

## Chapter Six: Working with God in Christ

### Introduction

We shall explore how Christ assists human persons in particular to assist God to fulfil His Plan.

### A. A SHORT HISTORY OF THE WESTERN LITURGY

#### Introduction

As this chapter will discuss the Eucharist, it would be an advantage to outline the historical background of then liturgy so the various features of the liturgy become clearer.

#### *The church building (naos, ναός)*

To the west of an early purpose built church,<sup>1</sup> there would often be an atrium or forecourt containing a fountain (*cantharus*, κάνθαρος) or *compluvium*. Around all four sides of the atrium was usually a colonnaded ambulatory. The building itself comprised a nave, a narthex to the west and the sanctuary to the east containing the altar, the east being from where Christ will return.<sup>2</sup> A narthex within the building itself is termed a *esonarthex* and one outside was a *exonarthex* usually as an intrusion into the ambulatory of the atrium.

St Germanus of Constantinople noted that a church had two focal points. The focal point of the nave was the *ambo* (*ambon*, ἄμβων) representing the Word near the centre of the nave from where the readings were read surrounded by the people.<sup>3</sup> The *solea* between the ambo and altar therefore represented the journey towards the *Parousia*. Unfortunately, the ambo went into decline so that the symbolism of Christ surrounded by His followers was lost. The sanctuary was often in the shape of an apse following the precedence of the basilica. The altar, the focal point of the sanctuary, represented the ‘holy tomb of Christ’<sup>4</sup> Around the altar, there was sometimes a canopy termed the *ciborium* (κιβώριον).<sup>5</sup> Between the nave representing the earth<sup>6</sup> and the sanctuary<sup>7</sup> representing heaven there was a rail supporting a curtain, columns supporting the rail and a waist high wall below all representing the distinction between God and the universe. There could also be a curtain around the ciborium.

Because the nave represented the earth, there was a tendency in the east for it to become square as the earth had four winds, four gospels and four archangels<sup>8</sup> protecting it. When builders of churches discovered how to construct domes, there tended to be a dome above the nave representing the remainder of the cosmos and the transition between the nave and the dome was an octagon representing the eighth day theology of the *Pleroma*. The octagonal

<sup>1</sup> As opposed to a *domus ecclesiae*, a house adapted into a church.

<sup>2</sup> St Germanus of Constantinople, *On The Divine Liturgy* 11 (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1999), p. 65.

<sup>3</sup> St Germanus, p. 63.

<sup>4</sup> St Germanus, p. 61.

<sup>5</sup> St Germanus 5, p. 59n; Jungman, p. 183.

<sup>6</sup> St Maximus, *Myst* 3; PG 91; trans. CWS-MC, p. 189.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid* 9, p. 63.

<sup>8</sup> Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, and Phanuel (Daniel).

transition was accomplished by means of a pendentive or sometimes a squinch.

Later, in Carolingian areas, the nave became longer in the east-west direction, the altar was moved to the rear of the apse, and choir stalls were placed between the sanctuary and the nave further separating the altar and clergy from the faithful.<sup>9</sup> This change was spread by the Normans in their conquests.

### *The liturgy (leiturgia, λειτουργία)*

The liturgy comprises three parts: the *Enarxis* (Ἐναρξίς) or Fore-mass, the *Synaxis* (Σύναξις) or Liturgy of the Word and the Liturgy of the Eucharist. The *Synaxis* became attached to the Liturgy of the Eucharist from the time of Justin Martyr.

#### The *Enarxis*:

Preparation for the Eucharist is not strictly part of the liturgy but, if our hearts are not open to God, the Spirit will not come to us. The scriptural view is that ‘whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the Body and Blood of the Lord. Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup.’<sup>10</sup> Self-offering tended to be later at the Offertory so that preparation tended to comprise repentance and humility to God. Preparation for the liturgy therefore tended to be at its commencement.

Repentance has long been associated with washing<sup>11</sup> and, in early purpose built churches, the faithful could wash themselves in the fountain in the atrium as they acknowledged their sins before entering the church.<sup>12</sup> This washing can be compared with Jewish practice. The entrance to the church therefore represents the abandonment of sin expressed by St Maximus as ‘the amendment of each one of us who believe.’<sup>13</sup>

In the first millennium, there was preparation for the liturgy by means of penitential processions between one church and another. After these processions were discontinued, their content became attached to the beginning of the liturgy in both east and west in the *Enarxis*. In both east and west, it included a litany with a *Kyrie eleison* response. According to Jungman, in the west, the litany was the *Deprecato Gelasii*. The preparation of the faithful in the western liturgy was in the form of a collective prayer. A collective prayer comprises an invitation from a deacon, silent prayer and a resume or *collecta* by the deacon.<sup>14</sup> The *collecta* of this collective prayer was the *Oratio Prima*.<sup>15</sup>

After the incorporation of the *Enarxis* into the liturgy, there has been a tendency for the clergy to arrive at its commencement of the *Enarxis* rather than at the *Synaxis*. In the west, this entrance was accompanied by the *Introit* sung by the choir.

The eastern liturgy has the advantage of having three antiphons instead of the *Introit*

<sup>9</sup> Rev Joseph Jungman, *The Mass of the Roman Rite* (London: Burns & Oates, 1959) pp. 63-64.

<sup>10</sup> 1 Cor 11. 27-28.

<sup>11</sup> 2 Kings 5.10 (seven times); Ps 50/51.7.

<sup>12</sup> St John Chrysostom, *In Joh* 73.3; PG 59, col. 399-400; trans.NPNF1, Vol. 14, p. 270.

<sup>13</sup> St Maximus, *Myst* 9; PG 91; trans. CWS-MC, p. 198.

<sup>14</sup> Collective prayers were used in the Gallic Rite and there was a collective prayer with many petitions in the Roman Rite of Good Friday which is considered to be fourth or fifth century. Jungman, p. 244.

<sup>15</sup> Jungman, p. 240.

chanted by the choir<sup>16</sup> which gives an opportunity for preparation but its initial litany has petitions from the deacon which could impede the preparation. The west addressed the problem by discontinuing the petitions of the litany. The remaining *Kyrie* was sung by the choir by the ninth century.<sup>17</sup> Also, in the seventh century in the pontifical liturgy, after the Introit, the Pope prostrated himself in prayer prior to the *Kyrie*.<sup>18</sup> The Pope thus demonstrated his solidarity with the faithful in the preparation for the Eucharist. This practice could have been improved still further if the Pope had stopped at the ambo with the faithful in the nave before vesting. Overall, the *Kyrie* without the petitions and the example of the Pope were therefore master strokes in securing an adequate preparation.

Unfortunately, in the sixth century, the *Gloria in excelsis* was occasionally inserted just prior to the *collecta* on feast days<sup>19</sup> implying that the preceding prayers of the faithful were either interrupted or were no longer in use. The *Gloria* became general by the eleventh century except during penitential periods.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, overall, in the first millennium, we can say that the west maintained the *Enarxis* as a preparation rite. In the second millennium, when the Eucharist became dominated by a judicial approach, the need for preparation declined.

The Liturgy of the Word or *Synaxis*:

The *Synaxis* was the continuation of the Jewish Sabbath Assembly. New Testament readings were added to those of the Old with psalms between including responses by the faithful. These were followed by the homily and general prayers.

Originally, the clergy did not proceed to the altar until the Liturgy of the Eucharist but only to the ambo.<sup>21</sup> When the clergy ceased to enter at the beginning of the *Synaxis* in the east, the procession remained as one of the Gospel Book. It was carried around the church ending at the ambo so that the faithful would be able to express their solidarity with the Gospel.

In the Gallic and eastern group of liturgies, the procession was followed by the *Trisagion* and the Gallic liturgy repeated it prior to the reading of the Gospel. We conclude that there is a strong connection between the *Trisagion* and the Gospel. Because the Gallic liturgy was the only western liturgy to include the *Trisagion* in the *Synaxis*, it is uncertain whether the chanting of the *Trisagion* was originally common practice in the Roman Rite even although it was included on Good Friday.

In the prayers of the ancient western Good Friday liturgy and other ancient liturgies, there was a prayer for the catechumens prior to their dismissal. Even though catechumens are no longer dismissed so that, as we are all catechumens to some extent, there is case for retaining that prayer.

The preliminary rites of the Liturgy of the Eucharist:

Some of following have fallen out of use but are included here to reflect ancient practice.

---

<sup>16</sup> Originally, this was not always the case. Casimir Kucharek, *The Byzantine-Slav Liturgy of St John Chrysostom* (Ontario, Canada: Alleluia Press, 1971) p. 365.

<sup>17</sup> Jungman p. 192.

<sup>18</sup> Jungman, p. 52.

<sup>19</sup> Jungman, p. 191.

<sup>20</sup> Jungman, p. 238.

<sup>21</sup> Alexander Schmemmann, *The Eucharist* (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988) p. 69. Joseph Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2000) pp. 71-72.

The non-baptized used to be excluded from the Liturgy of the Eucharist but could go elsewhere for instruction. The acclamation ‘The doors’ remains in eastern liturgies to denote their former dismissal. The focal point of the liturgy then changes from the ambo to the altar so there was a call to look to the east. The Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed said by the faithful was first placed in the liturgy in the sixth century. St Pseudo-Dionysius implied that the Creed took place after the dismissal of the catechumens and before the procession of the offered gifts.<sup>22</sup>

The offering by the people and the Kiss of Peace:

It is obviously important that the faithful should be reconciled to each other before they offer the gifts and themselves. Scripture states that ‘when you are offering your gifts upon the altar, if you remember that your brother or sister has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go first be reconciled to your brother or sister, and then come and offer your gift.’<sup>23</sup> The Kiss of Peace must therefore precede the self-offering at the invitation of the priest. St Maximus indicated that we should abandon any division amongst ourselves in the Kiss of Peace prior to the diptychs,<sup>24</sup> as (otherwise) ‘it is not possible to be gathered together towards the One and to partake of peaceful union with the One’<sup>25</sup> and to give ‘identity of concord.’<sup>26</sup> Unfortunately, the Kiss of Peace was moved to its present position before Communion by Pope Innocent I.<sup>27</sup> The Kiss of Peace amongst the faithful has been restored in the west but not yet in the east.

There is a case for coupling the self-offering of the faithful with their offering of gifts to the Church which could follow the Kiss of Peace but before the self-offering. The period of silence for the self-offering would give the opportunity for the deacons to complete the preparation for the gifts and for the bishop to wash his hands prior to receiving the gifts from the deacons. Justin Martyr reported<sup>28</sup> that the Kiss of Peace was prior to the Offertory Procession but later evidence showed the reverse order. The Justin position had the advantage that the procession gathers the offerings of the faithful with the offered gifts before they are placed upon the altar. The offertory procession was discontinued in the west but restored after the Second Vatican Council.

In the west, the period of silent self-offering was formalized into a collective prayer. The western rubrics stated ‘let us offer ourselves on the *paten (diskos)*’ prior to the silent prayer and afterwards there followed the *Orate fratres* and the variable *collecta*, the *Oratio super oblata*.<sup>29</sup> In the east, the deacon states, ‘Let us commend ourselves and one another and our whole life to Christ, our God.’ This invitation follows a short litany termed the *Aitesis*.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> St Pseudo-Dionysius, *Eccl Hier* 3.3.7; PG, col. 436c; trans. CWS-PD, p. 218.

<sup>23</sup> Mt 5.23-24.

<sup>24</sup> St Maximus, *Myst* 24; PG 91; trans. CWS-MC, p. 207. Also, Mt 5.23-24: ‘First be reconciled to your brother and sister ... when you are offering your gifts at the altar.

<sup>25</sup> St Pseudo-Dionysius, *Eccl Hier* 3.3.8; ; trans. CWS-PD, p. 218.

<sup>26</sup> St Maximus, *Myst* 24; PG 91; trans. CWS-MC, p. 207.

<sup>27</sup> Jungman, p. 481.

<sup>28</sup> St Justin Martyr, *Apol* 1.65; trans. Kucharek, p. 41.

<sup>29</sup> Jungman, p. 306.

<sup>30</sup> The *Aitesis* also featured in the early Roman rite according to Jungman but in the *Enarxis*. See Jungman, pp. 224-26.

Ancient Eucharistic Prayers<sup>31</sup> considered:

Abbrev.	Title	Century*
Embryonic:		
Didache	Didache	1
ApCon7	Apostolic Constitutions Book 7	2-3
Antiochene group:		
Ap Trad:	Apostolic Tradition	4+
ApCons8	Apostolic Constitutions Book 8	4
James	St James (Palestine connection)	5+
Alexandrian/Roman group:		
Serap	Euchologion of Pseudo-Serapion	4
Louvain	Louvain Papyrus	4
Ambrose:	Anaphora of Ambrose, (Treatise <i>De Sacramentis</i> ) (Roman Eucharistic Prayer similar)	4
BrMus	British Museum Tablet	4-5
Balyzeh	Deir Balyzeh Papyrus	4-8
CyrMk	Anaphora of St Cyril in the Liturgy of St Mark	5+
CopBas	Anaphora of St Basil of Caesarea	6+
* Scholars vary considerably in opinion		

The embryonic Eucharistic Prayers and the Apostolic Tradition:

The embryonic Eucharistic Prayers such as the Didache and ApCon7 comprised two prayers, the Prayer of Thanksgiving and the Prayer of Gathering. Regarding the former, thanking and praising God would be in humility to God and acknowledging that God is much greater than us. While thanking God has less spiritual depth than a self-offering or self-sacrifice, the Didache quoted Mt 5.23-24 and Mal 1.11 which both imply that the faithful make an offering. The Prayer of Gathering emphasized the gathering of members of the church by Christ *Logos* who gathers them in this life and at the *Parousia*. St Paul expressed this in the context of the Body of Christ so that the Prayer of Gathering and partaking of one loaf.<sup>32</sup> He therefore describes what the Eucharist is trying to achieve. It is by focussing upon the archetypal Christ that we work for God to bring His Plan to fruition.

ApTrad extended the Prayer of Thanksgiving and followed it with the Institution Narrative, *Anamnesis* and the *Epiklesis*. The reason for this addition may have been to give greater understanding of the Eucharist to the great number of new Christians following the Edict of Milan of 313 CE by the co-Emperors Constantine and Lucinius I proclaiming religious toleration and the Edict of Thessalonica by Theodosius I making Christianity the state religion in 380 CE.

---

<sup>31</sup> The term *anaphora* is the Liturgy of the Eucharist without the preliminaries and the offering of the faithful but the term Eucharistic Prayer excludes Communion. The latter term is used here in accordance with western practice.

<sup>32</sup> 1 Cor 10.16-17.

#### The Introductory Dialogue and the *Sanctus*:

The Introductory Dialogue was in place by the time of ApTrad and is the commencement of the Eucharistic Prayer and the *anaphora*. The *Sanctus* would have been taken from the third of the 18 Jewish blessings or directly from the sixth chapter of Isaiah. It was not included in the text of ApTrad but this does not necessarily mean that it was not in place. The *Sanctus* heralded the beginning of the Eucharistic Prayer just as the similar *Trisagion* heralded the reading of the Gospel.

#### The decline of importance of the Prayer of Thanksgiving:

We would expect the *Sanctus* would alert the faithful that the Eucharistic Prayer was to commence. James and ApCon8 had most of the Prayer of Thanksgiving before the *Sanctus*. However, the Eucharistic Prayer of CyrMk placed the whole of the prayer before the *Sanctus* as does the modern Roman Eucharistic Prayer. Moreover, since the eighth century, Rome has not regarded the Prayer of Thanksgiving as part of the Canon, its term for the core of the Eucharistic Prayer.<sup>33</sup> We conclude that this original part of the liturgy has declined in importance since ApTrad. The liturgy is close to the faithful so any decision to downgrade the Prayer of Thanksgiving relative to the Institution Narrative, *Anamnesis* and *Epiklesis* should perhaps have been made by both clergy and faithful over a long period.

#### The Institution Narrative:

The scriptural Institution Narratives<sup>34</sup> particularly emphasised the sacrifice of Christ. This is clear from the fact that the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist were considered separately and the latter is stated as *shed* for the forgiveness of sins. The letter to the Corinthians<sup>35</sup> specifically states that the Eucharist proclaims Christ's death.

#### The *Anamnesis*:

The *Anamnesis* ( Ἀνάμνησις ) has two functions. They are the calling to mind of the death and resurrection of Christ but the Last Supper had already been called to mind in the Institution Narrative. It also collects together all the offerings represented by the offered gifts of bread and wine.

#### *Epikleses* and Pleas for Acceptance:

We have ascertained that ApTrad had a full *Epiklesis* which requested God to send His Spirit upon the offered gifts and the faithful and this became the norm for the Antiochan group. There has been some confusion between Pleas for Acceptance of the offered gifts and the *Epiklesis* particularly in the Romano-Alexandrian group. The *Epiklesis* of ApTrad prayed for the Spirit to come upon *both* the gifts and the faithful. We shall term a prayer which asks for the sending down of the Spirit on only the gifts *or* the faithful as a *demi-Epiklesis*.

We should consider other Eucharistic Prayers in the group. They had a particular characteristic of having not only *Epikleses* but also Pleas for Acceptance for the offerings. Generally, *Epikleses* tend to be placed after the Institution Narrative and the *Anamnesis* and Pleas for Acceptance tend to be before the Institution Narrative but the difference between the Pleas and the *Epikleses* is complex. The prayers after the *Anamnesis* tend to be stronger

---

<sup>33</sup> Jungman, p. 364.

<sup>34</sup> Mt 26.28, Mk 14.24, Lk 22.20, and 1 Cor 11.25

<sup>35</sup> 1 Cor 11.26.

than those prior to the Institution Narrative and more likely to be associated with the transformation of the gifts *and* the faithful. Furthermore, those before the *Anamnesis* tend to cite the gifts and not the faithful.

The Eucharistic Prayers of CyrMk and BrMus are particularly interesting. Their Pleas for Acceptance prior to the Institution Narrative cited the Spirit so they could be classed as demi-*Epikleses*. CyrMk also had a full *Epiklesis* after the *Anamnesis* and BrMus had a demi-*Epiklesis* in the same place. A possible explanation of the above apparent duplication may have been that the Pleas for Acceptance for the gifts were developing into demi-*Epikleses* in the Alexandrian group but the ApTrad norm of an *Epiklesis* after the *Anamnesis* was then accepted but leaving the previous competing Pleas in place.

The early Ambrosian and Roman Eucharistic Prayers did not invoke the Spirit but the Roman prayer after the *Anamnesis*, the *Suprae quae/Supplices te*, stated that those receiving the transformed gifts would be filled with grace (Heb 10.10) in addition to taking the ‘sacrifice to heaven.’ It was probably originally an Alexandrian Plea for Acceptance but upgraded to include mention of the faithful and, although it lacked invocation of the Spirit, it was probably intended to serve as an *Epiklesis*. The *Quam oblationem* before the Institution Narrative cited neither the Spirit nor the faithful. CopBas, CyrMk and Serap all had full *Epikleses* after the *Anamnesis* but Balyzeh had one before the Institution Narrative. We conclude that despite the weakness of the Roman *Epiklesis*, the ancient post-ApTrad *Epikleses* of the Alexandrian/Roman group acknowledged the change of both gifts and faithful usually after the Institution Narrative.

The decline of the Prayer of Gathering:

ApTrad did not include the Prayer of Gathering. Either the writers did not necessarily intend that it should be discontinued, or decided that a mention of ‘gathering’ in the *Epiklesis* was sufficient to compensate for its loss. It remained in Balyzeh, Serap and even today in the Ethiopian Eucharistic Prayers of John, Son of Thunder, St Jacob of Serough and St Gregory II. It is not known why it is lacking in the Ambrosian/Roman Eucharistic Prayer. The danger of losing the Prayer of Gathering is that there would be less emphasis upon the *Parousia* and the journey towards it. Some Eucharistic Prayers compensated for this by recalling in the *Anamnesis* not just the death and resurrection of Christ but also the *Parousia*. For example, ‘Recalling ... His passion and death, His resurrection from the dead, His return to heaven, and His future *Parousia*.<sup>36</sup>

Amen:

As the Eucharistic Prayer is spoken by the celebrant and he is the representative of the faithful, it was therefore customary for the faithful to respond to the Eucharist Prayer with the Amen as noted by Justin Martyr.<sup>37</sup>

The Eucharist Prayer and general prayers:

Eucharistic Prayers often include prayers which are not directly involved with the Eucharist. Before the two parts of the liturgy became joined, general prayers concluded the Liturgy of the Eucharist in some liturgies as in the Strasbourg Papyrus. This practice continued into Roman liturgy even though most of these prayers duplicated those located after the Gospel.

---

<sup>36</sup> *ApCon8*, trans. Kucharek, p. 135.

<sup>37</sup> St Justin Martyr, *Apol* 1.65.

However, some prayers known as the Diptychs (*diptychon*) applied particularly to baptized members. They were for certain persons living and dead favoured by the particular church. This is particularly important at times of schism and the addition or removal of names from the diptychs would be crucial. The diptychs should ideally include the name of the bishop, archbishop and patriarch/Pope. In the Roman liturgy, despite the discontinuity it must have caused, the diptychs were moved into the Eucharistic Prayer in 789 CE.<sup>38</sup> They comprised the *Memento, Domine/ Communicantes* and *Memento, etiam* presently in the Eucharistic Prayer. According to St Pseudo-Dionysius, after the dismissal of the catechumens, the leader of the deacons ‘reads out the names of the saints who are already dead and judges the one most recently deceased to be worthy of commemoration along with them.’<sup>39</sup>

Traditionally, the diptychs were read following the offertory process according to St Pseudo-Dionysius as he stated that

‘Following on the peace there is the proclamation of the ... names ... of those who have lived holy lives and whose consistent efforts earned for them the perfection of a virtuous life’. It is while ... the reverend symbols (of) Christ ... are placed on the altar (that) one ... reads out the names of the saints. It is clear (that) in this way ... they are unshakably bound to Him in a sacred and transcendent union.<sup>40</sup>

Commemoration of the saints prior to communion:

The saints have already achieved the goal we are hoping to share. As Communion is a glimpse of the *Parousia*, it is appropriate to look up to the saints at the beginning of the Communion Rite. The western prayer was *Nobis quoque*. This list of saints tended to be fixed as opposed to those in the diptychs.

Communion:

Originally, there was no further preparation between the Eucharistic Prayer and Communion but the west inserted the Lord’s Prayer in the fourth century CE.<sup>41</sup> The east did the same. In the Middle Ages, communion had become very rare and the involvement of the faithful had declined because few were able to understand Latin, the standard western language of the liturgy.

The changes to the Roman Eucharistic Prayer(s) following the Second Vatican Council: Between 1963 and 1970, the Roman Eucharistic Prayer became subject to revision. In 1966, Pope Paul VI decided that the existing Eucharistic Prayer (I) should not be amended but supplemented by two or three further Eucharistic Prayers.<sup>42</sup> If the new Eucharistic Prayers were a failure, the church could revert back to the original Eucharistic Prayer. Since then, the new Eucharistic Prayers II and III are used more often than the other Eucharistic Prayers. Also, by 1975, a ‘proclamation’ was inserted after the Institution Narrative to which the faithful are expected to express vocally. This effectively divided the Eucharistic Prayer into two parts.

---

<sup>38</sup> Jungman, p. 398.

<sup>39</sup> St Pseudo-Dionysius, *Eccl Hier* 7.2; PG 3, col. 556C; trans. CWS-PD, p. 251.

<sup>40</sup> St Pseudo-Dionysius, *Eccl Hier* 3.3.8; PG 3, col. 437B; trans. CWS-PD, p. 218.

<sup>41</sup> Kucharek, p. 648.

<sup>42</sup> Annibali Bugnani, *The Reform of the Liturgy, 1948-1975* (Collegeville Minnesota 56321: Liturgical Press, 1990) p. 450.



Eucharistic Prayer II was adapted from the Apostolic Tradition with the following significant changes including a *Sanctus* was inserted *after* the Prayer of Thanksgiving, a demi-*Epiklesis* was extracted from the original *Epiklesis* and placed before the Institution Narrative, and various general prayers and diptychs were added. The final draft was produced by Louis Bouyer and Bernard Botte.

Eucharistic Prayer III was based upon Canon B prepared by Fr Cipriano Vagaggini (1909-1999).<sup>43</sup> Both Canon B and the final edition of Eucharistic Prayer III had a demi-*Epiklesis* prior to the Institution Narrative and included general prayers before the Amen.

Eucharistic Prayer IV was adapted from the Anaphora of St Basil but with several changes including a demi-*Epiklesis* was extracted from the original *Epiklesis* and placed before the Institution Narrative with the remainder of the *Epiklesis* left in its original position, and various general prayers were included.

---

<sup>43</sup> Dom Cipriano Vagaggini, *The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1967), pp. 124-152.

## B. WORKING WITH GOD IN CHRIST ACCORDING TO THE PATRISTIC TRADITION

### *Introduction*

We have established that according to scripture and the patristic tradition, Christ is the Archetype for union with God. If Christ was the Universal Christ, we need to confirm that Christ is also the Archetype of the Way to union with God in the spiritual life and the Eucharist.

### *Christ as the revelation of God through the Spirit*

The Incarnation reflects the *Parousia* in which the infinite God unites with beings which are restricted by time. The Incarnation therefore expresses the belittling of God in an infinite love which encompasses all things. As both divine *Logos* and man, we would expect that Christ would reveal God in human terms by His works and words. In this context, Christ is the true ikon (εἰκὼν) of God, ‘the image of the invisible God.’<sup>44</sup> As Christ is God as well as human, He is a universal so His revelation of God must encompass all knowledge of God over all time. The First Council of Constantinople confirmed this by stating that Christ, the Son of God, ‘spoke through the prophets.’<sup>45</sup>

We ascertained in Chapter Three that the roles of the *Logos* and Spirit are interdependent and, as Christ is the *Logos*, that interdependence must also apply to Christ and the Spirit. Accordingly, God is revealed by Christ through the Spirit and the Spirit ‘guides (persons) into the Truth’<sup>46</sup> by entering their hearts.

### *Christ as the Archetype for the natural path*

We ascertained in Chapter Five that Christ is the Archetype for the movement towards union with God. As the spiritual life of a person on the natural path is part of that movement, Christ must be the Archetype for the spiritual life. As Christ is God, His human will followed that of God. While the spiritual life is in imitation of God, it must therefore also be in imitation of both the divine and human Christ.

We have ascertained that those on the natural path allow God to work through them. Those working with God are therefore ‘instruments of the divine nature’<sup>47</sup> according to St Maximus. We could also describe God and the person as ‘co-workers’.<sup>48</sup> Scripture states that it would be ‘God who is at work in (them), enabling (them) to both will and to work for His good pleasure.’<sup>49</sup> The position on the natural path can therefore be expressed by the scriptural standard that ‘it is no longer I who live but Christ who lives in me’<sup>50</sup> and ‘in Christ, we live and move and have our being’<sup>51</sup> both quoted by St Maximus. This is therefore consistent with

---

<sup>44</sup> Col 1.15. Also 2 Cor 4.4.

<sup>45</sup> First Council of Constantinople, 381; trans. DEC, p. 24: ‘the Spirit ... spoke through the prophets.’

<sup>46</sup> Jn 16.13.

<sup>47</sup> St Maximus, *Amb* 7.26; PG 91, col. 1088B; trans. NC-AMB1, p. 113 after 2 Pet 1.3-4.

<sup>48</sup> 1 Cor 3.9.

<sup>49</sup> Phil 2.13.

<sup>50</sup> Gal 2.20. St Maximus, *Lib Asc* 34; PG 90; trans. CWS-MC, p. 123.

<sup>51</sup> Acts 17.28. St Maximus, *Amb* 7; PG 91, col. 1084B; trans. NC-AMB1, p. 105.

the Pauline concept of the Body of Christ quoted by St Maximus<sup>52</sup> in which members of humankind work with Christ as their head.<sup>53</sup>

The human Christ depended upon the Spirit indicating that His followers also need the Spirit to progress along the natural path. The role of the Spirit in progress along the natural path would not be changed by the Incarnation. Furthermore, the understanding of the natural path is only possible by the Spirit whether it is in imitation of God or Christ.

Convergence of eschatological movement:

St Maximus described this movement towards union with God as a convergence, a '*convergence* of the entire creation towards unity ... in Himself.'<sup>54</sup> The convergence is therefore in the Universal Christ. The use of the term 'convergence' implies that not only do things converge upon God in Christ but also upon each other. The convergence therefore involves all humankind as the Body of Christ.

Self-offering:

We ascertained that the key to the spiritual life is humility and the abandonment of will in favour of that of God. Scripture shows that Christ followed that course. St Maximus coupled the humility of human persons with that of Christ by quoting scripture.<sup>55</sup> For example, He stated at Gethsemane that it must be 'not what I want but what You want.'<sup>56</sup> In a similar way St Paul stated that Christ 'emptied Himself, taking the form of a slave (becoming) obedient to the point of death – even death on the Cross.'<sup>57</sup> The abandonment of will is a sacrifice of self reflecting the Cross. The direction or Way<sup>58</sup> of the natural path is therefore the Way of the Cross. Scripture quotes Christ as saying that 'whoever does not take up the cross and follow me is not worthy of me.'<sup>59</sup> The Cross is therefore essentially archetypal. Look up 1 Pet 2.20-25.

Taking on and forgiving sin:

Akin to the revelation of the divine love by the Cross is the archetypal lead from the Universal Christ who 'takes away the sins of the world'<sup>60</sup> thus anticipating making present the divine event of the *Parousia*. His followers also must take upon themselves the sins of others in imitation of Christ. This may involve making recompense for damage caused by others. When Christ said to the paralytic 'your sins are forgiven,'<sup>61</sup> He must be advocating that His followers also forgive. Accordingly, Christ advocates that we forgive our debtors<sup>62</sup> in the Lord's Prayer.

<sup>52</sup> St Maximus, *Amb* 7.36; PG 91, cols. 1096C and 1097A; trans. NC-AMB 1, p.129. 1 Cor 12.

<sup>53</sup> St Maximus, *Gnost* 2.84; PG 90; trans. CWS-MC, p. 165-66.

Col 1.18: (The Son) 'is the head of the Body, the Church'; Also Eph 5.23.

<sup>54</sup> St Maximus, *Amb* 41.8; PG 91, col. 1309C; trans. NC-AMB2, p. 113; Cf. Eph 1.10.

<sup>55</sup> St Maximus, *Or Dom* 4, PG 90; trans. CWS-MC, p. 108. Also *Char* 1.80, trans. CWS-MC, p. 44.

Mt 11.29: 'I am gentle and humble of heart.'

<sup>56</sup> Mt 26.39, Mk 14.36, Lk 22.42.

<sup>57</sup> St Maximus, *Th Pol* 6; PG 91; trans. BL-CM, pp. 173-75 and Phil 2.5, 7, 8.

<sup>58</sup> Jn 14.6.

<sup>59</sup> Mt 10.38. Also, Lk 14.27.

<sup>60</sup> Jn 1.29.

<sup>61</sup> Mt 2.5, 9-10.

<sup>62</sup> Mt 6.12

Divine love:

As the human Christ is united with God, He must expect that He would express the divine love of all things in His teaching. Individual journeys are not therefore in isolation from the remainder of the universe and humankind as a whole but involve them in the task of achieving the goal of the universe in Christ. In that context, St John particularly emphasised the love of Christ and His desire that all who follow Him should also love. For example, Christ states that we should ‘love one another as I have loved you.’<sup>63</sup> On the other hand, the Old Testament emphasised His ‘steadfast love.’ However, the old Jewish legends sometimes give the impression that God’s love is primarily directed towards the Jewish people rather than all things. Nevertheless, the principle of the God of Love is the same.

Christ and human persons as mediators:

We ascertained in Chapter Two that human persons are in a privileged position of being able to work with God in love. As it is likely that most of the universe does not have the above human abilities, we would expect that parts of the universe such as human persons would have to work for God on behalf of the remainder of the universe. Human persons working with God would also have to work on behalf of those who were able to work with God but choose the unnatural path. Moreover, St Maximus stated that ‘man was introduced last among beings – like a kind of natural bond mediating between the universal extremes through his parts and unifying through himself things that by nature are separated from each other by a great distance.’<sup>64</sup> Human persons are therefore mediators between God and the universe so that work in Christ is essentially cosmic. St Maximus also stated that Christ is the ‘Mediator between God and man.’<sup>65</sup> As He is a universal, He must be not only Mediator between God and humankind but also Mediator between God and the universe. Christ and human persons therefore work together in and for the universe so that it works in Christ. Accordingly, St Maximus implied that humankind aids Christ in ‘encompassing creation’ as he adds ‘with us and for us.’<sup>66</sup> As co-mediators with Christ, human persons have the cosmic role of assisting God to bring about the fulfilment of the universe according to the divine Plan. The object of the mediation is ‘to fashion a single earth, not divided by him in the difference of its parts, but rather gathered together.’<sup>67</sup> It is notable that St Maximus uses the term ‘gathering’ to describe the work of humankind while scripture uses it to describe the work of the Universal Christ.<sup>68</sup>

### *The Eucharist: Ascent and descent*

The Eucharist is typical of communications with God in which the faithful turn to Him and He responds to their open hearts with His Spirit. This the principle of ascent and descent of the spiritual life discussed in Chapter Four. We offer ourselves to God not only to protect our position on the natural path but to enable God to work through us. This work is not merely to obtain our individual union with God but to gather all things together so that they become united with God and with each other according to the divine Plan. We therefore ourselves not

---

<sup>63</sup> Jn 15.12.

<sup>64</sup> St Maximus, *Amb* 41.3; PG 91, col. 1305BC; NC-AMB2, p. 105.

<sup>65</sup> St Maximus, *Or Dom* 1; PG 90; trans. CWS-MC, p. 102 after 1 Tim 2.5.

<sup>66</sup> St Maximus, *Amb* 41.9; PG 91, col. 1312A; trans. NC-AMB2, p. 115.

<sup>67</sup> St Maximus, *Amb* 41.4; PG 91, col. 1305D; trans. NC-AMB2, p. 107.

<sup>68</sup> Eph 1.10.

only to God but to all creation and we work with God not only individually but with others. It is therefore highly appropriate to offer ourselves collectively in the Eucharist.

### *The Eucharist and the spiritual life*

The Eucharist reflects the spiritual journey for we enter the church for the liturgy as the worst sinner, repent our sins and those of others, offer both ourselves and all things to God and are then strengthened by the Spirit so that we become one with God and those who love Him.<sup>69</sup> The 'liturgy of the Eucharist is (therefore) a journey.'<sup>70</sup> Through the self-offerings of the faithful and Christ, the Eucharist is thus the life-blood of the Church.<sup>71</sup> Similarly, the self-offerings of the faithful thus become corporate not just because of their common purpose but in Christ through the Spirit. We can conclude that, from the point of view of the faithful, the Eucharist is both personal and corporate as supported by the patristic tradition.<sup>72</sup>

Scripture makes it clear that the Eucharist was instituted by Christ and so is archetypal. The prayers are centred upon Christ but they are addressed to God the Father. Both St Maximus and St Pseudo-Macarius<sup>73</sup> indicated that the liturgy was part of the monastic spiritual life. St Maximus stated 'that every Christian should ... frequent God's holy church and never abandon the holy *Synaxis*.'<sup>74</sup> As the early fathers regarded the Eucharist highly, the Eucharist must somehow be consistent with and enhance the spiritual life in Christ. We therefore need to explore the enhancement.

### *The Eucharist*

The offerings of the faithful and the sacrifice of Christ:

The scriptural account of the Last Supper confirms that, if the Last Supper was repeated as encouraged by Christ, it would be a memorial. However, we need to ascertain if the Eucharist is more than a memorial. When Christ held the bread and wine in His hands, He did not say that they were Himself but were His separated body and blood. This separation and the fact that the blood was 'shed' implied that the offering represented the sacrifice of the Cross which was 'proclaimed'. By making present the infinite love of God, the sacrifice of Christ reconciles all what divides God from his universe which is its deviation from the natural path. Accordingly, Christ indicated at the Last Supper that His blood was poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins thus opening the door of the *Parousia*.<sup>75</sup>

According to Hieromonk Gregorios, 'at the Last Supper, the all-pure hand of Christ ... became a terrible altar higher than the heavens.' But 'He Himself is Priest and Altar and Sacrifice.' 'The bloodless offering is being performed continuously in many different times

<sup>69</sup> Alexander Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World* (Crestwood, St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1973) p. 27: A new community with a new life.

<sup>70</sup> Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World*, p. 26.

<sup>71</sup> Pope John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, 2003, CTS, p. 18: 'The Eucharist builds the Church'.

<sup>72</sup> Alexander Schmemmann, *Liturgy and Life: Christian Development through Religious Experience* (New York: Department of Religious Education, Orthodox Church in America, 1993) p. 23.

<sup>73</sup> St Pseudo-Macarius, *Hom Spir* 27.17; PG 34; trans. CWS-PM, p. 181.

<sup>74</sup> St Maximus, *Myst* 24; PG 91; trans. CWS-MC, p. 206. By *synaxis*, it is likely that St Maximus means the whole liturgy.

<sup>75</sup> Mt 26.28.

and places ... but the presence of the one Christ does away with time and space.<sup>76</sup> Such a Christ must be the Universal Christ. We conclude that the Eucharist does not merely call to mind the earthly Cross but makes present its divine act.

We have ascertained that the true natural path is cosmic. The self-offering in the Eucharist is no different. Accordingly, Schmemmann stated that 'it is not simply bread that lies on the *paten/diskos* (as) on it, all of God's creation is presented.'<sup>77</sup> When the Spirit enters our hearts, He enters the heart of the universe which comprises the hearts of the co-workers with God.<sup>78</sup> Also, Kabasilas stated that when 'the offerings have been accepted at the heavenly altar, God, who has accepted them, sends us the Holy Spirit in return.'<sup>79</sup>

As Christ is the *Logos*, He encompasses all action that brings the universe nearer to its fulfilment as well as the fulfilment itself. Our self-offerings therefore become combined with the sacrifice of Christ 'which encompasses all our sacrifices, our offering of our very selves to God'.<sup>80</sup> Christ therefore both offers and is offered. By orientating our spiritual endeavours with Christ in the Eucharist, we place them in a universal perspective so our endeavours become part of those of humankind and the universe but also those of Christ. Our personal offering thus becomes corporate and cosmic.

The transformation of the people and their gifts:

Pope Gregory the Great stated that 'we must offer ourselves up to God with a contrite heart ... when we celebrate the mystery of the Passion of our Lord.'<sup>81</sup> Similarly, Augustine of Hippo states that 'the Apostle ... exhorted us to present our bodies as a living sacrifice ... acceptable to God'<sup>82</sup> (by this) sacrifice of ourselves ... we ... are one Body in Christ. (Therefore it is this) sacrifice which the Church continually celebrates in the sacrament of the altar.'<sup>83</sup> The eastern liturgy in offering the bread and wine states that 'we offer ... all our life to God.'<sup>84</sup> Self-offerings are in imitation with Christ's own self-offering at Gethsemane<sup>85</sup> which facilitated His sacrifice. Our sacrifice therefore follows the sacrifice of Christ who encompasses all sacrifices as He is universal. We conclude that self offering is an essential part of the Eucharist.

In the Eucharist, our self-offerings are represented by our gifts of bread and wine so they are not merely material things but are spiritualised by our self-offerings. Our offerings are then taken up to the altar on high and consequently there is a divine response through the Spirit. Those who offer themselves are therefore transformed not merely as individuals but in

<sup>76</sup> Hieromonk Gregorios, *The Divine Liturgy* (Cell of St John the Theologian, Mount Athos: Koutloumousiou Monastery, 2009) p. 47.

<sup>77</sup> Alexander Schmemmann, *The Eucharist* (Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Press, 1988), pp. 118. Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World*, 1963, pp. 122-23: 'Bread and wine ... symbol of this world'. ZIZ-CO, p. 301: 'The liturgy as ... the icon of the future kingdom.'

<sup>78</sup> 1 Cor 3.9.

<sup>79</sup> Nicholas Kabasilas, *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* (London: S. P. C. K., 1966) Para., p. 91.

<sup>80</sup> Schmemmann, *The Eucharist*, 1987, p. 110.

Meyendorff, John, *Byzantine Theology* (Oxford: A. R. Mowbray & Co Ltd.), p. 188: 'The Eucharistic offering is (Christ's) offering, bringing humanity ... to the throne of the Father'.

<sup>81</sup> Rik van Nieuwenhove, *An Introduction to Medieval Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) p. 48, after *The Dialogues* 4.61[1].

<sup>82</sup> Rom 12.1.

<sup>83</sup> Augustine of Hippo, *Civ Dei* 10.6; trans. NPNF1, Vol. 2, p. 184.

<sup>84</sup> Schmemmann, *The Eucharist*, 1987, p. 112.

Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World*, 1963, p. 34: 'Offer to God the totality of all our lives.'

<sup>85</sup> Mt 26.39, Mk 14.36.

a cosmic context of the Universal Christ.

As the Eucharist makes present the divine act, it encompasses the forgiveness of sins. The Eucharist would then be more than a memorial but a access to the God of Love. The *Anamnesis* couples the Cross with the Resurrection so that the people would look beyond the Cross to their future goal in the *Pleroma* by the Spirit in the Universal Christ. The Eucharist is therefore eschatological in nature.<sup>86</sup> The Eucharist is therefore about making the divine acts present through the Spirit.

The gifts of bread and wine therefore are not merely a symbol of the earthly Cross but of the universal Sacrifice of Christ coupled with the divine acts. They are therefore an invitation to glimpse Christ in His glory at the end of time by means of the Spirit. St. Maximus called the gifts ‘symbols’<sup>87</sup> but conceal an holy<sup>88</sup> or awesome<sup>89</sup> mystery (*mysterion*, μυστήριον). St John of Damascus explained this by saying that ‘the bread and wine are not merely figures of the body and blood of Christ ... but the *deified* body of the Lord ... The bread ... and wine are changed into God’s body and blood. If you enquire how this happens, it is enough for you to learn that it was through the Holy Spirit.’<sup>90</sup>

However, the change in the gifts is essentially coupled with the change of the faithful because it is they who experience the glimpse the deified Christ of the *Parousia*. According to St Pseudo-Dionysius, communion is ‘peaceful union with the One’<sup>91</sup> implying that ‘the Eucharist anticipates the *Parousia*’<sup>92</sup> and is ‘a foretaste of immortality’<sup>93</sup> thus giving us hope for the future. ‘The Eucharist’ is therefore an event which is taking place eternally’.<sup>94</sup> St Maximus stated that ‘the grace of the Holy Spirit ... transforms ... each person ... in proportion to what is divine in him.’<sup>95</sup> The transformation of the faithful therefore depends upon their spiritual state. However, without an openness of heart, the Spirit is powerless and there would be no change of the person and the change of the offered gifts would be meaningless.

Accordingly, St Maximus states that

‘by holy communion ... we are given fellowship and identity with Him by participation in likeness by which man is deemed worthy from man to become God. For we believe that, in this present life, we already have a share in these gifts of the Holy Spirit through the love that is in faith. (Also,) in the future age ... we shall pass from the grace which is in faith to the grace of vision.’<sup>96</sup>

<sup>86</sup> Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1966) p. 69.

<sup>87</sup> St Maximus, *Myst*, 24; PG 91, 705A; CWS-MC, pp. 207.

Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World*, p. 149: ‘Symbol of God’.

<sup>88</sup> Celebrated by the *Sanctus*.

<sup>89</sup> Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, Thanksgiving after Communion, trans. Kucharek, p. 722.

<sup>90</sup> St John of Damascus, *Fid Orth* 4.13; NPNF2, Vol 9.2, p. 83.

<sup>91</sup> St Pseudo-Dionysius, *Eccl Hier*, 8; PG 3, col. 437A; trans. CWS-PD, pp. 218.

<sup>92</sup> Olivier Clément, tr. Theodore Berkeley, *The Roots of Christian Mysticism* (London, Dublin, Edinburgh: New City, 1993) p. 114.

Nellas, Panayiotis, *Deification in Christ* (Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1987)

p. 157: ‘This bread, this body, to which people in this life draw near ... is that which in the age to come will appear to all eyes’.

<sup>93</sup> Zizioulas, John, *Communion and Otherness* (London: T & T Clark, 2006) p. 7, 79.

<sup>94</sup> Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, p. 69.

<sup>95</sup> St Maximus, *Myst* 24; PG 91; trans. CWS-MC, p. 206.

<sup>96</sup> St Maximus, *Myst* 24; PG 91; trans. CWS-MC, p. 207. (704D?)

Maximus thus differentiates between communion and the *Parousia* but also links them.

Conclusion:

As God wishes all to be united with Him, He is hardly going to refuse a request for even a glimpse of unity from those making a self-offering. The Eucharist is however essentially cosmic in character and therefore places our spiritual lives in the context of humankind and the universe as a whole under the Universal Christ.

As the Eucharistic is a glimpse of the *Parousia* by the Spirit for those with hearts open to God, the transformation of the gifts and the faithful are transformed in the same way as the universe remaining essentially the same but taken to a new unity with God.



## C. WORKING WITH GOD IN CHRIST ACCORDING TO TEILHARD

*Introduction*

Teilhard was very Christocentric. He would often refer to Christ rather than God but this issue is not considered here. Also, some may object to his terms such as ‘transubstantiation’ and perhaps ‘consecration’ which might give the impression that the Eucharist is a judicial procedure which is dealt with in Section D. If we treat these terms as a ‘transformation’, Teilhard’s arguments would not lose their fundamental meaning.

There are two principal papers by Teilhard on the Eucharist which are *The Priest*,<sup>97</sup> and *The Mass on the World*.<sup>98</sup>

*Personhood and Christ*

Under *Logos* theology, the individuality of the person is supported by the concept that all persons have a *logoi* which are in the *Logos*. Teilhard expressed this in terms of personhood which is a being which relates to God and other beings and is therefore distinct from those beings. Teilhard’s term for personhood is ‘personality’.

Teilhard also used the argument is that personhood depends upon Christ because He is a person. Teilhard also stated that ‘the personalization of the universe can only operate by preserving for ever in one Supreme Person the separate *sum* of “persons” born successively in the course of its evolution.’<sup>99</sup> This citation may be equivalent to *logoi* of persons being in the *Logos* and the gathering of all things in Christ.<sup>100</sup> Christ is therefore the ‘supremely autonomous focal point of union.’<sup>101</sup>

As the *Parousia* is made present over all time, Teilhard emphasises the dynamic aspect of the *Parousia* thus. Teilhard stated that ‘Christ ... *completes* the personality of the elements which He gathers together at the time of union.’<sup>102</sup> In Teilhard’s terminology, the ‘Supreme Person’ is Christ. We should perhaps point out that personhood begins before union with relationships between persons and God and what God loves and develops with God’s help towards union with Him.

As Creation is over all time, the *Parousia* is the completion of a multitude of things with *logoi* over all time. Because all *logoi* and unions with God are in Christ, it is reasonable for Teilhard to state that we ‘complete one’s self in Someone (Christ) other than oneself.’<sup>103</sup> Teilhard also stated that ‘only one person will be saved: Christ’<sup>104</sup> implying that all salvation is not only through Christ but with each other in Christ.

*Christ as the Archetype for the natural path*

Christ as goal:

---

<sup>97</sup> Teilhard, *The Priest*, 1918; 12WW, pp. 203-24.

<sup>98</sup> Teilhard, *The Mass on the World*, 1923; 13HM, pp. 119-34.

<sup>99</sup> Teilhard, *Sketch of a Personalistic Universe*, 1936; 6HE, p. 68.

<sup>100</sup> For example, Eph 1.10.

<sup>101</sup> Teilhard, *The Human Phenomenon*, 1940, rev 1948; 1HP, p. 187.

<sup>102</sup> Teilhard, *The Awaited Word*, 1940; 11TF, p. 99.

<sup>103</sup> Teilhard, *The New Spirit*, 1942; 5FM, p. 92.

<sup>104</sup> Teilhard, *The Divine Milieu*, 1927; 4DM, p. 106.

We have already ascertained that the universe will unite with God in Christ. Accordingly, the universe will converge upon God in Christ. Accordingly, Teilhard stated that there is a convergence of humankind.<sup>105</sup> We concluded above that, according to St Maximus, humankind is drawn towards Christ as a Centre so it converges upon God in Christ and also upon itself. Teilhard states that Christ is the ‘*divine* centre of convergence.’<sup>106</sup> St Maximus and Teilhard were therefore essentially in agreement on the convergence of humankind towards the goal of union with God..

#### The Way of the Cross:

We have ascertained that Teilhard had a patristic approach to the spiritual life including repentance, abandonment of will to that of God, and an openness to God at all times. The abandonment of will was particularly important in working with God.

Teilhard particularly emphasised the importance of the Cross as an archetypal act so that the Cross particularly reflects the sacrificial and self-offering aspects of the spiritual life. In other words, the humility to God and self-offering of the spiritual life is the Way of the Cross. Accordingly, Teilhard stated that ‘there is only one humility in the world ... one Sacrifice ... one resurrection and it is Christ’s.’<sup>107</sup>

It is therefore through suffering<sup>108</sup> that we progress along the natural path towards union with God. When Teilhard states that by ‘the Cross (which) beckons us, we rise by a path which is the way of universal progress,’<sup>109</sup> we can identify the path described by Teilhard with the natural path in this study. Our way forward, through which we find victory, Teilhard described as ‘the symbol, the Way, the very Act of progress’<sup>110</sup> Other citations from Teilhard’s writings confirmed that the Cross is the ‘symbol of progress.’<sup>111</sup>

We conclude that, according to Teilhard, the most important effect of Christ upon the spiritual life is the example of the Cross.

#### *The Eucharist*

##### Introduction:

For many in Teilhard’s time, the concept of the Universal Christ had been lost so we need to consider the consequences of that loss regarding the Eucharist. Nevertheless, if Christ had no universality, His life could still reflect the divine love he acted in a manner which reflected the divine acts. We would expect him to be humble to God, abandon his will to that of God and repented for sins even if there were none. He would therefore remain an archetype of the natural path for human persons and the Eucharist would draw people towards him and follow his example. In such a case, the celebration of the Eucharist would still draw people to Christ and His life of love.

---

<sup>105</sup> Teilhard, *The Basis of My Attitude*, 1948; 13HM, p. 36

Teilhard, *The Heart of Matter*, 1950; 13HM, p. 148.

<sup>106</sup> Teilhard, *Life and the Planets*, 1945; 5FM, p. 122.

<sup>107</sup> Teilhard, *Pantheism and Christianity*, 1923; 10CE, p. 72.

<sup>108</sup> Teilhard, *Some Reflections on the Conversion of the World*, 1936; 9SC, p. 123.

<sup>109</sup> Teilhard, *The Divine Milieu*, 1927; 4DM, p. 63.

<sup>110</sup> Teilhard, *The New Spirit*, 1942; 5FM, p. 95.

<sup>111</sup> Teilhard, *Introduction to the Christian Life*, 1944; 10CE, p. 163: ‘The Cross is the symbol of progress and victory won through ... hard work.’

Teilhard, *Christianity in the World*, 1933; 9SC, p. 108: ‘The Cross is ... a symbol of progress.’

If the Last Supper was an event involving a human person, it would be a memorial of a temporal event but if that person was also God, His acts would have a divine equivalent and a reinactment would be a make present that divine act. We therefore need to consider the importance of the Universal Christ in the Eucharist.

#### Self-offering in the Eucharist:

In the context of the Eucharist, Teilhard expressed his self-offering to God by asking Him, ‘take possession of me,’<sup>112</sup> and to ‘sublimate me till I become utterly what You (Christ) would have me be, through the utter annihilation of my ego.’<sup>113</sup> He felt that ‘my dearest wish, Master (Christ), is that I might offer so little resistance to You that You could no longer distinguish me from Yourself – so perfectly would we be united, in a Communion of will.’<sup>114</sup> Such an offering depends upon the open heart, but it is through the open heart that the divine power ‘must flood into the universe ... centred on me.’<sup>115</sup> We conclude that Teilhard regarded self-offering as being strongly coupled with the Eucharist.

We have ascertained that the Eucharist is essentially linked to unity with God in the *Parousia* but, it should be noted that in the view of Teilhard, unity is essentially an ‘alignment of wills’<sup>116</sup> with the divine will prevailing.

#### The cosmic Eucharist:

We have ascertained the support of Teilhard for the concept of the concept that human persons are mediators between God and the universe within the Body of Christ. This would be in accordance with God’s Plan for the universe. Consequently, in addition to his offering of his own self, Teilhard offered the universe to God by stating that ‘I have gathered ... the great world ... into my heart and now offer You in its entirety’<sup>117</sup> ... so that You ‘may make this universe ready to be united with You.’<sup>118</sup> Teilhard stated that ‘we should pray ... that the world may be transfigured’ and implied this should be done at a Plea for Acceptance before the Institution Narrative.<sup>119</sup> The offered gifts therefore represent not only ourselves but also the universe.<sup>120</sup>

As the offered gifts represent the universe, the transformed gifts represent the transformed universe so that ‘the Eucharistic transformation ... sanctifies matter.’<sup>121</sup> Both the universe and

<sup>112</sup> Teilhard, *The Priest*, 1918; 12WW, p. 215.

<sup>113</sup> Teilhard, *Mass on the World*, 1923; 13HM, p. 130.

<sup>114</sup> Teilhard, *The Priest*, 1918, 12WW, p. 216.

<sup>115</sup> Teilhard, *The Priest*, 1918, 12WW, p. 216.

<sup>116</sup> Teilhard, *The Priest*, 1918, 12WW, p. 216.

<sup>117</sup> Teilhard, *The Mass on the World*, 1923; 13HM, p. 121.

Teilhard, *The Priest*, 1918; 12WW, p. 223.

Teilhard, *The Mass on the World*, 1923; 13HM, p. 120: ‘The living surface of the world ... I will place on my paten’ and ‘All the things in the world (I) hold them out to You in offering’.

Teilhard, *The Mass on the World*, 1923; 13HM, p. 122: ‘The great world ... which I ... offer in its entirety.’

<sup>118</sup> Teilhard, *The Priest*, 1918; 12WW, p. 207.

<sup>119</sup> Teilhard, *The Divine Milieu*, 1927; 4DM, p. 105; The *Quam oblationem* of Eucharistic Prayer No. 1.

<sup>120</sup> Teilhard, *The Divine Milieu*, 1927; 4DM, p. 88: ‘The sacramental species are formed by the totality of the world’.

Teilhard, *My Universe*, 1924; 9SC, p. 65: ‘The Host of bread ... is continually being encircled by another, infinitely larger Host, which is nothing less than the universe itself’.

Also, Teilhard, *The Priest*, 1918; 12WW, p. 215: ‘Host of the world.’ See also p. 205.

Teilhard, *Pantheism and Christianity*, 1923; 10CE, p. 73: ‘The true Host, the total Host is the universe’.

<sup>121</sup> Teilhard, *The Divine Milieu*, 1927; 4DM, p. 87.

the human person are therefore transformed together in the movement towards their union with God. Teilhard expresses this by stating that ‘at Communion, (both) ourselves and the universe are united with God<sup>122</sup> as a glimpse of the universal communion.<sup>123</sup> Similarly, Teilhard said to God, ‘You take to Yourself and unite together the immensity of the world and the intimate depths of myself.<sup>124</sup> Communion is not therefore merely a glimpse of the *Parousia* with respect to humanity but to the whole universe.

Because all Eucharists reflect the *Parousia*, they are related to each other in a cosmic Eucharist. Consistently, according to Teilhard, ‘All our communions are ... in one communion.’<sup>125</sup> We conclude that Teilhard believed in the cosmic Eucharist.

#### Incarnation and the *Parousia*:

We ascertained that the Incarnation reflects the *Parousia* as both unite across the gulf between God and the universe. If the Eucharist reflected the *Parousia*, it would therefore also reflect the Incarnation. Teilhard accordingly stated that ‘a single event has been developing in the world: the Incarnation, realized, in each individual, through the Eucharist.’<sup>126</sup> The Eucharist is therefore particularly centred upon moving ahead rather than maintaining the *status quo*. We conclude that, according to Teilhard, the Eucharist reflects the divine acts. Accordingly, Teilhard regarded the Eucharist as a mystery.<sup>127</sup>

#### Conclusion:

Although Teilhard’s Christocentricity prevented him from discussing the role of the Spirit in the Eucharist, he nevertheless supported the principles of self-offering, the cosmic Eucharist and the connection between Communion and *Parousia* according to the patristic tradition.

---

<sup>122</sup> Teilhard, *Introduction to the Christian Life*, 1944, 10CE, p. 167: ‘When ... a Christian communicates (it is with) the whole body of the world.’

<sup>123</sup> Teilhard, *The Priest*, 1918; 12WW, p. 218. *The Christic*, 1955; 13HM, p. 94. *The Mass on the World*, 1923; 13HM, p. 130 and *Note on the Presentation of the Gospel*, 1919; 13HM, p. 216: ‘Universal consecration and communion’. The last reference continues ‘that is to say the possible convergence of all created efforts upon God’.

<sup>124</sup> Teilhard, *The Priest*, 1918, 12WW, p. 215.

<sup>125</sup> Teilhard, *Introduction to the Christian Life*, 1944; 10CE, p. 166. Also, *The Divine Milieu*, 1927; 4DM, p. 86.

<sup>126</sup> Teilhard, *The Divine Milieu*, 1927; 4DM, p. 86.

<sup>127</sup> Teilhard, *The Christic*, 1955; 13HM, p. 94: Eucharistic mystery.

## D. WORKING WITH GOD IN CHRIST CONTRARY TO THE PATRISTIC TRADITION

*The diminishment of the role of the laity: Exaggeration of descent relative to ascent*

In the Carolingian areas, there was an over-reaction to Arianism, advocated by Isidore of Seville (ca 560-636).<sup>128</sup> This stressed Christ's divinity at the expense of His humanity and also increased the importance of the clerical authority.<sup>129</sup> From the eighth century, it affected the Eucharist.<sup>130</sup> According to Jungman, while its sense of mystery remained, the Eucharist became a *bona gratia* which God grants us.<sup>131</sup> He described the situation by stating that 'the conscious participation of the community in the oblation of Christ is lost sight of ... Instead, the Mass (liturgy) becomes all the more the mystery of God's coming to man, a mystery one must adoringly wonder at and contemplate from afar.'<sup>132</sup> The highlight of the liturgy for the faithful therefore became the adoration of the consecrated host. Communion had already become rare so that the adoration of the consecrated bread did partially restore the involvement of the faithful in the liturgy, albeit at a distance. Churches then tended to have multiple altars with the overlapping liturgies so that the faithful could move from one elevation to another in succession.<sup>133</sup> What should have been the deified Christ therefore became an object subject to time to be adored. The Carolingian concept of the Eucharist therefore stressed the change of the gifts rather than on the gifts *and* faithful together.

We ascertained that the principle of ascent and descent was fundamental to the spiritual life, the descent representing a response to open hearts by God through His Spirit. The removal of that principle from the Eucharist would therefore be a radical change. In particular, if the Eucharist was only a descent, it would negate the role of those who offer themselves to God. Moreover, there would be separation between the spiritual life and the Eucharist. If there were no self-offerings, the gifts of bread and wine would not be spiritualised and would receive a response from God so the offerings would be merely material things.

*The liturgy of the diminished Christ*

We ascertained that in the patristic tradition, the Eucharistic Body and Blood of Christ are His deified Body which therefore reflects the Universal Christ of the *Parousia*. At the beginning of the second millennium, there was a tendency to emphasize the humanity of Christ at the expense of His divinity.

Pelikan noted that there is a 'confusion' concerning what form of Christ is made present in the liturgy. It could have been 'the Body of Christ in human form' or 'the Body of Christ in the Church'<sup>134</sup> but it could also be the Universal Christ. The first option was supported in

---

<sup>128</sup> Jungman, p. 63.

<sup>129</sup> Jungman, p. 62, 500.

<sup>130</sup> Jungman, p. 63.

<sup>131</sup> Jungman, p. 63.

<sup>132</sup> Jungman, p. 64.

<sup>133</sup> Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars*, 1992, p. 98.

<sup>134</sup> Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978), p. 191

the tenth to twelfth centuries by several theologians including Peter Damian,<sup>135</sup> Alger of Liege, RATHERIUS of Verona,<sup>136</sup> Robert Pullen, Rupert of Deutz,<sup>137</sup> and Herbert de Losinga according to Pelikan. This was despite the fact that the Body of Christ in human form would not remain the same over its physical life span. If we merely called to mind Christ's human form, His sacrifice would be His human sacrifice which would be in the category of the natural energies. Later, the linking of the transformed bread and wine with the physical body of Christ resulted in the formula that 'the substance of the bread and wine is changed into the substance of the living Body and Blood of Christ'<sup>138</sup> but the appearances or accidents of the bread and wine remain.<sup>139</sup> This device avoided the charge of alchemy by avoiding the change from one material object into another.

In 1905, Pius X (1903-1914) revolutionized Eucharistic practice by encouraging frequent communion by the faithful.<sup>140</sup> In parallel with this, translations of the liturgy, hitherto prohibited, began to emerge so that the liturgy began to become better understood by the faithful.<sup>141</sup> This movement eventually led to the restoration of the responses by the faithful. Pius X granted an indulgence in 1907 of seven years from Purgatory to those who, when they gazed upon the consecrated gifts, said silently, 'My Lord and my God'.<sup>142</sup> We conclude that, despite the stress upon the host as an object, at the time of Teilhard, this did not wholly deny Christ's divinity. Also, by the time of Teilhard, although communion became more common, the elevation was still regarded as important.

In modern times, the papal encyclical *Mediator Dei* of 1947 stated that there is no difference between the 'body which was once ... pierced by a lance, (that) given to us to eat (and) reigns in heaven,' but 'reigning in heaven.'

We conclude that, if the faithful lost the principle of the Universal Christ, He would be perceived as less universal and therefore less divine. We ascertained that the acts of Christ are not merely earthly events but also divine events but, as Teilhard pointed out, the concept of the divine act was not a secure belief in his time. Nevertheless, the liturgy is a continuation of the sacrifice of Christ and, if it only emphasised the human sacrifice, it would only be a memorial of that temporal event, but if it emphasised the cosmic Sacrifice, it would make that Sacrifice present together with the divine equivalents of the Resurrection and *Parousia*.

### *The diminishment of the role of the laity: The judicial approach to the Eucharist*

In the pre-Nicene tradition, the Offertory, Eucharistic Prayer, and Communion were not

<sup>135</sup> Peter Damian, *Sermones Ordine Mense Servato* 45; PL 144, col. 743; trans. Pelikan, p. 193: 'What the Catholic faith holds, what the holy church faithfully teaches us (is that) the very Body of Christ that the blessed Virgin bore ... this very body, I say without any doubt and no another, we now receive from the holy altar.'

<sup>136</sup> RATHERIUS of Verona, *Diagolus confessionum* 15; PL 136, col.403; trans. Pelikan, pp. 191-92: 'the flesh that (Christ) assumed for you, was crucified, died, buried and raised, the flesh that he elevated to heaven ... that flesh now enters you.'

<sup>137</sup> Rupert of Deutz, *De divinis officiis* 1; trans. Pelikan, pp. 192: 'The (body) received from altar and that which (Christ) received from the womb of the Virgin (are) one and the same body.'

<sup>138</sup> CAF; Commentary on Article 268.

<sup>139</sup> Pope Pius XII, *Mediator Die* 134, 1947.

<sup>140</sup> Jungman, pp. 120, 501.

<sup>141</sup> Jungman, p. 122.

<sup>142</sup> Jungman, p. 427.

considered as separate units but as a single whole.<sup>143</sup> When adoration of the transformed gifts became the highlight of the liturgy for the faithful, it was necessary to know when in the liturgy that the transformed or consecrated gifts could be adored. Of course, for a reasonable communion, it was only necessary for the faithful to believe that the transformation had taken place before communion. However to define a particular time would make the transformation into a judicial act rather than a change in the hearts of the faithful. Jungman attributed this judicial approach to the Eucharist to Isidore of Seville<sup>144</sup> mentioned above. It was decided that the consecration was complete at the end of the Institution Narrative.

A result of this decision, the Eucharistic Prayer was split into two parts. The second part after the consecration comprised the *Anamnesis*, the full *Epiklesis* and Amen were no longer aspects of the transformation of the gifts. While there was a Plea for Acceptance prior to the Institution Narrative, the request to strengthen the faithful by the Spirit after the Institution Narrative was presumably no longer considered important as it was after the consecration. This was however consistent with the emphasis being upon descent rather than ascent. Furthermore, as the Institution Narrative particularly emphasised the Cross, the emphasis of the Resurrection/*Parousia* in the later prayers would be diminished. The faithful were therefore no longer a factor in the transformation of the gifts so that the role of the clergy prior to communion was far more important than that of the faithful.

We conclude that the judicial approach appears to be incompatible with matters of the hearts of the faithful. As both the change in the gifts and the faithful are brought about by the Spirit who acts through the heart, changes of the heart would not be at a fixed time.

#### *Diminishment of the role of the laity: Hope followed by decline*

While the importance of the role of the laity declined with the judicial approach to the Eucharist, there were other developments which supported that decline. We ascertained that the west maintained the *Enarxis* as a preparation rite in the first millennium. Important features were the *Kyrie* litany without the petitions and the Collective Prayer, with both the celebrant and faithful sharing their preparation as noted above. In modern times, the *Introit* and the *Gloria* came to be sung by the laity. The time for personal preparation was therefore reduced to a few seconds particularly after the changes to the liturgy following the Second Vatican Council.

There appeared to be some support for the principle of self-offering in the Second Vatican Council.<sup>145</sup> The Council disapproved of faithful who attended the liturgy ‘as though they were outsiders or silent onlookers’ and stated that ‘they should learn to offer themselves as they offer the immaculate victim ... making the offering together with ... the priest’. This statement clearly recognised that self-offering in the liturgy has been neglected and, if that statement was reflected in the liturgy, it could restore the Eucharist to its former glory before self-offering in the liturgy declined.

That restoration in the following changes in the liturgy failed to materialise. While the Offertory procession was restored, hymns and/or prayers to which the faithful were expected to respond were inserted in the position of the former collective prayer of offering. Even

---

<sup>143</sup> Kucharek, p. 64. Presumably at the time of the Didache, Ap Con 7, Ap Trad.  
Alexander Schmemmann, *The Eucharist*, 1988, p. 164: ‘The sacrament of *Anaphora* ... would be impossible without the sacrament of offering and unity’.

<sup>144</sup> Jungman, p. 63.

<sup>145</sup> Second Vatican Council, Session 3, *Sacrosanctum concilium*, 1963; trans. DEC, p. 830.

without a hymn during the Offertory procession, any personal prayers of self-offering became difficult because the procession was preceded by the collection of money which was brought to the altar with the offered gifts. As self-offerings are from the heart and cannot therefore be hurried, it is difficult to envisage how they could be made during one line in the *Anamnesis* when all attention should be on the words of the celebrant which sum up all the offerings.

While for the housebound, communion with transformed gifts is reasonable provided the sick person makes an appropriate self-offering, in the liturgies in church, the faithful now often partake of gifts from an earlier liturgy. This gives the impression that the self-offering of the faithful and the transformation of the gifts are unconnected so that former would be unimportant. Unfortunately, as time passes, the above hopeful conciliar decree will be forgotten and former Eucharist will become a distant dream.

### *A Eucharist without self-offering*

Assuming it is in the context of the Eucharist, St John the Evangelist quoted Christ as stating that 'those who eat My flesh and eat My blood have eternal life, and I will raise them up on the last day' implying the connection between the Eucharist and the *Parousia*. However, one could attend a Eucharist for a period but then fall from the natural path and become separated from God. Union cannot therefore be guaranteed by a few attendances of the Eucharist. St Luke made this point strongly by stating that 'some ate and drank with' Christ but He could state that 'I do not know where you are from.' However, those who self-sacrifice are bound to receive a response from God.

We therefore need to ascertain if there is any value in a Eucharist without self-offering. Even if the Universal Christ and the union between God and the universe were long forgotten, many may still regard Christ as an Archetype for the spiritual life and consider their attendance at a Eucharist would strengthen that approach. Nevertheless, it has to be pointed out that as the Eucharist is essentially coupled with the sacrifice of Christ, and therefore, by neglecting to make a self-offering, they turn their backs on the archetypal Cross and also their journey towards God in Christ which depends upon it. The lack of self-offering is therefore a rejection of that journey. Some may however still take only a defensive approach to the spiritual life but this would merely maintain the *status quo* rather than to progress in Christ. The Eucharist would still be an invitation to self-offer and those who accepted the invitation from Christ would find their spiritual lives transformed. Even if only one in a million accepted Christ's invitation, even a much diminished Eucharist should not be abandoned.



## SECTION E: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As Christ is both God and man, St Maximus and Teilhard supported the concept that Christ is the Archetype for the spiritual lives of human persons because of His humility, self-offering, forgiveness, and being the mediator with humankind between God and the universe. They both accepted the cosmic aspect of the spiritual life which was consistent with the Universal Christ.

Both understood the cosmic aspect of the Eucharist. However, we have ascertained that the principle of the Universal Christ had been lost at the time of Teilhard so that Christ was no longer believed to encompass the union between God and all things. The loss of the Universal Christ may have contributed to the loss of the connection between the Eucharist and the *Parousia*. The loss of the cosmic aspect of the Eucharist would therefore undermine its essential purpose.

We conclude that the lack of balance between ascent and descent in the Eucharist was particularly disturbing owing to the lack of self-offering and the corresponding divine response through the Spirit. It is therefore important that the original function of the Eucharist should be reconsidered. This would require a reconsideration of the many changes over the centuries of both the principles of the Eucharist and its liturgy. It should however be borne in mind that even a reformed Eucharist is an enhancement of the spiritual life and not a substitute for it

Word count, 4 July 17: 12,386.