THE LIBERATION OF THE EUCHARIST: CONTEMPORARY ROMAN CATHOLIC REINTERPRETATIONS

BY

TERESA WHALEN

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF RELIGION

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
WINNIPEG, MANITOBA
SEPTEMBER 24, 1990

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-76839-8

Canada

THE LIBERATION OF THE EUCHARIST:

CONTEMPORARY ROMAN CATHOLIC REINTERPRETATIONS

BY

TERESA WHALEN

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1990

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the feedback, assistance and support of many people, this project could not have been completed. I am grateful to the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Gordon Harland, Dr. Richard Lebrun and Dr. John Badertscher for their much valued input and direction. To my advisor, Dr. Egil Grislis, I wish to extend my most profound appreciation. Dr. Grislis has been a supportive and sympathetic teacher and advisor who has directed, encouraged and inspired me not only academically, but spiritually as well. I am deeply indebted to him for teaching me that the study of religion is not merely an imparting of facts, but a shared search for meaning.

I would also like to acknowledge all those friends who have in one way or another contributed to and affirmed my effort during these past years. First, I wish to thank my former room-mate, Charlene Lipka, for always being there when I needed inspiration, affirmation and an example of perseverance. Second, to all those people at the Chancery Office of Regina, I extend my gratitude for their encouragement and understanding while I was trying to finish my thesis long-distance. Sandra Merk in particular was especially kind in helping me with the processing and printing of this work. Finally, in a special way, I would like to thank Bryan Hillis, Luther College, University of Regina for first introducing me to the study of religion, for giving me confidence in my own ability to pursue my studies and, most of all, for his unfailing wisdom, guidance and encouragement over the last five years.

I wish to dedicate this thesis to those two people who gave me the gift of faith and who, through word and example, nurtured it constantly over the years. Thanks, Mom and Dad, for everything!

INTRODUCTION

The eucharist is, and always has been, the central act of worship for Roman Catholics(1). As a result, the desire to reach a proper understanding of the meaning of the eucharist has dominated much of Roman Catholic sacramental theology throughout the centuries. In order to be able to authentically celebrate that sacrament which Christ instituted at the Last Supper, Catholics need to have a full understanding of the meaning behind it. From the very beginnings of the early Church right up until the present day, this quest for meaning has been manifested in the controversies that have raged and are raging over the correct understanding of the sacrament. While the point of the disputes has often varied, one thing has remained the same: all were without doubt concerned with the proper meaning and authentic celebration of the eucharist.

In the earliest Christian times, the eucharist was celebrated simply and informally as part of an ordinary meal. Even at this early time, however, there is evidence of this concern for a meaningful celebration of the eucharist. To the Corinthians, St. Paul writes:

> When you meet together, it is not the Lord's Supper
> that you eat. For in eating, each one goes ahead with
> his own meal, and one is hungry and another drunk...
> For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning
> the body eats and drinks judgement upon himself...
> (RSV I Corinthians 11: 20-21, 29)

According to the Pauline account, that which was most important was not merely believing that Christ was present in the bread and wine, but recognizing and acknowledging, through actions of care and concern, Christ's presence in the Body--the members of the worshipping community. "Thus," according to Joseph Powers, "the focus for the theological

understanding is not on the bread and the cup, but on the community and the quality of its life."(2)

With the passing of the next few centuries, the celebration of the eucharist became more standardized. When the unity of the Church became a key issue, efforts were made to regulate the celebration of the eucharist under the bishops' authority. Gradually the fellowship meal described by Paul disappeared and was replaced by a symbolic, ritual meal. The basic pattern of eucharistic worship emerged during this time: an offering of bread and wine, prayers of thanksgiving, breaking of bread and reception by all present. By the sixth century, "...Christian eucharistic worship evolved from a comparatively brief and simple ritual meal into a richly elaborate ceremonial liturgy."(3) The concern during this period was, therefore, with the development and regulation of the celebration of the eucharist.

By the Middle Ages, an almost complete shift in emphasis had taken place. Once the pattern for worship had been standardized, attention was turned to other matters. It was during these centuries, then, that an official and complex doctrine of the eucharist was developed. As a result of the controversies and conflicts which ensued over the years, the Church was called upon to clarify and illuminate its own understanding of the eucharist. The centre of attention was no longer the liturgical action but rather the doctrines of the real presence of Christ and the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass. Of primary importance, therefore, were issues dealing with the eucharistic bread and wine: how were the bread and wine changed into Christ's body and blood, and at what point did the sacrifice take place?

Corresponding to the emphasis on doctrinal matters of real presence and sacrifice was a change in the practice of eucharistic worship. Of greatest importance was the priest who was the only person able to consecrate the bread and wine and enact the sacrifice. Attention came to be focused on the priest, the altar and the bread and wine, while the worshipping community faded into the passive role of onlookers. Emphasis on the divinity of Christ present in the bread and wine resulted in a decline of those who would partake of the eucharist and an increase of the adoration of the host. As well, the fact that the Mass was said in Latin (a language understood primarily only by the clergy) meant that most people could not participate actively. As a result, separate devotions based on the adoration of the sacred species flourished and replaced communal eucharistic worship. The eucharist was no longer a community celebration, but a rite presided over by the clergy. It is no wonder, then, than the ritual lacked meaning for those who attended.(4)

Up until the time of the Second Vatican Council, most Roman Catholics were content to continue in the role of passive spectators at the eucharistic celebration. With the demand for active promotion which was advocated by the Church fathers at Vatican II, however, came a deep desire on the part of many Catholics to rediscover and clarify the meaning of the eucharist for their own lives. They are no longer content to accept the reiteration of traditional doctrine. Rather, many Catholics are now demanding that the eucharist be taken beyond the traditional context and made relevant to their daily lives. For the eucharist to remain irrelevant to their lives is to rob it of the significance and meaning which is its true nature.

Over the last twenty five years, there have been a number of attempts to go beyond the traditional explanation of the eucharist. Some have dealt with certain aspects of traditional doctrine, reinterpreting it in terms that would make it more understandable and meaningful for contemporary Catholics. Others have ventured further from doctrinal issues, delving into previously little emphasized aspects of the eucharist. Without doubt, all attempts at reinterpretation aim at making the eucharist relevant and meaningful to the daily lives of those who participate in the celebration.

The purpose of this thesis is to examine more closely two of the more well known reinterpretations of the eucharist which have emerged since Vatican II. The first is the work done by Edward Schillebeeckx in the 1960's, particularly his decisive work on the subject: The Eucharist. The second reinterpretation to be examined will be the more recent developments in eucharistic theology that have arisen within the context of liberation theology. In particular, the writings of Tissa Balasuriya, Leonardo Boff and Juan Luis Segundo will be studied

. Moreover, after exploring each reinterpretation individually, this thesis will conclude by assessing the similarities between the two, as well as the possibilities and implications which are a result of such reinterpretations.

CHAPTER ONE: THE OFFICIAL DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST

In order to have something with which to compare the two reinterpretations of the eucharist which will be explored in the course of this thesis, it is first necessary to establish the official Roman Catholic doctrine of the eucharist. To this end, this chapter will examine the doctrine of the eucharist as it developed through the centuries both as a result of controversies with opponents and of internal clarifications by Roman Catholic theologians. Due to the fact that the major emphasis in doctrinal development during these centuries was on the two central dogmas of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist (including the allied dogmas of the totality of presence, transubstantiation, permanence of presence and adoration of Christ's presence in the eucharist) and the sacrifice of the Mass, attention will be focused on these two doctrines.

In recognition of the fact that a complete historical analysis is far beyond the scope of this chapter, yet realizing that some historical overview is necessary in order to establish the continuity of the doctrine of the eucharist throughout the centuries, I have chosen to briefly examine what I consider to be three of the more important developments in the doctrine: the Berengarian controversy of the eleventh century, Thomas Aquinas' exposition of the doctrine of the eucharist and the Council of Trent of the sixteenth century.

A. BERENGAR OF TOURS

The first eucharistic controversy to have made a significant impact on the development of the doctrine of the eucharist in general and of

the real presence in particular was that of the eleventh century which centered around the teaching of Berengar of Tours. This is not to say, of course, that eucharistic theology had never, up until that time, been debated. To the contrary, the controversy begun by Paschasius Radbertus in the ninth century over the identification of the eucharistic body of Christ and his natural, earthly body is ample evidence that the conflict between advocates of a spiritual interpretation based on Augustine and those of a realistic interpretation based on Ambrose was a constant one. (1) It was, nonetheless, the Berengarian controversy that led the Church to officially clarify and state its own understanding of the real presence and the change involved. It was, therefore, "the first occasion for an official procedure on the part of the Church."(2) It is for this reason, then, that the Berengarian controversy shall be the starting point in determining the development of the official Roman Catholic doctrine of the eucharist.

1. The Point at Issue

Before delving into an analysis of Berengar's theology of the eucharist and the Church's subsequent repudiation of it, it is necessary to note that the exact point of issue often seems debateable. (3) While it is clear that Berengar unquestionably denied the dogma of transubstantiation, there are divided opinions as to whether or not he also denied the central dogma of the eucharist--that is, the fact of the real presence. Although Berengar's blatant denial of transubstantiation did seem to be tantamount to a denial of the real presence, there were indications that Berengar did believe in the real presence. In his one surviving work, De Sacra Coena, phrases such as "You have it for certain that I say that the bread and wine of the altar are indeed the Body and

Blood of Christ after consecration" and "The bread and wine on the altar are converted by the consecration into the true Body and Blood of Christ" seem to suggest a profound belief in the real presence. (4) There were, however, only a remarkably few such passages in Berengar's teaching. Most importantly, this claim "is only possible if [these phrases] are isolated from the rest of his teaching." (5)

Further proof of Berengar's denial of the real presence rests in the fact that scholars, when dealing with Berengar's theology of the eucharist, delineate two distinct stages in the controversy.(6) The first, from 1048 to 1059, was focused mainly on the real presence. As Allan McDonald asserts, although there was some inquiry into the fact of a change and how this came about, "the first phase in the Berengarian controversy was occupied by the orthodox writers with establishing the doctrine of the real presence." (7) It was not until the second stage of the controversy, after the 1059 profession of faith was signed by Berengar, that the emphasis was shifted to the interpretation of the conversion which took place during consecration and the theory of transubstantiation. This is to say, then, that Berengar's contemporaries obviously felt that his teachings advocated a denial of the real presence, since it was with this doctrine that they themselves were concerned with defending up until 1059.

McDonald also suggests that if Berengar had only been denying the theory of transubstantiation (which was not yet official church doctrine), something could have been worked out:

> Berengar was too acute a thinker to fail to perceive that if the only point at issue between himself and the authorities of the Church was his contention that the substance of the bread and wine remained, an effective compromise was possible at that date, when the doctrine of Transubstantiation was not

> so unreservedly demanded by the Church as at a later era. (8)

In actual fact, then, Berengar was denying the real presence.

As well, McDonald emphasizes that another proof of Berengar's denial of the doctrine of the real presence is the fact that the doctrine was not even necessary according to Berengar's understanding of the eucharist. This is to say that because Berengar stressed that all religious value was in the elements themselves, there was no need for the actual body of Christ to be present.(9)

It would seem safe to assume, then, that despite certain statements which seemed to propound the doctrine of the real presence, Berengar was in fact denying the doctrine itself as well as the corollary theory of transubstantiation. It is undeniable, however, that the majority of Berengar's efforts were directed to a more detailed criticism of transubstantiation. At this point, then, it would be appropriate to turn attention to the development of Berengar's theology of the eucharist as well as the Church's response to that theology.

2. Berengar's Eucharistic Theology

From the beginning of his career, Berengar consistently attacked the identification of Christ's physical body with the eucharistic body. Hence, that he denied a physical presence is incontrovertible: there was no physical change whatsoever in the elements of bread and wine after consecration. Instead, the fundamental principle of Berengar's conception of the eucharist was a dynamic symbolism which emphasized the effectiveness of the consecrated elements for the worthy recipient. As Allan McDonald clearly explains: "consecration surrounds the elements, for those who have faith and understanding, with the religious value of the body and Blood of Christ."(10) This is to say that Berengar

asserted that consecration did in fact have an effect on the bread and wine insofar as it added the invisible spiritual significance of the heavenly body of Christ to the elements. A conversion did take place, but the elements remained what they were and had no personal relation to the earthly or risen body of Christ.(11)

Furthermore, whereas the Church taught that Christ's body and blood were not dependant on the faith of the recipient, Berengar insisted that the spiritual significance of the elements was totally dependent upon the recipient who, through faith and understanding, recognized that the elements were spiritually the body and blood of Christ. At consecration, the bread and wine were given the virtue of possessing the effectiveness of Christ's body and blood, but this effectiveness was only available to the recipient with faith: "The eucharist is the body of Christ for the inner man only. It is not in itself an objective quantity." (12)

It is necessary to note that this was not a mere memorialist interpretation which sought to explain the eucharist as a purely emotional recollection of a distant Christ in heaven. Berengar's theory, McDonald insists, "does not waive aside the spiritual Body and Blood of Christ with an assertion that the consecrated elements are a mere picture or representation of their spiritual counterpart."(13) To the contrary, Berengar's emphasis on the spiritual feeding by faith strongly suggests that he did in fact maintain a doctrine of spiritual as opposed to corporeal presence. The consecrated elements, while not actually containing the body of Christ, were in fact symbolic of that body insofar as they exerted its significance to the faithful recipient. As J. Gonzalez affirms, Berengar "insists that communion is efficacious

and that, while the bread and the wine continue existing, they become a "sacrament"--that is, a 'sign' of the body of the Lord which is in heaven." (14)

Berengar, therefore, did in fact admit that insofar as the consecrated elements were given an added spiritual significance, a change did take place during consecration. That which he resolutely denied and emphatically rejected, however, was any notion of a substantial conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. J. Pelikan explains as follows: "the fundamental difference between Berengar and his opponents over the real presence lay in the interpretation of the "conversion" which took place through the consecration of the bread and wine." (15) Hence, it was a rejection of the Church's as yet undefined dogma of transubstantiation.

Although transubstantiation was not yet an official doctrine, it is obvious from Berengar's reactions that the Church already unofficially advocated a theory of the complete change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. This to Berengar was ludicrous: "The opinion of Paschasius and Lanfranc that the substance of bread and wine does not remain on the altar after consecration is madness." (16) The bread and wine, according to Berengar, were given a new religious value, but they did not cease to exist. Hence, the term "conversion" referred to the new religious significance rather than the metabolic change of the bread and wine.

The grounds on which Berengar based his rejection were numerous. His first and leading idea was to introduce reason into Church doctrine. Accordingly, if one said that a substantial change took place at the consecration and yet still insisted that the bread and wine were the

true body and blood of Christ, then the bread and wine must still exist or the proposition would be false.(17) Along the same lines, Berengar argued that a substantial conversion was contrary to reason insofar as an accident could not exist apart from its substance and a change of substance would necessarily mean a change of form. It would, therefore, be impossible for the substance of the bread and wine to be destroyed without its essential attributes also being destroyed. (18)

Berengar also repudiated transubstantiation on the simple grounds that it was contrary to the senses. After consecration, the bread was quite obviously still bread and the wine remained wine. No change in appearance was equated with no change in substance; if the bread and wine could be seen and touched, this meant they were there. Despite the seeming simplicity of this argument, it is, Mcdonald asserts, "...the fundamental principle of the whole Berengarian criticism of the Catholic dogma of Transubstantiation. It is contrary to the evidence of the senses." (19)

Finally, Berengar rejected the idea of a substantial change on the grounds that it would be contrary to the laws of nature. As McDonald explains: "reason compels an admission that it is contrary to the law of nature that one thing can be changed into another without the breaking-up or annihilation of its original elements."(20) According to Berengar, then, if a material change had occurred, that change would have taken place in a substance which had not existed before. Given the fact that the body and blood of Christ had been in existence for ages, such a change was an impossibility. In addition, since Christ's body had existed in a state incapable of suffering and corruption since the

Resurrection that body could not be handled, broken and chewed as a substantial conversion would seem to imply.(21)

As a result of these arguments, then, Berengar in no uncertain terms argued that not only did the substance of bread and wine remain in the eucharist, but also that the substance of Christ was not contained therein. His was, therefore, a denial of both transubstantiation and the real presence.

3. Church's Response to Berengar's Eucharistic Theology

Perhaps the best way to gain insight into the Church's response to Berengar and its consequential elaboration and clarification of its own eucharistic theology would be to examine both the major orthodox theologians who were in large part responsible for the eucharistic theology contained in the confessions as well as the confessions themselves.

a) Oath of 1059

i) Durand of Troarn

One of the first formal treatises influencing the development of orthodox theology was the book by Durand of Troarn which attacked the symbolic interpretation advocated by Berengar. The uniqueness of Durand's thought, according to McDonald, lies in the fact that he outlined a distinct separation between two aspects of the eucharist: the outward appearance and the inner reality. "It is," McDonald maintains, "a new step in the attempt to define the difference between the eucharistic species and their spiritual significance." (22)

In regard to the spiritual significance, Durand asserted that while the eucharist was in some sense symbolical, it nonetheless possessed a real and true content. Although what the recipient received was a

symbol of body or blood, it was still, through similitude, the real body and blood of Christ. The inner reality of the eucharist, then, was the true and substantial body and blood which was made available through the Incarnation:

> Although something different appears to human eyes, although as a type it is not denied that it usefully signifies something different, the sacramental element is actually nothing else substantially than the true flesh and blood of Christ.(23)

Although some difficulties were inherent in Durand's thought, his biggest contribution to eucharistic theology was his conception of the eucharistic presence as a substantial presence, probably the earliest use of the term substantialiter.(24) According to Durand, it was upon consecration that the substance of the body of Christ--flesh, blood, divinity and humanity--was present to the recipient. Since this substantial presence was brought about by an invisible change in the nature (rather than the form) of the elements, the real body of Christ remained invisible. Hence, included in Durand's defense of the real presence was an implicit theory of transubstantiation.

ii) Bishop Humbert

Despite Durand's use of the term "substance", Bishop Humbert, who was in large part responsible for the confession of faith of 1059, never used the term. (25) The sacramental body, in this early formula, was described as being "the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and perceptibly not only in the Sacrament, but in reality, are touched and broken by the hands of the priest and ground by the teeth of the faithful." (26) No mention was made of the substance of Christ's body and blood. Neither did Humbert explain the change; he simply asserted

that the bread and wine after consecration were the true body and blood, with no explanation as to how this occurred.

b. Oath of 1079

In spite of the fact that Berengar was forced to read the grossly realistic oath of 1059, never was he called on to make a written statement of consent to it. Soon after, then, he recanted what he had read in the oath and continued to further develop his own ideas.

i) Lanfranc

One of Berengar's major opponents during this time was Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury. Without delving deeply into the conflict that arose between the two, it is necessary to note that Lanfranc did help to refine the orthodox eucharistic doctrine, especially in regards to two important points.

Lanfranc's greatest contribution to the clarification of eucharistic theology was his theory of the eucharistic change. This change, as Lanfranc understood it, was a transformation in the essence of the elements. McDonald explains Lanfranc's theology in these words:

> The bread and wine are changed in nature essentially. In their interior nature they are changed into those things which they were not before. They do not remain in their original essence. (27)

The eucharistic body of Christ, according to Lanfranc, did not exist before the consecration, but came into being as a result of it. It was the same body of Christ in essence as the historical body received by the Virgin and as the same glorified body which now existed in heaven. The appearance of it, however, was masked by the bread and wine. The qualities of bread and wine such as appearance, flavour and smell, then, were retained as a visible cover for the body and blood of Christ. This was not yet, as McDonald insists, a complex theory of substance and

accidents. It was, nonetheless, the basis for the establishment of the theory of transubstantiation. (28)

It is important to note at this point that there were grave difficulties with Lanfranc's theory of change. Most significant was Lanfranc's claim that the bread and wine were themselves symbolic, not of the body and blood of Christ, but of the bread and wine that formerly existed before they were transformed into the essence of the body of Christ. At the same time, however, he also asserted that the material bread fed the body. As Justo Gonzalez questions: "How can a bread that does not exist nourish a body?"(29)

Another major difficulty with Lanfranc's theory was that in spite of his assertion that the eucharistic body was identical with the historical body of Christ, he still had to admit that they were not entirely the same. That is, the eucharistic body, unlike Christ's historical body, did not exist before the consecration. It was here, however, that Lanfranc's insistence on the mystery of the change and content of the eucharist was developed. Thus, his second great accomplishment during this time was the fact that he attempted to refine many of the crudities that had come to surface as a result of attempts to assert the real presence. It was by this emphasis on mystery that he strove to overcome the physical implications of his theory on the change of essence.

Finally, according to Lanfranc, faith was preferable to reason when attempting to interpret the change and content of the eucharist; belief in the real body of Christ was an exercise of faith. Hence, he wrote: "Rather do we believe that which we do not see, that faith may exist, for it cannot exist if what is to be believed can be perceived by the

corporal senses." (30) This is not to say, however, that Lanfranc, like Berengar, believed that the presence of Christ was conditional on the perception and faith of the recipient. Rather, what was most important was what one received and not how one received. Thus, the real presence was for Lanfranc an objective presence, independent of the subjective perception of the recipient.

ii) Guitmond of Aversa

Another of Berengar's opponents who, according to Purday, most influenced the wording of the 1079 confession of faith was Guitmond of Aversa. (31) Guitmond's greatest contribution to orthodox eucharistic theology was his elaboration of the assertion that the bread and wine were substantially changed into the body and blood of Christ. That which was received and eaten in the eucharist, according to Guitmond, was the true body in its substance; the whole substance of bread no longer existed. As Gonzalez explains: "His realism is such that he claims that the consecrated bread does not physically nourish the person who eats it." (32)

Guitmond further developed the doctrine of the real presence with his clarification that while the historical body of Christ was in fact present, the eucharistic presence was nonetheless sacramental in nature. He affirmed that the eucharistic body did not have either the appearance or the form of the historical body. As McDonald elaborates: "Yet the sacramental process, although changing the bread into the substantial body of Christ, does not involve a change into actual flesh--that is, it has not the appearance of flesh."(33)

A further consequence of this sacramental process, according to Guitmond, was that the eucharistic body was not capable of corruption or

dissolution. Although it may have seemed that the body was broken and ground, this breaking and grinding only happened in actual fact to the elements. That which appeared to be destroyed were the accidents of the bread and wine. These accidents, however, existed without their substance since the substance of bread and wine had been replaced by the substance of Christ's body and blood. (34) While many difficulties are inherent in such an explanation, the important result of it was that the term "accidents" had become the corollary of "substance". Thus, as Pelikan asserts: "the way was prepared for the definitive statement of the doctrine of the real presence, which took the form of the dogma of transubstantiation."(35)

The insertion of the term "substance", therefore, was a major breakthrough both in safeguarding the belief in the real presence and in forcing Berengar to affirm his opponents' interpretation of the eucharistic change. The confession of 1079 thus reads:

> ...the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are substantially changed into the true and proper and living flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, our Lord, and that after consecration it is the true body of Christ which was born of the Virgin and which, offered for the salvation of the world, was suspended on the Cross, and which sitteth at the right hand of the Father and the true blood of Christ, which was poured out from his side...(36)

The use of "substance" was an affirmation both of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist and of the identification of the historical body of Christ with the eucharistic body. At the same time, it helped to avoid the crass physical implications of the earlier confession of 1059.

4. Results of the Controversy

As a result of the Berengarian controversy, substance and accidents became part of the standard vocabulary used by the Church to explain the

process of the eucharistic change. In addition to contributing to the formulation of transubstantiation, the controversy "began the philosophic grounding of orthodox eucharistic teaching."(37)

As well, the issue of the use of reason in theology was pushed to the forefront of the theological debate as a result of the Berengarian controversy. Berengar's main arguments against the real presence and transubstantiation were based on reason. As a result, he was often severely criticized for his lack of respect for authority. And yet, his opponents often used reason as a basis for their arguments as well. Hence, without solving the issue, the Berengarian conflict certainly brought it into the open for debate.

Most importantly, the Berengarian controversy inevitably was a factor that helped to clarify and unite the Church's teaching on eucharistic theology. Had the conflict not arisen, the Church would not have explored its own understanding of the eucharist to such a degree, nor would they have been forced to clarify and expound that understanding as an official statement.

B. THOMAS AQUINAS' EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY

Another major influence on the development of Roman Catholic eucharistic doctrine was Thomas Aquinas' treatise on the eucharist in the Summa Theologiae of the thirteenth century. (38) The two major issues which Thomas dealt with in his exposition on the eucharist were the sacrifice of the mass and the real presence since it was, he contended, these two factors which made the eucharist distinct from the other sacraments and which were the two main sources of grace. The distinctiveness of the eucharist, Thomas insisted, was the real presence

of Christ contained therein: "In the other sacraments we have not got Christ himself really as we have in this sacrament."(39) It is for this reason, then, that the majority of his treatise is devoted to a systematic, detailed exposition of the real presence.

No less important, however, was the sacrifice of the Mass: "This sacrament adds this to the other sacraments, the character of being a sacrifice."(40) While the explanation of the sacrificial aspect of the eucharist was considerably less than that of the real presence, this can perhaps be explained also by the fact that a doctrine of sacrifice in many ways presupposed a belief in the real presence. Hence, as J. de Baciocchi explains: "On ne peut avoir la réalité de l'acte de donner sans avoir la réalité de l'être donné."(41)

1. The Doctrine of the Real Presence

For Thomas, the fact of the real presence was certain. In regard to those who argued that Christ's body and blood were only symbolically present in the eucharist, Thomas declared that such a position was heretical. He affirmed that it was right "that it should contain Christ himself who suffered for us, and contain him, not merely as by a sign or figure, but in actual reality as well."(42) This is to say, as he explicated in III, 73, 1 ad 3, that the eucharist contains something that is sacred absolutely--Christ himself--whereas the other sacraments contain something sacred not absolutely, but in relation to their power to justify. In the eucharist the distinctive source of grace was Christ's real presence through which the recipient was united to God.

The presence of Christ in the eucharist was explained by Thomas in terms of transubstantiation.(43) Thus, he asserted that: "The complete substance of the bread is converted into the complete substance of

Christ's body, and the complete substance of the wine into the complete substance of Christ's blood."(44) At the moment of consecration, the words "This is my body...This is my blood", spoken by the validly ordained priest over the bread and wine transformed them into the substance of Christ's body and blood. This total conversion of the substance of the bread and the wine was, according to Thomas, the only way to render Christ present in the eucharist.(45)

In contrast to the other sacraments, the eucharist was fully established as soon as the words of institution were spoken over the matter of bread and wine. While it was the pouring of the water (and not the blessing of the water) which constituted baptism, the eucharist was accomplished as a result of consecration. Hence, Thomas wrote: "However, there is this difference, for other sacraments are accomplished in the application of their matter and are thus achieved in being received, but this sacrament is achieved in the consecration of the matter."(46)

It is necessary at this point to explain that Thomas did not see this consecration as a magical act performed by the priest. Rather, when the priest uttered the words, he was acting as an instrument through which Christ spoke. Thus, "the priest consecrates this sacrament, not by his own power, but as Christ's minister in whose person he acts."(47) Furthermore, Thomas emphasized again and again that this transformation was a result of divine power. In III, 75, 4, for example, he wrote: "This conversion, however, is not like any natural change, but it is entirely beyond the powers of nature and is brought about purely by God's action."

Thomas further contended that, after consecration, the substance of bread and wine no longer remained in the sacrament; they had not disappeared nor been annihilated, but had been transformed into the body and blood of Christ. The change which occurred, therefore, was an ontological change of substance.(48) This is not to say, of course, that the person who received the eucharist could actually see Christ's flesh and blood. Instead, as he explained, God had arranged that while the substance of the bread and wine were changed, the accidents remained the same so that what the person saw was not Christ's human appearance, but the bread and wine:

> Divine providence very wisely arranged for this. First of all, men have not the custom of eating human flesh and drinking human blood; indeed, the thought revolts them...Secondly, lest the sacrament should be an object of contempt for unbelievers, if we were to eat our Lord under his human appearance.(49)

Furthermore, Thomas insisted that Christ's body and blood were not subject to change after consecration. The actual body of Christ was not chewed and broken by the recipient:

> It remains then that the fraction takes place in the dimensive quantity of the bread, where all the other accidents find their subject. And just as the sacramental species are the sign of the real body of Christ, so the fraction of these species is the sign of our Lord's passion which he endured in his actual body.(50)

The mode of Christ's presence in the sacrament was a spiritual, non-visible and non-physical one according to Thomas. Christ's body was not in the sacrament in its natural appearance or form. Nor was it in the sacrament in the same way that a body was in a place, with its dimensions corresponding to the dimensions of the place which contained it. As he explained: "wherever this sacrament is celebrated he is present in an invisible way under sacramental appearance...Christ's body

is here in a special way that is proper to this sacrament."(51) Hence, the mode of Christ's presence in the eucharist was a sacramental one.

It was at this point, Thomas affirmed, that the need for faith arose. Since Christ's presence was an invisible one, it would be impossible for a person to know by virtue of the senses that Christ's body and blood were truly present. It was the person's faith, then, which was given by God, that had to accept what could not be seen or sensed. "Now faith," Thomas wrote, "has to do with unseen realities, and just as he offers his divinity to our acceptance as something that we do not see, so in this sacrament he offers his very flesh to us in like manner."(52) Hence, because Christ had testified, by means of the words with which he instituted the eucharist, that he would be truly present in the sacrament, the person was to believe this to be true. The eucharist was itself an object of faith.

Due to Christ's real presence, the eucharist was, according to Thomas, quite obviously a source of grace. However, it is necessary to note that he did not affirm that reception of the eucharist was a mechanistic bestowal of grace. Instead, he maintained a distinction between sacramental and spiritual eating which seemed to accurately emphasize the need for faith on the part of the recipient. Sacramental eating, he explained, was when the sacrament was received without the reception of the resultant grace.(53) In the case of the person who was in the state of mortal sin, for example, or even in the case of the person who did not have a correct spiritual disposition, reception of the sacrament did not mean appropriation of its grace. This is not to say that the sinner did not actually receive Christ's body and blood; if the bread and wine had been properly consecrated, they were and remained

Christ's body and blood.(54) However, the unworthy recipient did not receive the grace contained in the eucharist as a result of that real presence of Christ. In fact, Thomas even went so far as to maintain that "if a person while in mortal sin receives the sacrament he earns condemnation." (55) Sacramental eating, then, was limited to the physical act of receiving the eucharist.

Spiritual eating, on the other hand, included sacramental eating but added to it insofar as both the body and blood of Christ and the resultant grace were received. Hence, Thomas wrote:

> Since then the embryonic and the full-grown are contrasted, so the sacramental eating, in which the sacrament is received without its effect, is contrasted with the spiritual eating in which is received the sacramental effect whereby a person is spiritually joined to Christ in faith and charity.(56)

It is interesting to note at this point that while Thomas maintained that the actual reception of the eucharist did confer grace more fully, he did add that even if the sacrament could not be eaten sacramentally, it could be received spiritually if the desire for it was present.(57)

Finally, the greatest effect of Christ's real presence in the eucharist, according to Thomas, was the forgiveness of sins. There were, however, some distinctions. Insofar as a person was conscious of mortal sin, that person could not receive the forgiveness resultant of the eucharist. Nonetheless, when a person was in a state of mortal sin, but was not cognizant of the fact, the sin would be forgiven upon reception, or even as a result of the desire to receive the eucharist. Venial sins, on the other hand, could always be forgiven. In addition, Thomas also affirmed that the eucharist had a preservative effect against future sin. As spiritual food for the soul, the eucharist built up the strength by which the recipient could ward off the future attacks

of sin. (58) Moreover, the eucharist was able not only to evoke the forgiveness of sins, but also the penalty of sin: "it follows as a consequence and by way of concomitance to the principal effect that a person obtains pardon of the penalty of sin, not indeed of all of it, but proportionately to the measure of his devotion and fervour."(59)

The eucharist, Thomas contended, served to draw the recipient into closer communion with Christ and the Church. As such, it became spiritual nourishment for those who received it. Hence, he concluded, "the eucharist is the summit of the spiritual life and all the sacraments are ordered to it."(60)

2. The Sacrifice of the Mass

Although Thomas placed the most emphasis on the exposition of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, he also treated at some length the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass. His treatment of it is, however, quite brief as compared with that of the doctrine of the real presence. Perhaps the greatest reason for this, as Francis Clarke suggests, "was that no significant controversies had arisen on that question, whereas the controversies about the real presence had provided a fertile field for discussion."(61) Thomas' exposition of the sacrifice of the Mass was, then, for the most part a reiteration of the traditional understanding of the Mass as sacrifice, with little elaboration and few additions.

The essence of the eucharistic sacrifice, according to Thomas, was the sacrifice of Christ. At one point, quoting Augustine, Thomas affirmed: "Once Christ was sacrificed in his very self, yet daily he is sacrificed in the Mass" and at another point in the same article,

declared that "it is peculiar to this sacrament that in its celebration Christ is the sacrifice."(62)

The fact that Christ was indeed present in the eucharist under the species of bread and wine was for Thomas a certainty. Logically, then, since Christ was present in this way during the re-presentation of His Passion that occurred in the Mass, it must necessarily be Christ himself who was sacrificed. Hence, Thomas wrote: "The eucharist is the perfect sacrament of Our Lord's Passion, because it contains Christ himself who endured it."(63)

Furthermore, according to Thomas, it was the double consecration of the bread and wine that in fact effected the re-presentation of the Passion of Christ.(64) For example, in affirming that both Christ's body and blood were in fact present under each species, Thomas maintained that: "there is a point in having the two species. First of all, this serves to represent Christ's passion, in which his blood was separated from his body."(65) That which made the sacrifice, therefore, was the actual consecration of bread and wine which made it into the body and blood of Christ.

John Hughes, in his discussion of Thomas' doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, further develops this relationship between the consecration and the sacrifice. He refers to Thomas' definition of sacrifice in general which ascertains that a sacrifice occurs when something is done to the object offered to God. Hughes' conclusion is that "in short, St. Thomas located the sacrifice of the Mass not in an offering of the body and blood of Christ subsequent to the consecration, but in the consecration of the elements themselves." (66)

The real presence of Christ in the eucharist, therefore, was ascertained by Thomas as proof that Christ was in fact sacrificed in the Mass. In other words, this assertion meant that the sacrifice of the Mass was the same sacrifice as that of Calvary insofar as the victim of the sacrifice was the same--Christ.(67) And yet, while emphasizing the identity of the two, Thomas necessarily maintained that Christ was present as victim in the sacrifice of the Mass under the sacramental species and in an unbloody manner: "But the body of Christ is not eaten as under its natural form, but as under the sacramental species."(68)

Furthermore, not only was the victim the same in both the sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the Mass, but so also, according to Thomas, was the priest, again albeit in a sacramental way. While he did in fact give great importance to the power of the priest who consecrated the bread and wine and who communicated in the person of all present, Thomas was nonetheless most emphatic in his assertion that the priest was not acting in his own person, but in the person of Christ. "The priest," he explained, "consecrates this sacrament, not by his own power, but as Christ's minister in whose person he acts."(69) The priest, therefore, was in essence Christ himself. This is, as Colman O'Neill succinctly expresses, the factor which makes the mass a true sacrifice: "For that is required an active offering of the victim; and, according to Thomists, it is Christ himself who actually, not merely virtually, makes this offering." (70)

Another important notion which Thomas expanded upon in order to explain why the celebration of the eucharist was called the sacrifice of Christ was the description of the Mass as the memorial and re-presentation of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary. Quoting Augustine, he explained:

> As Augustine writes, Images are called by the names of the things of which they are images, thus looking at a picture or fresco we say, That is Cicero, or, That is Sallust. Now, as we have said, the celebration of this sacrament is a definite image representing Christ's passion, which is his true sacrifice.(71)

As a memorial of Christ's Passion, the eucharist was to commemorate the Passion that happened in the past, as Christ himself requested at the Last Supper: "This sacrament was instituted at the Lord's Supper that it might in the future be a memorial of the Passion when that had been accomplished."(72)

More importantly, however, was the notion of the Mass as the re-presentation of Christ's Passion. Thomas' concept of a re-presentative image in no way meant a mere mental recollection of the unique sacrifice of Calvary on the part of the worshippers. As J. de Baciocchi attests, Thomas did not use the term "re-presentation" in the sense "qui suggère une simple évocation mental sans présence effective de l'objet ou de l'évenement."(73) Rather, his use of the term could better be expressed as a re-presentation wherein the sacrifice of the mass once again made present the sacrifice of Calvary. In Thomas' own words: "[The eucharist] has the nature of a sacrifice inasmuch as it makes present Christ's Passion."(74) The sacrifice of the Mass was not, therefore, a different sacrifice from that of Calvary but a re-presentation of it; the sacrifice of the Mass is Christ's sacrifice of the Cross offered in a sacramental manner.

Thomas gave much attention to outlining the various ways that the eucharist re-presented the Passion. The eucharist, he noted, was the only sacrament that was both received and offered, and insofar as it was offered, it had the nature of a sacrifice.(75) At still another point, Thomas declared that the host was broken during Mass in order to signify

the breaking of Christ's body during his Passion.(76) As well, in III, 76, 2 ad 1, Thomas explained that the fact that the eucharist consisted of two species signified the Passion in which Christ's blood was separated from his body. Likewise, at another point, he affirmed that: "the blood consecrated separately from the body gives us a more vivid representation of Christ's Passion."(77) Hence, further proof is shown of Thomas' assertion that it was by means of the double consecration that the Passion of Christ was most effectively re-presented.

Finally, intricately linked with the affirmation of the Mass as the re-presentation of Christ's Passion was Thomas' assertion that the eucharist was the sacrifice of Christ insofar as it carried on and applied the effects of that Passion which it re-presented. The forgiveness of sins won on the cross was, in the Mass, applied to each individual. Since it was Christ's Passion that was re-presented, "accordingly the effect his Passion wrought in the world the sacrament works in a man."(78) The sacrifice of the Mass, therefore, was one with the sacrifice of Calvary.

C. COUNCIL OF TRENT

A third great historical event which had a significant impact on the development of the doctrine of the eucharist was the Council of Trent of the sixteenth century. The importance of the clarification of the doctrine of the eucharist for the Council participants was obvious: more time and thought was devoted to the exposition on the eucharist than to all the other sacraments combined. It is important to note, however, that this exposition was in no way a complete analysis of

eucharistic doctrine. It was, rather, a reaction against the doctrine as set out by the Reformers. As K. McDonnell succinctly expresses:

> The Fathers had no intention of giving an exhaustive exposition of all the aspects of sacramental doctrine; they intended that the decrees constitute only the necessary minimum, in opposition and contrast to the prevailing heresies.(79)

The decrees of the Council were, therefore, polemical in tone.

While it is true that many practical issues such as communion under both species and the use of the vernacular were dealt with by the Council Fathers, the two main doctrinal issues were, once again, the real presence of Christ in the eucharist and the sacrifice of the Mass. Again, in light of the fact that the Council was in many ways a response to the Reformers, only those features of the real presence and the sacrifice of the mass which had been disputed were treated in great depth in the decrees. Little mention was made of those issues on which the Reformers and the Roman Catholic church were in agreement.

1. The Doctrine of the Real Presence

According to Joseph Powers, there are two essential affirmations in Trent's Decree on the Most Holy Eucharist: that of a distinct, real and sacramental presence of Christ in the eucharist and that of the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ which this real presence demanded.(8Ø) According to most scholars, the basic concern of this thirteenth session of Trent was to clarify exactly what was contained in the eucharist. Jaroslav Pelikan, for example, emphasizes this point by stating that: "The specification of that content was the most important issue in the first stage of the conciliar discussions, for on this issue most of the others depended."(81) This concern, then, led to both the affirmation of the doctrine of the real presence of

Christ as well as the affirmation of the aptness of the dogma of transubstantiation that was the means used to express the real presence.

a) Affirmation of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist

The first doctrinal issue which was dealt with at Trent was certain Reformers' assertions that the body and blood of Christ were present in the eucharist only as in a sign or figure. Zwingli and Carlstadt (among others) had denied the real presence and insisted instead upon a symbolic interpretation of the words of institution. (83) The result of such an interpretation was that the eucharist was seen as a meal of remembrance only. That is to say that according to these Reformers, the whole point of the eucharist was to remember Christ's saving death and, by faith, lift oneself to heaven to commune with Christ there.

In response to this denial of the real presence, the Council Fathers re-affirmed the actual reality of Christ's presence in the eucharist by issuing the following canon:

> If anyone denies that in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially contained the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ, but shall say that He is in it as by a sign or figure, or force, let him be anathema.(84)

That which was present in the eucharist was Christ in his entirety--body, blood, soul and divinity. The change which took place in the elements, therefore, was necessarily a radical change of being.

How this real presence was possible was explained by the Fathers in terms of concomitance. That is, Christ's body and blood were present in the sacrament by obvious virtue of the words of institution. By virtue of concomitance--that is, by virtue of the fact that all parts of Christ are united--Christ's divinity and soul were also present. As Chapter Three of the Decree set forth: "by force of that natural concomitance

by which the parts of Christ the Lord...are mutually united, the divinity also because of that admirable hypostatic union with His body and soul."(85) Carrying this even a step further, the Fathers asserted that Christ was wholly and entirely present under each species and each part of each species. Christ's body and blood, soul and divinity were therefore present in their entirety under the species of the bread alone or the wine alone, as well as under each fragment or drop of the bread and wine. Hence, Chapter Three concluded: "For Christ whole and entire exists under the species of bread and under any part whatsoever of that species, likewise the whole Christ is present under the species of wine and under its parts."(86)

The manner in which Christ was present in the sacrament, furthermore, was explained in the Decree in the following terms: "truly", "really", "substantially" and "contained under the species." An understanding of these terms, J. de Baciocchi insists, is of the utmost importance to gaining an understanding of the doctrine as expressed by the Council. "Truly", according to de Baciocchi, expressed the belief that the real presence was in accord with the words of Christ, who clearly stated "This is my body." "Really" was the term used to discredit the belief that Christ was present only in a figurative manner. "Substantially" was used to emphasize the fact that that which was contained was Christ's very being--human and divine. "Contained under the species", finally, signified that Christ's presence was not a spatial presence, but a sacramental one which was not in the least contradictory to His presence at the right hand of the Father. (87)

A further re-affirmation of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist was to be found by the Fathers in maintaining the excellence

of the eucharist over the other sacraments. In Chapter Three, it was declared that: "this excellent and peculiar thing is found in it, that the other sacraments first have the power of sanctifying, when one uses them, but in the Eucharist there is the Author of sanctity Himself before it is used."(88) This was to say that Christ was bodily present in the eucharist upon consecration. It was, therefore, an objective presence which was not dependent upon either its use or its reception. Contrary to the Reformers' insistence on the importance of faith in the reception of the eucharist, the Council Fathers adamantly maintained that Christ was present in the eucharist regardless of the recipient's faith.

Likewise, the real presence was re-emphasized by the Council's insistence on the lasting presence or permanence of Christ in the eucharist. In Canon Four, for example, an anathema was pronounced on anyone who denied that Christ's body and blood were present "only in its use, while it is taken, not however before or after, and that in the hosts or consecrated particles, which are reserved or remain after communion."(89) Hence, contrary to certain Reformers' opinions that Christ's body and blood were present only for the purpose of reception or communion, Chapter Five and Six of the Decree emphasized the appropriateness of the reservation of the sacrament both for veneration and to be taken to the sick. The affirmation of the reservation of the sacrament, therefore, pointed to the permanence of Christ's presence therein.(90)

b) Transubstantiation

In addition to examining and safeguarding the Church's belief in the doctrine of the real presence, the Council of Trent also found it

necessary to define the change of substance which was being used to affirm the real presence and which many of the Reformers were denying. Martin Luther, for example, while retaining the traditional doctrine of the real presence, denied both the complete conversion of substance and the separation of substance and accidents which were necessary factors in the dogma of transubstantiation. For Luther, the doctrine of the real presence should not have been dependent on transubstantiation. Transubstantiation, he argued, was merely an opinion rather than an article of faith and could, therefore, be held or not held with freedom.(91) Nonetheless, he did list transubstantiation alongside with the withholding of the cup from the laity and the sacrifice of the mass as one of the three captivities of the sacrament, calling it "a monstrous word and a monstrous idea."(92)

In response to Luther's (as well as other Reformers) denial of transubstantiation, the Council vehemently declared: "by the consecration of the bread and wine a conversion takes place of the whole substance of bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood."(93) This affirmation of a total conversion, as was further explained in Canon Two, necessarily implied first that the substance of bread and wine no longer existed after consecration and second, that only the species of bread and wine remained.(94) The whole substance of bread and wine were therefore converted into the whole substance of Christ's body and blood which were, nonetheless, contained under the remaining species of bread and wine.

It is necessary to note at this point that both the chapter and the canon which dealt with transubstantiation affirmed the appropriateness

of the term itself. "This conversion," Chapter Four continued, "is appropriately and properly called transubstantiation by the Catholic Church."(95) The use of the term, as many scholars insist, was met by some opposition. Schillebeeckx, for example, explains that some of the Council Fathers expressed the concern that the Council should not use a term which had been introduced so recently into Roman Catholic eucharistic theology.(96) Pelikan, furthermore, explains that there was some hesitation about its use because of the reason it had first been used by the Church. Of one of the Council Fathers in particular, Pelikan explains:

> While he acknowledged that 'since the beginning of the church there has scarcely been a more general and universal' council than the Fourth Lateran, he had nevertheless come to the conclusion that the outside pressure of heresy rather than the inherent appropriateness of the term had been responsible for that council's adoption of transubstantiation. (97)

Despite this opposition, however, transubstantiation was defended as the legitimate tradition of the Church and was subsequently used by the Council as the manner of expressing the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. Perhaps the best explanation for this is, as Schillebeeckx maintains, the fact that the term itself became "a political banner of the orthodox faith, very suitably proclaiming in the sixteenth-century situation, the difference between the Reformers' and the Catholic view of the Eucharist."(98)

In spite of the philosophical implications of the term "transubstantiation", the majority of scholars agree that the Council Fathers did not sanction one particular philosophical framework as a necessary part of the dogma of transubstantiation.(99) Thomas Ambrogi, for example, declares that "the dogmatic definition does not include the necessary identity of the dogma with its expression in an aristotelian-

scholastic dialectic of substance and accidents."(100) With regards to the term "substance', most scholars agree that it was not intended to be understood in a precise philosophical sense, but was rather used in the ordinary sense. "Substance", then, was understood by the Council Fathers to mean the profound reality of a thing as distinct from its appearance.(101)

Furthermore, the word "accidents" did not appear at all in the official decree, but was replaced by the term "species" as the corollary of "substance". According to Gustave Martelet, by not using the term "substance", any suggestions of systematic philosophy were denied: "when the word 'substance' is deprived of its habitual partner (represented, in the technical language of the time, by the word 'accidents'), it is detached from the philosophical universe in which it normally moves."(102) Due to the disassociation of "substance" and "accidents", then, any implications that Aristotelian philosophy must necessarily be used to explain the change of substance of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ were thereby avoided.

The major concern of the Council Fathers was <u>not</u> for the term itself or the philosophy implied, but for the affirmation of the profundity of the change which the term "transubstantiation" aptly suggested. This is to say that transubstantiation had become <u>the</u> official means by which the radical ontological change demanded by the real presence was expressed and safeguarded.(103)

2. The Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass

Eleven years after the <u>Decree on the Most Holy Eucharist</u> was issued, another important document dealing with the eucharist was written: <u>The Doctrine on the Most Holy Sacrifice</u>. The issue of the

sacrifice of the Mass was, once again, one that was greatly contested by many of the Reformers. Luther, for example, adamantly maintained that "as the greatest of all abominations I regard the mass when it is preached or sold as a sacrifice or good work."(104)

One factor that is, I would suggest, of great importance is that the exposition of the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass had, with the exception of the work of Thomas Aquinas, not been very noteworthy up until the time of the Reformation. As John Hughes aptly explains:

> The Catholic apologists in the Reformation period were hampered by the fact that they had inherited no living theology of eucharistic sacrifice. For several centuries the theologians had concentrated their attention more and more on the question of the real presence.(105)

It was, therefore, the task of the Council Fathers to delineate as clearly as possible a theology of eucharistic sacrifice and to maintain that theology as official doctrine.

The main doctrinal point to be set forth by the Council was the affirmation that the eucharist was a true and proper sacrifice insofar as Christ himself was contained under the species of bread and wine: "If anyone says that in the mass a true and real sacrifice is not offered to God, or that the act of offering is nothing else than Christ being given to us to eat: let him be anathema."(106) The sacrifice of the Mass was to be understood as the sacrifice of Christ himself through the priest. That God desired this to be so was obvious to the Fathers: it was foretold through Malachi, prefigured in the sacrifice of the Old Testament, and affirmed by Paul.(107)

The priesthood, furthermore, was established by Christ especially for the purpose of offering this sacrifice: through them Christ would continue forever the sacrifice which he began at the Last Supper when he

offered himself to the Father. At the Last Supper, Christ "offered to God the Father His own body and blood under the species of bread and wine, and under the symbols of those same things gave to the apostles (whom He then constituted priests of the New Testament)."(108)

The doctrinal point which was given the most attention was that dealing with the relationship between the sacrifice of the Cross and the sacrifice of the Mass. The Reformers' claim that the sacrifice of the Mass took away from or implied that something was missing from the sacrifice of the Cross, forced the Council Fathers to effectively describe and elaborate on the relation between the two.(109) The Fathers countered this attack by insisting that the sacrifice of the Mass did not cast blasphemy upon the sacrifice of the Cross precisely because the two sacrifices were the same. That is, insofar as "it is one and the same Victim, the same now offering by the ministry of priests as He who then offered Himself on the Cross", the sacrifice of the Mass is at one with that of the Cross. (110) The only difference between the two was the manner of offering. Through the priest, Christ did in fact offer Himself under the species of bread and wine, albeit in an unbloody manner. The difference, therefore, was that on the Cross Christ was immolated in a bloody manner; in the eucharist, he was immolated in an unbloody manner under the sacramental species.

The sacrifice of the Mass was believed by the Fathers to be a true sacrifice in and of itself. As Thomas Ambrogi clarifies, however, "the Mass is not an absolute sacrifice, but was instituted at the Last Supper as a relative sacrifice."(111) This is to say that the Mass was in itself a true sacrifice that was nonetheless related to the sacrifice of the Cross and a re-presentation of it. The Mass was more than a mere

commemoration of the Cross (although it was that too); it was a re-presentation which made that once-for-all sacrifice present. Hence, in Chapter One it was declared that Christ left the Church a visible sacrifice, "whereby that bloody sacrifice once completed on the Cross might be represented."(112)

In addition, certain Reformers proposed that the Mass was only a commemoration of the sacrifice of Calvary or that the only sacrifice contained in the Mass was that of praise and thanksgiving. As a result, the Council Fathers were forced to go a step beyond the idea of the Mass as a re-presentation of the sacrifice of the Cross and forcefully assert that the sacrifice of the Mass was in fact a propitiatory sacrifice.(113) Through it, they insisted, the forgiveness of sin won on the Cross was applied to the individual person who approached the Mass with faith and repentance: "the fruits of that oblation (bloody, that is) are received most abundantly through this unbloody one."(114) And, not only was the forgiveness of sin applied to the repentant person, but so also the punishment and satisfaction for sin. Finally, according to the Council, the sacrifice of the Mass applied the merits of the Cross not only to those who received, but to all people, living and dead, for whom it was offered. It is important to note, however, that great emphasis was placed on the fact that the merits of the sacrifice of the Mass were solely a result of those won on the Cross. All efficacy of the Mass, therefore, was due to the sacrifice of the Cross and was in no way derogatory to that once-for-all sacrifice.(115)

D. CONCLUSION

Each of the three developments which were examined helped in its own way to clarify and unite the Church's teaching on the doctrine of the eucharist. As a result of the Berengarian controversy, previously widely accepted concepts became official teaching. Aquinas' exposition of the eucharist gave a systematic and in depth presentation of the Catholic doctrines of the real presence and the sacrifice of the Mass, while the Council of Trent for the most part re-affirmed that traditional teaching in an official capacity.

With regards to the doctrine of the real presence, a certain objectivity gradually began to be emphasized in the doctrine. While Berengar insisted that without the faith of the recipient, Christ could not be present, Aquinas taught that although faith was in fact necessary for spiritual eating, Christ was present regardless of the individual's faith. In reaction to certain Reformers, Trent confirmed this by stating that Christ was bodily present in the Eucharist regardless of the faith of the believer and for as long as the species of bread and wine existed. Transubstantiation was also affirmed during these centuries as the valid manner of expressing the reality of Christ's presence. That is, belief in a change of substance became synonymous with the belief in the real presence. With regard to the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, the belief that the Mass was a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice was insisted upon by those who dealt with the doctrine. However, the fact that the sacrifice of the Mass was reliant on the unique, all-sufficient sacrifice of the cross was especially emphasized in the doctrine on sacrifice. It was, therefore, related to the Cross insofar as it was a re-presentation of that sacrifice, a

memorial of it, and most importantly, the application of the merits of that sacrifice.

This, then, is the official Roman Catholic doctrine of the eucharist which has been passed down through the centuries to the present day.

CHAPTER TWO: EUCHARISTIC RENEWAL AT VATICAN II

With little change, the eucharistic doctrine which was examined in the last chapter is the understanding of the eucharist which has prevailed into the twentieth century. To the majority of Roman Catholics, these two doctrines of the real presence of Christ and the sacrifice of the Mass defined the essence of the eucharist. In the latter part of the twentieth century, however, there came the recognition that the majority of Catholics attended the eucharistic celebrations as passive spectators who had little understanding of the true meaning behind the eucharist. In many ways, the eucharist had lost its transforming meaning and was but a shell of what it was meant to be.

In recognition of this lack of meaning which the eucharist held for many people, the twentieth century liturgical movement in general and the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in particular set out to restore that meaning. The culmination of many decades of work, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy promulgated in 1963 at the Second Vatican Council has as its primary goal the reform of the eucharistic liturgy. Reform, however, is not meant to be understood in terms of revolution, but rather as a revitalization of that which already exists. Josef Jungmann, in his commentary on the Constitution, explains:

> The reform of the liturgy cannot be a revolution. It must try to grasp the real meaning and the basic structure of the traditional rites and, making prudent use of existing deposits, build them on organically in the direction indicated by the pastoral needs of a living liturgy.(1)

Doctrinal issues centering around the real presence or sacrifice of the Mass, while important, are not central to the Constitution. What is important is that the ritual itself be made meaningful for the majority of Roman Catholic laypeople who attended the Sunday liturgies.

Relevance, then, is the key word for expressing that which is sought: reform of the liturgy must make the traditional rites meaningful and applicable for those who take part in them now. This chapter, then, will explore this twentieth century period of the development of eucharistic theology, a period which undoubtedly laid the groundwork for the reinterpretations which would follow.

A. LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

For decades before Vatican II, the liturgical reform movement had been a vital force in the Roman Catholic church; a force which promoted the active participation of all members of the church.(2) Starting as early as 1903 with Pope Pius X's decree on frequent communion, the whole idea of a liturgical reform gradually gained momentum until, in 1947, the call to reform was given official sanctioning: Mediator Dei was issued on November 20 of that year. In it, Pius XII ratified the liturgical movement of the previous decades and culminated his approval with the statement that "the Christian community is in duty bound to participate in the liturgical rites according to their station."(3) The entire aim of this reform, then, as Adrian Hastings maintains:

> ...is to make full meaning of the liturgy and the sacraments more manifest, thus assisting the faithful to enter into them more deliberately and more effectively and so benefit, not only ex opere operato (which does not vary), but also as much as possible ex opere operantis (which does vary enormously.(4)

Active participation, then, was the hoped-for end result of the movement.

Despite the emphasis of the liturgical movement on participation, however, a theological and doctrinal grounding was still perceived as a necessary basis for reform. That is, the faithful, in order to participate, must have some theological knowledge about that in which

they are participating. Hence, in Mediator Dei, for example, the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass as set out by Trent was resolutely maintained: "the Church prolongs the priestly mission of Jesus Christ mainly by means of the sacred Liturgy. She does this in the first place at the altar, where constantly the sacrifice of the Cross is represented and, with a single difference in the manner of its offering, renewed."(5) Likewise, the real presence of Christ in the eucharist was also clearly taught: "Christ is present at the august sacrifice of the altar...above all under the eucharistic species."(6)

While keeping doctrine in mind, however, the emphasis of the liturgical movement was clearly focused for the most part on the practical, pastoral aspect of the liturgy. Such an emphasis can quite likely be attributed to the fact that the practical aspect (especially participation) had largely been neglected in previous centuries. That is, so much emphasis had been placed on asserting the doctrinal points against prevailing heresies that the practical issues had been all but ignored.

B. VATICAN II--CONCILIAR EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY

The veritable high point of the liturgical movement was the promulgation on 4 December 1963 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. As a constitution, this document has a definite permanency to it: it is not meant to settle temporary questions but rather is a permanent Church law that must be adhered to. It is, however, presented not so much as a dogmatic statement but as a pastoral guideline which must nonetheless be carried out to the fullest possible extent.(7)

The goal of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy is stated at the very outset of the document: the renewal of the liturgy.

> It is the goal of this most sacred Council to intensify the daily growth of Catholics in Christian living; to make more responsive to the daily requirements of our times those Church observances which are open to adaptation; to nurture whatever can contribute to the unity of all who believe in Christ; and to strengthen those aspects of the Church which can help summon all of mankind into her embrace. Hence the Council has special reasons for judging it a duty to provide for the renewal and fostering of the liturgy.(8)

The primary concern of the document is, therefore, with the practicalities involved with the renewal of the liturgy. This is not to say, of course, that the doctrinal aspect is neglected. To the contrary, the official eucharistic doctrine which was already firmly established by the time of the Council, is quite evidently the basis of the entire document. As well, the official doctrine is extensively stated in The Roman Catechism which was published in accordance with Vatican II and post-conciliar documents. (9) Hence, in an attempt to clarify the meaning and significance of the doctrine of the eucharist, the vast majority of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy is devoted to the renewal of the liturgy.

The purpose behind renewing the liturgy is evident at first glance: "In the restoration and promotion of the sacred liturgy this full and active participation by all people is the aim to be considered before all else..."(10) The promotion of the active participation of all those present is, then, the dominant theme running through the Constitution. Over and over throughout the document, this active participation is demanded of the faithful. It has in fact been referred to as the refrain of the Constitution, since it occurs a total of fifteen times in the document.(11)

As well, this same theme is repeated at length in many of the post-conciliar documents. In his address to the United States bishops in

1978, for example, Pope Paul VI admonishes: "All the pastoral endeavors of our ministry are incomplete until the people that we are called to serve are led to full and active participation in the Eucharist."(12)

That such participation in the liturgy is a right and duty of all people is made clear in the Constitution: "Such participation by the Christian people as "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people" (1 Pet. 2:9; cf. 2:4-5), is their right and duty by reason of their baptism."(13) By virtue of baptism, all people share in the priesthood and are thereby called to worship God by actively participating in the liturgy.

It is important to indicate at this point that a major influence on this concept of the priesthood of all believers is the new vision of the church as the pilgrim people of God.(14) Before the Council, the term "Church" was often thought to be synonymous with clergy. With the development of the concept of people of God, however, the essential role of the laity is restored. The equality of laypeople is clearly stated in the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church:

> [Laypeople] are by baptism made one body with Christ and are established among the People of God. They are in their own way made sharers in the priestly, prophetic, and kingly functions of Christ...Therefore, the chosen People of God is one: "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph. 4:5). As members, they share a common dignity from their rebirth in Christ. They have the same filial grace and the same vocation to perfection. They possess in common one salvation, one hope, and one undivided charity.(15)

Thus, the concept of people of God marks the return to a communitarian theology of church. It emphasizes that the church is not made up of two separate entities—clergy and laity—but rather of one people. As a result, the layperson "...now enters the church building not as a second-class citizen, but as a living member of that primary category

that God first called to the work of salvation, viz, the People of God..."(16)

Nowhere should this equality between laity and clergy be more evident than in the liturgy. By baptism in Christ, all are called to take part in His worship. This does not mean, of course, that the distinctive role of the hierarchical priesthood is to be eliminated. It does mean, however, that the liturgy should not be an isolated action of the priest at which the faithful remain passive, but an action which concerns all members of the Church, albeit in different ways and with distinctive roles:

> Therefore liturgical services pertain to the whole body of the Church; they manifest it and have effects upon it; but they concern individual members of the Church in different ways, according to the diversity of holy orders, functions, and degrees of participation.(17)

Active participation by <u>all</u> members of the church is therefore a necessity.

Moreover, in keeping with the new understanding of the church as the people of God, great emphasis is placed on the primacy of the Christian community. As a result, the <u>Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy</u> stresses that a communal celebration is to be selected over a private ceremony:

> It is to be stressed that whenever rites, according to their specific nature, make provision for communal celebration involving the presence and active participation of the faithful, this way of celebrating them is to be preferred, as far as possible, to a celebration that is individual and quasi-private.(18)

Hence, the individualistic piety that had perceived the liturgy as a source of individual salvation is replaced by an understanding of the liturgy as an act of fellowship which incorporates the participants into a community with one another in and through Christ. As George Lindbeck

explicates: "Now, however, the emphasis has shifted to viewing worship as a matter not simply of our own individual relations to God but of incorporation into Christ through and together with our neighbors."(19) The liturgy, therefore, must necessarily grow into a commemoration of Christ's Paschal Mystery that is celebrated by the entire community rather than simply the clergy. And, since it is the whole community that celebrates the eucharist, participation is an essential element.

Finally, the reason that participation is essential, according to the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, is so that the liturgy may fully effect the grace which is contained therein:

> In order that the sacred liturgy may produce its full effect, it is necessary that the faithful come to it with proper dispositions, that their thoughts match their words, and that they cooperate with divine grace lest they receive it in vain.(20)

That is to say that while grace is indeed given to those who attend the liturgy as long as the sacramental action is validly performed, the benefits of that grace are received only by those who actively and knowingly participate. The objective gift of grace is received only by those who actively and knowingly participate. Hence, grace is received through participation, faith and knowledge.

Before delineating the means by which to promote active participation in the liturgy, it is first necessary to explain at some length what the meaning of the liturgy is as it is found in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. Full participation in the liturgy cannot be achieved unless those who are called upon to participate have some understanding of what the liturgy is. As well, as Everett Diederick insists, "we cannot make active participation an end term or merely an

external production."(21) The meaning of the liturgy must therefore be interiorized if active participation is to be authentic.

The basis of the Council's exposition is that the liturgy is the celebration of the Paschal Mystery of Christ through which God revealed His love:

> From that time onward the Church has never failed to come together to celebrate the paschal mystery: reading "in all scriptures the things referring to himself" (Lk. 24:27), celebrating the Eucharist in which "the victory and triumph of his death are again made present, and at the same time giving thanks "to God for his unspeakable gift" (2 Cor. 9:15) in Christ Jesus, "to the praise of his glory" (Eph. 1:12), through the power of the Holy Spirit. (22)

This is to say, then, that the liturgy makes present that action whereby humanity's salvation was won: the Passion, the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ. Rather than a simple memorial of that saving action, the liturgy makes the salvation won by that action fully present to those who, by participating in it, share in the life of Christ. It is, therefore, the sacramental re-enactment of Christ's Paschal mystery which accomplishes each week that which was once accomplished. That is, it is through the liturgy that the effects wrought by Christ's death are continued by His Church which shares in His life. "The effects of the paschal mystery of Christ's passion, resurrection, and ascension and of His sending of the Holy Spirit," Raymond Fullam maintains, "are renewed whenever His people assemble for participation in liturgical celebration."(23) The grace which is present in the liturgy is, therefore, that which is a result of Christ's saving action which is weekly proclaimed and accomplished now through the activity of the Church.

An essential element for this celebration of the Paschal mystery of Christ in the liturgy is the fact that Christ is truly present in the celebration:

> Christ is always present in His Church, especially in her liturgical celebrations. He is present in the sacrifice of the Mass, not only in the person of His minister, "the same one now offering, through the ministry of priests, who formerly offered himself on the cross," but especially under the Eucharistic species. By His power He is present in the sacraments, so that when a man baptizes it is really Christ himself who baptizes. He is present in His word, since it is he Himself who speaks when the holy Scriptures are read in the Church. He is present finally when the Church prays and sings, for He promised: "Where two or three are gathered together for my sake, there am I in the midst of them" (Mt. 18:20) (24)

According to conciliar theology, Christ is present at all times in the complete liturgy of His Church, not only in the liturgy of the Mass. That is, He is present not only under the eucharistic species and in the person of the minister in the Mass, but in the Word, the sacraments and the Church's worship as well. The traditional emphasis of the real presence of Christ is, therefore, extended by the Council to include his real presence in all aspects of the liturgy.

According to Joseph Powers, this emphasis on the multiple presences of Christ in the liturgy marks a return to a more Pauline theology of celebration. The eucharist is therefore understood not simply as the bread and wine, but rather as the entire communal liturgical celebration. He explains: "In the theology of celebration, the presence of Jesus to and in his community is real and effective in the whole action of the Eucharist..." and again, "The presence of Christ is seen as the enlivening power in the minister, congregation, Word, song and prayer."(25) In this understanding, then, the real presence of Christ becomes less static and objectified insofar as it is recognized at the heart of the entire active eucharistic community.

An important implication of this emphasis on the multiple presences of Christ in the liturgy is the changed understanding of the conversion

that occurs in the eucharist. Powers adamantly maintains that by acknowledging the presence of Christ in the entire ritual, Vatican II has altered the notion of conversion. If the presence of Christ is to be focused more broadly in the entire communal celebration, it cannot be attributed only to the conversion of bread and wine--transubstantiation. It must also include that transformation which has happened and is happening in the daily lives of those who participate in the liturgy. In Powers' own words:

> ...the "substance" which is to be changed is not only the substance of bread and wine. The "substance" which is changed in the Eucharistic community is the entire life of the community which gathers for celebration of the Eucharist..."Transubstantiation" takes place as the substance of people's daily lives are changed by works of charity, piety and by the ministry which is given to each in their baptism.(26)

Hence, instead of the bread and wine being the central focus of conversion, attention is also given to the transformation of the lives of the community members. The eucharist, then, should express and reflect this transformation.

This is not to say, of course, that the distinctiveness of the eucharistic presence (or transubstantiation) is in any way derogated. To the contrary, the Constitution explains that Christ is present especially under the eucharistic species. However, in light of the fact that the eucharistic presence had been so highly emphasized in previous centuries, Vatican II itself does not overly stress it. In Mysterium Fidei, however, Paul VI strongly affirms that although there are many authentic modes of presence, Christ is present above all in the eucharistic species. "This presence," he declares, " is called "real" not to exclude the idea that the others are "real" too, but rather to indicate presence par excellence, because it is substantial and through

it Christ becomes present whole and entire, God and man."(27) Thus, the traditional doctrine of the real presence is once again proclaimed in the affirmation that the eucharistic presence is unique because it alone contains Christ in the fullest sense.

Moreover, the distinctive eucharistic presence is most important insofar as it is the cornerstone of Christ's presence in the rest of the liturgy: "Christ's abiding presence in the whole Church has as its pre-eminent sacrament (effective cause and manifestation) the Eucharistic presence."(28) This is to say that it is upon the real presence of Christ in the eucharistic species that the other presences of Christ in the entire liturgical celebration are based. While all modes of presence are real and authentic, the eucharistic presence is supreme. Likewise, another proof of the importance of the eucharistic presence, despite the emphasis on the manifold presences of Christ in the liturgy, is the degree to which the reservation and adoration of the sacrament are encouraged in both conciliar and post-conciliar documents. Paul VI, for example, in an epistle to a eucharistic congress, adamantly declares that: "He remains in the hosts that are reserved after consecration as the bread of life that came down from heaven and under the veils of that sacrament he is worthy of divine worship in reverence and in the homage of adoration."(29) This, then, is a recognition of both the permanency of Christ in the sacrament and the uniqueness of that eucharistic presence.

Nevertheless, even this recognition of the eucharistic presence has been tempered with the admonition that while it is suitable to expose the Blessed Sacrament for veneration, the Church must never lose sight of the fact that Christ instituted the eucharist as spiritual nourish-

ment to strengthen us and draw us into close communion with Him and His Church.(30) The emphasis, therefore, must never be on the permanent, static fact of the real presence, but on the communion for which it was instituted: "The real presence in the host is for the sake of the real presence in communion and the real presence in communion is for the sake of the real presence abiding in the Christian and in the body of Christians."(31)

The fact does remains, however, that the eucharistic presence of Christ is not, nor was it meant to be, the main focus of conciliar theology. Rather, as Adrian Hastings indicates, an affirmation of the manifold presences of Christ in the entire liturgy is a necessity insofar as the Church could not be united with Christ unless Christ was present therein. That is, since the whole meaning of the Church depends upon Christ's presence, "it is perfectly clear that this presence cannot, either by Scripture or by the nature of the case, be limited to a particular time or place."(32)

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy declares that the liturgy is a two-way movement between God and people that includes both the sanctification of people by God and the glorification of God through communal worship. Participants in the liturgy are sanctified, first of all, because "they are given access to the stream of divine grace which flows from the paschal mystery of the passion, death and resurrection of Christ."(33) Secondly, the liturgy also glorifies God insofar as it "...is above all things the worship of the divine Majesty."(34) However, as Liam Walsh indicates, this worship aspect of the sacrament was a factor which had been sorely neglected in much of the official Roman Catholic sacramental theology. Of post-Tridentine theology, Walsh

maintains that "it expounded admirably the sanctifying efficacy [of the sacraments], that downward movement by which grace comes from God to the soul, through the intrinsic power of a validly celebrated sacrament. But it tended to see the upward movement of worship only in the sacrificial aspect of the Mass."(35) The emphasis, then, was on personal sanctification to the neglect of all else. Conciliar theology, however, stresses the idea that the liturgy is an encounter between God who reveals Himself in the celebration of the Paschal Mystery of Christ and the participants who are called upon to respond in the liturgy through their prayers and songs of praise and thanksgiving. The ultimate meaning of the liturgy, therefore, is God's glorification, achieved by the sanctification of the people who worship Him.

In order for this glorification to be achieved, full and active participation is obviously a necessity. The Constitution explains in great detail how this full and active participation can be achieved. First, as the centre and summit of the whole Christian life, the liturgy needs to be understood by all. Hence, the basis set out by the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy is the liturgical instruction and education of all who are present at the liturgy. While the primary aim of liturgical instruction is undoubtedly the laypeople, the emphasis of the document is on the education of the clergy. In Article 14, for example, it is declared:

> Yet it would be futile to entertain any hopes of realizing this goal unless the pastors themselves, to begin with, become thoroughly penetrated with the spirit and power of the liturgy, and become masters of it. It is vitally necessary, therefore, that attention be directed above all, to the liturgical instruction of the clergy.

Thus, all clergy are to be well instructed in the study of the liturgy in order that they may in turn give instruction to the laypeople since

it is only through instruction that they will grasp the meaning of the liturgy. The hoped-for result of this is, of course, the knowing, active participation of all who attend the liturgy.

The most important advocation of the Council is the revision of the rite of the liturgy, since it is by this revision that active participation can most effectively be accomplished:

> The rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between them, can be more clearly manifested, and that devout and active participation by the faithful can be more easily accomplished. For this purpose the rites are to be simplified, while due care is taken to preserve their substance.(36)

That is to say that those elements which are no longer functional or meaningful to those present are to be changed or excluded. "In this restoration," Article 21 admonishes, "both texts and rites should be drawn up so that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify. Christian people, as far as possible, should be able to understand them with ease and to take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community." Greater simplicity and authenticity are thereby the key to revision.

However, caution is very much advised by the Council with regards to the implementation of this revision. In fact, certain rules are laid down for the changes:

> That sound tradition may be retained, and yet the way be open for legitimate progress, a careful investigation is always to be made into each part of the liturgy which is to be revised. This investigation should be theological, historical, and pastoral...there must be no innovations unless the good of the Church genuinely and certainly require them.(37)

Hence, both tradition and progress are to be priorities.

Furthermore, the rites themselves are to be explained to all present in order that the people gain an understanding of the meaning of

the rite. That is, they must not remain outer ceremonies, but must become inner experiences for each person that forms the community. As A. Verheul insists: "If we cannot discover the essential core, the hidden reality that takes place under the veil of the external liturgical event, the liturgy will never become for us a meeting, a prayer."(38) Thus, the liturgy is not meant to be an empty ritual, but a meaningful and authentic experience of worship.

Part of this revision is a new emphasis on the vital importance of God's word in the liturgy: "Sacred Scripture is of paramount importance in the celebration of the liturgy...Thus if restoration, progress, and adaptation of the sacred liturgy are to be achieved, it is necessary to promote that warm and living love for Scripture."(39) After the minor role given to Scripture for so many years, the conciliar statement gives it a place of equal importance with the eucharist. Thus, Christ is present not only under the eucharistic species, but in His word as well. The homily, in addition, is to be included as an extension or continuation of God's word. Like Scripture, its task is not only to proclaim the mystery of Christ, but also to instruct the participants in the "mysteries of the faith and the guiding principles of the Christian life."(40)

As well, the prayer of the faithful is, according to the Constitution, to be re-introduced into the liturgy as a means by which all people could participate in the worship of God by bringing to Him their own concerns and needs. As Josef Jungmann indicates:

> The re-introduction of the common prayer met at once with approval in the Council. This is not surprising because it is an element in which the participation of the faithful finds expression in a remarkable way, both as regards its content, in that it takes up the concerns felt by all, and also as regards its form as a prayer with responses.(41)

Likewise, all those present are encouraged to take an active role, not only in the prayer of the faithful, but in other prayers and responses as well. Hence, "by way of promoting active participation, the people should be encouraged to take part by means of acclamations, responses, psalmody, antiphons and songs."(42)

The Council also, for the first time, officially endorses the use of the vernacular as a means by which all might take an active role in the liturgy:

> But since the use of the mother tongue, whether in the Mass, the administration of the sacraments, or other parts of the liturgy, may frequently be of great advantage to the people, the limits of its employment may be extended. This extension will apply in the first place to the readings and directives, and to some of the prayers and chants.(43)

Hence, the use of the vernacular, while extended, is to be limited to those parts of the liturgy which pertain in particular to the people. The notable exception here, of course, is the Canon of the Mass: Article 54 explicitly states that the Ordinary of the Mass must remain in Latin. However, as Gary MacEoin ascertains, the wording of the Article was deliberately left vague in deference to those who were opposed to any use of the vernacular. In response to the conflict between those who wanted to completely exclude any use of the mother tongue and those who advocated a complete change to it, the Council left it to the discretion of the local bishops to determine the extent to which the vernacular could be used.(44)

As can be imagined, the use of the vernacular is a major impetus for the full participation of those present at the liturgy. That is, it is logical that the incomprehensibility of the liturgy would block those present from taking a role in something that they did not understand.

It would be natural, then, for them to attend the liturgy as passive viewers rather than active participants. As well, the endorsement of a limited use of the mother tongue also serves to cut down the barrier between the priest and the people. Rather than the liturgy being a one man action in which the priest addresses those present in a foreign tongue, the vernacular would serve to illustrate the character of dialogue in which the people respond to the priest. Finally, MacEoin insists, the use of the vernacular also emphasizes the fact that the liturgy is a communal act of worship. That is to say that when Latin was used during the entire liturgy, the liturgy itself became the occasion to develop an isolated and individualistic spirituality. Those present could not understand what was occurring and, as a result became engrossed in their own private devotions.(45) Participation in the liturgy was, therefore, at a minimum.

Another decisive implementation by which the Council sought to achieve the full participation of those present at the liturgy deals with the communion of the eucharist. Two aspects are most notable. First, Article 55 declares that: "hearty endorsement is given to that closer form of participation in the Mass whereby the faithful, after the priest's communion, receive the Lord's body under the elements consecrated at that very sacrifice." The sacrificial victim is, therefore, to be received sacramentally by those who are present at the sacrifice of the Mass. This reception, then, emphasizes the fact that the liturgy is a sacrificial meal in which all are called to play an active role. Thus, the primary purpose of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist is not for reservation and adoration, but rather for reception by those who offer their sacrifice together with Christ.

Furthermore, as Adrian Hastings emphasizes, the reception of the host consecrated at the same Mass illustrates the fact that the people present are truly participating in Christ's sacrifice, and thereby in His redemptive work. As well, it helps to break down the barrier between priest and people that was erected when the priest communed at the altar and then used the hosts from the tabernacle for the rest of the people. "If the people now communicate with hosts taken from the tabernacle," he explains, "the priest has to walk away from the altar after his own communion to fetch them and the impression of a divorce between the sacrifice and communion, and between the priest's communion and the people's communion, is made still worse."(46)

The second significant fact dealing with the eucharistic communion is the admonition that, in certain circumstances, all those present may communicate under both species. Without rejecting Trent's declaration that Christ is wholly present under either species, Vatican II nonetheless declares: "Communion under both kinds may be granted when the bishops think fit, not only to clerics and religious, but also to the laity, in cases to be determined by the Apostolic See."(47) Once again, the purpose of this is to more fully express the sense of full participation in the eucharistic banquet: reception of both species makes the sign value of the sacrament more manifest since Christ did command His apostles to eat and drink. "Communion under both kinds," Hastings explains, "is not fuller at the level of the thing signified, but it is fuller and more complete at the level of the sign itself; and it is the level of the sign, the sacrament itself, that the Church has primarily to concern herself with."(48) As well, a result of communion under both kinds is that, again, an artificial barrier between priest and laypeople

will be broken down. That is, when the chalice is not given to the people, but reserved only for the cleric, the impression will logically be created that the layperson's communion is not as full or important as that of the clerics. Communion under both species for the laity will, therefore, "make clear that the participation of the laity in Holy Communion is as complete as that of the clerics."(49)

A final admonition expressed by Vatican II as a means to ensure the full participation of all present is the key idea that all people are called upon to offer the sacrifice of the Mass: "by offering the Immaculate Victim, not only through the hands of the priest, but also with him, they should learn to offer themselves too."(50) Those who attend the Mass should not, therefore, be present as passive onlookers but as active participants. They are to offer Christ to God the Father not only through the hands of the priest, but with him. As importantly, they are called upon to join themselves with Christ as sacrifice.

Two factors of doctrinal importance must, however, be affirmed. Firstly, the sacrifice of the Mass, as Trent determined, in no way takes away from the sacrifice of the cross but is, rather, the perpetuation and the memorial of it.(51) Secondly, despite the emphasis in the Constitution on the offering of Christ by all those present, the distinctiveness of the hierarchical priesthood is not neglected. Although all present are called upon to offer the sacrificial victim, it is still the unique role of the priest to consecrate the elements which effect the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass.

C. CONCLUSION

To conclude, then, the twentieth century liturgical movement has resulted in a major shift in emphasis on the part of the official Roman Catholic church. From being concerned almost solely with the refining, exposition and declaration of eucharistic doctrine as was the case in previous centuries, the church of the twentieth century has become more and more aware of the need to officially promote the active participation of all people present at the liturgy. This emphasis can be recognized especially in the conciliar documents of Vatican II, which state as their aim the reform of the liturgy in order to achieve active participation. As a result, the laypeople are being recognized as a necessary and important component. Rather than the attention being focused on the eucharist as a solitary action of the priest, all laypeople are called to offer themselves with the sacrificial Victim and to commune at the table of that Victim. As well, in previous centuries the eucharist was understood primarily in terms of causality. That is, that which was deemed to be of supreme importance was the objective conferral of grace achieved by the fact of the real presence and the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass. With the advent of Vatican II, however, the causality of the eucharist, although not neglected, is not stressed as much as in former centuries. Instead, more attention is paid to the value of the eucharist as an instructive sign which emphasizes that the eucharist is a sacrificial banquet in and of which all those present are to participate and partake.

Despite the official sanctioning of these changes by Vatican II, however, it is taking many decades of cautious refining before the final results are achieved. In the meantime, it is becoming increasingly

apparent that modern Roman Catholics are beginning to take a stance that makes evident their need to discover and understand the meaning that lies behind the doctrine of the eucharist so that they can in fact partake of the eucharist as active participants. That is, they are beginning to recognize that that which frustrates them and robs the eucharist of joy for them is the lack of meaning and relevance. To this end, they are striving to arrive at a new re-interpretation of the doctrine which, without going beyond the bounds of orthodoxy, will go beyond a purely objective and factual understanding of the eucharist in terms of the real presence and the sacrifice of the Mass and thereby give the eucharist a new meaning that is much more relevant to the modern layperson. This quest, I suggest, is an attempt to liberate the eucharist from its traditional trappings, and, in so doing, to speed up the process of giving the eucharist back to the ordinary Roman Catholic. It is, therefore, an attempt to allow the laypeople to understand the meaning of that which they receive in the Mass in order that they might participate in it joyfully and willingly, rather than out of a sense of obligation.

CHAPTER THREE: EDWARD SCHILLEBEECKX' INTERPRETATION OF THE EUCHARIST

During the years of the Second Vatican Council, as well as in those immediately following, it became clear that a number of theologians were taking seriously the Council's call to reform and were, as a result, striving to make the eucharist more meaningful for all those who joined together for the eucharistic celebration. This is not to say, of course, that such a movement arose only at that time. Rather, the years of 1964 and 1965 marked the era when specifically Catholic attempts at reinterpretation became widely known to the Church as a whole. (1) It was, furthermore, from Western Europe in particular that there arose a dominant school of Roman Catholic theologians who argued the need to reinterpret the Tridentine dogma of transubstantiation on the grounds that the medieval terms by which the dogma was expressed were of little or no relevance to the twentieth century person and often tended to be a hindrance to a proper understanding of the meaning of the eucharist. While striving to maintain the meaning contained in the dogma, these theologians endeavored to shift the emphasis away from the objective categories in which the real presence of Christ in the eucharist was previously expressed to the more personal and subjective categories of the encounter with the living Christ which the real presence entails. It was an attempt to make the eucharist more meaningful for those who partake of it. As Edward Schillebeeckx adamantly maintained:

> All wish to safeguard the authentic doctrine. They wish, however, to safeguard it in such a way that the people of God, especially the clergy, formed more and more in a non-scholastic mentality, might live it in a more authentic fashion and, so to speak, in a more existential manner. (2)

It is this reinterpretation of eucharistic doctrine, then, which will be the focus of this chapter.

A. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

As has already been mentioned, the reinterpretation of the eucharist which became prevalent in 1964 and 1965 was preceded by a number of years in which different aspects influencing the new theology were being developed. In fact, subtle traces of this attempt at reinterpretation can be found as early as the 1930's. (3) It was not, however, until the ten years immediately following the publication of Humani Generis by Pius XII in 1950 that theologians began to develop a number of new ideas which ultimately had a great impact on the change of approach to eucharistic theology that became prevalent especially in 1964 and 1965.

While the number of factors which led to the reconsideration of eucharistic theology are numerous, Edward Schillebeeckx indicates five major areas.(4)

1. The Influence of Modern Physics

The first is the totally non-theological discipline of physics. A series of articles, exchanged by F. Selvaggi and C. Columbo from 1949 to 1956, forced theologians to consider whether or not theology should enter into dialogue with science. This question in turn prepared the ground for theologians to deal more specifically with the issue of how and if atomic physics was related to the eucharistic conversion as described by Trent: "The quantum theory in physics made many neo-scholastics realise that the concept substance could not be applied to material reality..."(5)

The theological debate commenced in 1949 when Selvaggi published an article in which he articulated the need for theologians to look at transubstantiation in light of these findings of modern physics. He challenged them to determine whether the terms used by Trent should be understood in a physical sense or at a metaphysical level. His own view was that transubstantiation must be understood in terms of physical conceptions of reality and be readily explainable to a scientist. The consequence of this assertion, however, was that, in agreeing with the scientist that bread is not one simple substance but rather is made up of thousands of molecular structures, the theologian must be prepared to explain how the conversion of the bread into Christ's body takes place--as a whole or as components of the whole. Selvaggi's response, ludicrous as it may seem, was clear: "If...bread is now to be thought of as consisting of atoms and molecules, instead of as a sole entity, then one must say that transubstantiation involves the conversion of the substance of each of the atoms, molecules and mesons into the substance of the body of Christ." (6) For the thousands of particles which make up the substance of bread, Selvaggi argued that there must be a corresponding number of transubstantiations. Thus, for Selvaggi, the change which takes place in the eucharist was in fact on the physical level; the physical reality of the bread, he would claim, was part of transubstantiation.(7) With little change, this is the position that he upheld throughout the next decade of challenge and controversy.

Six years after the 1949 article, Selvaggi's view was challenged in a series of articles, extending over six years, written by Msgr. Carlo Colombo. According to Colombo, modern physics had no place within

theology. In dealing with transubstantiation, theologians are dealing with a metaphysical reality beyond the parameters of physics : "The reality of the substance of the bread, as well as of the body of Christ, is a metaphysical reality and as such is completely beyond the scope of the physical scientist, who is concerned with the accidental character, or species, of things."(8) Colombo maintained that the term substance, as it is used in eucharistic theology, is a theological term which tradition (Aquinas, for example) places on a metaphysical level. "Hence, the change takes place between realities that are beyond scientific investigation, that is, metaphysical realities."(9) That is to say, then, that while physics may be capable of addressing the issue of bread and wine on a physical level, it cannot speak to a change of substance, since tradition has dictated that substance is on a completely different level of reality.

These, then, are the two main positions in the debate. As Cipolla indicates, "...once the initial positions were adopted, there was little change on either side outside of some refinement."(10) The controversy was, as most scholars contend, long, complex, convoluted and often exaggerated.(11) Its importance, however, lies in the fact that theologians were forced to acknowledge, at least to a certain extent, the relation between physics and eucharistic theology, an issue which proved to be of significance in later years. Kenan Osborne explains the situation as follows: "Of itself, this Selvaggi-Colombo debate , that was joined of course, by theologians of that day, led nowhere. Nonetheless , the issue that it raised influenced in no small degree a number of other theologians who eventually became associated with the term "transsignification.""(12)

2. Rediscovery of the Sacramental Symbolic Activity

The second major factor which influenced the new approach to the eucharist was the rediscovery of the sacramental symbolic activity. In post World War II theology, emphasis was again being given to the fact that the sacraments are symbolic acts. Schillebeeckx explains that Trent, in reaction to the Reformers, emphasized the causality of the sacraments. Causality and sign value were then put into opposition and, as a result, the sign value of the sacraments fell into obscurity. (13) It was not until the years after the second World War that there began to emerge a re-appreciation of the eucharistic sign.

To a great extent, modern phenomenology added to the rediscovery of the sign value of the sacraments. Phenomenology seeks to discover and analyze the essential meaning of something as it appears within human experience rather than from metaphysical categories. As Kenan Osborne explains:

> More important than the question of what a thing is in itself or substantially is the question of what it means within its relationship to human existence and the way in which we from our human standpoint can unlock this meaning."(14)

Considered from this point of view, the reality of the sign can then be situated in an anthropology of the symbolic act. That is,if one can make an analogy: a sign is like a person whose interior spirituality is made visible in the way the human body directs itself outwards towards other persons and the world. The human person, then, is experienced directly in those actions. In terms of the sacraments, "...the reality itself can be experienced directly in human symbolic action."(15) As a result, the sacraments can then be taken out of the material level of things and taken up into the personal level.

One of the earliest attempts to situate the eucharist in the sphere of symbolic activity without giving it a purely symbolic interpretation was by J. De Baciocchi. The starting point for De Baciocchi in addressing this issue was the assertion that the real presence must never be understood as an isolated reality. Rather, he insisted, Christ's presence in the eucharist must be seen within the context of Christ's gift of himself to the Church. Basing his argument on the assumption that Christ's action of giving bread and wine both signifies and actualizes Christ's gift of himself to the Church, De Baciocchi argued that the bread and wine become the efficacious signs by which Christ's gift of himself to the Church is both explained and accomplished. That which is on the altar are sacramental signs which"...sont réelement le moyen par lequel s'exprime et s'accomplit le don total et veritable, personnel et corporel, du seigneur à l'Eglise."(16)

After affirming the real presence, De Baciocchi then explored the manner in which the bread and wine become effective signs of Christ's gift to the Church. He began by asserting that the empirical reality of the bread and wine do not change: volume, weight, taste, physical and chemical properties remain unaltered, on the level at which our senses grasp reality. However, by the power of Christ's word, the social and religious reality of the bread and wine are changed into the real sign of Christ's body and blood: "La parole du Christ, sans alterer ces dons en leur teneur empirique, change totalement leur destination sociale et religieuse."(17) That which is of importance, then, is the value which Christ gives to something; the bread becomes, in reality, Christ's body because that is the value which Christ has given to it by virtue of the words of consecration.

DeBaciocchi further insisted that insofar as Christ gives himself in the bread and wine, an objective fundamental change has taken place in the reality of those elements. This change, he asserted, does indeed merit the name "transubstantiation."(18) Despite the awkwardness of the term "substance" in today's world, transubstantiation does have a positive value: it affirms that the bread and wine, which remain bread and wine on the empirical level, truly and objectively become the body and blood of Christ. While adding nothing new to Christ's words at the Last Supper, transubstantiation, as De Baciocchi understood it, "...formulates the only possible way of establishing complete accord between the eucharistic gift and the testimony of the senses on the one hand, and the principle of identity on the other."(19)

3. Re-Interpretation of the Tridentine Concept of Substance

The third factor which influenced the new approach to eucharistic theology was the attempt to reinterpret the Tridentine concept of substance. In light of the new worldview, several theologians tried to determine exactly what Trent mean by the term "substance." E. Gutwenger, on the one hand, maintained that Trent did in fact make Aristotelian concepts a necessary component in Catholic faith in the real presence by virtue of their appeal to the Council of Constance.(20) On the other hand, G. Ghysens insisted that Trent consciously disassociated itself from the Aristotelian concept of substance. With regard to the eucharistic definitions of the eleventh to sixteenth centuries, Ghysens declared:

> ...les définitions eucharistiques en matière eucharistique du XIe au XVIe siècle aient attribué au terme "substantia" un sens technique spécial et nouveau. Elles ont repris ce mot en un sens très général, quoique très ferme, de réalité profonde, solide, fondamentale des choses.(21)

Edward Schillebeeckx agrees with neither: "the dogma was thought out and expressed in "Aristotelian" categories, but the strictly Aristotelian content of these categories was not included in what the dogma intended to say."(22) Whatever the case may be, that which was of the greatest significance was the unease with the concept of substance which led to the movement to reinterpret the dogma which was expressed by it.

4. Emphasis on the Manifold Presence of Christ

A fourth factor which led to the reinterpretation of eucharistic theology was the return to the biblical and liturgical emphases on the manifold presence of Christ within the whole scope of Christian life, rather than the Tridentine concentration on the real presence of Christ in the species. This renewed recognition that Christ's real presence can not be limited to the eucharistic presence was given official status first by the Fathers at Vatican II in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy and then by Paul VI in Mysterium Fidei.

According to these official documents, Christ is really, personally present in anyone (not only the priest) who is in a state of grace. In fact, according to Edward Kilmartin, the documents even go so far as to maintain that "...the presence of Christ in the believer, as sharing source of faith in his abiding presence, is basic to all other modes of personal presence of Christ in the Church."(23) In addition, Christ is really present in all the sacraments. In the context of the eucharistic liturgy, Christ is really present in the assembly and prayers of the faithful and in the service of the word. Finally, and most specifically, he is really present in the eucharist. It is important to emphasize that the recognition of the multiple presences of Christ was not meant to disparage the eucharistic presence. In fact, as Everett Diederich

declares: "...faith in the eucharistic presence of Christ is not belittled but heightened by our faith awareness of Christ's real presence in the assembly, his word and in the person of his minister."(24) Moreover, this was, Schillebeeckx insisted, a return to an awareness of the purpose for which Christ does become present in the elements: a more intimate presence in the heart of the Christian and the Christian community. Hence, "the eucharistic presence is thus no longer isolated. We no longer say, "Christ is there," without asking for whom he is present."(25)

5. Ecumenical Movement

The ecumenical movement was the fifth major factor which led to a rethinking of Roman Catholic eucharistic doctrine. Post World War II Europe was the scene for intense ecumenical activities; theologians on both sides were starting to exchange a certain amount of ideas . On the part of Roman Catholic theologians, it came to be recognized that a re-thinking of certain presuppositions and terms was necessary if open contact with other denominations was to be maintained. As well, the recognition of the validity of non-Catholic communities as grace-filled Churches led to a logical conclusion: the recognition of the authenticity of their theology. "The Protestant experience of the eucharist," Schillebeeckx (among others) concludes, "must therefore be taken into account by Catholic theologians."(26) In light of this discovery, the theology of F.J. Leenhardt in particular proved to be a great influence on Roman Catholic theologians.

The point of departure for Leenhardt's inquiry into transubstantiation was the conviction that the essential reality of a thing is

dependent on what God wills to make of it in order to realize His purpose of creative love for humanity. He explains:

> In other words, the true reality of things is to be found in what God wishes them to be for His creatures...What things are in the final analysis is what God gives through them to man...the essence of a reality lies in the divine intention which is realized through it.(27)

Drawing upon this concept of reality, Leenhardt went beyond the purely metaphysical definition of substance that was the framework of the dogma of transubstantiation. "Substance," he elucidated, "is the final reality of things as faith recognizes it in God's creation and in His ordinance to His creatures." (28) Substance, for Leenhardt, did not mean the matter behind the accidents, but the final reality that God wills an object to be. Transubstantiation, then, could be accepted, as long as it was not understood in Aristotelian terms. In fact, Leenhardt even admitted that transubstantiation was helpful insofar as it expresses these two affirmations about the transformation that occurs in the bread:

> 1. The substance of things is not in their empirical data, but in the will of God who upholds them. And 2. Jesus Christ declares in the upper room, in a sovereign manner, His will that the bread should be His body; He transforms the substance of this bread. (29)

The implication of this concept of reality for the doctrine of the eucharist was, according to Leenhardt, that the words of Christ gives to the bread a new meaning and therefore transforms its substance into his body.(30) That is, by declaring "This is my Body", Christ expresses the final reality of the bread.

> He pronounces over it a word which expresses what the final destiny of this bread shall henceforth be. He brings it about that this bread has no longer its final reason for existence in the nourishment of the body.... What is essential in this

> which Christ gives,declaring that it is His body, is not what the baker has made of it, but what Jesus Christ has made of it when He gives it and declares that it is His body. (31)

Thus, while remaining unchanged on the material level, the substance of the bread has, by virtue of God's will, become the instrument of Christ's presence.

B. THEOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENTS

During this time, sacramental theology began to undergo a complete shift in emphasis. Going beyond the traditional understanding of sacraments as instruments of divine grace conferred by God through an act of the church, theologians began to insist that the sacraments be understood as personal saving encounters between humans and God. Since it is in light of such an understanding of the sacraments that one must examine the development of eucharistic theology that emerged in the 1960's, attention will now be focused on the work of two of the leading proponents of the renewal of sacramental theology: Edward Schillebeeckx and Karl Rahner.

1. Theology of Grace

The starting point for this new understanding of the sacraments is the presupposition that grace is present in all aspects of human life; that is, personal saving encounters between God and humanity take place everywhere in everyday life.(32) God does not, according to this new conception of grace, "insert" grace into an otherwise ungraced world by means of certain divine actions; that is, "God is...not an outsider to human life, a God up there or out there, who from time to time perforates the fabric of human history by means of spectacularly interven-

tionist incursions."(33) Rather, God is present in every aspect of life and in the history of the whole world. The world is, therefore, already permeated with grace.

The impact of such a presupposition on the theology of the sacraments is tremendous. The belief that the world was evil or profane and that the sacraments were a primary means by which grace could be infused into such a world made frequent reception of the sacraments a necessity. Karl Rahner puts it in these words: "In order to get in touch with God, every now and then [one] steps out of this profane world into a "fane", a holy place...The sacrament alone puts [one] in touch with the Lord and makes [one's] life meaningful and "religious.""(34) When faced with the belief that the world itself is graced by God's presence,then, the idea that the sacraments are discharges of grace into a profane world is no longer valid . The sacraments are useful, however, insofar as they are a "...manifestation in one's own life of the grace that guides the history of the whole world."(35) Encountering God in the sacraments is an illumination of the encounter with God which can and does occur everywhere in the world in everyday life. The notion of what a sacrament is has thus been expanded far beyond previous definitions.

2. Christ: The Sacrament of God

Before continuing with a fuller explanation of the new understanding of the sacraments, it is of great importance to point out that at the basis of this expanded notion of sacrament is the fundamental belief that Jesus himself is the primordial or basic sacrament. According to both Schillebeeckx and Rahner, the deepest manifestation of that grace which is part of everyday life can be found in the life and actions of

Jesus of Nazareth. That is, in his life and relationships with others, Jesus makes visible the grace of God; an encounter with the human Jesus is a sacrament insofar as it is a visible and historical sign of God's love and forgiveness for all people. And, since every bestowal of grace occurs as a result of an encounter with this human Jesus, he is the primordial sacrament, the fundamental sign of God's love. Schillebeeckx explains as follows:

> The man Jesus, as the personal visible realization of the divine grace of redemption, is the sacrament, the primordial sacrament, because this man, the Son of God himself, is intended by the Father to be in his humanity the only way to the actuality of redemption. (36)

Schillebeeckx emphasizes that there are two dimensions to every encounter with God: an invitation on God's part and a human response. Jesus, as the primordial sacrament of the encounter with God, fulfills both elements: he is, at one and the same time, a visible embodiment of God's self disclosure and the human response of love to that revelation. Richard Gula, in his brief synthesis of Schillebeeckx' work ,puts it in these words:

> Jesus the Christ is the primordial sacrament because in him we find the fullest expression of what a sacrament is; the visible, audible, tangible expression of God's saving love for us and the human response to this love.(37)

Thus, Jesus himself is the basic or fundamental sacrament insofar as his very humanity gives a tangible and personal form to God's loving acceptance of humankind.

3. The Church: The Sacrament of Christ

Based on the assertion that Jesus is the primordial sacrament, both Schillebeeckx and Rahner ascertain that the Church is also a sacrament because it is a sign of the on-going presence of the risen Christ. As a

result of his death and resurrection, Jesus is no longer on earth in visible,historical form. However, since an encounter with God can happen only by virtue of an encounter with the human Jesus,his glorified state would appear to pose a problem. This is not the case, however, since the Church is the visible prolongation of the saving reality of Jesus. That is, insofar as it signifies God's offer of himself through Christ to humanity, the Church is also a sacrament. Rahner explains the concept as follows: "As the ongoing presence of Jesus Christ in time and space, as the fruit of salvation which can no longer perish, and as the means of salvation by which God offers his salvation to an individual in a tangible way and in the historical and social dimension, the church is the basic sacrament."(38) The Church, therefore, makes visible the risen Christ, who would otherwise be invisible and thus makes tangible the salvation offered by God in Christ. Thus, insofar as it is a sign which continues to make visible God's saving love, the Church too is a primordial sacrament.

Furthermore, as Schillebeeckx points out, the Church is a sacrament insofar as it also fulfills both dimensions of an encounter with God: the invitation and the response. "Thus the Church in its own proper activity is a historical manifestation of God's own love for men in Christ (a bestowal of grace) and, at the same time, of its own love and adoration of God in the same Lord (worship)."(39) Thus, the Church, too, is a sign of God's love for humanity and, in its worship, of the human response to this love.(40)

4. Toward a Definition of the Sacraments

It is on the basis of these two fundamental sacraments-Christ and the Church--that the seven ritual sacraments derive their

sacramentality. "Christ is the sacrament of our encounter with God, and we achieve our sacramental encounter with Christ in the Church through the seven sacraments." (41) When the Church, as the historical manifestation of God's love in Christ, makes that love present at specific moments in human life, the result is the seven ritual sacraments. Christ and the Church are,then, wellsprings from which all the sacraments draw their power and the source to which the sacraments can be traced.

Although the term sacrament can no longer be restricted to the seven rites of the Catholic church, these seven sacraments are special gifts from God to humanity. "The sacraments," Gula explains, "proclaim and enable us to appropriate the love of God already present and offered to us." (42) The seven sacraments, then, make humanity aware of the experience of God's grace which is already a reality.

Both Schillebeeckx and Rahner adamantly emphasize that the sacraments are not primarily physical things, but rather, "...first and foremost symbolic acts or activity as signs."(43) Humans need visible, tangible signs of God's love and the seven sacraments provide these at different times in life. The encounter with God is thus expressed and made tangible in visible actions and physical things which point beyond themselves to the saving reality of Christ. As acts or signs of the Church, they are also acts and signs of Christ.

The seven sacraments, finally, do not merely consist of God's action, but also demand an indication of human response of faith and devotion. In fact, Richard Gula even goes so far as to claim:

> Sacraments are our need, not God's. The whole point of celebrating sacramentally is to provide human situations in which we can respond in a tangible and visible way to our experiences of God in Christ and the spirit and to our

belonging to one another in community as the Body of Christ." (44)

Hence, it would appear that human response is necessary for a sacrament to develop into a real personal encounter with Christ.

C. THE REINTERPRETATION OF THE EUCHARIST

It is with this background in mind that we now turn our attention to the eucharistic theology that emerged from this era. Although much has been written by various theologians on this subject, for the sake of brevity, attention will be focused on the work of Edward Schillebeeckx, and, in particular, his book The Eucharist. This is not, of course, meant to be by any means exclusive. That is to say that some portions of the work of Schillebeeckx' contemporaries such as Piet Schoonenberg and Charles Davis must be examined in some detail, since this work prepares the ground for, and is used extensively by Schillebeeckx. For the purpose of this thesis, however, these theologians will be discussed only secondarily, as they apply to and are used by Schillebeeckx himself.(45)

1. A Re-examination of Trent

Schillebeeckx begins by asserting that his aim in dealing with a new approach to the eucharistic presence is to make the dogma of transubstantiation relevant to the twentieth century person while still retaining its basic meaning. Because Catholic faith is a living faith that exists within the progress of history, it is necessary to go beyond a mere repetition of a dogma of faith which was developed in the past. In order to seize the full implications of transubstantiation, Schillebeeckx maintains that it is necessary

> ...to reinterpret the world of ideas with which the dogma of transubstantiation has come down to us, precisely in order to be able to preserve in a pure form the basic meaning of the dogma and to make it capable of being freshly experienced by modern man.(46)

In order to do this, Schillebeeckx attempts to distinguish between that which was affirmed about the eucharistic presence at the Council of Trent and the way in which that affirmation was expressed. According to Schillebeeckx, that which emerged from Trent was an affirmation of a specific and distinctive presence of Christ which was brought about on the basis of a change of substance of bread and wine into Christ's body and blood, a change which was aptly named transubstantiation. This was, however, never meant to be two separate dogmas—one of the real presence and one of the substantial change--but simply one forceful statement of the real presence. Hence, he insists that "...the only aim of the Council of Trent was to proclaim the unique and distinctive character of the eucharistic presence as an inviolable datum of faith."(47)

The dogma of transubstantiation, then, was used to express the central dogma of the real presence. The two were, however, so intertwined that to deny the substantial conversion was equated with a denial of the real presence. Schillebeeckx, however, argues that the idea of a real change (which is what Trent wished to affirm) is in fact separable from the term transubstantiation. Thus, the affirmation of the reality of the change that occurs in the eucharist can and must be distinguished from the Aristotelian concepts used to explain it without fear of affecting the doctrine of the real presence itself. Karl Rahner agrees: he insists that a distinction must be maintained between "...what on the one hand is precisely and clearly implied in the dogma of transubstantiation...and therefore belongs to the dogma, and as to what on

the other hand only belongs to the theological explanation of the doctrine in terms of a given philosophical concept." (48) The truth expressed by the term transubstantiation can, therefore, be meaningfully expressed in other terms as long as the truth of the reality of the change is maintained. It is precisely this which Schillebeeckx endeavors to do: preserve the truth of the Church's belief in a real change in the elements of the eucharist while reinterpreting it in terms that are relevant to the twentieth century person.

2. A New Point of Departure: Interpersonal Relationships

Rather than starting from the framework of natural philosophy, the new point of departure for eucharistic theology, for Schillebeeckx and his contemporaries, is that of anthropology or human meaning. As Kenan Osborne explains in his brief summary, "the way in which human beings at particular points in time and space perceive the world is of the utmost importance" for the new eucharistic theology.(49) Thus, in order to make eucharistic theology more relevant to the modern Catholic, human perspective becomes the framework from which to work.

a)Laying the Foundations: Piet Schoonenberg and Charles Davis

Two theologians who were most instrumental in laying the foundations for the new framework, and to whom Schillebeeckx admits his indebtedness, are Piet Schoonenberg and Charles Davis. The proper context in which the eucharist should be discussed, they insist, is that of the dynamics of interpersonal relationships.

Schoonenberg's major contribution in this area is his analysis of the concept of presence in general and of the eucharistic presence in particular. He begins by asserting that Christ is already personally present to humanity through the reality of grace in life. This personal

presence is the highest form of presence: while spatial presence is simply a being in a place in a local way, personal presence is the presence of a person to a person, a relationship characterized by free self-determined communication and spiritual openness. (50) Furthermore,while there are different degrees of personal presence, only that presence which is both offered and accepted is brought to completion; only then does the relationship become interpersonal. Reciprocity is, therefore, an essential factor.

For humans, personal presence needs spatial presence to a certain degree. Without being totally dependent on it,personal presence does need spatial presence in order to come into existence; only if people meet first in a spatial way can they enter into a relationship. (51) In the case of Jesus' relationship to humanity, however, spatial presence is not a concern:

> In the case of Jesus also, we are not concerned with the spatial presence. This existed during his earthly life, but even then it was never important without his personal presence...Now that the Lord has been glorified, the spatial presence has been entirely done away with and the Lord is present everywhere where hearts believe in him.(52)

Hence, Christ is present to humanity by grace. Again, however, while Christ's offer is always open, it is only when this presence is accepted that an interpersonal relationship develops.

According to Charles Davis, this personal presence, this union with Christ through grace which is already an actuality, is deepened in the eucharist. The eucharist,therefore, both presupposes and expresses an already existing interpersonal relationship with Christ by grace: "...in the Eucharistic celebration Christ is really present to us in the full interpersonal sense, because this celebration is the embodiment and expression of his presence to us by grace."(53) The purpose of the

eucharist, then, and that which gives it meaning, is the establishment of a deeper and more intimate relationship with Christ. It is the time in which Christ offers the gift of his body and blood and humanity accepts that offer. The emphasis is not on the presence of Christ in the eucharist but on the purpose of that presence: further intimacy with Christ. Thus, as Davis concludes, the eucharist "...is a personal encounter with Christ in which he once again offers us union with himself, and invites us closer, and in which we accept and draw nearer to him."(54)

Davis carries this a step further. In light of this understanding of the eucharist as a personal encounter with Christ, he insists that the real presence of Christ in the eucharist is only the first stage in the process of developing an interpersonal relationship: "It is a preliminary stage in the achievement of that mutual personal presence by which Christ is present to us and we to him."(55) Only when a person accepts that presence is an interpersonal relationship achieved. The real presence of Christ in the eucharist can never, therefore, be made an objective end unto itself, since it "...is but a moment in the process of Christ's self-giving."(56) Human acceptance must always accompany Christ's offer of personal communion for an interpersonal relationship to develop.

Another dimension which results from working out of the framework of human meaning is the notion that reality is changed when humanity establishes new meaning for it. Once again,Charles Davis makes major contributions to this fundamental tenet. Bread, he insists, has no meaning, no existence, apart from its relationship to humanity. Bread itself is only a mixture of components, but "their unity and intel-

ligibility come from the finality imposed on them by man, and not from any substantial change in the order of physical reality."(57) Davis hastens to add, however, that this does not mean to imply that reality is of human making. To the contrary, he maintains that although an object is knowable according to its relation to humanity, the relation itself is given by God. E.L. Mascall summarizes Davis' thought: "...although the object is called bread...in view of its relation to man...the relation that is signified [is not] given to it by man; it is given by God. Relations to man, yes; relations established by man ,no. The relation is established by God."(58)

3. What is Reality? Schillebeeckx' Basic Principles

These two tenets—that reality is not of human making, but of God's, and that this reality is given its meaning in relation to humanity—are the two basic principles from which Schillebeeckx operates. With Davis, Schillebeeckx maintains that humanity gives meaning to reality. This is not to say, of course, that reality is of human making, since one must always keep in mind that "...meanings given by man are governed by a reality which is...in the first place God's, and only then man's."(59) Indeed, given the example of creation, one can see that God gives the ultimate meaning of the world and that the initiative is His. Furthermore, reality can only be known in signs. So great is the mystery of God, everything we know is only referential and a sign of the reality which escapes us.

Schillebeeckx, however, is suggesting that while reality is given to us by God, humans are nonetheless invited by God to give some purpose to it. "Situated within the mystery that is given to me, however, I establish a human world, the human meaning of which I am

continuously changing."(60) Reality is, therefore, a mystery determined by God alone to which humanity is nonetheless invited to give meaning. Schillebeeckx' conclusion is well articulated by Joseph Powers: "Only man can perceive meaning, but meaning is not man's creation; his mind is governed by the very "givenness" of the world around him."(61) In a limited sense, then, humans can impose new meaning on the world. Hence, human significance or meaning is in fact an element of reality.

Schillebeeckx then proceeds to apply these principles to the reality of the bread and wine. Bread and wine, he explains, are already the result of a human activity of giving purpose or meaning to something. That is, bread and wine are already products of human activity insofar as meaning has been assigned to the various elements which make them up. Furthermore, this same bread and wine can be given a variety of meanings on a variety of levels apart from purely biological nourishment: "They can become the expression of fraternal solidarity, of interpersonal intimacy, of the successful conclusion of an agreement or a treaty or of the sealing of a friendship."(62) While the biological reality of the bread and wine is not denied by this further meaning, it is assumed into a higher level of meaning. And, "in that case, the bread is different because the definite relationship to man at the same time defines the reality under discussion."(63) Thus, the bread and wine, which remain bread and wine physically, are nonetheless transignified and given new meaning, new significance, by humanity.

Nevertheless, Schillebeeckx cautions:

> It should, however, be remembered that, in this case, it is a question of man's relative attitudes to the world and that the basic assumption that the being of reality is given and is, in its own being, meaningful to man remains. This preliminary

> and basic meaning makes man's giving of relative meanings possible and invites it.(64)

This is to say, then, that that which occurs is undeniably a human recognition of the meaning of that reality of the body of Christ which is already a given.

It is, Schillebeeckx maintains, precisely because things have different meanings on different levels that one cannot jump from one level to another. To question whether or not the bread is actually still bread after the consecration is therefore irrelevant since it skips from the cultic, sacramental level to the physical level. And it is on this basis, then, that he makes the assertion that "...eucharistic transubstantiation cannot be viewed in isolation from the sphere of giving meaning in sacramental signs."(65)

4. The Eucharistic Presence of Christ

It is within this context that Schillebeeckx now approaches the specifically eucharistic presence of Christ. To begin, he maintains that "the basis of the entire eucharistic event is Christ's personal gift of himself to his fellow-men and, within this, to the Father."(66) The eucharist itself, then, is but a sacramental form of Christ's self-giving. It is not, however, only the bread and wine which are the signs of that self-giving. Sacraments, Schillebeeckx insists, are never things but human actions in which matter and gesture are used to convey religious meaning. Thus, given the Paschal context of the eucharist, "the primary sacramental form of the Eucharist is not therefore simply "bread and wine", but the meal in which the bread and wine are consumed."(67) This is to say, then, that the significance of the bread and wine as objects of nourishment have been assumed into the higher function of human fellowship.(68)

a) The Eucharist as Meal

It is, I would suggest, important at this point to expand a little more fully on the dynamics of this meal which becomes the sign of Christ's gift of himself. As a meal, the eucharist takes on all the human significance of a meal; it is based on what humans experience when they eat a meal. To begin, then, a meal is not simply the eating of food, but a complex of various factors. As most scholars will point out, there is a vast difference between a human meal and the way in which an animal eats. Although both consist of the physical ingestion of food, this biological aspect is included and transformed in the eating together of humans in a social context. "Between nourishment and the meal," Phillipe Rouillard explains, "there is a difference of degree and meaning. The meal consists in eating together and following a certain order. If nourishment responds to a biological necessity, the meal responds to a properly human need. While an animal eats, a human has a meal."(69) Sharing bread together with others in a community, then, is an essential part of the human experience of meal. Thus, in regards to the sacrament of the eucharist, it is all of these elements---the total complex of the meal--which becomes the sacrament, the sign of Christ's self-giving. Marie Zimmerman, in her study of Schillebeeckx' work, maintains that: "Dans l'Eucharistie, la nourriture, le répas et la communauté autour de la table sont unis; c'est la matière humaine qui devient sacrement."(70)

b) The Signifying Function of the Bread and Wine

Having said all this,it is necessary to emphasize the importance of the bread and wine, since it is these elements which become the sign of the real presence of Christ giving himself to us:

> ...the usual secular significance of the bread and wine is withdrawn and these become the bearers of Christ's gift of himself--"Take and eat, this is my body"... In this commemorative meal, bread and wine become the subject of a new establishment of meaning, not by men, but by the living Lord in the Church, through which they become the sign of the real presence of Christ giving himself to us."(71)

The change which takes place then is a change in the signifying function of the bread and wine; it is, therefore,a transignification which occurs. The meaning of the bread and wine, through the power of the words of consecration, are transformed to become signs through which and in which the offer of Christ's gift of himself to the Church is made, recognized and received in faith. Schillebeeckx is careful to insist, however, that this gift is not directed towards the bread and wine, but towards the believer. Christ's presence, then, is intended for the believer, but in and by means of this gift of bread and wine.

This notion of the bread and wine becoming signs through which the offer of Christ's gift is made has proven troublesome to eucharistic theology throughout the years. The official Church has always regarded the use of sign in explaining eucharistic theology with great suspicion. It must be noted, however, that often this distrust of sign has been based on a false understanding of the meaning of sign. As a result, it is helpful to delineate exactly what the term "sign" means and how it is used in contemporary eucharistic theology.

For years, sign and reality were seen as being in opposition to each other. This opposition, however, was based on the false premise that a sign lacked real content and was only a pointer to something else which is absent. To the contrary, the term sign as it is used by Schillebeeckx refers to the manifestation of a distinct reality. Within this context, a sign is an effective sign; it "...does not just point to

reality but realizes what it symbolizes...it communicates what it promised."(72) The reality is in the sign itself; the sign expresses the reality which is present within. In the eucharist, then, the bread and wine become the signs which effect or realize the offer of Christ's presence; that is, Christ's presence exists by virtue of the fact that the bread and wine become signs. Schillebeeckx explains: "The signifying function of the sacrament (sacramentum est in genere signi) is here at its highest value. It is a making present of himself of the real, living Christ in a pure,meaningful presence." (73) Hence, Schillebeeckx is adamant in ascertaining that the use of the term "sign" in no way means that Christ gives something other than himself in giving this new meaning: "What is given to us in the Eucharist is nothing other than Christ himself. What the sacramental forms of bread and wine signify, and at the same time make real is not a gift that refers to Christ who gives himself in them, but Christ himself in living, personal presence."(74) This, according to Schillebeeckx, is transignification: the bread and wine are given a new meaning by Jesus, a meaning which must be recognized by humanity.

According to Schillebeeckx, then, the change which take place is in fact an ontological change--a change in the reality of the elements. The bread is no longer bread, he asserts, but at the deepest level of reality, it is the body of Christ. This change, however, must be understood within the sacramental framework. He insists on the importance of the sign value of the bread and wine: "Eucharistic sacramentality demands precisely that the physical reality does not change, otherwise there would no longer be a eucharistic sign."(75) However, while the biological reality of the bread and wine must remain

intact in order to maintain their sign-value, at the deepest level of reality, they are the body and blood of Christ. Thus,"the conversion is sacramental and, within this framework, it is ontological."(76)

c) Reciprocity: The Real Presence of Christ in the Church

A fundamental dimension in the constitution of the eucharist, according to Schillebeeckx, is the bond between the real presence of Christ in the eucharist and his real presence in the Church. Schillebeeckx insists that the presence of Christ cannot be understood apart from the larger presence of Christ in the community: "This establishment of meaning by Christ is accomplished in the Church and thus presupposes the real presence of the Lord in the church, in the assembled community of believers and in the one who officiates in the Eucharist."(77) Thus, the celebration of the eucharist begins with a real presence of Christ and aims at making this presence more specific and intimate for the members of the community. This intimacy is the very purpose of the eucharist. The emphasis, then, is no longer centered exclusively in the elements of bread and wine, but is expanded to include the larger sphere of the whole believing community.

This emphasis on the community that gathers at the eucharistic celebration is further developed by Schillebeeckx' exposition of the reciprocity of the real presence. In keeping with the dynamics of interpersonal relationships, he maintains that the believing response of the community is necessary for the complete realization of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. The real presence in the sacrament is, Schillebeeckx explains,reciprocated when the Church makes herself present and responds by giving of self to humanity through fraternal love and service. This reciprocity, furthermore, is also signified and

effected in the sacramental form of the eucharistic meal. That is, the same eucharistic species which signify sacramentally Christ's gift of self also signify and realize the Church's responding gift of faith and worship. Thus:

> The sacramental bread and wine are therefore not only the sign which makes Christ's presence real to us, but also the sign bringing about the real presence of the church (and, in the church, of us too) to him. The eucharistic meal thus signifies both Christ's gift of himself and the Church's responding gift of herself, of the Church who is what she is in him and can give what she gives in and through him.(78)

Hence, the real presence of Christ in the sacrament is reciprocated by the faith of the church which makes herself present with Christ.

So adamant is Schillebeeckx about this, he even goes so far as to insist that if the larger presence of Christ is not considered, "...then the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist is in danger of being emptied of meaning."(79) The presence of Christ in the community is, therefore, central to the new eucharistic theology.

Schillebeeckx is quick to maintain, however, that this whole notion of reciprocity is not meant to imply that the presence of Christ in the eucharist is dependent on faith. The presence of Christ, he explains, is always an offered reality: "my disbelief cannot nullify the reality of Christ's real offer and the reality of the Church's remaining in Christ."(80) Thus, the real presence is really an offer of Christ's self-giving, which remains independent of faith.

Nonetheless, because of the reciprocal nature of the sacrament:

> ...the eucharistic real presence...is completely realized only when consent is given in faith to the eucharistic event and when this event is at the same time accomplished personally, that is, when this reciprocity takes place, in accordance with the true meaning of the sign, in the sacramental meal.(81)

This is to say, then, that the eucharistic presence of Christ reaches its full completion only when it is both offered and accepted in faith; only then does it become the presence of Christ in the believer's heart, thus realizing the intimacy which is the purpose of the eucharist. The eucharistic reality, therefore, can only be approached by faith; to the unbeliever, that reality does not exist.

Schillebeeckx adds, however, that the reality of Christ's presence in the eucharist is assured by virtue of the reciprocation of the believing Church. The Church, in which Christ is already present, responds in faith to Christ's offer. This response, Schillebeeckx indicates,"...implies a "human" giving of meaning which does not,however, come from man, but from the Lord living in the Church or from the Church as living in the Lord."(82) Thus, Christ's presence in the Church both assures and is assured by the reciprocal response in faith which is expressed in the Church's celebration of the eucharist. It is, then, the eucharistic liturgy which is the means by which the Church responds in recognition of the establishment of the new significance of the bread and wine. And, finally, it is within this context of the community celebration that each individual responds in faith to Christ's offer. Thus, what the faith of the Church "...realizes in the coming about of Christ's eucharistic presence as a sacramental offer, the faith of the individual realizes in his personal acceptance of this offered presence."(83)

5. Conclusion: Transubstantiation and/or Transignification?

It is against this background, finally, that Schillebeeckx deals with the issue of whether or not transignification is identical to, or a consequence of,transubstantiation. He begins by re-emphasizing that

reality is a gift given by God and cannot, therefore, be traced back to a human giving of meaning. "It is," he explains, "only within this already given mystery, and only if man builds upon the inviolable but mysterious gift which the "world of God" is, that man, giving meaning, can make a human world for himself."(84)

This same assertion applies to the eucharist. Schillebeeckx explains it as follows: "The active giving of meaning in faith by the Church and with her, by the individual believer takes place within the mystery of grace of the really present "body of the Lord" offered by God and attained by the Christian intention to reach reality."(85) This is to say, then, that it is on the basis of the given reality of Christ's body already present in the eucharist that the Church and the individual can both give meaning in faith to, and reach the reality of, Christ's offer. Transubstantiation, which assures that an objective reality (a "metaphysical density", as Schillebeeckx calls it) is contained in the elements, necessarily precedes transignification, which asserts that a change in the signifying function of the elements has taken place.(86) The significance changes, then, because the reality has already changed.

In answer to the question of whether or not transignification and transubstantiation are identical, then,Schillebeeckx, in The Eucharist, maintains that, while they are intimately connected they cannot simply be identified. Transignification is not simply a modernization that can be used to replace transubstantiation; to suggest that it is is to change, rather than enhance the doctrine defined at Trent and required of a believing Catholic. (87) Nor, however, does transignification deny or contradict transubstantiation. Rather, transignification, while helping to explain transubstantiation, both presupposes and demands it

as a necessary element. Transubstantiation, which Christ does to the elements, is necessary for transignification, which is what humans do in recognizing the changed meaning of the elements, to occur. Peter Beer aptly sums up Schillebeeckx' thought:

> Schillebeeckx wants to be clear about this: that Christ offering himself as food and the believer receiving him as food, presupposes Christ's presence as a metaphysical priority to the believer's act of faith. Christ's real eucharistic presence does not result from man's handiwork or from man's giving of meaning alone, even if this happens within faith.(88)

It is this conclusion which is the most problematic aspect of Schillebeeckx' eucharistic theology. Jill Raitt charges that, by distinguishing between the meaning of the symbolic act and the ontological change, Schillebeeckx has restricted the fundamental idea of transignification to such an extent that it becomes insufficient. That is, by insisting that the change which is effected by Christ must serve as the basis for the change of the meaning of this symbolic act, he is in effect declaring that a change in sign alone is not enough. Raitt argues: "...he has to change the fundamental idea of transignification to make it insufficient, i.e., he has to reduce it to the merely human giving of meaning whereas the change is in fact a liturgical one which involves primarily the institution of the action by Christ in the Church."(89) Thus, according to Raitt, Schillebeeckx has compromised the meaning of transignification by not insisting on the reality of Christ <u>in</u> the symbolic act.

In light of Raitt's convincing argument, I would agree with her fundamental thesis that Schillebeeckx does to some extent compromise the idea of transignification. That is, I agree that by distinguishing between ontological and symbolic reality, he is declaring that a change

in sign, while important, is not significant enough to constitute the change in reality demanded by the believing Roman Catholic.

I do not, however, agree with Raitt's dissatisfaction with the whole of Schillebeeckx' eucharistic theology. A large part of her dissatisfaction stems, I would suggest,from a different understanding of re-interpretation: whereas she is thinking of reinterpretation in terms of totally eliminating the whole concept of transubstantiation, Schillebeeckx sees reinterpretation as an enhancement of and an addition to the old concept of transubstantiation. While I admit that Schillebeeckx could have stated this more clearly from the beginning, I would argue that his intent all along was to use transignification not to replace transubstantiation, but to enhance that part of transubstantiation--the personal, human dimension--which for so long had been neglected. In so doing, Schillebeeckx achieves his larger aim which was:

> ...to interpret the reality of faith of the distinctive real presence of Christ in the Eucharist in a manner that is open to the experience of modern man and above all as an authentic Catholic dogma which every Catholic can accept and with which he can feel at home even in the new climate of thought of the twentieth century.(90)

Hence, despite some inherent difficulties that still need to be worked out, there is much to be said for Schillebeeckx' development of eucharistic theology. It has broadened the understanding of the real presence into the context of the total sacramental act rather than in the elements alone. That is, his development of transignification places the statement of transubstantiation in its religious context and removes the change in the substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ from a merely physical level to a specifically

sacramental level.(91) Thus, in using transignification to enhance transubstantiation, Schillebeeckx indicates that the notion of a change occurring at the eucharist is no longer simply a matter of physical change, but also, a matter of a change in the meaning and significance of the elements of the bread and wine for the believer and the larger Church. In so doing,the emphasis has been returned from the elements to the effect on the people. It is, therefore, to the credit of transignification that the eucharistic conversion is moving from the objective categories to more personal, human categories of meaning and significance. Thus, by moving the eucharistic change from the objective, purely physical level to a more subjective, sacramental level, Schillebeeckx is attempting to deepen the meaning of transubstantiation and thus make it more relevant to those participating in the eucharist. Hence,as Marie Zimmerman concludes: "Ainsi donc, si la transsignification nécessite la réalité exprimée par la transsubstantiation, cette première évite de situer la dernière au plan de l'objectivation, car dans le domaine de la physique, la transsubstantiation reste sans signification."(92)

D. CONCLUSION: VATICAN RESPONSE

On September 3, 1965, Pope Paul VI issued the encyclical Mysterium Fidei. It is important to re-emphasize at this point that such theological discussion had been, as Cyril Vollert points out, part of the theological scene for over a decade. (93) For example, while the final form of Schillebeeckx' decisive work, The Eucharist, was published in English only in 1967, it was the culmination of many years of work and had already been published in article form in early 1965. (94) That

which the encyclical was addressing, then, were these culminated attempts at interpretation.

The encyclical is addressed in very general terms: to the "patriarchs, primates, archbishops, bishops, and other local ordinaries...and to the clergy and faithful of the entire world." Although Paul VI never specifically mentions anyone by name, many sources (especially in the Italian press) cited Dutch Catholic theologians as being those to whom the encyclical was directed. As Donald Campion reports: "They call attention to the fact that almost the only known Catholic advocacy of new speculative views on the Eucharist in recent years has come from a few Dutch thinkers."(95) In reply, Osservatore Romano published a statement, "...saying that the encyclical was not directed against the clergy of any country in particular."(96) Nevertheless, most commentators on the encyclical agree that it must have been written at least in part to the theology which was emerging from the Netherlands. Indeed, as René Marlé points out,

> s'il ne s'était agi que de la Hollande, on voit mal pourquoi le Souverain Pontife, si soucieux de manifester la confiance qu'il porte à l'épiscopat,aurait éprouvé le besoin d'intervenir en quelque sorte par-dessus la tête des évêques ou de porter devant l'Eglise universelle les conflits et misères affectant uniquement une communauté particulière.(97)

Despite the fact that the person or persons to whom the encyclical is directed remains unclear, the purpose and scope of it is obvious:

> ...some of those who are dealing with this Most Holy Mystery in speech and writing are disseminating opinions on Masses celebrated in private or on the dogma of transubstantiation that are disturbing the minds of the faithful and causing them no small measure of confusion about matters of faith. (98)

Paul VI's concern, then, is that some misrepresentation and misunderstanding could and has occurred among both the faithful and

priests who do not correctly understand the new theology. As James Quinn ascertains: "The Pope's preoccupation seems to be to reassure the faithful; at the same time he warns the serious theologian of the dangers of misunderstanding by those less well equipped to appreciate the nuances of theological meaning."(99)

Despite this seeming condemnation, however, Paul VI adamantly denies that he disapproves of or wishes to hamper theological renewal in the field of the eucharist. Rather,he commends the "...praiseworthy effort to investigate this lofty Mystery and to set forth its inexhaustible riches and to make it more understandable to the men of today; rather,We acknowledge this and We approve of it."(100) It is clear, then, that he is not condemning theological speculation about the eucharist. That which he insists is that any attempts at reinterpretation must not reject the teaching of the past: "...he is insisting that such growth be consonant with the traditional faith of the Church so that, in the progress of the understanding of our faith, the unchangeable truth of faith be maintained."(101)

While commending the effort that has been made in making the eucharist more understandable to the contemporary person, Paul VI does delineate four deviations from the teaching and practice of the Church which must be condemned:

1. Extolling the "community" mass in a way that detracts from Masses that are celebrated privately. 2. Concentrating on the notion of sacramental sign as if the symbol fully expresses the manner of Christ's presence. 3. Neglecting the Council of Trent's teaching on transubstantiation to the extent that the body and blood of Christ involve merely a "transignification"or "transfinalization" and nothing more. 4.

Proposing or acting as if Christ is no longer present in the consecrated hosts after the celebration of the Mass.(102) It is important to note, however, that while the encyclical is concerned with the safeguarding of doctrine which might possibly be abandoned in the attempt to reinterpret the eucharist, Paul VI nonetheless gathers and provides a rich body of traditional eucharistic teaching. In fact, René Marlé even goes so far as to declare that the caution which Paul VI issues with regard to the four deviations does not by any means constitute the majority of the encyclical: "...elles tiennent materièllement beaucoup moins de place que l'exposé positif des données fondamentales du dogme et des témoignages de la tradition sur lesquels il s'appuie."(103)

While other aspects of eucharistic doctrine are brought to surface in the encyclical (in particular the private masses and the adoration of the Eucharist), most notable is the emphasis that is put on preserving the doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist and the dogma of transubstantiation. "Le plus important de ces gauchissements ou appauvrissements," maintains Marlé, "est sans doute celui qui concerne la présence réele et le dogme de la "transsubstantiation."(104)

In dealing with these, Paul VI begins, not by concentrating on the eucharistic presence, but by affirming the different modes of Christ's presence in the Church: in the prayers, the works of mercy, the preaching, the ruling of the Church as well as in the sacrifice of the Mass and the administration of the sacraments. All of these, however, are surpassed by Christ's substantial presence in the eucharist. "This presence, " explains the encyclical, "is called "real" not to exclude the idea that the others are "real" too, but rather to indicate presence

par excellence, because it is substantial and through it Christ becomes present whole and entire, God and man."(105)

Symbolism, according to Paul VI, while important, is inadequate to express this real presence of Christ in the eucharist. "It does not," he explains, " indicate or explain what it is that makes this Sacrament different from all the others."(106) That which is necessary to express the real presence is the Tridentine dogma of transubstantiation, which "assures us that the way in which Christ becomes present in this sacrament is through the conversion of the whole substance of the bread into His body and of the whole substance of the wine into His blood..."(107) The encyclical, then, is directed against any theory which would remove the idea of a substantial change in the eucharist and which is expressed by transubstantiation. Accordingly, any attempt

> ...to discuss the mystery of transubstantiation without mentioning what the Council of Trent had to say about the marvelous conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body and the whole substance of the wine into the blood of Christ, as if they involve nothing more that "transignification," or "transfinalization" as they call it...(108)

is insufficient.

Nonetheless, as many proponents of the new eucharistic theology assert, Paul VI does not outrightly condemn transignification or transfinalization. Rather, he insists that the eucharistic change cannot be thought of only in these terms and apart from the ontological change which is expressed by transubstantiation. He writes:

> As a result of transubstantiation, the species of bread and wine undoubtedly take on a new signification and a new finality, for they are no longer ordinary bread but instead a sign of something sacred and a sign of spiritual food; but they take on this new signification, this new finality, precisely because they contain a new "reality" which we can rightly call ontological.(109)

Once transubstantiation does occur, the bread and wine do indeed, Paul VI affirms, take on a new meaning and a new finality, but only as a result of the new ontological reality which they now contain. The transignification and the transfinalization which occur are, then, a consequence of transubstantiation. As E.L. Mascall concludes: "What is condemned then is not transignification and transfinalization as such, but the reduction of transubstantiation to these and nothing more."(110)

In the final analysis, there does not seem to be much difference between that which Schillebeeckx proposes in The Eucharist and that which is outlined in Mysterium Fidei. While it is true that the encyclical does at first glance appear to be an outright condemnation of transignification, this is not the case.(111) Rather, both Schillebeeckx and Paul VI arrive at the same basic conclusion: transignification does in fact occur but cannot be thought of apart from transubstantiation. Perhaps, as Paul Jersild suggests, Schillebeeckx' final conclusion was in part "...motivated by criticism of the new eucharistic theology from within his church..."(112) Be that as it may, however, I would reiterate that, despite certain weaknesses, Schillebeeckx does accomplish that which he sets out to do: by emphasizing the importance of transignification in the eucharistic change, he does in fact put the eucharist in the more subjective and personal realm of human meaning and significance and, in so doing, makes it more relevant to the twentieth century person. While safeguarding the traditional doctrine expressed at Trent and, at the same time, staying within the bounds of orthodoxy, Schillebeeckx manages to both clarify and deepen the meaning of transubstantiation in order that the twentieth

century person "...might live it in a more authentic fashion and, so to speak, in a more existential manner."(113)

CHAPTER FOUR: THE EUCHARIST IN LIBERATION THEOLOGY

Within the last three decades a new phenomenon has arisen on the theological scene: liberation theology. Throughout the years, the impact of the theology of liberation has gone far from being merely a Latin American concern; it is now in the forefront of theological reflection and has even gone beyond the borders of the Church to become of interest to the general public.(1) It is within this context of liberation theology, furthermore, that a new eucharistic theology is being developed. Liberation theologians, who also recognize the need to make the doctrine of the eucharist relevant for the layperson of the twentieth century, are going beyond this need for relevancy to reach out to those who are in, or concerned with, a situation of oppression and injustice. The meaning of the eucharist, they claim, is that of service. The eucharist must be understood as a consciousness-raising, community-forming event in which service and liberation are the main focus and outcome. It is, then, this re-interpretation of the eucharist that will be the focus of this chapter. Before commencing with a study of the eucharistic theology, however, it is necessary to first gain a general understanding of the theology of liberation, since it is from within this context that this particular re-interpretation of the eucharist has arisen.

A. LIBERATION THEOLOGY

The roots of contemporary liberation theology are most definitely based in Latin America. Although precursors of this type of theology can be traced back to the earliest colonial days in Latin America, it

was not until the 1960's that a concrete theology of liberation emerged on the scene.(2) Thus it was that during the 1960's, Latin American theologians began to make a break away from European theology and to take Latin America as their context for study.(3)

Two factors in particular led to the creation of liberation theology. First, the 1960's were a time of socio-political unrest in many Latin American countries. The recognition that many governments advocated a form of development which benefitted only the rich and excluded the majority of the population gave rise to popular movements seeking change in socio-economic structures. Latin Americans became aware that Western achievements should not be taken as the norm and, moreover, that the development of the Western world had occurred at the expense of the Third World.(4) The developmentalist theory which implied that underdeveloped countries must catch up to developed countries by imitation was henceforth rejected. Instead, the understanding grew that "if the underdeveloped countries are to attain liberation, they must break the cycle of dependence on the advanced, industrialized countries."(5) The existing social structures were therefore called into question. This, in turn, aided in the development of liberation theology.(6)

Along with the socio-political factor, there was also a distinct ecclesial factor that helped give rise to the development of liberation theology. Of primary importance was the Second Vatican Council with its emphasis on freedom and creativity in theology. It was as a result of this freedom that the Church began to understand itself as a pilgrim church and human history as the place in which God is at work. As a result of Vatican II, then, the Church was "...led to a profound re-

evaluation of its mission in the world and of the understanding of the Christian message."(7) The conference of 1968 at Medellin further developed this understanding. By officially applying Vatican II to Latin America, Medellin gave the new theology of the Council concrete form in Latin America.(8) It was, therefore, a combination of political and religious factors which precipitated the concretization of liberation theology: "In the 1960's new questions about the social order urgently demanded new answers, and church people felt a new freedom to respond."(9)

It is important to re-affirm at this point that liberation theology is no longer a purely Latin American phenomenon. It is, Robert McAfee Brown contends, "...a product of the Third World, enunciated thus far most clearly in Latin America, but with significant parallels among the dispossessed elsewhere (blacks in North America, Africa and Asia, for e.g.)..."(10) Latin American liberation theology is but one aspect, albeit the most prominent, of a much larger movement.

As a result of the growth of the movement in various countries, liberation theology is becoming increasingly diversified. That is, insofar as different countries have different concerns, the emphases developed in liberation theology are widely varied. The major concern in Latin American liberation theology, for example, is the socio-economically poor; those who, according to Leonardo Boff, lack or are deprived of the necessary means by which to live.(11) This type of material poverty is looked upon as an evil which dehumanizes people. It is, therefore, contrary to the will of God and something from which people should seek to be liberated.(12) The theology of liberation that is being developed in Asia, on the other hand, is distinct from Latin

American theology insofar as it focusses mainly on inculturation. It seeks to recognize Christ's presence in non-Christian religions in order to enter into meaningful dialogue with them. Dialogue is not, however,the only objective. Leonardo Boff points out that this dialogue is established "...with a view to awakening their huge potential for social liberation."(13) Hence both the inculturationist and the liberationist approaches are present in Asian liberation theology.

African liberation theology, too, shows aspects of both approaches. On the one hand, liberation theologians are working at rehabilitating the African culture and religious traditions which were ignored or destroyed during colonization in order to make room for white Christianity. At times, this inculturationist approach often comes into conflict with South African black theology which insists that liberation theology must go beyond the rehabilitation of African traditions to be a prophetic voice for the poor and oppressed.(14) To suggest, however, that these two approaches are in constant conflict is incorrect. As Phillip Berryman aptly affirms, the inculturationist approach is "...liberating insofar as it amounts to affirming their own being as Asians and Africans."(15) Thus, despite the vast differences in the expressions of liberation theology that are found on the different continents, all have much the same goal, although it may be approached in different ways. That is to say, then, that all are concerned with the liberation of those who suffer from any kind of oppression, be it social, economic, political, religious or racial.

It would be appropriate at this point, after having traced the history and development of liberation theology, to give a definition of this new type of theology. Liberation theology, according to Clodovis

Boff, is "faith reflection on the praxis of liberation" or,in other words, "reflection on the life of the Christian community from a standpoint of its contribution to liberation."(16) Such a definition, however, should not lead one to believe that reflection alone is the most important element in liberation theology. To the contrary, liberation theologians insist that the primary concern is the action of liberating those who are oppressed within human history. Hence, as Gustavo Gutierrez clearly explains, liberation theology is "...not so much a new theme for reflection as a new way to do theology...This is a theology which does not stop with reflecting on the world, but rather tries to be part of the process through which the world is transformed."(17)

Liberation theology marks a break away from a purely academic form of theology.(18) Liberation theologians do not, for the most part, teach full-time at a university, but spend a good portion of their time with grassroots communities, contributing to the community the benefits of an academic education. In fact, Gutierrez even goes so far as to claim that it is precisely because of this contact that the theologians are in fact theologians: "...professional theologians must be linked with a Christian community in order to gain answers."(19) As a result, liberation theologians are developing a theology that is truly from the people.

The primary element, or first act, of liberation theology is not the theology itself. It is, rather, a commitment to the oppressed and their struggle for liberation.(20) In order for this commitment to occur, direct, personal contact with the oppressed is a necessary precondition. By listening directly to the experiences of the people and

observing their actions, one begins to recognize the presence of God in their suffering and struggle. From this recognition comes the conversion of lifestyle.(21) Jose Miguez-Bonino describes this conversion as follows: "...what is needed is transformation--the kind of understanding that penetrates beyond facts to reality, the kind of understanding that can change lives."(22) Hence, once transformation occurs, true commitment to the poor can and does take place.

It is only after taking this first step of making a commitment that the secondary element of critical reflection can occur. As Theo Witvliet ascertains, the "...commitment of faith precedes the origin of any theological reflection."(23) Once the action is committed, reflection on that action can take place. Liberation theology is, therefore, a reflection on what has transpired because of the first act of commitment and as such is most definitely the second act.

The methodology of this critical reflection on praxis (or theology) takes place in three stages. First, social analysis must occur. Theologians must inform themselves about the forms of oppression that are suffered and, in so doing, discover the reasons and causes of that oppression. In Latin America, for example, where the pre-dominant expression of oppression is socio-economic poverty, theologians have determined that poverty occurs as a result of unjust social structures and plunder by oppressors. The way to end such oppression, they have concluded, is to transform or replace the existing social structures with alternatives.(24)

Liberation theology, therefore, uses a different set of tools than does classical theology. Whereas in the past, philosophy was used as an aid to theology (e.g. Aquinas' use of Aristotle), liberation theology is

using the social sciences--sociology and political science in particular--as an aid.(25) Marxism in particular is especially useful for liberation theologians as an instrument for social analysis. This is not to imply, of course, that liberation theology is based on Marxism or that those involved with the struggle for liberation are Marxists. To the contrary, most liberation theologians hasten to insist that "...the Bible provides our overall approach to life, while Marx is simply a useful analytical tool."(26)

The second step after having analyzed the social conditions is hermeneutical meditation. In this step, the Bible (and often church documents) is re-read from the perspective of the oppressed and in terms of their own experience.(27) The important element in this re-reading of the Bible is not to interpret Scripture,but to interpret their own experience according to Scripture. Application of Bible texts to daily life is, therefore, an important component of doing theology.

The major themes with which liberation theology deals most often come from this type of re-reading of the Bible. For example, from the story of Exodus comes the conviction that God does indeed side with the oppressed. By reading the Exodus account, those who are oppressed today come to the realization that God is concerned with the quality of social, political and economic structures, and that liberation from these unjust structures can be, as it was for the Hebrews, the basis for the religious experience of liberation from sin.(28) Likewise, when re-reading the Gospel accounts from their own situation of oppression, liberation theologians have developed a new christology. Without making Jesus out to be a social revolutionary, they have put the emphasis on Jesus' humanity, with all of its social and political implications. As

a result, they are able to point out the similarities between their own and Jesus' situation as well as to demonstrate Jesus' liberative program and practices.(29)

Stemming from such a christology is the conviction that God reveals Himself in human history, and that the Kingdom which Jesus preached is not in another world, but a transformation of this one. "We must," according to Enrique Dussel, "come to realize that day-to-day history is the one and only place where God reveals himself to us...God reveals himself before our eyes in our neighbor and in history."(30) The concern of liberation theology is not, therefore, with an interior or otherworldly spirituality. Rather, the focus is with this world and God's revelation of his Kingdom on earth.

After re-reading the Bible in light of one's own situation, the final stage in doing liberation theology is practical mediation, in which people combine the knowledge gained from the first two stages in order to work out a plan of action. During this stage a decision is made regarding what is possible, strategy and tactics are defined and a program for action is drawn up.(31) Hence, liberation theology both begins and ends with action: "theology must both issue from engagement and lead to renewed engagement."(32) It is, therefore, a theology which keeps in tension both theory and practice.(33)

It is important to emphasize at this point that doing liberation theology as described above is not only the task of professional theologians. In fact, according to Boff, there are three integrated levels at which liberation theology is done: professional, pastoral and popular. The theology which is done at these three levels is substantially the same; that which makes them distinct is the language which is

used at each level.(34) At the professional level are those professional theologians who have spent years in study, writing and teaching, but who are nonetheless an integral part of the community. As well, liberation theology is done at the pastoral level by those pastors, nuns and lay people who are committed to liberation. At this level, liberation theology enters into the fields of catechesis, liturgy, spirituality, art and preaching. The third level--the popular level--is the most important level according to Boff since it is the one at which liberation theology is most present and alive.(35) The people at this level include all those characterized by lack of employment, housing, food, health and education.(36) They are, therefore, those who live within the situation of oppression and are seeking concrete liberation from it. It is these people, then, who make up the basic Christian communities.

Basic Christian communities, as Phillip Berryman describes them, are "...small lay-led communities, motivated by Christian faith, that see themselves as part of the church and that are committed to working together to improve their communities and to establish a more just society."(37) They are, most liberation theologians agree, the primary embodiment of liberation theology and, some would say, of the wider church. Enrique Dussel, for example, emphatically declares: "I would say that we cannot really be part of the living Church nowadays without being a member of such a community."(38) Basic Christian communities, therefore, without being a parallel Church, are most definitely a new form of being church within the larger church society. As such, they seek to bridge the gap between the impersonal, hierarchical church and the individuals who are part of it.(39)

The reasons for the emergence of these base Christian communities in the late 1960's are numerous. First, previous experiences with small groups such as Curcillo or Catholic Action where the small cell structure basic to the group served as an early antecedent to the basic Christian communities.(40) More importantly, the awareness that the existing system of huge parishes was largely inappropriate for countries where people were widely dispersed led to the recognition that smaller, closer groups were necessary. Likewise, more and more there arose a desire for a distinctly Latin American form of church which would involve a larger number of people.(41) Furthermore, the acute shortage of priests in these countries has necessarily meant an increased role for the laity:

> The rise of the basic communities is also due to the crisis in the church institution. The scarcity of ordained ministers to attend to the needs of these communities has aroused the creative imagination of the pastors themselves, and they have come to entrust the laity with more and more responsibility.(42)

The basic Christian communities are, therefore, by and large a lay movement. While it is true that a great number of the communities got their start from a priest or nun, it is nonetheless the lay people who are in charge of the community and its ministries. Lay participation is primary and occurs to such an extent that it is no longer only priests and nuns who are starting the communities, but lay people from other communities. Lay participation, then, is developing more and more into lay leadership.(43)

Basic Christian communities are essentially pastoral. That is, the oppressed get together to try to understand their situation and the problems arising from it in the light of the Bible and their own faith.

They then seek to remedy those problems by obtaining the services and resources that they deem necessary.(44)

Despite the fact that the communities are pastoral in nature, however, they without doubt have a political and social impact simply because of the way in which they go about solving those pastoral problems. That is, the members of the community seek to solve their problems through the process of conscientization: they first try to discover the cause of their oppression and then organize themselves into movements which will take direct action in solving the problem.(45) Such action cannot help but affect the social and political environments. Furthermore, as a result of the action which the communities take, they are often bound up with the popular movement, which includes all organizations and activities by which the oppressed manifest their struggle for liberation. While the popular movement does add an extra dimension of strength to the communities, that which the communities give to the popular movement is more important: a testimony to the God who is working with the poor in their struggle for liberation.(46)

B. THEOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENTS IN LIBERATION THEOLOGY

Before delving into the re-interpretation of the doctrine of the eucharist, it will prove useful to first briefly examine the understanding of the sacraments in general as it has been discussed within the framework of liberation theology.(47) The starting point for dealing with the sacraments is the conviction on the part of liberation theologians that the meaning behind the sacraments has been distorted through the centuries. This crisis of meaning, according to Juan Luis Segundo,

is due in large part to the fact that the sacraments are often understood as magical actions:

> Magical actions are different from ordinary actions in two respects...Firstly, in terms of expected efficacy, there is no normal relationship between the means employed and the outcome. Secondly, the outcome it not dependent on whim; it is tied by a superhuman power to fixed ritual gestures or words.(48)

When sacraments are understood as actions which produce grace as long as the proper rite is performed (with the minimum human disposition), a magical conception of the sacraments is understandable. The tendency to interpret the sacraments in terms of their efficacy alone gives them a magical orientation. Moreover, in line with this understanding, that which is considered the most important is the grace which is accumulated by partaking in these magical rites. Thus, Segundo concludes: "...there is no doubt that the common sacramental theology is of the "bank deposit" type."(49)

The basis of this magic-oriented sacramental theology is the dualism that exists between everyday life and religious life, between the sacred and the profane: "we find a conflict between the "religious" conception of Christianity and their real life experience of a desacralized world."(50) A magical view of the sacraments occurs, therefore, when God's activity is limited to certain rites that effect salvation in religious life, independent of that which occurs in history. "Magic," Segundo insists, "is a matter of looking for divine efficacy in certain procedures without any relation to historical efficacy."(51) Hence, when God's activity is limited to otherworldly activities, rather than those in human history, the meaning of the sacraments becomes distorted.

Segundo continues by insisting that this crisis that is occurring

is not simply a crisis of the sacraments, but, more fundamentally, a crisis of the Christian community:

> In short, what is plaguing us is not a crisis over the sacraments but a crisis over the coherence and meaningfulness of the Christian community. There are times when it seems that our yearning and zeal for ritual reform and liturgical renewal is a superficial way of solving a much deeper problem. For it enables us to hide from the real problem: the problem of community.(52)

The more profound problem rests, therefore, with the meaninglessness of the Christian community in the present day situation.

When the Christian community is thought of as valuable simply because it dispenses the sacraments, it too becomes magical and otherworldly, and bears little relationship to human history. To the contrary, the community must be historically realistic; its members must be concerned with each other and with this world. It must be a community in the truest sense of the word:

> ...it must be a community of mutual aid in which people practice the dimensions of real encounter and fraternal love, not simply by reading or reflection, but by proffering real, concrete help...The community ought to be able to free itself on every level (material, moral, etc.) so that it can exercise service to the rest of mankind.(53)

Finally, as a true community, the Christian community would itself be transformed into a sacrament and sign of salvation.

The true meaning of the sacraments can be brought to light by a correct understanding of what the Christian community can and should be. Rather than the importance of the sacraments being attributed to the grace conferred to the individual, a new understanding of the sacraments would see the efficacy in their ability to aid in the community forming process. Hence, the sacraments

> ...are made so that the grace conferred may structure a community by way of signification; so that it may be turned into a community; and even more specifically, so that it may

> be turned into a community that thinks and dialogues in terms of what is really taking place in history, above and beyond mere appearance.(54)

Thus, the efficacy of the sacraments should be dependent on their ability to help create a community which is true to its call of service. As a result, they should no longer be understood as rites which ensure individual salvation,but as signs which promote the liberation of the entire community. The grace which is received in the sacraments is, therefore, the grace that will prepare the community to be a liberating factor in history.

Finally, it should be pointed out that the result of such an understanding of the sacraments as community building events will undoubtedly lead to the desacralization of the priesthood. This interpretation no longer professes that the grace of the sacrament is received only through the performance of sacred rites. Rather, the entire community is itself grace-filled. As a result, the conception of the minister of the sacraments will necessarily change: "So long as the priest's functions were seen by the faithful as something which had direct, salvific value, things that had efficacy in themselves independently of their benefit to the rest of mankind, then the priest himself felt he had a definite place in society."(55) With the change of understanding, then, this view of the priest will change to one of the minister who serves the community in their historical struggle. Thus, the sacraments will become truly <u>for</u> the people; instead of being solely the possession of the priest, the sacraments will be given back to the community.

C. THE RE-INTERPRETATION OF THE EUCHARIST IN LIBERATION THEOLOGY

As with most facets of Christian theology, liberation theology has also re-interpreted the doctrine of the eucharist from within the context of the struggle for liberation. Due to the centrality of the eucharist to the Christian faith, it is inconceivable that the doctrine of the eucharist would remain untouched by a new way of doing theology which is giving a total re-orientation to Christianity. It is, however, important to recognize that the eucharist is not one of the foremost concerns to liberation theologians. The document on liturgy, which was given first place at the Second Vatican Council, was given ninth position at Medellin. This is a good indication that the primary focus of liberation theology is not with doctrine, but with the human situation in which that doctrine is encountered.(56) Furthermore, since liberation theology is a relatively new way of doing theology, it is not surprising that not all aspects of Christian theology have yet been completely dealt with. Dermot Lane confirms this: "One particular area in which the perspectives of political theology, liberation theology and social theology have yet to be fully applied is the liturgy of the eucharist."(57) Hence, it is not a fully developed theology of the eucharist which has emerged from liberation theology. Be this as it may, however, many theologians have come to the conclusion that a re-interpretation of the eucharist is a necessary component of the overall re-orientation of theology.

The starting point for the majority of liberation theologians who have dealt with eucharistic theology is the conviction that the euchar-

ist as it is understood and practiced in the present day is for the most part lacking both in relevance and in meaning for those who partake of it:

> That so-called sacrament as it is celebrated in our churches has little or no relevance for modern [people], precisely because it has little or nothing to do with eating and drinking outside church walls. It has nothing to do with the problems of poverty and hunger which oppress all people in their daily lives. The Lord's Supper has no relation to their work, their economics and their politics.(58)

The eucharist as it is now being celebrated seems to have no relation to the social issues of the day. Likewise, it is often seen as an other-worldly flight from the problems of this world into an individualistic, pietistic world: "liturgy provides something of 'a break' from the hurly-burly of daily life and 'an escape' from the social responsibilities we bear for the world around us."(59)

This lack of relevance, however, would seem to stem from a deeper problem: the lack of <u>meaning</u> in the celebration of the eucharist. "There have," Tissa Balasuriya argues, "been serious distortions in its meaning. Whereas it began with the sacrifice of self for the liberation of others, it has long been a means of enslavement and domestication of believers."(60) This is to say, then, that the true inner meaning of the eucharist has been changed and often obliterated. Too often, the eucharist has become a means of perpetuating injustice both by forcing the oppressed to accept their condition for the sake of unity and by legitimizing the oppressors' activities of exploitation. Balasuriya explains the situation of colonization as follows: "The Eucharist went side by side with the worst and largest-scale exploitation that the world has ever seen...It has evolved alongside the world's worst

exploitation and did not contest it or, rather, it tended to justify the status quo."(61)

As a result of the irrelevance and meaninglessness of the eucharist, the Christian community has broken down. That is to say that those who oppose what the eucharist has become and what it supports no longer have their needs fulfilled at a standard celebration of the eucharist and therefore no longer attend. "It is not uncommon to find Christians fully committed to the creation of a better world for the sake of the Kingdom of God, who have at the same time opted out of the eucharistic community."(62) These people will move away from the large-scale celebration of the Mass to smaller group masses or prayer meetings or paraliturgies. It is these same people, moreover, who are in the process of renewing the eucharist so that its meaning may be restored.

The restoration of the inner meaning of the eucharist is the main concern for the liberation theologians who have dealt with the issue. The starting point, it seems, is to determine the biblical meaning of the eucharist. Roger Mahoney affirms this: "I would contend that the proper understanding of that first Eucharist is essential to grasping the depth and fullness of the eucharistic celebration throughout the ages."(63)

To begin, most theologians direct their attention to the Old Testament background to the eucharist--that is, the Jewish Passover as well as the Jewish prophetic tradition--as the context within which Jesus instituted the eucharist. The Passover was, for the Jews, the national celebration of their liberation from slavery in Egypt. This liberation, which prefigured the subsequent liberation of all of humanity in Christ, was not a matter of social assistance, nor was it a

situation from which people could liberate themselves merely through prayer. Rather, according to liberation theologians, "the liberation which God wrought for his people was a political liberation."(64) Liberation in this case meant a physical struggle for freedom in which the people participated, but in which God was involved and fully in charge. Thus, the Passover celebrated God's concern for His people within their own human history.

Another decisive aspect of the Old Testament background to the eucharist is the prophetic tradition which explicitly condemns worship without justice. Amos, for example, spurned worship which had no relation to a concern for the poor and oppressed:

> I hate, I despise your feasts, and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies...
> Take away from me the noise of your songs; to the melody of your harps I will not listen.
> But let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an everflowing stream. (Amos 5:21,23-24, RSV)

Genuine worship, therefore, necessarily included a concern for others.

It is important to recognize at this point that concern for others was not meant to be understood in terms of charity, but in terms of justice:

> ...the prophets never appealed for charity or generosity from the rich: instead they demanded justice based on the consistent biblical teaching that the earth and its resources can never be merely private property. Land is a gift of God that is only lent to human beings, not for the benefit of a few but for all equally.(65)

In fact, to worship God without caring for the poor and marginalized was not to worship at all, since God had shown Himself through the Exodus to be concerned with His people. Thus, "...to know God is to know a God of justice. It is only with this understanding that God can be worshipped authentically."(66)

It is from within this context that Jesus based his own teachings. Jesus, like Moses of the Old Testament, found his people oppressed and under the domination of foreign powers, and set out to liberate them as Moses had done during the Exodus. (67) Moreover, like the prophets, Jesus protested against wrong political and religious structures. In Matthew, for example, Jesus manifests the link between justice and worship that was evident in the prophetic tradition: "So if you are offering your gift at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled with your brother, and then come and offer your gift." (Matthew 5:23-24, RSV) Justice, therefore, was for Jesus a necessary part of worship. In fact, Boff contends that Jesus meant that worship should be primarily a reflection of life: "one's piety ought to be the expression of a righteous and just life."(68) It is clear, then, that Jesus' concern throughout his ministry was for just relationships between humans. It is not surprising, therefore, that this concern carries over to the eucharist.

The accounts of the eucharist, when read from within the context of liberation theology, all seem to indicate that "for Jesus, the eucharist was primarily the supreme symbol of his self-offering unto death."(69) The eucharist was the action in which Jesus explained the significance and meaning of his life and death: the giving of self to others for the cause of total human liberation. It was, therefore, the symbolic action of who Jesus was and why he became incarnate: to free those oppressed by sin and by other forms of oppression which are rooted in sin.(70) Hence, the eucharist, instituted at the Last Supper, was for Jesus the

fulfillment of the Jewish Passover which celebrated the liberation of God's people from Egypt.

In the accounts of the institution of the eucharist in the three synoptic gospels as well as in I Corinthians, the eucharist takes place within the context of a meal. Within this context, the emphasis was placed on the gesture of sharing the bread and wine: "the simple, central action of the eucharist is the sharing of food--not only the eating but the sharing."(71) It was this gesture, then, that symbolized the whole of Jesus' life of giving to others. Moreover, it was a way for Jesus to be present to his followers after his death. As Paul Abela eloquently explains:

> It was in this gesture of Jesus--in which he put his whole self because it summed up his whole life, in which everything was shared--a life totally given (even to dying for those he loved)--that his disciples were to recognize him after his resurrection; it was this gesture that summed up his last commandments to his disciples--the mandatum; it was through this gesture that they would celebrate him and steep themselves in his thought and his ethics.(72)

That which was of importance to Jesus, then, was the actual fact of sharing which symbolized his own sharing of himself with others.

A further indication that the eucharist was for Jesus a symbol of his self-giving is the account in John's gospel of the washing of the disciples' feet. According to Sandra Schneiders, John's account is "...the analogue of the eucharistic institution narratives in the synoptic accounts of the supper, i.e., it functions as the symbol and catechesis of Jesus' approaching death, his handing over of himself for and to his disciples."(73) The washing of the feet is, therefore, a reflection on the profound meaning of the eucharist insofar as it reveals Jesus' action of service for others. That which was most important to John was not the institution of the eucharist itself, but

that which the eucharist stood for. Thus, Dermot Lane concludes: "In replacing the liturgical act of the eucharist with the washing of the feet, John is here substituting for the sacrament the reality that it signifies, namely the active service of others in charity."(74)

In addition, according to liberation theologians, both the synoptic accounts of the institution of the eucharist and the washing of the feet in John's gospel stress the abolition of injustice and inequality among humans. Because the eucharist was instituted in the context of a meal, it became the symbol of the equality of the participants. Gustavo Gutierrez explains this idea in these words: "...communion with God and others presupposes the abolition of all injustice and exploitation. This is expressed by the very fact that the eucharist was instituted during a meal. For the Jews, a meal in common was a sign of brotherhood."(75) Likewise, by his act of menial service of washing his disciples feet, Jesus "...acted to abolish the inequality between them, deliberately reversing their social positions and roles" and was, therefore, "subverting in principle all structures of domination."(76) Thus, the eucharist was for Jesus also a sign of unity among humans. The implication of this unity, of course, is the abrogation of injustice and domination.

Another factor that both the synoptic gospels and John's gospel have in common is the fact that, at the Last Supper, Jesus exhorted his followers to continue to live in the way that he had lived, by giving of themselves in service to others. In the synoptics, the institution of the eucharist is followed by the command: "Do this in memory of me." "This", according to liberation theologians, referred in principle to the action of sharing that was symbolized in the eucharist. Rafael

Avila declares: "The command of Jesus, "Do this", refers primarily to his giving of himself for the people, and secondarily to the ritualistic commemoration of this giving."(77) The participants at the eucharist were therefore called upon to give of themselves as Jesus had. In John's gospel, likewise, the account of the washing of feet is concluded with a command which parallels that of the institution narratives: "You should also do what I have done for you." This, then, was an explicit reference to the act of service which Jesus had demonstrated and an exhortation to those present to do the same.

The institution of the eucharist also served to establish a covenant community of those who would be committed to and carry on Jesus' cause of liberation. Monika Hellwig explains this as follows: "At the Last Supper Jesus makes it quite clear that to eat and drink of the unleavened bread and the cup of blessing is to enter into intimate fellowship with him in his death--to accept what he does for them and to do this for others."(78) Thus, the sharing of the bread and wine also served to establish the community which would work for justice in Jesus' name.

It is important to take notice at this point of Leonardo Boff's contention that the texts which carry the accounts of the Last Supper are based on the witness of such a covenant community which was already celebrating the eucharist. This is to say, then, that the meaning of the eucharist as given in those accounts was the meaning given to it by the early Christian community. "In its primitive meaning, however, the Last Supper appears to have had a distinctly eschatological connotation...as a symbol of the heavenly repast to be enjoyed in the Kingdom of God..."(79) Thus, the eucharist was for Jesus also a

foreshadowing of that time when all--oppressed and oppressors without distinction--will eat the shared meal together in fellowship. Understood in this manner, the eucharist was not merely a memorial of the Last Supper alone, but of all those significant meals when Jesus had fed the hungry and shared meals with the tax collectors, sinners and other marginals of his society. Once again, this leads to the conclusion that those who follow Jesus must do likewise. Hence, "...those who celebrate the eucharist in memory of Jesus, who follow his command to "do this", must feed the same sort of people and involve themselves with the same sort of dinner guests as Christ had at table."(80)

Furthermore, after Jesus' death and resurrection, the early Christian community continued to celebrated the eucharist in a way that was true to the meaning with which it was instilled by Jesus. In the Acts of the Apostles, the eucharist was briefly referred to as the breaking of the bread, and was accompanied by a communal meal and fellowship. It was, Balasuriya indicates, an informal event: "They listened to the teaching of the apostles, they prayed together, they conversed about their own problems, they shared a meal and commemorated the Lord."(81) The description of the eucharist itself in Acts was brief. However, its relation to the social lives of the participants was nonetheless emphasized. After referring to the breaking of bread, the author of Acts continued: "And all who believed were together, and had all things in common; and they sold their possessions and goods and distributed them to all, as any had need."(Acts 2:44-45, RSV) Thus, according to liberation theology, the explicit concern for others took place within the context of the eucharistic celebration.

Likewise, in I Corinthians 11, the explanation of what the eucharist was to mean for the early Christians was distinctly enunciated in Paul's rebuke to the community:

> But in the following instructions I do not commend you, because when you come together it is not for the better but for the worse..When you meet together, it is not the Lord's supper that you eat. For in eating, each one goes ahead with his own meal, and one is hungry and another drunk...Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord..For any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgement upon himself. (I Corinthians 11: 17, 20-21,27,29, RSV)

Paul's concern in this letter was quite obviously that some members of the community were eating the agape meal without taking into account the meaning behind the celebration of the eucharist which was to follow; that is, sharing and equality between members. Without this essential element, there could be no genuine celebration of the eucharist. That which was most important to Paul, therefore, was the unity of the covenant community which was, for him, the fuller body of Christ. R. Kevin Seasoltz remarks:

> When [Paul] speaks of "discerning the body", he is not referring primarily to a recognition of the real presence of Christ in the eucharistic species but rather to the recognition of Christ in the organic unity that exists...To discern the body is to grasp the indissoluble link between the eucharistic action and the community that is created and sustained by that action.(82)

Thus, the building of genuine community was the most important aspect of the eucharistic celebration for Paul.

The meaning of the eucharist, by the time of the early Christian community, had been greatly expanded. As Boff explicates: "The Eucharist will no longer be merely an eschatological sign of the imminence of the kingdom. Now, in the time of the church, it will be the community's nourishment, the place where the People of God, by

eating the body of Christ, become the body of Christ."(83) This is to say, then, that the social, communitarian aspect of sharing and service in the eucharist was soon given precedence over the view of the eucharist as a foretaste of the Kingdom. St. John Chrysostom, in 400 A.D., clearly showed this precedence with the following exhortation: "Do you want to honour Christ's body? Then do not honour him here in the church with silken garments while neglecting him outside where he is cold and naked...First fill him when he is hungry; then use the means you have left to adorn his table."(84) Hence, for the early Christians the eucharist was a social act that explicitly demanded service of others in order for it to be authentically celebrated. It was not to be an end unto itself, but an action which led to service and giving of self.

Many liberation theologians claim that it was after these first few centuries of Christianity that the meaning which was given to the eucharist by Jesus at the Last Supper and by the early Church began to be distorted. First, the communitarian aspect of the eucharist which was so important to Paul began to be subordinated to the objective real presence of Christ under the species of bread and wine. The actions of sharing and service carried out by the eucharistic community were no longer seen as the most important proclamation of Christ's presence. Thus,

> ...the presence of Christ "placed" by the Bible primarily in the community...became primarily a thing generated as the result of a cosmological concept of the presence of Christ, which involved the accompanying dangers of misrepresentation, of magic,and of ritualism, and consequently of dehistoricalization.(85)

In addition, the emphasis on uniformity and ritual in the Mass, the notion that the eucharist could be a means with which to bless people who rarely received, and the fact that attendance at Mass had become an

obligation worthy of merit, all tended to make the eucharist an individualistic, otherworldly ritual which had no relation to the everyday lives of those who attended.(86) Most significantly, the eucharist had often gone hand in hand with large scale exploitation, be it during the period of colonization or later, when the rich countries exploited the poor. Far from contesting the wide spread desecration of countries and native peoples, the celebration of the eucharist seemed to legitimize (or at least justify) the exploitation insofar as it allowed and even encouraged exploiter and exploited to sit at the same table. As Balasuriya concludes, this recognition has led to the conclusion that the eucharist itself is in captivity and is therefore in need of liberation from world power and the status quo.(87)

Starting with the liturgical movement of the twentieth century, there came a gradual recognition that something was missing in the celebration of the eucharist and that the situation had to be rectified. With the advent of Vatican II and the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, many helpful changes were initiated towards updating the eucharistic liturgy. As noted in Chapter Two, active participation was promoted and, to a large degree, rigidity in ceremony and ritual was eased. Despite these changes, however, the essential meaning of the eucharist has still not been completely restored. That is, the changes that were made were of an external nature (songs, language, ritual) and had little to do with the social aspect of the eucharist. Hence, Balasuriya contends, "...all these changes are marginal to the main problem that the whole Mass is still a bulwark of social conservatism and not yet a means of human liberation."(88)

Liberation theologians now insist that the essential link between the eucharist and justice found in the biblical and early Christian accounts of the eucharist must be restored. Leonardo Boff adamantly maintains: "...the eucharist cannot be celebrated in the spirit of Jesus when that celebration is unaccompanied by a hunger and thirst for justice."(89) Thus, the inner meaning of the eucharist must be recovered and emphasized. This is not to say that doctrinal issues and debates over the real presence and the sacrifice of the Mass are unimportant. They are, however, facets of the eucharist which have been over-emphasized throughout the centuries to the detriment of another, equally important aspect: the relationship between the celebration of the eucharist and justice for the world. As Dermot Lane indicates:

> In so far as this liberating action for justice is absent from the Mass, to the extent we have to say an essential element of the eucharistic mystery is missing. This thesis that Christian action for justice is bound up with the celebration of the eucharist is as important as the other basic doctrines of the eucharist such as the real presence, the sacrifice of Calvary, the paschal meal, and the memorial. (90)

It is this link, therefore, that liberation theologians are seeking to recover.

As a result of searching for the biblical and early Christian meaning of the eucharist and discovering the necessary link that must exist between worship and justice, liberation theologians have concluded that the eucharist must be connected with human liberation. "The Eucharist," Balasuriya declares, "has to be related positively to human liberation if it is to be faithful to its origins and its performance."(91) The eucharist must therefore be a memorial, a celebration and an application of the meaning of Jesus' life and death of service and self-giving for others.

If the eucharist is to be related to human liberation, a necessary part of the eucharistic celebration would be to alert those who are participating to the essential meaning of that in which they are participating. "An essential element in the celebration of the eucharist," Dermot Lane insists, "should be raising the consciousness of those who worship to their responsibility for effecting a liberating change in the world around us and the creation of a more just society in the service of the kingdom of God."(92) In order for those who participate in the eucharistic celebration to be true to its meaning, they must be made aware of the implication of that celebration for their own lives. If not, the entire meaning of the eucharist as a means of human liberation will be falsified. For example, is a Mass celebrated with those responsible for the torture and death of civilians true to its meaning of a celebration of community. Aldo Vannucchi questions: "Is there room for the oppressors and the oppressed at the Lord's Supper to partake of the Eucharist?...What must be done in order that liberation is evidenced precisely at the time of the Eucharist? Should the celebration be suspended in certain times and situations?"(93)

A meaningful celebration of the eucharist must therefore raise certain questions about the authenticity of what is being celebrated. It is important, however, to make a distinction at this point. Leonardo Boff puts it in these terms: "By no means am I calling into question the theological context of the sacrament, with its effect ex opere operato and the real presence of Christ. What I am questioning is the use we make of the eucharistic celebration on these occasions."(94) Thus, the concern on the part of the liberation theologians is not so much with the theology of the eucharist as with the authenticity of the

celebration. It must be a consciousness-raising event in order to be true to its meaning.

One particular aspect of contemporary liberation theology that serves as consciousness-raising events are the "protest Masses" that are being celebrated in some parts of Latin America. The Mass should, according to some theologians, on certain occasions serve as a protest against the injustices and oppression of humanity: "...l'eucharistie doit être un puissant cri d'alarme et de protestation, quelque chose qui vient troublé les consciences et éveiller des responsabilités politico-sociales."(95) Any celebration, Segundo Galilea claims, which is true to the meaning of the eucharist cannot help but be a protest against oppression. By proclaiming the sole lordship of Christ, the eucharist is excluding any system which claims to have Lordship over a people: "à la messe, on proclame non seulement que le Christ est l'unique Seigneur, mais encore que sa seigneurie exclut tout autre seigneurie sur les hommes."(96)

The problem that such a celebration could cause for any oppressive regime is obvious: the liturgy would become a subversive activity with political consequences that could ultimately destroy an oppressive system. Just how far most eucharistic celebrations are from this ideal, however, is most clearly exemplified by Joseph Gelineau:

> ...totalitarian political regimes which react adversely to the Church begin by forbidding Christians any form of self-organized action in society; they then prohibit or supervise religious instruction and preaching; but in general they allow worship as inoffensive. Moreover they sometimes consider the liturgy to be useful because it inculcates respect for the ruling order and submission to the established powers whatever they may be.(97)

The implication of this statement, therefore, is that the celebration of

the eucharist is not living up to its full potential as a liberating factor in society.

Regardless of how effective or ineffective most eucharistic celebrations are at bringing out this aspect of the eucharist, such a discussion nonetheless raises the issue of the place of politics in worship. There are, states Roger Mahoney, two extremes to this issue: those who demand that politics be kept out of liturgy entirely and those who perceive the eucharist to be a forum for promoting specific causes and concerns. Neither extreme is true to the authentic nature of the eucharist.(98) However, most theologians do insist that eucharistic celebrations, by their very character, are necessarily political events. As Herman Schmidt indicates: "Politics is a human activity...Politics is necessary in all situations experienced by [humanity]...The idea of politics is not restricted, therefore, to the state with its political parties."(99) This is to say that, as a gathering of particular people, at a particular time and place, the worshipping community is a political reality. The liturgy, therefore takes place within a political context. The celebration of the eucharist, then, cannot take place outside of this context and this historical situation, but must be a part of it with all that that entails. To evade the political aspect of the eucharistic celebration is either to give implicit assent to injustice and oppression or else to become otherworldly. Hence, Avila asserts: "To attempt an ostensibly apolitical liturgy in a world essentially political is absurd--unless one wants to banish the Eucharist from history."(100)

There are, of course, dangers inherent in such an approach to the eucharist. There is the risk, first of all, that considerations of

faith will be subordinated to those of society and politics, with too little attention being paid to the faith aspect of the celebration.(101) The celebration of the eucharist in this case would come to be seen merely as a political weapon or statement. This is undoubtedly a very real danger. It is not, however, only a danger for liberation theology. All theology runs the risk of being used to sanction a certain political system. A classic example of this is the Dutch Reformed Church's stance on apartheid.

Another danger, Bertrand DeClerq explicates, is that, because the official Church limits liturgical creativity in the Mass, paralitυrgical celebrations which do not have these limitations may be substituted. This could occur to such an extent that these paraliturgies "...may even come to replace the eucharistic or sacramental liturgy, with the possible consequence that little or no attempt may be made to do justice to the legitimate "political" aspect of the eucharistic liturgy itself."(102) The liberating dynamics intrinsic to the celebration of the eucharist would therefore be ignored. Despite these dangers, however, most liberation theologians insist that the eucharistic celebration must be political to some extent if it is to be true to its function and meaning of liberation. Moreover, the fact that these theologians are aware of the dangers gives some indication that they are prepared to face them.

If it is an authentic celebration, the eucharist should never be understood simply as an exhibition at which the people are spectators. In accord with Vatican II, Aldo Vannucchi insists that "...the eucharist is not a spectacle to be seen or endured, but action...that involves us in the same process, breaking the bread as [Jesus] broke it, washing the

feet of others as he did..."(103) In order to be true to its inner meaning, the eucharistic celebration must move from thought to action. To be celebrated in the Spirit of Jesus, the eucharist must move people to work towards the building of a just world order. To receive Christ in the eucharist is to be transformed to do what he did: live for others. As Jurgen Moltmann indicates: "In worship and in the eucharist [people] are taken up into this eschatological process of the setting free of the world to be a kingdom of glory."(104) Hence, properly celebrated, a transformation should occur as a result of the eucharistic celebration which would lead people to work for the realization of the Kingdom of God.

Working for the realization of the Kingdom which is anticipated in the eucharist necessarily involves a commitment on the part of those who are celebrating. "A community celebration of the eucharist solemnly commits all Christians to struggle actively against everything that discriminates against and disintegrates humanity."(105) To celebrate the eucharist, therefore, is to take the pledge to work for that of which the eucharist is a foretaste.

A word of caution is necessary at this point: the Kingdom of God can never be identified with a particular political system that is brought about by humans in history. Rather, the work of justice that will bring about the Kingdom is God's alone. "[Humanity's] politics does not make the kingdom of God, but He makes His kingdom come by means of those who welcome his justice and love."(106) Thus, God works through people to establish His Kingdom. Those who are participants in the eucharist can only work towards the establishment of a just world. In the end, the achievement is God's.

One tangible way of working towards the realization of the Kingdom that is emphasized over and over in liberation theology is the physical sharing of goods. The sharing of bread and wine at the Last Supper was indicative, claims J. Moiser, of how all material things should be used:

> ...built into the Eucharist, therefore, is a demand for the just distribution of the world's wealth. To share the eucharistic bread is to say, using symbols, that this is how [people] should be using all material things; this places sharing at the basis of Christianity.(107)

The symbolism of the eucharist should become a radical commitment to the building of a just world order. To receive the token of sharing in the eucharist is a commission to do likewise: "Since food is shared around this table, it is also to be shared around other tables."(108)

The basic human experience needed to understand what sharing means is, according to Monika Hellwig, hunger. "Hunger," she writes, " is a total, global experience."(109) Those who are hungry are not only starving for physical sustenance, but also those who are starving for love and human fulfillment. One type of hunger is on the physical level, while the other is on the emotional or spiritual level. Despite this difference, however, the two levels are complementary and inter-dependent. Hellwig explains it as follows:

> It has been observed in the contemporary world that those who most insistently complain as adults of finding that hunger [for human fulfillment] unfulfilled, are also those who individually or collectively are amassing and hoarding and wasting so much of the material resources of the world, that others are kept on the verge of starvation in great numbers. (110)

As a result, all people--both oppressors and oppressed--need to be liberated from these oppressive situations.

While it may seem at first glance that such an explanation in some way justifies those who hoard goods for themselves, this is not true.

What is true is that physical hunger "...is not due to overpopulation but to patterns of land and food distribution."(111) This is to say, then, that the suffering of hunger is due to warped human behaviour which is intent only on self-preservation. It is, therefore, only by correcting this attitude and replacing it with one of sharing that physical hunger will cease to be the overwhelming problem that it is today.

This type of sharing should be the outcome of a meaningful eucharistic celebration. In fact, some theologians are even going so far as to say that this aspect of sharing is the very essence of the eucharist. Mark Searle, for example, proposes that:

> ...it used to be thought that the "matter" of the sacraments was bread, wine, oil, water and so forth. More recently there has been a healthy tendency to suggest that it is not the bread that constitutes the sacramental sign of the eucharist...but bread that is broken and shared, the cup of wine passed around for all to drink...(112)

It is, therefore, in the action of sharing that Christ's presence is affirmed.

When all is said and done, however, the most important facet of the eucharist in its relation to liberation is its ability to form a community which is committed to the work of justice and liberation. "Hence," Balasuriya explains, "our pre-occupation has not to be so much with the eucharistic service for its own sake, but, rather, with the building of a real sharing community that is concerned with the whole society."(113) The eucharist cannot remain an end unto itself, but must be related to what is occurring in the world. The building of a true community, therefore, must become the major issue in eucharistic theology and must be given precedence over matters of ritual.

It is, furthermore, in community that the real presence of Christ is acknowledged at its most profound level. In I Corinthians 11, for example, Paul made it clear that that which invalidated the eucharist was not the lack of correct rites, but rather the lack of a proper eucharistic community. Using this passage as a basis, many liberation theologians now insist that the reception of Christ's body in the bread must lead to the creation of a new Body of Christ: a community of fellowship. This is not to say, of course, that the distinctive presence of Christ in the bread and wine is not important. To the contrary, this presence provides the basis for the formation of the larger Body of Christ. That is, transformation of life occurs because it is really Christ who calls us to be transformed into the larger Body of Christ. (114) Dermot Lane expresses it this way: "...it is not just bread alone which is being called the body of Christ but the community of people drawn and assembled together as a new reality in sharing the eucharistic species."(115) The reason behind Christ's presence in the bread and wine, therefore, is to transform the participants, enabling them to create a new reality of sharing and service.

Once the Christian community is formed, it must take some sort of action against those injustices which it sees as being contrary to the true meaning of the eucharist. As Chris Manus explains: "The reception of Holy Communion has far reaching consequences many of us Catholics do not immediately realize. Becoming one Body carries with it a serious responsibility to the needy or poor brothers and sisters."(116) The community must, therefore, be true to the liberative message of the eucharist and, furthermore, express this message by taking action towards that liberation.

Such action as has been discussed should ideally result in the total transformation of society. Mercy Oduyoye indicates:

> The Eucharist elicits the expectation that the church will be actively involved in the transformation of the human community. The family that eats together is expected to stay together, sharing and ministering one to the other in order to eliminate the effects of poverty, suffering and oppression.(117)

Transformation of society, then, consists of service towards and sharing with others. The eucharist and the community which celebrates it should be an impetus for this metamorphosis.

Transformation of society cannot, however, occur unless those individuals who celebrate the eucharist also undergo an inner conversion which would enable them to work for the larger transformation. As Walter Burghardt eloquently explains:

> ...the Eucharistic signs and symbols do not of themselves change social, political and economic structures; but they should change 700 million hearts and minds, grace them to admit the oppressions of which they are victims and for which they are responsible, inspire them to work with others for the coming of a kingdom characterized by justice and love.(118)

Thus, a meaningful celebration of the eucharist should lead to the conversion of those who participate in the celebration. Only once this inner transformation occurs can the larger transformation of society be possible.

One problem that arises, however, is that any eucharistic community which could have this effect on society must be a group of people who know each other rather than a large, impersonal parish. That is, effective action can best be carried out by a community whose members know and care for each other in a significant manner. Thus, this "...means that a parish of one thousand or five thousand or ten thousand persons cannot easily become a relevant group for a meaningful and truthful eucharistic celebration."(119) To truly learn and live out the

inner meaning of the eucharist, then, the celebrating community must of necessity be comprised of a small number of members.

As Balasuriya indicates, it is these small base communities which are in large part responsible for the ever increasing demand to understand the inner meaning of the eucharist. He explains: "...today the main trends in the evolution of the eucharistic theology and devotion take place outside the official circles concerned with the control of the Eucharist, i.e. the Roman curia and the local diocesan authorities."(120) This is not to say that the official Church is completely denying or ignoring the necessary link between the eucharist and liberation. The 42nd International Eucharistic Congress in 1981, for example, which had as its theme "Eucharistic Bread Broken for a New World", sought to establish the link between the shared meal of the eucharist and the responsibility of the eucharistic community to take action to relieve world hunger. There it was concluded officially that a "synthesis between the eucharistic faith and efforts to satisfy human hunger is essential if the symbolic reality of the Eucharist is to remain alive and authentic."(121)

Despite such sanctioning from the official Church, however, Balasuriya insists that most eucharistic reforms that are ratified by the official Church are totally inadequate for dealing with the concrete situation of oppression.(122) As a result, the renewal of the eucharist is taking place apart from the official Church. Edward Schillebeeckx, however, contends that <u>any</u> renewal within the Church usually begins as an illegal deviation. Renewal, therefore, usually begins with the people, rather than being imposed on them from above.(123) Genuine

renewal of the eucharist, then, will most likely arise from out of the small base communities.

Another practical concern that arises inevitably from the effort to recover the inner meaning of the eucharist within the context of liberation theology is the nature of the priesthood and the need for an ordained priest as presider at the celebrations. The starting point for such a consideration is the undeniable right of a community to be able to celebrate the eucharist. The final document from Puebla, for example, follows the teachings of Vatican II by insisting that "the Eucharist is the root and pivot of the whole community."(124) The problem, however, is that eucharistic celebrations are often impossible since many base communities do not have an ordained priest living in their midst. The shortage of priests, therefore, leads to a decline in the celebration of the eucharist.

This shortage of priests, according to Balasuriya, is not only due to the obligatory celibacy that is forced upon priests, although this has led to a marked decrease in the priesthood. Just as important, however, is the fact that more and more priests are beginning to recognize the irrelevance of the celebration of the eucharist over which they preside. And, "when he begins to lose faith in its actual impact he begins to question the meaning of his whole life."(125) This is to say, then, that if the eucharist is properly understood, but not being practiced in a like manner, the celebrant will call into question his whole vocation which is centered around the eucharist. A change in the conception of the eucharist will therefore lead to a change in the nature of the priesthood.

One possible solution that is being discussed by liberation theologians to the problem of infrequent eucharistic celebrations involves the re-examination of the presiders of the eucharist. Berryman, for example, rightly indicates that "if a 'priest shortage' makes [the celebration of the Eucharist] impossible, the Catholic system for preparing and ordaining priests should be questioned and re-examined."(126) By studying the historical development of this system, theologians have discovered that it was not until the second millennium that the present system of ordination came into being. In the first millennium, Schillebeeckx points out, the primary emphasis for choosing office bearers was to be called, appointed and accepted by a specific community. These leaders, chosen by the community, were also those who presided over the eucharist: "Whoever was competent to lead the community was also ipso facto the leader in the Eucharist."(127) The most important factor, then, was being chosen by the community. By the second millennium, however, the eucharist had become clericalized and could only be celebrated by a validly ordained priest. The celebration was regarded not so much as an action of the people in which all took part, but rather, as an action of God through the intermediary of the priest.(128) In addition, the priest no longer had to be called and accepted by the community but was appointed by the bishop; the local community no longer had any significant input into who would become their leader.

That which many theologians are now advocating, after taking into account the historical system of ordination, is that alternative forms are necessary for the celebration of the eucharist. Thus, "in principle, the local community should satisfy its own ministerial needs

by having ministers from among its members."(129) The presider at the eucharist would be a community leader. This is, however, usually impossible since enforced celibacy is a requirement and few members of a community are likely to be celibate. According to Leonardo Boff, this can not be an excuse:

> ...to deprive thousands upon thousands of communities of the sacrament of the Eucharist, and of the incomparable benefits of having an ordained minister, through inflexibility in maintaining a tradition that has bound a necessary service (that of priesthood) to a free charism (that of celibacy) is tantamount to an unlawful violation of the rights of the faithful.(130)

One possible response, then, is to change the requirements for ordination: ordain married people and make celibacy an optional part of ordination.

Another solution to the crisis would be to allow the non-ordained community co-ordinator or leader, acting as extra-ordinary minister, to consecrate the eucharist. By virtue of the faith of the community in Christ's presence in the celebration, and based on the priesthood of all believers, the eucharist would be valid, though not sacramentally full. Thus, according to Boff,

> the absence of an ordained minister, in the presence of a need and desire for the Eucharist, does not seem to constitute an absolute obstacle to the eucharistic celebration. The common priesthood of all the faithful would permit the president of the community to render visible--sacramental--the priestly, eucharistic action of Christ. (131)

Despite the logic of such solutions, however, these alternatives would nonetheless be considered deviations from official Church teaching and the celebration of the eucharist would not be considered valid. As a result, many people are joining together under the leadership of the community co-ordinator for a special celebration. Boff describes this celebration as follows:

> This community celebration ought not to be called the mass, since the mass is a rigorously defined reality, theologically, liturgically, and canonically. It could be called the celebration of the Lord's Supper, however, as it would have a ritual organized by the community itself, in which would clearly appear the memorial character of meal, sacrifice and eucharistic presence of Christ.(132)

The celebration of the Lord's Supper, while not the Mass, greatly resembles the eucharistic liturgy. It is a mixture of scriptural readings, shared reflections, acts of repentance and conversion, offerings of either the region's produce or of bread and wine, a reading of the account of the Last Supper, the Lord's Prayer, communion and a commitment of service.(133) It is, therefore, a celebration which closely resembles the eucharistic celebrations of the early Christians.

While the official Church may not, at the moment, find this alternative totally acceptable, it is one that needs to be acknowledged. Without trying to dispense with the traditional mass formula, the celebration of the Lord's Supper as described above is one community's attempt to follow Jesus' command to "Do this in memory of me" in spite of the lack of an ordained priest. Thus, as Clodovis Boff concludes: "Perhaps the church ought to envision different ways of celebrating the Lord's Supper, ranging from Mass with the people of God, the traditional formula and still practically the only one in use today, to the "breaking of the bread" as it was celebrated in the early Christian communities."(134)

D. CONCLUSION: VATICAN RESPONSE TO LIBERATION THEOLOGY

The re-interpretation of the eucharist as advocated by liberation theologians differs in many ways from the standard conception of the

eucharist. Moving away from the emphasis on the real presence of Christ in the bread and wine, liberation theologians are insisting that Christ's real presence be recognized in a wider context: a community of sharing and service that comes into being as a result of the authentic celebration of the eucharist. The eucharist, these theologians maintain, must be integrally related to human liberation; that is, those who have celebrated Jesus' giving of self for others must take that liberative message into the world by following Jesus' example. The eucharist, therefore, cannot remain an end to itself, but must be the impetus for working towards justice and liberation.

Such an understanding, however, has wide-reaching effects. Not only is traditional eucharistic doctrine subordinated to the new emphasis on service, sharing and community, such an understanding also calls into question the meaningfulness of the standard celebration of the eucharist, of the eucharistic community and of the priesthood. It is not inconceivable, therefore, that the official Church would find some difficulties with such a re-interpretation. Be this as it may, very little has been said by the Vatican on this topic except within the context of liberation theology in general. With regards to liberation theology in general, however, much has been said and done. The Vatican has, for example, taken action against a number of liberation theologians: "Theologian Gustavo Gutierrez of Peru was under unceasing attack for three years, and Brazilian Leonardo Boff faced similar onslaughts."(135) Priests, too, have been pressured to stay out of politics and those in government have been forced to resign. As well, the 1984 Instruction on Certain Aspects of the "Theology of Liberation" by the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith outlined in

detail the problems that it found with liberation theology. All of this combined gives, according to Berryman, "strong indications that this was indeed a systematic attack by the Vatican aimed at delegitimizing liberation theology in all its forms."(136)

Before examining the objections as they are outlined in the 1984 Instruction, it is necessary to point out that not all of the response from the Vatican has been negative. The Instruction, for example, begins by outlining what it deems to be the positive aspects of liberation theology. The follow-up document in 1986--Instruction on Christian Freedom and Liberation--while still critical, was more positive than the former document. In fact, this is so to such an extent that Robert McAfee Brown claims that "it gives a clear signal that the Vatican has decided not to throw down the gauntlet to liberation theologians."(137)

While recognizing certain positive aspects of liberation theology, however, the 1984 Instruction is most definitely critical of certain tenets.(138) One major criticism found in the document is the assertion that liberation theology is reductionist; that is, that it places politics before religion, and material conditions before spiritual concerns. At one point, for example, the Instruction claims that faith and the Gospel are reduced to some earthly ideology and thus that the core of salvation is the struggle for justice:"To some it even seems that the necessary struggle for human justice and freedom in the economic and political sense constitutes the whole essence of salvation. For them, the Gospel is reduced to a purely earthly gospel."(139) Likewise, the Instruction warns against reducing sin to social structures, making liberation from temporal, earthly servitude more important than liberation from sin: "Nor can one localize evil principally or

uniquely in bad social, political or economic "structures" as though all other evils came from them so that the creation of the "new man" would depend on the establishment of different economic and socio-political structures."(140) As well, liberation theology is also accused of a reductionist reading of the Bible. By re-reading Scripture "politically", liberation theology tends to make the political aspect of the reading the only component.

Another criticism of liberation theology found in the Instruction is that it leads to the undermining of church authority. By emphasizing the need for a church of the people (which is ultimately a church of the class, according to the document), liberation theologians are supposedly denouncing church authority as classist. Hence, "building on such a conception of the church of the people, a critique of the very structures of the church is developed...There is a denunciation of members of the hierarchy and the magisterium as objective representatives of the ruling class which has to be opposed."(141) Those who do not share the same attitudes as liberation theologians are those who, according to the document, are denounced as belonging to the oppressors. As a result, the Church itself is divided and church authority is undermined.

The major criticism in the Instruction is of liberation theology's use of Marxism. The purpose of the document, it is stated, is

> ...to draw the attention of pastors, theologians and all the faithful to the deviations and risks of deviations, damaging to the faith and to Christian living, that are brought about by certain forms of liberation theology which use, in an insufficiently critical manner, concepts borrowed from various currents of Marxist thoughts.(142)

A total, unqualified acceptance of Marxism in the first place tends to legitimize the use of violence in all forms: "to the violence which constitutes the relationship of the domination of the rich over the

poor, there corresponds the counterviolence of the revolution, by means of which this domination will be reversed."(143)

More importantly, according to the Instruction, because of their acceptance of Marxism, liberation theologians tend to make the class struggle a necessity for Christians. Thus, "they pervert the Christian meaning of the poor, and they transform the fight for the rights of the poor into a class struggle."(144) As a result, everything--faith and theology included--becomes subordinated to the struggle.

It is within this context that the document makes explicit reference to the eucharist in liberation theology. As a result of the influence of Marxism, the eucharist is being used as a tool for the class struggle. By questioning whether or not Christians who belong to different social classes can share in the same eucharist and still retain its authentic meaning, liberation theologians are, according to the Instruction, distorting the meaning of the eucharist. Thus, "the eucharist is no longer to be understood as the real sacramental presence of the reconciling sacrifice and as the gift of the body and blood of Christ. It becomes the celebration of the people in their struggle."(145)

The most objectionable consequence of this type of eucharistic celebration which epitomizes the class struggle is that it destroys the unity of the Church:

> Unity, reconciliation and communion in love are no longer seen as a gift we receive from Christ. It is the historical class of the poor who by means of their struggle will build unity. For them, the struggle of the classes is the way to unity...the unity of the church is radically denied.(146)

The unity of the Church, therefore, is of primary concern in the celebration of the eucharist.

At this point, the question must be raised: should the authentic celebration of the eucharist be denied in order that uniformity of celebration be maintained? Is the so-called unity of the Church more important than justice? To this, the liberation theologians would answer with a resounding "NO!" It is, I suggest, an answer which the official Church should not try to ignore. Uniformity and unity cannot be thought of as synonymous terms. One cannot and should not, in the name of uniformity, force P.W. Botha and Allan Boesak to partake of the same eucharist and still pretend that it is an authentic celebration for them both.

Moreover, although the official Church disagrees with those liberation theologians who wish to exclude certain people (e.g. oppressors) from the eucharistic celebrations on the grounds that it destroys Church unity, this same Church does not hesitate to bar divorced Catholics from publically receiving the eucharist. Boff makes much of this point, stating that "the Church would not be judging the subjective culpability of the oppressor or agent, any more than it judges the subjective culpability of the divorced person whom it forbids to receive the eucharist in public."(147) To most liberation theologians, therefore, it is clear that impartiality is not an option: either communities must stop celebrating the eucharist or else take its implications seriously, even if this means barring those who are oppressors from its celebration.(148)

The logical conclusion would be the acceptance on the part of the official Church of different ways of celebrating the eucharist. While the different celebrations such as those experienced by the basic Christian communities may at present be regarded as deviations from the

norm, they are obviously fulfilling a great need in those places where they are being celebrated. If the traditional means of participating in the eucharist are totally inadequate and irrelevant for so many people (to the extent that they are no longer attending Mass) a new means of partaking of the eucharist which draws people to its celebration can only be a positive factor for the Christian community. Such celebrations, I contend, are a force to be reckoned with. Regardless of the official Church's stance at present, the grassroots communities which celebrate the eucharist in this way are going to continue to do so. That is to say that persecution and isolation by the official Church will not cause the movement to die, but perhaps even to flourish. The official Church will either have to accept and welcome their position, create a viable alternative or, if worse comes to worse, watch the Church become split in two.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION--THE FUTURE OF THE EUCHARIST

The influence of Vatican II on the developments in eucharistic theology which have taken place over the last twenty five years is unequivocal. It was undoubtedly Vatican II that was the catalyst for the tremendous changes which swept all areas of Roman Catholic theology. The air of openness, the freedom and the creativity which permeated the Council resulted in numerous changes and innovations in all realms of theology.

The changes put forth at Vatican II greatly affected the two reinterpretations which were examined in the course of this thesis.(1) Both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians, for example, emphasized and expanded certain aspects (such as the manifold presence of Christ in the liturgy) which were discussed in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. As well, according to Piet Schoonenberg, it is undoubtedly due to Vatican II's emphasis on freedom and creativity that the encyclical (Mysterium Fidei) which was directed to Schillebeeckx and other adherents of transignification was as gentle a reproof as it was. He explains: "It is probably due to Vatican II that this encyclical, in contrast to Humani Generis, does not fulminate against innovators but rather praises their intention and takes note of their thought and terminology..."(2) The same point can also be made about the influence of the Second Vatican Council on liberation theology. In short, the best example is the conference of Medellin. This conference, as indicated in Chapter 4, took its initiative from Vatican II and aimed at giving the innovations from the Council concrete form in Latin America. Hence, the willingness to change and accept new ideas that was sanc-

tioned at Vatican II had a tremendous impact on the attempts at reinterpreting eucharistic theology which followed the Council years.

It is important to note, however, that the Second Vatican Council was only the beginning of renewal. The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, for example, still found it necessary to reiterate traditional eucharistic doctrine, albeit with a concern for what that doctrine meant at a pastoral and practical level. The changes which resulted from the Constitution were primarily changes in the external rubrics of the eucharistic liturgy. Without downplaying or denying the tremendous need for such external changes, contemporary theologians such as Schillebeeckx and certain liberation theologians are recognizing that the problems that are encountered in eucharistic theology today are not those that a change in externals alone can solve. Mere liturgical reform, therefore, is insufficient.

The obvious conclusion, then, is that changes in eucharistic theology and practice must be carried out on a deeper, more profound level. In recent years, theologians such as Schillebeeckx and certain liberation theologians have recognized that the eucharist as it is understood is lacking in meaning and relevance for an ever-increasing number of Roman Catholics. Many no longer attend or participate in any Sunday eucharistic liturgy. Others, as indicated in Chapter 4, search for autonomous gatherings on the fringes of the institutional Church.

Both Schillebeeckx and those liberation theologians who have turned their attention to eucharistic theology have sought to give relevance to the eucharist. In order to make it more meaningful to the ordinary Roman Catholic layperson, these two reinterpretations have sought to liberate the eucharist from any traditional trappings which may inhibit

people from fully understanding its meaning. In so doing, they have changed the emphasis from the objective to the subjective. Rather than concentrating on objective, doctrinal elements of the eucharist (as was formerly the case), these theologians have focused to a large extent on the more subjective aspect of the people who celebrate the eucharist. Hence, those gathered to celebrate are being given priority over the elements of bread and wine.

All of this is not to say, of course, that the eucharistic doctrine which has been passed down through the centuries has been or is regarded with indifference. Theological reinterpretation does not mean that the old elements are excluded, but rather that these basic ideas can be renewed and given new meaning by modern insights. Charles Davis aptly explains this idea: "The old elements are still there, but they are now part of a new synthesis."(3)

One thing that has been instrumental in the various attempts at reinterpretation is the renewed appreciation of the various dimensions of the eucharist. That which is important to keep in mind, then, is that no one attempt at explaining the meaning of the eucharist can ever capture its multi-faceted essence. Leonardo Boff puts it in these words: "To emphasize certain aspects of this mystery is not necessarily to deny the others."(4) Thus, while doctrinal definitions are indeed essential for a proper appreciation of the eucharist, theologians are discovering other equally important dimensions which have not yet been fully explored.

It is on these dimensions that both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians have concentrated their efforts.(5) While using traditional doctrine as a basis, both have attempted to expand into

other areas. Schillebeeckx places the emphasis in his reinterpretation on the existential experience of the person who is celebrating the eucharist. His concern, while still doctrinal, focuses not solely on the doctrine, but on what it means for people. The reinterpretation of the eucharist in liberation theology progresses even further. Doctrine is not the focus of this reinterpretation. Rather, attention is focused on the effect that the eucharistic celebration will have on those who participate in it. Doctrine is retained, but transformation of life and action become the primary concern. Hence, both reinterpretations are trying to make the eucharist relevant and meaningful for those who participate in the celebration.

A. SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE TWO REINTERPRETATIONS

Both reinterpretations have, in the end, the same aim of clarifying the meaning and significance of the eucharist and in so doing, making it relevant for the ordinary Roman Catholic. It is not surprising, therefore, that there are a number of striking similarities between the two reinterpretations. Hence, attention will now be turned to those similarities which are most significant.

1. Refusal to Separate Faith and Life

In both reinterpretations that have been explored, there exists an adamant refusal to separate faith and life or, more specifically, life within the Sunday eucharistic liturgy and that which exists during the rest of the week. In previous centuries, the liturgy was often looked upon as an otherworldly flight from the problems of the world which had no relationship to daily living. The overemphasis on the sacredness of the liturgy meant that the liturgy had no roots in reality. (6)

In recent years, however, more and more people are staying away from the Sunday eucharistic celebration precisely because they see no relation between Sunday and the other six days of the week. (7) According to both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians, this is a basic problem. They insist, therefore, that if the eucharistic liturgy is to be alive, dynamic and relevant, it must be related to all aspects of daily life. The liturgy cannot be an escape from reality, but rather a celebration of that reality. Hence, it is a recognition that the Church and the liturgy do no exist apart from, but are an integral part of the world. Aldo Vannuchi sums up best: "True liturgy is wholly engrafted into the reality of the world."(8)

Much of this emphasis on the need to integrate the liturgy and life derives from the radical expansion of the concept of grace that is found in both reinterpretations. This notion, as illustrated especially in Chapter 3, presupposes the presence of grace in all aspects of human life and acknowledges the sacredness of human history. God is not divorced from human life, but rather already present in every aspect of life. Human life and history are, therefore, acknowledged by both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians as the place where God is revealed to humanity.

Accordingly, both reinterpretations insist that humanity must be the focus of eucharistic theology. Schillebeeckx, for example, insists that, since the eucharist is intended for humans, it must be related to human experience. As a result, he develops his reinterpretation of the eucharist around the framework of interpersonal relationships. Liberation theologians also ascertain that the eucharist must work from the basis of human experience. It must be a celebration of that which

exists in daily life, but also a celebration which will effect a transformation in daily life. Hence the emphasis in both reinterpretations is not on the sacredness of the eucharist, but on its integration with human life.

As a result, both reinterpretations are urging the official Church to make all aspects of theology concrete and grounded in history rather than abstract and otherworldly. In particular, the Church should strive to ground its eucharistic liturgies in the historical realities of the time and place in which they are celebrated. This implies taking some aspects of eucharistic theology and making them applicable to our time and situations. For example, this means looking into allowing indigenous people to celebrate the eucharist with elements which are staples for them rather than insisting on the use of bread and wine. The Church must therefore be willing to move beyond the traditional understanding of the eucharist if it wishes to narrow the already existing chasm between life in the Church and life in the world. As Joseph Powers aptly summarizes:

> ...any understanding of the Eucharist, if it is to be relevant and fruitful for the life of the Church in the world today, must go beyond ritual concerns and beyond speculations about "presence", "meal or sacrifice", to face the very fundamental and concrete question of the quality of life in the eucharistic community and in the world.(9)

Eucharistic theology must, therefore, be related to daily life.

2. The Meal Aspect of the Eucharist

Another significant similarity that can be found in both reinterpretations is the emphasis that is placed on the dynamics of the meal aspect of the Eucharist. Schillebeeckx, as illustrated in Chapter 3, insists that it is not only the bread and wine, but the community and the sharing--the total complex of a meal--which become the sacrament.

The liberation theologians, too, make much of the fact that the eucharist, precisely because it is a meal, must be characterized by sharing and equality.

This concentration on the eucharist as a meal is, I suggest, an attempt to return to, or restore, the essential meaning of the eucharist as it was celebrated in the first century. Hence, both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians emphasize Paul's explanation of the eucharist which focuses on Christ's real presence in the gathered community rather than merely in the elements of bread and wine. That is, both adamantly assert the importance of once again transferring that emphasis to the real presence of Christ in the community. The way to do this, they suggest, is by celebrating and emphasizing the communal meal aspect of the eucharist in the Sunday liturgy. Schillebeeckx expresses it best when he writes:

> Like those early Christians, we too must experience this reality within the concrete context of our contemporary lives by constantly making present and reinterpreting here and now, by giving new life to, what these first Christians experienced in contact with the living Christ. The past is also a call to us now...to realize a fraternal community by participating in a Christian meal. The living Christ identifies himself with the community at table...(10)

3. Importance of Community

Another dimension of eucharistic theology shared by both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians is the accentuation of the importance of the community which gathers to celebrate the eucharist. This stems, I suggest, both from the desire to escape from the excessive individualism which has characterized eucharistic theology for so long and from the desire to return to a more Pauline theology of eucharist which stresses the importance of community. This dimension is also intimately related to the renewed emphasis on the meal aspect of

the eucharist, since a meal is in fact a communal gathering. Hence, the authentic celebration of the eucharist as a meal depends in part on the community which gathers to celebrate.

Vatican II, as well as the liturgical movement which preceded it, places great emphasis on the fact that Christian worship is above all a public and communal experience. By acknowledging that Christ is truly present in all aspects of the liturgy, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy emphasizes Christ's presence in the worshipping community itself. As well, the Constitution stresses that the communal celebration of the sacraments is to be preferred over a private and individual ceremony: "Liturgical services are not private functions, but are celebrations of the Church..."(11) Indeed, even the language used expresses the importance of community. Rather than speaking in terms of "receiving" the eucharist, an expression which implies a personal and private act of one person, the Constitution uses the language of "celebration" which signifies a communal function in which everyone is involved. Communal celebration is therefore given partiality over personal worship.

This renewed emphasis on community that was first sanctioned at Vatican II is both continued and expanded by both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians. Schillebeeckx, as indicated in Chapter 3, insists that the presence of Christ in the eucharist cannot be understood apart from the larger presence of Christ in the community. The emphasis is no longer centered exclusively on Christ's presence in the elements, but is expanded to the larger realm of the community. Schillebeeckx even goes so far as to maintain that the believing response of the community is in fact necessary for the complete realiza-

tion of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist. The presence of Christ in the community is therefore central to Schillebeeckx' theology.

Despite his emphasis on the centrality of the community, however, Schillebeeckx' central focus is nonetheless the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist; the community is important, but it is still secondary. The liberation theologians, however, give the presence of Christ in the community precedence over his presence in the eucharist. As demonstrated in Chapter 4, they are insisting that it is in community that Christ's presence is most profound. Without the essential element of true community, there can be no genuine celebration of eucharist, for Christ will not truly be present. Hence, by focussing on the real presence of Christ in the community, the liberation theologians are emphasizing the reality of Christ's presence outside the elements of bread and wine to which it had previously been either limited (pre-Vatican II theology) or at least made secondary (Schillebeeckx' theology).(12)

4. Understanding of Church

Another similarity that can be found in the two reinterpretations is the changed understanding of church. Previous to Vatican II, the Roman Catholic conception of church was highly triumphalistic and exclusive. Along with Vatican II, Schillebeeckx and his contemporaries (most notably Karl Rahner) have expanded the notion of church by insisting on the model of church as the sacrament of Christ. As a sign of the on-going presence of the risen Christ, these theologians maintain, the church must make visible God's offer of himself through Christ to humanity through both worship and deed.

According to Richard McBrien, such an understanding of the church as expressed by Schillebeeckx and Rahner is too narrow: "[it] accords insufficient place for diakonia (service in the Church's mission to the world.)"(13) While there is some validity to this criticism, I suggest that this aspect of service is to some extent implicitly acknowledged. That is, these theologians assert that the church is the basic sacrament insofar as it makes salvation available in a tangible and historical way. In using these words, the notion of service is, although not expressed in so many words, at least inferred.

The liberation theologians, of course, have carried this element of service to a far greater and more explicit extent in their understanding of church. These theologians insist that if the church is to be the sacrament of Christ, it must be a church of service to the poor which is characterized by concern for and service to others. The importance of the church lies not so much in its capacity to be the custodian of the faith as in its call to service. This conception of church as servant, therefore, enlarges the idea of the church as the basic sacrament by making Christ present in very visible and tangible ways. There is, however, a need for balance. While church without service is in fact too narrow a concept, service without church is no different from any social agency. Edward Kilmartin expresses it best: "Service of the community without the Eucharist quickly becomes undistinguishable from humanitarian concerns. Eucharist without service becomes a senseless magical practice."(14)

This notion of Church as servant is, according to most liberation theologians, best characterized by the base Christian communities of Latin America. The idea of church as experienced in these communities

calls, however, for a radical redefinition of church. Kevin Seasoltz paints a picture of such a church:

> It has to be a suffering servant acknowledging its own need to be saved from sin. Like Christ, the Church must lay down its life for others. Hence, it must be unconcerned about its own prestige and prowess in the world; it must take its agenda, as Christ did, from the poor.(15)

This portrait of church is considerably different from the reality that is now being experienced in many quarters of the world. It is indeed a call for a radical restructuring of the Church. Hence, despite assurances from base communities that they do not wish to be a parallel church, but seek rather to bridge the gap between the hierarchical church and the individuals who are part of it, they are often viewed as a threat to the official church structure.

Another dimension of this new understanding of church is the subsequent rethinking of the roles of both clergy and laity within the church. As a result of Vatican II, the laity were given a place of some significance in the understanding of church. The emphasis on active participation of all people, along with such changes as the use of the vernacular and the turning of the altar serve to break down many barriers that had previously existed between the clergy and the laity.

The base communities which characterize the notion of church as developed in liberation theology also give evidence of this rapidly changing conception of laity and clergy. The call for diversified ministry is, as illustrated in Chapter 4, becoming more and more distinct, especially in light of the number of communities that are unable to celebrate the eucharist because of the lack of an ordained priest. Indeed, in these communities, it is no longer a question of "can we participate?" but rather "to what extent can we go?" . The

active participation which was sanctioned at Vatican II is rapidly being replaced by a fierce demand on the part of the laity to lead the liturgies. This, too, could conceivably be viewed as a threat to church authority.

In addition to the fact that the notion of church as depicted by the base communities is often understood as a threat to traditional ideas of church, another major problem is the question of its relevance to a number of Roman Catholics worldwide. If, as most liberation theologians assert, an authentic Christian community worthy of celebrating the eucharist is comprised of a small number of people who know one another's problems and concerns, this raises a problem for those parishes (such as the vast majority of those in North America, for example) where a large percentage of the congregation do not know one another. Are these not also authentic church communities?

There are, of course, some aspects of base communities which could be of tremendous use. Most notably, this notion of church provides a much needed challenge to the sense of individualism that is so prevalent in much of the so-called First World. Great lessons can be learned regarding the perception of community displayed by these base communities. As Penny Lernoux explains:

"While the Third World poor have little in the way of material goods, they have something that the First World has lost in the technical race--a sense of community."(16) Hence, while the base community idea of church is simply not adequate as a universal model, it can conceivably act as both a challenge and a paradigm to those already existing models of church , especially those of the First World.

5. The Importance of Response in the Eucharist

Both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians, when developing their reinterpretation of eucharistic theology, maintain that a response is a necessary component of the celebration of the eucharist. For a number of centuries, many Roman Catholics were led to believe that the grace contained in the eucharist was conferred automatically. Although Thomas Aquinas, among others, did assert that the recipient must have a favorable predisposition, the reaction against Luther's justification by grace through faith alone was so strong that many surmized that the eucharist was a mechanical source of grace, independent of the recipient.

Schillebeeckx, as demonstrated in Chapter 3, insists that the eucharist be understood in terms of interpersonal relationships. Human response to God's invitation is, then, a necessary element in that encounter between God and humanity which the eucharist embodies. While Christ is indeed present in the sacrament regardless of individual faith, that presence is nonetheless completely realized only when reciprocated by the individual and the worshipping community. Only when Christ's presence is both offered and accepted in faith does that presence become intimate.

This response, furthermore, can take a number of forms. The act of acceptance can be a matter of an individual's personal response in faith to Christ's offer of himself. On a communal level, Christ's presence in the eucharist is also reciprocated in the faith-filled worship of the believing community. In the eucharistic liturgy, then, the church responds to Christ's presence offered therein. As well, according to Schillebeeckx, the Church can respond to the encounter with Christ through acts of love and service outside the confines of the liturgy.

Encounters with others in daily life are, therefore, a response to the encounter with Christ in the eucharist. It must be noted, however, that although Schillebeeckx does mention this dimension of outreach, very little emphasis is given to it.(17) Rather, the bulk of Schillebeeckx' exposition on this aspect of response to Christ's presence in the eucharist is concentrated on faith, both individual and communal.

As indicated in Chapter 4, the liberation theologians also insist that a response to Christ's presence in the eucharist is indeed necessary for the complete realization of that presence. The central focus of response, for these theologians, is outreach and the giving of self to others in service. The eucharist can not be an end unto itself but must result in a transformation in the daily lives of those who participate in it. Unless this transformation occurs and those who celebrate the eucharist are empowered to serve others, the eucharist remains irrelevant. The emphasis on response as outreach and transformation does not, of course, mean that individual response is not important. Rather, the liberation theologians acknowledge that an inner conversion is a necessary prerequisite to the outer transformation that is concretized in acts of love and service.

B. IMPLICATIONS

No study of eucharistic theology would be complete without the acknowledgement of the fact that eucharistic theology is not, and has never been, one isolated area of theology. Reinterpretations of the eucharist such as those examined in the course of this thesis will, therefore, have serious implications and repercussions in many other theological areas. In light of its centrality to the faith of Roman Catholics, this is especially true of the eucharist.

1. Presider of the Eucharist

The theological area that is perhaps most profoundly intertwined with the reinterpretations of the eucharist as suggested by Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians is the role of the presider of the eucharist. This, of course, calls into question the entire ordained priesthood as it is now known. Indeed, it is this issue which is becoming the focal point for those who are dealing with questions of the eucharist. Perhaps the best example of this preoccupation is the shift in emphasis in Schillebeeckx' theology. In the 1960's, Schillebeeckx' primary concern was with issues of eucharistic doctrine and the language which he used was highly doctrinal. Beginning in the early 1980's, however, this changed: from matters of eucharistic doctrine, Schillebeeckx shifted his attention to the more pastoral matter of who, considering the crisis in the priesthood, should be allowed to preside at the eucharist. (18)

The concept of ministry is now being questioned primarily because of the number of Christian communities worldwide which are being deprived of the eucharist simply because there is no ordained priest available to preside over the celebration. Nor does the future look much brighter. Although the exodus from the priesthood has slowed down considerably since the late 1960's and early 1970's, the number of priests continues to decline. For one thing, fewer men than ever before are entering the seminaries. In addition, the average age of those already ordained and active in ministry continues to increase. As a result, more and more communities are left without an ordained minister. While some are administered by another priest, many are left without a

weekly eucharistic celebration. Hence, the chances that the crisis in the celebration of the Eucharist will change on its own seem slim.

Vatican II, as expressed in Chapter 2, made the declaration that the eucharist was the source and summit of the entire Christian life. As a result, every Christian community should have the right to a weekly celebration of the eucharist. If this is to be the case, however, wider provision must be made for its celebration. The issue seems clear: if something is not done, eucharistic celebrations will cease to be central to Roman Catholicism. That which is at stake, therefore, is the Catholic church's understanding of itself as a eucharist-centered community.

There are, I suggest, two possible solutions to this problem. The first, and less radical, is that the qualifications for ordination be changed. This could take a number of forms. One quick solution would be to allow those men who have already been ordained but have had to withdraw from the active ministry because they chose to marry to preside at the celebration of the Eucharist. Groups such as CORPUS (Catholic Organization for a Renewed Priesthood United for Service) are arguing that the solution to the crisis in the celebration of the eucharist would be solved by allowing those priests who are married to resume active ministry.(19)

Despite its attractiveness, however, many people are hesitant to use this alternative to solve the crisis. The official Church, for example, does not seem to regard this as an option. Moreover, many women theologians are against it, since such a solution would continue to perpetuate an all male concept of priesthood. A better option, according to these women, would be to allow the ordination of women. Again,

this does not seem to be a viable alternative for the future, since Rome continues to insist on an all-male priesthood.

Another possibility in solving the crisis in the priesthood would be to make celibacy an optional charism instead of a necessary requirement. This, I believe, is a central issue, especially since it profoundly affects both the ordination of women and the re-entry of married priests into active ministry. As well, it would appear that mandatory celibacy continues to be a prime reason why so few men are entering or staying in the priesthood. If celibacy is in fact the reason that so many communities are being deprived of the eucharist, this is, as Boff ascertains, "tantamount to an unlawful violation of the right of the faithful." and, as such, must be reviewed and rethought.(20)

All of the above mentioned possibilities deal with the structure that is already in place. That is, they would all retain ordination as a necessity in the celebration of the eucharist. A second, more radical, solution to the problem is to consider alternative practices of celebration in which non-ordained persons would preside over the eucharist. In light of his studies of the development of ministry throughout the history of Christianity, Schillebeeckx adamantly maintains that ministry was not intended to be developed solely around liturgical celebrations. In the early Church, leading the community in worship was only one of many functions. "Ministry," he explains, "is concerned with the leadership of the community: ministers are pioneers, those who inspire the community and serve as models by which the whole community can identify the gospel." (21) Hence,those chosen to lead the

worship and preside at the eucharistic celebrations were generally those people who had proven themselves competent at leading the community.

Over the centuries, however, this whole concept of ministry was altered. The idea of variegated ministries being shared by many members of the community became focused on one person who, as leader, would preside over the eucharistic celebrations. Nor was this leader chosen by the community. He was, rather, by virtue of his ordination chosen by the bishop to be the minister who would preside over all aspects of the community into which he was placed. Thus, as Richard Szafranski appropriately concludes:

> What is clear is that the eucharist was taken out of the hands of the people. And the one who presides at the eucharistic celebration, instead of being able to do so because of a leadership role in the community, can now only do so if "he" is ordained, and even if "he" does not have a leadership role in that community. (22)

In recent years, the call to return to the early Church's understanding of ministry is rapidly growing. In light of the number of Catholics who are being deprived of the eucharist, there is an ever-increasing insistence that the community's right to celebrate the eucharist supplants the requirements of being male and celibate as currently demanded of the presider of the eucharist. Accordingly, the community should be given its rightful role of recognizing its leaders and choosing those who will preside at the celebration. In circumstances when there is no priest, then, this non-ordained person would take on the role of presider. It is such a concept of ministry that is currently being sanctioned by Schillebeeckx and put into practice in the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the base communities of the Third World countries.(23)

Such a concept of ministry is, of course, an ideal that is not likely to be condoned by the official Church in the near future. Rather, it is often viewed as a threat, not only to the understanding of priesthood, but also to the entire existing church structure. First, it is a menace to the priesthood because it leads to the desacralization of the priesthood. That is, when the role of the community is given primacy, the role of the priest diminishes. Secondly, alternative practices of celebrating the eucharist are viewed as an assault on the existing church structure insofar as they blatantly indicate the need for a revision of the current structure.(24) It should, therefore, come as no surprise that both Ministry and The Church with the Human Face were investigated by the doctrinal congregation from 1981-1985 and were found to contain some questionable tenets. What was the main issue? "Schillebeeckx irresponsibly accepts the possibility that, under certain circumstances, someone not officially ordained could preside at the Eucharist." (25)

I would suggest, however, that although the idea of a non-ordained person presiding at eucharistic celebrations under extra-ordinary circumstances will not be officially sanctioned in the near future, it will eventually prevail. As Schillebeeckx indicates, and as can be seen in the base communities celebration of the Lord's Supper, such alternative practices are already taking place and are increasing in number. Moreover, in Schillebeeckx' own words:

> ...in the history of the church there is also a way in which Christians can develop a practice in the church from below, from the grassroots, which for a time can compete with the official practice recognized by the church, but which in its Christian alternative form can eventually nevertheless become the dominant practice of the church, and finally be sanctioned by the official church...That is how things have always been.(26)

2. Ecumenism

According to Kenan Osborne, "...eucharistic theology today cannot be done except in an ecumenical framework."(27) Both of the reinterpretations studied substantiate this statement. That is to say that the theology of both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians have had and will continue to have serious implications for further ecumenical endeavors in eucharistic theology.

Schillebeeckx' reinterpretation of transubstantiation was certainly welcomed by other Christian denominations. First, Schillebeeckx has explained that the term transubstantiation was used, in the sixteenth century, as a "political banner of orthodox faith" which heralded the difference between the Catholic and Protestant views. There is, furthermore, little doubt that such an antagonistic understanding of the term has to some extent filtered down to the present day. Schillebeeckx, in his reinterpretation of transubstantiation, while both mentioning and retaining the term, does not make it primary. His reinterpretation reflects the awareness of the need to find a common language in which to communicate with other Christian churches. Thus, by attempting to explain the reality of the real presence in terms other than strictly transubstantiation, Schillebeeckx' reinterpretation will help to ease the barrier that undoubtedly arises when the term is used.

Besides the issue of language, there are also certain other aspects of Schillebeeckx' reinterpretation which can be viewed as ecumenically fruitful. Most notable is the emphasis that is placed by Schillebeeckx on the eucharist as a sign which realizes what it symbolizes. According to Paul Jersild, a Lutheran scholar, this is promising to ecumenical dialogue insofar as it places the reality of Christ's presence within

the context of the symbolic act rather than in the elements of bread and wine alone.(28) Jersild also cites Schillebeeckx' insistence that the change which occurs is not a physical change, his assertion that Christ is really present in the entire liturgical assembly and, finally, his recognition of the faith response aspect of the interpersonal relationship as ecumenically favorable.(29) All in all, therefore, Schillebeeckx' reinterpretation of the eucharist has been seen by Protestant theologians as a step forward for ecumenism.

The reinterpretation of the eucharist that has been suggested by liberation theologians also has ecumenical ramifications. Again, the language that is used by the liberation theologians in their development of eucharistic theology is not the traditional language of substance and accidents which often proved to be antagonistic in ecumenical endeavors. Hence, ecumenical dialogue will most definitely be facilitated.

Most important, however, is the fact that many groups that may not agree about doctrine are nonetheless discovering that they are being brought together in their common work for justice. Doctrine, as indicated seen in Chapter 4, is not the foremost concern for most of these theologians, but rather, the human situation in which that doctrine is lived. In the celebration of the Lord's Supper, therefore, people are celebrating together in the Spirit of Jesus, regardless of doctrinal differences which may be a cause of division.

Another issue which arises from such ecumenical celebrations, and which has a large impact on ecumenism, is once again that of ministry. If Rome does not consider these celebrations which are presided by a non-ordained person to be a celebration of the eucharist, what is to be said of those celebrations led by Protestant ministers who have not

received the sacrament of orders in the Catholic church? Are these not to be considered authentic, albeit incomplete, eucharistic celebrations?(30) And, if they are considered authentic, then "...what holds for Protestant celebrations should hold a fortiori for the celebrations of Catholic lay co-ordinators."(31)

3. Church Authority

One final, major implication of the two reinterpretations of the eucharist which have been examined is the effect on church authority. As has been demonstrated, both reinterpretations have to some extent been viewed as deviations from traditional church doctrine. . Both, futhermore, have been refuted by Vatican documents--most notably, Mysterium Fidei and Instruction on Certain Aspects of Liberation Theology. I argue, however, that both reinterpretations are more an expansion of, rather than a deviation from, traditional doctrine. Schillebeeckx, as indicated in Chapter 3, insists that transubstantiation be retained in the doctrine of the eucharist. Transignification, he maintains, should not replace transubstantiation, but should be used to enhance that part of transubstantiation--the personal, human dimension--which for so long had been neglected. The liberation theologians also retain transubstantiation. Transubstantiation is taken for granted in this reinterpretation of the eucharist insofar as they insist that the transformation of life occurs because it is really Christ who, in the eucharist, calls us to be converted. Thus, while at the same time retaining traditional doctrine, both reinterpretations go beyond the doctrine to make it more meaningful for those who celebrate and are transformed by the eucharist.

Be this as it may, there is undoubtedly tension between the advocates of these reinterpretations and the official church. This tension stems, I suggest, from a distortion on the part of the official church about the meaning of unity. The call in both Mysterium Fidei and the Instruction has been a demand for unity. At times, however, the call for unity has appears to be more of a demand for uniformity.

In terms of liturgical celebrations, for example, Vatican II called for plurality which, while retaining unity, would also take into account regional and even congregational diversities. (32) Often, however, such religious inculturation is difficult. In many Third World countries, bread and wine are not a daily fare. Phillippe Rouillard questions their use in eucharistic celebrations:

> Bread and wine are foreign words for many Christians of Africa and the Far East who do not use them as food and drink. One can very legitimately wonder whether it is in accord with Christ's intention to employ signs which in these regions really do not signify anything and if it would not be better to adopt instead some food and beverage in use in the region in question. (33)

Unfortunately, in the name of unity, Rome has declared that bread and wine are to be the matter of the eucharist.

Likewise, mandatory clerical celibacy is being demanded of the presider of the eucharist by the official church authorities. Again, this does not take into account the traditions and conventions of many Third World people.

> ... in many tribal cultures celibacy is not regarded as an authentic human value...[Therefore] there will never be enough priests to celebrate the Eucharist because few tribal people will sacrifice their standing in the community to become ordained. (34)

Thus, the demand for uniformity of practice has surpassed Vatican II's call for plurality.

Increasingly, many Roman Catholics are insisting that the pluralism advocated by Vatican II be put into practice. As a result, they are asking the official church for the freedom to try new methods of worship which would be better suited to their own situations. Unity, they insist, takes into consideration the diversity of people. "Uniformity is a caricature of genuine unity, which depends on a respect for diversity." (35) Unity, they contend, does not necessarily demand uniformity.

This criticism of the official church's position is in no way meant to imply that there is nothing good happening at the official level. As indicated in the course of this thesis, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy at Vatican II, certain aspects of the encyclical Mysterium Fidei and the work done at the 41st Eucharistic Congress on the theme of the eucharist and human hunger are evidence that some progression is being made at the official level. Such changes, however, are often inadequate and slow in providing answers to urgent problems. Instead of working to provide solutions to such problems as the lack of ordained presiders for the eucharistic celebrations, the official church for the most part is content to reiterate the teaching that has been passed down through the centuries. Dissatisfied with this seeming indifference on Rome's part, many theologians are insisting that "theology also has the mission of seeking out adequate answers to new and urgent problems, using the resources of the depositum fidei."(36) It is precisely this "seeking out of adequate answers" that both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians have attempted.

The ideal here would be a collaborative effort on the part of both the official church on one side and the theologians and people on the

other. Unfortunately, this does not seem to be happening. To the contrary, that which appears to be emerging are two separate tracks. On the one hand, there are those theologians who, in recognition of the problems of contemporary eucharistic theology, are attempting to expand traditional doctrine in order to make it meaningful for those who participate in the eucharistic celebration. Also included in this group are those Roman Catholics who participate in such liturgical celebrations as the Lord's Supper where there is no ordained minister and who, despite Rome's insistence on the conditions of ordination, still consider these to be authentic eucharistic celebrations. To say that this group is oblivious of the official church's position is a wrong choice of words. They well know the persecution that their theologians are undergoing because of their stances. Be this as it may, however, the fact that they continue to celebrate these "illegal deviations" proves that these people intend to proceed in developing authentic and meaningful celebrations of the eucharist, regardless of Rome's dissatisfaction.

On the other side is the position taken by the official church. In addition to the direct criticism and rejection of the work of the theologians who are attempting to reinterpret the doctrine of the eucharist, there is also some evidence that the official church does not take into account the advances that have been made in the area of eucharistic theology over the past thirty years. At this point, I refer to the proposed Catechism for the Universal Church which is scheduled to be promulgated by November 1990. Of the Catechism, William Spohn remarks: "[It] is couched in terms which have been bypassed over the last thirty years. To go back and talk about the issues of the late

eighties in the language of the fifties is not an accident. It is an attempt to say that all that happened in between doesn't count."(37)

Nowhere is this fact more evident that in the section on the eucharist. Those reviewing the document maintain that the major flaw is the statement that the eucharist is not a meal. This meal aspect, as we have seen, is one of the major emphases in the reinterpretations of both Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians. Likewise, other significant aspects of the two reinterpretations have been downplayed or ignored altogether in the Catechism. "The catechism downplays the communal aspects of the eucharist. The document makes few references to the Church as People of God."(38) It would appear, therefore, that the official church is satisfied with simply repeating the eucharistic theology put forth four hundred years ago at the Council of Trent without taking into account the progress made at and since the Second Vatican Council.

In arguing this point, I am not saying that the two reinterpretations are totally correct while the church's stance against them is totally wrong. Certainly, there are problems which still have to be worked out in both reinterpretations, and both are probably subject, as is all of theology, to a certain amount of distortion. The official Church is justified, therefore, in proceeding with some degree of caution. However, as we have seen, the trend appears to be more than reluctance on the official church's part, but rather, an indifference to the cries of the people. As a result, the gulf between the two positions continues to widen.

What the outcome will be of these two divergent tracks of theology remains to be seen. Perhaps the two will grow insurmountably apart,

resulting in a split within the church. The hope remains, however, that these so-called "illegal deviations" will eventually be sanctioned by the official church. It is to be desired that the changes in eucharistic theology and practice such as those put forth by Schillebeeckx and the liberation theologians which are at the moment taking place outside the limits of the official church will one day be accepted as authentic and meaningful expressions of the eucharist celebrated in the Spirit of Jesus.

ENDNOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. Throughout the course of this thesis, I will refer to the eucharist with a lower case "e". This is a deliberate attempt on my part to avoid the objectification of the term. That is, it is my contention that when the eucharist is spelled with a upper case "E", the emphasis is put on the elements of bread and wine as objects of worship rather than the entire celebration as an action of worship.
2. Joseph Powers. "Eucharist: Symbol of Freedom and Community." in Christian Spirituality in the United States. Ed. F. Eigo. 1978. p.191.
3. Joseph Martos. Doors to the Sacred: A Historical Introduction to Sacraments in the Catholic Church. (Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1982), p. 248.
4. Ibid, p. 259-278.

CHAPTER ONE

1. As Allan McDonald attests, Berengar "completed rather than started a long line of spiritual teachers who held views similar to his own." Allan McDonald. Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine. (Merrick, New York: Richwood Publishing Company, 1977), p. 227.
2. J. Pohle. "Eucharist." in The Catholic Encyclopedia. Volume 5. (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913), p. 577.
3. This unclarity is due in no little part to the fact that the majority of Berengar's works were destroyed and the one which did survive was not discovered until seven centuries later. As a result, "it has largely been from quotations supplied by his opponents that later scholars have been obliged to reconstruct Berengar's thought." Jaroslav Pelikan. The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300). (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), p. 187.
4. As quoted in K.M. Purday. "Berengar and the Use of the Word Substantia." The Downside Review. (Volume 91. Number 303. April 1973.), pp.101-108.
5. Mcdonald, p. 320, n.7.
6. I am referring at this point to Allan McDonald. McDonald's work, although dated, seems to be the authority on the Berengarian controversy: all other scholars refer to this work.
7. McDonald, p. 284.
8. Ibid, p. 362.
9. Ibid, p. 361.
10. Ibid, p. 259.
11. Gustave Martelet. The Risen Christ and the Eucharistic World. (New York: Seabury Press, 1976), p. 133.
12. McDonald, p. 261.
13. Ibid, p. 315.

14. Justo Gonzalez. A History of Christian Thought. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971), p. 151.
15. Pelikan, p. 198.
16. McDonald, p. 285.
17. Joseph M. Powers. Eucharistic Theology. (New York: Herder and Herder,1967), p. 29.
18. It is necessary to note at this point that the metaphysical theory ofsubstance and accidents had not yet been standardized. Berengar in fact did not even use the term "accidents" in connection with "substance" but referred rather to the qualities of an object. K. Purday notes this fact and goes on to explain that the term "substance" for Berengar referred to the entire physical structure of a thing. Purday, pp. 104-106.
19. McDonald, p. 256.
20. Ibid, p. 256.
21. Purday, p. 101.
22. McDonald, p. 278-279.
23. Ibid, p.280.
24. Ibid, p.281.
25. Purday, p. 101.
26. Oath of 1059 as quoted in McDonald, p. 130.
27. McDonald, p. 296.
28. Ibid, p. 296.
29. Gonzalez, p. 152.
30. McDonald, p. 295.
31. Purday, p. 103.
32. Gonzalez, p. 153.
33. McDonald, p. 347.
34. Purday, p. 103.
35. Pelikan, p. 203.
36. Denzinger. The Sources of Catholic Dogma. (London: B. Herder Book Co., 1957),#355. (Hereinafter referred to as DS #)
37. McDonald, p. 263.
38. Thomas, of course, discussed the doctrine of the eucharist in other works such as the Commentary on the Sentences. For the purposes of this thesis, however, attention will be focussed on the Summa Theologiae as the sum of Thomas' theological investigations.
39. Aquinas, Thomas. Summa Theologiae. Latin text and English translation;introductions, notes, appendices, glossaries. Blackfriars. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode; N.Y.: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964. (Hereinafter referred to as ST). III, 75, 2 ad 2.
40. Ibid, III,79,7 ad 1.
41. J. de Baciocchi. L'Eucharistie. (Tournai, Belgium: Desclée and Co., 1961), p.82.
42. ST III,75,1.
43. By the time Thomas was writing the Summa, transubstantiation had already been made the official dogma of the Roman Catholic Church. The IV Lateran Council in 1215 had declared: "Jesus Christ, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine, the bread changed into His Body by the divine power of transubstantiation, and the wine into His Blood...", DS #430.

44. ST III,75,4.
45. As Yves de Montcheil explains: "la conversion de la substance du pain est le seul moyen de rendre le Christ réelement présente dans l'Eucharistie." in "La raison de la permanence du Christ sous les éspèces eucharistiques d'après Bonaventure et Thomas." Mélanges Théologiques: Série Théologie, n. 9. (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1946), p. 81.
46. ST III, 80, 1 ad 1. As well, related to this discussion of the fact of the real presence is Thomas' assertion of the permanence of the real presence after consecration. In asserting that all people receive Christ's body and blood, Thomas insisted that after consecration Christ's body remained under the species of the bread as long as the bread remained. This assertion may be seen as further proof of the reality of Christ's presence in the eucharist.
47. ST, III, 82, 5.
48. Part of Thomas' explanation of the mode of the real presence included the assertion that the whole Christ was present under each and every part of the species: "You are to think then of the whole Christ as being under each and every part of the appearances of the bread." ST III, 76, 3.
49. ST III, 75, 5. Accidents by this time was a normal part of the vocabulary of eucharistic doctrine. Thomas does, however, also use the term species--cf. for example ST III, 80, 3. Accidents, the editor of the Summa explains, refers to "the quantity, quality and all the other extra-substantial forms that affect a substance." ST Vol. LVIII, p. 74. It is important to note, however, as K. McDonnell affirms, that "Thomas did not raise the tools of substance and accidents--Aristotelian precisions--to the level of a dogma.", p. 299. Thus, while making use of the terms of Aristotelian philosophy, Thomas did not make them part of the doctrine of transubstantiation itself.
50. ST III, 77, 7.
51. Ibid, III, 75, 1 ad 2 and ad 3.
52. Ibid, III, 75, 1.
53. In ST III, 80, 1, for example, Thomas explained: "Since the embryonic and the full grown are contrasted, so the sacramental eating, in which the sacrament is received without its effect, is contrasted with the spiritual eating in which is received the sacramental effect whereby a person is spiritually joined to Christ in faith and charity.
54. ST 80, 3.: "So long as the species last, Christ's body does not cease to be under them."
55. Ibid, III, 80, 4.
56. Ibid, III, 80, 1.
57. ST III, 75, 1 ad 1. This concept of spiritual eating, as K. McDonnell observes, did not exclude a real eating but simply a material eating. In defence of Augustine's statement "You will not be eating this body which you see", Thomas asserted that: "He does not intend to exclude the reality of Christ's body; what he does rule out is that they would eat it under the same form in which they were looking at it." III, 75,1 ad 1. Thomas' exposition of spiritual eating, then, while ensuring a belief in

Christ's real presence in the sacrament, excluded a capharnaitic understanding of that presence. Hence. McDonnell concludes, by maintaining a distinction between sacramental and spiritual eating, Thomas guarded against "a species of sacramental realism which is in fact not at all sacramental but quite clearly crude religious materialism." Kilian McDonnell. John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist. (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1967), p. 306.

58. ST III, 79, 3-6.
59. Ibid, III, 79, 5.
60. Ibid, III, 73, 3.
61. Francis Clarke. Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, Ltd., 1960), p. 79.
62. ST III, 83, 1.
63. Ibid, III, 73, 5 ad 2.
64. As Colman O'Neill observes, Thomas did not ever offer an explicit explanation of the intricate relationship between the consecration and the sacrifice of the Mass. However, O'Neill continues this observation with the statement that "Abbot Vonier's sacrament-sacrifice theory, according to which the double consecration symbolizes and effects sacramentally the Passion of Christ, appears to interpret faithfully his theology." Colman O'Neill. "The Role of the Recipient and Sacramental Signification." Thomist. Volume 21. 1958. P. 523.

    Likewise, Nicholas Gihr, when considering the way in which Christ's body and blood are offered in the eucharist, interprets Thomas' understanding as follows: "This consists in the mystical shedding of blood, that is, in the separate consecration of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. The separate species, under which Christ's body and blood are rendered present by virtue of the words of consecration, that is, mystically immolated, are symbols of the violent and bloody death of Christ on the cross." Nicholas Gihr. The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1949), p. 138.

65. ST III, 76, 2 ad 1.
66. In II-II, 85, 3 ad 3, Thomas explained: "Sacrifices properly speaking occur when something is done with regard to a thing offered to God: as when animals are killed, when bread is broken, and eaten and blessed." As quoted in John Hughes. "Eucharistic Sacrifice: Transcending the Reformation Deadlock." Worship. Volume 43. Number 9. P. 541.
67. It was, the editor of the Summa maintains, in order to stress the real identification of the sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the Mass that Thomas preferred the more explicative term of immolatio, rather than sacrificium. ST Volume LIX. P. 133.
68. ST III, 77, 7 ad 3.
69. Ibid, III, 82, 5.
70. O'Neill, p. 523.
71. Ibid III, 83, 1.
72. Ibid III, 75, 5 ad 3.
73. De Baciocchi, p. 47.
74. ST III, 79, 7.

75. Ibid III, 79, 5.
76. Ibid III, 77, 7.
77. Ibid III, 78, 3 ad 7.
78. Ibid III, 79, 1. It is necessary to recognize that while Thomas did assert that the mass as sacrifice was effective not only for those who consecrated the eucharist, but for those who received as well as for those for whom it was offered (III, 79, 5), he did nevertheless continue to affirm the need for faith in Christ's Passion. In III, 79, 7 ad 2, he declared that "this sacrifice, which is a memorial of the Lord's passion, has no effect save on those who are united to the sacrament through faith and charity." Hence, despite the fact that the eucharist, as the sacrifice of Christ, need not be received in order to be efficacious, faith in that which was re-presented and from which it gained its power was a necessary element in the appropriation of its grace.
79. McDonnell, p. 327.
80. Powers, p. 40.
81. Jaroslav Pelikan. Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700). (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), p. 298.
82. An important point to note here is that, as Schillebeeckx explains, Trent did not deal with the manifold presences of Christ in the liturgy. The concern was not with the different forms of Christ's real presence, but with the safeguarding of the significance of his presence in the eucharist. Edward Schillebeeckx. The Eucharist. (N.Y.: Sheed and Ward, 1968), p. 42.
83. Although these Reformers agreed that the words of institution were not to be taken literally, they did not agree on what the interpretation should be. Zwingli, for example, used the interpretation set forth by Cornelius Hoen who suggested that the verb "to be" is often used in the Bible in a metaphorical sense, as when Jesus calls himself the true vine, the resurrection and the life, and the bread of life. As in these contexts, when Jesus obviously used the verb "to be" in the sense of "to signify", so in the words of institution "This is my body" should be understood as "This signifies" or "This represents" my body. Oecolampadius' interpretation was close to that of Zwingli; the bread and wine were to be seen as a figure or sign of the body and blood of Christ. Schwenckfeld, on the other hand, did not equate "to be" with "to signify", but proposed that the words of institution should instead be interpreted to mean, "Take and eat. My body given for you is this." viz. a spiritual food." (LW 37:40). Karlstadt, finally, proposed that when Christ said "This is my body", he was pointing to himself and not, therefore, to the bread and wine. All of the above did, however, agree that a symbolic interpretation was the only proper one. Cf. also David Steinmetz. "Scripture and the Lord's Supper in Luther's Theology." Interpretation. Vol. 37. No. 3. July 1983. Pp. 225ff.
84. DS, #883.
85. Ibid, #876.
86. Ibid.
87. DeBaciocchi, p. 81.
88. DS, #876.

89. Ibid, #886.
90. As Edward Schillebeeckx concludes: "This insistence of the Tridentine dogma on the lasting character of Christ's real presence in the eucharist point to the special and distinctive reality of this particular presence." Schillebeeckx, p. 44.
91. In The Babylonian Captivity of the Church, Luther expressed this concern; "My one concern at present is to remove all scruples of conscience, so that no one may fear being called a heretic." Martin Luther. Luther's Works. (Hereinafter referred to as LW) Vol 36. Ed. by Helmut T. Lehmenn. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1951), p. 30.
92. LW 36:31.
93. DS,#877.
94. Ibid, #884.
95. Ibid, #877.
96. Schillebeeckx, p. 42.
97. Pelikan, p. 299.
98. Schillebeeckx, p. 41.
99. Schillebeeckx is a notable exception. In response to claims that the Council avoided using the term "accidents' purposely in order to disassociate itself from the Aristotelian philosophical framework, Schillebeeckx insists both that species and accident were synonymous terms for the Fathers, and also that they themselves were Aristotelian scholastics. hence, while he does agree that the Council was not concerned with settling scholastic disputes between Catholic theologians, he does emphatically maintain that the Fathers were not trying to disassociate themselves from a certain framework. Cf. pp. 54-56.
100. Thomas Ambrogi. "Contemporary Roman Catholic theology of the eucharistic sacrifice: sacramental reality, sign and presence." in Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue, I-III. Ed. by Paul C. Empie and T. Austin Murphy. (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1974), p. 157.
101. "The sense is general but fixed and means the profound fundament of a thing."McDonnell, p. 301.
102. Gustave Martelet. The Risen Christ and the Eucharistic World. (N.Y.: Seabury Press, 1976), p. 106.
103. "The fundamental element of the scholastic doctrine of transubstantiation, the complete change of substance, should be upheld, not on any merely philosophical ground, but as corresponding with the full faith of the Church in the real presence." D.J.B. Hawkins. "Reflections on transubstantiation." The Downside Review. Vol. 80. 1962. P. 315.
104. LW 37: 370-371. While Luther did retain the idea that the sacrifice of Christ was present in the eucharist insofar as His body and blood, given in that one sacrifice of Calvary were also present, he nonetheless rejected the conception of the Roman Catholic priesthood which claimed to have inherited the power to enact Christ's sacrifice in the Mass. Furthermore, Luther rejected the Roman Catholic understanding of the Mass, not merely as a result of the abuses that had arisen around the doctrine of sacrifice, but also on the grounds that it had distorted the true

meaning of the eucharist. That is, he insisted that the Mass had come to be understood as a means to an end and a way to appease God, rather than as a testament by which Christ had bequeathed to His heir the inheritance of the forgiveness of sin.(LW 35:86-87). It was, then, on this basis that Luther rejected the Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass.

105.Hughes, p.536.

106.DS, #948.

107.DS, #939.

108.It is important to note that there was some disagreement on this point. Hubert Jedin maintains that some doubt was expressed not only about the sacrificial nature of the Lord's Supper but especially about the transfer of the power to sacrifice Christ to the apostles. In view of the fact that this doubt was expressed by a minority, however, the two assertions became part of the official doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass. Hubert Jedin. Crisis and Closure of the Council of Trent: A Retrospective View of the Second Vatican Council. (London: Sheed and Ward, 1967), p. 70.

109.Pelikan, p. 300. Also cf. Canon four: "If anyone says that blasphemy is cast upon the most holy sacrifice of Christ consummated on the Cross through the sacrifice of the Mass, or that by it He is disparaged: let him be anathema." DS, #951.

110.DS, #940. Nicholas Gihr succinctly sums up this idea with the following affirmation: "Between the two there exists the most perfect unity so far as we consider the victim and the priest; for it is Christ who offers upon the altar His body and His blood, consequently the same gift which He once offered on the Cross.", p. 139.

111.Ambrogi, p . 152.

112.DS, # 938.

113.Perhaps this was not the only reason for the Fathers' assertion that the Mass was a propitiatory sacrifice. John Hughes maintains that the Fathers understood the representation as a mental recalling of Calvary on the part of the worshippers, as did the Reformers. "Hence the Catholic apologists of the Reformation period felt it necessary to go beyond the notion of representation-which for them did not safeguard the truth that the mass was a true sacrifice." p. 536. However, I would suggest that the Fathers may well have understood "representation" in the more forceful sense of making present Christ's sacrifice, but, in light of the fact that the Reformers did not understand it in that sense, went on to declare that the Mass was a propitiatory sacrifice.

114.DS, #940.

115.Ibid, #940.

CHAPTER TWO

1. Josef Jungmann. Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II. Ed. Herbert Vorgrimler (N.Y.: Herder and Herder, 1967), p. 20.
2. This is not to say that the need for authentic reform was not felt before the twentieth century. To the contrary, seventeenth

century France and eighteenth century Germany in particular called for a renewal of liturgy. However, these centuries are not of particular importance to this study because, as Jungmann points out, "these earlier attempts at reform did not lead to any lasting success.", p. 2.

3. Pope Pius XII. Mediator Dei. in The Papal Encyclicals in their Historical Context. Ed. Anne Fremantle. (N.Y.: New American Library, 1956), p. 287.
4. Adrian Hastings. A Concise Guide to the Documents of the Second VaticanCouncil. (London: Darton, Longmann and Todd, 1968), p. 129.
5. Pope Pius XII, p. 286.
6. Ibid, p. 287.
7. Jungmann, p. 8.
8. "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy." in The Documents of Vatican II. Ed. Walter M. Abbott. (New Jersey; New Century Publishers, 1966), Article 1. (Hereinafter referred to as CSL.)
9. Even in The Roman Catechism, however, the exposition on the doctrine of the Eucharist is for the most part a repetition of that which was established at the Council of Trent.
10. CSL, Art. 14.
11. Jungmann, p. 17.
12. Documents on the Liturgy, 1963-1979: Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts. (Hereinafter referred to as DOL.) (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1982), 189 #1325.
13. CSL, Art. 14.
14. It is important to acknowledge the new vision of the Church which is developed in the Council documents. In the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, the Church is referred to primarily as the Pilgrim People of God. This concept of church, as opposed to the notion of the church as the institution of salvation has numerous repercussions. The Church is no longer identified with the Kingdom of God on earth, but is understood as working towards that end. The Church as pilgrim people is subject to deviations and imperfections,since it has not yet reached the end of the pilgrimage. Likewise, the Church is deeply involved in, rather than apart from history. George Lindbeck. The Future of Roman Catholic Theology: Vatican II--The Catalyst for Change. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), pp. 33-34.
15. CSL, Art.31 and 32.
16. Joseph Cordeiro. "The Liturgy Constitution." in Vatican II Revisited by those who were there. Ed. Alberic Stacpoole. (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1986), p. 189.
17. CSL, Art. 26.
18. Ibid, Art. 27.
19. Lindbeck, p. 72.
20. CSL, Art. 11.
21. Everett Diederich. "Reflections on post-conciliar shifts in eucharistic faith and practice." Communio(US). Vol. 12. Summer 1985. P. 226.
22. CSL, Art.8.

23. Raymond B. Fullam. Exploring Vatican II: Christian Living Today and Tomorrow. (Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1969),p. 224.
24. CSL, Art. 7.
25. Joseph Powers. "Eucharist: Symbol of Freedom and Community." in Christian Spirituality in the United States. Ed. F. Eigo. 1978. P. 189-197.
26. Joseph Powers. "Food for Wayfarers." New Catholic World. January-February 1986. P. 40.
27. Pope Paul VI. Mysterium Fidei. In The Papal Encyclicals: 1958-1981. Ed. Claudia Carlen. (McGrath Publishing House, 1981), #39.
28. Hastings, p. 122.
29. DOL 177 #1223.
30. Eucharisticum Mysterium. In Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents. Ed. Austin Flannery. (Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1975), p. 133.
31. Hastings, p. 123.
32. Ibid, p. 121.
33. CSL, Art. 61.
34. Ibid, Art. 33.
35. Liam Walsh. "The Sacraments and Sacramentals." in Vatican II: Liturgical Constitution. Ed. Austin Flannery. (Dublin; Scepter Books, 1964), p. 45.
36. CSL, Art. 50.
37. Ibid, Art. 23.
38. A. Verheul. Introduction to the Liturgy. (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1968), p. 33.
39. CSL, Art. 24.
40. Ibid, Art. 52.
41. Jungmann, p. 39.
42. CSL, Art. 30.
43. Ibid, Art. 36,#2.
44. Gary MacEoin. What Happened at Rome? The Council and its Implications for the Modern World. (N.Y.: Echo book, 1967), p. 91.
Also cf. CSL Art. 36, #3: "It is for the competent territorial ecclesiastical authority mentioned in Article 22, #2 to decide whether, and to what extent, the vernacular language is to be used according to these norms; their decrees are to be approved, that is, confirmed, by the Apostolic See."
45. MacEoin, pp. 93-94.
46. Hastings, pp. 129-130.
47. CSL, Art. 55.
48. Hastings, p. 131.
49. Louis Bouyer. The Liturgy Revived: A Doctrinal Commentary of the Conciliar Constitution on the Liturgy. (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964), p. 67.
50. CSL, Art. 48.
51. Cf. CSL Art. 47: "He did this in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross throughout the centuries until He should come again, and so to entrust to His beloved spouse, the Church, a memorial of His death and resurrection."

CHAPTER THREE

1. It must be emphasized that this train of thought had been circulating for a number of years prior to the Second Vatican Council. In fact, certain elements--in particular, the expanded notion of sacrament--greatly influenced Vatican II documents.
"The years 1964 and 1965 marked the beginning of a new phase in the reinterpretation of Christ's real presence. By this, I mean that it was then that the new ideas which had been developed in different countries, especially during the ten years following the publication of Humani Generis in 1950, became widely known in the Church as a whole." In Edward Schillebeeckx. The Eucharist. (N.Y.: Sheed and Ward, 1968), p. 114.
2. Edward Schillebeeckx. "Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration." Worship. vol. 40. No. 6. 1966. P. 325.
3. Kenan Osborne cites a number of theologians who were precursors of this work even before World War II: L. Billot, M. de la Taille, Odo Casels, A. Vonier, J. Ternus, A. Maltha, and F. Unterkircher. Cf. Kenan Osborne, "Contemporary Understandings of the Eucharist: A Survey of Catholic Thinking" Journal of Ecumenical Studies. Vol. 13. No. 2. Spring 1979. P. 4.
As well, Edward Kilmartin adds to the list by citing Yves de Montcheuil as the first to use the term 'transfinalization'. Cf. E.J. Kilmartin. "Sacramental Theology; The Eucharist in Recent Literature." Theological Studies. Vol. 32. June 1971. P. 234.
4. Schillebeeckx, 1968, pp. 94-106.
Kenan Osborne adds to these five by including the rise of historical consciousness and philosophical pluralism. Osborne, 1979, p. 6.
5. Ibid, p. 94. For the purposes of this thesis, we will use only Selvaggi and Columbo in order to explain the issue. This is not to say that they were the only two involved in the controversy. Cf., for example, Cyril Vollert's excellent overview: "The Eucharist: Controversy on Transubstantiation." Theological Studies. Vol. 22. 1961.
6. Richard G. Cipolla. "Selvaggi revisited: Transubstantiation and Contemporary Science." Theological Studies. Vol. 35. No. 4. December 1974. P. 668.
7. Vollert, 1961, p. 394. Vollert is quick to point out that Selvaggi did in fact make a distinction: if by physical change, one was referring to a real change between two real physical terms, transubstantiation is a physical change. But "if by physical change we mean, in the language of modern physics, a change brought about by a series of physical operations, evidently transubstantiation is not a physical change. Although the substance of bread is no longer present under the species after the consecration, it is impossible to verify experimentally the change that has occurred since all experimentation has as immediate object the species of properties, not the substance, which is the object of judgement.
8. Cipolla, 1974, p. 669.
9. Vollert, 1961, p. 397.

10. Cipolla, 1974, p. 670.
11. Both Cipolla and Osborne state that the argument was long and rather obscure.
12. Osborne, 1979, p. 5.
13. Schillebeeckx, 1968, pp. 96-100.
14. Osborne, 1979, p. 5.
15. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 100. Joseph Powers gives a great example of this: "Canvas and oil, drafting pens and paper, paper and ink are robbed of their physical reality in their assumption into the act of conveying insight, intelligence or emotion from one person to others. They remain themselves physically, it is true, and they can be subjected to physical examination and be found to be paper, canvas, oil and so on. But their existential reality in the human sign-act is that of the symbolic instrument which literally and effectively incarnating and expressing that reality to man's world." Joseph Powers. Eucharistic Theology. (N.Y.: Herder and Herder, 1967), pp. 85-86.
16. J. De. Baciocchi. "Présence eucharistique et transsubstantiation." Irénikon. vol. 32. 1959. P. 148.
17. Ibid, p. 150. Transubstantiation is necessary, de Baciocchi maintained, in order to discard several wrong ideas of what occurs at the eucharistic change. First, it dismisses the notion that what occurs at the consecration is a complete transmutation in the area of chemical reactions, since nothing changes on either the experiential or the scientific level. As well, transubstantiation rejects the idea that the change which occurs is a purely relative change; that is, that the bread itself is not modified at any level, but merely made use of in a different way. The dogma also repudiates the position--consubstantiation--which states that the bread remains bread and, at the same time, becomes the body of Christ. Lastly, transubstantiation reacts against the theory that the bread is made up of two separate entities—an outer membrane that can relate to the senses and an inner core or substance. At consecration, according to this position, only the bread's outer stratum remains, while the inner kernel disappears and is replaced by Christ's body and blood.
18. Ibid, pp. 155-158.
19. Vollert, 1961, p. 418.
20. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 102.
21. G. Ghysens. "Présence réele et transsubstantiation dans les définitions de l'Eglise Catholique." Irénikon. Vol 32. 1959. P. 429.
22. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 102.
23. Edward J. Kilmartin. "Christ's presence in the Liturgy." in Bread from Heaven. Ed. Paul Bernier. (N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1977), p. 105.
24. Everett Diederich. "The unfolding presence of Christ in the Mass." Communio (US). Winter 1978. P. 336.
25. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 104.
26. Ibid, p. 105.
27. F.J. Leenhardt. "This is my Body." Ecumenical Studies in Worship:

Essays on the Lord's Supper. Ed. J.G. Davies and A. Raymond George. (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958), pp. 47-48.

28. Ibid, p. 50.
29. Ibid, pp. 49-50.
30. To temper his retention of the term transubstantiation, Leenhardt was adamant in his denial of "static substantialism". As Thomas Dicken points out, "static substantialism" is a danger to any eucharistic theology that is based on the term "substance": "Because substance philosophy suggests a static interpretation of the real presence, it tends to focus attention exclusively on the elements,in abstraction from the total context of the eucharist." To safeguard against this tendency, Leenhardt insisted that the real presence of Christ was not to be found in the bread and wine apart from everything else, but within the total event of the supper and especially within the action of distribution. Transubstantiation, therefore, cannot localize the body of Christ within the elements of the bread. By explaining it in this manner, Leenhardt attempted to go beyond isolating the real presence of Christ in a substance, to the broader context of recognizing it in an action. T.M. Dicken. "Process Philosophy and the Real Presence." Journal of Ecumenical Studies. Vol. 6. 1979. P. 73.
31. Leenhardt, 1958, p. 48. A necessary requirement for this change of reality to occur, Leenhardt insisted, is the faith of the person. That is to say that the kind of knowledge that is necessary to comprehend the change in the reality of the bread is possible only to the believer; all the others will consider the change impossible. Thus, only the person of faith will see in the substance of the bread the reality which God wills for it--the real presence of Christ.
32. Grace, according to Schillebeeckx, can be defined as personal saving encounters with God. He explains: "On God's part this encounter involves a disclosure of himself by revelation and on the part of man it involves devotion to God's service—that is, religion. This encounter itself, seen from man's side, is the reality of what is called sanctifying grace." Edward Schillebeeckx. Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God. (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963), pp. 4-5.

    For a more general discussion on grace in the world, cf. Joseph Fitzer. "Teilhard's Eucharist: A Reflection." Theological Studies. Vol 34. No. 2. June 1963. Pp. 251-264.
33. D. Gray. "Sacramental Consciousness-Raising." Worship. Vol. 46. 1972. P. 131.
34. Karl Rahner. "How to receive a sacrament and mean it." Theology Digest. Vol. 19. 1971. P. 227.
35. Ibid, p. 228.
36. Schillebeeckx, 1963, p. 15.
37. Richard Gula. To Walk Together Again. (N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1984), p. 74.
38. Karl Rahner. Foundations of Christian Faith. (N.Y.: Crossroads, 1984), p. 412. Avery Dulles makes a very good point about this: "The Church does not always signify this equally well. It stands under a divine imperative to make itself a convincing sign. It

appears most fully as a sign when its members are evidently united to one another and to God through holiness and mutual love, and when they visibly gather to confess their faith in Christ and to celebrated what God has done for them in Christ." Models of the Church. (N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1974), p. 72.

39. Schillebeeckx, 1963, p. 51.
40. It is important to point out that despite the emphasis on the Church as the sign which carries on Christ's presence in the world, however, it is necessary to indicate that such an expanded notion of the sacrament is in no way meant to be exclusive. That is, it does not mean that the Church is an encounter with the saving reality of Christ only for those within. Rather, in accord with the new theology of grace which affirms that the entire world is itself full of grace, the notion of Church as sacrament necessarily involves all people, those who are within the Christian community as well as those who are not. Thus, the Church, as the sign which perpetuates the saving reality of Jesus, far from remaining apart from the world, proclaims to the world that it too is redeemed by its encounter with Jesus. Cf. Rahner, 1971, p. 232.
41. Charles Davis. "Understanding the Real Presence." The Word in History. Ed. T. Patrick Burke. (N.Y.: Sheed and Ward, 1966), p. 166.
42. Gula, p. 79.
43. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 97. As well, for good, concise explanation, cf. Thomas Ambrogi. "Sacramental Reality, Sign and Presence." in Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue, I-III. Ed. Paul C. Empie and T. Austin Murphy. (Minneapolis: Augsbury Publishing House, 1974), pp. 182-183.
44. Gula, p. 82.
45. In placing the dogma of transubstantiation within the broad context of the eucharist itself, Schillebeeckx relies heavily on the work of Schoonenberg and Davis. "The authentic context in which the Eucharist should be seen has been very suggestively described by Schoonenberg and Davis especially." Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 122.
46. Ibid, p. 90.
47. Ibid, p. 53.
48. Karl Rahner. "The presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper." Theological Investigations IV: More Recent Writings. (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1966), p. 303.
49. Kenan Osborne. "Eucharistic Theology Today." Alternative Futures for Worship: Volume 3--The Eucharist. Ed. Bernard J. Lee. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1987), p. 97.
50. Piet Schoonenberg. "Presence and the Eucharistic Presence." Cross Currents. Vol. 17. Winter 1967. Pp. 40-50. I am using Schoonenberg here because, as Schillebeeckx points out, even though Luchesius Smits did a fair amount of work in this area, it follows the same basic direction as that of Schoonenberg's thought. Cf. Schillebeeckx, 1968, pp. 117-121.
51. Powers, p. 121.
52. Schoonenberg, 1967, p. 52.
53. Davis, 1966, p. 169.
54. Ibid, p. 160.

55. Ibid, p. 170.
56. Ibid, p. 162.
57. Charles Davis. "The Theology of Transubstantiation." Sophia. Vol. 3. 1964. P. 19.
58. E.L. Mascall. "Eucharistic Doctrine after Vatican II: Some Anglican Anticipations." Church Quarterly Review. Vol. 169. April-June, 1968. P. 148.
59. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 128.
60. Ibid, p. 130.
61. Joseph Powers. "Mysterium Fidei and the theology of the Eucharist." Worship. Vol. 40. No. 1. 1966. P. 21.
62. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 131.
63. Ibid, p. 131.
64. Ibid, p. 132.
65. Ibid, p. 133.
66. Ibid, p. 137.
67. Ibid, p. 134.
68. This, according to Mascall, is the principle of transignification: "Transignification does not mean the substitution of one signification or another, but the transformation of one signification into another in which it finds its own fulfillment.", p. 155.
69. Phillippe Rouillard. "From Human Meal to Christian Eucharist." Living Bread,Saving Cup: Readings on the Eucharist. Ed. R. Kevin Seasoltz. (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1982), p. 132.
Kenan Osborne explains it as follows: "The food is part of a meal, but so is the social context and interpersonal sharing which accompanies a meal.", 1987, p. 97. For an indepth description, cf. Bernard Besret. Tomorrow a New Church. (N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1973), pp. 112-115.
70. Marie Zimmerman. "L'Eucharistie: Quelques Aspects de la Pensée de Schillebeeckx." Revue des Sciences Religieuses. Vol. 49. July 1975. P. 239.
71. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 137.
72. Paul Jersild. "A Lutheran View of the Real Presence in Roman Catholic Theology Today.' Dialog. Vol. 12. Spring 1973. P. 139.
73. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 139.
74. Ibid,p. 139.
75. Schillebeeckx, 1966, p. 337.
76. Ibid, p. 337.
77. Schillebeeckx, 1968, pp. 137-138. Piet Schoonenberg concurs with this: "...the whole presence of the Lord in his Church—in the celebration of the Eucharist--is important, even more important than his presence in the sacred species alone. Only when we try to plumb the depths of the riches of this presence in community do we find therein the meaning of the real presence under the sacred species." Cf. Schoonenberg, 1967, p. 40.
78. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 139.
79. Ibid, p. 138.
80. Ibid, p. 141.
81. Ibid, p. 141.
82. Ibid, p. 142.

83. Ibid, p. 144.
84. Ibid, p. 147. In relation to this, Schillebeeckx maintains that although the way something appears is normally the sign of reality which contains the reality itself, this is not always the case. It is, he claims, "the inadequacy of man's knowledge of reality that accounts for a certain difference between reality and its appearance as a phenomenon."
85. Ibid, p. 150. This is well summarized by Powers: "there is a change in the signifying function of these appearances but that change (a 'transsignification') is a change precisely because the reality which is contained in these appearances is no longer the reality of the bread and wine, but Christ's bodily reality." Powers, 1967, p. 153.
86. Ibid
87. Ernest Schoenmaeckers explains that Schillebeeckx had expressed grave doubts about methods that did not clearly state what Trent asked. "Birdcages in Dutch Churches." America. Vol. 113. October 1965. P. 408.
88. Peter Beer. "G.B. Sala and E. Schillebeeckx on the eucharistic presence: a critique [transignification and transubstantiation]." Science et Esprit. Vol 38. No. 1. Jan-April 1986. P. 34.
Joseph Powers also has a succinct explanation: "What, then, is the meaning of the statement that the change which takes place in the eucharist is a "transignification"? Negatively,it does not mean that the believer merely thinks or feels differently about the bread and cup...Positively, it means that God, in the creative power of his word, transforms the religious meaning (the inner value and power) of the unleavened bread and the cup of benediction by fulfilling in Christ all that the bread and cup promised to Israel. In the Eucharist, God transforms the meaning of this bread and cup, giving it a new inner value and power.' 1966, p. 30.
89. Jill Raitt. "Roman Catholic Wine in Reformed Old Bottles?" Journal of Ecumenical Studies. Vol. 8. 1971. P. 603. Raitt goes on to explain that: "This fundamental inconsistency is avoided by other Roman Catholic authors, e.g. Piet Schoonenberg [who states]"...if we consider the finality and the significance themselves as substantial, as given with the reality of the bread and wine and co-constitutive of these elements, then transfinalization and transignification are identical with transubstantiation."" Quote is from Schoonenberg, 1967, p. 45.
90. Schillebeeckx, 1968, p. 21.
91. Powers, 1966, pp. 29-30.
92. Zimmerman, 1975, p. 245.
93. Cyril Vollert. "Transubstantiation and the Encyclical." Continuum. Vol. 3. Autumn 1965. P. 388.
94. Edward Schillebeeckx. "Christus' tegenwoordigheid in de eucharistie." in Tigdschrift voor theologie. Vol 5. 1965. Pp. 136-173. As well, Schoonenberg's works had been published as early as 1959 and Davis' in 1964.
95. Donald Campion. "New Trends in Encyclicals." Commonweal. Vol. 82. 1965. P. 714.

As well, Joseph Powers claims that "who they are is not mentioned by the Pope, although a segment of the Italian press has dispensed itself from Pope Paul's laudable discretion and focussed its attention on one of the greatest theologians of this age, Prof. E.H. Schillebeeckx." 1966, p. 20.

96. Schoemnaeckers, 1965, p. 408. According to Vilmos Vajta, however, "the denial published in L'Osservatore Romano entangled the question still more, since it was misleading." "Mysterium Fidei: A Lutheran View." Concilium. Vol. 14. 1966. P. 159.
97. René Marlé. "L'encyclique Mysterium Fidei sur l'eucharistie." Etudes. Vol. 323. Novembre, 1965. P. 545.
98. Pope Paul VI. Mysterium Fidei. From The Papal Encyclicals, 1958-1981. Ed. Claudia Carlen (McGrath Publishing House, 1981), #10.
99. James Quinn. "Interpreting Mysterium Fidei." Month. Vol. 5. April 1966. P. 206.
100. Paul VI, # 14.
101. Powers, 1966, p. 32.
102. Paul VI, #11.
103. Marlé, 1965, p. 552.
104. Ibid, p. 550.
105. Paul VI, #39.
106. Ibid, #44.
107. Ibid, #46.
108. Ibid, #11.
109. Ibid, #46. Joseph Powers agrees with this, stating "what he is rejecting is the contention that 'transignification' or 'transfinalization' are the only terms in which the theology of the Eucharist can be developed and that the traditional expression of the church's faith in 'transubstantiation' has no place in the theology of the Eucharist.", 1966, p. 20.
110. Mascall, p. 149.
111. Quinn, p. 205.
112. Jersild, p. 137.
113. Schillebeeckx, 1966, p. 325.

CHAPTER FOUR

1. Liberation theology is still most clearly enunciated in the so-called Third World. However, it is also becoming a factor in the First World. In the United States, for example, black theology is becoming more widely known and developed. In Europe and North America, theology is becoming increasingly concerned with the responsibilities of the First World with regard to the Third World; problems of ecology and nuclear energy; issues concerning the 'new poor' (drug addicts, the elderly and migrant workers.) Feminist theology is also a decisive issue in both the First and the Third World. Cf. Leonard and Clodovis Boff. Introducing Liberation Theology. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1987), p. 81.

   Liberation theology is also overflowing the borders of the church and becoming a public concern, since it is dealing with social, political and economic issues which affect all of society.

Leonardo and Clodovis Boff. Liberation Theology: From Confrontation to Dialogue. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1986), p. 7.

2. In the earliest days of colonialism, for example, Bartalome de las Casa devoted himself to the defense of the natives by arguing that they had the right to be treated as free people. As a result, he is often regarded as a prophet of liberation and a forerunner of present day liberation theology. Theo Witvliet. A Place in the Sun: Liberation Theology in the Third World. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1985), p. 11.
3. The Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians (hereinafter referred to as EATWOT) has declared that "theologies from Europe and North America are dominant today in our churches and represent one form of cultural domination." "Why we need a Third World Theology" (London: Catholic Institute for International Relations, 1987), p. 16. However, this is beginning to change. As Jose Miguez-Bonino explains: "These theologians are increasingly claiming their right to 'misread' their teachers, to find their own insertion in the theological tradition, to offer their own interpretation of the theological task." Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situtation. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p. 62.
4. Boff, 1987, pp. 66-68.
5. Enrique Dussel. History and the theology of liberation: a Latin American Perspective. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1986), p. 116.
6. "It is within this situation of disillusionment with development that liberation theology has emerged..." Robert McAfee Brown. "Reflections of Liberation Theology." Religion in Life. Volume 43. Autumn 1974. P. 270.
7. A.J. Hennelly. Theologies in Conflict. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979), p. 3.
8. Phillip Berryman. Liberation Theology: essential facts about the revolutionary movement in Latin America--and beyond. (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987), p. 22.
9. Ibid, p. 12.
10. Brown, 1978, p. 269.
11. Boff, 1987, p. 46.
12. "In the Bible poverty is a scandalous condition inimical to human dignity and therefore contrary to the will of God." Gustavo Gutierrez. A Theology of Liberation. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1973), p. 291.
13. Boff, 1987, p. 81.
14. Witvliet, pp. 89-98.
15. Berryman, p. 164.
16. Boff, L. and C., 1986, p. 13.

Avery Dulles gives a very helpful definition of the term praxis as it is used in liberation theology. Praxis means "...those human activities which are capable of transforming reality and society, and thus of making the world more human. More specifically, praxis is the action that tends to overcome the alienation by which man has become separated from the fruits of his labor. Praxis is

therefore revolutionary; it is directed to changing the economic and social relationship. Liberation theologians apply this principle to faith and come up with the Word of God being distorted and alienating whenever it is accepted without commitment to the praxis oriented toward the Kingdom of God." "Faith in Relationship to Justice." The Faith That Does Justice. Ed. John C. Haughey. (N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1977)

17. Gutierrez, 1973, p. 15.
18. "Theology itself needs to be "liberated" from the ivory towers of academies, universities and seminaries. It must take far more account of the experience of faith, and of believers, and confront actual historical reality." Brian Hearne. "Liberation Theology and the Renewal of Theology." African Ecclesial Review. Vol. 26. December 1984.

    EATWOT carries this a step further by declaring: "We reject as irrelevant an academic type of theology that is divorced from action. We are prepared for a radical break in epistemology which makes commitment first act of theology and engages in critical reflection on praxis of the reality of the Third World." , p. 16.
19. Gustavo Gutierrez. "The Task of Theology and Ecclesial Experience." Concilium 176: La Iglesia Popular: Between Fear and Hope. Ed. by Leonardo Boff and Virgil Elizondo. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, Ltd, 1984), p. 63.
20. This stage is, according to L. Boff, a preliminary, pre-theological stage which is of the utmost importance. Without it, liberation cannot occur and liberation theology cannot be developed. Boff, 1987f, pp. 21-22.
21. Gutierrez, 1984, p. 62.
22. Bonino, Jose Miguez. Room to Be People. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), p. 8.
23. Witzliet, p. 25.
24. Boff, 1987, pp. 24-28.
25. Berryman, p. 87. It is important to note here the term "aid"": liberation theologians for the most part have not become involved to any great extent with social theory, but rather, have accepted the premises of social theorists which state that basic structural changes in society are necessary.

    26. As quoted in Robert McAfee Brown. Theology in a New Key. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), p. 67.
27. Witlviet, p. 131. According to Jon Sobrino, the poor rarely consider the dogmas of the Church in their hermeneutical meditations, placing the majority of their emphasis on the Bible. "The 'Doctrinal Authority' of the people of God in Latin America." Concilium 180: Teaching Authority of Believers. Ed. by J.B. Metz and Edward Schillebeeckx. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, Ltd, 1985), p. 57.
28. Boff, 1987, p. 51.
29. Leonardo Boff, Jesus Christ Liberator. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1978), p. 279.
30. Dussel, 1987, p. 139.
31. Boff, 1987, p. 40.
32. Brown, 1978, p. 71.

33. This tension is often a major concern for liberation theologians. That is, by over emphasizing the practical, often political, aspect of liberation theology, there is the danger that the core of liberation theology--the spiritual aspect of experiencing God in the suffering of the poor--will be neglected. Boff, 1987, p. 64.
34. Boff, 1987, pp. 11-16.
35. Ibid, p. 85.
36. Alvaro Barneiro. Basic Ecclesial Communities and the Evangelization of the Poor. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1982), p. 9.
37. Berryman, p. 64. This definition is very broad. There is, as Thomas Bruneau indicates, tremendous variation from diocese to diocese and from country to country. "The Catholic Church and Development in Latin America: the role of Base Christian Communities." Religious Values and Developments. Ed. K. Jameson and C. Wilbr, 1980, p. 539.
38. Dussel, p. 165.
39. Most theologians emphatically insist that the base Christian communities are not parallel, clandestine or rebel churches, but rather, a movement of renewal from within the larger church. Cf., for example, Pablo Richard. "The Church of the Poor Within the Popular Movement." Concilium 176: La Iglesia Popular: Between Fear and Hope. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd, 1984), p. 10.
The base communities do, however, present a challenge to the official church insofar as they hold tremendous implications for the re-definition of the church. Bruneau, p. 540.
40. Berryman, pp. 65-66.
41. Bruneau, p. 537.
42. Leonardo Boff. Ecclesiogenesis: The Base Communities Reinvent the Church. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1986), p. 2.
43. Berryman, p. 76.
44. Bruneau, pp. 539 and 542.
45. Boff, 1987, p. 5.
Cf. also Brown, 1974, p. 272--"The process of working for change is called conscientization; raising the level of consciousness; perceiving the social, political and economic contradictions in the society; and becoming more and more aware of how truly repressive it is so that action can be undertaken to destroy such structures and bring about liberation."
46. Richard, pp. 10-13.
47. The theology of the sacraments has been dealt with most extensively by Juan Luis Segundo. For that reason, we will rely in large part on his work: The Sacraments Today. (Maryknoll, N.Y.; Orbis Books, 1974)
48. Segundo, p. 6.
49. Ibid, p. 92.
50. Ibid, p. 20.
51. Ibid, p. 63.
52. Ibid, p. 38.
53. Ibid, p. 39.
54. Ibid, pp. 79-80.
55. Ibid, p. 104.

56. Rafael Avila. Worship and Politics. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1981), p. 74. Another indication that the eucharist is not of foremost concern is the amount of literature devoted to it. The Third World theologians dedicate the majority of their efforts to obtaining liberation from a concrete situation. It is usually North American and European writers who deal more exclusively with the eucharist within the context of liberation. For example, Monika Hellwig, Joseph Grassi, Dermot Lane.
57. Dermot Lane. Foundations for a Social Theology: Praxis, Process and Salvation. (N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1984), p. 151.
58. A.C. Cochrane. "Eating and Drinking with Jesus." Christian Century. Vol. 91. April 10, 1974. p 392.
59. Lane, p. 151.
60. Tissa Balasuriya. The Eucharist and Human Liberation. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979), p. 2
61. Ibid, p. 57.
62. Lane, p. 143.
"Today the trends in the evolution of the eucharistic theology and devotion take place outside the official circles..." Balasuriya, p. 39.
63. Roger Mahoney. "The Eucharist and Social Justice." Worship. Vol. 57. January 1983. P. 54.
64. Balasuriya, p. 11.
65. Joseph A. Grassi. Broken Bread and Broken Bodies: The Lord's Supper and World Hunger. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1985), p. 28.
66. Ibid, p. 26.
67. Balasuriya, p. 16.
68. Boff, Leonardo. When Theology Listens to the Poor. (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989), p. 95.
69. Balasuriya, p. 33.
70. R. Kevin Seasoltz. "Justice and the Eucharist." Worship. Vol. 58. November 1984. P. 520.
71. Monika Hellwig. The Eucharist and the Hunger of the World. (N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1976), p. 10.
72. Paul Abela. "Celebrating and then practicing the Eucharist." Concilium 109: Charisms in the Church. Ed. Christian Duquoc and Casiano Floristan. (N.Y.: Seabury Press, 1978), p. 103.
73. Sandra Schneiders. "The Foot Washing (John 13:1-20): An Experiment in Hermeneutics." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Vol. 43. 1981, p. 81.
74. Lane, p. 149.
75. Gutierrez, p. 263.
76. Scheiders, p. 87.
77. Avila, p. 93.
78. Hellwig, p. 70.
79. Boff, Ecclesiogenesis, p. 53.
80. Seasoltz, p. 519.
81. Balasuriya, p. 23.
82. Seasoltz, p. 523.
83. Boff, Ecclesiogenesis, p. 57.
84. John Chrysostom. Homily 50. Quoted in Lane, p. 151.
85. Avila, p. 65.

86. Balasuriya, pp. 33-36.
87. Ibid, p. 36.
88. Ibid, p. 8.
89. Boff, 1989, p. 95.
90. Lane, p. 142.
91. Balasuriya, p. 128. Cf. also Avila, p. 82: "For this reason the Eucharist obliges us to review and renew the commitment we have made to Christ to collaborate with him in the total liberation of all human beings."
92. Lane, p. 144.
93. Aldo Vannucchi. "Liturgy and Liberation." International Review of Missions.. Vol. 65. April 1976. Pp. 192-193.
94. Boff, 1989, p. 100.
95. Segundo Galilea. "Les messes de protestation." Parole et Mission. Vol. 14. 1971. P. 334.
    Rafael Avila, when discussing the protest masses and the article by Galilea seems to take offense at the fact that Galilea seems to consider Protest Masses as "deviations of rebel priests who are imprudent and undisciplined." (85) To the contrary, Avila insists that such Masses "...are not deviations but rather challenging liturgical correctives."(86) Protest Masses are, then, an outline of future Latin American liturgies.
96. Galilea, p. 334.
97. Joseph Gelineau. "Celebrating the Paschal Liberation." Concilium 92: Politics and Liturgy. Ed. Herman Schmidt and David Powers. (N.Y.: Herder and Herder, 1974), p. 107.
98. Mahoney, p. 53.
99. Herman Schmidt. "Lines of Political Action in Contemporary Liturgy." Concilium 92: Politics and Liturgy. Ed. Herman Schmidt and David Powers. (N.Y.: Herder and Herder, 1974), pp. 18-19.
100. Avila, p. 104.
101. Boff, 1987, p. 64.
102. Bertrand DeClercq. "Political Commitment and Liturgical Celebration." Concilium 84: Political Commitment and Christian Community. (N.Y.: Herder and Herder, 1973), p. 113.
103. Vannucchi, p. 191.
104. Jurgen Moltmann. "The Liberating Feast". Concilium 92: Politics and Liturgy. Ed. Herman Schmidt and David Power. (N.Y.: Herder and Herder, 1974), p. 79.
    Just world order and kingdom often seem to be used synonymously. Cf. for example, Boff's use: "Kingdom of God...means a new world order, where God is all in all." Boff, Ecclesiogenesis, p. 51.
105. Avila, p. 100.
106. Gelineau, p. 118.
107. J. Moiser. "Promise of plenty: the eucharist as social critique." The Downside Review. Vol. 91. October 1973. P. 305.
108. Brown, 1978, p. 185.
109. Hellwig, p. 12.
110. Ibid, p. 18.
111. Grassi, p. 84.
112. Mark Searle. "Serving the Lord with Justice." Liturgy and Social

Justice. Ed. Mark Searle. (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1980), p. 27. Cf. also Brown, 1978, p. 183.

113.Balasuriya, p. 131.

114.Hellwig, p. 80.

115.Lane, p. 163. Leonardo Boff expresses this same idea as follows: "the communion of the body and blood of the Lord has real existential meaning only when accompanied by a communion in the social body.", 1989, p. 98.

116.Chris Manus. "The Eucharist: a neglected factor in comtemporary theology of liberation." African Ecclesial Review. Vol. 27. August 1985. Pp. 203-204.

117.Mercy Oduyoye. "The Eucharist as Witness." International Review of Missions. Vol. 72. April 1983. P. 227.

118.Walter Burghardt. "Preaching the Just Word." in Liturgy and Social Justice. Ed. Mark Searle (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1980, p. 45.

119.Balasuriya, p. 131.

120.Ibid, p. 39.

121.David Hollenbach. "A Prophetic church and the Catholic Social Imagination." The Faith That Does Justice. Ed. John C. Haughey. (N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1977), p. 258.

122.Balasuriya, p. 41.

123.Edward Schillebeeckx. "The Christian Community and its Office Bearers." Concilium 133: The Right of a Community to a Priest. Ed. Edward Schillebeeckx and J.B. Metz. (N.Y.: Seabury Press, 1980), p. 126.

124.Puebla and Beyond. Ed. John Eagleson and Philip Scharper. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Press, 1979), Final Document #662.

125.Balasuriya, p. 117. This shortage of priests is found in most countries. In Latin America, there is 1.8 priests per 10,000 people. Boff, Ecclesiogenesis, p. 61.

Likewise, "the context in which the local churches in Africa usually find themselves is one afflicted by a scarcity of sacramental ministers." Amadeus Msarikie. "The Sacraments are for People." African Ecclesial Review. Vol. 20. August 1978. P. 222.

126.Berryman, pp. 78-79.

127.Schillebeeckx, 1980, p. 107.

128.Balasuriya, p. 28.

129.Msarikie, p. 229.

130.Boff,Ecclesiogenesis, p. 63.

131.Ibid, p. 70.

132.Ibid, p. 73.

133.Ibid, p. 73.

134.Clodovis Boff. Feet-on-the-Ground Theology. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1984), p. 133.

135.Robert McAfee Brown. "The Roman Curia and Liberation Theology: the second and final round." Christian Century. Vol. 103. June 4-11, 1986. P. 552.

136.Berryman, p. 109.

137.Brown, 1986, p. 554.

138.According to Juan Luis Segundo, that which is being attacked in the Instruction is simply a caricature of liberation theology in which

no liberation theologian of any standing would recognize himself. (Pp. 8-13) Furthermore, Segundo concludes, it is not only liberation theology that is being attacked in the Instruction, but the whole of Vatican II and post-conciliar theology. (Pp. 155-156) Theology and the Church: A Response to Cardinal Ratzinger and a Warning to the Whole Church. (N.Y.: Seabury Press, 1985).

139. "Instruction on Certain Aspects of the "Theology of Liberation." Origins. September 13, 1984. Volume 14. VI,4.
140. Ibid, IV, 15.
141. Ibid, IX, 13.
142. Ibid, introduction.
143. Ibid, VIII, 6.
144. Ibid, IX, 10.
145. Ibid, X, 16.
146. Ibid
147. Boff, 1989, p. 102.
148. John McKenna. "Liturgy: Toward Liberation or Oppression?" Worship. Vol. 56. July 1982. P. 299.

CHAPTER FIVE

1. The influence of Vatican II on these two reinterpretations of eucharistic theology is unmistakable. This is not to be understood, however, as an assertion that Vatican II was the only or even the direct cause of the changes that were later developed in the reinterpretations. In this regard, Kenan Osborne makes a valid observation when he states: "Long before the council, theologians were already at work; changes had already been established, implications had begun to be drawn. In a positive but cautious way, the Second Vatican Council allied itself with this contemporary approach to sacramental theology." Kenan Osborne. "Eucharistic Theology Today." in Alternative Futures for Worship. Volume 3--The Eucharist. Ed. Bernard J. Lee. (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1987) This is especially true with regard to the work that had already been done by Schillebeeckx and his contemporaries in sacramental theology. Much of this work was used by and served as a basis to that developed at the Council.
2. Piet Schoonenberg. "Presence and the Eucharistic Presence." Cross Currents. Vol. 17. Winter, 1967. p. 86.
3. Charles Davis. "Understanding the Real Presence." in The Word in History. Ed. T. Patrick Burke. (N.Y.: Sheed and Ward, 1966), p.155. In addition, one must also take into account the fact that history also shapes theological renewal; changes in theology are always conditioned by outside factors. Theology can not, therefore, remain outside or apart from the progress of history.
4. Boff, Leonardo. When Theology Listens to the Poor. (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1989), p. 89.
5. It is highly likely that these two reinterpretations are not totally unrelated. The reinterpretation of the eucharist in liberation theology, which came about later, undoubtedly was influenced by Schillebeeckx' work, especially his emphasis on community and the multiple presence of Christ in the liturgy. Many of the liberation

theologians who deal with eucharistic theology studied in Europe where they no doubt came into contact with Schillebeeckx' writings. On the other hand, it is also highly plausible that Schillebeecx' later work on alternative ways of celebrating the eucharist gained something from those practices which were already in place in many areas of Latin America from whence liberation theology arose. Hence, one can speculate that the two re-interpretations had, to some extent, an influence on each other.

6. Abela, Paul. "Celebrating and then practicing the Eucharist." in Concilium 109: Charisms in the Church. Ed. Christian Duquoc and Casiano Floristan. (N.Y.: Seabury Press, 1978), p. 100.
7. Arthur Cochrane. "Eating and Drinking with Jesus." Christian Century. Volume 91. April 10, 1974. P. 392. Cf. Chapter 4, Footnote 58.
8. Aldo Vannuchi. "Liturgy and Liberation." International Review of Missions. Vol. 65. April 1976. P. 189.
9. Powers, Joseph M. "Eucharist: symbol of freedom and community." in Christian Spirituality in the United States. Ed. F. Eigo. 1978. P. 208.
10. Schillebeeckx, Edward. The Eucharist. (N.Y.: Sheed and Ward, 1968), p. 125.
11. "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy", #26. in The Documents of Vatican II. Ed. Walter M. Abbott. (N.Y.: Guild Press, 1966)
12. Liberation theology also carries the notion of the multiple presence of Christ one step further. While both Vatican II and Schillebeeckx recognized and acknowledged Christ's presence in the whole of the eucharistic liturgy, including the gathered assembly, liberation theologians are now expanding this concept beyond the boundaries of the church community and its liturgies. That is, they insist on acknowledging Christ's presence in other people, especially the poor, in a very real way. Many of these theologians maintain that Christ's presence in the Eucharist is the same as, and therefore must complement, Christ's presence in the poor. As a result, the church community cannot choose to revere the one and ignore the other. Cf., for example, Dermot Lane. Foundations for a Social Theology: Praxis, Process and Salvation. (N.Y.: Paulist Press, 1984), p. 155.
13. Richard McBrien. Church: The Continuing Quest. (Paranus, N.Y.: Newman Press, 1970), p. 61. Quoted in Avery Dulles. Models of the Church. (N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1974), p. 78.
14. E.J. Kilmartin. "Sacramental Theology: the Eucharist in Recent Literature." Theological Studies. Vol. 32. June 1971. P. 263.
15. R. Kevin Seasoltz. "Justice and the Eucharist." Worship. Vol. 58. November 1984. P. 520.
16. Penny Lernoux. People of God: The Struggle for World Catholicism. (N.Y.: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1989), p. 9.
17. While it is true that Schillebeeckx' reinterpretation is found wanting in this dimension of service, this is not necessarily a major defect. In his defense, it must be acknowledged that this dimension was almost unheard of at the time when he was writing. It is, I would suggest, most notable that Schillebeeckx mentions it in this regard at all. Most importantly, his reinterpretation

seeks to put eucharistic theology into more personal, human categories of meaning and significance. This shift in emphasis from an objective concentration on the elements of bread and wine to a subjective focus on the meaning of these elements for the individual believer was a necessary change. I would argue that this focus on self is a prerequisite to being able to focus on others. That is to say that the Eucharist must be meaningful and able to affect a person on a personal level before that person can go beyond self to others in service and outreach. It is necessary, therefore, to first interiorize the meaning of the Eucharist before being able to put that meaning into action beyond oneself.

18. "Schillebeeckx has written with some regularity on church ministry since the mid-1950's. His understanding of ministry has evolved with his understanding of church. Some of his views became widely known on the basis of his book on clerical celibacy in the latter part of the 1960's. But it was especially his book Ministry which brought his views to world attention." The Schillebeeckx Reader. Ed. Robert Schreiter. (N.Y.: Crossroad Publishers, 1984), p. 220.
19. CORPUS Canada Journal. November 1989. P. 4.
20. Quoted in Chapter 4, p. 40.
21. Edward Schillebeeckx. Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ. (N.Y.: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1981), p. 29-30.
22. Richard Szafranski. "The One Who Presides at the Eucharist." Worship. Vol. 63. No. 4. July 1989. P. 311
23. Edward Schillebeeckx. The Church with a Human Face.: A New and Expanded Theology of Ministry. (N.Y.: Crossroad, 1987), p. 256-257.
24. Ibid, p. 258.
25. Ad Willems. "The Case of Edward Schillebeeckx." in The Church in Anguish. Ed. by Hans Kung and Leonard Swidler. (San Francisco; Harper and Row, Inc., 1987), p. 219-221.
26. Schillebeeckx, 1987, p. 255.
27. Osborne, 1987, p. 102.
28. Paul Jersild. "A Lutheran View of the Real Presence in Roman Catholic Theology Today." Dialog. 12 (Spring 1973), p. 139.
29. Ibid, p. 140.
30. In Vatican II's Decree on Ecumenism, for example, it is declared that while non-Catholics do not have access to the fullest possible means of grace in the eucharistic celebrations, grace is nevertheless conveyed through the sacred actions. (As A. Bea points out, while the decree does not specify exactly what these sacred actions are, "it would be difficult not to infer that they include the very centre of Christian worship." Augustin Bea. The Way to Unity After the Council. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967. P.147.
31. Leonardo Boff. Ecclesiogenesis: Base Communities Reinvent the Church. (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1987), p. 64.
32. Hastings, p. 136.
33. Phillippe Rouillard. "From Human Meal to Christian Eucharist." in Living Bread, Saving Cup: Readings on the Eucharist. Ed. R. Kevin Seasoltz. (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1982), p. 132.

34. Quoted from Sean McDonagh. To Care for the Earth. in "Here Rice is Holier than Wheat." in National Catholic Reporter. March 10, 1989.
35. Lernoux, p. 412. Lernoux here is quoting Marie Dominique Chenu.
36. Boff, Ecclesiogenesis, p. 63.
37. "Officials say Document to have wide effect." in National Catholic Reporter. February 9, 1990. p. 7. It could be argued that since the Catechism is intended for those bishops who have the task of composing and approving national catechisms, there is little danger that it will have an effect on the large, majority of Catholics. To the contrary, however, this document would have a tremendous impact on all Catholics. It will be used as the norm from which to judge national catechisms. In terms of the statement that the Eucharist is not a meant, then, the implications are, according to some critics, evident: "If it stays in the final revision, it will be used by pressure groups to label entire catechetical programs as unfaithful to the Universal Catechism. " Francis Buckley. Quoted in "Officials say document to have wide effect.' in National Catholic Reporter. February 9, 1990, p. 7. As well, there is some speculation that the catechism will be used as a tool to disciple theologians and scholars. (Hollenbach. Quoted in "Catechism draft roundly criticized" by Jerry Filteau. Prairie Messenger. January 15, 1990. P. 5. Thus, in both cases, it is evident that the catechism will ensure that that which is taught is traditional eucharistic doctrine.
38. Pat Windsor. "World's bishops get Universal Catechism but have little time to consult, respond." in National Catholic Reporter. January 12, 1990, P. 9.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abela, Paul. "Celebrating and then practicing the Eucharist." Concilium 109: Charisms in the Church. Ed. Christian Duquoc and Casiano Floristan. New York: Seabury Press, 1978.

Ambrogi. T. "Contemporary Roman Catholic theology of the eucharistic sacrifice: sacramental reality, sign and presence." Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue, I-III. Ed. Paul C. Empie and T. Austin Murphy. Minneapolis: Augsbury Publishing House, 1974.

Aquinas, Thomas. Summa Theologiae. Latin text and English translation; introductions, notes, appendices, glossaries. Blackfriars. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode; New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

Assman, Hugo. Theology for a Nomad Church. Trans. Paul Burns. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1976.

Avila, Rafael. Worship and Politics. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1981.

Balasuriya, Tissa. The Eucharist and Human Liberation. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1979.

Barneiro, Alvaro. Basic Ecclesial Communities and the Evangelization of the Poor. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1982.

Bea, Augustin. The Way to Unity After the Council. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.

Beer, Peter. "G.B. Sala and E. Schillebeeckx on the eucharistic presence; a critique [transignification and transubstantiation]." Science et Esprit. Volume 38. Number 1. January-April. 1986.

Berryman, Phillip. Liberation Theology: essential facts about the revolutionary movement in Latin America--and beyond. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.

Besret, Bernard. Tomorrow a New Church. New York: Paulist Press, 1973.

Boff, Clodovis. Feet-on-the-Ground Theology. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1984.

----------, and Boff, Leonardo. Introducing Liberation Theology. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1987.

---------- Liberation Theology: From Confrontation to Dialogue. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1986.

Boff, Leonardo. "A Theological Examination of the terms "People of God" and "Popular Church"". Concilium 176: La Iglesia Popular: Between Fear and Hope. Ed. Leonardo Boff and Virgil Elizondo. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, Ltd., 1984.

---------- Ecclesiogenesis: Base Communities Reinvent the Church. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1987.

---------- Jesus Christ Liberator. Trans. Patrick Hughes. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1978.

---------- When Theology Listens to the Poor. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989.

Bonino, Jose-Miquez. Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

---------- Room to be People. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Bouyer, Louis. The Liturgy Revived: A Doctrinal Commentary of the Conciliar Constitution on the Liturgy. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964.

Bradley, Robert and Kevane, Eugene. The Roman Catechism. Trans. and annotated in Accord with Vatican II and Post-Conciliar Documents and the New Code of Canon Law. Boston, Massachusetts: St. Paul Editions, 1985.

Brown, Robert McAfee. "Reflections on Liberation Theology." Religion in Life. Volume 43. Autumn 1974.

---------- "The Roman Curia and Liberation Theology: the second and final round." Christian Century. Volume 103. Number 19. June 4-11 1986.

---------- Theology in a New Key. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.

Bruneau, Thomas C. "The Catholic church and development in Latin America: the role of the base Christian communities." Religious Values and Development. Ed. K. Jameson and C. Wilbr, 1980.

Burghardt, Walter. "Preaching the Just Word." Liturgy and Social Justice. Ed. Mark Searle. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1980.

Campion, Donald. "New Trends in Encyclicals." Commonweal. Volume 82. October 1, 1965.

Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests. Translated and Notes by John A. McHugh and Charles Callan. Indiana: Marian Publishers, 1972.

Chemnitz, Martin. Examination of the Council of Trent. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1971.

Cipolla, Richard G. "Selvaggi revisited: Transubstantiation and Contemporary Science." Theological Studies. Volume 35. Number 4. December 1974.

Clarke, Francis. Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation. London: Darton, Longmann and Todd, Ltd, 1960.

Cochrane, A.C. "Eating and Drinking with Jesus." Christian Century. Volume 91. April 10, 1974.

CORPUS Canada Journal. November 1989.

Davis, Charles. "The Theology of Transubstantiation." Sophia. Volume 3. 1964.

---------- "Understanding the Real Presence." The Word in History. Ed. T. Patrick Burke. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.

De Baciocchi, J. L'Eucharistie. Tournai, Belgium: Desclée and Co., 1961.

---------- "Présence eucharistique et transsubstantiation." Irénikon. Volume 32. 1959.

De Clercq, Bertrand. "Political Commitment and Liturgical Celebration." Concilium 84: Political Commitment and Christian Community. New York: Herder and Herder, 1973.

De Montcheuil, Yves. "La raison de la permanence du Christ sous les espèces eucharistiques d'après Bonaventure et Thomas." Mélanges Théologiques: Série Théologie n.9. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1946.

Denzinger. The Sources of Catholic Dogma. Trans. Roy DeLerrari. London: B. Herder Book Co. 1957.

Dicken, T. M. "Process Philosophy and the Real Presence." Journal of Ecumenical Studies. Volume 6. 1969.

Diederich, Everett. "Reflections on post-conciliar shifts in eucharistic faith and practice." Communio (US). Volume 12. Summer 1985.

---------- "The unfolding presence of Christ in the Mass." Communio (US). Winter 1978.

Documents of Vatican II, The. Ed. Walter M. Abbott. New Jersey: New Century Publishers, Inc., 1966.

Documents on the Liturgy, 1963-1979: Conciliar, Papal and Curial Texts. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1982.

Dulles, Avery. "Faith in Relationship to Justice." The Faith That Does Justice. Ed. John c. Haughey. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.

---------- Models of the Church. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1974.

Dussel, Enrique. History and the theology of liberation: a Latin American perspective. Trans. John Drury. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1976.

---------- "The bread of eucharistic celebration as a sign of justice in the community." Concilium 152: Can we always celebrate the Eucharist? Ed. M. Collins. New York: Seabury Press, 1982.

Ecumenical Association of Third World Theologians. "Why we need a Third World Theology." London: Catholic Institute for International Relations, 1987.

"Eucharisticum Mysterium". Vatican II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents. Ed. Austin Flannery. Wilmington, Delaware: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1975.

Filteau, Jerry. "Catechism draft roundly criticized." Prairie Messenger. January 15, 1990.

Fink, Peter E. "Perceiving the presence of Christ." Worship. Volume 58. January 1984.

Fitzer, Joseph. "Teilhard's Eucharist: A Reflection." Theological Studies. Volume 34. Number 2. June 1973.

Fullam, Raymond B. Exploring Vatican II: Christian Living Today and Tomorrow. Montreal: Palm Publishers, 1969.

Galilea, Segundo. "Les messes de protestation." Parole et Mission. Volume 14. 1971.

Gelineau, Joseph. "Celebrating the Paschal Liberation." in Concilium 92: Politics and Liturgy. Ed. Herman Schmidt and David Power. New York: Herder and Herder, 1974.

Ghysens, G. "Présence réele et transsubstantiation dans les définitions de l'Eglise Catholique." Irénikon. Volume 32. 1959.

Gihr, Nicolas. The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1949.

Gonzalez, Justo. A History of Christian Thought. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971.

Grassi, Joseph A. Broken Bread and Broken Bodies: The Lord's Supper and World Hunger. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Press, 1985.

Gray, D. "Sacramental Consciousness-Raising." Worship. Volume 46. 1972.

Green, H. Benedict. "The Eucharistic Presence: Change and/or signification." The Downside Review. Volume 83. 1965.

Gula, Richard. To Walk Together Again. New York: Paulist Press, 1984.

Gutierrez, Gustavo. A Theology of Liberation. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1973.

---------- "The Task of Theology and Ecclesial Experience." Concilium 176: La Iglesia Popular: Between Fear and Hope. Ed. Leonardo Boff and Virgil Elizonda. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, Ltd., 1984.

Hastings, Adrian. A Concise Guide to the Documents of Vatican II. London: Darton, Longmann and Todd, 1968.

Hawkins, D.J.B. "Reflections on Transubstantiation." The Downside Review. Volume 80. 1962.

Hearne, Brian. "Liberation Theology and the Renewal of Theology." African Ecclesial Review. Volume 26. December 1984.

Hellwig, Monika. The Eucharist and the Hunger of the World. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.

Hennelly, A.J.(ed) Theologies in Conflict. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1979.

"Here Rice is Holier Than Wheat." in National Catholic Reporter. March 10, 1989.

Herzog, F.L. "Origins of Liberation Theology." Duke Divinity Review. Volume 38. Fall 1973.

Hollenbach, David. "A Prophetic Church and the Catholic Social Imagination." The Faith That Does Justice. Ed. John C. Haughey. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.

Hughes, John. "Eucharistic Sacrifice: Transcending the Reformation Deadlock." Worship. Volume 43. Number 9.

"Instruction on Certain Aspects of Liberation Theology." Origins. Volume 14. September 13, 1984.

Jedin, Hubert. Crisis and Closure of the Council of Trent: A Retrospective View From the Second Vatican Council. Trans. N.D. Smith. London: Sheed and Ward, 1967.

Jersild, Paul. "A Lutheran View of the Real Presence in Roman Catholic theology." Dialog. Volume 12. Spring 1973.

Jungmann, Josef. "Commentary on the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy." Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II. Ed. Herbert Vorgrimler. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.

Kee, Alistair. "Authority and Liberation: conflict between Rome and Latin America [Boff-Ratzinger confrontation]." Modern Churchman. Volume 28. Number 1. 1985.

Kiesling, Christopher. "Roman Catholic and Reformed Understandings of the Eucharist." Journal of Ecumenical Studies. Volume 13. Spring 1976.

Kilmartin, Edward J. "Christ's Presence in the Liturgy." Bread From Heaven. Ed. Paul Bernier. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.

---------- "Sacramental Theology: The Eucharist in Recent Literature." Theological Studies. Volume 32. June 1971.

Lane, Dermot A. Foundations for a Social Theology: Praxis, Process and Salvation. New York: Paulist Press, 1984.

Leenhardt, F.J. "This is My Body." Ecumenical Studies in Worship: Essays on the Lord's Supper. Ed. J.G. Davies and A. Raymond George. London: Lutterworth Press, 1958.

Lernoux, Penny. People of God: The Struggle for World Catholicism. New York: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1989.

Lindbeck, George A. The Future of Roman Catholic Theology: Vatican II-Catalyst for Change. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.

Luther, Martin. Luther's Works. Volumes 35-38. Ed. Helmut T. Lehmenn. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1951ff.

McCue, James F. "The Doctrine of Transubstantiation from Berengar through the Council of Trent." Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue, I-III. Ed. Paul C. Empie and T. Austin Murphy. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1967.

McDonald, Allan J. Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine. Merrick, New York: Richwood Publishing Co., 1977.

McDonnell, Kilian. John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967.
McKenna, John H. "Liturgy: Toward Liberation or Oppression?" Worship. Volume 56. July 1982.

MacEoin, Gary. What Happened at Rome? The Council and its Implications for the Modern World. New York: Echo Book, 1967.
Mahoney, Roger. "The Eucharist and Social Justice." Worship. Volume 57. January 1983.
Manus, Chris U. "The Eucharist: a neglected factor in contemporary theology of liberation." African Ecclesial Review. Volume 27. August 1985.
Marlé, René. "L'encyclique Mysterium Fidei sur l'Eucharistie." Etudes. Volume 323. Novembre 1965.
Martelet, Gustave. The Risen Christ and the Eucharistic World. Trans. Rene Hague. New York: Seabury Press, 1976.
Martos, Joseph. Doors to the Sacred: A Historical Introduction to Sacraments in the Catholic Church. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1981.
Mascall, E.L. "Eucharistic doctrine after Vatican II; some Anglican anticipations." Church Quarterly Review. Volume 169. January-March; April-June, 1968.
Michel, A. "L'encyclique Mysterium Fidei et les déviations doctrinales sur l'eucharistie." L'Ami du Clergé. Volume 75. 1965.
Mikloshazy, Attila. "Commentary on the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy." The Church Renewed: The Documents of Vatican II Reconsidered. Ed. George P. Schner. New York: University Press of America, 1986.
Moiser, J. "Promise of plenty: the Eucharist as social critique." The Downside Review. Volume 91. October 1973.
Moltmann, Jurgen. "The Liberating Feast." Concilium 92: Politics and Liturgy. Ed. Herman Schmidt and David Power. New York: Herder and Herder, 1974.
Msarikie, Amedeus. "The sacraments are for people." African Ecclesial Review. Volume 20. August 1978.

Oduyoye, Mercy Amba. "The Eucharist as Witness." International Review of Missions. Volume 72. Number 286. April 1983.
"Officials Say Document to have Wide Spread Effect." National Catholic Reporter. February 9, 1990.
O'Neill, Colman. "The Role of the Recipient and Sacramental Signification." Thomist. Volume 21. 1958.
Osborne, Kenan. "Contemporary Understandings of the Eucharist: A Survey of Catholic Thinking." Journal of Ecumenical Studies. Volume 13. Number 2. Spring 1979.
---------- "Eucharistic Theology Today." Alternative Futures for Worship. Volume 3: The Eucharist. Ed. Bernard J. Lee. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1987.

Paul VI, Pope. Mysterium Fidei. The Papal Encyclicals: 1958-1981. Ed. Claudia Carlen. McGrath Publishing House, 1981.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. Reformation of Church and Dogma (1300-1700). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

---------- The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Pius XII, Pope. Mediator Dei. The Papal Encyclicals in their Historical Context. Ed. Anne Fremantle. New York: New American Library, 1956.

Pohle, J. "Eucharist." The Catholic Encyclopedia. Volume 5. New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913.

Powers, Joseph M. "Eucharist: Symbol of Freedom and Community." Christian Spirituality in the United States. Ed. F. Eigo. 1978.

---------- Eucharistic Theology. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.

---------- "Mysterium Fidei and the theology of the Eucharist." Worship. Volume 40. Number 1. 1966.

Puebla and Beyond. Ed. John Eagleson and Phillip Scharper. New York: Orbis Press, 1979.

Purday, K.M. "Berengar and the Use of the Word 'Substantia'". The Downside Review. Volume 19. Number 303. April 1973.

Quinn, James. "Interpreting Mysterium Fidei." Month. Volume 5. April 1966.

Rahner, Karl. "How to receive a sacrament and mean it." Theology Digest. Volume 19. 1971.

---------- Meditation on the Sacraments. New York: Seabury Press, 1977.

---------- The Church and the Sacraments. Freiburg: Herder, 1963.

---------- "The Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." Theological Investigations IV: More Recent Writings. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1966.

Raitt, Jill. "Roman Catholic Wine in Reformed Old Bottles?" Journal of Ecumenical Studies. Volume 8. 1971.

Richard, Pablo. "The Church of the Poor within the Popular Movement." Concilium 176: La Iglesia Popular: Between Fear and Hope. Ed. L. Boff and V. Elizondo. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, Ltd. 1984.

Rouillard, Phillipe. "From Human Meal to Christian Eucharist." Living Bread, Saving Cup: Readings on the Eucharist. Ed. R. Kevin Seazoltz. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1982.

Scheiders, Sandra M. "The Foot Washing (John 13:1-20): An Experiment in Hermeneutics." The Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Volume 43. 1981.

Schillebeeckx, Edward. Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.

---------- Ministry: Leadership in the Community of Jesus Christ. New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1981.

---------- "The Christian Community and its Office Bearers." Concilium 133: The Right of a Community to a Priest. Ed. Edward Schillebeeckx and J.B. Metz. New York: Seabury Press, 1980.

---------- The Church with a Human Face: A New and Expanded Theology of Ministry. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1987.

---------- The Eucharist. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1968.

---------- The Schillebeeckx Reader. Ed. Robert Schreiter. New York: Crossroad Publishers, 1984.

---------- "Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transfiguration." Worship. Volume 40. Number 6. 1966.

Schmidt, Herman. "Lines of Political Action in Contemporary Liturgy." Concilium 92: Politics and Liturgy. Ed. Herman Schmidt and David Power. New York: Herder and Herder, 1974.

Schoenmaeckers, E. "Birdcages in Dutch Churches: Mysterium Fidei on the Eucharist in light of modern theology." America. Volume 113. October 9, 1965.

Schoonenberg, Piet. "Presence and the Eucharistic Presence." Cross Currents. Volume 17. Winter 1967.

---------- "Transubstantiation: How Far is this Doctrine Historically Determined?" Concilium 24: The Sacraments: An Ecumenical Dilemma. Ed. Hans Kung. New York: Paulist Press, 1967.

Searle, Mark. "Serving the Lord with Justice." Liturgy and Social Justice. Ed. Mark Searle. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1980.

Seasoltz, R. Kevin. "Justice and the Eucharist." Worship. Volume 58. November 1984.

Segundo, Juan Luis. The Sacraments Today. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1974.

---------- Theology and the Church: A Response to Cardinal Ratzinger and a Warning to the Whole Church. Trans. John Dierchsmeier. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985.

Sobrino, Jon. "The 'Doctrinal Authority' of the People of God in Latin America." Concilium 180: The Teaching Authority of Believers. Ed. J.B. Metz and Edward Schillebeeckx. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, Ltd, 1985.

Steinmetz, David. "Scripture and the Lord's Supper in Luther's Theology." Interpretation. Volume 37. Number 3. July 1983.

Szafranski, Richard. "The One Who Presides at the Eucharist." Worship. Volume 63. Number 4. July 1989.

Vajta, Vilmos. "Mysterium Fidei: A Lutheran View." Concilium 14. 1966.

Vannucchi, Aldo. "Liturgy and Liberation.' International Review of Missions. Volume 65. April 1976.

Verheul, A. Introduction to the Liturgy. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1968.

Vollert, Cyril. "The Eucharist: Controversy on Transubstantiation.' Theological Studies. Volume 22. 1961.

Vollert, Cyril. "Transubstantiation and the Encyclical." Continuum. Volume 3. Autumn 1965.

Walsh, Liam. "The Sacraments and Sacramentals." Vatican II: The Liturgical Constitution. Ed. Austin Flannery. Dublin: Scepter Books, 1964.

Willems, Ad. "The Case of Edward Schillebeeckx." The Church in Anguish. Ed. Hans Kung and Leonard Swidler. San Francisco: Harper and Row, Inc. 1987.

Windsor, Pat. "World's bishops get Universal Catechism but have little time to consult, respond." National Catholic Reporter. January 12, 1990.

Witzliet, Theo. A Place in the Sun: Liberation Theology in the Third World. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1985.

Zimmerman, Marie. "L'Eucharistie: Quelques Aspects de la Pensée de Schillebeeckx." Revue des Sciences Religieuses. Volume 49. July 1975.