

WHEN SACRAMENTS SHALL CEASE:
TOWARD A PNEUMATOLOGICAL AND ESCHATOLOGICAL
APPROACH TO THE EUCHARIST

A thesis by

Kevin Andrew Montgomery

presented to

The Faculty of the

Graduate Theological Union

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Berkeley, California

February 2006

Committee Signatures

Coordinator

Date

Date

Date

Contents

Abstract	ii
Introduction	1
Chapters	
One	6
Two	30
Three	50
Four	67
Conclusion	87
Works Cited	89

Abstract

This thesis examines the historical development of the eucharistic epiclesis through the 1979 revision of the Book of Common Prayer (BCP) for the Episcopal Church in the United States of America. This examination then serves to move discussion of the Eucharist away from the idea of a “moment of consecration” toward a model-based approach focusing on the pneumatological and eschatological aspects of the sacrament.

Introduction

This study begins with an observation about the eucharistic rite in the Episcopal Church in the United States. The current Book of Common Prayer (1979) includes two different “rites” for the celebration of the Eucharist. Rite One preserves the type of language used in previous Prayer Books while Rite Two, along with other significant changes, presents the liturgy in a more updated idiom. In addition, the latter rite includes four new eucharistic prayers largely based on more classical forms from the earlier centuries of the church.

One of the major differences between the Rite One and Rite Two prayers is found in the epiclesis, the invocation. In the former, God is asked to send the Word and Holy Spirit, while all of the Rite Two Prayers have only an invocation of the Spirit. Initially, this observation led to the question of what the difference between the two types of epiclesis means. Is one type more theologically “correct” than the other? Does one have more historical precedent? In future Prayer Book revisions, should we maintain a set of eucharistic prayers with an invocation of “Word and Holy Spirit”?

These questions then led to further inquiries regarding the nature of the Eucharist. If the difference in the epicleses does indicate a difference in theology, or at least theological emphasis, how does that affect one’s view of consecration of the elements in the liturgy? This kind of question easily leads to others such as the role of the Word and/or Holy Spirit in the Eucharist and the relation of the invocation to the institution narrative, that perennially favorite part of the eucharistic liturgy in Western theological discussions.

Those questions, however, simply lead the inquirer into the old battles regarding a moment of consecration and the nature and agent of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. Instead, I propose that we reframe the question. Instead of rehashing old arguments (but not dropping them entirely), I suggest an alternative: How might an investigation of this difference in invocations lead to a way of viewing the sacrament of the Eucharist that moves us away from the questions of a moment of consecration and toward a more holistic and integrated vision of the Eucharist?

In this case, I take inspiration from two main sources. The first is Kevin Irwin's book *Models of the Eucharist*. In this study, he tries to move beyond "either . . . or" rhetoric that sets one view of the Eucharist against another. Instead, he recognizes that the reality of this sacrament contains many facets of understanding and that one must look at several different facets to begin to get a truer picture. "It is intended to offer a series of concepts which when taken together offer rich insight into the reality that is the Eucharist."¹

While Irwin sets forth ten models of the Eucharist, the limitations of this thesis advise a more modest strategy for me. Instead, I want to limit my discussion primarily to one model that can encompass the question with which I started.

This is where the other source becomes relevant. Toward the end of *The Eucharist in the West*, Edward Kilmartin proposes the need for a new synthesis for eucharistic theology for the third millennium based on the reintegration of the *lex orandi* (law of prayer) and the *lex credendi* (law of belief). Although he admits that he cannot know what that final synthesis might look like, he goes give some possibilities.

¹ Kevin Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2005), 33.

First, he suggests beginning with Communion as a way to integrate the eschatological dimension of the Eucharist that has been often neglected in the West. As he writes, “This would take the eucharistic celebration as a sacramental sign of the heavenly banquet . . . and that all the other effects of this celebration of the life of faith are included in the effect, namely, the *res tantum sacramenti*.”² Nevertheless, he decides to begin with the sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist and proceed from there.

Of course, Irwin puts forth his book from a Roman Catholic perspective and intends it to advance a eucharistic theology and practice in line with Roman Catholic liturgy and tradition. Likewise, Kilmartin writes as a Roman Catholic, though with significant Eastern Christian influence. I, however, come from a different (but not totally unrelated) Christian background. I write as an American Episcopalian raised as a Methodist. Therefore, I stand with a foot firmly in the more protestant side of Anglican tradition but at the same time with significant recent formation in the more catholic side as well.

Given the historical reaction against the medieval over-emphasis on eucharistic sacrifice and materialistic notions of Christ’s presence as well as my own unfamiliarity with the paradigm of sacrificial language, I found that the Kilmartin’s first idea about the eschatological dimension might make a better starting point. Indeed, in my research of the epiclesis, I found eschatology to be essential to this part of the Eucharist, even from the beginning.

² Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert J. Daly (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2004), 352.

Therefore, to use the analogy of a multi-faceted gem, one can look at the Eucharist in eschatological terms; but with the epiclesis, one can also see it from a pneumatological perspective that considers the action of the Holy Spirit.³ Given the focus of this thesis on the epiclesis, I conclude that a way to proceed is to look not just at one facet or another but to look at the edge where the two join together. The question then arises as to what this kind of eschatological and pneumatological model might look like. This thesis, though, can only begin the process and suggest a possible method.

With this starting point, the rest of the discussion proceeds from an historical examination of the role of the epiclesis in the eucharistic liturgy toward a more theological assessment. In the first chapter, I present a quick overview of the epiclesis in eucharistic prayers from the early centuries of Christianity up to the Protestant Reformation. Chapter two then narrows the focus to the Anglican tradition from the Reformation through the first American Book of Common Prayer in 1789. The third chapter looks specifically at the latest version of that Prayer Book and goes systematically through the eucharistic prayers found in that 1979 edition to find the theological currents running through them as connected to the eucharistic invocations. This is the section that looks at the question with which I started the paper, namely, the difference between an epiclesis of Word and Spirit and an epiclesis of the Spirit alone.

The final chapter, however, continues in the theological avenue begun in chapter three but moves outward to a more general reading of the Eucharist in terms of eschatology and the Holy Spirit. Ultimately, I conclude with a brief look at some of the

³ See Irwin, 263-289. In this chapter, he sets forth a model of the Eucharist as the work of the Holy Spirit.

implications of this model of the Eucharist, both in the liturgy itself and in the larger Christian life.

Chapter 1: Evolution of the Eucharistic Epiclesis up to the Reformation

In general terms, the word “epiclesis” (Greek: ἐπίκλησις) literally means “an invocation, a calling upon” and derives from the verb ἐπικαλεῖν, “to call upon.”

Specifically, it refers to a prayer that invokes the name of God upon a person or thing.

In this broad sense of an invocation of the divine name, the epiclesis emerges early in the Christian tradition with the invocation of the name of Jesus or of the Trinity during baptism. Other forms of it are found in the rites of confirmation, ordination, and the blessing of the baptismal font.⁴ Although a definite eucharistic invocation does appear in the apocryphal *Acts of Thomas*⁵, clear evidence of developed epicleses do not appear in the extant records until the third century.

Before discussing the clear and extant examples of the evolution of the epiclesis in Christian liturgical families, however, I wish to look at some of the possible early precursors that might have influenced later developments. John McKenna, in his study *The Eucharist and the Holy Spirit*, calls attention to attempts to forge a link to the various Jewish *berakoth* formulas⁶, especially concerning the idea of the *Shekinah*, the divine

⁴ *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed., 15 vols., vol. 5 (Detroit: Thomson/Gale Group, in association with the Catholic University of America, 2003), 279.

⁵ “Come, O perfect compassion, Come O communion of the male, Come, she that knoweth the mysteries of him that is chosen, Come, she that hath part in all the combats of the noble champion (athlete), Come, the silence that revealeth the great things of the whole greatness, Come, she that manifesteth the hidden things and maketh the unspeakable things plain, the holy dove that beareth the twin young, Come, the hidden mother, Come, she that is manifest in her deeds and giveth joy and rest unto them that are joined unto her: Come and communicate with us in this eucharist which we celebrate in thy name and in the love-feast wherein we are gathered together at thy calling.” *The Acts of Thomas*, 50.

presence, as well as the Blessing for Jerusalem (*berakah rahem*) in the meal-prayer *birkath ha-mazon*, part of which includes the following eschatological petition:

Have mercy, Lord our God, on us your people Israel, and your city Jerusalem, on your sanctuary and your dwelling place, on Zion, the habitation of your glory, and the great and holy house over which your name is invoked. Restore the kingdom of the house of David to its place in our days, and speedily build Jerusalem.⁷

Regarding the New Testament, very little evidence, if any, exists. Some point to the expression *Maranatha* found at the end of 1 Corinthians: “Our Lord, come!” The Greek μαραναθά transliterates an Aramaic phrase. Most translations of this passage use the imperative form *marana tha* as an indication that the writer (in this case Paul) is expressing hope in the future advent of the Lord (Jesus); however, one can also translate the phrase as “Our Lord has come” (*maran atha*), acknowledging that his arrival has already occurred.

For a similar use, I call attention to another passage of Scripture: “The one who testifies to these things [i.e. Jesus Christ] says, ‘Surely, I am coming soon.’ Amen. Come, Lord Jesus!” (Rev. 22:20 NRSV).⁸ Here an unambiguous present imperative responds to the former statement of future activity. The author is calling for Christ to

⁶ John H. McKenna, *The Eucharist and the Holy Spirit: The Eucharistic Epiclesis in Twentieth Century Theology (1900-1966)*, Alcuin Club Collections, vol. 57 (Great Wakering, UK: Mayhew-McKrimmon, for the Alcuin Club 1975), 16-18. See also Louis Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Notre Dame Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968), 50-115; Thomas J. Talley, "From Berakah to Eucharistia : A Reopening Question," *Worship* 50, no. 2 (1976): 115-137; Thomas J. Talley, "The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer," *Worship* 58, no. 5 (1984): 404-420.

⁷ R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd ed. (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 10.

⁸ All subsequent Bible references, unless otherwise noted, will be from the New Revised Standard Version.

come and be present on earth.

Although these two examples carry possible echoes of ritual usage, a more explicitly liturgical use occurs in another early Christian document known as the *Didache*. Chapters nine and ten contain a meal blessing adapted from Jewish forms.

Then at the end of the thanksgiving after the meal, one finds this section:

May grace come, and may this world pass away.
Hosanna to the God of David.
If anyone is holy, let him come;
if anyone is not, let him repent.
Maranatha! Amen.⁹

This eschatological hope echoes an earlier sentiment expressed in the blessing over bread:

As this broken bread was scattered over the mountains, and when brought together became one, so let your Church be brought together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom; for yours are the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for evermore.¹⁰

Then again in the final thanksgiving, one sees a similar petition for God to remember the church and to gather it together into the final kingdom. While one cannot say definitely that the familiar epiclesis developed from this form, these prayers from the *Didache* do have a petitionary dimension with a strong eschatological request similar to some later Christian epicletic formulas.

In addition, we find pieces of indirect evidence in the writings of several Church Fathers. Although McKenna cites examples from the second through the eighth

⁹ "The Didache (the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles)," in *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, ed. Michael W. Holmes (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999), 263.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 261.

centuries, at this point I only plan to review four such instances.

In the *First Apology*, Justin Martyr (d. 165), describes some of the early worship practices of some second century Christians in Rome. When he comes to the description of the eucharistic bread and wine, he draws a parallel between the consecrated gifts and the Incarnation:

And this food is called among us Εὐχαριστία [the Eucharist] . . . For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. . . .¹¹

The gifts are “eucharistized” by the “prayer of His word,” but what exactly does the latter phrase mean? McKenna mentions five possible explanations, including the institution narrative or even a possible epiclesis of the Logos; but to me the option that risks the least speculation is that the early Fathers probably did not try to isolate a specific prayer as a “moment of consecration” but rather saw the entire prayer as consecratory.¹² Nevertheless, from the analogy to the Incarnation, we can infer that Justin possibly saw the Word as the effective agent in establishing the bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ.

A few decades later, Irenaeus of Lyons wrote his famous treatise *Against*

¹¹ Justin Martyr, "The First Apology," in *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325 (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996), 185.

¹² McKenna, 50. [McKenna himself, however, seems to favor the idea of a Logos epiclesis.]

Heresies, in which he includes a proof of the bodily resurrection based on the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. In the passages relevant to this study, he writes:

For as the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly . . .¹³

When, therefore, the mingled cup and the manufactured bread receives [sic] the Word of God, and the Eucharist of the blood and the body of Christ is made . . . And just as a cutting from the vine planted in the ground fructifies in its season, or as a corn of wheat falling into the earth and becoming decomposed, rises with manifold increase by the Spirit of God, who contains all things, and then, through the wisdom of God, serves for the use of men, and having received the Word of God, becomes the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ. . .¹⁴

On one hand, Irenaeus does clearly refer to an invocation (ἐπίκλησις) and to the reception of the Word by the elements of bread and wine to make them the body and blood of Christ. One could possibly construe these references as evidence of a Logos epicleresis. On the other hand, at an earlier point, Irenaeus makes fun of the Gnostic Marcus for expounding at great length an invocation over cups of wine;¹⁵ so this lends evidence against his use of ἐπίκλησις to refer to any one particular piece of a prayer.¹⁶ Nevertheless, as with Justin, Irenaeus appears to see the Word as the agent especially active in making Christ present in the Eucharist.

¹³ Irenaeus, "Against Heresies," in *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325 (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996), 486.

¹⁴ Ibid., 528.

¹⁵ Ibid., 334.

¹⁶ McKenna, 53.

In time Christian theology developed to a point that, especially in the East, the Holy Spirit came to be seen as the primary agent of consecration. For example, we find some of the earliest evidence for a eucharistic petition for the Spirit to transform the gifts of bread and wine in the late fourth century *Mystagogical Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem. In describing and commenting on the anaphora in the fifth of the mystagogical catechetical lectures, he states:

Once we have sanctified ourselves with these spiritual hymns, we call upon the merciful God to send the Holy Spirit on our offerings, so that he may make the bread Christ's body, and the wine Christ's blood; for clearly whatever the Holy Spirit touches is sanctified and transformed.¹⁷

Likewise, in an earlier lecture, he warns the newly baptized not to think the Holy Chrism is simple ointment just as “the bread of the Eucharist after the invocation of the Holy Spirit is no longer just bread, but the body of Christ.”¹⁸ Clearly, from these examples, Cyril sees the Holy Spirit as actually effecting a change in the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ and indeed is one of the earliest to state it in such conversionist terms.¹⁹

Another late fourth century figure, Theodore of Mopsuestia, provides another set of catecheses that include an explanation of the eucharistic activity with a parallel to Christ's resurrection. These lectures, however, provide greater detail regarding the epiclesis and the action that is taking place. In the sixth catechesis, he writes:

¹⁷ Cited in Edward Yarnold, *The Awe-Inspiring Rites : The Origins of the R.C.I.A.*, 2nd ed. (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1993), 92.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 82.

¹⁹ McKenna, 54.

But by virtue of the sacramental actions, this [the epiclesis] is the moment appointed for Christ our Lord to rise from the dead and pour out his grace upon us all. This can take place only by the coming of the grace of the Holy Spirit, by which the Holy Spirit once raised Christ from the dead. . . . Accordingly, the bishop is obliged by the liturgical rules to entreat God that the Holy Spirit may come and that grace may descend from on high on to the bread and wine that have been offered, so showing us that the memorial of immortality is truly the body and blood of our Lord. . . . Just as our Lord's body was clearly revealed as immortal when it had received the Spirit and his anointing, so too in the liturgy the bread and wine that have been offered receive at the coming of the Holy Spirit a kind of anointing by the grace that comes upon them. From this moment we believe that they are the body and blood of Christ, free from death, corruption, suffering, and change, like our Lord's body after the resurrection.²⁰

Unlike Cyril he does not employ language of transformation in this instance, but like him he does specifically refer to an epiclesis of the Holy Spirit upon the gifts. Shortly after that Theodore also describes the epiclesis on the gathered faithful.

"The bishop also prays that the grace of the Holy Spirit may come upon all the assembly. The new birth has made them grow into a single body; now they are to be firmly established in the one body by sharing the body of our Lord, and form a single unity in harmony, peace and good works. Thus we shall look upon God with a pure heart; we shall not incur punishment by communicating in the Holy Spirit when we are divided in our views, inclined to arguments, quarrels, envy and jealousy, and contemptuous of virtue. By our harmony, peace and good works, and by the purity of heart with which our soul looks upon God, we shall show that we are awaiting to receive the Holy Spirit. In this way, by communion in the blessed mysteries, we shall be united among ourselves to be, and through whom we 'become partakers of the divine nature.'"²¹

Although we see both in Cyril and in Theodore an invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the gifts, the former claims that the purpose of the epiclesis is to transform the bread and wine. The latter, on the other hand, states that grace of the Holy Spirit makes the gifts to be shown (or "known"²²) to be the body and blood of Christ. While Cyril focuses

²⁰ Cited in Yarnold, 233-234.

²¹ Ibid., 234.

on the conversion of elements, Theodore maintains the intention of the spiritual food and drink and the work of the Holy Spirit to be for the transformation of the faithful into the one Body of Christ in the world.

These two examples, though, are of a relatively late period in the fourth century. As indicated in the above discussions of Justin and Irenaeus, some early evidence indicates the possibility that the earliest form of the epiclesis may have involved an invocation of the Logos. Only one definite example exists, however. In the anaphora attributed to Sarapion, bishop of Thmuis in Egypt, the epiclesis asks for the Word of God to come upon the bread and cup. This particular prayer dates from around 350 and might not even reflect the Alexandrian tradition of that time.²³ For a more thorough survey of the question, I refer the reader to the appropriate section on the history of the epiclesis in McKenna and the accompanying citations²⁴ as well as to Max Johnson's work on the prayers of Sarapion.²⁵

Despite the possibility of an early invocation of Logos, the earliest extant epicleses do invoke the Holy Spirit. The *Apostolic Tradition* presents the earliest model of a prayer we have for a Christian Eucharist. The epiclesis follows immediately after the anamnesis and before the concluding doxology. According to the Latin version, this section prays as follows:

²² Jasper and Cuming, 136.

²³ McKenna, 27.

²⁴ Ibid., 103-106.

²⁵ Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis : A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, vol. 249 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995), 233-253.

And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit in the oblation of [your] holy church, [that] gathering [them] into one you will give to all who partake the holy things [to partake] in the fullness of the Holy Spirit, for the strengthening of faith in truth, that we may we praise and glorify you . . .²⁶

The prayer does not call for the transformation of the gifts but rather focuses on the unity of the members of the assembly and the support of their faith in order to praise God.

A number of problems, though, have arisen regarding this particular prayer. For example, the Latin text itself presents challenges for translation. (e.g. Just who or what is being gathered?) Indeed some have even argued that this is an indication of a later interpolation at this point in the text. At the same time, the developed invocation of the Holy Spirit also seems to reflect a later stage in Trinitarian theology than would have been present in the early third century. On the other hand, one could argue (along with the later example of Sarapion) that among early Christian thinkers the distinction between the Logos and the Spirit was not as clear cut as it would become later in the fourth century.²⁷

Others point to the lack of a full epiclesis in the anaphoral section a Syriac text entitled the *Testamentum Domini*, which shows significant influence from the *Apostolic Tradition*. Bernard Botte argues that the Syriac translator mistranslated the Greek, and he attempts to reconstruct what he thinks to be the original epiclesis.²⁸ Others, though, have

²⁶ Paul F. Bradshaw, Maxwell E. Johnson, and L. Edwards Phillips, "The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary," ed. Harold W. Attridge (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002).

²⁷ McKenna, 19-20.

²⁸ Bernard Botte, "L'epiclèse De L'anaphore D'hippolyte," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947): 245-247; Bernard Botte, "A Propos De La 'Tradition Apostolique'," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 33 (1966): 184.

countered Botte's view and have tried to prove that no epiclesis actually existed in the text and thus neither did it exist in the *Apostolic Tradition*.²⁹ Enrico Mazza has suggested that only the second part of the invocation, which prays for the unity of the church and the fullness of the Holy Spirit, is part of the older layer.³⁰ Given more recent studies regarding the late nature of imperatives addressed to the Father, "Send your Holy Spirit," rather than direct imperatives such as "Come," a significant case remains for the epiclesis being a later interpolation.³¹

Nevertheless, the eucharistic prayer as we have it in the extant texts of the *Apostolic Tradition* (at least the Latin and Ethiopic versions) does provide a model that has been used in a number of Christian traditions during the liturgical revisions of the late twentieth century. I will discuss this to a greater degree at a later stage.³²

Another example of an anaphora from this period is the one contained in Book VIII of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. This particular prayer, once known as the "Clementine Liturgy,"³³ incorporates parts of the *Apostolic Tradition* but alters and expands them considerably. It gives thorough praise and thanks for God and creation and recounts the story of the Fall and of the Old Testament, the Sanctus coming at the end of

²⁹ Bouyer, 170-177.

³⁰ Enrico Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1995), 169-174.

³¹ See note 15 in Bradshaw, Johnson, and Phillips, 42.

³² See chapter 3.

³³ So-called because of the attribution to St. Clement of Rome found at the beginning of the *Apostolic Constitutions*.

the twenty-second paragraph followed by the anamnesis, epiclesis, and intercessions. The wording of the epiclesis states:

And we beseech you to look graciously upon these gifts set before you, O God . . . and to send down your Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice . . . that he may make this bread body of your Christ, and this cup blood of your Christ; that those who partake of it may be strengthened to piety, obtain forgiveness of sins, be delivered from the devil . . . be filled with Holy Spirit, become worthy of your Christ, and obtain eternal life, after reconciliation with you, almighty Master.”³⁴

One wonders whether a prayer of this length was ever actually used in its entirety.

Nevertheless, this anaphora remains an important historical source, especially given the esteem in which it was held by certain eighteenth-century Anglicans.³⁵

At this point I wish to look at several different anaphoras and their invocations as grouped by regional tradition. The first one I want to look at is that of the Egyptian tradition, which has the interesting phenomenon of the epiclesis preceding the institution narrative instead of following it as with most eucharistic prayers.³⁶

The most famous of the Egyptian prayers is the Alexandrian Anaphora of St. Mark. Although we have part of an earlier Coptic version, the Greek manuscripts of the final form only date to the thirteenth century.³⁷ In this version, the epiclesis immediately follows the Sanctus with “Fill, O God, this sacrifice also with the blessing from you

³⁴ Jasper and Cuming, 103-113.

³⁵ See chapter 2 of this paper.

³⁶ While the explicit epiclesis of the Word in Sarapion does follow the narrative, we do find the following phrase just before the words of institution: “Fill also this sacrifice with your power and your partaking . . .” Jasper and Cuming, 77.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 57.

through the descent of your Holy Spirit.”³⁸ Later, after the narrative of institution, the priest prays:

And we pray and beseech you . . . send out from your holy height . . . the Paraclete himself, the Holy Spirit [of truth], the Lord, the life-giver . . . [look] upon us and upon these loaves and these cups; <?send> your Holy Spirit to sanctify and perfect them . . . and make the bread the body . . . and the cup the blood of the new covenant of our Lord . . .³⁹

In the case of the former epiclesis, this invocation serves to link, through its language of “fill,” the end of the Sanctus (“heaven and earth are full of your holy glory”) with the institution narrative.

Likewise, the sixth- or seventh-century prayer found in the fragmentary Deir Balyzeh papyrus also has an epiclesis prior to the institution narrative. Following the Sanctus, the priest says, “Fill us also with the glory from (you), and vouchsafe to send down your Holy Spirit upon these creatures (and) make the bread the body of our (Lord and) Savior Jesus Christ, and the cup the blood . . . of our Lord . . .” Then follows a petition for the gathering of the church in unity similar to the one found in the Didache (see above). Right after the narrative and the anamnesis, the extant text cuts off; so we do not know if the prayer originally contained a second epiclesis. Even so, the first one has already asked for the transformation of the gifts and for the filling of the faithful with the Holy Spirit, two petitions found in the second epiclesis in St. Mark.⁴⁰

³⁸ Ibid., 64.

³⁹ Ibid., 65-66.

⁴⁰ Another fragment of an Egyptian anaphora is found in a Louvain Coptic papyrus which only has an epiclesis for the transformation of the bread of wine, not for the sanctification of the people. Ibid., 81.

Now we proceed from Egypt to eastern Syria.⁴¹ The main anaphora in this tradition is that of Addai and Mari. Although extant manuscripts for this anaphora come from a later historical period, scholars suggest that the original form dates as early as the fourth century, making it one of the earliest eucharistic prayers we have.⁴²

In Addai and Mari, the anaphora begins with the introductory dialogue followed by a section of praise for the Holy Trinity for the creation and redemption of the world before transitioning into the Sanctus hymn. Then the priest gives thanks to Christ for the work of salvation and prays the intercessions for the church and the world before continuing with the anamnesis and epiclesis.⁴³ This particular anaphora maintains the trait of not having an explicit institution narrative.⁴⁴ The epiclesis, unlike those of later eucharistic prayers, does not ask for the transformation of the elements but rather, as with earlier ones, petitions for the sanctification of the bread and wine for the benefit of the faithful.⁴⁵ The text of the epiclesis is as follows:

May your Holy Spirit, Lord, come and rest on this offering of your servants, and bless and sanctify it, that it may be to us, Lord, for remission of debts, forgiveness

⁴¹ One can find examples of this tradition primarily in the Assyrian Church of the East, the Chaldean Catholic Church, and some of the Mar Thoma churches of southern India.

⁴² McKenna, 37.

⁴³ Jasper and Cuming, 42-43.

⁴⁴ Also note that one does not find a narrative in the Didache or in Cyril's *Mystagogical Catecheses*. For a recent ecumenical look at the issue, see also Robert Taft, "Mass without the Consecration? The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East Promulgated 26 October 2001," *Worship* 77, no. 6 (2003): 482-509.

⁴⁵ Jasper and Cuming, 40-41. Cf. *Apostolic Tradition*.

of sins, and the great hope of resurrection from the dead, and new life in the kingdom of heaven, with all who have been pleasing in your sight.⁴⁶

The words “bless and sanctify” are probably a later addition given their absence from the epiclesis in the Third Anaphora of St. Peter, also known as Sharar. This prayer, used by the Maronites of Lebanon, is thought to share a common ancestor with Addai and Mari but has added material, such as an institution narrative, while also apparently preserving some more primitive readings.⁴⁷ Otherwise, the epiclesis in Sharar is almost identical with the one in Addai and Mari.

The East Syrian tradition also has two other eucharistic prayers attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia and to Nestorius. Each of the invocations shares features with that of Addai and Mari but greatly expands the petitions for the benefits of communion. In Nestorius the text of the epiclesis is as follows:

And may there come, my Lord, the grace of the Holy Spirit and may it [she] dwell and rest upon this oblation which we offer before you and may it [she] bless and sanctify it and make this bread and this cup the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, changing them and sanctifying for us by the activity of the Holy Spirit, so that the partaking of these glorious and holy mysteries may be to all those who receive them, eternal life and resurrection from the dead and the pardon of the body and soul. And for the light of knowledge and for uncovered face towards you: and for eternal salvation which you have promised us through our Lord Jesus Christ, so that we may be united together one with another in harmony to one bond of love and peace. And that we may be one Body and one Spirit, as we are called in one hope of our calling. . . .⁴⁸

Likewise, the text of the epiclesis in the Anaphora of Theodore states:

⁴⁶ Ibid., 43.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 39, 45.

⁴⁸ Bryan D. Spinks, *Mar Nestorius and Mar Theodore the Interpreter: The Forgotten Eucharistic Prayers of East Syria*, Joint Liturgical Studies, vol. 45 (Cambridge: Grove Books, Ltd., for the Alcuin Club and the Group for Renewal of Worship, 1999), 33.

And may there come the grace of the Holy Spirit upon us and upon this oblation and rest and reside upon this bread and upon this cup. And may it [she] bless and hallow and seal them in the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit. And by the power of your Name may this bread, and drink from cup, may be for them, my Lord, for the pardon of debts and the forgiveness of sins, and a great hop of the resurrection of the dead, and salvation of body and soul, and new life in the kingdom of heaven and glory for ever and ever. And make us all worthy by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that with all those who have been well pleasing to your will . . . we may rejoice in the kingdom of heaven, in the good things that are prepared and will not pass away.⁴⁹

In both of these of these examples, the priest prays for the “grace of the Holy Spirit” to “come” upon the gifts although Theodore precedes it with a request for the Spirit to come on the gathered people, as one finds in the West Syrian tradition, the Anaphora of St. Mark, and the catechetical lectures of Theodore of Mopsuestia. This use of the more primitive term “come” rather than “send” sets all three of the East Syrian prayers apart from other traditions and harkens back to some of the possible early precursors discussed above.⁵⁰ At the same time, though, both Nestorius and Theodore draw on other sources and expand on the epiclesis of Addai and Mari, especially in petitioning for the “eschatological fruits of communion.”⁵¹

Now we come to the eucharistic prayers characteristic of the West Syrian tradition which looked to Antioch for much of its theology and liturgical practices. These anaphoras find their greatest usage in the Byzantine rites of the Eastern Orthodox

⁴⁹ Ibid., 37. Note that the epiclesis in the Anaphora of Theodore also calls on the “Name” of the entire Trinity to “bless and hallow and seal” the gifts as well as on “the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ” to make the participants worthy to be brought into the kingdom.

⁵⁰ Especially regarding *Maranatha* in the New Testament and the Didache.

⁵¹ Bryan D. Spinks, *Worship: Prayers from the East* (Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1993), 94. For more information on the East Syrian epicleses, see chapter six in his book, pages 89-96.

Churches (Greek, Russian, Antiochian, et al.) and certain churches in communion with Rome (Melkite, Greek Catholic, Ruthenian, et al.) and as structural models for most of the revised Western eucharistic prayers of the late twentieth century.⁵²

Let us begin by examining the eucharistic prayer known to us as the Anaphora of St. Basil. The earliest form of this prayer, though, is actually found in Egyptian manuscripts and is today the most common of three used by the Coptic Orthodox Church.⁵³ Despite some Egyptian influences, it retains a West Syrian structure and may have been brought to Egypt (perhaps by Basil) from Cappadocia, where the major center of influence was Antioch. While the earliest manuscript was likely written in the seventh century, parts of the text indicate a possibly older original dating to the fourth century.⁵⁴

In this anaphora, the epiclesis follows the anamnesis and oblation, unlike in other Egyptian prayers where the invocation precedes the institution narrative.⁵⁵ After the gifts are offered, the priest prays:

And we, sinners and unworthy and wretched, pray you, our God, in adoration that in the good pleasure of your goodness your Holy Spirit may descend upon us and upon these gifts that have been set before you, and may sanctify them and make them holy of holies.

Make us all worthy to partake of your holy things for sanctification of soul and body, that we may become one body and one spirit, and may have a portion with all the saints who have been pleasing to you from eternity.⁵⁶

⁵² See chapter 3.

⁵³ The other two are the Anaphoras of St. Cyril [i.e. the Anaphora of St. Mark] and St. Gregory the Theologian [i.e. of Nazianzus].

⁵⁴ Jasper and Cuming, 67.

⁵⁵ Cf. Anaphora of St. Mark, Deir Balyzeh fragment, etc. . . .

⁵⁶ Jasper and Cuming, 71.

This epiclesis clearly asks for the transformation of the bread and wine but also requests the Holy Spirit to unite the partakers in one body with the communion of saints.

The importance of this form of the Anaphora of St. Basil is that it provides a major influence on other eucharistic prayers. Translations exist in both Syriac and Armenian showing intermediate phases between the Egyptian and the later Byzantine versions.⁵⁷ In addition, it has served as a basis for a modern ecumenical eucharistic prayer shared (to a certain extent) by several Christian denominations.⁵⁸

The Byzantine form of St. Basil expands the text enormously, making it about twice as long as the Egyptian version. With its oldest extant text preserved in the Barberini manuscript (c. 800) (though with a large section missing), St. Basil served as the primary liturgy for the city of Constantinople (also within the theological and liturgical influence of Antioch) until it was replaced by the shorter Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. Nevertheless, St. Basil still remains in use in Orthodox Churches on certain Sundays and feast days throughout the year.⁵⁹

With its characteristically florid language, the text of the epiclesis in this anaphora states as follows:

[W]e pray and beseech you, O holy of holies, in the good pleasure of your bounty, that your all-Holy spirit may come upon us and upon these gifts set forth, and bless them and sanctify and make . . . this bread the precious body of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ. Amen. And this cup the precious blood of our

⁵⁷ Ibid., 114.

⁵⁸ E.g. Eucharistic Prayer IV (Roman Catholic Revised Sacramentary), Eucharistic Prayer D (Episcopal Book of Common Prayer, 1979), et al.

⁵⁹ Jasper and Cuming, 114.

Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ, Amen. which is shed for the life of the world . . . Amen.

Unite with one another all of us who partake of the one bread and the cup into fellowship with the one Holy Spirit; and make none of us to partake of the holy body and blood of your Christ for judgement or for condemnation, but that we may find mercy and grace with all the saints who have been well-pleasing to you .
⁶⁰
..

Again we see, as is usual for this tradition, a prayer for the coming of the Spirit first on the people and then on gifts for their transformation into the body and blood of Christ but this time with greater emphasis on the conversionist language by the insertion of “Amen” after the sections on the bread and the cup.

Another anaphora that shows the influence of Basil (both the Egyptian and Byzantine versions) is that of St. James. In many ways, this eucharistic prayer represents a melding of the Jerusalem rite presented by Cyril in his *Mystagogical Catecheses* and the early form of Basil.⁶¹ The Syriac translation of St. James shows an earlier form than the extant Greek texts, but they both contain much of the same content regarding the epiclesis.⁶² The epiclesis runs to great length asking for the mercy of God and detailing the work of the Holy Spirit while also petitioning for the descent of the Spirit for the change of the elements and for the benefits of communion. The abridged text is as follows (parts only in the Greek are in square brackets):

Have mercy on us, [Lord,] God the Father, almighty . . . and send out upon us and upon these [holy] gifts set before you your [all-]Holy Spirit . . . [send down, Master, your all-Holy Spirit himself upon us and upon these holy gifts set before you,] . . . that he may descend upon them, [and by his holy and good and glorious

⁶⁰ Ibid., 119-120.

⁶¹ Ibid., 88.

⁶² McKenna, 34-35.

coming may sanctify them,] and make this bread the holy body of Christ (*People: Amen.*) and this cup the precious blood of Christ. (*People: Amen.*) . . . that they may become to all who partake of them [for forgiveness of sins and for eternal life] for sanctification of souls and bodies, for strengthening your holy, [catholic, and apostolic] Church . . . rescuing it from every heresy, and from the stumbling-blocks of those who work lawlessness . . . until the consummation of the age.⁶³

Finally in this look at the West Syrian / Byzantine traditions, we come to the principal anaphora used in the Orthodox Churches, that of St. John Chrysostom. The epiclesis is as follows:⁶⁴

We offer you also this reasonable and bloodless service, and we pray and beseech and entreat you, send down your Holy Spirit on us and on these gifts set forth; and make this bread the precious body of your Christ, [changing it by your Holy Spirit,] Amen; and that which is in this cup the precious blood of your Christ, changing it by your Holy Spirit; so that they may become to those who partake for vigilance of soul, for fellowship with the Holy Spirit, for the fullness of the kingdom <of heaven>, for boldness toward you, not for judgement or condemnation.⁶⁵

As before, we have the typical language of transformation of the elements and the petition for the fruits of communion, including the eschatological fullness of God's kingdom.

In the Latin traditions of the Western churches, the state of the epiclesis does not fare as well. Although some sources from North Africa, such as Fulgentius of Ruspe and Pope Gelasius I, who also came from that area, exist as possible indirect evidence of an epiclesis used in at least some places in the West, extant eucharistic texts from there are

⁶³ Jasper and Cuming, 93.

⁶⁴ The text from Jasper and Cuming is a translation primarily from the Barberini manuscript. Sections omitted from modern texts are in square brackets, and later additions are in angle brackets.

⁶⁵ Jasper and Cuming, 133.

unfortunately lacking.⁶⁶ In Rome the developed Canon as we have it contains no explicit invocation of the Holy Spirit.⁶⁷

Unlike most of the Eastern (and some more contemporary) eucharistic prayers, the Canon is not just one fixed text. Instead, it consists of a fixed order of sections, parts of which do not change while others vary throughout the year based on the season or feast day. The basic structure consists of an introductory dialogue (identical to that found in the *Apostolic Tradition* and in the Anaphora of St. Mark) followed by a variable preface leading into the Sanctus. Then instead of a continuation of thanksgiving the Canon proceeds to a series of petitions and intercessions. The central focus lies on the words of institution, found in the section known as the *Qui pridie*. These words of Christ would eventually be considered *the* consecratory moment in much of medieval Roman Catholic thought.

Nevertheless, parts of the Canon can be construed as epicletic. The *Te igitur* includes a petition for the Father to “accept and bless” the gifts and to protect and preserve his church. Later, in the *Quam oblationem*, the priest prays that God might

⁶⁶ E.g. “Now that question has come around to us concerning the mission of the Holy Spirit: If a sacrifice is offered to the Holy Trinity, why is the sending of the Holy spirit only asked for, for the sanctifying of the gift of our oblation . . .” Fulgentius of Ruspe, *To Monimus* 2.6.1. Also, “For how shall the celestial Spirit, invoked for the consecration of the divine mystery, descend, if the priest who (*et qui*) petitions him to be at hand, stands condemned as full of wicked deeds.” Gelasius [*Epistola*] *Elpidio episcopo Volterrano* fragm. 7.2, as found in Kilmartin, 52-53.

⁶⁷ Although partial quotations exist in Roman and non-Roman sources from as early as the fourth century, such as in Ambrose’s *De Sacramentis*, the oldest manuscripts of the developed Canon date only to the eighth century. Jasper and Cuming, 159.

make the offering holy and acceptable and that it may “become to us” (*fiat nobis*) the body and blood of Christ. Then follows the *Qui pridie* with the institution narrative.⁶⁸

Afterwards, we find the *Unde et memores* (the anamnesis and oblation), the *Supra quae* (petition for acceptance), and the *Supplices te rogamus*, consisting of the following:

We humbly beseech you, almighty God, bid these things be borne by the hands of your angel to your altar on high, in the sight of your divine majesty, that all of us who have received the most holy body and blood of your Son by partaking at this altar may be filled with all heavenly blessing and grace; through Christ our Lord.⁶⁹

Here we do have a petition for the sacrifice to be brought before God by his “angel” so that the benefits of communion may descend upon those who partake. Nowhere in these sections, though, is there explicit mention of the Holy Spirit except in some of the prefaces and in the *Per quem*, the final doxology.

The Western pre-Reformation tradition, however, does include other eucharistic rites besides the Roman. The most noteworthy ones are the Gallican (in Gaul/France) and the related Mozarabic (in Spain), both of which would over time be supplanted by the Roman Rite.⁷⁰ Each of these two rites shows signs of Eastern influence with a much more florid style than the more concise Roman language. Unlike the invariable Eastern eucharistic prayers or the Roman Canon with its fixed text and variable prefaces, the prayers of the Gallican family vary practically from Sunday to Sunday, retaining only the

⁶⁸ Ibid., 164-165.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 165.

⁷⁰ When used collectively, these rites will be referred to as the Gallican family. On a historical note, though, the Mozarabic Rite is still used regularly in one of the chapels in the cathedral in Toledo. Another of the non-Roman rites, the Ambrosian, is still authorized for use today in Milan, but unfortunately, it lies outside the purview of this study.

fixed points of the *Sursum corda*, *Sanctus*, institution narrative, and doxology.⁷¹ As with the Roman Canon, in none of these sections do we find an invocation of the Holy Spirit.

We do find a few references in some examples of the section that follows the institution narrative,⁷² yet these are few and far between. In the words of J. Armitage Robinson:

I have examined 225 forms of the *Post Pridie* prayer, and find that in 39 only is sanctification asked for through the Holy Spirit. In 29 it is asked direct from Christ; in one from the Holy Trinity; in six by means of an angel: usually the petition is simply addressed to God. In only six instances is there a request that the Holy Spirit may be sent for the purpose of effecting the change of the elements into the Body and Blood of Christ. . . .⁷³

This quotation gives at least some hint of the variety of prayers available for use in the Gallican family. Some ask for the benefits of communion, including the hope of resurrection and the fellowship with all the saints in the Holy Spirit. At least one even invokes the Logos with the aforementioned “come,” indicating both in the language and in direct address a preservation of an older form of epiclesis.⁷⁴ While greater study of the epiclesis in the Gallican family would be beneficial, the wide diversity of prayers and the lack of direct connection with more contemporary forms preclude a more detailed analysis at this time.⁷⁵

⁷¹ Jasper and Cuming, 147.

⁷² *Post-secreta* in the Gallican Rite and *post-bridie* in the Mozarabic Rite.

⁷³ J. Armitage Robinson, "Invocation in the Holy Eucharist," *Theology* 8 (1924): 94., as found in McKenna, 41.

⁷⁴ McKenna, 43.

⁷⁵ A few sources of greater depth of study of these non-Roman Latin rites include the following: W. C. Bishop, "The Mass in Spain," in *The Mozarabic and Ambrosian*

We have now done a brief survey of some of the major Christian liturgical traditions up until the time of the Reformation. Each of these adds to the understanding of the Eucharist, in both its historical and theological development, especially regarding the epiclesis, which is the topic of the study. As we have seen, most of the developed epicleses occur at a point in the eucharistic prayer following the words of institution with the exception of the Egyptian tradition (epiclesis split by the institution narrative) and the East Syrian Anaphora of Addai and Mari (no words of institution). In addition, almost all of the extant examples of the invocations call upon the Holy Spirit with the exception of Sarapion's Logos epiclesis (possibly harkening to an earlier form).

Early examples of the epiclesis, such as in the *Apostolic Tradition*, do not ask for the transformation of the bread and wine but for the unity of the church and the fruits of communion for those who partake. By the fourth century, most of the developed eucharistic prayers contain a so-called "consecratory" epiclesis that calls upon the Holy Spirit to change the elements into the body and blood of Christ, as first indicated in Cyril of Jerusalem, while the West Syrian – Byzantine anaphoras also include an invocation directly on the people. Nevertheless, even in these examples the conversion is for the benefit of those who receive the sacrament, including fellowship in the Holy with all the saints in heaven and on earth.

Rites: Four Essays in Comparative Liturgiology, C. L. Feltoe, ed. (Oxford: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd., for the Alcuin Club, 1924) 18-54.; John Mason Neale and G. H. Forbes, *The Ancient Liturgies of the Gallican Church ; Now First Collected with an Introductory Dissertation, Notes, and Various Readings Together with Parallel Passages from the Roman, Ambrosian, and Mozarabic Rites* (reprint: New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1970; original: London: n. pub., 1855).

The major exception lies in the Latin tradition, especially in the Roman Canon, which contains no explicit invocation as found in the Eastern prayers. Although parts of it can be seen as parallels to an epiclesis, none of them mention the Holy Spirit. One should not be surprised that the focus over time rested more and more narrowly on the Words of Institution as the moment of consecration.

Chapter 2: Epiclesis from the Reformation through the Anglican Traditions

The Western focus on the institution narrative did not change with the Reformation. In fact, most of the Reformation eucharistic prayers continued and even enhanced it, sometimes almost exclusively. The Anglican experience, though, provides an interesting story in the employment of the eucharistic epiclesis. The eucharistic prayer of Thomas Cranmer's 1549 Book of Common Prayer does involve an invocation of "Holy Spirit and word" leading into the Words of Institution.⁷⁶ In this case, the use of "word" does not necessarily indicate a Logos epiclesis but perhaps merely refers to the scriptural story of the institution of the Lord's Supper, but I will return to this topic later. In 1552 even this bit was removed, leaving a very Reformed prayer focusing on the account of the Last Supper, which immediately preceded communion. The epiclesis did not occur again in official English liturgies until the Alternative Services Book of 1980.

A 1549-type epiclesis of "word and Holy Spirit," however, did appear next in the proposed 1637 Scottish Book of Common Prayer. This Prayer Book, though, met with resounding failure when it was introduced. Nevertheless, it would serve as a eucharistic model for the Scottish Episcopal Church and through them for the American Episcopal Church. This resulted in a new form of Anglican eucharistic prayer that included the epiclesis and served as a basis for the American Episcopal Prayer Books through the 1928 version and Rite I of the 1979 revision.⁷⁷ Before discussing the details of the American Prayer Book, however, I wish to go through a history of this development of

⁷⁶ Jasper and Cuming, 239.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 302-303.

the epiclesis in the Anglican tradition.

As indicated, the 1549 Book of Common Prayer did include what one might consider an invocation of word and Holy Spirit. Prior to the words of institution, the Prayer Book has the priest pray, “And with thy Holy Spirit and word vouchsafe to ble+ss and sanc+tify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ . . .”⁷⁸ In many ways, this 1549 version was a conservative attempt at an English version of the Roman Canon, and this particular section parallels in several places with the *Quam oblationem*. One might also want to draw a connection to the epiclesis found in the Anaphora of St. Basil because of the invocation of the Holy Spirit, the use of the verbs “bless” and “sanctify,” and the reference to the bread and wine as “gifts.” It seems more likely that he would be drawing on an explanation of the consecration handed down in the Middle Ages from Paschasius Radbertus but attributed at the time to Augustine.⁷⁹

Given the compromise nature of the 1549 Prayer Book, the response from both traditionalists and reformers was generally negative. Bishop Stephen Gardiner of Winchester, though, did express approval of the epiclesis and its translation of the *fiat nobis* as indicating, against Cranmer’s objections, the doctrine of the Real Presence in the eucharistic consecration.⁸⁰ That statement alone probably contributed enormously to the

⁷⁸ Ibid., 239.

⁷⁹ *De corpore et de sanguine Domini*, 12. See also Bouyer, 416-417; Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: Dacre Press, 1945), 657.

⁸⁰ Cited in Thomas Cranmer, *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*,

removal of that section in 1552. Martin Bucer, in his 1551 *Censura* response to the Prayer Book, opposed the invocation on the gifts as having no biblical basis and as being construed to support such “horrid impieties” as transubstantiation. Instead, he favored the prayer to be directed to the blessing and sanctifying of the people by the Word and Holy Spirit.⁸¹ The final result in 1552 was a eucharistic prayer patterned on Reformed lines that focused almost exclusively on the institution narrative.

In 1637, however, King Charles I and the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud, sought to impose a new Prayer Book, at the insistence of certain Scottish bishops, on the Scottish church. Given the High Church persuasions of these bishops, as well as the king and archbishop, this book was modeled primarily on the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, especially in the Eucharist.⁸² The “Prayer of Consecration” includes an epiclesis of word and Holy Spirit before the institution narrative that is almost exactly the same as the earlier one.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy Almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy word and Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son; so that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of the same his most precious body and blood . . .⁸³

The main differences are the reversal of Holy Spirit and word and the insertion at the end

ed. John Edmund Cox, for the Parker Society (Cambridge, UK: The University Press, 1844), 79.

⁸¹ Martin Bucer, “The *Censura*,” in *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer*, ed. E. C. Whitaker, Alcuin Club Collections (Great Wakering, UK: Mayhew-McCrimmon, for the Alcuin Club, 1974), 52-55.

⁸² Jasper and Cuming, 258.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 262.

of the receptionist line from the 1552 Prayer Book. Although some parts of the rite, such as the epiclesis and manual acts at the institution narrative, were according to Scottish custom, other aspects of the book, such as the elimination of the prohibition of elevation, led to violent rejection of the book as well as the episcopacy that it represented.⁸⁴

With the rise to power of the Puritans in England, the fixed liturgy of the Prayer Book was abolished. In its place the Westminster Commission set forth *A Directory for Public Worship*, approved by the Long Parliament in 1645. It sought to bridge the differences between the Presbyterians, who wanted a set of fixed prayers of the Scottish-Genevan type, and the Independents, who wanted greater freedom for extemporaneous prayer. Therefore, the *Directory* provided rubrical directions and suggestions for prayers but with allowances, especially in the Lord's Supper, for ministerial variation. Although, in keeping with Reformed liturgy, the focus was on the institution narrative and the remembrance of Christ's passion, the suggested prayer of thanksgiving included references to the work of the Holy Spirit and even an epiclesis of sorts.

Earnestly pray to God, the Father of all mercies, and God of all consolation, to vouchsafe his gracious presence, and the effectual working of his Spirit in us; and so to sanctify these elements, both of bread and wine, and to bless his own ordinance, that we may receive by faith the body and blood of Jesus Christ, crucified for us, and so to feed upon him, that he may be one with us, and we with him . . .⁸⁵

The *Directory*, however, did not have any lasting effect on the development of Anglican worship.

With the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 and the election of a Cavalier House

⁸⁴ Ibid., 263-264.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 268.

of Commons in 1661, many of the bishops and the members of Parliament wanted to return to the 1604 Book of Common Prayer as used prior to the Commonwealth. Charles II called a conference (later known as the Savoy Conference) of equal numbers of episcopal and presbyterian divines for the purpose of Prayer Book revision.⁸⁶

By the time the conference began, the tide had turned against the Presbyterians. They had lost control of Parliament and then were told that they were to write for the conference a set of “Exceptions” they had to the Prayer Book liturgy rather than starting from scratch to draft a new book. To these the bishops drew up their “Answers” coming from a totally opposite set of principles. With both sides so far apart and with so much outside pressure against major change, neither group was able to maintain a constructive attitude.⁸⁷

On a historical note, two interesting developments did accompany this conference. Bishop John Cosin of Durham brought with him an annotated printing of the 1604 Prayer Book. This *Durham Book* reflected his Laudian opinions by drawing largely on the 1549 and 1637 Prayer Books, especially in regard to rubrics and the employment of the 1637 epiclesis in the Prayer of Consecration. This book, though, was submitted late in the Conference, and the editor charged with making a “fair copy” removed the epiclesis and put it in an appended “Paper B” that he declared under censure along with

⁸⁶ Colin Buchanan, ed., *The Savoy Conference Revisited*, Joint Liturgical Series, vol. 54 (Cambridge: Grove Books, Ltd., for the Alcuin Club and the Group for Renewal of Worship, 2002), 3-4.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 5-7.

the unaltered 1604 edition.⁸⁸

On the other side, the Presbyterians had their leader, Richard Baxter, draft an alternative liturgy that they could present to the conference. Although the eucharistic liturgy was modeled on Genevan lines, it contained both a petition for the sanctification of the elements and even a prayer directed to the Holy Spirit for the sanctification of the people.

Almighty God . . . Sanctify these thy creatures of bread and wine, which, according to thy institution and command, we set apart to this holy use, that they may be sacramentally the body and blood of thy Son Jesus Christ. Amen. . . .

Most Holy Spirit . . . illuminate us, that by faith we may see him that is here represented to us. Soften our hearts, and humble us for our sins. Sanctify and quicken us, that we may relish the spiritual food, and feed on it to our nourishment and growth in grace. Shed abroad the love of God upon our hearts, and draw them out in love to him. Fill us with thankfulness and holy joy, and with love to one another. Comfort us by witnessing that we are the children of God. Confirm us for new obedience. Be the earnest of our inheritance, and seal us up to everlasting life. Amen.⁸⁹

One finds it quite intriguing that both the Laudian and Puritan poles in this debate wanted some sort of explicit prayer for the sanctification of the bread and wine as well as a place for the Holy Spirit. Unfortunately, neither of these suggested liturgies yielded much influence on the final (and little changed) Book of Common that was approved by Parliament in 1662.

Toward the end of the seventeenth century, the religio-political situation in England had reached another crisis point. Charles II's brother and successor, James II,

⁸⁸ Ibid., 9. See also G. J. Cuming, ed., *The Durham Book: Being the First Draft of the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer in 1661* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 166-167, 290.

⁸⁹ Jasper and Cuming, 273-275.

openly espoused his personal commitment to Roman Catholicism and also sought greater political toleration for Roman Catholics and non-Anglican Protestants. These actions, as well as others, led the Archbishop of Canterbury and six other bishops in 1688 to petition the king to reverse them. James, however, imprisoned them in the Tower of London and placed them on trial for seditious libel. The court acquitted them, much to the joy of the people and the consternation of the monarch. By the end of the year, William and Mary had arrived from the Netherlands at the invitation of Parliament, and James had fled to France.⁹⁰

Not all of the bishops and clergy could swear allegiance to the new king and queen. Even some of those who had opposed the previous monarch still felt constrained by their oaths to him. Many of these “Nonjurors” held a theology that saw the monarch as God’s anointed sovereign over the nation and the church. Because James was still alive, their oaths to him were still binding and could not be transferred to another. As a result, nine bishops, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, and about 400 other clergy were deprived of their offices.⁹¹

Some, such as George Hickes, former Dean of Worcester, took a much harsher stance. They believed that the Church of England had lost legitimacy and that only the Nonjurors could be considered the true English church. He and Thomas Wagstaffe were nominated by James II to become bishops and were then consecrated as suffragan bishops for Thetford and Ipswich, even though the Nonjuror bishops had no authority to

⁹⁰ Stephen Neill, *Anglicanism* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965), 166-168.

⁹¹ William P. Haugaard, "From the Reformation to the Eighteenth Century," in *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John Booty (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 21.

do so. This action resulted in a schism of Nonjurors from the Church of England. Even the deaths of James II in 1701 and Wagstaffe in 1712 did not end the schism. Rather, Hickes and two Scottish bishops consecrated three new bishops to act at large for the Nonjurors. This particular line of English nonjuring bishops did not fully end until 1805.⁹²

At this point, however, I wish to make a small detour from the history of the Nonjurors toward John Johnson, a major figure in the development of Anglican eucharistic theology during this time and one of great importance to the later Nonjurors. As Vicar of Cranbrook, he published a book in 1714, *The Unbloody Sacrifice*, that argued forcefully for the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist as well as for other elements that affirmed a high view of the church and the sacraments.

In contrast to Johnson's thought, the eucharistic prayer in the 1662 version of the Book of Common Prayer remained similar in many key aspects to Cranmer's more reformed one from 1552. It did not include an offering of the gifts or an invocation of the Holy Spirit. Instead, it consisted mostly of the institution narrative followed immediately by reception of communion.⁹³ This prayer eschewed any hint of sacrifice other than that of "reasonable, holy, and living" one on the part of the worshipers. In many ways, the eucharistic theology presented here could lend itself to a interpretation of consecration

⁹² Neill, 174-175.; Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924), 10-14, 290.

⁹³ *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church According to the Use of the Church of England*, (1662), 215.

that saw the presence of Christ effected through the faith of the one receiving communion, commonly known as receptionism.

Not everyone maintained this heavily Reformed view of the Eucharist but continued an approach to the sacraments more in line with that of the seventeenth century Caroline divines. Johnson, though always a member of the established Church of England, was one of these. His *Unbloody Sacrifice* sought to prove several things — the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist, its propitiatory nature, the need for it to be offered by those in the proper offices as well as on a proper altar, and the need for it to be consumed by eating and drinking.

By drawing on both biblical and patristic sources, he tried to show that it was indeed a sacrifice in which the gifts of bread and wine are offered to God for consecration as the Body and Blood of Christ, really present to the Church.

We offer the Bread and Wine, separated from all other oblations of the people; we offer them, as having been solemnly pronounced by the words of institution to be the full representatives of Christ's Body and Blood. And we make propitiation with them, after God has first, by the illapse of the Holy Spirit, perfected the consecration of them. When we say, we offer Bread and Wine, and that we offer the Body and Blood of Christ, we mean the same material things . . .⁹⁴

In addition, he goes on to elucidate his point about the role of the Holy Spirit in the consecration of the gifts and the proper structure of the consecratory prayer.

Now I have already proved that the Holy Ghost was, by the vote of antiquity, the principal immediate cause of the Bread and Wine's becoming the Body and Blood. It now remains only that I shew, that the subordinate or mediate cause of it is, 1. The reciting of the words of institution. 2. The oblation of the symbols. 3. The prayer of invocation. All these three did, in the ancient Liturgies, immediately follow each other, in the order that I have mentioned them; and each

⁹⁴ John Johnson, *The Unbloody Sacrifice*, 2 vols., *The Theological Works of of the Rev. John Johnson*, vol. 1 (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847), 304.

of them was believed to contribute towards the consecration of the elements into the Body and Blood. . . .⁹⁵

In this schema, the agent of consecration is the Holy Spirit, which acts through this threefold structure of institution narrative, oblation, and invocation (in this order).

Nevertheless, even though Johnson held certain views that contrasted sharply with the official interpretation of the liturgy — such as the permanent presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist, and the need for both a liturgical oblation and epiclesis— he remained faithful to the authorized Prayer Book. He did advise those who, like himself, found the 1662 rite wanting to supply the necessary parts through their private devotions.⁹⁶ On one hand, Johnson represented a strain in Anglican thought from before the Restoration that placed more emphasis on a more Catholic understanding of the sacramental life of the church; however, his views, especially on the permanent presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, put him in a small minority in the Church of England at the time. Anglican theology regarding the Eucharist, though, would increasingly feel the impact of his ideas, especially through their adoption by some of the Nonjurors.

At this point, I return to the Nonjurors but at a point a few decades after the initial schism. In 1710, after the death of one of the deprived bishops and the return of others to the national church, the now rapidly shrinking Nonjuror movement had reached a point where those who remained did so for more than the original reason of the oath of

⁹⁵ Ibid., 329-330.

⁹⁶ Richard F. Buxton, *Eucharist and Institution Narrative: A Study in the Roman and Anglican Traditions of the Consecration of the Eucharist from the Eighth to the Twentieth Century*, Alcuin Club Collections, vol. 58 (Great Wakering, UK: Mayhew-McCrimmon, for the Alcuin Club, 1976), 171.

allegiance.⁹⁷ Many of them maintained theological opinions that divided them from the established church.

At first most were content to continue using the liturgy from the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. Eventually, some began to feel that since they no longer were part of the official Church of England (but rather saw themselves as the rightful remnant of that body), they no longer had to be constrained by the same liturgical norms. That feeling was combined with the writings of the Caroline divines, the work of John Johnson, and increasing contact with and study of the Eastern Orthodox Churches and their liturgies. These Nonjurors became convinced that the eucharistic liturgy of the 1662 Prayer Book was so deficient in a number of areas that it needed to be changed to bring it closer to the tradition of the ancient church.

These changes would eventually lead to a division among the Nonjurors in what is known as the Usages Controversy. In 1716 a petition appeared calling for certain changes in the church, including remedy to the lack of uniformity in public worship, clearer direction regarding their attitude toward the established church, and a more thorough system of discipline and repentance, as well as the reform of four major defects in the eucharistic liturgy. These four included the lack of an oblation of the gifts, an invocation of the Holy Spirit, prayers for the dead, and the mixture of water with wine in the chalice.⁹⁸ These four items were referred to as “usages,” and those who advocated them became known as “Usagers” while those who did not were the “Non-Usagers.”

Several reasons have been given for this desire for liturgical reform. Some of the Usagers saw the eucharistic liturgy of 1549 as superior to that of 1552, which had been influenced by Continental Reformers such as Martin Bucer, thus diverting it from the

⁹⁷ Broxap, 1.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 39.

supposed ancient tradition. Meanwhile, knowledge of Eastern rites had increased by this time; so even those who preferred the 1549 Eucharist did not see it as the definitive standard but began to look at even older liturgies.⁹⁹

Under the leadership of Thomas Brett, the attention of the Usagers focused on the so-called “Clementine Liturgy” found in Book VIII of the *Apostolic Constitutions* since it was considered by him and others at the time to be the “very fair and good exemplar of the traditional form of administering the Eucharist, which the church received from the apostles; which traditional form, that is, a form agreeing in sense, though not in words, was used by the whole church before the council of Nice [i.e. Nicaea] . . .”¹⁰⁰

For Brett the 1549 prayer, though containing an oblation and invocation, remained too close to the medieval Roman Canon for his liking. Although Cranmer’s first eucharistic prayer rendered the *Quam oblationem* into English with a direct petition for the Holy Spirit (and Word) to “bless and sanctify” the elements, this section continued in its position preceding the Words of Christ, which would have been seen as the consecratory element. The liturgy in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, on the other hand, ordered its structure with the institution narrative, oblation, and epiclesis, with the apparent consecratory emphasis on the invocation of the Holy Spirit. One can see that Johnson would have approved.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ Ibid., 41.

¹⁰⁰ Thomas Brett, *Collection of the Principal Liturgies Used in the Christian Church in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist ... with a Dissertation Upon Them* (London: Rivington and Co., 1838), 151. For details on the *Apostolic Constitutions*, see above in chapter 1.

¹⁰¹ Of course, one can debate just what kind of connection existed between Johnson and Brett. Did one influence the other, and/or did they derive similar conclusions from the use of common sources?

In 1716 the Nonjuror bishops met to elect a Primus and to discuss matters pertaining to their church. According to notes supposedly taken by the Scottish bishop Archibald Campbell, the synod affirmed several of the usages, including the oblation and the invocation, but did not order them implemented until they were approved and received by the people. Eventually, the notes, which did not appear publicly until about eighteen months later, proved a point of contention during the controversy.

Another meeting took place shortly after the first, and in this one the petition for the adoption of the usages was presented to contentious debate. One presbyter, Thomas Bell, questioned the meaning of “primitive” that the petitioners had in mind and wondered how far they would go.¹⁰² Bishop Collier, who had been elected as Primus, proposed that the 1549 liturgy be restored or, if not that, at least the authorization be given for the four usages. When a vote came, only three, including Collier and Brett, voted for the changes. This would be the last time the English Nonjuror bishops would meet as one body.¹⁰³

At this point, given the often confusing nature of the situation, I wish to provide an extended quote from Henry Broxap that summarizes the issues involved.

The Usages were four in number. (1) A definitely expressed Oblation of the Elements in the Eucharist to God the Father. (2) A direct Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the Elements that they might be made the Body and Blood of Christ. (3) Such alterations in title and expression in the prayer for the Church or the great Intercession as would include the departed as well as the living. (4) The use of the mixed chalice. It has been stated that the difference between the two sides was not so much as to the truth expressed by these Usages, but as to the expediency of introducing them at this particular time, but it cannot be denied that

¹⁰² He even asked if they would go so far as to authorize infant communion, of all things.

¹⁰³ Broxap, 45-47.

there was a party among the Non-Jurors who were definitely opposed to the Usages in themselves . . .¹⁰⁴

Of those four usages, only the prayers for the dead and the mixed chalice faced significant opposition.¹⁰⁵ For the purposes of this study, though, attention will continue to focus more on the invocation.

The people involved in the controversy maintained a wide spectrum of opinions regarding the usages. Some, such as Thomas Deacon, held an unwavering support for all four usages and backed them up with logical arguments and heated rhetoric. Others, such as Thomas Bell, believed that the 1662 English liturgy was perfect as it was. Most fell somewhere in the middle. Collier held fast to the four usages but would go no further than those four. Campbell, himself a Usager, advocated a more tolerant attitude.¹⁰⁶ He even described Deacon, a fellow Usager, as one of the “fiery zealots.” Brett, on the other hand, possessed a more scholarly mind that was ill-suited to heated controversy, and he ended up being misunderstood and mistrusted by people on both sides. Committed to avoiding schism, he only fully joined the Usager side after he had been excommunicated by the other.¹⁰⁷

Thus out of the schismatic group, yet another schism arose. While some, such as Collier and Brett tried to seek reconciliation; others, especially on the Usager side, even

¹⁰⁴Ibid., 47-48.

¹⁰⁵ Ironically, although these points proved the most contentious, even Brett himself admitted that they were not as essential as the other two.

¹⁰⁶ At least he might have been a more effective voice of moderation if he had not been so clearly prejudiced against because he was a Scot.

¹⁰⁷ Broxap, 49.

denied the validity of the sacraments of the other side. The schism became complete at the end of 1717 when Collier and Brett, acting in their roles as bishops, signed a declaration requiring the priests under them to employ the usages in the eucharistic liturgy.¹⁰⁸

Given the new separation within the church and the enforcement of the usages, Brett, Deacon, and others set out in 1718 to prepare a new Communion Office although Brett played a lesser role in the actual drafting of it. The liturgy was compiled in a relatively short time but nevertheless showed signs of good scholarship in that major parts of it were based on the liturgies of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Basil, James, and the 1549 Prayer Book. In the structure of the anaphora, the *sursum corda* is followed by the Sanctus (and Benedictus) with the Post-Sanctus concluded by the institution narrative. Then proceed the oblation and invocation from the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the prayer for the Church from the first Prayer Book. Overall, this new office was modeled specifically on the ancient liturgies rather than on the 1549 rite.¹⁰⁹

Whatever Brett's role in the drafting of the communion office, he nevertheless played a key role in the defense of it. In 1720, he published a collection of translated ancient liturgies along with a dissertation on them. These included the "Clementine" Liturgy; the Anaphoras of St. Mark, St. Basil (Byzantine and Egyptian), and St. John Chrysostom, along with others; the Roman Canon; Cranmer's 1549 eucharistic prayer; and the testimonies of Justin Martyr's *Apology* and Cyril of Jerusalem's Fifth Mystagogical Catechesis. By showing all of these texts, Brett argued that all four of the

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 61-62.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 66-70. For the entire text of the Nonjuror Liturgy of 1718, see W. Jardine Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London: S.P.C.K., 1958), 273-296.

usages employed in the 1718 office had a basis in ancient practice that had been abandoned by the church.

In his opinion, this liturgy remained faithful to Scripture, ancient tradition, and even the dictates of the Church of England. “[She] has given us direction . . . to adhere to the practice of the Primitive Church in the celebration of the eucharist: saying, Before all other things, this we must be sure of especially, *that this supper be in such wise done and ministered, as our Lord and Saviour did, and commanded to be done; as his holy Apostles used it, and the good fathers in the primitive church frequented it.*”¹¹⁰ By following such a rule, with its wording of “before all other things,” the Nonjurors could not in his opinion be deviating from the Church of England by going against the seemingly contrary directive of the 1662 liturgy. Certainly, he held that they had the superior position, given the antiquity of their usages. “If we are in the right . . . it is plain that the eucharist is not rightly administered by the present form of the Church of England . . .”¹¹¹

Several years later, in 1732, an accord was reached between Non-Usagers and Usagers, with Thomas Brett as one of the signatories (along with the other Bishop Thomas Brett). Although it acknowledged the need for the four usages for a proper Eucharist, it only explicitly allowed the private mixture of a little water with the wine. The other three usages were held to be implicit in the authorized liturgy, which was to be the only one allowed.¹¹² In many ways, one can see this accord as a retraction (perhaps for the sake of unity) by Brett of the opinions he had earlier put forth.

¹¹⁰ Brett, 463. (Capitals and italics are the author’s.)

¹¹¹ Ibid., 434-435.

¹¹² Broxap, 149.

Such a compromise led to even further schism, this time with three factions. The middle (and smallest) one adhered to the supposed unity. On one side of them were the convinced Non-Usagers under the leadership of Bishop John Blackburne. On the other side were the hardened Usagers led by Bishop Archibald Campbell, who opposed Brett's "double-think."¹¹³ Campbell even went on to consecrate by himself two new Usager bishops, Roger Laurence and Thomas Deacon.

The latter, after succeeding Campbell, required the use of a liturgy that he had written and published in 1734. Although that liturgy's direct influence was much less than the 1718 communion office, I do have a few words to say about it. This particular eucharistic service was based on the much-esteemed liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* and followed it almost exactly but in the style of eighteenth-century English. In other writings, Deacon explicitly referred to the Eucharist as a sacrifice and to the real presence of Christ in the consecrated elements by means of the Holy Spirit.¹¹⁴ Later in his life, he would even cease to consider himself an Anglican, seeing the Church of England as being both too Roman and too Calvinist. Instead, he and his dwindling "Orthodox British Church" looked to the Eastern Churches as the more perfect examples of true Christianity. Nevertheless, his eucharistic theology proved very influential to the later Scottish Episcopal liturgy.¹¹⁵

Having now discussed the English Nonjurors, I turn north to Scotland. There the episcopate had been re-established by Charles II, but those bishops also maintained their oaths to James and were thus separated from the established church. Therefore, the state church in Scotland was to maintain a presbyterian polity while a smaller non-established

¹¹³ Grisbrooke, 115.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 124, 127.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 134-135.

church retained the episcopacy. These Scottish Nonjurors forged close ties with their English counterparts and over time developed their own distinctive form of Anglicanism and even their own liturgy.

One cannot discuss the Scottish liturgy without mentioning the failed 1637 Prayer Book imposed by King Charles I and Archbishop William Laud. Largely due to the strife it caused, this Prayer Book did not see use in Scotland for quite some time, even after the episcopacy had been restored in 1661. In fact Scottish Episcopal liturgy differed little from presbyterian worship.¹¹⁶

Only around 1707 or 1708 did the 1662 English Prayer Book begin to be adopted for public use. Queen Anne personally supplied a large number of them to the Scottish Episcopalians. This small and at times heavily persecuted church could not afford to reprint the 1637 liturgy in sufficient quantities. They simply used the English Prayer Book and pasted over the names of Anne and her Hanoverian successors. Then in 1712 the Scottish Prayer Book began to be privately reprinted though it did not find wide acceptance at first. Later, beginning in 1724, several editions of “wee-bookies” were published by Bishop James Gadderar that provided the eucharistic liturgy of 1637 for wider use. The eucharistic theology presented in it over time found greater assent among the Scottish bishops and their church members, mainly due to influence from the English Nonjurors.¹¹⁷

At first, many of those who agreed with the Usager party simply used the English eucharistic liturgy and inserted the lacking material, but after the publication of the 1718

¹¹⁶ John Dowden, *The Annotated Scottish Communion Office: An Historical Account of the Scottish Communion Office and of the Communion Office of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America with Liturgical Notes* (Edinburgh: R. Grant and Son, 1884), 48.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 51, 56-57.

office, both parties of the English Nonjurors solicited the support of the Scottish Episcopalians. Eventually, in 1731 the two sides reached an agreement that only the English and Scottish rites would be allowed. Although the signers agreed not to introduce the ancient usages, the formal recognition of the 1637 liturgy did indirectly allow the use of the oblation of the gifts and the invocation upon them. Interestingly, though, changes to the order of the liturgies were not seen as a violation of the accord.¹¹⁸ Therefore, one could legitimately place the 1637 invocation after the institution narrative instead of before it, or one could transpose the first post-communion prayer from the English liturgy to a place following the Prayer of Consecration (i.e. the narrative of institution).

Another key moment in the development of the Scottish liturgy occurred in 1744 with the posthumous publication of Bishop Thomas Rattray's translation of the Liturgy of St. James, which he saw as the use of the ancient church in Jerusalem. Rattray, bishop of Dunkeld and later elected Primus, had studied the liturgies of the Eastern churches and had even been involved in discussions regarding possible reunion with the Orthodox. Out of this work, he saw that the 1718 Nonjuror liturgy had the elements and order to make it consistent with the practice of the early church. By using the "Clementine" Liturgy as a standard and with the help of other liturgical texts, he took the Liturgy of St. James and attempted to sort through the later interpolations to find the actual ancient liturgy. In addition to this recension, he included a version meant for actual use. Although it was not adopted by the Scottish church, it did provide a major influence on the revision that would occur twenty years later.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 78-79.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 88-92.

In the early 1760's, William Falconar, Bishop of Edinburgh and Primus, proposed that his fellow bishops set about to change the communion office of their church. In 1764 he and Bishop Robert Forbes published such a liturgy that reflected many of the elements found in the 1637 Prayer Book, the 1718 Usager liturgy, and the work of Bishop Rattray.¹²⁰ After the *sursum corda* came a proper preface and the Sanctus. The Post-Sanctus consisted of a thanksgiving for redemption and then the institution narrative using very similar language to that of the 1637 prayer, followed by an offering of the gifts and the invocation of God's word and Holy Spirit to "bless and sanctify" the bread and wine, which had been mixed with water. After the *Amen*, the priest led the prayer for the whole state of Christ's church.¹²¹ All four of the usages were employed in this liturgy. Whereas the English Usager Nonjurors eventually died out as a party, the Scottish Usagers had become the dominant core of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

The main contribution of the Usages Controversy to Anglican practice has been in the area of eucharistic liturgy. It was the 1764 communion office that was taken by Samuel Seabury and later adopted (with slight changes) as the official eucharistic liturgy of the American Episcopal Church. This prayer remained so for the Episcopal Church in both Scotland and the United States until the liturgical revisions of the late twentieth century. Even then, they still maintained the importance of both the offering of the gifts of bread and wine to be consecrated and the invocation of the Holy Spirit that they might be the Body and Blood of Christ for the Church.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 97-99.

¹²¹ Ibid., 9-17.

Chapter 3: A Theological Look at the Present Epicleses in the 1979 Book of Common Prayer for the Episcopal Church of the United States of America

At the present moment in this study, we have looked at the development of the eucharistic epiclesis first in the traditions up to the Protestant Reformation and then in the Anglican tradition up to the 1789 American Book of Common Prayer. One of the major liturgical developments of the first few centuries of church history was the evolution of the epiclesis from a petition for Christ's return to invocations of the Logos or the Spirit upon the gifts for the sanctification of the people. In a number of places, we begin to see a growing focus on the request for the Spirit (alone) to consecrate the bread and wine so they would become the body and blood of Christ.

Even though the Roman Canon does not have a direct invocation of the Spirit but focuses primarily on the institution narrative, there is still a prayer for the consecration of the offering, but it was the Christocentric emphasis on the words of Christ that the Protestant Reformers maintained in the liturgy. Nevertheless, in the 1549 English revision of the Canon, Thomas Cranmer did include an invocation of the Holy Spirit and word (in this case, probably, the words of institution), an invocation that would resurface intermittently among Anglican thinkers until its full embrace by certain English and Scottish Nonjurors.

As indicated above, the Scottish form of it made its way to the American Episcopal Church and continues to this day in Rite One (Eucharistic Prayers I and II) of the 1979 Book of Common Prayer. Rite Two, on the other hand, with its more contemporary language, arrives by way of a different route. These four eucharistic prayers (A, B, C, and D) include invocations only of the Spirit, but they draw on much older sources for their inspiration. This latest revision of the American Prayer Book is

the result of almost a century's work in studying the ancient liturgical sources and bringing them into the context of modern-day liturgy through education and eventually liturgical revision.¹²²

In light of this evolution, I now wish to present the epiclesis as it occurs in each of the six eucharistic prayers (I and II in Rite One, A-D in Rite Two) in the 1979 Book of Common Prayer.¹²³ The first of these is Eucharistic Prayer I, which is the same prayer used in the 1928 Prayer Book. For more details on the development of it, I refer the reader to the previous chapter. Following the anamnesis of Christ's passion, death, resurrection, and ascension, the celebrant (to use the wording of the text itself) continues with the following:

And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Savior Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.¹²⁴

¹²² Unfortunately, a more detailed look at the Liturgical Movement lies beyond the purview of this study. For further information, see John R. K. Fenwick and Bryan D. Spinks, *Worship in Transition : The Liturgical Movement in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Continuum, 1995). In addition, for a focus on North American developments see also James F. White, *Roman Catholic Worship : Trent to Today* (New York: Paulist Press, 1995), 76-140; James F. White, "Protestant Public Worship in North America: 1935-1995," in *Christian Worship in North America : A Retrospective, 1955-1995* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1997), 115-133.

¹²³ Each epiclesis will also appear at the end of this chapter in a table placing them side-by-side along with their place in the structure of their respective eucharistic prayers.

¹²⁴ *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church Together with the Psalter or Psalms of David*, (1979), 335.

As one notices, this epiclesis does call for the sanctification of the bread and wine by the Word and Holy Spirit as with the 1549 rite as well as the Scottish liturgies;¹²⁵ however, it maintains the (arguably) receptionist reading in the result clause carried over from the 1662 rite. The following petitions then ask for the Father's acceptance of the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" and that those who partake may receive "remission of sins, and all other benefits of his passion" and may be made one body with Christ.¹²⁶

Eucharistic Prayer II, on the other hand, is an updated and shortened version of the first prayer. This particular one, though shorter, presents a theologically fuller view of salvation history with new references to God's work in creation and the incarnation. In addition, the anamnesis concludes with a look ahead to Christ's second coming. The epiclesis, though similar in wording to the previous one, actually returns to the older Scottish form by asking God, by the Word and Holy Spirit, to bless and sanctify the gifts "that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy dearly-beloved Son Jesus Christ."¹²⁷ The petitions that follow, slightly abbreviated, now also ask that the whole church, not just the partakers of communion, may be joined together as Christ's body.

These two eucharistic prayers are both found in Rite One, which maintains the type of language used in previous Prayer Books. Rite Two, on the other hand, updates the language to bring it closer to contemporary usage, but it also goes forward in a new

¹²⁵ "Word" here was first capitalized in the Standard Book (1793) of the American Prayer Book. Although one might want to draw a comparison with the Logos epiclesis of Sarapion, it should be remembered that Sarapion's eucharistic prayer had not yet been discovered. Marion J. Hatchett, *Commentary on the American Prayer Book* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1995), 370-371.

¹²⁶ *Prayer Book (1979)*, 335-336.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 342.

direction with four prayers relying on research done over the course of the Liturgical Movement. Of these, Eucharistic Prayers A and B have variable prefaces, in keeping with Anglican (and Roman) tradition while those of C and D are fixed. All of them except for C have the same basic structure, but I will go into greater detail about each one below.

Eucharistic Prayer A, drafted by the Rev. Dr. H. Boone Porter, is based on a modern adaptation of Prayer I. Opening with the customary *Sursum corda*, it proceeds with a common preface followed by a variable proper preface for Sundays and other special days of the church year. The preface then leads into the *Sanctus*, followed by thanksgiving for the creation and the incarnation and by acknowledgement of humanity's sinful condition. The prayer then continues with the institution narrative and a memorial acclamation said by the people, "Christ has died. Christ is risen. Christ will come again."¹²⁸

The epiclesis then follows the anamnesis and oblation, but now, though based on the 1549 and 1637 liturgies, it contains an invocation of the Holy Spirit (and not the Word) for the sanctification of both the gifts and the people.

Sanctify them [i.e. the gifts] by your Holy Spirit to be for your people the Body and Blood of your Son, the holy food and drink of new and unending life in him. Sanctify us also that we may faithfully receive this holy Sacrament, and serve you in unity, constancy, and peace; and at the last day bring us with all your saints into the joy of your eternal kingdom.¹²⁹

One notes the parallel structure that petitions for the sanctification of the gifts and then for the sanctification of the people in order to "faithfully receive" the sacrament and thus

¹²⁸ Ibid., 363.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

receive its benefits. In addition, by the inclusion of such phrases as “holy food and drink of new and unending life in him” and “at the last day bring us with all your saints into the joy of your eternal kingdom” along with the memorial acclamation’s “Christ will come again,” one notices an eschatological aspect largely absent from earlier Anglican liturgies.¹³⁰

The epiclesis of the next prayer (B) states the following:

We pray you, gracious God, to send your Holy Spirit upon these gifts that they may be the Sacrament of the Body of Christ and his Blood of the new Covenant. Unite us to your Son in his sacrifice, that we may be acceptable through him, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit. In the fullness of time, put all things in subjection under your Christ, and bring us to that heavenly country where, with [_____ and] all your saints, we may enter the everlasting heritage of your sons and daughters; through Jesus Christ our Lord, the firstborn of all creation, the head of the Church, and the author of our salvation.¹³¹

Again, Eucharistic Prayer B starts like A with the *Sursum corda* and variable preface leading into the *Sanctus*. What comes next is a thanksgiving that includes the calling of Israel and the speaking of the Word through the prophets in addition to the creation and the incarnation. This section is composed of a blending of two prayers, one based on the *Apostolic Tradition* and the other one drafted by the (then) Rev. Frank T. Griswold, III (now Presiding Bishop as of the writing of this thesis). The institution narrative is the same as the one in A and D, but the memorial acclamation (and proclamation of faith), “We remember his death. We proclaim his resurrection. We await his coming in glory,” is a literal translation of the Byzantine version but also serves

¹³⁰ Hatchett, 374-375.

¹³¹ *Prayer Book (1979)*. For more information on Prayer B, see Hatchett, 375.

as an anamnesis, such as in certain Ethiopic anaphoras. Then by presenting to God the bread and wine, “we offer our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.”¹³²

The epiclesis explicitly asks for God to send the Holy Spirit on the gifts so that “they may be the Sacrament of the Body of Christ and his Blood of the new Covenant.” This epiclesis on the people, though, is more subtle, following the request for the people to be united with Christ in his sacrifice in order to be made acceptable through him, “having been sanctified by the Holy Spirit.” The subsequent petitions, though, take on a greater eschatological dimension than in Eucharistic Prayer A and even include a lengthier reference to the communion of saints, along with provision for the insertion of the names of individual saints.

Before moving to Eucharistic Prayer C, I wish to continue next with Prayer D instead, given its structural similarities to the others. Based on the Egyptian form of the anaphora of St. Basil, this prayer represents the work of a group of American Catholic, Anglican, and Protestant scholars who sought to draft a eucharistic prayer that could be approved by the major American denominations. They relied on both the early versions of Basil as well as the more recent adaptation found in the fourth eucharistic prayer of the revised Roman sacramentary. Therefore, the major substance of this eucharistic prayer is sanctioned for use in more Christian traditions than any other.¹³³

Like the customary Eastern anaphoras, this one is a fixed prayer with no provision for a variable preface. Though considerably shorter and less florid than the original, it is still longer than any of the other American eucharistic prayers. Here we have the basic

¹³² *Prayer Book (1979)*, 369.

¹³³ Hatchett, 377.

West Syrian anaphoral structure with introductory dialogue followed by praise and thanksgiving to God the Father for his glory and for his power in creating all things. The people then join with the heavenly chorus in the Sanctus. The prayer then continues with thanksgiving to the Father for creation and for covenant with us despite our disobedience. Next comes thanks for the sending of Jesus Christ, incarnate from the Virgin Mary, to proclaim “the good news of salvation” and then to fulfill the divine purpose by surrendering to death in order to rise again, destroying death and renewing the whole creation. Concluding this Trinitarian formula, the prayer praises Christ’s sending of the Holy Spirit “to complete his work in the world, and to bring to fulfillment the sanctification of all.”¹³⁴

Then follows the institution narrative with wording similar to that in Eucharistic Prayers A and B. The anamnesis and oblation are taken essentially from the earliest manuscript of Basil along with the people’s acclamation, and the epiclesis appears largely as it does in the Eastern prayer with a request for the Father to send the Holy Spirit upon first the people and then the gifts, followed by a request for the unity of the communicants with Christ’s body and the communion of saints, along with the optional provision for intercessions.

Lord, we pray that in your goodness and mercy your Holy Spirit may descend upon us, and upon these gifts, sanctifying them and showing them to be holy gifts for your holy people, the bread of life and the cup of salvation, the Body and Blood of your Son Jesus Christ.

Grant that all who share this bread and cup may become one body and one spirit, a living sacrifice in Christ, to the praise of your Name. . . .

¹³⁴ *Prayer Book (1979)*, 373-374.

And grant that we may find our inheritance with [the Blessed Virgin Mary, with patriarchs, apostles, and martyrs, (with _____) and] all the saints who have found favor with you in ages past. . . .¹³⁵

Unlike in the other epicleses, we have here a clear petition for the descent of the Spirit onto the people, but the primary focus is on the Spirit's action in sanctifying the bread and wine and "showing"¹³⁶ them to be the body and blood of Christ. There is only an implicit connection between the descent of the Holy Spirit on the people and the forming of their unity. In addition, besides the request for union with all the saints, one does not find as explicitly eschatological a dimension as in Prayer B or even A.

The three Rite Two eucharistic prayers I have covered so far share the same basic structure that places the epiclesis after the words of institution and the anamnesis and oblation. Eucharistic Prayer C, however, uses a different structure. This one, more similar to the Alexandrian tradition (and contemporary Roman), precedes the institution narrative with an invocation of the Spirit on the bread and wine, a so-called "consecratory epiclesis."¹³⁷ Later comes a quasi-epiclesis for the sanctification of the people, a "communion epiclesis;" however, the one in Prayer C is more implicit regarding the petition for the Holy Spirit than the Alexandrian anaphoras or the revised Roman prayers. This "split epiclesis," as it is commonly called, sets Prayer C apart from the other eucharistic prayers of the 1979 Prayer Book.¹³⁸

¹³⁵ Ibid., 375.

¹³⁶ This particular wording has been rendered differently in various versions of this ecumenical prayer and would make an intriguing theological investigation, but that must remain for a future project.

¹³⁷ Interestingly, this first epiclesis follows a preliminary oblation of the gifts.

Nevertheless, for the sake of a full study of Rite Two, I include a brief look at the epiclesis for Eucharistic Prayer C:

And so, Father, we who have been redeemed by him and made a new people by water and the Spirit, now bring before you these gifts. Sanctify them by your Holy Spirit to be the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord. . . .

Lord God of our Fathers; God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: Open our eyes to see your hand at work in the world about us. Deliver us from the presumption of coming to this Table for solace only, and not for strength; for pardon only, and not for renewal. Let the grace of this Holy Communion make us one body, one spirit in Christ, that we may worthily serve the world in his name.¹³⁹

Although this epiclesis does provide a rare, though welcome, verbal link to the sacrament of baptism and later a supplication for worthy reception and continuance of service, the overall theology presented here does not seem to be as full as it could be in comparison to the other epicleses.

In contrast, the Canadian eucharistic prayer modeled on Prayer C does provide that added theological depth. Here is the text of that invocation:

We who have been redeemed by him, and made a new people by water and the Spirit, now bring you these gifts. Send your Holy Spirit upon us and upon this offering of your Church, that we who eat and drink at this holy table may share the divine life of Christ our Lord. . . .

Pour out your Spirit upon the whole earth and make it your new creation. Gather your Church together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom, where peace and justice are revealed, that we, with all your people, of every language, race, and nation, may share the banquet you have promised.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁸ It should also be noted that the prayer based on C in the 1985 Canadian *Book of Alternative Services* (Eucharistic Prayer 4) reunites the epiclesis in the customary position after the institution narrative, though with an adapted wording more akin to the Byzantine epiclesis. For a comparison between these two eucharistic prayers, see the table at the end of this chapter.

¹³⁹ *Prayer Book (1979)*, 371-372.

Not only does it maintain the reference to baptism, it also links together the sending of the Spirit on the people and the gifts in such a way that emphasizes the intentionality towards the participation in the divine life rather than focusing solely on the conversionary consecration of the elements. In addition, after the people's response, the epiclesis continues by asking for the Holy Spirit to be poured out on the entire earth for the renewal of all creation and then links that with a gathering supplication rich in eschatological imagery.

So far in this chapter, I have examined the text of the epiclesis found in each of the eucharistic prayers in the 1979 Book of Common Prayer along with the one from the Canadian *Book of Alternative Services* that was based on the American Eucharistic Prayer C. The two prayers in Rite One maintain the traditional language and the invocation of both Word and Holy Spirit. The four prayers in Rite Two, on the other hand, only invoke the Holy Spirit but on both the gifts and the people (though only implicitly in Prayer C).

This main difference between the epicleses Rites One and Two brings us back now to the question that started this investigation: What difference exists between an invocation of the Word and Holy Spirit and an invocation of just the Holy Spirit? Perhaps more specifically, what theological difference exists between the type of epiclesis found in Rite One (and previous Anglican liturgies) and the modern type found in Rite Two but based on older forms?

In the invocations of Word and Holy Spirit, one finds the request focusing primarily on the elements of bread and wine. In Prayer I, we have a prayer for God to

¹⁴⁰ *The Book of Alternative Services for the Anglican Church of Canada*, (Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1985), 203.

“bless and sanctify” the gifts by the Word and Spirit so that by receiving them we may partake of Christ’s Body and Blood. In Prayer II, again God is asked to “bless and sanctify” the gifts with the Word and Spirit but with the original wording “that they may be unto us the Body and Blood” of Christ. Although later in each there is a petition for God’s grace for those who partake in communion and for union with Christ, one cannot make the case that there is an explicit epiclesis upon the people.

In addition, despite the similar wording, these two prayers present slightly different theological approaches to the invocation and its relation to the consecration of the bread and wine. One can argue that Prayer II maintains a more objective stance towards the presence of Christ in the elements (“that they may be unto us the Body and Blood . . .”) as opposed to a slightly more receptionist take in Prayer I (“that we, *receiving* them . . . may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.” [italics are my own]) On the other hand, one can also say that Prayer I simply emphasizes our reception of Christ’s Body and Blood really present in the bread and wine while Prayer II emphasizes the real presence of Christ in the bread and wine that we receive in communion.

Both of them, however, do focus primarily on the sanctification of the gifts whereas the Rite Two epicleses involve both the gifts and the people. The invocation in Prayer A petitions first for the sanctification of the gifts “to be for your people the Body and Blood of your Son, the holy food and drink of new and unending life in him” and then in a parallel structure for the sanctification of people to “faithfully receive this holy Sacrament, and serve [God] in unity, constancy, and peace” and to be brought at the last day into the eternal kingdom. In Prayer B the epiclesis asks God to send the Holy Spirit

upon the bread and wine so that they may be the Body and Blood of Christ and also through the sanctification of the Spirit to unite us with Christ's sacrifice. It then continues with a longer petition for the coming of God's kingdom and our unity with the entire communion of saints through Christ our Lord.

As stated earlier, the epiclesis in Prayer C, based on the Alexandrian and revised Roman models, departs from the standard structure of the other prayers and precedes the institution narrative. Here we find an explicit request for God to sanctify the bread and wine by the Holy Spirit to be Christ's Body and Blood. There is, however, no similar invocation of the Spirit on the people but only a request for the grace of the Holy Communion to unite us to Christ for service in the world.

Prayer D, on the other hand, prays explicitly for the descent of the Spirit upon those gathered together and upon the gifts of bread and wine that they may be revealed/shown as Christ's Body and Blood. Then as part of a lengthy series of petitions and intercessions, God is asked that those who share the bread and the cup be brought into unity with Christ and the saints.

Like the epicleses in Prayers A and B, the one in Prayer D does include at least some eschatological reference in connection with the invocation of the Holy Spirit. Prayer C does not, or at least contains only an implicit one. The Canadian eucharistic prayer based on it, though, provides a more extensive and evocative petition for the coming of the kingdom and our life in it in union with Christ. With the exception of Prayer C, all of these modern prayers given here place greater stress on this eschatological dimension of the Eucharist, especially regarding the work of the Holy Spirit as emphasized in the epiclesis.

It is this eschatological aspect that leads me to the conclusion that the invocation of Word and Spirit, as received in the Anglican Prayer Books up through Rite One of the 1979 book, does not provide as full a theology of the Eucharist as the newer prayers do. First of all, the capitalization of “Word” presents an unnecessary ambiguity as to whether it refers to the Logos or to the Words of Christ in the institution narrative. If the former, then it raises questions regarding the mission of the Spirit in regard to the eucharistic action, such as whether or not the Spirit acts only through Christ or with a fully personal but complementary mission from the Father.¹⁴¹ If the latter, then it would provide a more accurate description of the consecration of the elements in line with the importance Western Christianity has placed on the Words of Institution and would also be in accord with the form given for supplemental consecration.¹⁴² Even this interpretation, though, seems to raise the question of undue emphasis on a “moment of consecration.”¹⁴³

¹⁴¹ By a “personal” mission of the Spirit, I mean that the Spirit is seen as being sent by the Father as part of the economy of salvation with a mission distinctive from the Son’s. Such a mission, though, fully complements the incarnate mission of the Son.

¹⁴² “Hear us, O heavenly Father, and with thy (your) Word and Holy Spirit bless and sanctify this bread (wine) that it, also, may be the Sacrament of the precious Body (Blood) of thy (your) Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who took bread (the cup) and said, “This is my Body (Blood).” *Amen. Prayer Book (1979)*, 408.

¹⁴³ On the other hand, one could expand the interpretation of “Word” beyond just the Words of Institution to encompass also the entire first part of the liturgy in which God’s Word in Scripture is proclaimed. Cf. “[The] *letter-as-sacrament precipitates itself into the body-as-sacrament . . . From the table of the Scriptures to the table of the sacrament . . .* That the sacraments are always in a sense sacraments of the Word in the Spirit reminds us that their effects are no more automatic or ‘magical’ than Scripture’s. . . . As is clearly shown in the baptismal formula, the sacrament is the *precipitate of the Christian Scriptures.*” Louis Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993), 220-221. However, this is a discussion that deserves its own treatment in a separate work.

Therefore, I believe that the more classic (unified, post-anamnesis) epiclesis of the Holy Spirit found in the newer prayers provides a better theological grounding. For one thing, it allows for a more solid Trinitarian structure to the eucharist prayer, such as outlined by Thomas Talley.¹⁴⁴ Secondly, it gives greater emphasis to the Spirit's personal mission within the economy of salvation as evidenced in the more explicit role ascribed to the Spirit in the eucharistic action. Finally, the more recent epicleses, reflecting ancient usage, present an eschatological dimension that has been largely absent, along with the pneumatological aspect, from Western liturgical and theological life. The eucharistic intersection of these two dimensions of pneumatology and eschatology is the theological point I wish to develop further in the following chapter.

¹⁴⁴ "In this Antiochene structure, then, a theological praise of the Creator ending in sanctus leads to a Christological thanksgiving that comes to its climax in the institution narrative and anamnesis and then turns to a supplication with pneumatological reference. In such a structure, the eucharistic prayer manifests the same trinitarian pattern as is evident in baptismal creeds, and their more developed conciliar progeny." Thomas J. Talley, "Eucharistic Prayers, Past, Present and Future," in *Revising the Eucharist: Groundwork for the Anglican Communion: Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation*, ed. David Holeton (Bramcote, UK: Grove Books, Ltd., for the Alcuin Club and the Group for Renewal of Worship, 1994), 9.

Epiclesis in Rite One

<u>Eucharistic Prayer I</u>	<u>Eucharistic Prayer II</u>
<p><i>Sursum corda</i> <i>Common preface</i> <i>Variable proper preface</i> <i>Sanctus</i> <i>Praise to God for redemption (and theological explanation of rite)</i> <i>Institution narrative</i> <i>Oblation and anamnesis</i></p> <p>And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Savior Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood. . . .</p> <p><i>Prayer for acceptance and for the benefits of Christ's passion</i> <i>Offering of "our selves, our souls and bodies"</i></p> <p>humbly beseeching thee that we, and all other who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with him . . .</p> <p><i>Prayer for acceptance</i> <i>Doxology</i> <i>Amen</i></p>	<p><i>Sursum corda</i> <i>Common preface</i> <i>Variable proper preface</i> <i>Sanctus</i> <i>Praise to God for creation and redemption</i></p> <p><i>Institution narrative</i> <i>Oblation and anamnesis</i></p> <p>And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, to bless and sanctify these gifts of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy dearly-beloved Son Jesus Christ. . . .</p> <p><i>Prayer for acceptance of our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, "whereby" we offer "our selves, our souls and bodies."</i></p> <p>Grant, we beseech thee, that all who partake of this Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, and be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction; and also that we and all thy whole Church may be made one body with him . . .</p> <p><i>Doxology</i> <i>Amen</i></p>

Epiclesis in Rite Two

<u>Eucharistic Prayer A</u>	<u>Eucharistic Prayer B</u>	<u>Eucharistic Prayer D</u>
<p><i>Sursum corda</i> <i>Common preface</i> <i>Variable proper preface</i> <i>Sanctus</i> <i>Thanksgiving for redemption</i></p> <p><i>Institution narrative</i> <i>Memorial acclamation</i> <i>Anamnesis and oblation</i></p> <p>Sanctify them [i.e. the gifts] by your Holy Spirit to be for your people the Body and Blood of your Son, the holy food and drink of new and unending life in him.</p> <p>Sanctify us also that we may faithfully receive this holy Sacrament, and serve you in unity, constancy, and peace; and at the last day bring us with all your saints into the joy of your eternal kingdom.</p> <p><i>Doxology</i> <i>Amen</i></p>	<p><i>Sursum corda</i> <i>Common preface</i> <i>Variable proper preface</i> <i>Sanctus</i> <i>Thanksgiving for creation and redemption</i> <i>Institution narrative</i> <i>Memorial acclamation / (anamnesis)</i> <i>Oblation</i></p> <p>We pray you, gracious God, to send your Holy Spirit upon these gifts that they may be the Sacrament of the Body of Christ and his Blood of the new Covenant.</p> <p>Unite us to your Son in his sacrifice, that we may be acceptable through him, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit. In the fullness of time, put all things in subjection under your Christ, and bring to that heavenly country where, with [_____ and] all your saints, we may enter the everlasting heritage of your sons and daughters; through Jesus Christ our Lord, the firstborn of all creation, the head of the Church, and the author of our salvation.</p> <p><i>Doxology</i> <i>Amen</i></p>	<p><i>Sursum corda</i> <i>Fixed preface of praise and thanksgiving</i> <i>Sanctus</i> <i>Thanksgiving for creation, redemption, gift of the Spirit</i> <i>Institution narrative</i> <i>Anamnesis and oblation</i> <i>Acclamation</i></p> <p>Lord, we pray that in your goodness and mercy your Holy Spirit may descend upon us, and upon these gifts, sanctifying them and showing them to be holy gifts for your holy people, the bread of life and the cup of salvation, the Body and Blood of your Son Jesus Christ.</p> <p>Grant that all who share this bread and cup may become one body and one spirit, a living sacrifice in Christ, to the praise of your Name. . . . <i>[Intercessions]</i> And grant that we may find our inheritance with [the Blessed Virgin Mary, with patriarchs, apostles, and martyrs, (with _____) and] all the saints who have found favor with you in ages past. . .</p> <p><i>Doxology</i> <i>Amen</i></p>

<u>Eucharistic Prayer C</u>	<u>Canadian Eucharistic Prayer 4¹⁴⁵</u>
<p><i>Sursum corda</i> <i>Preface of praise and thanksgiving for creation and redemption, with varied responses</i></p> <p><i>Sanctus</i></p> <p>And so, Father, we who have been redeemed by him and made a new people by water and the Spirit, now bring before you these gifts. Sanctify them by your Holy Spirit to be the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord.</p> <p><i>Institution narrative</i></p> <p><i>Anamnesis and [2nd?] oblation</i> <i>People's response</i></p> <p>Lord God of our Fathers; God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: Open our eyes to see your hand at work in the world about us. Deliver us from the presumption of coming to this Table for solace only, and not for strength; for pardon only, and not for renewal. Let the grace of this Holy Communion make us one body, one spirit in Christ, that we may worthily serve the world in his name.</p> <p><i>People's response</i></p> <p><i>Prayer of acceptance and doxology</i> <i>Amen</i></p>	<p><i>Sursum corda</i> <i>Preface (mostly the same wording as Prayer C but with a fixed response, "Glory to you for ever and ever.")</i> <i>Sanctus</i></p> <p><i>Institution narrative</i> <i>"Glory to you. . ."</i> <i>Anamnesis</i></p> <p>We who have been redeemed by him, and made a new people by water and the Spirit, now bring you these gifts. Send your Holy Spirit upon us and upon this offering of your Church, that we who eat and drink at this holy table may share the divine life of Christ our Lord.</p> <p><i>"Glory to you . . ."</i></p> <p>Pour out your Spirit upon the whole earth and make it your new creation. Gather your Church together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom, where peace and justice are revealed, that we, with all your people, of every language, race, and nation, may share the banquet you have promised.</p> <p><i>Doxology</i> <i>"Glory to you . . . Amen."</i></p>

¹⁴⁵ B.A.S., 201-203.

Chapter 4: Toward a Pneumatological and Eschatological Model for the Eucharist

Up to this point, I have focused mainly on the historical and textual aspects of the eucharistic epiclesis from the ancient church through the Anglican tradition up to the current American Book of Common Prayer (1979). The third chapter, though, began to move toward a more theological approach based on the eucharistic texts found in the Prayer Book. This chapter will now begin with a deeper theological reading of Eucharistic Prayer B in order to proceed to a more general theological examination of the way eschatology and pneumatology intersect in the Eucharist, especially in the invocation of the Holy Spirit. By moving toward a more eschatological and pneumatological model, I hope to show the beginnings of an approach to the Eucharist that moves beyond certain debates, such as about a particular moment of consecration.

Before looking at Eucharistic Prayer B, though, allow me to deal with some terminology. What is meant by eschatology? This particular term “eschatology” derives from the Greek word ἔσχατος, meaning “last.” Therefore, in Christian theology “eschatology” refers to the study of last things. Traditionally, this has often referred to the individual aspects such as death, judgment of the individual, heaven, hell, etc. Collectively, though, it also refers to the world’s end, Christ’s Second Coming, and the subsequent general resurrection and judgment.¹⁴⁶ In this fuller sense, the term *eschaton* that refers to the end time does not signify so much the final point along a trajectory but rather the ultimate conclusion of the world’s history, both in time and in purpose.

To put it another way, one cannot dismiss eschatology to the safe confines of popular fantastic images of Armageddon or obscure chapters tacked onto manuals of

¹⁴⁶ *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 342.

dogmatic theology. At its heart, eschatology involves the consummation of God's plan for salvation. As Wolfhart Pannenberg writes, "'Because God and his lordship form the central content of eschatological salvation, eschatology is not just the subject of a single chapter in dogmatics; it determines the perspective of Christian doctrine as a whole.'"¹⁴⁷ As Christians we do not believe that we exist in a world that just moves about from this event to the next like an unending cosmic billiards game. Rather, salvation history involves a *telos*, an ultimacy that gives meaning to the entire course of creation.

With all of that in mind, how are we to look at Eucharistic Prayer B? The reason I chose this anaphora is that I believe it presents the fullest eschatology of the four eucharistic prayers found in Rite Two. First of all, the prayer gives the context for our thanksgiving in the course of salvation history from creation, through the calling of Israel and the preaching of the prophets, to the Incarnation of the Son in Jesus Christ. Only in "these last days" was he sent "to be incarnate from the Virgin Mary, to be the Savior and Redeemer of the world."¹⁴⁸ Secondly, as with the other Rite Two anaphoras, this one contains a memorial acclamation that includes not just the death and resurrection of Christ but also his future advent. "We remember his death. We proclaim his resurrection. We await his coming in glory."¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷ Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 3 vols., vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991), 531.

¹⁴⁸ *Prayer Book (1979)*, 368.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

It is in the invocation, however, that one finds the fullest eschatological reference.

To refresh the reader's memory, let me give the text of this prayer's epiclesis and intercessory section:

We pray you, gracious God, to send your Holy Spirit upon these gifts that they may be the Sacrament of the Body of Christ and his Blood of the new Covenant. Unite us to your Son in his sacrifice, that we may be acceptable through him, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit. In the fullness of time, put all things in subjection under your Christ, and bring us to that heavenly country where, with [_____ and] all your saints, we may enter the everlasting heritage of your sons and daughters; through Jesus Christ our Lord, the firstborn of all creation, the head of the Church, and the author of our salvation.¹⁵⁰

The eschatology becomes especially clear in the final clause, "In the fullness of time . . ." Here we have reference to the final days not just as the end of time but the fulfillment of time in which all things become subject to Christ.

At the same time, however, if one looks at other instances of this phrase, "the fullness of time," one finds not only the "not yet" but also the "already." Prayer C recounts the Incarnation in this way: "And in the fullness of time you sent your only Son, born of a woman, to fulfill your Law, to open for us the way of freedom and peace."¹⁵¹ Prayer D also uses this phrase to describe the context of Christ's birth world. Together these references indicate both the hope for the future completion of salvation history and an acknowledgement of the fullness of time now. One might consider it analogous to the double-sided translation of *Maranatha* as "Come, Lord" and "The Lord has come."

With this "already"/"not yet" dynamic, the prayer asks God to bring the church with all the saints (with provision for individual saints to be named) into "that heavenly

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 369.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 370.

country.” Thinking poetically, one might even say that the church as a body and its individual members are praying to be guided through their pilgrimage to that final home to which they are headed but by whose light they travel. These prayers are made through Christ, “the firstborn of all creation, the head of the Church, and the author of our salvation.” It is only by the Holy Spirit, however, that such prayer can be made; and indeed, prior to this eschatological petition, the Spirit has been invoked upon the bread and wine to be the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, which are to be received by the gathered faithful. The faithful pilgrims, through sanctification by the Holy Spirit, are to be united to Christ’s sacrifice so they might be made acceptable to be Father, namely to be brought through Christ and in the Holy Spirit into participation in the divine Trinity.

Admittedly, this is but one reading of this particular eucharistic prayer, but it remains in keeping with traditional Christian theology. What we notice are the three main components mentioned at the beginning of this chapter that are also present in this telling — eschatology, the Eucharist, and pneumatology. Leaving Prayer B for a while, the rest of this chapter continues with a more detailed look at the ways these three intersect.

One of the primary treatments on the topic of eschatology in sacramental theology in the last few decades has been Geoffrey Wainwright’s *Eucharist and Eschatology*. In this book, he argues that the sacrament of the Eucharist is preeminently an eschatological event in the life of the church. Over the course of his discussion, several aspects emerge related to this link; and I intend to show some of those characteristics and expand upon them.

At this point, I wish to give some of the aspects of eschatology that Wainwright presents toward the end of his book.¹⁵² According to him, eschatology consists of several polarities. The classic one is the tension between “already” and “not yet,” but others exist as well. Regarding the kingdom, we also encounter both hiddenness and visibility, limited extension and universal scope, incomplete obedience and perfect service, and so forth. Although we might stress one side of each polarity at times, we have to remember to maintain the tension between them.

Eschatology also involves the individual in community. Therefore, both the individual and corporate aspects must be preserved. One cannot fall to the side of atomistic salvation that ignores the communal nature of the church and of God’s reign, but one also cannot stress a “totalitarian optimism” that removes personal responsibility in bringing about the kingdom.¹⁵³ With this in mind, one sees that eschatology entails both divine gift and human appropriation. God does not impose the kingdom by force from above, but neither can it be built by human effort and goodness alone.

The building of God’s reign does not limit itself to the spiritual but scandalously incorporates the material as well. Wainwright notes Irenaeus’ attempts to convey this idea to counter Gnosticism by appealing to Christ’s presence in the physical bread and wine in the Eucharist. This embrace of the material shows part of the universal scope of God’s plan for salvation. Not only does God intend for the kingdom to include all

¹⁵² Geoffrey Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology* (Akron: OSL Publications, 2002), 182-187.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 183.

peoples (though by their own free and joyous choice) but also the whole of human existence through the general resurrection.

Eschatology, according to Wainwright, must also include provision for progress toward the kingdom. God did not establish it fully on earth at any point in the past, nor does he do so in the present. Nevertheless, in each Eucharist, the church goes forth in the hope that the kingdom is indeed coming closer. This picture of progress, however, must also sit beside an eschatology of judgment. It is this moment of “crisis” (from the Greek word for judgment) that allows renewal to occur. One encounters this moment of judgment and renewal on the final day but also projected into the present in the context of the Eucharist.

These aspects that Wainwright presents do not exhaust the nature of eschatology, but they do provide some important ideas, especially as it relates to the Eucharist. In summary, an adequate eschatology contains the following:

- (a) Acknowledges polarity: already & not yet, hidden & visible, limited extension & universal scope, incomplete obedience & perfect service, etc.
- (b) Involves the individual in community
- (c) Includes both divine gift and human appropriation: the kingdom is not imposed by force from above nor built by human effort alone
- (d) Embraces the material as well as the spiritual
- (e) Shows the universal scope of salvation, but the accent falls on God’s gracious will to allow people to embrace the kingdom freely and with joy
- (f) Allows progress in establishment of kingdom
- (g) Includes a moment of judgment and renewal ¹⁵⁴

With these ideas in mind, let us continue by looking at the eschatological nature of the Eucharist, the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., 182-187.

The first part of Wainwright's book deals with relation of the Eucharist as meal to the nature of God's kingdom. First, the Lord's Supper on earth expresses both continuity with and difference from the heavenly banquet. It is a true taste that does not yet contain the fullness of the final reality. Secondly, it reveals the reality in which God has chosen to bind himself with humanity, a structure where God feeds people with his own being yet remains transcendent and distinct. Also, unlike in some gnosticizing visions of salvation, God chooses to affirm the positive value of the physical universe by embracing the whole of material creation and the physicality of human life within it. Another aspect of the reality of the Eucharist as meal of the kingdom is the way that it reveals how embodied existence falls short of its intended purpose if fails to mediate the connection between God and humanity. Finally, just as a solitary earthly meal can fall short of the fullness of human feasting, the heavenly banquet is by its very nature communal.¹⁵⁵ Of these elements, I especially wish to highlight the aspects of continuity and difference between the earthly and heavenly feasts and the nature of the Eucharist as a sign of right relation between God and humanity and among humankind.

At the same time, according to Wainwright, the Eucharist shows other characteristics that reveal its eschatological substance. For one thing, the Lord's Supper is celebrated as a memorial of Christ himself, not just one particular event in his earthly life but rather the whole of his mission for salvation. As such, the church that gathers to celebrate this memorial (in all of its dimensions) affirms the presence of Christ now but also lives under the promise of his final advent. God, who is sovereign over time, assures that Jesus is present to his church in the present and "clothed with the mighty acts of the

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., 73-75.

incarnation, passion, resurrection and ascension which are the promise of man's final salvation, and already exercising the functions which he will exercise at his final coming.”¹⁵⁶ This is one example of the aspect of eschatological projection in the Eucharist. On one hand, we have a “throwing forward” of the reality of Christ’s future advent into the current age; but at the same time, as with a map-maker’s projection, the larger reality of the kingdom is given in a set of comprehensible symbols.¹⁵⁷

Although the Eucharist does exist as a taste and sign of the kingdom, it is not the kingdom in its fullest sense but rather falls short in certain ways. For example, even though we believe that God’s plan for salvation has a universal scope and purpose, we still have to acknowledge that we only experience a limited extension of it here on earth. God chooses to reveal that universality through particular persons, communities, things, and events. In addition, the church’s celebration of the Lord’s Supper exists as a periodic celebration instead of a continuous reality. Finally, in the Eucharist we encounter Christ mediated through symbols; we do not see the divine glory directly. One can argue, however, that it is this mediation that allows frail and finite humanity to experience the kingdom in a way that allows for free and joyful embrace of God’s reign.¹⁵⁸

In this vein of the falling short of the kingdom, Wainwright also presents some images and concepts of the Eucharist that evidence the polarity of “already” and “not yet” present in this sacrament.¹⁵⁹ As a taste of the kingdom, it serves as a provisional but

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., 115.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 114-116.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 149-152.

genuine experience that flavors, so to speak, the whole life of the church. The Eucharist also exists as a sign of the kingdom both representing and pointing the way toward the ultimate reality. It “*announces and initiates, or . . . furthers, the coming of the kingdom of God.*”¹⁶⁰

Wainwright also sees the Eucharist as an image (εἰκών) of the kingdom. In this way, while not identical, it shares in the nature of God’s reign in order to communicate the qualities of that reality to humanity. Finally, the Eucharist serves as mystery of the kingdom, existing in eschatological tension between hiddenness and visibility. As stated above, it is in the nature of divine glory to be seen, but humanity can only see it within the fullness of the kingdom. “When the Mystery of God has been completed (Rev. 10:7), sacraments will cease and the eucharist [sic] will give way to vision of God in his incontestable kingdom.”¹⁶¹

In all of this discussion, several key concepts come to the fore. I have already highlighted the Eucharist’s continuity with and difference from the kingdom as well as its nature as a sign of right relation between God and humanity and among humankind. Other qualities, however, also stand out as especially important to this treatment of Eucharist and eschatology. These include the polarity of already and not yet, the hidden state of the divine glory that is to be made fully visible in the final kingdom, and the

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 187-191.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 188.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 191.

Eucharist as icon of the kingdom. In addition to these, I also include the missionary aspect of the eucharistic celebration.¹⁶²

To round out this section on the eschatological nature of the Eucharist, I wish to give a quote from Alexander Schmemmann.

A sacrament is both cosmic and eschatological. It refers at the same time to God's world as he first created it and to its fulfilment [sic] in the kingdom of God. It is cosmic in that it embraces all of creation, it returns it to God as God's own – “Thine own of Thine own . . . on behalf of all and for all” -- and in and by itself manifests the victory of Christ. But it is to the same degree eschatological, oriented toward the *kingdom which is to come*.¹⁶³

The sacrament of the Eucharist involves both protology (first things) and eschatology (last things). It acts as a sign of the transformation of the world to right relation with God and itself as God intended in the beginning and will fully accomplish at the end of time.

Another aspect of eschatology important to this study is its relation to the Holy Spirit. According to John Zizioulas, “[The] first fundamental particularity of Pneumatology is its eschatological character. The Spirit makes of Christ an eschatological being, the ‘last Adam.’”¹⁶⁴ Christ, the one anointed by the Spirit of God, was raised from the dead and now lives and reigns with the Father in the unity of the Holy Spirit. In that same Spirit, we are baptized into the one body of Christ. (1 Cor. 12:13). As he was raised, so as members of his body will we be raised. “For since death

¹⁶² Wainwright also discusses this on pages 159-161 but primarily with an eye toward the question of who is invited to receive communion in the Eucharist and with implied favor toward the Methodist practice of open communion.

¹⁶³ Alexander Schmemmann, *The Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom*, trans. Paul Kachur (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987), 34.

¹⁶⁴ John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985), 130.

came through a human being, the resurrection of the dead has also come through a human being; for as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ.” (1 Cor. 15:21-22)

God will raise those in whom the Spirit dwells and by that Spirit breathe life into their mortal bodies. (Rom. 8:11) In this present age, we do not experience the fullness of the kingdom but wait in pregnant expectation for the future glory. “We know that the whole creation has been groaning in labor pains until now; and not only the creation, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly while we wait for adoption, the redemption of our bodies.” (Rom. 8:22-23) As the “first fruits” (cf. Ex. 23:19) of the kingdom, the seal of the Spirit in our baptism represents the whole of God’s reign and serves as a pledge of that future glory. (2 Cor. 1:22, 5:5; Eph. 1:13-14)¹⁶⁵

Pannenberg also deals with this relation between pneumatology and eschatology.

In the third volume of his *Systematic Theology*, he writes:

Pneumatology and eschatology belong together because the eschatological consummation itself is ascribed to the Spirit, who as an end-time gift already governs the historical present of believers. Conversely, then, eschatology does not merely have to do with the future of consummation that is still ahead; it is also at work in our present by the Spirit. . . . Thus we are to view the presence of the eschatological future by the Spirit as an inner element of the eschatological consummation itself, namely, as a proleptic manifestation of the Spirit who is the eschatological future will transform believers, and with them all creation, for participation in the glory of God.¹⁶⁶

In summary, one finds that the present life of the church is conditioned by the Spirit, which serves as a promise of the future kingdom.

By that Spirit, humanity is transformed and brought into the glory of the Trinitarian life. "Relating the third and final phase of the economy of salvation [i.e.

¹⁶⁵ See also Wainwright, 157.

¹⁶⁶ Pannenberg, 553.

consummation] to the Holy Spirit seems to make sense only from the standpoint that we can also ascribe to the Holy Spirit . . . the eschatological participation of creation in the life of the Trinity by its glorification, the glorification of God by creatures and that of creatures by God being two sides of one and the same event."¹⁶⁷

“The Holy Spirit is the Person who, as it were, 'applies' Christ to the Christian and to the church; or we may say that it is 'in the Holy Spirit' that Christ comes to the church.”¹⁶⁸ Just as the Spirit made real the presence of Christ in the flesh, so too does the Spirit make real the presence of Christ as a body in the church community. Each baptized person becomes “Christ” and is born as a new person by water and the Spirit with an existence marked by communion.¹⁶⁹

In the resurrection and glorification, the body of Christ transcends the limits of individuality and becomes a corporate body through the introduction of the eschatological realities of the Spirit into history.¹⁷⁰ By the Incarnation, the Logos surrenders to history and becomes subject to time and death; but through the resurrection of Christ in the Spirit, time is brought in subjection under him. Therefore, the Son, who is coming in glory on the last day, can be present to his church today in that same Spirit.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 554.

¹⁶⁸ Wainwright, 135.

¹⁶⁹ Zizioulas, 111, 113.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 113 (n. 116).

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 114.

Not only is Christ present to the church, but the church also is present to Christ. In fact, the Christian community is joined to the Risen Lord by the Spirit in unity yet distinction. One can compare this idea to the ascending Christology of the “bestowal model” as presented by Edward Kilmartin and based on the work of David Coffey. On one hand, the Incarnation can be seen in terms of the Logos’ procession from the Father and descent to earth as Jesus of Nazareth, but one can, on the other hand, view it from a different perspective. Here, the Spirit sanctifies the created humanity of Jesus so that it can be joined with the eternal Word, but the Spirit is also sent by the Risen Lord from the Father to unite ordinary human beings with the Son.¹⁷²

The Father sends the Son into the world to be incarnate by the Holy Spirit. This Spirit anoints Jesus as the Christ at his baptism and enlivens his mission on earth. Jesus responds to the love of the Father all the way to death on the cross, but then the Father gives his response by sending the Spirit to raise him from the tomb. The glorified Christ gives back this Spirit so that the Father might bestow it upon the church to unite it to the Son as a body to its head. Christ and the Church are united by the same Spirit yet remain distinct in that the latter, like the humanity of Jesus, is not swallowed into the divinity of the Word. The Church, with its individual members, is united to Christ also in his mission of self-offering to the Father.¹⁷³ Like Christ, the Church as a body is anointed to proclaim the good news of God’s reign. (Luke 4:14-21)

¹⁷² Edward J. Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy: Theology and Practice*, vol. 1 (Kansas City, Mo.: Sheed & Ward, 1988), 161-162.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 174-176.

While Christ institutes the church on earth, the church is also constituted by the Holy Spirit. The former establishes it as a fact in history; the latter brings it about from the standpoint of the future kingdom with the involvement of humanity, having been sanctified by the Spirit to become the body of Christ and thus be drawn freely and joyously into the life of the Holy Trinity.¹⁷⁴

One of the chief ways the church experiences this new life is the sacrament of the Eucharist. "The eucharistic community is the Body of Christ *par excellence* simply because it incarnates and realizes our communion within the very life and communion of the Trinity, in a way that preserves the eschatological character of truth while making it an integral part of history."¹⁷⁵ In baptism one is made part of the body of Christ by water and the Spirit. In the Eucharist, the baptized member participates through the Spirit in the saving mystery of Christ and is nourished with the food and drink of eternal life. As witnessed earlier in the chapter, the eucharistic feast serves as a taste and pledge of the future banquet, but we are only able to engage in this proleptic celebration because it is accomplished through the Holy Spirit.

One also finds this relationship between baptism and Eucharist treated directly in *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist*, the findings of the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation (IALC) in Dublin. The relevant section states:

The eucharist is therefore an eschatological sign of God's new creation in Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit. In this sense it is intimately linked to baptism. Baptism is the primary sacrament of the making of an eschatological community.

¹⁷⁴ Zizioulas, 140.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 114.

In baptism, Christians are born again and reimagined; they become a new creation. The eucharist calls out and renews the baptized community.¹⁷⁶

Wainwright draws another parallel between these two chief sacraments by appealing to the way the Spirit “applies” Christ.

But if the material means of the spoken and heard word, the written and read word, and the water poured in baptism, are claimed and used by the Holy Spirit to “apply Christ” . . . then we may wonder why the bread and wine eaten and drunk in the eucharist may not be seen in the same kind of way, without recourse to the numerical identification of the elements with Christ. The difference between the eucharist and the others would not be a difference in kind, but a difference perhaps in degree.¹⁷⁷

At another point, Wainwright draws on the fourth-century mystagogical catecheses of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Here one finds another explanation of the Eucharist in terms of the work of the Holy Spirit. This one compares the epiclesis of the Holy Spirit upon the gifts to the work of the Holy Spirit in Christ’s resurrection. Just as the Spirit gave immortality to the buried Jesus so too does the Spirit make the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, the food and drink of immortality. In each particle of the broken loaf, Christ approaches the communicant in manifestation of his own resurrection as a pledge of the life to come.¹⁷⁸ As Theodore writes, “Just as our Lord's body was clearly revealed as immortal when it had received the Spirit and his

¹⁷⁶ David Holeton, ed., *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist: Findings of the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, Dublin, Eire, 1995*, Grove Worship Series, vol. 135 (Cambridge, UK: Grove Books, Ltd., 1996), 18.

¹⁷⁷ Wainwright, 135.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 58.

anointing, so too in the liturgy the bread and wine that have been offered receive at the coming of the Holy Spirit a kind of anointing by the grace that comes upon them.”¹⁷⁹

That “anointing” to which Theodore refers is the epiclesis, the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the gifts and the people. In the case of Eucharistic Prayer B, we find the petition, “We pray you, gracious God, to send your Holy Spirit upon these gifts that they may be the Sacrament of the Body of Christ and his Blood of the new Covenant.”¹⁸⁰ The prayer then follows with a request for the faithful, having been sanctified by the Holy Spirit, to be united in Christ’s sacrifice and through him be made acceptable to the Father. In looking at other eucharistic epicleses over the ages, one finds this double invocation upon the gifts and the people to be constitutive of the invocation’s classical content.¹⁸¹

Often, however, the epiclesis has gotten caught up in the misguided debate over a “moment of consecration.” Geoffrey Wainwright describes this argument well when he writes, “To my mind, the desire to fix a precise *moment* of consecration is a perverse departure from the earlier conception that consecration is effected by or in response to the whole eucharistic prayer, perverse because it is a step in the direction of that objectivism into which man's understanding of the sacraments always threatens to fall.”¹⁸²

Schemmann concurs in stating that questions of *how* or *when* consecration occurs could

¹⁷⁹ As cited in Yarnold, 233-234.

¹⁸⁰ *Prayer Book (1979)*, 369.

¹⁸¹ Of course, this has appeared in various forms. For further discussion, see chapter 1 of this thesis.

¹⁸² Wainwright, 119.

only arise when the eschatological dimension was no longer seen by scholastic theology as essential to Christian faith.¹⁸³

Indeed, the focus on this narrow interpretation of consecration takes one away from the ultimate *telos* of the sacrament, the unity of the gathered church in Christ. As Kilmartin writes:

[The] growing fascination with the somatic presence of the body and blood of Christ . . . had the effect of obscuring the vision of what is ultimately signified by the sacrament, i.e., the eschatological dimension, namely, Christ in heavenly glory, in the midst of the holy ones, as fulfillment of the eucharistic celebration.¹⁸⁴

Again, using Prayer B as an example, we find this kind of language in the rite itself. After the petition for the sanctification of the people, the prayer asks God to bring all things in subjection under Christ and to gather us all into the “heavenly country” will all of the saints, all of the holy ones.

We find this fulfillment symbolically represented in the transformation of the bread and wine. While the language of “transformation” might come perilously close to the old battles over Christ’s presence, it is still important to maintain this kind of language but place it in a larger context. The bread and wine do not act simply as arbitrary objects to be magically changed into Christ’s body and blood. If we view the bread and wine as more than simple objects but rather as the intersections of the complex strands that have gone into producing them, the gifts of the earth and the work of human hands, we can understand their sanctification as symbolic of the sanctification of all creation and human society. “When transformationist language is united with symbolic

¹⁸³ Schmemmann, 218.

¹⁸⁴ Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 64.

language and placed in an eschatological perspective, the transformation of the elements becomes the sacramental sign of the transformation of the whole earth into the kingdom.”¹⁸⁵

The change that happens with the bread and wine does not occur simply for its own sake. Instead, as seen above, they symbolize the world put right side up in relation to itself and to God and finding ultimacy not in its own self but in the heavenly dance of the Holy Trinity. It is not a case of “ontic sanctification,” of “being-in-itself,” but a “being-for-human beings.”¹⁸⁶ In the context of the eucharistic celebration, we find this image of the kingdom realized in the sharing of the bread and wine in Communion. It is a vision of the collapse of social barriers, the provision of each person (ideally at least) with the same amount, and a restoration of right relations among people and with God.

One must not, however, go too far and assume that this kingdom exists already in its entirety and that the Eucharist realizes it fully. Indeed, as Paul tells the Corinthians, “For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.” (1 Cor. 11:26) The full marriage supper of the Lamb does not take place until the final consummation. (Rev. 19:7-9)¹⁸⁷ Those who partake of the eucharistic feast must still remember that it is but a taste of what is to come. As stated in *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*, “The Holy Spirit through the eucharist gives a foretaste of the Kingdom of

¹⁸⁵ William R. Crockett, *Eucharist: Symbol of Transformation* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1989), 262.

¹⁸⁶ Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 183. I would also hasten to add that this “being-for” takes in more than just human beings but must also be seen in a larger ecological and cosmological perspective, but that is a point that must be further examined at a later time.

¹⁸⁷ Wainwright, 48-49.

God: the Church receives the life of the new creation and the assurance of the Lord's return."¹⁸⁸

Although we behold the fullness of this sanctification in the Eucharistic celebration and partake of that transformation in ourselves through communion, the final fulfillment of this change remains incomplete. As petitioned in the epiclesis in Prayer B, the Holy Spirit sanctifies us so that we can be united in Christ's sacrifice. That sacrifice, however, encompasses not only Christ's death upon the cross but also his life of love and obedient service that led to his death as well as his resurrection and ascension. The reality of Christ's sacrifice and high priestly intercessions is then sealed for the church at Pentecost but not ended. According to Boris Bobrinskoy:

The Son never ceases his priestly supplication for mankind, for his brothers. That is why the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost is only *inaugurated*, and cannot be considered absolutely as closed. . . . This is the notion of a "continuing Pentecost."¹⁸⁹

The historical event in the upper room signaled the "advent" of the *eschaton*, which will not be closed until the final coming of Christ. Pentecost continues because the Holy Spirit, who effects the presence of Christ to us in time, "makes of Christ an eschatological being, the 'last Adam'" by freeing him from the "bondage of history" that confines him to one particular time and location.¹⁹⁰

United in Christ's sacrifice, we as human beings nevertheless remain within the

¹⁸⁸ World Council of Churches, *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*, sec. E18, (1982, accessed 2 January 2006); available from <http://www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/faith/bem4.html>.

¹⁸⁹ Boris Bobrinskoy, "The Holy Spirit in the Liturgy," *Indian Journal of Theology* 12 (1963): 124.

¹⁹⁰ Zizioulas, 130.

course of time and live in the world that is still out of right relation with itself and God. Therefore, we who are joined by the Holy Spirit into the body of Christ must be sent out into the world to continue our Lord's mission of proclaiming God's reign until all creation is brought into the fullness of the divine life and of placing ourselves and our entire social systems under both the judgment and grace of God. Full acceptance of this grace entails first a new social vision, then a critique of current social structures in the light of that vision, and finally advocacy for those marginalized by the unjust society and social change.¹⁹¹ "If we connect this eschatological perspective with the eschatological judgment scene in Matthew 25:31-46, we see that to serve the least our neighbors is to serve Christ himself . . . The service of the neighbor is the eschatological test of the authenticity of our eucharistic communities and of our commitments."¹⁹²

¹⁹¹ Crockett, 256.

¹⁹² Ibid., 257.

Conclusion

At the end, we now return to the question that began this discussion: How might an investigation of this difference between an epiclesis of Word and Spirit and an epiclesis of the Spirit alone lead to a way of viewing the sacrament of the Eucharist that moves us away from the questions of a moment of consecration and toward a more holistic and integrated vision of the Eucharist? As shown in the preceding chapters, one way is to look at the question of the epiclesis in terms of a pneumatological and eschatological model of the Eucharist.

As indicated in chapters two and three, an invocation of the Word and Holy Spirit has considerable basis in Anglican tradition and does to an extent provide an accurate expression of eucharistic theology. Nevertheless, it remains mostly as an anomaly in the realm of historical eucharistic epicleses. It also presents a number of problems that can be avoided by having an invocation of just the Holy Spirit.

The examples of this type of Spirit-epiclesis found in the 1979 Prayer Book attest to the importance of the eschatological dimension to the epiclesis and to the Eucharist as a whole. The eschatological, however, only makes sense in Christian theology if taken in concert with a theology of the Holy Spirit. In the Eucharist, the Holy Spirit allows for the mutual presence of Christ and his church to each other, as evidenced in the epicletic petitions for the unity of the church not only with itself but also with Christ. This presence, though, also contains an element of absence; for the Eucharist only provides a foretaste of the heavenly banquet.

The world is not yet fully in subjection under Christ, and we can only view the divine glory through the mediation of sacramental symbols. We perceive the

transformation of ourselves and the world that will be completed in the age to come when we are restored to right relation with ourselves and with God and behold God's glory face-to-face. With the transformation not yet fully accomplished, we are sent out to continue Christ's mission of proclaiming the good news of salvation and working to heal the infirmities of this world.

By viewing the Eucharist in terms of eschatology and the work of the Holy Spirit, we move beyond questions of how the eucharistic elements are consecrated and by what agent that consecration occurs. Instead, we begin to see a model that provides a more dynamic vision of the sacrament that more fully takes into account salvation history and God's mission to bring the world into the divine life of the Trinity.

That vision, however, still remains obscured in much of the practice of Christian liturgy and life. Future revisions of the Prayer Book might want to emphasize the eschatological dimension further. Even a better liturgical text, though, will not mean much if that message does not become a more integrated part of the life of individual Christians and Christian communities. That particular question remains for a future investigation that, I hope, uses some of what this thesis provides as a starting point.

Works Cited

The Acts of Thomas.

Bobrinskoy, Boris. "The Holy Spirit in the Liturgy." *Indian Journal of Theology* 12 (1963): 123-132.

The Book of Alternative Services for the Anglican Church of Canada. Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1985.

The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church According to the Use of the Church of England. 1662.

The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church Together with the Psalter or Psalms of David. 1979.

Botte, Bernard. "L'epiclèse De L'anaphore D'hippolyte." *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 14 (1947): 241-251.

_____. "A Propos De La 'Tradition Apostolique'." *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 33 (1966): 177-186.

Bouyer, Louis. *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer.* Notre Dame Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.

Bradshaw, Paul F., Maxwell E. Johnson, and L. Edwards Phillips. "The Apostolic Tradition: A Commentary." ed. Harold W. Attridge. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Brett, Thomas. *Collection of the Principal Liturgies Used in the Christian Church in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist ... with a Dissertation Upon Them.* London: Rivington and Co., 1838.

Broxap, Henry. *The Later Non-Jurors.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1924.

Bucer, Martin. "The *Censura*." In *Martin Bucer and the Book of Common Prayer*, ed. E. C. Whitaker, 55, 10-173. Great Wakering, UK: Mayhew-McCrimmon, for the Alcuin Club, 1974.

Buchanan, Colin, ed. *The Savoy Conference Revisited.* Vol. 54, Joint Liturgical Series. Cambridge: Grove Books, Ltd., for the Alcuin Club and the Group for Renewal of Worship, 2002.

Buxton, Richard F. *Eucharist and Institution Narrative: A Study in the Roman and Anglican Traditions of the Consecration of the Eucharist from the Eighth to the*

- Twentieth Century*. Vol. 58 Alcuin Club Collections. Great Wakering, UK: Mayhew-McCrimmon, for the Alcuin Club, 1976.
- Chauvet, Louis Marie. *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence*. Collegetown, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993.
- Cranmer, Thomas. *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, ed. John Edmund Cox, for the Parker Society. Cambridge, UK: The University Press, 1844.
- Crockett, William R. *Eucharist: Symbol of Transformation*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1989.
- Cuming, G. J., ed. *The Durham Book: Being the First Draft of the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer in 1661*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- "The Didache (the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles)." In *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, ed. Michael W. Holmes, 246-269. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999.
- Dix, Dom Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. London: Dacre Press, 1945.
- Dowden, John. *The Annotated Scottish Communion Office: An Historical Account of the Scottish Communion Office and of the Communion Office of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America with Liturgical Notes*. Edinburgh: R. Grant and Son, 1884.
- Fenwick, John R. K., and Bryan D. Spinks. *Worship in Transition : The Liturgical Movement in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Continuum, 1995.
- Grisbrooke, W. Jardine. *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. London: S.P.C.K., 1958.
- Hatchett, Marion J. *Commentary on the American Prayer Book*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1995.
- Haugaard, William P. "From the Reformation to the Eighteenth Century." In *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. Stephen Sykes and John Booty. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- Holeton, David, ed. *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist: Findings of the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, Dublin, Eire, 1995*. Vol. 135, Grove Worship Series. Cambridge, UK: Grove Books, Ltd., 1996.

- Irenaeus. "Against Heresies." In *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, Vol. 1, 315-567. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996.
- Irwin, Kevin. *Models of the Eucharist*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2005.
- Jasper, R. C. D., and G. J. Cuming. *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*. 3rd ed. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Johnson, John. *The Unbloody Sacrifice*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. *The Theological Works of of the Rev. John Johnson*. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847.
- Johnson, Maxwell E. *The Prayers of Sarapion of Thmuis : A Literary, Liturgical, and Theological Analysis*. Vol. 249 *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1995.
- Justin Martyr. "The First Apology." In *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, Vol. 1, 163-187. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996.
- Kilmartin, Edward J. *Christian Liturgy: Theology and Practice*. Vol. 1. Kansas City, Mo.: Sheed & Ward, 1988.
- _____. *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert J. Daly. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2004.
- Mazza, Enrico. *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1995.
- McKenna, John H. *The Eucharist and the Holy Spirit: The Eucharistic Epiclesis in Twentieth Century Theology (1900-1966)*. Vol. 57 *Alcuin Club Collections*. Great Wakering, UK: Mayhew-McKrimmon, for the Alcuin Club 1975.
- Neill, Stephen. *Anglicanism*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1965.
- New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 5. 15 vols. 2nd ed. Detroit: Thomson/Gale Group, in association with the Catholic University of America, 2003.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Systematic Theology*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. 3. 3 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1991.
- Robinson, J. Armitage. "Invocation in the Holy Eucharist." *Theology* 8 (1924): 89-100.
- Schemmann, Alexander. *The Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom*. Translated by Paul Kachur. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987.

- Spinks, Bryan D. *Worship: Prayers from the East*. Washington, DC: The Pastoral Press, 1993.
- _____. *Mar Nestorius and Mar Theodore the Interpreter: The Forgotten Eucharistic Prayers of East Syria*. Vol. 45 Joint Liturgical Studies. Cambridge: Grove Books, Ltd., for the Alcuin Club and the Group for Renewal of Worship, 1999.
- Taft, Robert. "Mass without the Consecration? The Historic Agreement on the Eucharist between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East Promulgated 26 October 2001." *Worship* 77, no. 6 (2003): 482-509.
- Talley, Thomas J. "From Berakah to Eucharistia : A Reopening Question." *Worship* 50, no. 2 (1976): 115-137.
- _____. "The Literary Structure of the Eucharistic Prayer." *Worship* 58, no. 5 (1984): 404-420.
- _____. "Eucharistic Prayers, Past, Present and Future." In *Revising the Eucharist: Groundwork for the Anglican Communion: Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation*, ed. David Holeton, 27, 6-19. Bramcote, UK: Grove Books, Ltd., for the Alcuin Club and the Group for Renewal of Worship, 1994.
- Wainwright, Geoffrey. *Eucharist and Eschatology*. Akron: OSL Publications, 2002.
- White, James F. *Roman Catholic Worship : Trent to Today*. New York: Paulist Press, 1995.
- _____. "Protestant Public Worship in North America: 1935-1995." In *Christian Worship in North America : A Retrospective, 1955-1995*, 115-133. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1997.
- Yarnold, Edward. *The Awe-Inspiring Rites : The Origins of the R.C.I.A.* 2nd ed. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1993.
- Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.