

Translation of Tillard by F. W. Burridge.

(superseded by Bishop Clarke's revised version)

Introductory note to the English version

In working out this English version of J.M.R. Tillard's paper it would have been possible to produce something in a language only 'understanded' of the theologian academic - after all the paper is a splendid piece of academic work suitably written in the original. It seemed to me however that to do so would be a failure to communicate with a very much wider potential readership who have a right to read the findings of our ecumenical theologians in particular, even if they lack some theological equipment. Theologians perhaps do not always realise that they are living in a world in which half the people do not know how the other half think. Hence a good many unfortunate misunderstandings created, much light concealed under bushels and many a valuable piece of writing put down in disgusted incomprehension.

The academics would be surprised to find how few of the People of God - even amongst those whose profession would suggest the contrary and those who ought to read this paper - know what res and res tantum etc. is all about. In an attempt to make the paper readable therefore to many more people I have avoided as far as possible a technical bookish approach, inserted parentheses to carry the reader over technical stiles and added some footnotes. I beg the academics to believe that even the most elementary additional information has been added with this 'pastoral' awareness, all the less hesitatingly since an academic recently took me by the sleeve and confided that he could not quite place Apostolicae Curae.

But in case there is any fear that my plebian intrusions should soil the academic finery I have been careful to put my parentheses in distinguishing square brackets, numbered my footnotes with an 'a' (thus 14a on the scholastic sacramental terminology) and, to protect Father Tillard's good name, have initialed them "W.B."

William Burridge, W.F.

This study is a somewhat extended version of a working paper prepared for the meeting at Windsor of the Anglican-Roman Catholic Theological Commission in 1970, to serve as a basis for the discussion on the Eucharist. The Commission subsequently issued a statement of substantial agreement between Anglicans and Roman Catholics on that subject.

At the present time fairly wide consensus is emerging pretty well everywhere on the Eucharist. It may therefore come as a surprise to find that an attempt to draw up a precise statement of common grounds of belief between the Roman Catholic tradition and the Anglican tradition regarding the Lord's Supper, with an eye to ultimate organic unity, encounters difficulties which there can be no question of playing down.

The first of these difficulties comes from the conditions in which theologians have to do their work. On the one hand, the unsparing theological research conducted by Roman Catholics and by Anglicans leads to an identical outlook, solidly based and bearing on deeply significant issues. On the other hand, the results thus achieved are not finding their way into the approved official teaching of the Churches or at best are only slowly infiltrating. (1) They simply rank as opinions. This is a particularly sensitive point on the Roman Catholic side. In these circumstances the theologians entrusted with working out a common statement are left with an uphill task on their heads. It amounts to this. As far as their theological expertise is concerned certain issues which were a source of division in the

past have now been resolved, thanks to a new overall approach to the factual Eucharistic data; but despite this they have to go on finding ways and means of showing that the traditional belief of their respective Churches is safeguarded in the common statements they, the theologians, elaborate. As long as the relationship between theology and official teaching remains what it is, this has to be faced up to; otherwise any unity ultimately reached would rest on a totally fruitless compromise instead of blossoming into the genuine koinonia^(1a) of faith and life which we must envisage. It is no use having a consensus to which you merely append your signature: it has got to be a thing you live by. This means that its contents must be such that they can be absorbed into the preaching and catechetics of both communities⁽²⁾. There is no denying that in constraining the theologians in this way to work on their findings with one eye on current and traditional teaching, the ecclesiastical authorities are doing the cause of unity a considerable service: it means that the consensus is tied up less with ~~new~~ drawing up of ^{new} theological formulae and more with throwing light on the implications for faith in practice, which people often misunderstand or just do not know about. This approach eliminates the danger of falling for unity on the cheap.

But the dialogue between Anglicans and Roman Catholics comes up against yet another kind of obstacle. For the lines of cleavage are often found within each of the two Churches and it is less the Churches as such that take sides over an issue as people from both of them, lined up according to their particular reading of the data of faith or their own type of Churchmanship. This is found amongst Roman Catholics but it is mostly verifiable in the Anglican body where the "Catholic wing" and the "evangelical wing" go their own separate ways over the central doctrine of the Eucharist. Anglican comprehensiveness often ^{puts} finds the Roman Catholic theologian in a position

where he is confronted with two conflicting outlooks. He may feel in full agreement with one of them - not necessarily the "Catholic" one - but be left wondering how far such an agreement really goes to the heart of the Anglican tradition. One is thus forced to envisage consensus ^{as} ~~at~~ it were at two levels - the first of which is within the Anglican Church (the kind of problem that prompted the work of the authors of Growing into Union ⁽³⁾), but also to admit that there is a certain 'comprehensiveness' within the Roman Catholic Church, not indeed in the sense of detracting from the axis of its common faith nor of consenting to an equivocal minimalism, but all the same leaving room for variants of interpretation and practice.

This last point seems to me to be a crucial one. Surely in the perspective of the Roman Catholic Church's universal ecumenical activity the chances of successful dialogue with the Anglican Church must play a decisive role, for contact through dialogue, with Anglicans, because of the very nature of Anglicanism, can serve to bring out an official readiness to investigate the content of Roman Catholic data in terms of a healthy pluralism. ⁽⁴⁾ It may well be that up to the present, in its dialogue with Anglicanism, the Roman Catholic Church has counted too exclusively on strong and self-evident affinities with the Catholic wing and has not paid sufficient attention to the claims of the Evangelicals. Yet there can be neither meaning nor prospects for the union of the Roman and Anglican Churches as things stand today - quite a different situation from past centuries - unless, far from provoking new ruptures, it implies the union of the totality of both Churches.

It will, therefore, be readily understood that the consensus on the Eucharist which we are seeking cannot aim at showing that the two Churches proclaim and do the same thing at every point and with one voice. In any case, that is not required for unity. It is on the axis of a common faith and not on uniformity of practice and of doctrinal exposition that unity must be

built, though, of course, the demarcation between faith and doctrine can sometimes be a very narrow one.

The above statement must not be taken as a clever way of glossing over difficulties or a magic panacea that will simply sweep all the ills of division under the carpet. It is a statement that echoes a profoundly traditional approach rooted in what has been the reasoned practice of the Church at epochs when unity was a crucial issue.⁽⁵⁾ During the Trinitarian or Christological controversies, men like Basil, Hilary, Athanasius, and Cyril, accepted compromises on formulae and ~~this~~^{thus} conceded a doctrinal pluralism based on divergences of outlook, so long as this did not mean watering down the essential content of faith. Paul VI referred to this in speaking about ~~div~~^{er}gences in his address to Patriarch Athenagoras in July 1967. "On this matter also," he said, "charity must come to our aid as it did with Hilary and Athanasius at a time of serious rifts in the Christian episcopate, to help them acknowledge the identity of faith that lay behind their different ways of expressing themselves. And did not St. Basil himself, with his pastoral charity, defend the authentic faith in the Holy Spirit whilst carefully eschewing terms which, however exact, might have been a stumbling block for a section of the Christian people? And did not St. Cyril of Alexandria, in 433, set aside his splendid theology for the sake of peace with John of Antioch once he had made quite sure that the faith underlying their different terminology was identical?"⁽⁶⁾

Granted there are many differences to be taken into account, this is also surely the right attitude to be adopted in the search for full communion between Rome and Canterbury. That, incidentally, is exactly what the remarkable Report of the Archbishop's Commission on Intercommunion (Intercommunion Today) recognises.⁽⁷⁾ Agreement must bear on the axis of the Eucharistic faith. And we should remember that, if that approach is lost sight of, all the enrichment achieved by the embodiment of our common data in a great tradition will be lost to unity.

What we propose to do in the following study is to clarify the essential elements of this agreement by showing that, in the light of contemporary theological research, the controversy that has long been maintained on many points has in fact been due to misunderstanding. Obviously we cannot claim that there is full agreement - certainly not in regard to the Anglican Church as a whole - but may it not be that we can already speak of a substantial agreement.

We shall, then, confine our present study to aspects which, in the course of history, have given rise to dissensions. It can be said that broadly speaking these have not borne on the effects of the Eucharist. At that level our two traditions have always converged and have even enriched each other. (8) For we all acknowledge that at the Lord's Table the baptised receive the fruits of the victory of Christ our Lord - and that thus the Church, by the power of the Holy Spirit, is drawn together in its unity, becomes more securely rooted in its inner reality of being the Body of Christ and is confirmed and refreshed in its mission. We are also in profound agreement, especially in recent years, in our insistence on the important dimension of thanksgiving and praise sustained throughout the Eucharistic celebration. Together we are rediscovering the importance and meaning of the eschatological trait which belongs specifically to the sacrament in which the Church rekindles its hope for the coming of the kingdom and is conscious of being impelled by the Spirit in the task of transforming the world. But where the issue is not yet crystal clear is in the matter of affirming the "sacrificial" value of the Eucharist and the manner in which our Lord gives his Body and Blood to those who "approach his Table with faith." (10)

I. The affirmation of the "sacrificial" value of the Eucharist.

The Thirty-nine Articles have undoubtedly contributed in practice to the importance of the part played by the liturgy in the Anglican tradition. (11) But Article XXXI is also significant as a statement of one of the most provocative of our controversial issues. (12) It reads: "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction,

for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."

Yet it is perhaps at the level of these issues more than at any other that we have converged for some years now, thanks especially to renewed interest in the Bible and Patristics. The notion of Memorial (zikkaron, anamnesis), which has a firm place in tradition (it is widely used in the oldest liturgical texts, it drew from Thomas Aquinas his quite simple explanation of the Eucharistic rite (13) and Thomas Cranmer referred to it constantly) has served as a catalyst, and that at the very moment when the genuine Biblical significance of Memorial came to light once more.

A. The Eucharist belongs specifically and integrally to the world of sacraments.

This highlighting of the notion of Memorial was set, as far as the Roman Catholic Church was concerned, at the very core of what must be one of the richest contributions to the renewal of sacramental theology, namely, the affirmation that the Eucharistic mystery belongs in its totality to the realm of sacraments and, consequently, that it must needs conform in all its aspects to the specific laws governing that realm. Works like Abbot Vonier's A Key to the Eucharist (1925), read all the more widely because of E. A. Roguet's excellent French translation, has had an immeasurable influence and has shown to what an extent the immutationist theories, such as those put forward by de Lugo or Bellarmin, distort the perspective of medieval theology. The sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist is to be found within the sacrament. "This sacrament is not only a sacrament but also a sacrifice. For it has the nature of a sacrifice in as much as in this sacrament Christ's Passion is represented whereby Christ offered himself a Victim to God (Eph.5,2), and it has the nature of a sacrament in as much as invisible grace is bestowed in this sacrament under visible species."⁽¹⁴⁾ This assertion, every word of

which should be weighed, is from Thomas Aquinas.

Granted this, several implications emerge which enable us to dispose without more ado of certain misunderstandings and to dispel some of the apprehensions entertained by our Anglican brethren. The first of these implications may seem a bit of a truism. In reality it is central to the whole issue and it has been all too easily overlooked. It is this. Since the Eucharist, even allowing for its transcendence, belongs in its entirety to the realm of sacraments, it must have the special aim that all sacraments have, that is, to reach man in view of his salvation. It belongs to God's scheme — economy^{of} of means of obtaining grace. From this statement we must deduce that the dynamism of the Eucharist is of its nature meant for man. All the elements that go to the integral making of this sacrament are essentially identified by the fact that they share the selfsame object, namely, affording the recipient the benefits of salvation. To put it in the technical language of theologians, the supereminent quality of the Eucharist which makes of it the sacrament par excellence in no way detracts from the orientation of the totality of its component factors towards the res tantum.^(14 a) One of those factors of the Eucharist is its sacrificial dimension. Therefore that also, whilst losing nothing of its specific characteristics, must belong fundamentally to the movement of God towards man and be conceived in terms of that movement. So we find ourselves in agreement with the emphatic assertion of the earliest Anglican position, that the Lord Jesus instituted the Eucharist essentially and primarily as a source of grace for men.

When we speak, as we are doing here, of the sacramental realm, we are thinking in terms of a particular mode of existing which is not subject to the laws of the phenomena of nature and is totally dominated by the notion of "sign" as conceived in Christian antiquity. This notion comprises two things inseparably: the representation of a salvific reality and its mysterious and efficacious presence; this reality is present in a way which is not the way proper to nature, and yet a way which is not merely figurative.⁽¹⁵⁾ When the reality in question is a past event, the "sign" has the look of a

treasured memory about it. We note, therefore, that the sacramental way of image and presence is a specifically distinctive way of existing, and essentially to do with relationships. It is connected to the past (i.e., to what was accomplished in the salvific Event), ^[Christ's death and Resurrection at a point in history, W.B.] to the present (to what God wishes to imprint on the life of the believer by the power inherent in that Event) and to the future (i.e., to what God wishes to lead the believer in saving him by the power of that Event).⁽¹⁶⁾ But in talking of "signs" and "memories" we are emphatically not talking of mere imaginary. ~~_____~~ ¹⁷

Indeed, in the sacramental realm we are never dealing simply with just conjuring up memories or using the portrayal of a thing just to set the mind and faith dwelling on it. The sign does not just serve to set the imagination going about some absent salvific reality. The reality that is recalled actually comes into play, though it does so in a manner which cannot be explained by its own nature, a way which is traceable exclusively to the Holy Spirit's mysterious scheme, economy. So, once you have said that the sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist belongs within the very notion of sacrament, it follows that what we have been saying about a sacrament applies to it also. That is why we use the expression "sacramental sacrifice." In this way we eliminate any possible muddled thinking about the Eucharist adding something to the value and inner sufficiency of the historic Event of the Paschal Sacrifice. As soon as you speak of the Eucharist you are always dealing with that distinctive sacramental realm, the Eucharistic sacrifice being radically fixed in the $\epsilon\phi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ^(16a), and totally relative to it. For in this whole question, the Event of the Death-and-Resurrection is here the salvific reality from which all the rest proceeds. There is nothing in this analysis that contradicts the exigencies that are at the core of Article XXXI.

This leads us to a further conclusion implied in the fully sacramental nature of the Eucharist. Given the nature of a sacrament, as we have just described it, the meaning of the sacramental elements used for the Eucharistic celebration must pervade and characterise the understanding

and interpretation of all the aspects of the sacrament, including its sacrificial dimension. For in the sacramental "system" the compass of interior res (plural) ^(17a) ~~(17a)~~ ^[see footnote 14a] in which the action of the Holy Spirit is at work is only unfolded in the outward signs. In the case of the Eucharist, the bread and wine, the fraternal meal and the words of thanksgiving (i.e., the elements selected by our Lord) are the sign of the full compass of the mystery of the Last Supper. Hence, the "sacramental sacrifice" is only accomplished in terms of the fundamental meaning of these elements as that meaning transpires in the relevant scriptural text. To set aside this essential criterion of the sacramental signs for the sake of emphasising a particular dimension of the Eucharist would be totally inconsistent with the laws that govern the whole area of sacraments. The signs are the constant primary criterion.

Now, the Eucharistic signs all refer to the believer's act of sharing the benefits of salvation with his brethren in the experience of the fraternal meal. The "matter" ^(17a) ~~(17a)~~ ^[see footnote 14a] of the "sacramental sacrifice" is the "matter" of the "sacramental eating." That indeed is the unifying factor of all the elements of this sacrament. Hence offering and communion are so linked together that the object special to each is merged with that of the other — a link which must be seen in the impetus that begins in our Lord's unique and 'once and for all' sacrifice and extends to the building up of κοινωνία (fellowship, communion) of the Church. We are faced with one single process but two phases of it. That is what Augustine had in mind when he spoke of Christians celebrating the memorial (memoria) of the sacrifice of Christ: "The sacred oblation and participation of the body and blood of Christ." ⁽¹⁷⁾ The Instruction on the Worship of the Eucharistic Mystery ^(17a) is still more emphatic: "In the Mass therefore the sacrifice and sacramental meal belong to the same mystery — so truly that they are held together by the closest of links." ⁽¹⁸⁾ Medieval theology held firmly

that the minister must receive communion, host and cup, precisely by reason of the nature of the "sacramental sacrifice."⁽¹⁹⁾ It would not do justice to this traditional insight if we were to portray it as merely an affirmation that the bread and cup of communion are the bread and cup of the "sacramental sacrifice." We need to go straight on from that with the correlated affirmation that the bread and cup of the "sacramental sacrifice" are the bread and cup destined to communicate to the people of God the benefits of salvation acquired by the death and resurrection of Christ. The sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist is impregnated, shot through, with its essential relationship to "communion," which is the intended outlet, so to speak, of the accumulated power of the sacrifice. You can see what serious consequences there would be theologically if one were to segregate in the Lord's Supper its relationship to the "once-and-for-all" of the Pasch (the sacrificial dimension) and its relationship to the fact of eating and drinking together, the bread and the cup. Such a dichotomy would destroy the profound unity of the sacrament.

The above analysis meets the insistent requirement of many Anglicans, particularly of the Evangelical tradition, that we should avoid at all cost glossing over this fact; namely, in the Eucharist, whatever its complexities may be, we are dealing primordially with the process by which the historic Paschal sacrifice is brought intimately to men now, for their salvation—a process of salvation. But over and above meeting that requirement, it seems to me that this also shows more clearly how this communion, replete with the efficacy of the historical Pasch, manifests its reality and all it contains in the reception of those very signs by which the saving sacrifice itself has just been here and now celebrated. What it amounts to is this: if you highlight the rightly understood sacrificial dimension, this cannot fail to bring out the richness of the content of the communion dimension.

There remains a last point to be drawn from the fact that the Eucharist

belongs to the realm of sacraments. For Tradition by and large, the sacraments are denoted 'sacraments of faith' (sacramenta fidei). That must not be taken only as meaning that a sacrament is an objective and actual proclamation of the essential content of the faith. That 'objective' faith solicits a response of faith in the recipient of a sacrament ('subjective' faith). But this subjective faith must not be thought of as purely intellectual assent to what God proffers in the sacrament: if it is to be genuine it must entail the involvement of the whole person of the recipient in God's demands and claims over him. For what God lays claim to is the whole man.⁽²¹⁾ This involvement, which is only possible thanks to the communication of the fruits of the historic Pasch and therefore is integrally and radically dependent upon it, belongs specifically to the dynamism inherent in a sacrament.⁽²²⁾ We must be careful not to picture this as something you can measure with a chromometer: between^{the} proffering of grace by God in a sacrament and the response to it by the recipient, the relationship is not one of precedence in time but of metaphysical priority. Man can only make this response in so far as he is caught up in the power of the spirit and this power is always to be traced to the once-and-for-all of the Pasch. But being ^u caught up will mean that his response in accepting the proffered grace will be expressed concretely by making a gift of himself, that is, by saying "yes" to God's claims ^{over} of him. This "yes" is produced in and through the power of the historic Paschal Sacrifice and is therefore not something added to that sacrifice nor confining the range of its efficacy. All this is true of every sacrament. It is eminently true of the Eucharist.

Now, the well-known passages of the New Testament - the ones precisely which bring out the difference between the economy of salvation in Christianity and in Judaism - use the terminology of sacrifice to express this "yes", by which the man justified by God responds to God's radical claims over him. (1 P 2,5;

Rm. 12, 1; Phil 2, 17; 4,18; Heb. 13, 15-16).⁽²³⁾ Is it not, then, quite legitimate to employ the same terminology in speaking about the intimate nature of the mystery of the sacraments in order to designate the attitude of the believer who is caught up in this power of the Sacrifice of Christ? And if we are careful to bear in mind that the Sacrifice of the Cross, far from being just a ritual sacrifice in the Biblical meaning of that expression, consists of a human life given totally to the Father in radical obedience and love, then we see what St. Augustine really meant when he envisaged that in the celebration of the Eucharist through, with and in the sacrifice of the Head, the whole Body (i.e., the faithful incorporated in Christ) offers itself to the Father. Since this movement of man towards the Father can only be achieved in so far as the believer is at the actual moment (hic et nunc) the beneficiary of the one and only efficacious sacrifice, it is God who gives and man who receives. D. M. Baillie put it beautifully when he said: "The gift of himself which God makes to us and the gift of ourselves to him represent two ways of giving expression to one and the same thing,"⁽²⁴⁾ namely, salvation which comes from God and was acquired by the Cross. Far from obscuring the unique value of the historic sacrifice of Christ, the participation of the Church in the offering of it sacramentally serves to manifest its wonderful efficacy.*

All this seems to line up with the conclusions reached by the authors of Growing into Union and with their theological analysis which leads them to say: "In the act of communicating, the Church, reintegrated and reappropriated by the one means of grace, is made a living sacrifice to God." In this connection they lay great emphasis on the fact that "there is no real time sequence to be represented."⁽²⁵⁾ We are thus brought back to the constant factors we have so far been encountering: the "sacramental sacrifice" in no way detracts from the "once-and-for-all" of the historic

Pasch and is in no way incompatible with the situation of man vis-a-vis salvation, namely, that he is fundamentally on the receiving end of it. For E. Jacob this is the central theme of the Biblical view of sacrifice, "an act by which God reveals and communicates his life-giving power; in which man receives infinitely more than he contributes; in which, therefore, the sacramental factor is more in evidence than the sacrificial." (26)

B. The "memorial" of the historic sacrifice of Christ.

This notion of "sacramental sacrifice" fits in very closely with research conducted by experts in exegesis, of many denominations, regarding the nature of "memorial" as seen by Judaism at the time of Christ. The expression "memorial" is a rendering of the Hebrew zikkaron and the Greek anamnesis. Basically, both of these words mean a recalling, a remembrance with multiple aspects - thinking about something that happened in the past; reviving in one's mind certain obligations or certain situations that impose on one a clearly defined attitude; remembering something favourable or unfavourable to someone; reminding somebody of something. In a "liturgical memorial," the People of God are seen as performing an act of cult by which they evoke the memory of a past event that had to do with salvation, but they do so giving praise and benediction whereby the grace attached to the event may enter again into their lives here and now, and this in turn rekindles their hope in the final accomplishment of that salvation, at the very moment when they are reminding God of his Promise by begging him to fulfil it. (27)

No need here to elaborate on the well-known findings of the exegetes showing that this notion of "memorial" throws light on the words of Christ recorded in the Gospel tradition — τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν — "do this in memory of me." This command does indeed seem to refer us to the type of ritual by which the salvific Event is called to mind in order that the participants may, in some way, enter personally into its efficacy. But without going into all the implications of that for the moment, we need only

link up the point we have just made with what we said about "sacramental sacrifice." For this perspective of the Eucharist as "memory", "memorial" was the starting point from which Tradition reached the notion of the historic sacrifice being "sacramentally" present here and now.

The point is that "memorial" in Biblical terms excludes any suggestion that the Event commemorated is repeated and any suggestion that the Event is just called to mind and nothing more. So what "memorial" of the Pasch in the Eucharist amounts to is, on the one hand, to uphold and honour the "once-and-for-all" of Christ's Sacrifice in point of time and quality, and, on the other hand, to assert the presence en musterio (in sacramento) of this "once-and-for-all" in the rites of the liturgical Repast. The Eucharist is not something added on to the historic Pasch and yet it is not just a hollow image or symbol of it. It is a way of being that is catered for philosophically by the category of "being" known as "sacramental being," which is defined as a way of being which is real though not natural [i.e., not provided by the order of nature; by the nature of the factors involved] W.B. and is entirely dependent on the power of the Spirit. It must be borne in mind, however, that if you take this notion of "memorial" and set it in the context of the narratives of the Last Supper, it will transpire that "sacramental" presence is not restricted to the Body and Blood of our Lord. It includes the unfolding of the Pasch in its entirety. Thus, by going back to the scriptural sources we are saved from concentrating on a narrow area of investigation and neglecting the full extent of its horizon.

This perspective of "memorial" comes into play all through the important pastoral document known as the General Instruction of the Roman Missal, the first draught of which, prefaced by an Apostolic Constitution signed by Paul VI, appeared 3 April 1969. ^(27a) The modifications that were subsequently made to its texts, far from being amendments to its doctrinal content, were an affirmation, by the Bishops of the Concilium [an ad hoc committee for the liturgical renewal] W.B. and the experts, that after

thorough examination there were no doctrinal errors at all.⁽²⁸⁾ All they were out to do was to clarify what had been said and forestall any possible misunderstandings.⁽²⁹⁾ We can therefore take the original text (duly approved by the competent authority and printed at the head of the Ordo Missae),^{as} the spontaneous expression, worded by the official body entrusted with finalising the renewal of the liturgy of Mass, of the traditional belief of the Roman Catholic Church in continuity with the underlying teaching of Trent.

Now, no. 7 of the said Instruction states: "The Lord's Supper, that is, the Mass, is the sacred synaxis, that is to say the assembly of the People of God, under the presidency of the priest, for the celebration of the memorial of the Lord."⁽³⁰⁾ The amended text writes in the twin expressions: "Memoriale Domini seu sacrificium eucharisticum," as we might well expect. The amended text of No. 48 spells this idea out, better than the original draught, but replacing memoriale by the pair of expressions sacrificium et convivium," thus: "At the Last Supper Christ instituted the sacrifice and Paschal banquet by which the sacrifice of the Cross is ceaselessly made present in the Church."⁽³¹⁾ It seems difficult to doubt that Roman Catholic teaching has not, with due reflection, taken up this understanding of the Eucharistic sacrifice in the perspective of the Biblical concept of "memorial" in all its richness. The amendments made to the Instruction, far from invalidating this assertion, actually confirm it.

Once this is accepted a number of misunderstandings are cleared up, in particular the suggestion that the Roman Catholic position implies the re-immolation of Christ, albeit sacramentally; whereas what that position in fact holds is an efficacious sacramental presence of the one and only and "once-and-for-all" offering on the Cross. It is that offering and that alone which is communicated to the Church by the Holy Spirit under the sacramental signs. This statement is so true that the Eucharist itself belongs to the

order of "means"— thanks to which believers participate, really and truly in the mystery of the Paschal Sacrifice, the one and only sacrifice and sufficing for all the sins of all men, past, present, and future.

Seen in this light, the old quarrels about the propitiatory value of the Mass are scaled down to size. If the Mass has a real effect on sin, this comes from the fact that in the Mass there is the active power at work of the one and once-and-for-all propitiatory sacrifice whose "memorial" is being celebrated, and which, itself alone, extends to and effaces the sin of the world. (32) This statement pinpoints the affirmation of faith. It is up to each theological tradition to live it and to express it in terms of its own genius. But the present writer must confess to finding unconvincing the attitude of those who, whilst they recognise in the Eucharist a sacramental presence of the "once-and-for-all" Pasch, yet hesitate to admit that the propitiatory character of that Sacrifice is found in its liturgical celebration. Why this restriction?

Nevertheless it is easy to understand that many Anglicans of evangelical tendencies are not happy with the argument that bases the presence of the efficacy of the Cross in the Eucharist on the notion of an eternal offering made by Christ the Priest of his Sacrifice. This argument has been widely used by both Anglicans and Roman Catholics. Some pages from the pen of Jeremy Taylor are typical of it (33) and there are ardent exponents of it amongst Roman Catholic theologians. But is it not really stretching the meaning of words to speak of "heavenly sacrifice" to designate Christ's attitude in the presence of the Father?

For it is one thing to talk of an eternal value and efficacy of the task accomplished by Christ in his Sacrifice as Ebed Yaweh (Servant of Yaweh), but quite another thing to speak of a prolonging of the offering of his sacrifice in heaven, an offering, these people would say, to which the Church links itself by the celebration of the Eucharist. According to the

salvation scheme (economy) of the Incarnation, the redeeming sacrifice is something accomplished at a given moment in history,⁽³⁴⁾ and the state of glory of the Lord (κνρ(ως)), the point of arrival of the Paschal dynamism, is rather the sign or seal of the consummation and final acceptance of the Sacrifice than the "eternal prolonging of the Cross." There has already been a decisive act on the part of God. Granted that the interior attitude to the Father, which gave his Sacrifice its value, still endures, there is no call for Christ our Lord to go on offering his Sacrifice; for now he, and we with him, has entered on that era permanently characterised by the Father's acceptance of the redemptive measures achieved by Christ. There are some extreme cases of bald statements about the heavenly sacrifice which reveal a regrettable confusion between the historical point in time of the Sacrifice (moving on into the Resurrection which is, as it were, God's seal stamped on it) and the repercussions of that historic act. Some people make a quite unwarranted appeal to the Letter to the Hebrews, in particular 7, 25: "He is always living to plead on their behalf," and 8, 3: "Every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices; hence this one too must have something to offer." But the correct interpretation of these quotations is to be found in the highly important verses 7, 26-28; 9, 12-14; 10, 11-18; which forcefully underline the "once and for all" of the historic work of Christ as the term of reference. It is Christ's achievement on the Cross sealed by his Resurrection, that is in itself the one and only and sufficing propitiation, the propitiation which is always before God.⁽³⁵⁾

It would seem preferable, then, to confine our dialogue to the context of the narratives of the Institution of the Eucharist, conscious of that notion of "memorial" unmistakably discernible in them. Since the sacrifice is an accomplished fact, God has its value eternally before him. Instead of talking about entering into the act of the heavenly Priest offering himself

here and now to the Father, it is far better to base our study on the "vertical" relationship between the Sacrifice and each single moment throughout history. In celebrating the "memorial," the Church enters into communion, not so much with the "prolonging" of the sacrificial offering in eternity, as with the historic Event itself and its efficacy, patently linked to every moment of time in history and to all places. ¹⁵(36) Thus it is sacramentally that the Church is brought into the propitiatory dimension of the Event - and this is done in the manner which we have been analysing above. Entering into that dimension, which is only made possible through the communication of the power inherent in the Pasch, is itself an effect of Salvation. In the light of this it should be possible for us all to reach an understanding on essentials, even allowing for a variety of emphases and theological outlook.

The notion of Eucharistic "memorial" serves to clear up yet another misunderstanding. Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches, both in this matter perfectly faithful to the sacred Scriptures and the most ancient Tradition, ⁽³⁷⁾ use the expression "Sacrifice of praise" and see in it an essential stratum of the mystery known by that name. There are many people who hold that this is the only usage to be conceded in applying the terminology of sacrifice to the Eucharist. This leaves a great deal of obscurity when it comes to establishing the relationship between this "sacrifice of the Church" and the ~~e~~ Cross.

The historical event of the Sacrifice of Christ is not presented in the sacred revealed texts as a sacrifice of ~~praise~~ ^{praise} but essentially as a sacrifice of expiation and redemption. It is indeed that very salvific work of the Pasch that constitutes the inner reality of the mystery celebrated in the "memorial." But, true enough, that is done at the very moment when the Christian People are blessing and praising God for the marvels of his Redemption - and begging him to bring his redemptive work to its ultimate fulfilment. The expiatory sacrifice is brought to the Church engaged in the

sacrifice of praise and intercession in which the Biblical tradition sees a power that belongs to communal offering. In this way two notions of sacrifice are knit together in the "memorial," the first of them linked to the "once-and-for-all" posited by Christ in history, the second consisting of the ever new reaction of the Church. It is important to note that when the earliest patristic documents apply the terminology of sacrifice to the Eucharist they are thinking above all of the sacrifice of praise and the offering made by the Church, whether they are dealing with the oblation of the gifts or with thanksgiving as such. (38)

Great importance, one would think, should be attached to this emphasis on the "sacrifice of the Church," which does not seem to present any particular problem for either Evangelical or Catholic traditions in which great care is taken to avoid anything that might impare the absolute sufficiency of the Paschal sacrifice. (39) Such emphasis serves to show that the Church cannot share in salvation without, at the same instant and under the influence of the very grace of salvation, offering itself to God through, with and in Christ's own offering. This becomes all the more apparent if the factor of praise and intercession is given its rightful place, a central one, in "memorial."

But do we in fact take into account the full import of this "offering of the Church"? May it not be that a number of Anglican theologians are inhibited by fear of the taint of Pelagianism (40) from drawing all the doctrinal consequences from this entry of the Church, from its humble place, into the dynamism of the Pasch of its Lord? Caught up in the power of the Holy Spirit - which comes from nothing other than that very Pasch - the Church is pervaded by the impulse towards salvation, that giving of oneself to the Father in communion with Christ. True enough, the Church does not contribute anything that can add to the efficacy of the Pasch, and what the Church does can only be, as it were, an echo, reverberating in it, of what Christ has achieved:

the Church enters into Christ's accomplishment, sole source of salvation. All the same, this "entering into" must not be thought of as something purely passive, for in that case it would not be the act of man attained here and now by Redemption, re-created in freedom. Indeed, we are here face to face with the mystery of the joining^r operation of the absolutely free gift of salvation from God and the personal responsibility of man, its recipient. In view of this, there is nothing void or ineffective about the Church's unfolding of itself to the Event, or the Church's entering into the impulse of the Saviour, who does it the gracious favour of carrying it along with the gift of himself to the Father in associating it with his mission. The whole question of the Church's participation in the work of Salvation arises here, along with the Church's relationship to the Redemption of the mass of mankind; a participation about which there cannot be the slightest doubt, albeit one must always bear in mind that it can only happen in Christ and that it is itself one of the fruits of Salvation. In the "memorial" this mysterious participation is something beyond the attainment of the participation by ordinary prayer and commonplace witness. It is a participation discoverable only within the act of Christ who is present (a sacred mystery). It is an act which holds good for the universal redemption of mankind. The participation of the Church of which we are speaking actualises that universal worth. These reflections bring us to some extent in line with J. Jeremias' views on the "memorial."

If we have understood correctly what the authors of Growing into Unity are saying, it would seem that we can come to some understanding on this issue also - if not on the doctrinal exposition at least in terms of our intuitive reactions to the problem. On that basis, it must be admitted that our differences regarding the sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist do not constitute a real obstacle to unity. The new wording of Article XXXI put forward in 1968 by the Anglican commission On Christian Doctrine seems, despite its aura of compromise, to be evidence of our converging tendencies. (41)

It is quite possible, indeed, that in the beginning the tenets of the opposing parties were not as clear-cut as you might think from reading the contemporary documents, written as they were in an atmosphere of tense discussion. It is very difficult to put your finger on exactly what Cranmer meant to cover, at least from 1546 onwards, by the term "memorial," on which he based himself in his explanation of the nature of the Lord's Supper - an important point since the interpretation of both the first Prayer Book (1549) and the ^{second} ~~second~~ (1552) depends on it. Was it a "memorial" in a purely subjective sense in regard to the participants? Or what measure of objective reality was attributed to it? Recent studies⁽⁴²⁾ have all come to the conclusion that Zwingli influenced the 1549 Book. But along with this it is important to stress that, over against Luther's radical attitude and even Calvin's, Cranmer's outlook seems to show a desire not to strip the Eucharist of all trace of a sacrificial dimension. There is no doubt whatever that he was out to reinterpret - and that, radically - the current teaching of his day. Yet the violence of his reaction did not necessarily involve throwing out remorselessly a factor of such weight in the traditional liturgy. When you read his Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament (1550) you get the impression that everything turns on an equivocation: in his view the expressions "propitiatory sacrifice" and "offered by the priest" are inescapably associated with a repetition of Christ's act Λ and a new immolation. This view is already found in his Questionnaire on the Mass (1547).⁽⁴³⁾ Perhaps, then, the following passage reveals a more positive and less reductive outlook.

*The priest should declare the death and passion of Christ, and all the people should look upon the cross in the mount of Calvary, and see Christ there hanging and the blood flowing out of his side into the wounds to heal all their sores; and the priest and people all together should laud and thank instantly the chirurgeon and physician of their souls. And this is the priest's and the people's sacrifice, not to be propitiators for sin but ... to worship

continually in mystery that which was once offered for the price of sin.^a
It is not all that easy to make out what he is trying to say. True enough,
the Anglican is not confined to Thomas Cranmer. But once you start trying to
pin down the origins of it you run into the same ambiguity all along the
line. Does Nicholas Ridley, for instance, with his roots strongly embedded
in the theses of Ratramne, throw out all trace of sacrifice? What difference
does he really put between a presence "only in figure" and a "lively presence"
which "effectuously representeth his body"? What does he mean to convey by
the affirmation that the sacrifice is present "by signification?"⁽⁴⁶⁾ He
certainly means something more than the Zwinglians, but what exactly? Or
take John Jewel. In his Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae (1561) and again in
his Replie unto M. Hardinges Answere he is far from reducing the relation
between the Eucharist and the Cross to nothing more than an empty commemoration.⁽⁴⁷⁾

In the light of this one can account more easily for the various
openings onto an unmistakably objective view of "eucharistic sacrifice"
that were to make their appearance at a later date. There is, for example,
Lancelot Andrewes, who wrote passages to which few Roman Catholics today
would hesitate to put their names,⁽⁴⁸⁾ ^a And, of course, William Laud in his
controversies with the Jesuit, John Fisher, alias Percy (c.1637).⁽⁴⁹⁾ Laud's
ideas left their mark on the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, which is itself
evidence that something of the traditional values were recuperated. No
need here to recall the widespread repercussions of the arduous Tractarian
controversies,⁽⁵⁰⁾ except to note that the Tractarian movement itself was a
natural outcome of the lack of precision in the Anglican view of the Eucharist.
Seen against all this background the statement of the 1958 Lambeth Conference
appears to the outside observer as important evidence of a search for
clarification of Anglican belief, with due regard for maintaining a balance
between the diverse positions within a Church that sets out to be "Catholic and
reformed". It seems to the present writer that all this has the makings of
a substantial agreement, at least with regard to the positions held today.

But if it is to be a genuine agreement and not just a vague conciliation, a further issue must be faced up to, namely the presence of Christ in this "memorial." The two issues, sacrifice and presence, are inseparable.

II. The Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ.

What must be done is to determine how we conceive the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the signs of the memorial. We all admit that this body and blood are given to us in the Eucharist. We all go on to add that they are given as spiritual food received in a spiritual way.⁽⁵²⁾ None of us would hesitate to affirm that Christ is truly present in the sacrament of the Last Supper. But, though we all use the same terms, do we all mean the same thing? In examining this question we shall find ourselves sooner or later back with the question of "Eucharistic sacrifice," and we can never reach agreement on that until we have clarified the question of the Eucharistic presence of Christ.

The intricacies of these questions have got rather entangled and it is no easy matter to unravel them. And that goes for both Churches. The wording of Article XXVIII of the Articles of Religion, it will be remembered, seems to reintroduce a compromise doctrine:⁽⁵⁴⁾ "The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another; but rather a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Church is Faith. The

Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."

On the part of Christ, then, there is an offering and gift of his Body and Blood. The signs are not a mere empty shell. The position is, therefore, far removed from that of Zwingli. And yet, the Article goes on to say that this gift proffered by Christ only becomes a reality in the recipient by virtue of that recipient's faith. Article XXVIII adds: "The wicked and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as Saint Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing."

What we have to make up our minds about is whether this mesh of affirmations, mostly traditional ones, matches at least in essentials what Catholic tradition (in the widest sense) holds as indispensable truth, truth that emerges from an accurate interpretation of the content of faith.

Catholic thinking has been assessing its position (especially since the revival of patristic and liturgical studies) on the true nature of the Eucharistic presence, against a broader horizon.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Thanks especially to a contact in depth with the tradition of the Oriental Churches and a new awareness of the primordial role of the sign in all sacramental reality, the Catholic Church has gradually come to a clearer discernment of the authentic meaning of its faith in the true presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Last Supper. Several aspects of this investigation (they clear up many subtle misunderstandings which a Roman Catholic ill acquainted with the real implications of traditional terminology might not have noticed but which would strike other Christians) have been written into Council documents or the pastoral decisions taken by the official Magisterium. Our business here is to set out the essential traits of what one might specifically designate as the enlightened faith of the Roman Catholic tradition today.

There are many other theological trails which it would be rewarding to explore but they are in the order of personal views, still to undergo critical examination and to win approval through dialogue: a process required by the status of the theologian to which we have already referred. And if we here rather dwell on the Roman Catholic outlook, that is only because of certain difficulties encountered in dialogue.

Sacramental Presence

It will come as no surprise that we here take up once more the set of categories which served to throw light on the nature of "Eucharistic sacrifice," for the Body and Blood is present for the actualisation of that sacrifice and to bring its effects intimately within the life of the believer. The most essential of those categories is the "sacramental reality" (ens sacramentale). The real presence of Christ in the memorial is therefore not the equivalent of a "physicist" type of presence. It belongs to a different order of things, a specifically different reality which must not be confused with realities in the order of nature, the reality of the new world opened up by the Resurrection and in which it is the Holy Spirit who acts. But it must be emphasised that this idea of a "sacramental" and "not natural" manner of being present is not the outcome of an attempt to twist the texts of Trent. In the first chapter of the Decree on the Eucharist (Session XIII of Trent) there appears the following passage which unfortunately is often quoted in a truncated form. The full text reads: "In the first place this holy Synod teaches, and openly and simply professes, that, in the august (almo) sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, after the Consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly, really and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things. For neither are these things mutually repugnant, /namely/ that the Saviour Himself always sits at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that, nevertheless, He is in many other places sacramentally

present to us in his own substance, by a manner of existing, which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet we can, by understanding illuminated by faith, conceive, and we ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God."⁽⁵⁶⁾ The Latin original is: "Principio docet Sancta Synodus et aperte ac simpliciter profitetur, in almo sanctae Eucharistiae sacramento post panis et vini consecrationem Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum verum Deum atque hominem vere, realiter ac substantialiter sub specie illarum rerum sensibilium contineri. Neque enim haec inter se pugnant ut ipse Salvator noster semper ad dexteram Patris in caelis assideat juxta modum existendi naturalem, et ut multis nihilominus aliis in locis sacramentaliter praesens sua substantia nobis adsit, ea existendi ratione, quam etsi verbis exprimere vix possumus, possibilem tamen esse Deo, cogitatione per fidem illustrata assequi possumus et constantissime credere debemus."

Now, that order of reality, as we have already said, is essentially conditioned by its connection with "sign". What Trent is condemning in its Canon 1 of Session XIII is the minimalist position which reduces this "sacramental reality" to a mere empty sign and disregards the fact that in the sacramental scheme (economy) the sign is itself the bearer of that mysterious presence which it signifies.⁽⁵⁷⁾ When the Church celebrates the memorial, the Paschal humanity of the Lord is truly brought into its midst. It is not a matter of being present, by way of a mere evocation or in terms of causality. That humanity itself is present in itself. But, having asserted this, we must immediately add that,¹⁾ it is present in a manner which is not the natural manner [not a manner found in the natural order]; 2) yet the specific end of the manner in which it is present is to establish contact with the natural order.

This sacramental manner of being and operating can be characterised in terms of mediation. And this at two levels. First, because the sign and its objective content are linked with the humanity of Christ in its natural

being [as it exists in the way natural to it] - and that excludes any kind of changeability and a fortiori any multiplication - but at the same time they are linked with men in their great numbers and variety of situations, men upon whom the riches of salvation are to be showered. Thus, the sacramental reality makes it possible for the one and only and unchangeable to become present to countless members of mankind throughout the ever changing phases of history. But at a second level, the sacramental reality can provide what one might call an intermediary presence situated between, on the one hand, natural and historical presence which, in itself, is the kind of experience that is past recall for man, and on the other hand that "face to face" presence which it is not yet given to man to experience. These two levels correspond to two dimensions of one single mediation: mediation considered vertically (of Christ to the Christian) and considered horizontally (as between two moments of the mystery of the encounter of Christ and man). But it is the second dimension that determines the specific end of the first. They match the situation of the Church. It is out of the question, therefore, to imagine that the manner of this presence is the same as the manner whereby Christ was present with his disciples during his ministry.⁽⁵⁸⁾ The threefold orientation of the memorial— a) reminder of the past, b) designation of the grace wrought by God here and now, c) foretelling of the future— written large on the signs themselves, determines the nature of the memorial and shows what its quality is. Welling up from the great Event of Salvation and stretching forth in hope, it is, in the fullest sense of the expression, that presence which the Spirit brings about for our particular era of Salvation, the Spirit of whom Christ said (John 16, 14) "He will take what is mine and declare it to you."

The first conclusion we draw from these considerations is that this is a presence that cannot be defined in terms of place and space. If medieval theology and Trent do use such terms as "contineri" or "contineri sub speciebus"

("contained under the species"),⁽⁵⁹⁾ they are careful to make it clear that "in no manner is the body of Christ in this sacrament as in a place" ("nullo modo corpus Christi est in hoc sacramento localiter").⁽⁶⁰⁾ Thomas Aquinas is perfectly clear that the place where the Body of Christ is sacramentally present is not "filled with the substance of Christ's body."⁽⁶¹⁾ No need, however, to dwell on this point here since it is no longer a source of misunderstanding amongst us.

It is true that the use of the word "substantia" to designate all the wealth and realism of what is ^{is} "contained" and given remains a major cause of misunderstanding, not only because patterns of thought have evolved over the years and the original use of "substantia" is hard to grasp, but also because the original meaning of the term is not entirely clear anyway and seems to have fluctuated between its usage in common speech and as a technical term. Simply stating that the texts of Trent do not allow the faith to be made subservient to a philosophical system does not dispel all the misunderstandings as though by magic.

(62)

What exactly does Roman Catholic tradition mean by "substantial presence?" The term "substantia" here is taken in a sense that falls outside the systematic exposition which specifically contrasts substance and accidents - though that exposition is not altogether lost sight of. It corresponds to the answer to the question, "What is this?" In other words, what a thing is deep down once you look beyond the mere appearances; the radical 'what?' of a reality. To put it another way, "substantia" is here taken to mean that which the intellect discerns as the ultimate depths of a given reality and which is the bearer of all its manifestations and attributions and accounts for them. The senses can never grasp that substance: it can only be perceived by spiritual intuition which becomes aware of it through its appearances and its manifestations. That holds true whether it is a question of natural or of artificial realities. It explains how it is that one can

say: "This has the smell of a rose," "This has the taste of bread." That is as complete an answer as you can ever get from this normal level of human curiosity. To go beyond that demands a new step altogether which can only be taken by the intellect setting itself questions about the nature of the rose and the nature of bread. So, in the Eucharistic memorial, to the question "what is this?" the believer who receives the bread-made-Eucharist (le pain eucharistique) replies in the light of his faith: "It is the body of Christ giving himself as food, as the Bread of Life." He thus asserts that what is present and is given is not just a spiritual power but the profound reality of the Body of Christ, the "what?" which is manifested and unfolded in all that faith attributes to the reality of the Body of Christ and which affords the unity of all those attributes.

Yet at the same time the believer asserts that, real and genuine though that presence is, it is brought about in a special and mysterious manner. Insufficient attention has been paid to the aim of the medieval and scholastic scholars who worked on the use of substance and transubstantiation to express - and this was at a technical level - what had hitherto been conveyed in another terminology by Tradition: they sought not only to safeguard all the reality and richness of the presence but also to ward off materialistic or 'physicist' ideas about it. Whatever may be said about the validity of the philosophical equipment with which they worked - and it is ill-attuned to ours - it must be admitted that the assertion of a presence per modum substantiae (in the manner of substance) implies that the Body of Christ is sub speciebus (under the species) in a way that is not provided for by our patterns of metaphysical thinking and which one could not begin to imagine. For medieval Scholastic thought, material substance (in its entirety in the whole and in each of its parts) cannot be seen, touched, 'exist as in a place' (localiter), except in and through its own specific accidents. It is only by means of these accidents that one can have any experience of the substance, and that becomes a radical condition the moment there is any

question of perceiving its presence. Now in the Eucharist the accidents that are perceived by the senses are the accidents of bread and wine. The presence of Christ, believed by faith, is brought to the faithful only through accidents of the sacramental sign. The Bread of Eternal Life, which is in truth the Body of Christ given in all reality, is not offered and received except in the accidents of bread, terrestrial food. Sacramental sign and presence are here bound together and that in a manner that is characteristic of this type of presence, assimilating it - though it is indeed distinct - to the manner in which a spirit is made present. (64)

Clearly this is the antithesis of a materialistic view.

We note too that the Body and Blood given thus are the Body and Blood of Christ glorified, become by the power of the Spirit Lord of Creation. The recent new awareness of the nature of the Paschal mystery in which the Death and Resurrection are inseparable, has made it possible for Roman Catholic thought to pick up the threads of the great insights of the tradition of the Oriental Churches. (65) The Cross only becomes salvific in and through the acceptance by the Father of that which Christ offers on it. Now the assent the Father gives to the Cross is the Resurrection. The saving Body and Blood are the Body and Blood of Christ become the Kurios, the Lord. Thus Paul speaks of the repast of the Lord, the table of the Lord, the cup of the Lord, and he is choosing his words. (1 Cor. 11, 23-33; 10, 21). The reality that becomes present in the Eucharist belongs, then, to a specific universe, that of the "new world," the world of the Spirit of God, a world whose inmost nature we are powerless to scrutinise. It is not only the manner of this presence that is quite outside the laws of our created universe, but also the gift itself.

Note the above insistence on the role of the Holy Spirit. One of the most fruitful dogmatic products of dialogue with the Oriental Churches is without doubt the highlighting of the primary and necessary link between the mystery of the Eucharistic presence and the Spirit of the Lord. There is some

restrained allusion to this in the documents of Vatican II and the only place in them where there is a forthright exposition of it is the truly splendid text of the Decree on the life and ministry of the priest.⁽⁶⁶⁾

But it has left its mark notably on the Instruction on Eucharistic Worship⁽⁶⁷⁾ and the General Instruction on the [new] Roman Missal,⁽⁶⁸⁾ and indeed has widely influenced the renewal of the Eucharistic liturgy. This is particularly true of the prayers of the epiclesis in the new Anaphoras and the general atmosphere of the celebration of Mass as we now have it. To the Christian who examines the new texts carefully it is clear that it is indeed not a matter of some sort of magical action but of a mysterious presence, actively orientated towards an encounter in which, in the power of the Holy Spirit, the Lord of the Church gives himself truly to the Church through the sacramentality of the Memorial. What it amounts to is this: both the content of the Eucharistic signs and the nature of this reality find their explanation in the ever transforming power of the Spirit of God; he, to whose action Creation is originally traced, taking hold of things from the realm of Creation, brings about the active possession of them by the Lord of the new heaven and the new earth. In other words, the Holy Spirit "appropriates these things to Christ the Lord," renders them the total and radical possession of the Kurios (the Lord), who thus, in and through the world of the first Creation, shows forth the dawning of the pledge of the eschatological world, the hereafter.

Now the Kurios exercises his sovereignty over men essentially through the dynamism which reconciles them and brings them together by making of them one sole Body - his Body.⁽⁶⁹⁾ The gift of the Eucharistic Body and Blood represents in the scheme (economy) of the new age the act par excellence of full Salvation, the effect of the Paschal Sacrifice. And note that the Sacramental presence is the means of the efficacious encounter of the Lord with the community celebrating the memorial - and, in the community, with each one

of the faithful. Hence this presence, since it is the presence of the Kurios here and now exercising his Lordship over his Church, properly belongs to the area of a dynamism directed to a welcoming in which faith on the part of the believer plays a key role. Trent is careful to state that this presence is for our benefit (nobis).⁽⁷⁰⁾ That is why the Eucharistic Anaphoras, whilst they ask for the transformation of the bread and wine, do so without ever dwelling on that presence as such but on a further transformation, namely, that which the Body and Blood of Christ are to bring about in the life of Christians receiving them. The real presence of the Body and Blood of the Lord therefore - and this is not merely accidental to it - is unintelligible without its insertion in the movement— which is a salvific operation— by which the Lord gives himself to his own. In other words, the presence represents what this movement of Christ towards man contains - the reality which that movement communicates. The end of all that the presence truly is and of all the richness it contains is therefore determined by the experience of grace of those who through and in that presence will receive communion with the mystery of reconciliation and peace which the humanity of the Lord is. In the technical language of the scholastic theologians, we are here dealing with res et sacramentum which is wholly directed to the ultimate res.^(70a)

We note, indeed, that this dynamising passing from Christ to the assembly and having its source in the sacramental Body and Blood achieves a presence which extends beyond the confines of the signs. For whilst it is true that it is only in the bread and wine, which communicates the fulness of the gift of himself, that Christ becomes present in the way we have described above, it is nevertheless the same Lord who, in the Word that is proclaimed, awakens the hearts of his own people so that they will welcome him in truth and, *who,* through the person of the minister, presides at the Repast to which he invites them. It is within the ambiance of that wider presence of Christ in his

People that what Catholic tradition calls the substantial presence (praesentia substantialis) unfolds. Vatican II's Constitution on the Liturgy and, especially, the encyclical Mysterium Fidei and the Instruction on Eucharistic Worship⁽⁷¹⁾ explain clearly the nature of this wider presence. It cannot be properly understood unless it is perceived within the process whereby the Kurios - through his minister and his Word - invites his own to his Table, presiding at it through his minister, giving himself sacramentally but truly in the Body and Blood of his Pasch, in order that all may be enlisted in the power of his Lordship, thus becoming his Body. But we must add forthwith, that it is the Lord present at the right hand of the Father, therefore outside the realm of the sacramental order, who offers to his Church, in the signs-made-Eucharist (signes eucharistic), the sacramental gift of himself.

In one, obviously restricted, sense it may be said that the sacramental Body and Blood, with all their wealth of salvific content, are a presence-that-is-proffered, awaiting welcoming reception by the believer,⁽⁷²⁾ but this act of the believer can only happen through living faith, which is itself a gift of the Holy Spirit. By that faith the presence burgeons into a vivifying encounter. The Roman Catholic tradition has always maintained the Augustinian concept of diverse ways in which the Body of Christ is taken as food. Without the faith of the Christian who receives it, the Eucharist, despite the reality it contains, could not produce its res, the grace of the sacrament. And yet, is it not true that the conferring of that grace is what the Eucharist, like all sacraments, is specifically for? Hence the capital importance attached to the role of faith. By faith, and only by faith, the presence - which has no need of faith in its objective reality of Christ's gift of himself - becomes no longer only a presence brought about with the benefit of the believer in view but a presence with him, in the meaning given to the word presence by the personalist philosophy where it is

linked with the notion of interpersonal and reciprocal relation. In this sense G. Marcel says, "Presence is something more than object; it fans out beyond its confines."⁽⁷⁵⁾ Seen in this way, being present does not mean just being positioned in front of someone but being linked with him in ties of a relationship. When, therefore, we consider the Eucharistic mystery, we are faced with presence at two levels, each belonging to a different order yet both linked closely together. For on the one hand, in the terms of classical theology, the objective presence of Christ's Body and Blood postulates ultimately the res which is its effect and which contemporary thought-patterns see first and foremost as an interpersonal presence; and on the other hand, this interpersonal presence cannot in fact exist except thanks to the fact that the sacramental signs transmit the objective reality of the gift proffered by Christ.

At this point in our exposition of the classical Roman Catholic concept, many of our Anglican brethren will feel less embarrassed by the assertion of the presence as we have explained it than by the insistence on what we have called, to avoid equivocation, the objective presence. They accept with us that the presence of the Lord is real and genuine and essentially linked with the bread and wine. But because of the great prominence they give to the role of faith - which we have just been emphasising - they have no wish to make a division between Christ's proffering of the gift of his Body and Blood in the sacramental signs and the welcoming reception of them by the believer. They prefer to link the presence of the Kurios with the global movement of the Eucharist culminating in the act of sacramental communion, without trying to pinpoint the moment at which the bread and wine become bearers of the gift of his Paschal humanity which the Lord means to make. Their reading of the words of Christ at the Last Supper, "Take and eat, this is my body," leads them to exclude what they consider to be an artificial dichotomy between the beginning of the presence and

the act of sacramental eating. That does not necessarily mean that they adopt a purely receptionist view.^(73a) The Body and Blood become truly present and are really and truly given. The bread and wine are not just empty signs devoid of objective content.⁽⁷⁴⁾ But, for these Anglicans, there can be no question of envisaging them apart from the overall, integral dynamism of the memorial.

In the eyes of Roman Catholic theology this position does not sufficiently take into account certain issues emphasised in the revelation contained in texts of Sacred Scripture, in particular in the tradition of Paul and of Luke, concerned to focus attention on the identification of the broken bread and the Body. To the said Anglican position, therefore, Roman Catholic theology replies by formulating this question: Are you not obscuring the fundamental fact which dominates the entire mystery of Christ, namely, that God is prevenient, forestalls; that his gift is not only anterior to man's response but incites and is expectant of that response, an expectation which may, indeed, not be fulfilled? True enough, we are here dealing with the realm of sacraments, and when we use talk about things happening at successive moments in time we are referring to realities which in the nature of the Eucharistic mystery are in fact concomitant. Furthermore, serious theological thinking today no longer takes the narrow view that sought to indicate the exact word which completes the formula that ensures that the presence is an accomplished fact. The new thinking sees the efficacy of the Spirit and of the Word which brings about the presence as extended to the whole of the Anaphora which is the utterance of faith of the Church; at the same time recognising that this efficacy has its source and centre in words of the Last Supper. But remember that we are precisely dealing with the realm of sacramental realities and even the presence is governed by the specific principles of that realm. Must we not, then, admit that as the rites proceed there are two sacramental phases linked together in a sole and indivisible dynamism of Salvation, namely, the moment when the

gratuitous proffering of himself by the Lord and God's initiative are brought to the fore, and secondly the moment of the Church's access to this gift, welcomed and received with faith in communion? It seems to the present writer that, provided the overall, englobing dynamism of the celebration is respected and the first of the two phases is not understood in crude 'physicism' terms, this distinction between these two phases safeguards more fully the assertion, so suitably maintained by the Anglican tradition, that everything here is based on that outgoing movement of God towards man which governs faith itself.

It is highly important to give serious attention to the divergence of views we have just delineated. The more one examines it the more one sees it as a constant stumbling block and a major source of opposing positions amongst us in regard to the Eucharist. To shelve it would only be a disservice to the cause of unity, all the more so because on the score of the other issues regarding the question of the Eucharistic presence, which we are at present discussing, we are able, it would seem, to dispel many a misunderstanding.

The ideas of Thomas Cranmer and of the early Anglican tradition suffer from the same kind of ambiguities as we pointed out in connection with the notion of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Where does the influence of Zwingli end? What role did the ideas of Wycliffe play? If one had to rely on the overall impression created by the writings of Cranmer, Ridley, and even John Jewel, one would be strongly inclined to characterise the Anglican reaction as a movement away from an objective concept of the presence to a subject concept having scant regard for the content of the sacramental signs and focussing its attention on the reception of those signs through lively faith. Numerous texts could be quoted in support of this allegation, in particular Book III of Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament (1550) which really does not seem open to any other interpretation.

Take just one quotation from a less known work, Writings and Disputations:
"When I say and repeat ... that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the sacrament; lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet he is corporally in the persons that duly receive them, this is to advertise the reader that I mean no such thing; but my meaning is that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us ... be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacraments: but all this I understand of his spiritual presence ... Nor no more truly is ^{he} corporally or really present in the due administration of the Lord's Supper that ⁿ he is in the due administration of baptism."⁽⁷⁶⁾ That text is clear enough. And yet in the work of other writers there are already signs of the conflicting views that were to be clarified in the course of the countless efforts to reframe theological thought within Anglicanism: the acknowledgement of a real action of Christ in the Last Supper points the way to acknowledging a certain presence in the signs of the repast. It is not a matter of pure subjectivism. Thus Ridley confesses his faith in the true body of Christ in the Eucharist but at the same time refuses to see in it a corporal presence of the body of the flesh: he who ascended to the right hand of the Father is on the Table of the Last Supper ("The heavenly Lamb is on the table") but by way of a spiritual presence ("by grace and not after any corporal substance of his flesh taken of the Virgin Mary").⁽⁷⁷⁾ In 1571, in his Apology of the Church of England, John Jewel uses this ambiguous formula: "We affirm that bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the body and blood of Christ, and that by them Christ himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so presently given unto us that by faith we verily receive his body and blood."⁽⁷⁸⁾

Now an attentive study of the principal relevant writings show that at the root of this ambiguity there is confused thinking on the nature of sacramental presence. The whole issue turns on this proposition: if Christ is in heaven it is not possible for him to be on earth. It is found in Lambert and Ridley, and Cranmer writes: "Our faith is not to believe him (Christ Jesus) to be in bread and wine but that he is in heaven."⁽⁷⁹⁾ In the Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine he describes what he takes to be the position of the Roman Catholic Church and in so doing reveals his own thoughts on the Eucharist: "Now to return to the principal matter, lest it might be thought a new device of us, that Christ as concerning his body and his human nature is in heaven and not in earth: therefore by God's grace, it shall be evidently proved, that this is no new devised matter, but that it was ever the old faith of the catholic Church, until the papists invented a new faith, that Christ really, corporally, and sensibly is here still with us in earth, shut up in a box or within the compass of bread and wine."⁽⁸⁰⁾

This is a far cry from the exposition we gave earlier on in this study and from the distinction between the natural body of Christ and the sacramental body - yet Thomas Aquinas had long since put his finger firmly on it. Cranmer's equivocation rests on the manner, the how of the presence. It is no mere chance that Cranmer, as he himself admits, took transubstantiation as the central papist error responsible for all their other deviations, and gave it the key role in his revision of Eucharistic belief.⁽⁸¹⁾ This leads us, incidentally, to attribute more importance than is sometimes done to Rattranne's influence on Ridley.

The efforts of Lancelot Andrewes,⁽⁸²⁾ John Cosin,⁽⁸³⁾ and Laud, and later the attempted via media of Waterland, not to mention the theology of the Tractarians, are surely all rooted in this same ambiguity. Tractarian thinking is a typical example. On the one hand they reject transubstantiation because they find it is prompted by the desire to find a human explanation for a reality of faith, and yet they go to the trouble of making a clear

distinction between the Roman Catholic view and the errors of the Caparnaeanites.⁽⁸⁴⁾ Then they endeavour to show that the "spiritual" presence is not inconsistent with a "real" presence but with a "natural" presence perceptible by the senses.⁽⁸⁵⁾ They thus came round to a view that profoundly respected the mystery - more so than does the position of certain Roman Catholics - but was anxious not to dislodge an authentic Eucharistic realism.

What conclusion can be drawn in regard to our consensus? First of all it is not possible to speak of a complete convergence on the question of the Eucharistic presence. If we are not to build on a tottering compromise we must reflect together on the far reaching implications of our points of divergence. Is it really an illusive optimism to think that we can reach a substantial agreement even on this issue? If we bear in mind the exegetical research that has been done on the nature of "sign" which is central to our present discussion, and if we also go deeply into what we have said already about the various types of presence of Christ which we all recognise and which converge in the Eucharist, and if we are careful not to take the Roman Catholic position for crude materialism, then a rapprochement on essentials can be brought about. True enough, it is difficult to base such optimism on official documents like the Answer of the Archbishops of England to the decisions of Apostolicae Curae or the report on Doctrine in the Church of England with its notion of the real presence and its interpretation of receptionism.⁽⁸⁶⁾ Many Anglicans do not find their own convictions expressed there. All the same, if you set these documents in the new overall perspectives which we have just mentioned, they will be seen to show that whenever the question of Eucharistic belief comes up we find that our points of convergence outweigh our divergences.

The Question of Transubstantiation

There is, however, a point on which Anglican tradition seems to have

maintained its opposition to Roman Catholic views, despite some discordant voices, namely transubstantiation. Although the proposed new version of the Thirty-nine Articles was clearly aimed at breaking with the old polemics and dropped the paragraph on transubstantiation, it still maintains that the nature of the bread and wine is not changed.⁽⁸⁷⁾ It is thus in line with the report on Doctrine in the Church of England, which, after recalling the exact meaning of the Thomist and Tridentine position, goes on to say: "There is solid ground for the Anglican rejection of the doctrine of Transubstantiation as formulated by St. Thomas and the Council of Trent."⁽⁸⁸⁾ It would be easy to show how the authors of the seventeenth century— even Lancelot Andrewes who nevertheless has several passages full of concessions⁽⁸⁹⁾— the Tractarians, and a number of contemporary theologians all join hands on this matter. It must, however, be said that some Anglicans see in the authentic Thomist explanation of transubstantiation a "tenable opinion."⁽⁹⁰⁾

On the side of the Roman Catholics it is evident that the need is keenly felt in the various theological milieu for profound rethinking about the terminology used in this field - and also the categories of ideas on which that terminology is based. The encyclical Mysterium Fidei, whilst reacting against attempts that failed to date to give proper expression to the content of the traditional belief, in no way set out to put a brake on research. It is interesting to note from the ecumenical point of view that the research— for instance into theories that have not yet been fully exploited but are full of promise, like trans-signification and trans-finalisation— is grafted onto the efforts that have been undertaken for a considerable time outside the Roman Catholic tradition, with the aim of investigating what exactly happens in the innermost being of the bread and the wine when the Spirit of God takes hold of them that they may become the sacraments of the Body and Blood of the Lord. Indeed, long before the Roman Catholic theologians who are now looked on as the originators of these ideas started work on them, French Reformed

theologians as far back as the seventeenth century - in particular Michel Le Faucheur - were rendering Theophylactus' Greek expression metastoiceio not only as transelementation but also as "changement d'usage et d'effet."⁽⁹¹⁾ More recently, the Anglican, W. Spens, starting from the new potentialities acquired by the elements, takes up the same line of thought.⁽⁹²⁾ Whilst resisting the temptation to discover concord where it does not exist and not forgetting the divergences we have been pointing out regarding the presence, may it not be possible to see some affinity between these exploratory studies and what Ridley has to say in one of his last works: "In the sacrament is a certain change, in that that bread, which was before common bread, is now made a lively presentation of Christ's body, and not only a figure, but effectuously representeth his body; that even as the mortal body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of Christ's body, which the eyes of faith see, as the bodily eyes see only bread. Such a sacramental mutation I grant to be in the bread and wine, which truly is no small change but such a change as no mortal man can make, but only the omnipotency of Christ's word."⁽⁹³⁾

Turning now to Andrewes, perhaps he can help us to see more clearly where the problem of agreement lies: "All his witnesses (of the Jesuit) speak of some kind of change (pro mutatione, immutatione, transmutatione). But there is no mention there of a change in substance or of the substance. But neither do we deny in this matter the preposition 'trans'; and we allow that the elements are changed (transmutari). But a change in substance we look for, and we find it nowhere."⁽⁹⁴⁾

The problem is not entirely clear even for Roman Catholic theology. But one thing is quite certain: there can be no question of making the doctrinal exposition of the data of faith subservient to any philosophical system, albeit in the course of history, use has been made of one or another system that lent itself to couching the mysterious and transcendent content of faith in the

terms of contemporary thought-patterns. We have already established that in the sphere of theological analysis the vocabulary of substance, etc., had for Thomas Aquinas a precise and delicately defined meaning which no longer strikes a chord in today's patterns of thought. Clinging to it^{at}/all costs would, therefore, serve no useful purpose. In this question as in all else, what we have to do is to keep clearly in mind the difference between the truth to be expressed and the language used in expressing it. We must also remember that language, even when it has acquired the mellow texture of antiquity, is only relative.

Now the truth which the Roman Catholic Church is out to preserve and defend and clarify is the reality of the conversio mirabilis and not directly the manner of that conversion. This distinction is essential to our discussion. Furthermore, if there is this insistence on the conversio it is purely and simply to bring out the realism of the presence. In these considerations the conversion takes second place in regard to the presence. If therefore the Roman Catholic tradition speaks of the conversion of the substance it does so as a means of spelling out fully the primordial assertion of the presence per modum substantiae (in the manner in which substance is present).

It is striking to note the progressive shift in St. Thomas' preference for the term transubstantio. By the time he had fully worked out how the various elements of the structure of contemporary philosophy fit to ether to throw light on the realism of the mystery of the presence, he seems to deliberately reduce the use of the word transubstantiation to a strict minimum. In his commentary on the sentences of Peter Lombard he uses "transubstantiation" currently, sixty-eight times in fact, whereas it appears only three times in the Summa Theologiae, whilst "conversion^{is}," which barely puts in an appearance in his early writing, comes gradually to pervade all his explanations of the "quomodo," the "how" of the presence. This brings out the hierarchy of the various spheres of doctrinal elaboration in this question. It also explains why it is that our divergences on the nature of

the presence keep taking us back to our ideas about its quomodo, its ^{"how"} ~~"Love"~~.

We make no claim to offer a solution to the problems arising from the notion and implications of transubstantiation. One important thing we can do, however, is to work out in terms of a broader view of conversio some of the conclusions we drew up above. It does indeed seem that it is in that direction that we ought to look for the points of agreement we are anxious to find.

We said just now that the content of the Eucharistic signs could only be explained by reference to the power of the Spirit, who, ever since the Pasch, actualises in the realities of Creation, whose author he is, the empire of the Kurios. For the Eucharist is essentially epiclesis.⁽⁹⁶⁾ (96a) It belongs therefore to the realm of the new Creation which cannot be other than the work of the spirit, leading to their teleiosis [the "bringing to completeness"] the diverse benefits initiated by God for man (amongst them the original Creation), linking them to the Sovereignty, the Overlordship, of Christ. This can never be a mere matter of the Spirit bringing some artificial complement, something brought in from outside the created universe to put a finishing touch to it. No, it is the Spirit of God exercising his power in "fulfilling" the capacities that are already in his original creation and its gravitations that cry out for fulfilment; by that power, creation surpasses itself, whilst yet retaining its identity intact. The realm and order of grace, despite its radical transcendence, respects the order of nature and, far from adjoining itself to nature artificially, bears nature along with it. This principle holds true, analogically, throughout the whole range of the scheme (economy) of Salvation. We find this principle at its zenith in the mystery of Christ whose humanity preserves its nature wholly intact although it is the humanity of the person of the Son of God, but we find it just as truly at the lower level of the justification and sanctification of a man who, by faith and baptism, becomes the genuine adoptive son of the Father

without ceasing to be fully a man for all that.⁽⁹⁷⁾ Sanctifying grace, whatever our dogmatic explanation of it, offers a constant example of the transformation of a being (in this case, man) by the power of the Spirit of the Kurios whilst integrally safeguarding the structures and imperatives of Creation. ^(created being) What is more, this transformation is not just a matter of a gift of whose efficacy is transient: it endows the recipient with a new quality destined to endure unto its unfolding in the life of the world to come.

There can be no doubt that it is within this dispensation of the Spirit, which dominates the Christian view of ecclesial realities, that we must set the Eucharistic mystery - and account for the mysterious transformation of the sacramental elements. This, of course, with due regard for the laws of analogy.⁽⁹⁸⁾ Thus the question of transubstantiation drops into place. There is a restraint in the thinking of the Oriental Churches and yet a firm insistence that deep down in the bread and wine something happens whereby the bread and wine become in very truth the reality of the Lord himself present to his own people. This outlook may well serve as a guide. It is not a matter of bread and cup for this passing life but for the new Life which - and here we have once more law that regulates the sacramental realm and organism - without cancelling out this passing life, takes hold of it to lead it on until it enters into the unending happiness of everlasting communion. But the food that nourishes eternal Life can only be he who is Life itself. Thus it comes about that in and through the Spirit, an act of Christ's dominion is exercised in the midst of creation, and therein glimpses are perceived of the pledges of the world to come. Failure to place the Eucharist integrally in this setting of the ever transforming economy of the Holy Spirit exposes us either to discountenance radically any profound modification in the elements assumed (bread and wine) or to go round and round in explanations too rigidly ^{coloured} ~~welded~~ to the philosophical laws of this universe of ours. The whole question is

about a happening of the Spirit in the new era, brought about within the taking possession of this creation [this creature world of ours] by the Lord of the new Creation.

If what we have just set out is exact, then we find ourselves with a viewpoint somewhat similar to that of the Oriental Churches which should provide both of us, Roman Catholics and Anglicans, with a means of unravelling the difficulties in which each of us is enmeshed. When you narrow the confession of faith down to its essence, segregated from theological expositions, it really seems to amount to the kind of assertion made by Theodore of Mopsuesta: "When the Holy Spirit comes it is like a kind of anointing by grace received by the bread and wine that are presented. And thenceforth we believe them to be the body and blood of Christ, immortal, incorruptible, impassible, immutable by nature, as it happened to the body of our Saviour by means of the Resurrection."⁽⁹⁹⁾ Or there is this passage from Cyril of Jerusalem: "We implore God who loves men to send the Holy Spirit upon the gifts which have been presented, that he may make the bread the Body of Christ and the wine the Blood of Christ; for whatever is touched by the Holy Spirit is sanctified and transformed."⁽¹⁰⁰⁾

There are numerous passages from pat^ristic literature and Oriental liturgical texts that could be quoted to show how the acknowledgement of a profound change in the bread and wine can go hand in hand with a real sense of the mystery, once the reference to the Holy Spirit is taken as the key to the explanation and when, at the same time, the reality of the Eucharist is not isolated from the overall structure of the new scheme (economy) of Salvation. A more explicit text may be read in the Explanation of the Divine Liturgy by the medieval writer Nicholas Cabasilas: "The priest makes supplication that these gifts, having received his [Christ's] most holy and all powerful Spirit, may be transformed - the bread into his precious and holy Body, the wine into his pure and holy Blood. After these prayers and

these words ... the bread is no longer the figure of the body and blood of the Lord nor just an offering that bears the image of the true offering or just containing, as a picture contains, a representation of the saving Passion; no, what it is now is really and truly the offering itself, the very Body, infinitely holy, of the Master; the Body which really endured the outrages, insults and blows [of the Passion]; the Body which was crucified, immolated, 'which gave the supreme witness under Pontius Pilate,' was scourged, tortured, spat upon, tasted the gall. So also the wine has become the Blood which was poured out from the immolated Body. It is that Body, with the Blood, formed by the Spirit, born of the blessed Virgin; buried, risen the third day, ascended into heaven and seated at the right hand of the Father." (101)

This, surely, is what the new Anaphoras of the Roman liturgy assert in the prayers of the epiclesis, now fully restored to their important role.

The Tridentine assertion on transubstantiation, seen in the context of theological comment, is precisely aimed at safeguarding what we have here called the focal point of the assertion of traditional belief, namely, the bread and cup of this creation (our created world) become really and truly, by the power of the Spirit and in a mysterious manner, the Body of him who in his Pasch was made the Lord of Creation and of history. It is up to each ecclesial tradition to interpret this in keeping with its schemas and its own ethos. It is there that the doctrinal plurality, which we spoke of at the beginning of this study, comes into play.

III. THE MINISTER AUTHORISED TO CELEBRATE THE EUCHARIST

Once you have endeavoured to place the question of the Eucharist in the ecclesiological and pneumatic context to which it properly belongs, you inevitably find yourself faced with the difficult problem of ministry, the question which is at one and the same time an object of consensus and division between the Anglican and the Roman Catholic Churches. The consensus is on the existence of a ministry structured in three degrees, deaconate, priesthood,

and episcopate, and thus going back to the "apostolic" Tradition. The divisions, rendered more poignant in the recent period of history, arose in a large measure from the official pronouncements against the validity of the Anglican ministry since the consecration of Matthew Parker. And besides that there are the liberal views on ministry which are so much at home in the Anglican Church itself. These views are represented in their radical form by Approach B to intercommunion in the report on Intercommunion Today. (102) The authors of Growing into Union treat this radical aspect from a new angle and reach a unified view which, to the present writer, seems to be in line with the essentials of "Catholic" faith, taking that term in its wider meaning. (103) We must here give a brief sketch of the problem in its bearing on the Eucharist.

The historical aspect regarding the problem of episcopal succession is not what we are dealing with here. Our question is whether or not Anglicans and Roman Catholics have or have not an identical conception of the nature and the purpose of the ministry. On the Roman Catholic side the question can be put as follows: In Anglican doctrine what is the relation between Article XXV of the Articles of Religion (which seems to be geared to a liberal view) and the Preface [i.e., Introduction] traditionally printed at the head of the Ordinal, which has a distinctly "Catholic" aura about it? (104) This way of framing the question is more than ever justified because of the talks going on amongst the Churches of the Anglican Communion, in view of effecting an Organic Union with other Churches (Methodists, etc.) whose conception of ministry is emphatically not a "Catholic" one. It is, therefore, quite reasonable to ask oneself how documents like the "Answer of the Archbishops of England to Apostolica^e Curae" (104a) or the report on Doctrine in the Church of England stand up to the new situation of Anglican ecumenical overture to non-episcopal Churches.

We are not then studying here the validity of the Anglican ministry as it exists here and now, nor whether the Anglican Eucharist truly confers grace. We may note that on this point Roman Catholic theology, in regards to the Churches which it hesitates to include in its concept of apostolic succession, offers solutions of an increasingly positive turn, though the arguments in support of them are of uneven value and the least cogent of them seem to attract the most sympathetic hearing.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ What we have to do is to examine whether or not we receive communion with the same view of what the ministry really is deep down. This we must discover because we are not out to sit at all costs at/^aprecipitously prepared Eucharistic Table but to ~~ensure~~ ^{may} ensure that we ^Λmeet there in a genuine Koinonia of faith, life and worship. For do we not declare that the Eucharist celebrates and affirms the unity of the Church in giving to the ecclesial Body the true Body of the Lord, and that the historical ^{al} ministry is part and parcel of the very existence (belongs to the esse) of the visible unity of the Church of Christ?⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ It must, therefore, be impossible to treat of one without the other. As the authors of Growing into Union observe in their examination of Ignatius of Antioch's thoughts on the subject, there is an essential link between the rooting of the Church in the Salvation Event (by the profession of the genuine apostolic faith and the common celebration of the Eucharist) and the function of the ministry as Christ meant it to be.⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ It is in this perspective that we are considering the question of ministry.

The first step towards finding out what a Church conceives the ministry in fact to be is to make an attentive examination of the rites of ordination. Now in view of union with the Methodists (who have only one degree of ministry) the Anglican Church worked on a new Ordinal preceded by a Preface,^(108 a) a Latin translation of which was published with it as an appendix. This met with a great deal of criticism and the project with which it was linked has not succeeded, but the Ordinal remains an important document throwing light on the Anglican view of ministry, all the more valuable for the care taken

in preparing it. The authors of Growing into Union, who ardently opposed the proposed scheme for union, nevertheless admit that this Anglican-Methodist Ordinal is a valid starting point.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ We thus have a document that can reveal the "form" of ministry the Anglican Church explicitly intends to keep and practise - because that Church considers it essential - and asserts this in the very act of working out a process of union with a "non-Catholic" Church. We are, indeed, clearly told: "The doctrine of the Ministry and the priesthood of the Ministry is to be sought in what is said about the Orders in the Ordinal itself and in the revised Preface of the Ordinal, and any title used must be interpreted in the light of what is said there."

An attentive and critical analysis of the Commentary of the Draft Ordinal, the Preface, and the Ordinal itself, leaves us with the conviction that, taken objectively, despite some lack of precision (perhaps intended, to help the project along), the new rites are substantially in accord with what the Roman Catholic Church itself professes concerning the ministry as Christ willed it. The comparative study of the Ordinal and the new De ordinatione diaconi, presbyteri et episcopi^(110a) in the Roman Pontifical is extremely enlightening. All we can do in this present study is to point out the main areas of convergence. The most important point of all for our purpose is quite certainly the synthesis of the ministry given in the Preface, within a wide theological conspectus in which one finds the starting point of the Conciliar decree Ad Gentes.^{(111) (111a)} It first describes the Church seen in the dynamism of the mission of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, then brings out the royal priesthood of all the baptised in its double function of worship and mission, and then goes on: "The New Testament shows the Church on the Day of Pentecost as a body of believers having within it, as its recognised focus of unity and organ of authority, the Apostolate, which the Lord himself instituted."

The ritual, as we shall see later, spells out amply the functions that make of the Apostolate, and all that comes in its wake, the active centre of unity of the New Israel. But the Preface is careful to explain: "The commission given by Christ to the apostles has been perpetuated in the Church, and it is the desire of the Church of England and the Methodist Church, in following God's call to unity, faithfully to preserve and transmit this commission in their ordinations. The two Churches have provided in this Ordinal forms by which the historic Ministry may be continued among them and which they agree to use when they ordain men to any of the three Orders of Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon." Even the titles of bishop, priest, deacon, which were those employed by the Church before the break, are meant to "indicate the continuity of each order with the historical ministry."⁽¹¹⁴⁾ The intention of remaining faithful to the "Catholic" tradition could not be more clearly evidenced. We could even wish the statement regarding the link between the ministry and the charge of the Apostles was worded more subtly.⁽¹¹⁵⁾

The Preface is indeed careful to delineate the exact relationship between this ministry and the priesthood of the whole Church: "The royal priesthood which the whole Church has received from Christ her Lord and in which each member of his Body shares, is exercised by the faithful in different ways. The distinctive Ministry is a special form of this participation. It is in this way that the priesthood of bishop and presbyter should be understood."

True enough, there is not here the firm assertion of the profound distinction between royal priesthood of all the baptised and the ministerial priesthood which is made by Roman Catholic tradition in its Pontifical. On the Roman Catholic side care is always taken to recall that there is a difference not merely of degree but in essence (essentia et non gradu tantum) between the participation of all the baptised in the priesthood of Christ and the participation of the ministerial priest in it.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Here again,

Growing into Unity is more felicitous and more precise⁽¹¹⁹⁾ than the Ordinal. It would be wrong, however, to accuse the Ordinal of being confused; it bears a similarity with a passage of the Constitution Lumen Gentium which says: "The common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial priesthood are interrelated. Each of them in its own special way is a participation in the one priesthood of Christ."^(119a) The rite of ordination of presbyters and bishops attributes to them exactly what Lumen gentium sees as specifically distinguishing them from the rest of the faithful.⁽¹²⁰⁾ The Preface synthesises its concept of the ministry in the following definition: "The Ministry is this a divinely appointed organ which acts in relation with the whole Body in the name of Christ and which represents the priestly service of the whole Body in its common worship. Ministers are, as the Methodist Statement on Ordination expresses it, both the ambassadors of Christ and the representatives of all the People of God."⁽¹²¹⁾

A second area of convergence is found in the assertion that this ministry is conferred by an ordination whose effects last for the whole of the recipient's lifetime.⁽¹²²⁾ The Preface gives the following definition and description of this ordination and a Roman Catholic can find in it, especially since the Apostolic Constitution Sacramentum Ordinis,^(122a) what his own Church teaches and practises: "Ordination is a solemn act by which one who is acknowledged to have received God's call is brought into a particular Order of Ministry within the Church. Central to it is the action of the Holy Spirit in bestowing upon the person being ordained that which makes him a minister ... Those who voice the prayer are themselves already ministers with authority to ordain, and they accompany it by laying their hands on those who are being ordained. Both Churches present their candidates in the belief that the Holy Spirit will act in response to this prayer. Thus, for both, prayer with the laying on of hands is the outward sign whereby the ordinand receives the gift of the Spirit making him a minister."

The rest of the ceremonies are simply additions meant to explain the various aspects of the ministry which has been thus conferred. ⁽¹²⁴⁾ Add to this that the minister conferring the ordination is always a Presiding Bishop who is accompanied by two other bishops for an episcopal ordination and at least three presbyters for a presbyterial ordination. ⁽¹²⁵⁾

As to the prayers of ordination, they conform substantially, order for order, with the ideas that are at the heart of the ordination prayer of the Roman Pontifical. The two texts of the ordination of a bishop are here set down for comparison:

Ordinal

"Send down thy Holy Spirit upon this servant, for the office of a Bishop and Chief Pastor in thy Church. Endue him, we pray thee, as thou didst endue thine apostles with the fullness of thy grace, that he may be worthy as a true shepherd, to feed and govern thy flock; to offer with all thy People spiritual sacrifices acceptable in thy sight, to preside at the celebration of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of thy dear Son; and to promote unity and love within thy Church. Grant him such grace that he may evermore be ready to spread abroad thy Gospel, the glad tidings of reconciliation with thee; and to use the authority given him not to destroy but to save, not to hurt but to help. So strengthen him at all times against the assaults of the devil, that whether as ruler over thy household or as ambassador for Christ in the world he may stand ever blameless before thee: and abiding steadfast in thy service all his days he may be called at the last, with all thy good and faithful servants to enter into thine eternal joy, through Jesus Christ, thy Son our Lord, the Chief Shepherd and our great High Priest, who is alive ... "

Pontifical

"Pour then upon your chosen one that power which comes from you alone, the perfect Spirit which you gave to your beloved Son Jesus Christ. He gave this Spirit to the apostles who built the Church in every place as a sanctuary to the undying praise and glory of your name. Father, you search the hearts of men, grant that this your servant whom you have chosen to be bishop may provide pasture for your holy flock. May his high priesthood be without reproach. Serving you night and day may he remain ever blameless in your sight. May he bring blessings on your holy Church. By the grace of your Spirit may he have power to forgive sins according to your word and exercise his functions according to your will. With the authority of a successor of the apostles may he set free those in bondage. Grant that he may please you in humility and purity of heart, offering himself to you as a wholesome gift: through Jesus Christ ... "

The same parallels can be shown in the case of the ordination to the priesthood, though the Pontifical dwells more emphatically than the Ordinal

on its special aspect of worship. The text of the Ordinal is particularly beautiful.⁽¹²⁷⁾ We must admit that the new Roman ritual does not match its evocative style nor its richness of theological content.

This brings us to a third important point of convergence where we indeed find ourselves face to face with the subject of this study, namely, the question of the particular functions of each of the ministries. The Ordinal determines what they are in the series of questions which precedes each ordination and in the consecratory prayer. We cannot here go into the details of these functions. It will be sufficient to give the two essential passages whilst bearing in mind that the other texts carry the elements to which Roman Catholic thought pays particular attention, especially since Vatican II. The declaration on the priesthood ^(in the Ordinal) is most interesting: "A presbyter is called to be a fellow-worker with the bishop and with his fellow-presbyters as servant and shepherd in the place to which he shall be sent. It is his work to preach Christ's Gospel to all men; to call sinners to repentance; to assure them God's mercy; and to baptize. He is to teach, edify, encourage, both by word and example, the People entrusted to his charge. He is to lead them in prayer and worship; to preside at the celebration of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ and in his Name to absolve the penitent. He is to prepare the baptized for Confirmation and to make ready the dying for their death. He must set the Good Shepherd always before himself as the pattern of his calling, so that he care for his people, serving with them in their common witness to the world. Brethren, such is the work of a presbyter. It is no light or easy thing."

The passage concerning bishops is in the same vein: "A Bishop is called to be a Chief Minister and Chief Pastor, and with other Bishops, to be also a guardian of the faith, the unity and the discipline which are common to the whole Church, and an overseer of her mission throughout the world. It is his duty to watch and protect the congregations committed to his charge and therein

to teach and govern after the example of the Apostles of the Lord. He is to lead and guide the Presbyters and Deacons under his care and to be faithful in ordaining and sending new ministers. A Bishop must, therefore, know his people and be known by them; he must proclaim and interpret Christ's Gospel to them; and lead them in the offering of spiritual sacrifice and prayer. He must take care for the due ministering of God's Word and Sacraments; he must also be diligent in confirming the baptized and, whenever it shall be required of him, in administering discipline according to God's holy Word ... These are the duties of a Bishop."

The functions imposed on the deacon are the same as those of the diaconate in the Roman Catholic Church. It is interesting to note that the parallel is all the more striking since the restoration of the practice of permanent diaconate in the Roman Catholic Church.

There is one surprising detail in the Ordinal's prayer of ordination of a bishop: it asks for the power of the Spirit, that the newly ordained may "preside at the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of thy dear Son," whereas the interrogation said of him that he must "lead them [the people] in the offering of spiritual sacrifice and prayer." Now the prayer of ordination of a presbyter asks that the Holy Spirit may make him "worthy to offer with all thy people spiritual sacrifices acceptable in thy sight," whilst the interrogation says that it is the function of the presbyter to "preside at the celebration of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ." Is this inversion intentional? Is this a matter of deliberate ambiguity or at least is it a deliberate evasion of a clear statement of the function of the minister at Lord's Supper (Communion Service)? The question is an important one for our consensus on the Eucharist, because of the emphasis placed by the Roman Catholic tradition on the relationship between the ministerial priesthood and the offering of the "sacramental sacrifice": it is an emphasis that sees in the intervention of the minister in the memorial not only an essential condition for the accomplishing of the sacrament but also the culminating

point of his function as pastor. What is meant here exactly by "sacramental sacrament?" Is the minister limited to gathering together the holy life of the faithful and offering it to the Father, or does his own personal action fulfil a specific and irreplaceable role in the sacramental gift of the Body and Blood of the Lord, a role in which his mission as servant and minister of the Koinonia reaches its highest peak?

The study of the Anglican tradition — it would take more space than we can afford here to set down even its main documentation — its constant refusal ^{allow} to laymen (people, therefore, not ordained) to preside at the Eucharist (in keeping with Articles XXIII and XXXVI)⁽¹³¹⁾, all that we have said about sacrifice in the first half of this present study, the overall analysis of the Ordinal — all of this makes us inclined to take a) the presidency of the Lord's Supper, and b) the function of the minister in the offering of the spiritual sacrifice(s) of the People of God, and interpret each in the light of the other, which means giving to the presidency a content of sacramental efficacy proper to it and irreplaceable.

It remains true, however, that the Anglican-Methodist ritual taken globally gives little emphasis to the specifically Eucharistic dimension of the ministry and seems sometimes to put it on a level with its other functions. It is surprising, for instance, to find in the questions put to the ordinands no allusions, not even an implicit one, to the celebration of the Lord's Supper. It is only mentioned in the list of duties, whereas diligence in prayer, reading and studying the Word of God, all figure in the special questions put to them. If these questions are read in parallel with those of the Pontifical, the difference of emphasis becomes apparent.

But there are two important points to be noted. First, Roman Catholic thought, whilst maintaining the hierarchy of a minister's functions, today no longer places somewhat exclusive emphasis on the function of worship. This is a departure from the attitude of past centuries. The Decree on the life and

ministry of the priest, like No. 28 of Lumen Gentium (drawn up before it), is evidence of this new outlook, which restores aspects long since left in obscurity. The second remark is on a point of fact. In the prayer of ordination of a bishop the wording of the Pontifical is less explicit than the Ordinal in speaking of the specific Eucharistic function of the bishop: "Offerat dona sanctae Ecclesiae tuae."⁽¹³²⁾ And whilst it is true that in the interrogation and especially in the handing of the bread and the chalice to the ordinand, the Ordination of a Priest brings out his function in the offering of the sacramental sacrifice, the prayer of ordination only makes an indirect reference to it by recalling the priesthood of Aaron. The prayer says nothing about the Christian presbyter's specific function in the Eucharist. Note also that the model given in the Pontifical for the allocution^(132a) in the rite of the Ordination of a Priest also speaks of "spiritual sacrifice."⁽¹³³⁾ And, while we are making comparisons in the perspective of the Eucharist, we may add that in the Pontifical there is emphasis rather on the link between the bishop and the local church⁽¹³⁴⁾ and the relationship between the priest and the bishop, whereas the Ordinal brings out excellently the communion that must exist between on the one hand the People of God and their ministers and on the other hand the communion of all priests amongst themselves.

The inevitable conclusion we reach, it seems to the present writer, is that objectively— in their internal structure and in what the rites express therefore in their form^(134b)— the Ordinal and the Pontifical share essentials. Of course, the Ordinal has not been given any official approval and the vote taken in 1969 has even withdrawn the value it previously enjoyed as an "official project." However, it remains the most thoroughly worked-out statement— with a church mandate for its undertaking— of the rites in which the Anglican communion recognises, in the ecumenical situation with which it was concerned and the current liturgical revision, what its concept is of apostolic ministry. And, we note, the objective content of these rites and that of

the new Roman rites match each other.

This conclusion is of capital importance. Does it of itself provide sufficient grounds for a deep seated consensus? That would be wishful thinking. Every ^sSacrament, including the sacrament of ministry, is a signum fidei (a faith-sign). It therefore derives the fulness of its reality equally from the nature of the constant continuing intention [intention vecue] and from the faith of the assembly that celebrates the sacrament. ⁽¹³⁵⁾ Hence, the study of the objective signification of the rites of the Ordinal leads on to the further question: "Is this objective intention absorbed into and made its own by a constant continuing ecclesial intention [a church-lived intention]? In other words, is there an equation between the content objectively delineated in the rite and the meaning read into that rite by the Church which uses it? What that meaning is will determine the ecclesial intention pervading the entire celebration. An inadequate or a minimising meaning on the part of the Church officially using the ritual can so take possession of the intention and ^{of} the objective sense as to alter them. We see this from what happens in other areas of the sacramental realm, in particular in the case of the Eucharist where rites that are objectively similar have not an entirely identical signification for all the Churches using them. We are therefore obliged to place our reliance on the analysis of official teaching. But the principle invoked in the introduction to the Ordinal, and according to which the doctrine of the ministry is to be found in the rites, proves to be inadequate for that purpose: the sacraments belong within (are interior to) the constant continuing and lived faith and derive their ultimate meaning from it.

It is at this point that from the Roman Catholic angle a difficult but important question must be put to the Anglican body at large. ^(135a) It is a question that takes up the authors of Growing into Union on the point not of the Ordinal as such but of the overall process in which it has its setting.

It is this. How does one reconcile the deeply "Catholic" objective concept, which is put to use in the Ordinal, with the wide freedom of interpretation of the meaning of the historical episcopate and of its nature officially acknowledged as existing de facto in the bosom of the Anglican body?⁽¹³⁶⁾

We know, of course, that Intercommunion Today affirms that in the various projects for unification there is always insistence on the acceptance of the episcopacy, "as a necessary element in the future constitution of the Church."⁽¹³⁷⁾ As regards union with the Methodists, one respects the expression in the Preface^(137a) of the Ordinal which declares the desire to maintain the historical ministry, the hub of unity for the Church of Christ. One also bears in mind the important passage in the 1963 Report where the distinction is made between the wide range of doctrinal interpretations discernable within the Anglican body and the invariable unity of practice:⁽¹³⁸⁾ it is because the historical episcopacy does in fact exist that it is possible to indulge in radical views concerning it. At the very beginning of this present study the point was made that doctrinal pluralism was possible and even necessary, provided the axis of faith is safeguarded. But this assertion of the "capital role" of the historical episcopacy in the mystery of the Church, is it or is it not a factor determining the authentic meaning of "I believe in one, holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church?"

The question is perfectly reasonable in view of the fact that at the very moment when it delineates in the Ordinal a remarkably "Catholic" liturgy of the ministry, the Anglican Church seems, in the various Reports concerning Anglican-Methodist union, to give more weight to minimising views, even if it does refrain from voicing approval of them. We find ourselves agreeing with Growing into Union when it points out the perplexing passage ^{on} ~~in~~ pages 23 to 26 ~~of~~ of the 1968 Report.⁽¹³⁹⁾ Is it a pure accident due to the special climate of the Anglican-Methodist dialogue?

There is still, then, some clarifying to be done in the area of our

getting together, on the question of the intention which each of our Churches attributes to ministerial ordination. On this score we are happy to see theologians of both the Anglo-Catholic and the Evangelical tendencies marking out in Growing into Union what may prove to be the first steps towards a consensus primarily within the Anglican Church. It is not within our present scope to discuss the passages in question with which the present writer finds himself substantially in agreement, though there is surely a great deal for Roman Catholics to gain from a close study of it.

It is evident that on the immediate issues regarding the Eucharist a deep cleavage in the concept of the manner in which the minister is linked with the Apostolic Church cannot fail to effect the manner in which we conceive the link between each Eucharist and Christ and the Church. This is an essential aspect of the Eucharistic mystery once you envisage it within the totality of the New Alliance. For through its minister each celebration of the memorial links the assembled community with all the other communities which, dispersed in time and place, remain, or have remained, in communion with the apostolic faith.⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ But what we have so far shown makes one think that our divergencies are not so deep that they prevent us from jointly recognising at least one thing: the President, ordained in the historical ministry is, in the Eucharist, the link and the witness of the visible unity of the Church and of its constant identity down the ages and in all places. It would seem then that even on this point (which is still to be discussed) about the quality of the minister of the Eucharist and the role proper to him as sacramentum of visible unity and sacramentum of the ministry of Christ himself giving himself to his own, our two Churches are in agreement at least on the essentials.

This study has enabled us to analyse and assess the situation and to set out an appreciative view - a necessary process even if it

is sometimes laborious - of the areas of convergence discernible within our two Churches. It should be borne in mind that the purpose of this study called for an awareness of what one might call the average conscience of each of our two Churches and not an investigation of the insights of theologians deeply involved in opening out the traditions of their own Church to new perspectives. Some readers, who do not know about the Commission⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ for which all this research was originally done, may feel that all that has been achieved here is to sift the same old problems yet again. Perhaps so. But the rifts and misunderstandings of centuries are not mended just by a resolve to think up something new. There is a long history stretching back from our day and it has left its mark on us.

What can one say at the close of this study, if not that in the matter of Eucharistic faith and doctrine there are many points that divide us still? - including some that demand attention if we are ever to reach genuine unity; and, whilst therefore we cannot speak of full agreement we can say there is substantial agreement. True enough, this substantial agreement has to be sought in the midst of a variety of doctrinal emphases, divergent theories, dissimilar practices and especially basic differences of attitude. Thus, on the one hand there is the preoccupation to respect the incomprehensibility of the mystery and not to sully it by trying to harness it to over clever reasoning, and on the other hand the endeavour to spare no pains to throw light on it. For all that, we are surely close to each other. What must now be done is to discover whether a substantial agreement of this kind is sufficient, taking doctrinal pluralism into proper account, to justify saying that the question of the Eucharist no longer constitutes in itself an obstacle to our communion.

1. Evidence of this was seen in the debate concerning the General Instruction for the Roman Missal. The tone of the Declaration of the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship [the Vatican 'department' for the Liturgy], 18 November 1969 is suggestive of this malaise (see Notitiae 5, 1969, pp. 417-418).

1a. communion.

2. ~~It~~ It came as a surprise to some members of the Section for Worship at the Upsala assembly, 1968, ^{to} find that there ~~several~~ a number of delegates were not in agreement over points that had already been accepted in official consensus drawn up by their churches. One sometimes asks oneself whether ~~some~~ ^{recent} consensus are not rather agreed formulae than a genuine ^Cproclamation of faith ^{held} in common.

3. C.O. Buchanan, L. Mascall, J.I. Packer, The Bishop of Willesden, Growing into Union, proposals for forming a united Church in England. (London, 1970). Written by two authors of the Evangelical wing of the Church of England and two from the Catholic wing, this book is surely an important witness to serious research, not for vague compromises but for unity in what I designate as the axis of the faith.

4. It is sometimes forgotten that this pluralism already exists, even on points of considerable importance. Without going into the ~~complicated~~ complicated problems arising from the situation in which the Uniates are placed, we may note ^{simply} ~~en-the~~ at the level of theology, the dualism ^{a significant fact since} regarding theological views on grace, ~~the~~ the primordial importance of the mystery of grace is recognised by all. Note also how our consciousness of unity of faith with the Orthodox Churches is consistent with considerable divergences, for example the intricate discussions on the question of the Filioque. Even before ~~Roman/Roman~~

W. B.

W. B.

Footnotes

Catholic theology took up anew the balanced view of the ~~epiclesis~~ ~~invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist~~ role of the Holy Spirit in the ~~Lord's~~ Eucharist, the quarrel over the epiclesis [invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharistic liturgy. W.B.] did not impede us from acknowledging the truth (and the validity) of the Orthodox Eucharist.

5. see the studies by Dom E. Lanne, Les différences compatibles avec l'unité dans la tradition de l'Eglise ancienne, in Istina, 1961-1962; 227-256; Pluralisme et unité; possibilités d'une diversité de

typologies dans une même adhésion ecclésiale, in Istina, 1969, pp. 171-190.
6. Text in DC, 1967, 1381-1383 (1382).

7. Intercommunion To-day, being the Report of the Archbishop's Commission on Intercommunion (London, 1968) No. 158, p. 93; No. 41, p. 24.

8. The Patristic and exegetical research of the Anglican tradition have played an important role in bringing to light the full meaning of the

Eucharistic

res considered in relation to the totality of the mystery of Salvation. [see footnote 14a. W.B.]

9. Here also our discovery is one we have both made. The point has been made of Cranmer's scant interest in the dimension of thanksgiving in the Lord's Supper. (see Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England, a memorandum of the Church of England Liturgical Commission (London, ~~1958~~ ~~1958~~ 1958), pp. 30-31. The works of G. Dix and the English translation (by A.G. Hebert) of Y. Brilioth's Eucharistic Faith and Practice evangelical and Catholic (London, 1930) have made their mark on Roman Catholic thinking, just as J. Jungmann and L. Boyer, for example, have influenced Anglican research. It is interesting to note that the documents of the ¹⁹⁵⁸ Lambeth Conference quotes Boyer several times. (pp. 2.8 and 2.8)

Footnotes

10. The points not discussed here have been gone into in depth in the work by J. Zizioulas, J.M.R. Tillard, J.J. von Allmen, L'Eucharistie (Collection, Eglise en dialogue, Paris, 1970).
11. see Subscription and Assent to the 39 articles, Report of the Archbishop's Commission on Christian Doctrine (London, 1968) pp.9 - 18.
12. These, especially in the nineteenth century and in the Tractarian Movement, were within the Anglican body itself. Traces of them are still to be found in A.M. Stibbs, Sacrament, Sacrifice and Eucharist (London, 1961) (London, 1961)
13. Summa Theologica, III, 83, 1.
14. Summa Theologica, III, 79, 7
- 14a. The Scholastic theologians devised the following technical sacramental terminology:-
1. sacramentum tantum (sacrament alone) meant that which signifies but is not signified, namely, the external rite consisting of the 'matter' (e.g. in baptism, water and the washing with it) and the 'form' (e.g. in baptism, the words "I baptise" etc...).
 2. res tantum (the thing alone) meant that which is signified and does not signify, namely, the grace conferred, which is signified by the exterior rite but does not itself represent anything further.
 3. res et sacramentum (the thing and the sacrament) meant that which is signified and also signifies something further (e.g. in the Eucharist there is the Body of Christ signified by the sacramental species ('accidents' of bread and wine) and signify the grace of spiritual nourishment.
15. see the remarks of ~~Zizioulas~~ E. Käsemann, The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, in Essays on New Testament Themes (London, 1964) pp.108-135 (128)

16. see J.M.R. Tillard, Le Sacrement, événement de Salut (Brussels-Paris, 1964).

16a. ephapax = "once for all"; see for instance Romans, 6, 10: "For in dying as he did, he died ~~for~~ to sin once for all". w. B.

~~16b. see footnote 16a above. w. B.~~

17. Contra Faustum, XX, 18; C.S.B.L., 25, 559.

17a. London, Catholic Truth Society. w. B.

18. No. 3b. The same balance is found in the General Instruction of the Roman Missal, Nos. 48; 56h. At Trent, in an impressive intervention, the theologian John Gropper emphasised that "eucharistia ut sacramentum et ut sacrificium non differt nisi ratione distinguantur". (Consilium Tridentinum, ed. Societas Goeresiana, t. VII, vol. 1. (Freiburg, 1961) ^{p. 406,} line 27. In Session XIII, chap. 5, the Council asserted that "this sacrament was instituted by Christ to be received" (J. Waterworthth, Council of Trent, London, 1848).

19. The text of Thomas Aquinas is particularly interesting because of the ~~close~~ close link he establishes between sacramentum and sacrificium. "The Eucharist is not ~~only~~ only a sacrament but also a sacrifice. Now whoever offers sacrifice must be a sharer in the sacrifice, because the outward sacrifice he offers is a sign of the inner sacrifice whereby he offers himself to God.... In the same way also by dispensing the sacrament to the people the priest shows that he is the dispenser of divine gifts of which he ought himself to be ~~the~~ the first partaker.... It is by eating of the sacrifice that he shares in it (per hoc autem fit particeps quod de sacrificio sumit).... Therefore it is necessary that the priest, so often as he ~~consecrates~~ consecrates, receive the sacrament in its integrity". (III, ~~82~~ 82, 4.)

20. This assertion is constantly made, by A.M. Stibbs, op. cit., ~~for instance,~~ ^{for instance,}

who refers to other works.

21. This expression is used by R. Bultman, Jesus Christ and Mythology, (London, S.C.M. Press, 1960) [w. 6]
22. I have endeavoured to demonstrate this in Le Mémorial dans la vie de l'Eglise, in Maison Dieu, 1971.
23. This aspect has been studied often. See A.M. Denis, La fonction apostolique et la liturgie nouvelle en Esprit, étude thématique des métaphores pauliniennes du culte nouveau, in Revue de Sciences Phil. et Théol., 1958, pp. 401-436; 617-656; J.H. Elliot, The Elect and the Holy, an exegetical examination of 1 Peter 2, 4-10 (Leiden, 1966); J. Coppens, ~~Le SACRÉDOCE ROYAL DES FIDÈLES~~ Le sacerdos royal des fidèles, in, Au service de la Parole de Dieu (Mélanges Charue) (Gembloux, 1969) pp. 61-75.
24. D.M. Baillie, The Theology of the Sacraments (London, 1957) p. 115.
25. pp. 58-51; 190-192.
26. E. Jacob, Théologie de l'Ancien Testament (Neuchâtel-Paris, 1955) pp. 218-219.
27. On the Biblical meaning of zikkaron, see N. Dahl, Anamnèsis, mémoire et commémoration dans le christianisme primitif, in Stud. Theol., 1947, 69-95; P.A.H. de Boer, Gedenken und Gedächtnis in der Welt des Alten Testaments (Stuttgart, 1960); W. Schottroff, Gedenken im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament, die Wurzel ZKR im semitischen Sprachkreis (Neukirchen, 1964); B.S. Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel (London, 1962) For the application of these notions directly to the Christian Eucharist see especially M. Thurian, L'Eucharistie, Mémorial du Seigneur, Sacrifice d'action de grâce et d'intercession (Neuchâtel-Paris, 1959) and Boyer, Eucharistie, (Paris-Bruges, 1966).
- 27a Ed. in English; good life Neale, Birmingham. w. B.
28. see Notitiae 6, 1970, p. 177.
- ~~28a Goodlife Neale (Birmingham) (w. B.)~~
29. see ibid., pp. 177-179 and 5 (1969), pp. 417-418.

30. The Latin text of the two versions reads as follows: "Cena dominica sive Missa ^{est} ~~est~~ sacra synaxis seu congregatio populi Dei in unum convenientis, sacerdote praeside, ad memoriale Domini celebrandum" (1969 version). "In Missa ^{seu} ~~est~~ Cena dominica ^c populus Dei in unum convocatur, sacerdote praeside personamque Christi gerente, ad memoriale Domini seu sacrificium ^{eucharisticum} ~~eucharisticum~~ celebrandum" (1970 version).

31. "In Cena novissima, Christus sacrificium et ^{convivium} ~~convivium~~ paschale instituit, quo sacrificium crucis in Ecclesia continue praesens efficitur, cum sacerdos, Christum ^D ~~D~~ominum representans, idem perficit quod ipse Dominus egit atque discipulis in sui memoriam faciendum tradidit" (1970 version). See also No. 55.

32. On the problem of propitiation in general see the studies by ~~P.~~ P. Lyonnet. A synthesis of his research may be seen in A. Robert and A. Feuillet, Introduction to the Bible On Trent's statement of the ~~the~~ propitiatory value of the Mass, see ~~the~~ M. Thurian's remarks, op. cit. pp. 240 - 241 where he says: "It must be noted in the very first place that if the Council pronounces against the Protestants who accept nothing ^{beyond} ~~more~~ than a sacrifice of praise or a simple commemoration, it just as much condemns the 'Catholic' error ~~which~~ stigmatised by the Confession of Augsburg, according to which the Mass would have expiatory value for actual sins [the sins which we ourselves ^{W.B.} commit], whereas the Cross would be the expiation for original sin [inherited from our first parents. W.B.] For in choosing the adjective ^{'propitiatory'} ~~'expiatory'~~ the text avoids using 'expiatory', a word which would have given rise to confusion between Mass and Cross. Expiation evokes suffering and immolation, propitiation can be taken ~~to mean~~ to mean the memorial of the one and only expiatory sacrifice, a memorial presented to the Father to invoke his grace. If

'propitiation' can be repugnant to Protestant thought, it may be pointed out that the adjective avoids all notion of actual expiation, in the sense of the Cross, all notion of actual redemption, in the sense of the one and only sacrifice of Christ". This remark, which reflects the position held by M. Lepin, would seem to be confirmed by the analysis of the debates at Trent. See also, E.C.S. Gibson, The Thirty-nine articles of the Church of England (London ~~1896~~ 1896) p. 693, note. 2. A close study of the Summa Theologica shows, ~~also~~ be it noted ^{that}, despite certain ~~precipitous~~ affirmations to the contrary which ~~are~~ come surprisingly from the pens of specialists, Thomas Aquinas was extremely cautious in the use of the terminology of propitiation. Of the ~~none~~ mentions of it throughout the Summa most are quotations from St Paul and not one ^{refers to} ~~concerns~~ the specifically sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist. The mention in III, 83, 5 is to do with propitiation in the Old Testament.

33. See the text published by Paul Elmer More and Frank Leslie Cross, Anglicanism (London. 1962) pp. 495 - 496. Ch. Gore, The Body of Christ (London 1901) pp. 185 - 214 is typical. The Anglican position is summed up by G. Aulen, Eucharist and Sacrifice (Edinburgh. 1958) pp. 190 - 192 ^{On} ~~Ch.~~ Ch. Gore, see E.L. Mascall, Corpus Christi, Second Edition, London. 1965) p. 238. Cf. Beaufort Moss, The Christian Faith, and introduction to Dogmatic Theology (London. 1965) pp. 368-370, takes firmly the notion of union with the ^{heavenly} ~~heaven~~ Christ. That was also the position of J. ~~Wesley~~ Wesley. See W.H.F. Scott, The Eucharist and the heavenly ministry of our Lord, in Theology, 1953, pp. 42-50. Pusey and Wilberforce also take this view. (see Alf. Hardelin, The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist (Upsala. 1965) pp. 215; 216-219.

34. This is well brought out by G. Aulen, op.cit. pp. 191-192.

35. See A. Vanhoye, Situation du Christ, Hebreux ~~#~~ 1-2. (Paris. 1969) pp. 378-383.

36. For a tentative explanation, see Le Sacrament^e, événement de Salut, pp.95-

128.

37. An analysis of the most important of the ancient documents may be found in J. de Watteville, Le Sacrifice dans les Textes Eucharistiques des premiers siècles. (Neuchâtel-Paris, 1966).

38. Thus, Justin, Clement, Irenaeus, Cyprian.

39. Thus A.M. Stibbs, op.cit. p.63. See also Doctrine in the Church of England, the Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922, pp.141-156; The Lambeth Conference 1958, 2.83 to 2.85.

40. This is pointed out by the authors of Growing into Union .p189.

41. "The offering of Christ once made ~~up~~ upon the Cross is that perfect redemption, propitiation and satisfaction for all the sins of the ^{whole} world, both actual and original; there is no other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. In the Sacrament of the Holy Communion a perpetual memory is made of the oblation of Christ. No addition to his self-offering on the Cross is intended or conveyed. Therein we offer ourselves and our ~~fi~~ gifts, and receiving the spiritual food of the Body and Blood of Christ are made one with him and are incorporated into his mystical Body, which is the blessed company of the faithful both living and departed. Therein too we receive through the operation of the Holy Spirit by faith the saving benefits of Christ's death and resurrection!" (Subscription and Assent to the 39 Arts, 65.)

42. Thus Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (London. 1946); A. Kavanagh, The Concept of Eucharistic Memorial in the Canon Revisions of Thomas Cranmer (St Meinrad, 1964) esp. pp.93-120; 136-171); P. Brooks, Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist (London. 1965) E.P. Echlin, The Anglican Eucharist in Ecumenical Perspective, doctrine and rite from Cranmer to Seabury (New York. 1968);

C.C. Richardson, Cranmer and the Analysis of the Eucharistic Doctrine, in Journal of Theological Studies, 1965, pp.421-437; C.W. Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers (London. 1958)

43. "The oblation and sacrifice of Christ in the Mass is so called not because Christ indeed is there offered and sacrificed by the priest and the people, for that was done but once by Himself ^{upon} the Cross, but it is so called because it is a memory and representation of that very true sacrifice and

- and immolation which before was made upon the Cross" (from G. Dix, op.cit. p.641). See also Writings and Disputations of Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr 1556, relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper? edited by J.E.Cox (Parker Society, Cambridge, 1844) pp.356; 369.
44. Writings and Disputations.... p.359. See also Answer to Gardiner, 1551, which gives a highly symbolic interpretation (ibid. p.366).
45. This explains the variety of interpretations. See, E.J. Bicknell, The Thirty-nine Articles, third revised edition by H.J. Carpenter (London, 1963); in Article XXXI he holds that "the language is most carefully chosen. There is no denial of the Eucharistic sacrifice but of current perversions of it, as embodied in the practical system of worship during the Middle Ages. The plural 'sacrifices' condemns any idea that each Eucharist is in any sense a repetition of the sacrifice once offered on Calvary or an addition to it, or that by multiplying Eucharists blessings could automatically be multiplied... It is not the 'sacrifice of the Mass' but the 'sacrifices of masses' that is condemned; not any formal theological statement of doctrine -- for such did not exist -- but popular errors (quod vulgo dicebatur)" (pp.417-418). See likewise E.C.S. Gibson, op.cit. pp.687 - 694. But how can one make these analyses of competent scholars tally fully with the findings of the historical research done by C.W. Dugmore, op.cit. ? We here put our finger on that ambiguity which we have been coming up against throughout our study of the most representative writings and documents of the earliest Anglican tradition.
46. See The Works of Nicholas Ridley, ed. H. Christmas (Parker Society, Cambridge, 1848) pp.216-217.
47. This transpires from a careful study of Part II of Apology of the Church of England, ed. J.E. Booty (The Folger Shakespeare Library, Ithaca, 1963) pp.137

pp.

(p) 31-39 : "We say that the Eucharistia, the supper of the Lord, is a sacrament, that is to wit, ^{an} evident token of the body and blood of Christ, wherein is set, as it were, before our eyes the death of Christ and his resurrection, and what act soever he did whilst he was in his mortal body; to the end that we may give thanks for his death and for our delivrance; and that by the often receiving of this sacrament, we may daily renew the ~~renew~~ remembrance of that matter, to the intent we, being fed with the body and blood of Christ, may be brought into the hope of the resurrection and of everlasting life and may most assuredly believe that the body and blood of Christ doth in ~~the~~ like manner feed our souls as bread and wine doth feed our bodies!" (31-32). Elsewhere he declares ~~that~~ that the sacrifice of the Cross, "is revived and freshly laid before our eyes, in the ministration of the holy mysteri^es". (quoted by C.W. Dugmore, op.cit. p.231).

48. Thus the text quoted by P. Elmer More and F. Leslie Cross in Anglicanism, p.497 and by H. S. Symonds in The Council of Trent and Anglican Formularies, (London, 1933): "We are in this action ^vnot only carried up to Christ, but we are also carried back to Christ as he was at this instant, and in the very act of His offering..... By the incomprehensible power of His eternal Spirit, not He alone, but He at the very act of His offering is made present to us". These texts came to our notice thanks to a note taken by Prof. R. J. Halliburton.

49. Note should be taken of this text : "My third instance shall be in the sacrifice ^{which} is offered up to God in that great and high mysytery of our Redemption by the death of Christ; for, as Christ offered Himself up once for all, a full and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sin of the ~~the~~ ^{whole} world, so ~~as~~ ^{did} He institute and command a memory of this sacrifice in a sacrament, even till his coming ~~again~~ again. For, at and in the Eucharist, we offer up to God three sacrifices, One by the priest only; that is the commemorative sacrifice &

— of Christ's death represented in bread broken and wine ~~is~~ ^{poured} ~~used~~ out. ~~the~~
 Another by the priest and the people jointly; and that is the sacrifice of
 praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and graces we received by the
 precious death of Christ. The third, by every particular man for himself only;
 and that is the sacrifice of every man's body and soul, to serve Him in both
 all the rest of his life, for this blessing thus bestowed on him". (Quoted ~~at~~
 from the Library of Anglo-catholic Theology, The Works of the Most Reverend
Father in God William Laud, D.D., vol. II, Conference with Fisher. (Oxford, 1849)
 pp. 339-341).

50. See the thorough work of Alf. Hardelin, The Tractarian Understanding of
the Eucharist (Upsala, 1965), esp. pp. 199-222.

51. The Lambeth Conference 1958 ; 2.83 to 2.85. See the Answer ^{of} ~~to~~ the
Archbishops of England (29 March 1897) to Apostolicae curae. No. XI of
 the Answer sets out to show that the Anglican Tradition is in harmony
 with Trent's views of the concept of 'Eucharistic sacrifice'.

52. Thus the General Instruction of the Roman Missal ^{says} ~~says~~ : "cum celebratio eucharistica convivium paschale sit, expedit ~~ut~~ ut, juxta mandatum Domini, Corpus et ^{Sanguis} ~~Sanguis~~ ejus ut cibus spiritualis accipiantur"(1969) ; and (1970)"Corpus et Sanguis ejus a fidelibus rite dispositis ut cibus spiritualis accipiatur". (52a."Since the Eucharistic celebration is a paschal meal, ^{it is expedient that} the Body and Blood of the Lord be received as spiritual food in accordance with the his command" -1969; 1970 - "...received by the faithful rightly disposed.....").

53. We agree with E.L.Mascall's remark in Corpus Domini (Seceond ed. London, 1965, p.83): " I cannot agree with those who hold that without a satisfactory doctrine of the Presence and adequate understand^{ing} of the sacrifice is either possible or sufficient".

54. See W. Jardine and A.Grisbrooke in their splendid book Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteen Centuries. (London, 1958) particularly the introduction) and E.J.Bicknell's comments, op.cit. pp. 382 -407 and Edgar C.S.Gibson, op.cit. pp.640 - 667. See also the history of the famous Black Rubric . This was inserted illegally into the 1552 Prayer Book(Edward VI) when the book was already in the process of being printed. It stated that communicants, if they knelt to receive communion ~~and so~~ " it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's natural flesh and blood". In 1559 the Rubric ^{dis} ~~dis~~appeared. It reappeared in 1662 but freshly worded in a way that ^{allows room for} ~~sought to exclude~~ faith in a Eucharistic presence, thus :
 "...any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood". Note

also that Article XXVIII as we have it is from the pen of Edmund ~~Guest~~ ^{Guest}, Bishop of Rochester, who asserts in a letter to Cecil that it was not at all his intention to "exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof". The text can be found in C.F. Hogdes, Bishop Guest : Articles Twenty-eight and Twenty-nine (London, 1894, p22.)

55. In this connection one should bear in mind the work of Dom Odo Casel and the Mysteriengegenwart school, which incidentally, forced the Thomists to rediscover some pertinent views of St Thomas Aquinas; and also the work done by Anscar Vonier and, nearer to our day, E. Masure's Le Signe (Paris, 1954) and Le Sacrifice du Chef (Paris, 1957).

56. The translation is from Water^{worth}ten. The original text can be seen in DS, ~~1636~~ 1636.

57. DS, 1651.

58. D.M. Baillie brings this out well; op.cit. pp. 102 - 107.

59. DS, 1636, 1651, 1653. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, III, 76.

60. Th. Aquinas, III, 76, 5.

61. ibid, ad 2.

62. E. Schillebeckx, La Presence du Christ dans l'Eucharistie (Paris, ~~1970~~ 1970), He here studies the thought of Trent on the subject. I would ^{sl} ~~slightly~~ modify his conclusions concerning the influence of Aristotelian ~~revelation~~ ^{thought} in the discussions. A study of the Council debates seen in the light of the writings of the theologians and bishops ^{some of them,} involved, shows that ~~some of them,~~ ~~thanks to their use of patristic sources~~ shows that it was thanks to the use of patristics sources that some of them realised that a formula couched in terms inspired by Aristotelianism could only be of relative value. I myself go along with J. Ch^h Didier in Esprit et Vie, 1970, 134-139; 449-450.

63. Thus μεταβαλλειν, μεταποιειν transformare, transmutare, convertere, etc. (to undergo change, alter, cast anew....)
64. Th. Aquinas, Summa Theologiae, III, 75, 1, ad 4 makes this comparison but does not expatiate on it.
65. In keeping with the line of thought in Rom. 4, 25, Vatican II took up this view in a particularly attractive text in the Constitution Gaudium et Spes, No. 38, par. 2: "The Lord left to his own ^{the} pledge of this hope and food for the journey towards its fulfilment, ~~the~~ —the sacrament of faith in which ~~the~~ elements of nature, cultivated by man, are changed into the Lord's glorified Body and Blood. It is the meal of brotherly togetherness and a foretaste of the heavenly Banquet" (trans. ^{W.B.} WEBB). There is a long study of this point in L'Eucharistie Pâque de l'Eglise, J.M.R. Tillard, Unam Sanctam collection, (Paris, 1964).
66. No. 5. see Lumen Gentium, No 50; Decretum on Ecumenism, No. 15. (Documents of Vatican II, published by Geoff. Chapman, London) (W.B.)
67. Especially Nos. 3, 6, 8, 38, 50.
68. No. 56.
69. This has been studied by ~~the~~ J. Zizioulas, J.M.R. Tillard, J.J. von Allmen, op.cit.
70. DS, 1636.
- 70a. see footnote 14a.
71. Constitution on the Liturgy, chap. 1, No. 7; Mysterium Fidei (Text of this Encyclical : The Holy Eucharist, Catholic Truth Society, London) (W.B.)
72. see E. Schillebeeckx's enlightening study, op.cit. pp. 81 - 145.
73. G. Marcel, Position et approches concrètes du mystère ontologique (Louvain-Paris, 1949). p. 79

73a.

~~73a~~ Receptionism denies the Real Presence of Christ's actual Body and Blood and teaches that by means of the reception of the elements believers are made partakers of the heavenly gifts of which the bread and wine are efficacious signs. (W.B.)

74. A.M.Stibbs,op.cit. pp.74-75 adopts this quotation from P.T.Forsyth, The Church and the Sacraments(London,1947)pp 233-234 : "[Our action] does not simply point to the thing signified, nor suggest it, but conveys it, has it within it, brings it with it, gives it, does something, is really sacramental. We do not enact a small 'mystery' or table⁸ of Christ's sacrifice; but Christ the Redeemer in his Church's ~~Act~~ Act gives Himself and His saving act to us anew (to us, not to God); and we give ourselves anew to Him in responsive faith".

75. see ¹note 42. G.Dix,op.cit p.656 is radical : "For my part, surveying all the expositions of his teaching in his own words given here, I am quite unable to distinguish the substance of his doctrine from that of Zwingli". E.P.Echlin,op.cit. p.22, is less rigid.

76. We may add from the Defence of the true and Catholic Doctrⁱne of ~~of~~ the Sacrament : "They teach that Christ is in the bread and wine; but we say, according to the truth, that he is in them that worthily eat the bread and wine....They say that Christ is received in the mouth, and entereth in with the bread and wine; we say, that he is received in the heart and ~~we~~ entereth in by faith". Book III, chap.2. (Ed. J.I.Packer, Thomas Cranmer, Courtenay ~~Lecture~~ Library of Reformation Classics, p.124. Abingdon, 1964). This passage and others that repeat it in essence, certainly propounds a doctrine very close to that of Zwingli. But see also the reply analysed by C.W.Dugmore,op.cit. pp. 198-199 where the distinction between the presence of the Body of Christ "effectually in

- the sacrament" is distinguished from the presence "truly in the bread". There it is less easy to relate Cranmer and Zwingli with precision.
77. These texts are in the edition of the Parker Society, pp.236, 249. They are quoted and studied by C.W.Dugmore op.cit. p.197. Some passages from Cranmer collected by C.W.Dugmore, op.cit. pp.191 - 192 express very much the same view.
78. Ed.cit. ~~33~~ p.33.
79. Quoted by A.Kavanagh op.cit. p.135 ;but I have not been able to check it. On Ridley, see a similar assertion in the ^{edition} ~~edition~~ of the Parker Society, p. ~~21~~ 213.
80. Book III, chap.3 ed.cit. pp.126-127. Compare ^{with} the exposition in Book I, chap.17, ed.cit. pp.78-79 which is worded with greater nuance though ~~it is~~ from some angles more ~~vehemently~~ ^{vehemently}.
81. see Writings and Disputations..... P. ~~374~~ 374. Compare with Guest's view quoted in Note 54 above.
82. see the text published by P.Elmer More and F.Leslie Cross, op.cit. pp.465-466, particularly towards the end.
83. Ibid. 467-470. (note the carefully weighed expressions).
84. Thus R.I.Wilberforce (see A.Hardelin, op.cit. 193 - 195; but Pusey did not find it convincing, see ibid pp.195-198)
85. Ibid. pp.155-157. ~~It~~ It notes the ~~that~~ Tractarians' interpretation of the Black Rubric (see ibid. pp.158-160)
86. No. XI of the Responsio Archiepiscoporum Angliae ad Litteras ~~A/~~ Apostolicas Leonis Papae XIII, de Ordinationibus Anglicanis expresses an almost total agreement with the Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice (and its implications, including the Presence) as defined by Trent. The Report on ~~the~~ Doctrine in the Church of England, pp.159-186, also shows

a desire to maintain a link with a positive outlook, witness the care with which it presents the objective historical background to its statements.

~~87~~⁸⁷. "The Bible does not state the means whereby the bread and wine, remaining in their nature, are the Body and Blood of Christ, nor does it enjoin any use of the Sacrament except partaking of it" (p.63)

88. Ed.cit. p.174

89. see the text published in P.Elmer More and F.Leslie Cross, Anglicanism, pp.464-465.

90. Thus Cl.Beaufort Moss ^{who} writes: "Many Anglican theologians have ~~admitted~~ admitted that transubstantiation, properly understood, is a tenable opinion, even in the Church of England, but not a dogma" (op.cit. p.363)

See also the carefully ^{weighed} ~~weighed~~ position of John Macquarrie, Principles of Christian Theology (New York, 1966, ~~pp~~ pp424-426)

91. see the texts quoted and studied by P.Y.Emery, Le sacrifice eucharistique selon ~~les~~^{les} ~~les~~ theologiens réformés français du XVII^e siècle pp.57-65 (Neuchatel-Paris, 1959)

92. Essays Catholic and Critical (London, 1926)

93. Ed.cit. p. ~~274~~ 274.

94. Text in P.Elmer More and F.Leslie Cross, op.cit. 464. The original is in Latin.

95. see the informative ^{study} ~~study~~ by A.R.Motte, La chronologie relative du quodl. VII et du commentaire sur le IV^e livre des Sentences, in BT 3, 1933 (notes et communications), pp.29-45, especially 30-35. It was a note in J.Ch.Didier, art.cit. p.133 that brought this study to my notice. The numbers ~~274-275~~ given here can easily be checked in Complete Index of the Summa Theologica... by R.I. Deferrari and M.I. Barry.

96. I have emphasised this specifically pneumatic⁷ [inbreathing of the Spirit (W.B.)] dimension of the Eucharist in several studies. See in particular L'Eucharistie Pâque de l'Eglise, pp.59-105;174-227; L'Eucharistie et le Saint-Esprit, Nouvelle Revue Théologique, 1968, pp.363-387; it was also the subject of my contribution to the collective work L'Eucharistie by ~~J. Zizioulas~~ ^{J. Zizioulas}, ~~J.N.R. Tillard~~ ^{J.N.R. Tillard}, J.J.Allmen. 96a. epiclesis, invocation of the Holy Spirit.

97. ~~W.B. analogy~~ This is a classical analogy in theological tradition. For example we find Lancelot Andrewes writing: "There is that kind of union between the visible Sacrament and the invisible reality (rem) of the Sacrament which there is between the manhood and the Godhead of Christ, where, unless you want to smack of Euthyches, the Manhood is not transubstantiated into the Godhead". (P.Elmer More and F.Cross, op. cit. p.404). ~~As regards~~ ^{For} the analogy between the presence by grace (per gratiam) and the presence in the sacrament (in sacramento) see the celebrated text of Faustus de Riez: "Nec dubitet ^{quisquam} ~~quicquam~~ primarias creaturas nutu ~~potentias~~ ^{potentia} potentiae, praesentia Majestatis, in dominici corporis transire posse naturam, cum ipsum hominem videat artificio celestis ^{miseri cordiae} ~~conspicior~~ Christi corpus effectum". (Patrologia Latina, 67,1056). F.X.Durwell, Eucharistie et Parousie, in Lumen Vitae, 26,1971, develops this analogy at length.

98. A matter of recognising diverse achievements within the one economy [scheme, pattern of operation. W.B.] of the Spirit. For example, the hold of the Spirit upon a person is different from the hold of the Spirit ~~upon~~ ^{sensible} ~~upon~~ ^{by the senses. w.B.]} upon a ~~person~~ [perceptible/matter. But ~~it is not~~ ^{it is not} all such instances ~~there is~~ ^{there is} in both cases are cases of the extending and actualising of the Overlordship of Christ.

~~99. Theodore of Mopsuestia~~

99. Les Homélie Catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste, ed. R.

Tonneau and R.Devreesse, p.553. (Vatican City, 1949). See, Homily XVI, 2, No.12 on the Mass.

100. Cat. Myst. V,7. ~~XXXV~~ 1 - 6.

101. Chap. XXVII, ed. ^{See,} Sources Chrétiennes, No.4 bis, pp 175-177

102. "Yet the historic episcopate, however venerable and valuable, is strictly a post-New Testament development, both as an institution and as a subject for theological reflection; and all views which posit as an historical fact the transmission through it of the apostolic ministerial commission, or which regard the succession as part of the given structural essence of ~~Christ's~~ Christ's Church and so of the apostolic faith concerning that Church, remain unverifiable hypotheses" (No.100, p.57; see also Nos. 101, 102, pp.57-58).

103. op.cit. 69-88; 137-142.

104. Article XXV says: " Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly as states of life allowed in ^{the} Scriptures ; but yet have not the nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God". The Preface ^{to} of the Ordinal of the Prayer Book begins thus : "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the holy Scripture ~~and~~ and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend Estimation, that no man might presume to ~~execute~~ ^{refuse} execute

any of them except he were first called, tried, examined and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority. And therefore, to the extent that these Orders may be continued and reverently used and esteemed....."(1550 text).
 104a. Apostolicae Curiae, ~~the~~ Pope Leo XIII's declaration of invalidity of Anglican Orders, 1896
 105. see, Answer No. XVII; Doctrine in the Church of England, pp 156-159; 199, and especially 114-124.

106. see the brief but highly informative critical exposition drawn up by G.H. Tavard, ~~from~~ Roman Catholic Theology and 'Recognition of Ministry', in Journal of Ecumenical Studies, 1969, pp. 623-628.; and D.N. ~~Power~~ Power, Ministers of Christ and his Church, pp. 177-178 (London, 1969).

107. see A.M. Allchin, Intercommunion: an Anglican Approach, in One in Christ, 1969, p. 351. Intercommunion To-day observes: "Different Anglicans give ~~very~~ very different answers to the question of the necessity of episcopacy in the Church. But despite these differences of interpretation, all Anglican provinces engaged in negotiations with other Churches in this ~~century~~ century have insisted on the acceptance of the episcopate as a necessary element in the future constitution of the Church". (No. 165, p. 96).

108 Op.cit. 70, with footnote 1.

108a. i.e. an introduction, not a Preface in the liturgical meaning ~~of~~ the word. W.B.

109. Ibid. 121. Two of the authors of this Ordinal were ^{Anglican} observers at the Roman Catholic Consilium for the Liturgy.

110. Report of the Anglican-Methodist Unity Commission, I - The Ordinal p. 9. (London, 1968).

110a. The revised liturgy of the Ordination of Bishops, Priests, Deacons. W.B.

111. ~~Of~~ Growing into Union takes the same line in its proposals for a revised text, p.121.
112. Report.....I - The Ordinal. p.11.
113. Ibid. No 7, p.13. ~~This~~ Preface should be read alongside the Appendix II, pp.34-36.
114. Ibid.No.8.p.13
115. Growing into Union, p.74, is much more satisfactory : "We may say that all ministerial oversight embodies an authority which stems from Christ as Head of the Church and witnesses to his Lordship over ~~the~~ his Church, including its ministers themselves. And we may further say that, though New Testament presbyter-bishops were not Apostles, ~~yet the authority of their office,~~ just as present-day bishops and presbyters are not Apostles, yet the authority of their office was identical with the authority exercised by the Apostles -- namely, the personal authority of the Lord".
116. Report....I - The Ordinal, No.4. p.12.
117. Pontificale Romanum ex Decreto Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani II instauratum. Auctoritate Pauli PP.VI promulgatum. De Ordinatione Diaconi, Presbyteri et Episcopi. (Vatican, 1968), 88 (this is a suggested, but not prescribed, admonition).
118. see Lumen Gentium, No.10; Presbyterorum ~~Sacri~~ Ordinis, Nos.2;5. (Documents of Vatican II (Chapman; London). W.W.B.)
119. Op.cit. p.74. See also ibid, p.71.
- 119a. ^{Lumen} ~~Sacra~~ Lumen Gentium No.10.
120. Report....I - The Ordinal, pp.24;32-33.
121. ibid. No5.p.12
122. Ibid.No.6.p.12 (see Appendix II, p35.)

123. Ibid.

124. Ibid. pp.4-5 (The Shape of the Forms of Ordination)

125. Ibid. No.8.p.13.

126. Ibid. 32-33 and the Pontificale Romanum, 75. The Apostolic Tradition is easily recognisable in this text. (The Apostolic Tradition, compiled by Hippolytus about 200 AD is one of the earliest extant records of liturgical formularies. It gives a description of an episcopal ordination which includes the earliest ~~Roman~~ Roman Mass formulary. W.B.)

127. "Pour forth thy grace upon these thy servants, we beseech thee, O Lord, that within the royal priesthood of thy People they may faithfully fulfil this their priestly ministry. Grant that as true pastors they may watch over the sheep committed to their care, gathering the scattered, bringing back the strayed, and seeking the lost, until they be found. Strengthen them to proclaim effectually the Gospel of thy salvation and to declare to the penitent the absolution and remission of their sins. Make them worthy to offer with all thy People spiritual sacrifices acceptable in thy sight, and to minister the Sacraments of thy New Covenant. Give them a spirit of wisdom and discipline, that they may show themselves wise in counsel. Make them to be apt and profitable fellow-workers with their brethren in the Ministry and with thy chief Pastors, the Bishops. Keep them ever blameless in their ministry, so that they, abiding steadfast all their days, may be called at last, with all thy good and faithful servants, to enter into thy eternal joy, through Jesus Christ thy Son...." Report...I - The Ordinal, 26-27.

128. Ibid. p.24.

129. Ibid. pp.30-31
130. The most notable may be found in P.Elmer More and F.Leslie Cross op.cit. pp.345-377. See also the sources indicated in note 105, above. Instances of a strongly 'Catholic' interpretation, ~~may~~ see E.C.S.Gibson, op.cit. pp.573-580; 593-605 and, especially, 729-758; E.J.Bicknell, op.cit. pp. 322-341. Cl.Beaufort Moss gives a good ~~summary~~ ^{synthesis} of a study of the Anglican tradition when he writes: "The earthly priest is the necessary organ of the Church for this purpose ~~is~~ [Eucharist], as the eye is the necessary organ of sight; there can be no offering without him, but the offering is the people's, not his alone". op.cit. p.370.
131. Report....2 - The Scheme (London, 1968). ^{Nos.180-181} See Growing into Union, p. ~~86-87~~ ⁸⁶⁻⁸⁷
132. Pontificale Romanum, ^u75.
- 132a. Made by the bishop.
133. "Munere item sacrificandi in Christo fungemiri. Ministerio enim vestro sacrificium spirituale fidelium perficietur, Christi sacrificio conjunctum, quod per manus vestras super altare incruenter in celebratione mysteriorum offeretur". (ibid.33,89). There is here an echo of the Decree on the life and ministry of the priest, No..2. (Documents of Vatican II),
134. In particular in the first paragraph of the prayer of ordination.
- 134a. by local Church is meant the diocese over which the bishop presides. w. B.
135. See my study: A propos de l'intention du ministre et du sujet des sacrements, in Consilium ⁱ 26. 1968, pp.101-112.
- 135a the Anglican communion. (w. B.)
136. See Report....2 - The Scheme (London, 1968) ^{pp} 23-29, especially Nos. 67, 70-77, 81).

137. No.165.p.96.

137a. i.e. the introduction.

138. p.48.

139. op.cit. 71-72

140. See the remarkable study by J.Zizioulas, La Communauté eucharistique et la Catholicité de l'Eglise , in Istina, 1969, pp.

67-88. See also Growing into Union, p.76.

140a. The Anglican-Roman Catholic ~~Comm~~ Theological Commission. v.3.