of the Holy Spirit they become the vehicles of the objective gift of the body and blood of Christ, they become ~~πνευματικον~~ βρωμα and πνευματικον πομα.

St. John⁽¹⁾ is especially concerned to stress the importance of holding together both symbol and reality. We live in the 'hour' that is 'not yet' but, through the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, we receive a foretaste of the glory that is yet to be. In do doing we experience the Word made flesh who is present in our Eucharist, and we may feed on him who is the bread of life.

Second century writers such as Justin and Irenaeus, in their fight against docetism and gnosticism, draw the analogy between the objective nature of the presence of Christ in the Incarnation and the objective reality of his presence in the eucharistic symbols.⁽²⁾ This suggests two clear natures or polarities which must be held together if we are to have an adequate eucharistic doctrine. The eucharistic symbols of bread and wine 'become' (cp. Justin's use of μεταβολη) the flesh and blood of Christ not in any sense that the symbol is subsumed, but in that the reality of the symbols is outmatched by the greater reality of the eucharistic gift. Indeed Irenaeus specifically speaks of the eucharistic bread as consisting of 'an earthly and a heavenly' reality. (A.H. 4. 18. 5.)⁽³⁾

In a similar way the modern documents take great care to stress that the presence of Christ is in no way restricted to the eucharistic bread and wine. This links us back to the concept of the Messianic Banquet. Thus we may read:

(1) v. above pp. 110ff.

(2) v. above p. 142

(3) v. above p. 142

'Christ is present and active, in various ways, in the entire eucharistic celebration. It is the same Lord who through the proclaimed word invites his people to his table, and who gives himself sacramentally in the body and blood of his paschal sacrifice.' - ARCIC III 7.⁽¹⁾

'We confess a manifold presence of Christ, the Word of God and Lord of the world. The crucified and risen Lord is present in his body, the people of God, for he is present where two or three are gathered in his name.' (Mt. 18.20)

'He is present in baptism, for it is Christ himself who baptizes. He is present in the reading of the Scriptures and the proclamation of the gospel. He is present in the Lord's supper.' - LES DOMBES II 1.a⁽²⁾

We may perhaps detect a primitive approach to the 'manifold presence of Christ in the Eucharist', in Luke's account of the Emmaus walk and meal⁽³⁾ where he sees salvation-history, the symbol/typology of the reality of the Christ-event, as being prefigured in the Scriptures and in their proclamation by Christ, and present in the gathered community and the act of breaking bread.

Luke's stress falls on the relationship between soteriology and the Eucharist. The Christ-event is salvation-event; the salvation worked by Christ is for all: poor, outcast, sinner and even Gentile. Thus, our examination of the eucharistic gift of Christ, leads us back to the discussion of 'universalism' versus 'exclusiveness' which we first touched on under the heading of the Messianic Banquet. It is inevitable

(1) M.E.A., p.28

(2) M.E.A., p.29

(3) v. above pp. 84ff

that it should do so, since the whole question of the eucharistic presence of Christ rests not on the minor premise that he is present to us in the Eucharist, but on the major premise that he is present so that we may participate in the salvation which he has won for us.

In this context the LIMA statement points us towards the theological rectitude of having an 'open table', since the offer of salvation is to all; and also we are reminded that the proclamation of the 'good news' is one vital part of the anamnesis:

'As it becomes one people, sharing the meal of the Lord, the eucharistic assembly must be concerned for gathering also those who are at present beyond its visible limits, because Christ invited to his feast all for whom he died. In so far as Christians cannot unite in full fellowship around the same table to eat the same loaf and drink from the same cup, their missionary witness is weakened at both the individual and the corporate levels.'

- LIMA 4.26⁽¹⁾

This links to the discussion on the Eucharist as the sacrament of unity raised during the examination of Augustine's thought.⁽²⁾ It seemed to be that Augustine holds that the Eucharist is both expressive of an already existing unity that is ours through faith and baptism, and also creative of a new and deeper unity. This, I suggested, fits in well with his distinction between symbol (sacramentum) and reality (res sacramenti) which results in the virtus sacramenti. Wainwright comments:

'In the past, it has almost always been the case that a serious disagreement of doctrine or practice has entailed a break in eucharistic fellowship.....'

(1) B.C.C., p.10

(2) v. above pp 214ff.

And we must not imagine that emotive talk of 'the open table' will change this - or indeed, that it necessarily should. As we saw when examining the concept of the Messianic Banquet there is a clear tradition of 'exclusivity' which has to be held together with the 'universal' invitation. Equally Mt. 5.23f could be and often has been cited in favour of the necessity of unity before we can share in the Eucharist. Writers such as the Didache, Ignatius and even Augustine himself can also speak in terms of exclusivity.

All the same, Augustine's development of the causative role of the Eucharist in bringing about unity needs to be given its proper weight. To return to Wainwright:

'It might be in better agreement with this principle if neither of the disputing groups celebrated the eucharist until such time as they were reconciled to one another and able to meet around the Lord's table together.... It might be argued from the eschatological perspective that the eucharist is more important for what it makes of us than for what it expresses as being already true of us....'(1)

To put the same argument in a different way and from different premises: the Eucharist gift is Christ himself who comes to bring us salvation and offer himself to us as spiritual food and drink. If we are truly to be incorporated in him and fed by him it is impossible for us at the same time to be separated from our brothers and sisters who are also 'in Christ'. Thus the very nature of the eucharistic gift demands of us much in the area of ecumenical thought and action. The presence of Christ, the offer of salvation, the objective gift of his body and blood,

(1) Wainwright, op.cit., p.142

demand our ethical response in thanksgiving.

Thus in the eucharistic statements we find outlined the same pattern of liturgical salvation experience as we found in the primitive liturgies: the prevenient Word of God summons his people so that through anamnesis and epiclesis they may share in communion with Christ and so offer themselves through Christ to the Father. This leads us to our third section: the eucharistic sacrifice.

(iii) The Eucharistic Sacrifice

In the first three sections of this thesis I have argued that in the mainstream of thought from the NT to Augustine, the eucharistic sacrifice was closely linked to the eucharistic anamnesis. The eucharistic sacrifice links together the once for all sacrifice of Christ on Calvary (together with its OT typologies) with Christ's eternal work as High Priest and also our own self-offering in response to Christ's sacrifice. As Clement of Rome writes in his otherwise prosaic letter:

'Jesus Christ (is) the High Priest by whom our gifts are offered.'

Similarly, Ignatius, writing to the Philadelphians, links the themes of unity, soteriology and the eucharistic sacrifice:

'There is but one body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup of union with his Blood, and one single altar of sacrifice....' (1)

The Lutheran-Catholic document states:

'The confessional documents of both traditions (Roman Catholic and Lutheran) agree that the celebration of the Eucharist is the Church's sacrifice of

(1) v. above p.125

praise and self-offering or oblation. Each tradition can make the following statement its own: "By him, with him and in Him who is our great High Priest and Intercessor we offer to the Father, in the power of the Holy Spirit, our praise, thanksgiving and intercession. With contrite hearts we offer ourselves as a living and holy sacrifice, a sacrifice which must be expressed in the whole of our daily lives."

- SACRIFICE I 1.b. ⁽¹⁾

Thus any suggestion that the eucharistic sacrifice is in any way a 're-sacrificing' of Christ is firmly rejected. This is in line with the NT and the Fathers. Even some of Irenaeus' phrases ⁽²⁾ which may suggest 'propitiatory sacrifice' are probably best understood in terms of a 'symbolic' re-presentation of the saving-event of Christ through those sacrifice we receive the grace of ἀνακεφαλαιωσις. Similarly, Clement of Alexandria ⁽³⁾ sees Christ both as High Priest and as sacrifice. Thus in sensu strictu we can offer nothing - except ourselves through the once for all sacrifice of Christ. But that sacrifice is re-presented eschatologically in the eucharistic anamnesis - not that we sacrifice, but that Christ offers the eternal sacrifice of himself. This seems to be the main stream interpretation of the later patristic writers and it seems to be an evolution of doctrine consistent with the Pauline presentation of Christ as the Christian Passover Lamb. Origen ⁽⁴⁾ draws on the Passover theme to interpret the Eucharist as 'the only memorial which makes God propitious to men.' But this is not to say that we offer a propitiatory sacrifice. On the contrary the one sacrifice which makes us acceptable to God is the once and for all sacrifice of Christ on

(1) M.E.A., p.37

(2) v. above p.145ff.

(3) v. above p.166ff.

(4) v. above p.178f.

Calvary, which is re-presented for us through the eschatological inbreaking of the Logos. At the same time it must also be remembered that Origen interpreted the eucharistic sacrifice primarily in terms of the individual Christian's personal inner-sacrifice.⁽¹⁾

The ARCIC document makes substantially the same points:

'There can be no repetition of or addition to what was then (i.e. on Calvary) accomplished once for all by Christ... Yet God has given the eucharist to his Church as a means through which the atoning work of Christ on the Cross is proclaimed and made effective in the life of the Church.' - ARCIC II.5⁽²⁾

So the concept of the eucharistic sacrifice is clearly linked to the NT concept of anamnesis:

'The notion of memorial as understood in the passover celebration at the time of Christ - i.e. the making effective in the present of an event in the past - has opened the way to a clearer understanding of the relationship between Christ's sacrifice and the eucharist. The eucharistic memorial is no mere calling to mind of a past event or of its significance, but the Church's effectual proclamation of God's mighty acts.' - ARCIC II.5⁽³⁾

Consequently the Church's role as the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is to make anamnesis of the 'totality of God's reconciling action in (Christ)', thereby being able to share in Christ's great High Priestly intercession and also in his act of sacrifice.

(1) v. above pp. 181ff.

(2) M.E.A., p.27

(3) M.E.A., p.27

In the 2nd century Justin Martyr, the first to give a proper theological treatment to the eucharistic sacrifice, argues strongly, by use of OT typology and anti-Jewish polemic, that only 'spiritual' sacrifice was truly Christian sacrifice.⁽¹⁾ Thus for Justin the Eucharist is itself a 'type', a symbol of the reality of the one sacrifice of Christ, the only true Passover Lamb; a soteriological reality present for us in the Eucharist as we, in thankful response, offer ourselves as a true spiritual sacrifice through Christ to the Father.

Later Cyprian of Carthage can speak clearly of Christ as High Priest.⁽²⁾ This links the themes of both sacrifice and the Messianic Banquet. In the Eucharist the true Priest is Christ himself, just as he is Host at the Messianic Banquet. In Cyprian's thought the Church offers Christ in that we make anamnesis of him who is in fact High Priest presiding over the eucharistic sacrifice. At the same time Cyprian's stress on the 'historical imitation' of the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary evolves away from earlier approaches, such as Justin's, towards what we may term 'historical/re-enactment' rather than the earlier 'anamnetic re-presentation'. This later approach reaches a climax in the thought of Cyril of Jerusalem. But modern statements would seem to shy away from any suggestion of 'historical re-enactment'.

Thus the ARCIC statement reads:

'In the eucharistic prayer the Church continues to make a perpetual memorial of Christ's death, and his members, united with God and one another, give thanks for all his mercies, entreat the benefits of his passion on behalf of the whole Church, participate in these benefits and enter into the movement of his self-offering.' - ARCIC II.5⁽³⁾

(1) v. above p.138ff.

(2) v. above, p.186

(3) M.E.A., p.27f

This is much more in terms of 'anamnetic - re-presentation' than of 'historical re-enactment'. Does it however suggest any concept of the Eucharist as propitiatory sacrifice?

In an examination of the anamnesis concept⁽¹⁾ we noted that discussion has centred around two polarities: that the eucharistic anamnesis is a 'reminder' to God of his Messiah and that it is a proclamation to man of the saving work of Christ. I suggest that we need to hold both polarities together. Some theologians, however, are much concerned that an interpretation of anamnesis with a God-ward reference implies that the Church is as it were 'standing in the gap' and mediating between God and his Christ. Any such interpretation is clearly to be rejected and, in fact, I suggested that the God-ward reference of the anamnesis is in fact part and parcel of the petition 'Thy Kingdom come'. We do not stand between God and Christ; rather we, the Body of Christ, are found in Christ who died for us and intercedes for us with the Father. The prayer of oblation in the Eucharist may well be cast in the terms of the hymn by William Bright - himself a patristic scholar:

'Look Father, look on his anointed face
And only look on us as found in him.'

The ARCIC statement seems to be in line with some such interpretation of the God-ward reference of anamnesis and of the eucharistic sacrifice:

'There can be no repetition of or addition to what was then accomplished once for all by Christ.... Yet God has given the Eucharist to his Church as a means through which the atoning work of Christ on the cross is proclaimed and made effective in the life of the Church.'

- ARCIC II.5⁽²⁾

(1) v. above, pp. 19ff.

(2) M.E.A., p.27

LES DOMBES makes the same point:

'Making the memorial of the passion, resurrection and ascension of Christ, our High Priest and Mediator, the Church presents to the Father the one perfect sacrifice of his Son and asks him to accord every man the benefit of the great work of redemption it proclaims.' - LES DOMBES III.10⁽¹⁾

Thus the eucharistic sacrifice can also be seen in terms of the anamnesis/proclamation of the victory of Christ. Only one document appears to speak of this victory in NT terms as the Christian Passover. The LOUVAIN statement opens by stating:

'The eucharist is the sacramental meal, the new paschal meal of the people of God.....' - LOUVAIN 1.⁽²⁾

We are reminded of Paul's words at 1 Cor. 5.7:

'For our Passover also has been sacrificed, even Christ.'

And also of Mark 10.45 (cp. 14.24): the Eucharist is the anamnesis of the sacrifice offered for all.⁽³⁾

By the end of the 2nd century Clement of Alexandria can link the salvation of the true gnostic with the necessity of the ethical self-offering:

'We glorify him who gave himself in sacrifice for us, we also sacrificing ourselves.' - STROM 7.3⁽⁴⁾

The LIMA document in three separated paragraphs also sets out this classic interpretation of the eucharistic sacrifice in terms of anamnesis and self-offering:

'The eucharist is the great sacrifice of praise by which the Church speaks on behalf of the whole creation. For the

(1) M.E.A., p.58

(2) M.E.A., p.83

(3) v. above pp60ff.

(4) v. above pp.166ff

world which God has reconciled is present at every eucharist: in the bread and wine, in the persons of the faithful, and in the prayers they offer for themselves and for all people. Christ unites the faithful with himself and includes their prayers with his own intercession so that the faithful are transfigured and their prayers accepted. This sacrifice of praise is possible only through Christ, with him and in him.'

- LIMA 3.4⁽¹⁾

'The eucharist is the sacrament of the unique sacrifice of Christ, who ever lives to make intercession for us..... What it was God's will to accomplish in the incarnation, life, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, God does not repeat.... In the memorial of the eucharist however, the Church offers its intercession in communion with Christ, our great High Priest.'

- LIMA 3.8⁽²⁾

'In Christ we offer ourselves as a living and holy sacrifice in our daily lives; this spiritual worship, acceptable to God, is nourished in the eucharist, in which we are sanctified and reconciled in life, in order to be servants of reconciliation in the world.'

- LIMA 3.10⁽³⁾

We are reminded of St. Paul's words at 1 Cor. 5.7:

'Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are unleavened. For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ.'

⁽⁴⁾

(1) B.C.C., p.7
(2) B.C.C., p.8
(3) B.C.C., p.8
(4) v. above p.16ff

St. John⁽¹⁾ also stresses the necessity for our self-offering in the Eucharist when he places the account of the Foot Washing at the very point where we should expect the Institution Narrative. Further, according to Johannine dating, Jesus is the true Paschal Lamb. We, his followers, are incorporate with him as branches in the vine (John 15). We are to serve as he served. We are acceptable to the Father only in him.

In this context of self-sacrificial love, we are reminded also of Ignatius's stress on the necessity for unity in the eucharistic assembly.⁽²⁾ The LIMA document⁽³⁾ also expresses the hope that one day 'Christ'sx divided people will be visibly united around the Lord's Table' - LIMA 4.33.

Thus, through the eucharistic bread and wine offered in anamnesis of the saving work of God in Christ, in our response to that work by thanksgiving and self-offering, the Church becomes what she already is, the Body of Christ. Augustine speaks to us:

'You are on the table, you are in the chalice.'

- C.D. X.6

It is in terms of the eucharistic sacrifice that we discover the liturgical necessity for the whole Body of Christ (the Church) to share in the act of thanksgiving, anamnesis and self-offering. This is the whole thrust of the primitive liturgies in which all take their proper part. This is why I Clement stresses the need for proper liturgical discipline in which all the various orders can fulfil their liturgies.⁽⁴⁾ Only so can we offer the full eucharistic sacrifice. Only so can we know that we are acceptable to the Father through the offering of Christ. Only so can we have communion in the real gift of Christ through the eucharistic symbols. It is to the relation

(1) v. above pp. 108 f

(2) v. above pp. 125ff

(3) B.C.C., p. 10

(4) v. above p. 122

between symbol and reality that we turn in the final section.

(iv) Symbol and Reality

Time and again throughout this thesis we have come back to the question of the relationship in the eucharist between symbol and reality. In a sense it has underlain all that has been written. It is my contention that a full and fruitful understanding of the Eucharist is only possible when both symbol and reality are held together in terms of the eschatological inbreaking of Christ. In particular I find this to be true of the concept of the eucharistic anamnesis.

The Lutheran-Roman Catholic statement examines this whole area of thought when discussing the nature of the eucharistic presence of Christ:

'Through the centuries Christians have attempted various formulations to describe this presence. Our confessional documents have in common affirmed that Jesus Christ is 'really', 'truly' and 'substantially' present in this sacrament.... Our traditions have spoken of this presence as 'sacramental', 'supernatural' and 'spiritual'. These terms have different connotations in the two traditions, but they have in common a rejection of a spatial or natural manner of presence, and a rejection of an understanding of the sacrament as only commemorative or figurative.'

- SACRIFICE II.1.c⁽¹⁾

Similarly in the 3rd century Tertullian⁽²⁾ can happily hold together highly literalist language concerning

(1) M.E.A., p.40

(2) v. above pp. 151ff

the nature of the eucharistic gift and also speak of the 'figure' which Christ represents in the bread. In John McQuarrie's terminology: 'Being manifests itself in being.'

In other words the eucharistic presence of Christ - in the Word, in the Church, in the elements - is a real presence, but a symbolic presence. The symbols are the vehicles of the reality - but they are never more than symbols; the reality is presented through the symbols - but it is never less than reality. The symbol is the vehicle of reality because of the action of the Church in the anamnesis and of the Holy Spirit in the epiclesis. In the power of the Spirit Christ inbreaks eschatologically and enables his Church to share his saving work. Therefore we can offer ourselves in sacrifice and intercession and look forward to the final consummation.

Thus Justin Martyr who can speak of a 'change' (*μεταβολη*) in the eucharistic elements, and goes on to speak of the 'eucharistized food' in highly realist terms, also draws the analogy between Eucharist and Incarnation precisely in an attempt to combat patripassianism and docetism. This would suggest that he considered it of the greatest importance that the eucharistic bread and wine was not considered simply to 'disappear'. Rather, through the work of the Logos in response to the prayer of the redeemed community, the elements are 'changed' in that they become the symbolic vehicles of the reality of redemption.

In the 4th century Cyril of Jerusalem, while still using the (by then) traditional language of 'type' and 'figure', removes any importance from them and suggests that the 'symbol' is of such lesser importance than the 'reality' as virtually to cease to exist.⁽¹⁾ The real

(1) v. above p. 197ff

difficulty with such an evolution of eucharistic doctrine is that it accords Christ an almost passive role⁽¹⁾ and at the same time the symbol of the liturgical action can come to be seen as a 'reality' of historical re-enactment. In turn this could mean that the liturgy becomes a static 'ritual' rather than a dynamic 'action'. Also such a 'monophysite' approach to the Eucharist is in an important sense a denial of true incarnation - the whole point of which is that the two natures of Christ, human and divine, are both entirely real, though experienced in differing ways, and are firmly held together to bring about atonement.

LES DOMBES picks up our argument:

'Christ's act being the gift of his body and blood, that is to say of himself, the reality given in the signs of the bread and wine is his body and his blood. It is by virtue of Christ's creative word and by the power of the Holy Spirit that the bread and wine are made a sacrament and hence a 'sharing of the body and blood of Christ.' (1 Cor. 10.16)

'They are henceforth, in their ultimate truth, beneath the outward sign, the given reality....' - LES DOMBES V.19⁽²⁾

Commenting on the term 'sign' SACRIFICE states:

'The term 'sign', once suspect, is again recognised as a positive term for speaking of Christ's presence in the sacrament. For though symbols and symbolic actions are used, the Lord's supper is an effective sign: it communicates what it promises.'

- SACRIFICE II 1.c⁽³⁾

(1) v. above p.196

(2) M.E.A., p.60

(3) M.E.A., p.40

This is echoed by the ARCIC document:

'The elements are not mere signs; Christ's body and blood become really present and are really given. But they are really present and given in order that, receiving them, believers may be united in communion with Christ the Lord.' - ARCIC III.9⁽¹⁾

If I understand the force of this last paragraph correctly it is that both symbol and reality in the Eucharist have to be held together in tension. In this context we can appreciate Origen's divisions of interpretation into literal, moral and spiritual⁽²⁾ which enables Origen to speak forcefully both on the literal real presence of Christ in the sacrament and also of that same presence as 'the nourishing word of truth.'

- (In John. 22.24.16)

The eucharistic symbols are vehicles of the reality of the saving-event of Christ. Second century writers such as Ignatius⁽³⁾ could not have used more uncompromising language concerning the reality of the eucharistic presence of Christ. And yet Ignatius will not see the eucharistic action as 'magic'. Even the difficult phrase 'φαρμακον ζωωντων' should be seen in terms of his stress on the objectivity of the soteriological gift in the Eucharist.

The LIMA document makes substantially the same point as Ignatius:

'The eucharist is essentially the sacrament of the gift which God makes to us in Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit. Every Christian receives this gift of salvation through communion in the body and blood of Christ.' LIMA 3.2⁽⁴⁾

(1) M.E.A., p.28

(2) v. above p.173

(3) v. above pp.124ff.

(4) B.C.C., p.7

And in this same line of thought Daly can speak of Origen's approach to the Eucharist as drawing on the 'metahistorical, triple dimension of the Passover.'⁽¹⁾ In other words, the historical saving event of Christ is made available to all men throughout time since it is the eschatological, anamnestic representation of the Heilsgeschichte.

Thus we find in modern ecumenical thought the same necessary stress on symbol and reality as we found most clearly in St. John: the same attempt to vocalise the eschatological mystery of the hour that is 'now' and 'not yet'; the same stress on the 'glory' of the inbreaking into time of the eternal Messianic Banquet; the same stress on the inter-relationship between Christ's self-offering and ours; the same stress on the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, balanced by the same stress that 'the flesh profiteth nothing.'

So it is that, thanks to the labours of generations of scholars, to whom this thesis bears but a scant and partial witness, we are able to go back through the Fathers to the New Testament, and to see, as it were for the first time, something of the glorious mystery of redemption which is enacted and memorialised in the Eucharist and in which it is our privilege to share. Renewed by the eucharistic $\kappa\omicron\lambda\upsilon\omega\nu\tau\iota\varsigma$ we are able to re-form and re-new the Body of Christ as we are united in a common worship of the Crucified and Risen Lord who is our High Priest and who is present to us in the eschatological symbol that is at once the reality of the inbreaking of the Kingdom of God in the Messianic Banquet. Let these words of Bishop Michael Ramsey stand at the end of this study as representative of both my thought and prayer:

(1) Daly, op.cit., p.114

'Past, present, future. Nowhere more than in the Eucharist is this unity apparent. In the eucharistic rite the death of the Lord is recalled into the present while the Christian feeds upon the living Jesus who is the bread of heaven, and anticipates the future in prayer: Lord come.'⁽¹⁾

Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus.

(1) A.M. Ramsey, 'Jesus and the Living Past', Hale Lectures 1978, OUP 1980, p.8

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AUDET J.P. La Didache, Instruction des Apotres,
Etudes Bibliques, Paris 1958
- Literary Forms & Contents of a
Normal *Evangelion* in the First
Century in The Gospels Reconsidered,
Oxford, Blackwell, 1960
- AUGUSTINE City of God, ed. D. Knowles, Penguin,
1972
Confessions, trans. R.S. Pine-Coffin,
Penguin, 1961
- BARRETT C.K. Jesus & the Gospel Tradition, SPCK,
1967
St. John, SPCK, 1965
- BAUER W. Orthodoxy & Heresy in Earliest
Christianity, N.T. Library, SCM 1972
- BAUMSTARK A. Comparative Liturgy (ET), Mowbray,
1958
- BELL & DEISSMANN (ed) Mysterium Christi, Longmans, 1930
- BETTENSON The Early Christian Fathers, OUP, 1956
- BLACK M. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels &
Acts, 3rd edtn., Oxford, 1967
- BOOBYER J.H. The Miracle of the Loaves and the
Gentiles in St. Mark's Gospel,
Scottish Journal of Theology, 6,
1953, pp. 77-87
- BORNKAMM G. Early Christian Experience, N.T.
Library, SCM, 1969
- BOUYER L. Life and Liturgy, Sheed and Ward, 1956.
- BRITISH COUNCIL OF CHURCHES 'Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry,' 1982.
- BRILIOTH Y. Eucharistic Faith & Practice:
Evangelical and Catholic, SPCK, 1930
- BROWN P. Augustine of Hippo, Faber & Faber, 1967
- BRUCE F.F. The Book of the Acts, London, 1968
- BULTMANN R. Theology of the N.T., Vols. I & II,
SCM, 1952.
- CAIRD G.B. St. Luke, Pelican N.T. Commentaries,
1963.

- CHADWICK H. The Early Church, Pelican History of the Church, 1964
- CHILDS B.S. Memory & Tradition in Israel, S.B.Th. 37, SCM. Press, 1964.
- CLARK A.C. The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts
- CLEMENTS R.E. Prophecy and Covenant, S.B.Th. 43, SCM 1965
- COLE A. The Body of Christ, Christian Foundations Series, Hodder & Stoughton, 1964.
- CRANFIELD C.E.B. St. Mark, Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary, CUP. 1966.
- CREED J.M. The Gospel According to St. Luke, Macmillan, 1969.
- CROSS F.L.(ed.) St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on THE Christian Sacraments, SPCK, 1951
- CULLMAN W.D. Early Christian Worship, Studies in Bib. Theol., 1st Series, SCM. 1953.
- DALY R.J. The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, D.L.T., 1978
- DAVIES W.D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 3rd edtn. SPCK, 1970
- DEISS L. It's the Lord's Supper, Eucharist of Christians, Collins, 1980.
- DIX G. The Shape of the Liturgy, Dacre Press, 1945.
- DODD C.H. Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, CUP. 1965.
- The Parables of the Kingdom, Nisbett, 1961.
- EVERY G. Basic Liturgy, London, 1961.
- FILSON F.V. The New Testament against its Environment, Studies in Bib. Theol. No. 3, SCM. 1950.
- FREND W.H.C. The Early Church, Hodder & Stoughton, 1965.
- FRERE W.H. The Anaphora, London, 1938.

- GASQUE & MARTIN (ed.) Apostolic History & The Gospel, Paternoster, 1970.
- GORE C. The Body of Christ, John Murray, 1901.
- HARRISON D.E.W. Common Prayer in the C. of E., SPCK, 1969.
- HICKS C.N. The Fulness of Sacrifice, SPCK, 1930
- HIGGINS A.J.B. The Lord's Supper in the N.T., London, 1952
- HOOKE N. The Eucharist in the N.T., London, 1964.
- HOOKE & HICKLING (eds.) What about the N.T.? SCM. 1975.
- HOSKYNNS E.C. The Fourth Gospel, Faber & Faber, 1945.
- HOWARD W.F. The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation, London 1931
- JASPER & CUMING (eds.) Prayers of the Eucharist Early and Reformed (PEER) Collins, 1975.
- JONES, WAINWRIGHT, YARNOLD (eds.) The Study of Liturgy, SPCK, 1978 (Liturgy)
- JEREMIAS J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, N.T. Library, SCM. 1966.
- JONES D.R. ἄναμνησις in the LXX and the interpretation of 1 Cor. 11.25. J.T.S., Vol. VI, 1955, pp.183 - 191
- KÄSEMANN E. Essays on N.T. Themes, S.B. Theol. 41
- KELLY J.N.D. Early Christian Doctrines, 4th edtn., A.C. Black, 1968.
- Early Christian Creeds, 3rd edtn., Longman, 1972.
- KILMARTIN E.J. The Eucharist in the Primitive Church, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965.
- LAMBERT J.C. The Sacraments in the N.T., T. & T. Clark, 1903.
- LIBRARY OF CHRISTIAN CLASSICS Vols. I - VIII, SCM.
- LIETZMANN H. A History of the Early Church, Vols. 1-4, London, 1961.

- LIETZMANN H. Mass & The Lord's Supper, (E.T.),
Leiden, 1953-76
- LIGHTFOOT R.H. St. John's Gospel, OUP, 1960.
- LOHMEYER E. The Lord's Prayer, Collins, 1965
- MACDONALD The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy
Communion, Heffer & Sons, 1930
- MACQUARRIE J. Principles of Christian Theology,
SCM, 1966
- Paths in Spirituality, SCM., 1972.
- McADOO H.R. (ed.) Modern Eucharistic Agreement, SPCK,
1973.
- McKENNA J.H. Eucharist & Holy Spirit, SPCK, 1975
- MARSH J. Saint John, Penguin, 1968
- MARSHALL I.H. Last Supper & Lord's Supper, Paternoster,
1980.
- MARXSEN W. The Resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth.
- MIGNE Patrologia Graeca.
Patrologia Latina.
- MOULE C.F.D. The Origin of Christology, CUP, 1977.
- MOULTON A Grammar of N.T. Greek, Vol.III,
T. & T. Clark.
- NINEHAM D.E. St. Mark, Penguin, 1963
- OESTERLEY The Jewish Background of the Christian
Liturgy, Clarendon Press, 1925.
- POCKNEE C. The Eucharist across the Centuries,
C.L.A., 1979.
- PRESTIGE G.L. Fathers & Heretics, SPCK, 1968.
- RACKHAM R.B. The Acts of the Apostles, Methuen, 1912.
- von RAD The Message of the Prophets, SCM. 1968.
- RAMSEY M. Jesus & the Living Past, OUP. 1980.
- RICHARDS H.J. The Miracles of Jesus, Collins, 1975.

- RICHARDSON A. An Introduction to the Theology of the N.T., SCM, 1972
- (ed.) A Theological Word Book of the Bible, (TWBB) SCM, 1972
- RICHARDSON R.D. The Place of Luke in the Eucharistic Tradition in The Gospels Reconsidered, Blackwell, 1960.
- ROBERTSON & PLUMMER 1 Corinthians, I.C.C., T. & T. Clark, 1929.
- ROBINSON J.A.T. The Earliest Liturgical Sequence? Stud. Bib. Theol. 10, SCM. 1969
- The New Look on the Fourth Gospel in The Gospels Reconsidered, Blackwell, 1960.
- The Body, SCM, 1977
- ROWLEY H.H. Worship in Ancient Israel, SPCK, 1967.
- The Faith of Israel, SCM, 1970.
- RUEF Paul's First Letter to Corinth, SCM, 1977.
- The SEBOLS and Christianity, SPCK Theol. Collections 1969
- SRAWLEY J.H. The Early History of the Liturgy, Cambridge, 1947.
- STANIFORTH Early Christian Writings, Penguin.
- STEVENSON J. A New Eusebius, SPCK, 1968.
- Creeds, Councils & Controversies, SPCK, 1972.
- STONE D. History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, Vols. I & II, London 1909.
- TAYLOR V. St. Mark, Macmillan, 1952.
- van UNNIK W.C. The Purpose of St. John's Gospel in The Gospels Reconsidered, Blackwell, 1960.
- VERMES G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, Penguin, 1968.
- WAINWRIGHT G. Eucharist & Eschatology, Epworth, 1971.

WAND J.W.C.

The Early Church, Mowbray.

WESTCOTT B.F.

St. John, Clark, 1958

WHITELEY D.E.H.

The Theology of St. Paul, Blackwell,
1964.

WILES M.

The Christian Fathers, Hodder &
Stoughton, 1966.

The Remaking of Christian Doctrine,
SCM, 1974.

