

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND THE REAL PRESENCE

RAYMOND A. ADAMS, S.J.

Campion Hall, Oxford

VATICAN II'S Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy declares that "the liturgy is the summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed; at the same time it is the fountain from which all her power flows."¹ The liturgy, and in particular the Eucharist, is the central act which manifests the Church as bride of Christ as she proclaims to the world the life-giving passion, death, and resurrection of her heavenly Lord. This mission of the Church and her baptismal inauguration were realized at Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit opened the apostles to the world and "those who received the Spirit were baptized." And "they continued steadfastly in the teaching of the apostles and in the communion of the breaking of the bread and in the prayers . . . praising God and being in favor with all the people" (Acts 2:41-47). This passage from Acts illustrates the fundamental role the Spirit has in energizing the Church, since the Spirit is the living water which Christ sends to all who believe in Him. "For we were all made to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor 12:13). Clearly, then, if a proper understanding of the Eucharistic mystery is to be achieved, we must take into account the mission of the Holy Spirit, who vivifies the Church by manifesting Christ's presence as risen, redeeming Lord. The members of the Church attain their union with the Lord by participating in the life of the Spirit. Through this same participation, this *koinonia*, we attain salvation because we share the life of God.

Vilmos Vajta has pointed out that the Holy Spirit receives almost no mention in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. Instead, the Church is described mainly as the continuation of the Incarnation, which is concretely symbolized by the hierarchical structure of its sacramental life; for the hierarchy is in some sense the historical prolongation of our Lord's humanity. As a result of this hierarchic emphasis, Vajta believes that the conciliar statement has overlooked one of the fundamental aspects of the liturgy: the *koinonia* in the body

¹ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, no. 10 (*Documents of Vatican II*, ed. Walter J. Abbott, S.J. [New York, 1966] p. 142).

and blood of our Redeemer.² This *koinonia* is the communion in the Holy Spirit of which St. Paul speaks in 2 Cor 13:14. This participation in the gift of the Spirit results in a true *koinonia* of the faithful: "Now the company of those who believed were of one heart and soul" (Acts 4:32). Thus, *koinonia* involves two realities, the communication of the Spirit and communion with one another in one Body of Christ. As soon as we participate in the life-giving grace of the Holy Spirit through word and sacrament, we enter into the community of believers who share this same participation in the Spirit.³ In Ephesians Paul announces that there is one body and one Spirit (Eph 4:4), and in this same Spirit we have access to the Father (Eph 2:18). In the same letter Paul also mentions that in the Holy Spirit we have been sealed and promised salvation (Eph 1:13-14). The Holy Spirit becomes in the post-Pentecost Church the movement of Christ to us and the return of ourselves to Christ. In this movement two things are accomplished: first, a re-presentation of the passion, death, and resurrection of Christ: "If the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, He who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through His Spirit which dwells in you" (Rom 8:11); secondly, a work of incorporation into the Body of Christ which is the Church (Eph 2:22-23). Thus the plurality of believers shares the work of the Head through the life in the Spirit. This new creation is a community progressively transformed into the image of Christ. The sign of this transformation and unity is the one loaf shared by all in the breaking of bread. In this experience the early Christians were conscious of the presence of the Spirit, who mediated to them the presence of the risen Christ. Consequently, "to be in the Spirit" came to mean "to be in Christ." The manifestation of incorporation in the Spirit or in Christ was the Church, the new Israel of God, bound to Christ in the covenant of blood and mercy.⁴

This body of the faithful was essentially a praying body. But even the prayer of the Church cannot be effective without the intercession of the Holy Spirit (Rom 8:26-27); for it is the Spirit that shapes and

² Cf. Vilmos Vajta, "Renewal of Worship: De Sacra Liturgia," in G. Lindbeck, ed., *Dialogue on the Way* (Minneapolis, 1965) p. 107.

³ Cf. Hendrikus Berkhof, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Richmond, 1964) p. 59.

⁴ Cf. Lindsay Dewar, *The Holy Spirit in Modern Thought* (New York, 1959) p. 78.

divinizes our weak human prayers and brings them to the Father. It is the Spirit who gives life to the love offering of the Church in union with her Head. The sacrifice of love is wrought through the indwelling of the source of all love, the Spirit crying "abba, Father."

This action of the Spirit is essential to the Eucharist, which is, in the words of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, "a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity."⁵ The Constitution illustrates the close relationship of Pentecost with the Eucharist when it states that "from that time onward the Church has never failed to come together to celebrate the paschal mystery . . . 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 in Christ Jesus, to the praise of His glory, through the power of the Holy Spirit."⁶

This power of the Spirit makes the Body of Christ grow together: "You are in the Spirit if the Spirit of God dwells in you. Anyone who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to Him" (Rom 8:9). "To be in the Spirit" also means that we have "put on Christ in baptism" (Gal 3:26). When we eat the one loaf, the bread from heaven, we receive the loaf of the glorified Christ, who is the life-giving Spirit. In the Eucharist the Holy Spirit is encountered precisely as He is sent from the Father and the Son, giving life and manifesting the presence of Christ in the *koinonia* of the faithful. The Spirit in the Eucharist, as well as in baptism, is the living water "flowing from the throne of God and of the lamb" (Ap 22:1) and welling up into eternal life (Jn 4:17). Thus, in the Eucharist the mission of the Son and the Spirit is continued and renewed in the re-presentation of the saving acts of God in Christ. The Eucharist recapitulates the Incarnation by the Holy Spirit, the baptismal manifestation at the Jordan, Christ's death on the cross when He handed over the Spirit, and His resurrection and glorification when He became a life-giving spirit.

The texts of the New Testament clearly indicate that the Church was aware of her constitution as the Body of Christ through the power and indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It was only natural to attribute the Eucharistic presence of Christ to this same power of the Spirit; for the

⁵ Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, no. 47 (*Documents of Vatican II*, p. 154).

⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 6 (*Documents of Vatican II*, p. 140).

koinonia with Christ is the koinonia in the Spirit. This concept of liturgical worship and Real Presence has strong repercussions in the formation not only of sacramental theology, but also in the entire range of ecclesiology; for if, as the Constitution on the Liturgy declares, the liturgy is the summit of the Church's activity and the source of her existence, it is obvious that the Church becomes conscious of herself only when she is conscious of what she does as a worshipping community. The Church, in turn, can only be a worshipping community when her members live in the koinonia of the Spirit.

Vajta's observation on the absence of the place of the Spirit in the Constitution on the Liturgy illustrates the lack of Roman Catholic theological speculation on the role of the Holy Spirit. This same lack of a pneumatic theology was also criticized by Orthodox theologians with regard to the Constitution on the Church. Vajta's remarks are mainly concerned with the distinction between the hierarchic priesthood and the priesthood of the faithful. According to the Lutheran conception of participation in the liturgy, the hierarchy is not primary; what is primary is the koinonia of the Spirit.

The purpose of this paper will be to assess historically the development of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist. From this investigation it will be clear that the Oriental Churches have preserved a vital tradition by inserting after the narrative of institution an epiclesis, or invocation of the Holy Spirit, which completes the Eucharistic anaphora. Regardless of the polemic concerning the form of the Eucharist and the moment of transubstantiation, it still remains true that the theology of the Eucharist can be immeasurably enriched by a more explicit Trinitarian understanding of the Real Presence. Consequently, this paper will not be concerned with the polemical aspect of the debate on the epiclesis.

It is the belief of the Roman Catholic Church that the form of the sacrament of the Eucharist is contained in the words of Christ, "This is my body; this is my blood." This means that the priest accomplishes the Sacrament when he pronounces the words of the Saviour in the person of Christ. According to the Decree for the Armenians given at the Council of Florence, transubstantiation is effected by the formula of institution (*DS* 1321). The Council of Trent declares that it has always been the faith of the Church that immediately after the con-

secration the body and blood of Christ are present under the appearances of bread and wine (*DS* 1640). Despite canon 4 of the decree *De eucharistia*, most theologians do not consider this to be defined doctrine and assign the note *fidei proxima* to the teaching.⁷

Nevertheless, in almost all the liturgies of the Church, with the notable exception of the Roman Liturgy, there is a solemn prayer addressed to the Father or to the Son to send the Holy Spirit to sanctify the gifts on the altar. This prayer is found after the consecration, and in the Oriental liturgies used today its consecratory significance is quite obvious. The question naturally arises whether this prayer of invocation was considered a consecratory prayer from the very beginning of the Church's formulation of a liturgical order of worship. While the evidence is scanty, it does seem probable that the Church invoked the Holy Spirit over the gifts and made this invocation part of the regular formula of the Eucharist at a very early date. The chief evidence for this comes from the anaphora of Hippolytus, which already contained an epiclesis at the beginning of the third century.⁸ The text of this particular epiclesis does not exhibit a consecratory intention, but it serves as a framework for future development. Noteworthy is the fact that the Father is asked to send the Spirit upon the oblation of the Church in order to sanctify and unify all who partake of the offering and fill them with the Spirit and confirm them in the truth of the faith. Here, in this third century anaphora, we have a remarkable summary of the New Testament doctrine of the *koinonia* of the Spirit. It is the Church, the Body of Christ, which offers the sacrifice, and it is the Holy Spirit sent by the Father who is the unifying principle of the Church. At this time the epiclesis is not viewed as a consecratory prayer; rather, it is an invocation asking for unity and sanctification in faith. The Spirit is sent by the Father upon the gifts of the Church to manifest to the faithful the presence of Christ already in their midst as covenant partner.

In the latter part of the third century and at the beginning of the fourth, there is evidence of a growing realization that the words of institution in conjunction with a prayer of invocation effected the

⁷ Cf. M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium* 3 (Paris, 1930) 256; S. Salaville, "Epiclesè," *DTC* 5, 194 ff.

⁸ The original Greek text has been lost, but the Latin version seems to have been made soon after the Greek version came to be used in Rome.

presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Origen together with Eusebius of Caesarea states that Christ is present in the Eucharist "through the ineffable words of the New Testament."⁹ Basil of Caesarea maintains that the whole anaphora transmitted through tradition with its focus around the words of institution constitutes an epiclesis.¹⁰ In the West, Cyprian of Carthage attributes to the Holy Spirit a major role in the Eucharist by maintaining that the offering cannot be sanctified (consecrated) apart from the Holy Spirit.¹¹

By the fifth century all the major writers in the East attribute a consecratory significance to the epiclesis, but at the same time they are unanimous in insisting that the words of institution have an essential part in the total Eucharistic action. The reasons for this development can be traced to the theological ferment which took place in the East in the wake of the Trinitarian controversies of the third and fourth centuries. Cyril of Alexandria illustrates this Trinitarian consciousness and at the same time provides a guideline for understanding the nature of the epiclesis itself: "Every grace and every perfect gift comes to us from the Father through the Son and in the Holy Spirit."¹² John Chrysostom is most explicit on the subject and insists that the change in the Eucharistic elements is due to the power of the Holy Spirit acting through the ministry of the priest.¹³ Nevertheless, he also attributes a transforming power to the words of institution.¹⁴ Cyril of Jerusalem in the *Mystagogic Catecheses* states the matter quite clearly: "After we have been sanctified by spiritual hymns, we ask God to send the Holy Spirit in order that He might make the bread the body of Christ and the wine the blood of Christ; for absolutely everything which the Holy Spirit touches is sanctified and changed."¹⁵

The importance of the Eucharistic epiclesis with its Trinitarian implications cannot be divorced from the epiclesis used at baptism. Many of the Greek Fathers attributed a special power to the prayer of blessing, so that the baptismal water itself after it had been con-

⁹ *Demonstratio evangelii* 8, 2 (PG 22, 629).

¹⁰ *De Spiritu sancto* 27, 66 (PG 32, 188).

¹¹ *Epist.* 64, 4 (PL 4, 392).

¹² *In Luc.* 22, 19 (PG 72, 908).

¹³ *In Ioan. hom.* 45 (PG 59, 253).

¹⁴ *De prod. Iudae hom.* 1, 2, 6 (PG 49, 380, 389).

¹⁵ *Cat.* 23, 7 (PG 33, 1113).

secrated contained the power of the Holy Spirit, thereby rendering the water an efficacious element in purifying the recipient. This realistic understanding of the epiclesis was gradually transferred to the Eucharist, with the result that the simple prayer of Hippolytus' anaphora became an efficacious formula of consecration. If the invocation of the Spirit rendered the baptismal water capable of purifying the neophyte and remitting his sins, then the invocation of the same Spirit in the Eucharist rendered the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ. In the East the Holy Spirit was considered to be the principal minister of the sacraments, since He was the Sanctifier and source of all power. While the role of Christ is not excluded, it remains true that the Western concept of the sacramental effect taking place in terms of the *persona Christi* did not achieve great prominence in the East. The Orientals developed a theology of baptism and anointing in the Holy Spirit that transformed the Christian by uniting him to Christ in the death and burial symbolized by the immersion. Since the Church recognized the close connection between baptism and the Eucharist, it was only to be expected that the theological concepts developed in connection with baptism would be applied to the Eucharist. Thus the blessing of the waters and the Trinitarian doxology influenced the formation of the epiclesis over the gifts which was inserted into the anamnesis prayer after the narrative of institution. The reason for this position after the words of our Lord is due to the fact that the anaphora had a Trinitarian structure. In the anaphora the Church first recounted the saving acts of the Father, who finally sent His Son; the Son in turn offered Himself for the sins of the world and has been taken up in glory. The Spirit now continues the redemptive mission of the Son by dwelling in the Church. Thus the anaphora became in effect a résumé of salvation history from creation to Pentecost.¹⁶

In scriptural terms the divinity of the Third Person of the Trinity is considered as a saving fire which consumes the sacrifice and purifies the hearts of the communicants.¹⁷ "He has appointed me as a priest of Jesus Christ, and I am to carry out my priestly duty by bringing the good news from God to the pagans, and so make them acceptable as an offering, made holy by the Holy Spirit" (Rom 15:16).

¹⁶ Cf. J.-J. von Allmen, *Worship: Its Theology and Practice* (New York, 1965) pp. 28-29.

¹⁷ Cf. W. H. Freer, *The Anaphora* (London, 1938) p. 72.

The Sacrifice of the Altar constitutes the great theophany of the new economy. The Three Persons have their roles, just as they had their roles in the great theophanies of the New Testament. The Father loves Jesus and dwells in Him: "This is my beloved Son." Jesus, the anointed priest and victim, stands in the Jordan and hangs on the cross obedient to the Father. Finally, the Holy Spirit is sent by the Father and manifests Jesus to the world as the Lamb of God. The theophany of the Eucharist is a representation of the theophanies of the New Testament, but with a new purpose: the Spirit is sent to produce a union between Christ and His disciples, a union whose ideal type is the union of the Three Divine Persons. The analogy is strengthened by the fact that the words used to describe the action of the Spirit in the epiclesis are the same words used in the Annunciation account and in the baptism of Christ in the Jordan (Lk 1:35; Mk 1:10; Mt 3:16). Thus, from the very beginning of liturgical development the anaphora was considered a Trinitarian prayer. Cyril of Jerusalem refers to the anaphora as an epiclesis of the Holy Trinity.¹⁸ An analysis of the structure of the epiclesis will reveal its fundamental Trinitarian emphasis.

The first explicit epiclesis is found in the anaphora of Hippolytus, which is dated from the first quarter of the third century. Although it was originally used by the Greek-speaking community of Rome, its influence was notable in the formation of later Oriental liturgies.¹⁹ Freer maintains that this anaphora presents a picture complete for its time and place and shows us the Eucharistic practice of the early Church. Not until the catechetical lectures of St. Cyril of Jerusalem and Theodore of Mopsuestia in the fourth century do we have information as vivid as the liturgy of Hippolytus. The Latin text of the epiclesis is given together with the anamnesis which is so closely associated:

Memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis eius, offerimus tibi panem et calicem, gratias tibi agentes quia nos dignos habuisti adstare coram te et tibi ministrare. Et petimus ut mittas spiritum tuum sanctum in oblationem sanctae ecclesiae; in unum congregans des omnibus qui percipiunt sanctis in repletionem spiritus sancti, ad confirmationem fidei in veritate.²⁰

¹⁸ *Cat.* 19, 7 (PG 33, 1072).

¹⁹ Cf. Freer, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

²⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 51.

Two elements are noteworthy in this prayer. The Father is asked to send the Spirit on the oblation of the Church and by so doing unite the communicants in the Spirit of faith and truth. The Spirit does not perform the action, since it is the Father who is the subject of the prayer. While the anaphora is Trinitarian in form, the role of the Spirit is brief and undeveloped as yet. Nevertheless, at this date the Eucharistic offering of the Church and the Spirit's role in it have as their purpose the union and growth of the communicants in faith.

During the next one hundred and fifty years, especially after the Council of Nicaea when theological concepts of the Trinity were formulated, a corresponding development took place in the liturgy as the faithful realized more fully the fellowship and activity of the Holy Spirit. Thus, the simple Hippolytean epiclesis was embellished in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, indicating the lines of future development. The *Constitutions* add to the phrase "Send down upon this oblation your Holy Spirit" the words "the witness of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, that He may manifest this bread as body of your Christ, and this cup as blood of your Christ."²¹ From this addition it is clear that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is manifested to the faithful by the Holy Spirit. It is still too early for a direct consecratory function to be attributed to the epiclesis.

This situation changed, however, as a result of the Trinitarian controversies of the fourth century. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of the bread becoming the body of Christ after the epiclesis, "for whatsoever the Holy Spirit has touched is certainly hallowed and changed."²² Although we do not have the text of Cyril's liturgy, it is reasonable to assume that the epiclesis at that time had a consecratory function, without there being any question of exact time or manner of change. Theodore of Mopsuestia, writing after the Council of Constantinople, which defined the divinity of the Holy Spirit, is more explicit. In his liturgical catechesis for the newly baptized he states that the baptized "ought not to regard the elements merely as bread and cup, but as the body and blood of Christ, into which they were so transformed by the descent of the Holy Spirit."²³

²¹ F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies, Eastern and Western* (Oxford, 1896) p. 21.

²² *Cat.* 21, 3; 13, 6 (cited in Freer, *op. cit.*, p. 69).

²³ A. Mingana, ed., *Woodbrooke Studies* 6 (Cambridge, 1933) 76.

During the fifth century the anaphoras of the liturgies derived from the Antiochene family received their basic form and are still, with minor alterations, used in the Byzantine and Syrian Rites. The oldest form of the Liturgy of St. Basil has an epiclesis which asks that "your all-holy Spirit come upon these gifts placed here and bless them and sanctify them and proclaim (*anadeixai*) this bread the precious body of our Lord, God and Saviour, Jesus Christ, and this chalice the precious blood of our Lord, God and Saviour, Jesus Christ."²⁴ The formula used in the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom is even more developed: "We pray and beseech you, send your Holy Spirit on us and upon these gifts placed here and make this bread the precious body of Christ, changing it by the power of your Holy Spirit, and what is in this chalice the precious blood of Christ, changing it by the power of your Holy Spirit."²⁵ This text of the epiclesis represents the apex of development, for the prayer of invocation receives a solemn emphasis as a direct consecratory formula.

The epiclesis in the anaphora of St. James, which is still used by the Syrian Jacobites, retains more primitive elements derived from the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The Holy Spirit is not invoked to descend only upon the gifts but also upon the congregation, "that they be to all who receive them the hallowing of souls and bodies, fruitfulness in good works, for the confirmation of your holy Church, which you have founded upon the rock of faith. . . ." The descent of the Holy Spirit is also situated in the context of the baptism at the Jordan and the theophany at Pentecost: ". . . who descended in the likeness of a dove upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the River Jordan, who descended upon the holy apostles in the likeness of fiery tongues. . . ."²⁶ Thus the epiclesis of St. James still preserves the original Trinitarian and scriptural reference, although the actual change of the elements is attributed to the Spirit.

The anaphora attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia and used by the Chaldeans and Nestorians is remarkable for the inclusion of a doxology which in most liturgies terminates the anaphora: "And may there come upon us and upon this oblation the grace of the Holy Spirit; and may He dwell and rest upon this bread and upon this cup, and may He bless and sanctify and seal them in the name of the Father

²⁴ Brightman, *op. cit.*, pp. 329-30.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

and the Son and the Holy Spirit. And by the power of thy name may this bread become the holy body of our Lord Jesus Christ, and this cup the precious blood of our Lord Jesus Christ."²⁷ The similarity of this formula to the baptismal formula is obvious, especially with regard to the use of the word "seal," which is one of the descriptions of baptism and anointing as "the seal of the Spirit." To effect the presence of Christ, the co-operation of all three Persons is needed, and hence the prayer in question is an invocation of the Trinity as well as of the Holy Spirit. Thus the statement of Cyril of Jerusalem that the whole anaphora is an epiclesis of the Trinity has been applied in the anaphora of Theodore to the epiclesis prayer alone.

In the West the Trinitarian significance of the anaphora went largely unnoticed; for in the West the theology of the Eucharist began to use a terminology which differed from that of the East. These differences touched the very roots of the Eucharistic mystery. Cyprian, in a letter on the Eucharist to Caecilius, avoids using the Greek term *eucharistia* and prefers instead the word *sacrificium* to describe the service.²⁸ Thus the Greek infinitive *eucharistein* becomes *sacrificium celebrare* in Latin terminology. Even at this early date, therefore, a rift had developed in the thinking of East and West regarding the fundamental act of worship. *Oblatio* meant sacrificial action and tended to be equated with the passion of our Lord rather than with the whole of His redemptive work in His incarnation, death, resurrection, and exaltation. Hence the anamnesis or memorial aspect, which receives such emphasis in the anaphora of St. James, is toned down in the Latin liturgies, and greater emphasis is placed upon a consecratory sacrifice than upon a remembrance sacrifice. It was only natural for the Latin theologians to lay stress upon the words of institution, since the liturgy is performed *in persona Christi*. Even in the non-Roman rites of the West which contained an epiclesis, the prayer did not have the consecratory function which it had in the East, according to the evidence which is available in the extant Mass Books of the Gallican Church. Whether the epiclesis in the Gallican Liturgy originally had a consecratory epiclesis which was subsequently altered under Roman influence is

²⁷ R. H. Connolly, "The Meaning of Epiclesis: A Reply," *Journal of Theological Studies* 25 (1924) 356.

²⁸ *Epist.* 63 (PL 4, 383-401).

still a much-debated question among historians of the liturgy.²⁹ In the Gallican sacramentaries which survive, the Holy Spirit renders the consecration which had already taken place a *legitima eucharistia*, a phrase which suggests a dogmatic minimizing of the Spirit's role.³⁰

At this point the question arises whether the Roman anaphora contained a clause invoking the Spirit, and, if it did, why it was eliminated. Scholars are divided on the question and there is not enough solid evidence to decide it.³¹ Despite the absence of the epiclesis in the Roman Rite, Western theologians held that the consecration was effected through the power of the Holy Spirit, just as their confreres in the East maintained, though in a more explicit way.³² Consequently, there is unanimity among Eastern and Western theologians both regarding the words of institution, which all held were necessary, and the role of the Holy Spirit as Sanctifier of the gifts. The major difference lies in the fact that the East verbalized its belief in the epiclesis, while the West attended to the words of the Lord alone.

Controversy arose when the theologians in the High Middle Ages began to discuss the moment of the change. More and more the act of worship in the Western Church became focused on the miracle of consecration brought about by the words of the priest. The mystery had to be revealed to the congregation by an elevation which introduced the "theology of the gaze" with its concomitant misconceptions about the miraculous powers of the consecrated Host. Since the Sacrifice could be effected by the words of institution alone, the role of the people and deacons was no longer needed and the unfortunate anomaly of the Mass priest became common. The word "liturgy," the work of the People of God, was superseded by the term "Mass."

The teaching of the Byzantine Church was finally formulated by Nicholas Cabasilas in the fourteenth century. In his *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* Cabasilas maintains that the words of institution do not have the efficacy they once had when spoken by our Lord at the Last Supper:

The words of the Lord about the holy mysteries were spoken in a narrative man-

²⁹ Cf. Freer, *op. cit.*, p. 166. ³⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 169.

³¹ Cf. J. A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite 2* (New York, 1955) 194.

³² Cf. Gaudentius of Brescia, *Serm. 2* (PL 20, 858); Augustine, *De trin.* 1, 3 (PL 42, 873-74); Fulgentius of Ruspe, *Ad Monimum* (PL 45, 184).

ner. None of the apostles or teachers of the Church has ever appeared to say that they are sufficient to consecrate the sacraments. The blessed John [Chrysostom] himself said that, spoken once by Christ, and having actually been said by Him, they are always effective, just as the word of the Creator is. But it is nowhere taught that now, spoken by the priest, and by reason of being said by him, they have that efficacy.²³

From this brief résumé of the patristic and liturgical data concerning the epiclesis it is apparent that the epiclesis should not be studied historically or ritually in order to determine whether or not it has a consecratory function which can be pinpointed in time. Rather, the significance of the epiclesis affects the whole area of Eucharistic theology. It is a commonplace to say that the worship of the Church reflects her dogmatic belief. In this context the presence or absence of an epiclesis should primarily be considered and evaluated in terms of the action of the Spirit in the liturgical cult and not in terms of consecratory efficacy as such or the moment of sacramental transformation. We have already seen that the primitive liturgies were constructed in terms of the Trinitarian doxology. It is no accident that the introductory formula to the anaphoras of many of the Eastern liturgies is taken from 2 Cor 13:13; "The love of the Lord and Father, the Grace of the Lord and Son, the Communion (*koinōnia*) and Gift of the Holy Spirit be with us all."

The life of the Church commences at Pentecost, when the apostles begin to "break bread" (Acts 1:15) and "filled with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2:4) build the universal Church. In baptism the descent of the Paraclete is the operative power which forms one body out of diversity (1 Cor 12:13). The Eucharistic epiclesis is a reiteration of the Church's belief that her whole sacramental life has a Trinitarian significance. Thus the Fathers of the Church in both East and West are unanimous in teaching that the presence of Christ in the Eucharist is through the operation of the Spirit. The problem lies in understanding the relationship between the sacrificial nature of the liturgy and the work of the Trinity in the re-presentation of this sacrifice. Is the sacrifice confined to the words of institution or is the sacrifice a much more inclusive reality embracing the whole mystery of Christ's redemptive work,

²³ Nicholas Cabasilas, *A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy*, tr. J. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty (London, 1960) p. 76.

which includes the promise of the Father, the descent of the Holy Spirit, and the *koinonia* of the faithful?²⁴

It was not until the High Middle Ages that Aristotelian concepts and categories were applied to the sacraments. Since there is a substantial change in the elements, this change must necessarily be instantaneous and must take place when the formula of institution is uttered by the priest speaking *in persona Christi*. St. Thomas could further clarify the matter by stating that if a priest pronounced the words of Christ independently of any other prayer with the intention of completing the sacrament, the elements would be consecrated, since the intention suffices.²⁵ Thus in the West it was theoretically possible to have a sacrifice without a liturgy.

The Orientals, on the other hand, never considered the efficacy of the epiclesis, or the formula of institution for that matter, apart from the whole canon. The epiclesis is conditioned by the words of Christ which precede it. Eastern theologians never considered the epiclesis as a consecratory formula by itself. The priest pronounces the prayer *in persona ecclesiae* and asks that the Father send the Spirit and sanctify the gifts. The words of Christ are a historical or narrative statement which is part of the narrative of the saving acts of Christ. This theological conception is present in the Byzantine formulas for the administration of baptism and penance, where a deprecativ or third-person formula is used rather than an indicative or first-person formula. "The servant of God is baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." "O Lord our God, pardon him his sins in your goodness, for you alone have the power to remit sins."²⁶ This reflects the Eastern conception of the priest acting for the Church, whereas in the West the emphasis has been placed on the priest acting as *alter Christus*, with the consequence that his priestly office has been assimilated to that of Christ. The solution lies in the fact that the priest acts both *in persona ecclesiae* and *in persona Christi*.

The Orthodox theologian Cyprien Kern has pointed out that every liturgy is an anamnesis of the Last Supper. In this memorial act, however, the celebrant cannot be identified with the One who spoke at the Last Supper. The celebrant is, instead, an image of Christ and symbolizes Him, whereas the Eucharistic elements are in reality the body and blood of the Lord. Consequently, the Orthodox find it difficult to

²⁴ Cf. Nicholas Cabasilas, *ibid.*, p. 52. ²⁵ *Sum. theol.* 3, q. 78, a. 1, ad 4m.

²⁶ Cf. Cyprien Kern, "En marge de l'epiclèse," *Irénikon* 24 (1951) 184.

accept the view that the celebrant speaks in the person of Christ and identifies his liturgical role with that of Christ Himself.³⁷

The Orthodox Church views the liturgy not merely as a sacrament and a sacrifice, but also as a participation in the life of the Trinity. The liturgy becomes "an immense symbolic icon of the heavenly liturgy."³⁸ In celebrating the liturgy, the Church is aware that the full realization of the kingdom has not been reached. The Holy Spirit is invoked to hasten the coming of the kingdom, to manifest the presence of the Lord. This presence is not at the disposal of the Church, for the Church is the minister of the presence. J.-J. von Allmen maintains that the epiclesis is rooted in the *Maranatha* of the apostolic Church. Consequently, the epiclesis has a fundamental eschatological meaning.³⁹ Even though the epiclesis was placed after the words of institution, it does not imply that Christ is not present before such an invocation. Essentially, the difference between the Christian East and West concerning the doctrine of the Holy Spirit becomes apparent in the East's explicit invocation after the words of institution. The epiclesis implies that the realization of the Eucharistic presence depends not on the celebrant but on the free grace of God. But this dependence on God in the sacramental action is precisely what is meant in the phrase *ex opere operato*. God remains free in offering His grace and presence.

Previous efforts to pinpoint the moment of consecration and by so doing deny the necessity of an epiclesis do not reach the heart of the matter. The epiclesis recalls the work of the Spirit in the redeeming mission of the Son. This redeeming mission is not yet fully accomplished in spite of all the glory of the liturgy, which reflects the heavenly liturgy "where there is no temple, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb" (Ap 21:22).

The Spirit continually manifests the presence of Christ to His Church. Thus the prayer of the epiclesis invokes the Spirit not only upon the gifts but also upon the faithful, that they may realize the mystery of salvation that is being recapitulated before their eyes and participate in its accomplishment. This is the *koinonia* of the Spirit which unifies the faithful in one body because they partake of one loaf and drink of the same Spirit. In this *koinonia* they share in the priestly offering of Christ. "By this we know that we abide in Him and He in us, because He has given us of His own Spirit" (1 Jn 4:13).

³⁷ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 189. ³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 167. ³⁹ J.-J. von Allmen, *op. cit.*, p. 29.