

1. Criticism of Windsor as centred on sacrifice and presence

(a) Sacrifice

On the one hand, in spite of the firm statement of the 'once for all' nature of Christ's sacrifice, some have still been anxious that the term anamnesis may cover the reintroduction of a repeated immolation. On the other hand, others have doubted whether the term sufficiently implies the reality indicated by traditional sacrificial language concerning the eucharist. Moreover, the accuracy and consistency of the Commission's exegesis of 'anamnesis' have been questioned.

(b) Presence

Some critics have been unhappy at the realistic language used in Windsor, and have questioned such words as 'become' and 'change'; there have also been requests for a greater emphasis on the eschatological dimension of the eucharist. Others have wondered whether the permanence of Christ's presence in the eucharistic elements has been sufficiently protected, with a consequent request for a treatment of the reserved sacrament, and of devotion to it. Similarly there has been request for clarification of the Commission's attitude to receptionism, and of the apparent inconsistency in speaking of Christ's presence both 'in' and 'through' the eucharist. [Again, the question of a 'moment of consecration' has been raised.]

2. Behind these criticisms there lies a profound but often unarticulated anxiety that the Commission has been using new theological language to hide basic controversial issues. Related to this anxiety is the further question as to the

nature of the agreement the Commission has claimed: is there an ambiguity (either deliberate or indeliberate) in the language of the Statement which enables members of the two churches to see their own faith in Windsor without real consensus?

3. One of the most serious anxieties we encountered is an overall uneasiness that the use of anamnesis in explaining the nature of the eucharist means that the Roman Catholic doctrine that the Mass is a sacrifice is no longer affirmed.

But the Commission deliberately used the term "anamnesis" because of the Biblical account of the institution of the Eucharist at the Last Supper:

- (a) Paul, I Cor. XI, 25: 'Do this in commemoration of me'.  
Luke XXII, 19: ditto
- (b) Justin (Apol. I 66), recalling the Last Supper writes: Jesus, taking bread and having given thanks, said, "Do this for my memorial, this is my body"; and likewise taking the cup and giving thanks he said, "This is my blood."

The Greek tradition corroborates the use of the word, and in the Latin tradition, when Trent elucidates the will of Christ regarding the relation between His own sacrifice and the eucharist, it used the words "commemoratio" and "memoria" (Section XXII cap.I). As regards contemporary theological approaches, it is noteworthy that this same terminology is adopted by Faith and Order in its document (WCC 1975) on the Eucharist.

Tradition understood the word as belonging to the order of sacramental realities. In the sacramental order the once-for-all event of salvation becomes effective in the present through the action of the Holy Spirit.

With regard to what Christ accomplished for our redemption, Christian doctrine has used the word "sacrifice" in two ways, intimately associated but at different levels. In the New Testament "sacrifice" refers to the historical events of Christ's saving work for us. The liturgical tradition of the Church used the same word also to designate in the eucharistic celebration the anamnesis of this historic event. Therefore, it is possible to say at the same time that there is only one unrepeatable sacrifice in the historic sense, but that the celebration of the Eucharist is a sacrifice in the liturgical sense, provided that it is clear that this is not a repetition of the historical sacrifice. Hence there remains one, historic, unrepeatable sacrifice, offered once for all by Christ and accepted once for all by the Father. In the liturgical action of the Church, Christ in the Holy Spirit unites his people in a sacramental way with this unique sacrifice. And so, even though the Church is active in the celebration of the memorial, this adds nothing to the efficacy of the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ, for this action is itself the fruit of this sacrifice.

As the community of believers, gathered together by the Holy Spirit and already redeemed, the Church is the Body of Christ, offering and presenting itself as a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice to God. When, therefore, it celebrates the Eucharist and thanks God for the gift of Christ's sacrifice, His members

identify themselves with the will of Christ, who has offered himself to the Father on their behalf, and, in this response, enter into his intercession to the Father for all mankind.

4. Criticism has been evoked by the Agreed Statement's use of the word 'become' to describe how bread and wine can be sacramentally the Body and Blood of Christ in the eucharist. It has been suspected of a (too) materialistic conception of Christ's presence. The footnote on <sup>the word</sup> transubstantiation, which speaks also of 'change', has seemed to some to confirm this. It is feared that this implied a view of Christ's presence in the eucharist which is limited to a physical presence in the elements.

In order to respond to these comments, the Commission recalls the fact that it is the glorified Lord himself that the community of the faithful encounters in the eucharistic celebration through the preaching of the word, through the fellowship of the Lord's Supper and in the heart of the believer, and, in a special way, through the gift of his Body and Blood, already given on the cross for their salvation.

The gift of his Body and Blood comes about through the action of the Holy Spirit, appropriating the bread and wine of this creation <sup>so that they "become for us"</sup> ~~in order to make them~~ elements of the new creation already present through the coming of Christ.

~~the~~ 'Becoming' does not imply a material change; it does not imply that the bread becomes Christ in such a way that in the eucharistic celebration the presence is limited to a presence

in bread and wine; [it does not imply that the bread becomes Christ in the same manner in which he was present in his earthly life or is now present before the Father; it does not imply that the bread becomes Christ according to the laws of this world, but rather that it belongs to the sacramental order of the new creation.] This is what we are indicating by the term sacramental presence whereby the <sup>bread which</sup> <sup>was bread for</sup> (elements of) this world are used by God to convey the realities of this new creation.

See below

The sacramental order <sup>realities</sup> ~~makes~~ (the world) of faith <sup>is present in</sup> visible and tangible <sup>signs.</sup> <sup>This enables</sup> the Christian to avail himself of the fruits of the once-for-all redemption. In the eucharist the whole human person encounters in faith the whole Christ in his sacramental Body and Blood. <sup>Moreover</sup> The community, which is already the Body of Christ, by partaking together of this sacramental Body of the Risen Lord, grows into the unity God intends for his Church. The bread and wine become the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ in order that the Christian community may become more effectively what it already is, the Body of Christ. In fact, in the purpose of God, the ultimate change that is sought is the transformation of the lives of men.

It does not imply that that presence is of the same mode as his presence in his earthly life or his presence now before the Father. He is not present according to the laws of this world, but in a way which belongs to the sacramental order of the new creation.

5. Consequently, this full effect can only be realised when the Eucharistic gifts are received in faith. ~~Christian tradition maintains that~~ <sup>not one but</sup> In the mystery of the Eucharist we have to discern two complementary movements - that of Christ giving his Body and Blood and that of the communicants receiving the same in faith. As a result of this duality of movement, some traditions have placed a special emphasis on the association of the Real Presence with the elements and some others on the association of the Real Presence with reception by faith. <sup>In the past acute difficulties</sup> (Many of our past differences) have arisen when one or other of these emphases has become almost exclusive. In the opinion of the Commission neither emphasis is contrary to eucharistic faith provided it is expressed in such a way as not to deny the complementary movement emphasised by the other position. Since the Eucharist is the <sup>at</sup> sacrament of the New Covenant in which Christ gives himself to his people so that they may receive him in faith, eucharistic doctrine must hold together these two movements.

*within an  
irreducible unity*