

# Person and Church

By

Anthony Joseph Kotlar



Originally:

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY  
OF  
THE ECUMENICAL INSTITUTE OF THEOLOGY  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN THEOLOGY

*Corrected for errata and with page headers added*

The Ecumenical Institute of Theology  
St. Mary's Seminary and University

Baltimore, Maryland

May 2001

The Ecumenical Institute of Theology  
St. Mary's Seminary and University

# PERSON AND CHURCH

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY  
OF  
THE ECUMENICAL INSTITUTE OF THEOLOGY  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN THEOLOGY

By

Anthony Joseph Kotlar

Baltimore, Maryland

May 2001

In loving memory of my mother  
Mathilda (1912-1985)  
and my father  
Anthony (1913-2000)

Of their “bounty,  
There was no winter in’t; an autumn ‘twas  
That grew the more by reaping.”

— William Shakespeare  
*Antony and Cleopatra*  
Act 5, Scene 2

## Ecclesia ex Trinitate

— Medieval Dictum

# Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Acknowledgments .....                      | ix |
| Abbreviations and General References ..... | x  |
| Chapter                                    |    |
| 1 Prologue .....                           | 1  |
| Part I. In the Beginning                   |    |
| 2 Trinity .....                            | 17 |
| 3 Catholic .....                           | 35 |
| 4 Person .....                             | 51 |
| Part II. Time / <i>chronos</i>             |    |
| 5 Man /Anthropos .....                     | 69 |
| 6 Incarnation .....                        | 83 |

Part III. Event / *kairos*

Chapter

|                          |                 |     |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----|
| 7                        | Eucharist ..... | 111 |
| 8                        | Eschaton .....  | 145 |
| 9                        | Church .....    | 159 |
| * * *                    |                 |     |
| 10                       | Epilogue .....  | 191 |
| Appendix                 | .....           | 223 |
| What Is Man?             | .....           | 225 |
| When Jesus Touches Bread | .....           | 237 |
| Selected Bibliography    | .....           | 261 |

## Acknowledgments

To acknowledge here is to give thanks — a eucharist — for those persons who, each in their own way, shared my journey, and assisted me along the way:

Fr. Conan Timoney, pastor of Patronage of the Mother of God Church, mentor and friend, who encouraged me to enroll at the Ecumenical Institute of Theology (the “EI”) as a preparation for diaconal formation for the Church of Passaic (Catholic Eparchy, Ruthenian)

My teachers at the EI:

Dr. Vigen Guroian

Rev. Ebenezer Afful

Dr. Michael Gorman

Fr. E. Joseph Camilli

Dr. Walter Sherwin

Rev. Dr. Eric Gritsch

Dr. Edwin Hostetter

Rev. Dr. Emora Brannan

Dr. Christopher Dreisbach

Dr. Patricia Lamoureux

Dr. Brian Berry (also thesis reviewer)

Fr. David Pietropaoli, thesis advisor, priest, and friend

Dr. Michael Gorman, in his capacity as Dean, and always the good teacher, provided the personal attention and encouragement, so characteristic of the EI, that enabled me to transition into the degree program and pursue this thesis.

My classmates at the EI, teachers, also, in their own way

My teachers and classmates for diaconal formation, and our bishop, our holy father and teacher, Andrew of Passaic

The financial support of Patronage, and the EI through their Partnership and Dean’s List scholarship programs is appreciated.

Finally, those without whom I am not complete, my family, my special privilege and joy: our children Jennifer, Anthony, Joseph, Nicholas, Catherine, Thomas, and Anne; and my wife — עֵזֶר כַּנְגִידוֹ — Theresa.

## Abbreviations and General References

All quoted scripture texts are from the program *BibleWorks* (tm), HERMENEUTIKA Computer Bible Research Software Copyright © 1998 BibleWorks, LLC.

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| AAS        | <i>Acta Apostolica Sedis</i>  |
| BEM        | <i>Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry</i> , Faith and Order Paper 111, World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1982.  |
| BEMR       | <i>Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990: Report on the Process and Responses</i>   |
| BHS        | <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>   |
| CCC        | <i>Catechism of the Catholic Church</i>   |
| LSJ        | Liddell-Scott-Jones Lexicon. Source for Greek definitions using internet version at Project Perseus: <a href="http://www.tufts.perseus.edu">www.tufts.perseus.edu</a> |
| LXX        | Septuagint of Rahlfs  |
| MT         | Masoretic Text, BHS   |
| NAB        | New American Bible  |
| NC         | Creed of Nicea-Constantinople   |
| NRSV / NRS | New Revised Standard Version  |
| NT         | New Testament: Greek text, 4 <sup>th</sup> ed., United Bible Society  |
| PG         | <i>Patrologia Graeca</i> , Migne  |
| PL         | <i>Patrologia Latina</i> , Migne  |
| RSV        | Revised Standard Version  |
| ST         | <i>Summa Theologiae</i>   |
| VC II      | Vatican Council II  |

# Chapter 1

## Prologue

### Introduction

*Person and Church* is a study of what may be termed visible “ecclesial structures,” both the large “structure,” the church, and the small “structure,” the person. The two are considered to be intimately related on a most fundamental level; as such, this thesis presents an approach to a theology of the church based on the ontology and the meaning of *person*. The thesis establishes and presents a particular understanding of the term *person* in what can be generally described as a relational context; it then proposes a new expression for understanding the term *person* that relates the one and the many in what is designated (and explained) as the *catholic* sense. With this understanding, *person* is proposed and used as the basic theological expression uniting anthropology and theology (properly so called), that is, Mankind (creation) and God as Trinity. The thesis proposes to describe and develop a broad but particular theological perspective on the foundation of the *theology of the person* ranging from the Trinity to the Church — from the mystery of God as the Three Divine Persons to the mystery of God among us, from the immanent to the economic. Thus the discussion of the term *person* that will be presented derives from and must be seen not only in relation to God the Trinity but also in relation to the Incarnation. The concept of *person* is used as the basis for describing a Christian anthropology that, in a natural and consistent manner, gives rise to a Eucharistic understanding of *church*. The thesis strives, ultimately, to present a thematically unified theology of the Church: an ecclesiology based on the concept of *person*.

## Perspectives and Methodology

*Person and Church* is written from the perspective of the mystical theology of the eastern<sup>1</sup> Christian church. Wherever possible and appropriate the western theological perspective is also included since it effectively complements the eastern viewpoint and can provide another, and perhaps a more familiar, point of reference. With this in mind, the study attempts to maintain a broad ecumenical outlook and one, especially, that bridges the gap between east and west. The perspective of the Christian east, as presented in this thesis, is principally represented and exemplified by Eastern Orthodox and Eastern Catholic (Byzantine) theology. As will be discussed in more detail shortly, the thesis focuses in a particular way on the thought of the Greek Orthodox Bishop (Metropolitan) John D. Zizioulas, but it does so within the general framework of the Eastern Church's mystical theology. In brief, that theological perspective — and the perspective of this thesis — holds that mysticism / spirituality and theology are inseparably united. In personal terms, since spirituality and theology form a unified whole, the true theologian is also the saint; the saint is the authentic theologian. Just such an approach is summed up by the Orthodox (lay) theologian Vladimir Lossky:<sup>2</sup>

The eastern tradition has never made a sharp distinction between mysticism and theology; between personal experience of the divine mysteries and the dogma affirmed by the Church.

---

<sup>1</sup> Eastern in the sense of the theological patrimony of the Christian world reckoned according to the ancient Patriarchal Sees: Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, (Jerusalem) — East; Rome — West.

<sup>2</sup> Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976), 8. Recently, Bishop Kalistos of Diokleia, "The Witness of the Orthodox Church," *The Ecumenical Rev.* 52 (2000): 52, makes the same reference to Lossky's explanation.

Byzantine theology is decidedly apophatic in character,<sup>3</sup> but the theologian — the believer — must go as far, but no farther than is possible and proper in contemplating the mystery of God. Lossky quotes “a great Orthodox theologian, the Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow” who provides a concise prescription for the sense in which the inquirer, with humility and daring, should approach the subject, that is the sacred mysteries, as doctrine, dogma, liturgy, and, to sum it up, life:<sup>4</sup>

‘None of the mysteries of the most secret wisdom of God ought to appear alien or altogether transcendent to us, but in all humility we must apply our spirit to the contemplation of divine things’.

Lossky continues, explaining the synergism that must obtain between the dialectic of a faith that is accessible and common to all and personal experience:<sup>5</sup>

To put it in another way, we must live the dogma expressing a revealed truth, which appears to us as an unfathomable mystery, in such a fashion that instead of assimilating the mystery to our mode of understanding, we should, on the contrary, look for a profound change, an inner transformation of spirit, enabling us to experience it mystically. Far from being mutually opposed, theology and mysticism support and complete each other. One is impossible without the other. If the mystical experience is a personal working out of the content of the common faith, theology is an expression, for the profit of all, of that which can be experienced by everyone. Outside the truth kept by the whole Church personal experience would be deprived of all certainty, of all objectivity. It would be a mingling of truth and of falsehood, of reality and of illusion: ‘mysticism’ in the bad sense of the word. On the other hand, the teaching of the Church would have no hold on souls if it did not in some degree express an inner experience of truth, granted in different measure to each one of the faithful. There is, therefore, no

---

<sup>3</sup> See Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, ch. 2, “The Divine Darkness,” 23-43, 31-35; Vladimir Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Erikson et al. eds., Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1985), 13; and Vladimir Lossky, *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1978), 31-35, on the “negative way”: ἀποφατικός / *apophatikos*, adj., negative.

<sup>4</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 8, quoting from *Sermons and Addresses of Metropolitan Philaret*, Moscow, 1844.

<sup>5</sup> *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 8-9.

Christian mysticism without theology; but, above all, there is no theology without mysticism.

To achieve this end it is proper and even necessary, within the perspective of the Christian east, to place theology within a doxological and liturgical context. As LaCugna states in the Forward of her book *God for Us*, the desire is “to articulate how doxology, the praise of God, might bridge speculative and practical theology.”<sup>6</sup> In a real sense the most effective and profound theology is done by the believer in church, gathered with fellow Christians at prayer,<sup>7</sup> especially (for what is arguably a growing consensus among Christians) the great prayer of the Church: the Divine Liturgy / Mass / Eucharist / Lord’s Supper. The conviction is that doxology, and consequently ὀρθοδοξία / *orthodoxia*, is primary theology.<sup>8</sup> The thesis, therefore, relies on the liturgical prayers of the church, especially the Byzantine church, ancient in composition yet still current in use, to illuminate and reinforce theological perspectives.

Another important aspect of this work, in its methodology, is the desire to provide a scriptural framework throughout the discussion without in any way, however, taking a “proof text” approach for any points. The premise is that sacred scripture is undoubtedly the Church’s, and therefore the Christians’, chief written source of theology and spirituality, but that scripture as the inerrant word of God<sup>9</sup> affirms and describes rather than defines and dictates beliefs and practice, i.e. theology and worship. This scriptural orientation gives rise to two fairly detailed exegetical sections included in an appendix (only results and conclusions are summarized in the thesis) treating: (1) the biblical basis for delineating the essential features that constitute the event and the celebration of the Eucharist (chapter 7), especially as witnessed by the synoptic

---

<sup>6</sup> Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God For us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992), ix.

<sup>7</sup> Jean-Jacques von Allmen, *The Lord’s Supper* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966), 19: “A theologian is one who knows how to pray is the assertion of the Eastern tradition, according to Gregory of Nyssa and Evagrius Ponticus.”

<sup>8</sup> E.g., LaCugna, *God for Us*, 357 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Wherein, following the prescription of Hugh of St Victor, “De Scripturis et Scriptoribus Sacris,” *PL* 175, c13, “litteram legimus sed non secundum litteram,” we read the letter, but not according to the letter.

Gospels; and (2) the anthropological-theological concept of “sonship” in Paul’s letter to the Galatians (chapter 6).

### Focus

The writings of Zizioulas, especially his theology of the person, in many ways form the core and focus of this thesis. The writings of Vladimir Lossky are used extensively, especially to provide background and further systematic detail. Although these theologians are Orthodox, their theological perspective stems from a common heritage of the theological expression of the Christian east enshrined and experienced, that is lived, by all the faithful as a practiced faith, and one that is shared by the Catholic churches of the east.<sup>10</sup> This theological perspective is centered in a well established, though by no means closed and rigid, ecclesial, doctrinal, and liturgical framework — the “great church” of the first millennium, the church of the early councils, the church that celebrates the Divine Liturgy (the Mass, Lord’s Supper, Eucharist). Although the chief spokesmen for this theology, as indicated above, are Orthodox, the specific perspective of this thesis is that of the Catholic churches of the East and, therefore, a mystical theology that harmonizes the traditions and patrimony of the mostly Orthodox east and the primarily Catholic west. There are, of course, well known areas where theological positions diverge in their Orthodox and Catholic expression and emphasis, to which may readily be added viewpoints that trace their origin to Reformation theologies. One can not do better, faced with the ecumenical challenge, than to reflect on the balanced optimism of St Thomas Aquinas concerning faith, reason, and intellectual challenges:<sup>11</sup>

Cum enim fides infallibili veritati innitatur, impossibile autem sit de vero demonstrari contrarium, manifestum est, probationes, quae contra fidem inducuntur, non esse demonstrationes, sed solubilia argumenta.

---

<sup>10</sup> See *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, Apostolic Letter of Pope John Paul II promulgated on May 2, 1995. AAS 87 (1995), 745; VC II *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, AAS 57 (1965), 76.

<sup>11</sup> St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 1a.1.8. “Since faith rests upon infallible truth, and since the contrary of a truth can never be demonstrated, it is clear that the arguments brought against faith cannot be demonstrations, but are difficulties that can be answered.”

The proper course here is to address and answer difficulties rather than affirm or encourage contradictions.

### Overview of the Important Sources

The thesis will examine Eucharistic theology, ecclesiology, anthropology, and ontology — in a sense all are related — especially that of the Greek Orthodox theologian (and now Metropolitan Bishop of Pergamon) John D. Zizioulas whose major work in English is the compilation of a number of his writings in *Being and Communion*.<sup>12</sup> Vladimir Lossky's classic work, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*,<sup>13</sup> and his collected essays, especially those published in *In the Image and Likeness of God*,<sup>14</sup> are used to provide general background. Also aiding in this endeavor, and as discussion partners, are recent publications that, in various degrees, comment on Zizioulas's theology and the theology of *person* and *church*. These works also interact with one another to some extent, and present western Catholic and Protestant perspectives to Zizioulas's treatment. This gives an ecumenical perspective. Zizioulas's and Lossky's viewpoints illustrate the approach of the Orthodox and, to a very large extent, Catholic east. Paul McPartlan's *The Church Makes the Eucharist*,<sup>15</sup> compares in detail the eucharistic theology and the ecclesiology of Zizioulas with the views of the noted Catholic, Henri de Lubac. Alan J. Torrance's (Reformed background) work *Persons in Communion*<sup>16</sup> is primarily an engagement of Barth and his revelation model, but he also comments significantly on Zizioulas, and brings into the discussion the work of LaCugna (The title of Torrance's book is a chapter

---

<sup>12</sup> John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1993).

<sup>13</sup> Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976).

<sup>14</sup> Vladimir Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God* (Erikson et al. eds., Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985).

<sup>15</sup> Paul McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).

<sup>16</sup> Alan Torrance, *Persons in Communion* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996).

title in LaCugna's book). Catherine Mowry LaCugna in *God for Us*<sup>17</sup> offers a very engaging and broad perspective in synthesizing the diverse yet related views of Aquinas, Gregory of Palamas, Rahner, Zizioulas and others, treating the Trinity and economia, a doxological approach to theology, and the person. Perhaps the most critical and significant challenge to the views and orientation of Zizioulas is a recent work by Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*,<sup>18</sup> which presents a detailed Free Church ecclesiology in the context of Trinitarian theology. Volf also critiques the theology of Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger and relates and compares it to that of Zizioulas. Coincidentally, the titles of Volf's chapters illustrate the scope, terminology, and basic content of this thesis: *Communion and the Whole; Communion, One, and Many; The Ecclesiality of the Church; Faith, Person and Church; Trinity and Church; Structure of the Church; The Catholicity of the Church*.

### Scope and Thrust of the Thesis

Of the several chief works just mentioned, Volf's proposal is very important because it coincides with the scope of this thesis, yet it is so different. His views, and the others,<sup>19</sup> serve to interrogate the perspective of the thesis. Although strongly echoing the theology of Zizioulas and Lossky, the thesis does not purport to be an apology for their theology per se, nor a comprehensive refutation of viewpoints that disagree with them. In fact, no attempt is made to give anything close to a complete and systematic presentation of Zizioulas's or Lossky's theological expression; however, the doctrinal and liturgical framework of their church — and the eastern church in general, Orthodox and Catholic — is presumed. And that framework provides the general orientation. Volf also presents a theology thematically similar to that of

---

<sup>17</sup> Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992).

<sup>18</sup> Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. LaCugna, *God for Us*, 15: "Chapter 8 develops a relational ontology, assembling from Greek and Latin patristic and medieval theology, as well as from contemporary philosophy, theology, and culture, the elements of an ontology of persons in communion. I argue in chapter 8 that the metaphor of communion is eminently appropriate to the deepest meaning of the economy as the place where God and creature meet and unite as persons in communion."

Zizioulas. Ultimately Volf's analysis of Zizioulas misses the mark for, while he explains Zizioulas well (even in disagreement) and shares with him a recognition of the same fundamental issues, he does not address the most significant theological thrust of Zizioulas which, besides being Trinitarian, is Incarnational and Eucharistic. Volf is aware of this to some extent and comments on his approach in engaging Zizioulas:<sup>20</sup>

According to Gaëtan Baillargeon, the methodology I [Volf] am choosing here is not commensurate with Zizioulas's work, since "the heart" of his thinking resides in the Eucharist (Baillargeon, *Communion*, 61). As soon as one inquires what it is that actually gives his eucharistic thinking its particular character, however, one must go back to his ontology of person as acquired from the perspective of trinitarian reflection. It is thus advisable to follow the inner logic of Zizioulas's thinking and to begin with the Trinity itself, and then to make the transition to the eucharistic community. This is precisely how Zizioulas himself proceeds (see Zizioulas, *Communion*, 27-65); it is probably no accident that his widely published and widely translated essay "Eucharist and Catholicity" stands in the middle rather than at the beginning of his volume of essays (see Zizioulas, *Communion*, 143-69).

In fact, Zizioulas begins the introduction to his major work with the church, that is, with the present tangible, experiential, communal point of reference. This is the beginning of the Introduction of the "volume of essays"<sup>21</sup> by Zizioulas just cited by Volf.<sup>22</sup>

The Church is not simply an institution. She is a "mode of existence," *a way of being*. The mystery of the Church, even in its institutional dimension, is deeply bound to the being of man, to the being of the world and to the very being of God. In virtue of this bond, so characteristic of patristic thought, ecclesiology assumes a marked importance, not only for all aspects of theology, but also for the existential needs of man in every age.

---

<sup>20</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 75 n15. The reference is to Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*. Baillargeon's work was not available for this thesis.

<sup>21</sup> *Being as Communion* is the single most extensive compilation of the writings of Zizioulas in English.

<sup>22</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 15. See the discussion of Zizioulas by Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 295.

The scope of this thesis is broad;<sup>23</sup> and since the scope is broad, choice of details will necessarily be selective. Two important areas not considered in detail in the thesis by design are ministry in the church — the person of the one who ministers — and the ethical and moral aspects of the person. These are very important topics that Zizioulas addresses in some detail, but they are not considered here as foundational. Also, questions arise (suggesting further study) on the troika eschatology, church, kingdom of God. In order to identify and address such questions, the thesis provides the panoramic view that emphasizes associations not just facts, pointing the way to details provided by Zizioulas and the others. The goal is synthesis: to synthesize a theology of the Christian community, of those who understand themselves as ἐκκλησία and לְקָהָל<sup>24</sup> — as the People of God through the covenant in Christ, completing and perfecting the covenant with יְהוָה / YHWH — from the time of “Abel the righteous”<sup>25</sup> until the final age,<sup>26</sup> in such a way that the ecclesiology that is articulated pertains to Christianity today, and to practical issues concerning the Church. Following Zizioulas, as noted in Volf’s quote of Gaëtan Baillargeon, this thesis will progress towards an emphasis on the Eucharist in determining the fundamental theology of the person, and a prominence of the Eucharist in understanding the Christian assembly as the church. As such, the thesis could also be seen as

---

<sup>23</sup> As is the scope of ecclesiology; see e.g. Avery Dulles and Patrick Granfield, *The Theology of the Church: A Bibliography* (New York: Paulist Press, 1999).

<sup>24</sup> *Ekklesia* and *qahal*; see Everett Ferguson *The Church of Christ: A Biblical Ecclesiology for Today* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996), 129 ff. Also, Gerhard Lohfink, *Does God need the Church? Toward a theology of the people of God* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 59: “Since Easter the name of the Israel gathered around Jesus is *ekklēsia* (congregation, assembly)”; Louis Bouyer, *Liurgical Piety* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983), 23 ff.

<sup>25</sup> Mt 23:35, Lk 11:51, Heb 11:4, Heb 12:24; and, e.g., Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (New York: Image Books, 1987), 51: “All the just from Abel on are in the Body of Christ, in the *Ecclesia ab Abel*”; and, Francis A. Sullivan, *The Church We Believe In: One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 113: “One could speak of a church of all the just, that had existed since the time of Abel, the first man whose life had been wholly pleasing to God.” Also, Henri de Lubac, S. J., *Catholicism: Christ and the Common Destiny of Man* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988), 142.

<sup>26</sup> Jeffrey Vanderwilt, *A Church Without Borders: The Eucharist and the Church in Ecumenical Perspective* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 104, 144.

presenting a Eucharistic theology of the Church, or even what could be termed the Eucharist in a ‘*catholic*’ context (a meaning that will be made clear later), that is, in the sense of Ephesians 3:18-19, ‘to be fully able to attain (ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι) with all the holy ones what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ that surpasses knowledge, so that you may be filled by / into (εἰς) all the fullness of God.’<sup>27</sup> This is surely the thrust of the theology of the person and the church and the Eucharist as developed by Zizioulas. Given the prominence of the Eucharist for Zizioulas (and others), it becomes necessary to ask: Is the Eucharist, and a specific understanding of the Eucharist, a *sine qua non* for understanding the church, and especially the church in terms of *person*? It is essential, therefore, to answer why the Eucharist is not just another of many approaches or “models” for the church or the worshiping community.<sup>28</sup>

The Eucharist for Zizioulas (and this thesis) is the crux; the Trinity is the point of departure (conceptual if not actual). Volf, from a significantly different theological orientation, also intends in his study to allow Trinitarian theology to inform the meaning of church — in his

---

<sup>27</sup> Eph 3:18-19.

ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε καταλαβέσθαι σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις τί τὸ πλάτος καὶ μῆκος καὶ ὕψος καὶ βάθος, γινώναί τε τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα πληρωθῆτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. see Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (New York: Image Books, 1987). Braaten, *Mother Church*, 82-85. This is not intended as a criticism of a discussion of the church on the basis of models, rather, that the Eucharist, in the view of Zizioulas and eastern theology in general — Orthodox and Catholic — and western Catholic theology does not admit the Eucharist as just another model of the Church. A similar point is made by Vanderwilt, *A Church Without Borders*, 140, in reference to the related “communion model” and the views of J.-M. R. Tillard, O.P., *Church of Churches: The Ecclesiology of Communion* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992):

Tillard refused on more than one occasion to call his ecclesiology of communion an “ecclesiological model.” Perhaps he was obliquely referring to Avery Dulles’s important book on the models of the Church. Communion is a model for the Church, but it is also far more than a “model” because it extends far beneath other explanatory systems. Communion reaches down to the existential core of the Church. Tillard therefore claims to be describing fundamental structures of grace. Every valid ecclesiological model must take these primordial structures of grace into account.

program and according to his beliefs, for what he terms “the Free Churches.” Concerning this he says, referring to his work:<sup>29</sup>

The following study is concerned *with placing this cry of protest of the Free Churches — “We are the church” — into a trinitarian framework and with elevating it to the status of an ecclesiological program, and with doing so in dialogue with Catholic and Orthodox ecclesiologies.* I am hopeful that this will also indirectly provide a modest theological contribution to clarifying the problem the political protest “We are the people!” presents to social philosophy. My primary objective, however, is to contribute to the rediscovery of the church.

“...the rediscovery of the church”? It is seemingly not possible for Byzantine theology to envision, allow, or accept a “rediscovery of the church” — certainly not in the way or to the extent that Volf envisions it<sup>30</sup> — anymore than one can be said to have rediscovered one’s self, although an articulation and appreciation of a new self-awareness is always possible.<sup>31</sup> In achieving just that new self-awareness, this thesis proposes that the concept of *person* is the key. *Person* is the central category — ontological and existential — for examining the theological path that leads eventually to an understanding of the church and how the church is experienced and known in the world. *Person* is certainly used and even emphasized in other studies as an

---

<sup>29</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 11; the italics are in the original. Paul M. Quay, *The Mystery Hidden for Ages in God* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 352 n 23 dissents: “The slogan, “We are the Church,” stale left-over from the Council of Basel (de Lubac ...) fails ...”

<sup>30</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, xi, writes: “In the most general way, I am trying to show that the typically Protestant — above all “Free Church” — form of ecclesial individualism and the classical Catholic and Orthodox forms of ecclesiological holism are not the only adequate ecclesiological alternatives, but that an appropriate understanding of the Trinity suggests a more nuanced and promising model of the relationship between person and community in the church. The goal of my efforts is an ecumenical ecclesiology — not in the sense of a construct that draws on all traditions but is rooted in none, but in the sense that all the great themes of this unmistakably Protestant ecclesiological melody are enriched by Catholic and Orthodox voices.”

<sup>31</sup> Joseph A. Loya, O.S.A., “Review Essay,” *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 38 (1994): 331 [reviewing Joseph Holland, *Varities of Postmodern Theology* (State University of New York Press, 1989)], refers to “Eastern Orthodox visions of eucharistic ecclesiology” as an example that ‘looks not to a production of “new offspring,” but to a deeper realization of what it is to be the ecclesial Body of the Second Adam.’

important concept.<sup>32</sup> In this study it is the common and essential point of reference and focus. *Person* is the chief building block: it is the canon, the rule for interpreting theological assertions — it is both the compass and the anchor. If the assertion violates the sense or notion of *person*, then the assertion is found wanting and must be modified or abandoned.

## Overview

This thesis commences with a treatment of the Trinity. Following this Prologue / Introduction (chapter 1), Part I presents the basic vocabulary, the foundational terms, starting with (chapter 2) Trinity and leading to the key concept of Person (chapter 4). These are linked through the idea of what it means to be καθολική / *katholike* (catholic) in (chapter 3) Catholic. Part II continues by developing the *person* in the sphere of creation starting with a general anthropology in (chapter 5) Man/Anthropos; this leads to the “special case” of the Incarnation (chapter 6). Following *person* from the Incarnation leads into Part III which begins with (chapter 7) Eucharist, the key to this part, and the basis for understanding the relationship of persons in and to the church. The vision of the person in this present time, from the perspective of the Eucharistic community and the eschatological dimension of our response as persons, is presented in (chapter 8) Eschaton; the discussion culminates in (chapter 9) Church. Lastly an Epilogue / Conclusion (chapter 10) recaps and offers some proposals.

The Trinity is the point of departure since it provides the foundation for an understanding of *person*. *Person* in turn is manifested in Mankind/creation ultimately by the Incarnation: Christ and the Holy Spirit give us the Eucharist whereby the Church constitutes herself. And the Church, the body of Christ,<sup>33</sup> His Spouse<sup>34</sup> and the Temple of the Holy Spirit,<sup>35</sup> in turn celebrates

---

<sup>32</sup> E.g., Christoph Schwöbel, and Colen E. Gunton, eds., *Persons, Divine And Human, King's College Essays in Theological Anthropology*, For the Research Institute in Systematic Theology (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995).

<sup>33</sup> Col 1:13, 18; Eph 1:22-23.

<sup>34</sup> Eph 5:31-32; Rv 19:7.

<sup>35</sup> Ferguson, *The Church of Christ*, 127: “Paul used both body [1 Cor. 12:27] and temple [1 Cor. 3:16] for the church”; and, 399, “The images used for the church (Chap. 2) uniformly

and lives the Eucharist as the epiphany, the manifestation of Christ today, doing the will of the Father.<sup>36</sup> The sequence is classical revelation / salvation — doxology,<sup>37</sup> the subject is the person: Trinity — Incarnation, Adam — Eucharist — Trinity. One leaves in order to arrive.<sup>38</sup>

Although this thesis commences with a treatment of the Trinity one could, reasonably, start with the Incarnation or the creation in Genesis or with the Church: the discursive process is somewhat cyclic. The humble prayer of the disciple who addresses these topics, and the one which I now utter here, is that the true content of theology, which is the life of God in the fullness of God, will compensate for the limitations in any approach, and heal all that is lacking in method and presentation. For it is necessary (the *δεῖ* / *dei* of the Gospel<sup>39</sup>) that the disciple first understands and then takes what is given and hands it on — in the sense of *παράδοσις* / *paradosis*<sup>40</sup>— as fresh and as whole as it was received. Recall the words of our Lord to His disciples:<sup>41</sup>

“Do you understand all these things?” They answered, “Yes.” And he [Jesus] said to them, “Therefore every scribe who has been trained for [literally discipled

---

denote its oneness: body of Christ (he has one body — Eph 4:4), bride of Christ (the one husband has one wife — 2 Cor. 11:2; Eph 5:22-33; Rev. 21:9; cf. 1 Cor. 7:2), temple (God authorized one temple, that at Jerusalem — Deut. 12:5, 14; Eph 2:21).”

<sup>36</sup> Cf e.g. Gal 1:4 κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.

<sup>37</sup> LaCugna, *God for Us*, 114, rightly notes “the order of salvation history, the *exitus* and *reditus* of all things from God to God, *a Patre ad Patrem* (cf. Rom. 8:15; John 14:6; Eph. 2:18).”

<sup>38</sup> Cf Hugh of St Victor, *PL* 177, c1215: “quoniam qui non veniet, non pervenit”.

<sup>39</sup> NAB Lk 19:5 When he reached the place, Jesus looked up and said to him, “Zacchaeus, come down quickly, for today **I must** stay at your house.” Lk 19:5 καὶ ὡς ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἀναβλέψας ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· Ζακχαῖε, σπεύσας κατὰβηθι, σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου δεῖ με μέναι Jn 4:4 He **had to** pass through Samaria. Jn 4:4 Ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας A note in the NAB here calls it a “theological necessity.”

<sup>40</sup> Tradition, i.e., handing on; this will be discussed later. See 1Cor 11:2, 2 Thes 2:15.

<sup>41</sup> Mt 13:51 Συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα; λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ναί. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· διὰ τοῦτο πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ, ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά.

for, μαθητευθεὶς] the kingdom of heaven is like a householder who brings out of his treasure what is new and what is old.”

# Part I

ἐν ἀρχῇ (John 1:1 & Genesis 1:1)

בְּרֵאשִׁית Genesis 1:1

*In the beginning*



## Chapter 2

# Trinity

Τριάς<sup>42</sup>

The Troparion for the great feast of the Theophany<sup>43</sup> in the Byzantine liturgy sings:<sup>44</sup>

At Your baptism in the Jordan, O Lord, worship of the Trinity was revealed, for the Father's<sup>45</sup> voice bore witness to You, calling You His “beloved Son”, and the Spirit in the form of a dove confirmed the truth of these words. O Christ God, Who appeared and enlightened the world, glory be to you!

---

<sup>42</sup> ἡ Τριάς - ἄδος. The number three, the triad; feminine. Reference Liddell-Scott-Jones Lexicon for all Greek terms used: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/>

<sup>43</sup> January 6, celebrating the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan: Mt 3:13, Mk 1:9, Lk 3:21.

<sup>44</sup> This is the current English translation used in the Catholic (Ruthenian) Metropolitan Church of Pittsburgh. Ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ βαπτιζομένου σου, Κύριε, ἡ τῆς Τριάδος ἐφανερώθη προσκύνησις· τοῦ γὰρ Γεννήτορος ἡ φωνὴ προσεμαρτύρει σοι, ἀγαπητόν σε Υἱὸν ὀνομάζουσα· καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐν εἶδει περιστερᾶς ἐβεβαίωτο τοῦ λόγου τὸ ἀσφαλές.. Ὁ ἐπιφανεὶς Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός, καὶ τὸν κόσμον φωτίσας, δόξα σοι.

<sup>45</sup> Actually and literally, “the begetter,” Γεννήτορος / *Gennetos*; see previous note.

Christianity, especially in the theology of the Christian east, is the mystery<sup>46</sup> of God-become-Man<sup>47</sup> — God-with-us<sup>48</sup> — revealing the greatest mystery, the central mystery, the mystery of mysteries, the Trinity.<sup>49</sup> The appraisal of Lossky is typical:<sup>50</sup>

The revelation of God the Holy Trinity — Father, Son and Holy Spirit is the basis of all Christian theology; it is, indeed, theology itself, in the sense in which that word was understood by the Greek Fathers, for whom *theology* most commonly stood for the mystery of the Trinity revealed to the Church. Moreover, it is not only the foundation, but also the supreme object of theology; for, according to the teaching of Evagrius Ponticus (developed by St. Maximus), to know the mystery of the Trinity in its fullness is to enter into perfect union with God.

The Trinity is the ultimate mystery, and everything is contingent except the Trinity.<sup>51</sup> It then must follow that the ultimate mystery is also the ultimate reality; since creation is contingent there is, in the beginning, only the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Thus all theology, all existence, derives from the Trinity: the theology of the Παναγιά Τριάς,<sup>52</sup> the All-holy Three, is the revelation of the fullness of God insofar as we, as finite creatures, are able to grasp it.

---

<sup>46</sup> τὸ μυστήριον. LSJ: secret revealed by God, i.e. religious or mystical truth; (military) *sacramentum*.

<sup>47</sup> Man is used here in the gender neutral sense equivalent to Mankind = Humankind, i.e. humanity in a collective sense, and also in what can be termed a personal sense. The ambiguous sense in English of also meaning a man conveys the same sense as the biblical *Adam*. This is further discussed in (chapter 5) Anthropos/Man.

<sup>48</sup> Is 7:14: אֵל עִמָּנוּ (Immanu El); Jn 1:14 Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν.

<sup>49</sup> LaCugna, *God for Us*, 43, “The doctrine of the Trinity is *Theology* strictly speaking.”

<sup>50</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 67.

<sup>51</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 45, 48, 49.

<sup>52</sup> E.g. Father George L. Papadeas, ΜΕΓΑΛΗ ΕΒΔΟΜΑΣ ΠΑΣΧΑ, (Patmos Press, 1997), 38.

“The Holy Trinity is a *primordial* ontological concept,”<sup>53</sup> says Zizioulas. It is the most fundamental theological assertion.<sup>54</sup>

The doctrine of the Holy Trinity constitutes the fundamental grammar of Christian theology, for it is upon our knowledge of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, One God, Three Persons, that all Christian faith and worship depend, and from it that they take their essential orientation and significance.

Consequently, the theology of the Trinity conditions all Christian theology, especially, as this discussion will demonstrate, the theology of the *person*.

### **Zizioulas on the Cappadocians**

Trinitarian theology informs, and is manifested throughout, the works of Zizioulas. It is especially in “The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity: The Significance of the Cappadocian Contribution”<sup>55</sup> that he presents a thorough discussion giving the background for his views. Here we trace his discussion in order to eventually present and develop, in the next two sections, the two key concepts resulting from Trinitarian theology: *catholic* and *person*.

Zizioulas identifies the four Cappadocians<sup>56</sup> as those “whose theological and philosophical originality sealed the entire history of Christian thought,”<sup>57</sup> and produced a true theological “revolution.”<sup>58</sup> The Cappadocians redefined the language of ontology, thus giving

---

<sup>53</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 17.

<sup>54</sup> Thomas F. Torrance, *Trinitarian Perspectives* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 4.

<sup>55</sup> John Zizioulas, “The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity: The Significance of the Cappadocian Contribution,” Chapter 2 in Christoph Schwöbel, ed., *Trinitarian Theology Today: Essays on Divine Being and Act* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995), 44-60; see also, Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 27-46.

<sup>56</sup> St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Amphilochius.

<sup>57</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 44.

<sup>58</sup> See also Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 76.

us a vocabulary for describing the mystery of God. The Cappadocians understood God as Trinity (*Trias*, ἡ Τριάς): three divine persons (*hypostasis*, ἡ ὑπόστασις) — Father, Son, Holy Spirit — who each have one and the same divine nature (*physis*, ἡ φύσις), and are one divine substance (*ousia*, ἡ οὐσία).<sup>59</sup> With this approach they were able to reject all forms of Sabellianism / modalism by “stressing the fulness and ontological integrity of each person of the Trinity.”<sup>60</sup> Also, against the other extreme of tritheism they “suggested that *ousia* (substance) or *physis* (nature) in God should be taken in the sense of the general category which we apply to more than one person.”<sup>61</sup> Furthermore, the nature of God is to be understood as the communion of persons, consequently, *koinonia* (ἡ κοινωνία), communion, is also an ontological category for the Cappadocians. This is important, as Zizioulas writes:<sup>62</sup>

The *nature* of God is communion. This does not mean that the persons have an ontological priority over the one substance of God, but that the one substance of God coincides with the communion of the three persons.

---

<sup>59</sup> There is a stereotype that considers the Cappadocians to be more interested in Trinity than unity, the “well-known textbook thesis that the West began with unity of God and then moved to the Trinity, while the East followed the opposite course” noted by Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 46. LaCugna, *God For Us*, 147, argues convincingly, regarding Aquinas and the *Summa Theologiae*, that the treatises, *De Deo Uno* and *De Deo Trino*, “are ‘one book’, not two.” She also notes that the standard medieval textbook, Lombard’s *Sentences*, begins with the treatment, “De Trinitate.” See also LaCugna, *God For Us*, 192: “The three persons do not *have* a common *ousia*; they *are* the divine *ousia*.”

<sup>60</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 46.

<sup>61</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 47. Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 227, notes the ongoing concern of “latent tritheism” with this new (4<sup>th</sup> c) use of hypostesis. He also says that “Zizioulas is just one example of a person who expounds its radical compatibility with the notion of *ekstasis* in such a way that to talk of three personal hypotheses does *not* involve reference to a separateness existing between three ontologically circumscribable or ‘monadic’ beings.”

<sup>62</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 134; cf. 41, and John Zizioulas, “Communion and Otherness,” *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 38 (1994): 353. Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 77 n 26, sees an inconsistency in Zizioulas regarding “*whether substance or person represents the ultimate ontological reality*.” Zizioulas will go on to apply this understanding to the relationship between the local and universal church. See also LaCugna, *God for Us*, 14.

Equally, however “the Holy Trinity is a *primordial* ontological concept and not a notion which is added to the divine substance or rather which follows it.”<sup>63</sup> “Nothing in existence is conceivable in itself, as an individual ... since even God exists thanks to an event of communion.”<sup>64</sup>

It is in the Trinity that the one and the many, i.e. the three, perfectly “coincide”:<sup>65</sup>

The three persons of the Trinity are thus one God, because they all are so united in an unbreakable communion (*koinonia*) that none of them can be conceived apart from the rest. The mystery of the one God in three persons points to a way of being which precludes individualism and separation (or self-sufficient in and self existence) as a criterion of multiplicity. The ‘one’ not only does not precede – logically or otherwise – the ‘many’, but, on the contrary, requires the ‘many’ from the very start in order to exist.

For the immediate purpose, there are two main points that emerge from Zizioulas’s writings. The first is the *prominence of the term person* as a foundational theological concept — the primitive principle. The second, related to the first — it is, in a sense, a corollary that follows from the meaning of person — is an understanding of the concept termed *the monarchy of the Father*, that is, of a person.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 18.

<sup>64</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 17.

<sup>65</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 48.

<sup>66</sup> Colen E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), xxiv- xxv, notes his and Torrance’s difficulties with this concept of the Father as Source. This concept seems difficult for western theologians in general. But for the east, the Father is the source as His name implies; Son and Spirit proceed, appropriately, from the Father as source, as the Creed affirms. No subordination is implied by saying the Father is the source except that which is forced upon it by over-rationalization. For Zizioulas, identity and, therefore, properties we infer or ascribe, must pertain to a person, ultimately to one of the Three Persons. In the abstract, or beside the Three, anything else, communion, relation, being — ANYTHING — becomes an unacceptable fourth. As an example, consider LaCugna, *God For Us*, 271: “*Perichōrēsis* provides a dynamic model of persons in communion based on mutuality and interdependence. The model of *perichōrēsis* avoids the pitfalls of locating the divine unity either in the divine substance (Latin) or exclusively in the person of the Father (Greek), and locates unity instead in diversity, in a true communion of persons.”

## Person and Source of Being

It is Zizioulas's contention that the Cappadocians revolutionized ontology by taking a term denoting *Being* in general, *hypostasis*, and applying it to the concept denoting the particular which was to emerge eventually as *person* (*prosopon*, τὸ πρόσωπον). Ultimately this means that the notion of "one God" does not arise from the divine nature or substance, but is instead associated with person.

*Ontological Language.* Words change their meanings and ontology has a vocabulary with a history.<sup>67</sup> There is presently a "Christian" meaning for ontological terms; these are based on the language of Greek philosophy. Up to the time of the Cappadocians this classical (pagan) understanding emphasized what was general as opposed to the particular, and can be summarized, in part, as:

| The Particular                             | The General  |
|--|--|
| The Many<br>Diversity<br>Specific          | The One<br>Unity<br>Common   |
| [ <i>prosopon</i> but denoting the facade] | Nature<br>Substance, οὐσία, <i>substantia</i><br>ὑπόστασις / <i>hypostasis</i> |
|  | Being: being <i>qua</i> being, essence, existence                              |

Zizioulas notes that in the classical meaning from Greek philosophy the term hypostasis was identified with *Being*<sup>68</sup> but in the sense of the general, as in the above scheme, or even with *logos* (ὁ λόγος, reason).<sup>69</sup> Person (*prosopon*) did not enter into this scheme since it denoted a

---

<sup>67</sup> LaCugna, *God For Us*, 244.

<sup>68</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 33.

<sup>69</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 31.

facade, or rôle, that was merely a cover for *Being*, something like the mask of the actor (προσωπεῖον, *posopeion*), which is related to the word person.<sup>70</sup> “‘Being’ or the ‘world’, precedes the ‘person’,”<sup>71</sup> and there is a “priority of ‘being’ or ‘substance’ over against the person.”<sup>72</sup> The patristic insight was the eventual identification of hypostasis with person as a “concrete”<sup>73</sup> ontological category distinct from substance. Thus the Cappadocians introduced a radical philosophical and theological concept. They argued that it is necessary to propose at least two different notions of being: *hypostasis* and *ousia*.<sup>74</sup> They took the term hypostasis which was the equivalent of substance<sup>75</sup> / *ousia*, the general, and used it to designate the particular.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> von Balthasar, “On the Concept of Person,” *Communio* 13 (1986): 20: “The derivation of *persons* from the Etruscan *phersu* is almost universally recognized today.... *Phersu* evidently denoted a mask, or the wearer of the mask, at festivals in honor of P(h)ersephone.”

<sup>71</sup> John D. Zizioulas, “Human Capacity and Human Incapacity: A Theological Exploration of Personhood,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 28 (1972): 415.

<sup>72</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 415.

<sup>73</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 38 n 30; also 39, 46. Hypostasis is substantial; and it is concrete, that is, πρᾶγμα (*pragma*). This sense is captured by the biblical use of the term: Hebrews 11:1 Ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων. RSV Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen.

<sup>74</sup> Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*, 10, refers to this as the “desynonymising of *ousia* and *hypostasis*.” Cf. Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 112-13:

It was a great terminological discovery to introduce a distinction between two synonyms, in order to express the irreducibility of the ὑπόστασις to the οὐσία and of the person to the essence, without, however, opposing them as two different realities ... However, οὐσία and ὑπόστασις remain synonyms, and each time one wants to establish a distinction between the two terms, by attributing to them a different content, one inevitably falls back into the domain of conceptual knowledge: one opposes the general to the particular.

<sup>75</sup> Zizioulas notes, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 47, that the Latin *substantia* and the Greek *hypostasis* are literal translations of each other; also noted in Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 52, and LaCugna, *God For Us*, 66. The strong association of hypostasis with substance is evident in Aquinas and the *Summa*, indicating also that the terminology, Greek versus Latin, was still in a state of some flux. *ST* 1a.30.1.ad1: Ad primum ergo dicendum quod substantia non ponitur in definitione personae secundum quod significat essentiam, sed secundum quod significat suppositum: quod patet ex hoc quod additur individua. Ad significandum autem substantiam sic dictam, habent Graeci nomen hypostasis: unde sicut nos dicimus tres personas, ita ipsi dicunt tres hypostases. Nos autem non consuevimus dicere tres substantias, ne intelligerentur tres essentiae, propter nominis aequivocationem.

In so doing, they ultimately shifted the focus to the particular rather than the general as the ontological point of reference. It is not that substance is merely an abstraction — general and useful but not inherent. Rather, in this view, it is not proper to envision substance in any way apart from hypostasis / person. Thus Zizioulas says “the revolution is expressed historically through an identification: the identification of the “hypostasis” with the “person.”<sup>77</sup> This was a consequence of the need to formulate Trinitarian (and eventually Christological) dogma.<sup>78</sup> And so, a new concept of the person emerged as a result of the need to clarify the personal relationships of the Trinity (and later the Incarnate Person of the Son).

This radical movement in ontology from substance to person is reflected, as Zizioulas discusses, in the shift in language from that of the Council of Nicaea, AD 325, to the Council of Constantinople, AD 381. This is a very significant fact because it encapsulates in an historical and creedal form the transformation that was developing. Nicaea preferred to speak in terms of “one source extended into three.”<sup>79</sup> The Council of Constantinople, however, “took the bold step of altering the creed of Nicaea at the point where it referred to the Son as being ‘from the substance of the Father’ (*ek tes ousias tou patros*) and making it simply read ‘from the Father’ (*ek*

---

The definition of “person” includes “substance,” not as meaning the essence, but the “suppositum” which is made clear by the addition of the term “individual.” To signify the substance thus understood, the Greeks use the name “hypostasis.” So, as we say, “Three persons,” they say “Three hypostases.” We are not, however, accustomed to say Three substances, lest we be understood to mean three essences or natures, by reason of the equivocal signification of the term.

<sup>76</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 51, indicates that the subtle difference in emphasis of the two terms has been reversed from the original: “The two terms would thus appear to be more or less synonymous; *ousia* meaning an individual substance, while being capable at the same time of denoting the essence common to many individuals; *hypostasis*, on the other hand, meaning existence in general, but capable also of application to individual substances.”

<sup>77</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 36.

<sup>78</sup> Hans Urs von Balthasar, “On the Concept of Person,” *Communio* 13 (1986): 19: “Historically, the word [person] has vacillated between two very different realms: that of common sense (where the everyday understanding may be rendered more precise in moral theology, law, and philosophy) and that of Christian theology, in which the concept of person acquires a completely new sense first in trinitarian doctrine and then in christology.”

<sup>79</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 46.

*tou patros*)... it is the person of the Father and not divine substance that is the source and cause of the Trinity.”<sup>80</sup> Zizioulas concludes, perhaps sounding somewhat bold and surprising (and to some perhaps just plain wrong), that even “God owes His existence to the Father, that is to a person.”<sup>81</sup> The Father is the ontological source, the source of being. In Zizioulas’s view hypostasis must have ontological parity with if not precedence over substance since, in a sense, it conceptually contains it,<sup>82</sup> just as the Trinity of persons conveys One God. And in the Trinity itself the ontological source is the Person of the Father: “The one God is not the one substance but the Father, who is the ‘cause’ both of the generation of the Son and of the procession of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>83</sup> The term *Being* then must also be identified with person, the particular, and not just the general, i.e. nature or substance, giving:

| The Particular  | The General                                       |
|---|---|
| The Many<br>Diversity<br>Specific                                 | The One<br>Unity<br>Common                        |
| Person, πρόσωπον, <i>persona</i><br>ὑπόστασις / <i>hypostasis</i> | Substance and Nature<br>οὐσία, <i>substantia</i>  |
| Being, with the Father as source, origin,<br>cause                | Being: being <i>qua</i> being, essence, existence |

---

<sup>80</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 51-52. The complete Greek text of the creeds for the respective phrases, ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς and ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς is in Philip Schaff, ed., *The Creeds of Christendom*, Vol II (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996), 60 and 57, respectively.

<sup>81</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 18.

<sup>82</sup> This is opposite the classic sense described by Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 415-16: “For the Greeks ‘being’, or the ‘world’, precedes the ‘person’ ... To deny this would imply a denial of the ultimacy of ‘being qua being’ and give ontological priority to personhood.”

<sup>83</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 40-41. A note refers to the *filioque*, and its accommodation by the West “because it identified the being, the ontological principle, of God with His substance rather than with the person of the Father.”

This alignment of *Being* with the person is, according to Zizioulas, its proper place since person implies “freedom,” while nature, *ousia*, being *qua* being imply “ontological necessity.”<sup>84</sup>

For Zizioulas the ontological imperative is *person* more so than substance or even communion,<sup>85</sup> even though relation (σχέσις / *schesis*) is also important.<sup>86</sup> It is still proper to say, following Tertullian and the west, *unus substantia, tres personae*.<sup>87</sup> The intent of the east however would produce a subtle but significant shift from μία οὐσία, τρία πρόσωπα<sup>88</sup> to τρία πρόσωπα, μία οὐσία. (The use of πρόσωπον would be canonized at Chalcedon; see chapter 6.). Thus it must be concluded that substance, nature, and communion are valid, necessary, and useful ontological categories, but they must be understood always in relation to and based on the

---

<sup>84</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 44.

<sup>85</sup> But LaCugna, *God for Us*, 260, overstates Zizioulas’s position as “priority of person over being.” Rather, it is the case that person always conveys subsistence, that is, substantive being; there is simultaneity. Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 414, does say, however, that “Being ... owes its being to Personhood and becomes ultimately identical with it,” and, 416, he alludes to the Christian doctrine of creation *ex nihilo* giving “ontological priority to personhood.”

<sup>86</sup> E.g. Zizioulas, “Capadocian Contribution,” 50, quoting Gregory Nazianzus, *Or.* 29 (PG 36, 96): “The Father is a name neither of substance nor of energy but of *schesis*”; Zizioulas, “Communion and Otherness,” 358: “The Person is an identity that emerges through relationship (*schesis*, in the terminology of the Greek Fathers)”; an extensive discussion in Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 436-7; see also Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 86, quoting Zizioulas. Also, Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 17-18, explains:

But this communion is not a relationship understood for its own sake, an existential structure which supplants “nature” or “substance” in its primordial ontological role — something reminiscent of the structure of existence met in the thought of Martin Buber. Just like “substance,” “communion” does not exist by itself: it is the *Father* who is the “cause” of it. This thesis of the Cappadocians that introduced the concept of “cause” into the being of God assumed an incalculable importance. For it meant that the ultimate ontological category which makes something really *be*, is neither an impersonal and incommunicable “substance,” nor a structure of communion existing by itself or imposed by necessity, but rather the *person*.

<sup>87</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 37, quoting Tertullian, *Against Praxeas* 11-12 (PL 2, 1670D).

<sup>88</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 40.

concept of person.<sup>89</sup> Clearly if these other categories are absolutized they jeopardize the integrity and exclusiveness of the Three Persons;<sup>90</sup> but neither are they mere abstractions.<sup>91</sup> Nor does communion displace substance<sup>92</sup> or supercede person. Zizioulas describes a kind of synergism in that “the person cannot exist without communion; but every form of communion which denies or suppresses the person, is inadmissible.”<sup>93</sup>

In relation to the person, Zizioulas also mentions love, that is, in the biblical sense that, “God is Love.”<sup>94</sup> There is also the accepted view, most certainly at least of traditional Latin/Western theology and metaphysics, that God is Being.<sup>95</sup> From revelation, seemingly, God

---

<sup>89</sup> Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* (TAN Books and Publishers, Inc., 1974), 69, writing from the dogmatic perspective of the (Catholic) west summarizes: An hypostasis is an individual complete substance existing entirely in itself, an incommunicable substance (substantia singularis completa tota in se or substantia incommunicabilis). A Person is a hypostasis endowed with reason (hypostasis rationalis). The classical definition comes from that of Boethius (De duabus naturis 3): Persona est naturae rationalis individua (= incommunicabilis) substantia (a Person is the individual (incommunicable) substance of a rational nature). Hypostasis and nature are related to each other in such a manner that the hypostasis is the bearer of nature and the ultimate subject of all being and acting (principium quod), while the nature is that through which the hypostasis is and acts (principium quo).

<sup>90</sup> The Trinity then becomes the Quaternity.

<sup>91</sup> Indeed the Divine Liturgy sings, Τριάδα ὁμοούσιον καὶ ἀχώριστον (from *H ΘΕΙΑ ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΑ. The Divine Liturgy*. Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1985), “the Trinity **one in substance** and undivided [inseparable].” And, from the Praises (Vespers/Matins), Δόξα τῇ Ἁγίᾳ καὶ ὁμοουσιῳ καὶ ζωοποιῳ καὶ ἀδιαιρέτῳ Τριάδι in Father George L. Papadeas *ΜΕΓΑΛΗ ΕΒΔΟΜΑΣ ΠΑΣΧΑ. Holy Week - Easter* (South Daytona: Patmos Press, 1997), “Glory to the holy, **consubstantial**, life-creating and undivided Trinity.”

<sup>92</sup> A position that Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 17, ascribes to Martin Buber.

<sup>93</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 18.

<sup>94</sup> 1 Jn 4:8, 1 Jn 4:16: Ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 46. LaCugna, *God for Us*, 261, in discussing the position of Zizioulas says “love is constitutive of God’s being but as a predicate of person, not substance.”

<sup>95</sup> As in a paraphrase of the Baltimore Catechism: God is the Supreme Being infinitely perfect who made all things out of nothing and keeps them in existence.

first is revealed as Being, the  $\acute{\omicron}$   $\acute{\omega}\nu$ <sup>96</sup> of Exodus 3:14 (LXX) and only afterwards, intimately, as a person, as Father. However Exodus 3:14 must be read in conjunction with Exodus 3:15 and Exodus 6:2 giving “the Name,” something that is very personal.<sup>97</sup> Ultimately, the biblical path,<sup>98</sup> leads to Lk 11:1, “Lord, teach us to pray.” And Jesus said “Our Father...”<sup>99</sup> Is this merely the Son instructing creatures or the Son’s acknowledgment of the *Personal Source of Being*, who, as Zizioulas says, as love is free of necessity, free of causality, free of the cosmos — absolutely free and therefore absolute love:<sup>100</sup>

It thus becomes evident that the only exercise of freedom in an ontological manner is *love*. The expression ‘God is love’ (I John 4:16) signifies that God ‘subsists’ as Trinity, that is as person and not as substance. Love is not an emanation or ‘property’ of the substance of God ... but is *constitutive* of His substance, i.e. it is that which makes God what He is, the One God. Thus love ceases to be a qualifying — i.e. secondary — property of being and becomes the *supreme ontological predicate*. Love as God’s mode of existence ‘hypostasizes’ God, *constitutes* His being. Therefore, as a result of love, the ontology of God is not subject to the necessity of substance. Love is identified with ontological freedom.

---

<sup>96</sup> That is, the present active nominative masculine singular participle. Byzantine iconography, and the dismissal at vespers provide a liturgical hermeneutic. The blessing at Vespers is: “Ὁ ὦν εὐλογητός Χριστός ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, πάντοτε, νῦν, καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων (Blessed is the-One-who-is Christ our God, always, now and to the ages of the ages); icons of Christ have ὁ ὦν written in the nimbus surrounding His head. Traditionally this is understood to be based on Ex 3:14 ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὦν, and Jn 1:18 Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὦν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

<sup>97</sup> By “the name,” יהוה / *YHWH*, God is also known as *One*, Dt 6:4, יהוה אחד; and *Holy*, Lv 19:2, יהוה אלהיכם; and *Holy*, Lv 19:2, יהוה אלהינו. See also Ex 34:5 ff.

<sup>98</sup> And explicitly even in the Old Testament, e.g. Is 63:16 for You [are] our Father אֱבִינִי אֱתָהּ. Were Abraham not to know us, nor Israel to acknowledge us, You, LORD/Yahweh [are] our Father אֱבִינִי יהוה אֱתָהּ; our redeemer forever [is] Your Name. גְּאֻלֵּנוּ מִעוֹלָם שְׁמֶךָ. See also, Is 64:8, Tb 13:4. For a more extended discussion see Gerald O’Collins, S.J., *The Tripersonal God: Understanding and Interpreting the Trinity* (Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1999) 12-23.

<sup>99</sup> Mt 6:9; cf. Lk 11:2.

<sup>100</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 46. In a footnote Zizioulas cautions however that this love is not common to the three persons but is to be identified with the Father.

### One God, the Father — One God, the Trinity

Regarding the oneness (ένωσις, *henosis*) of God relative to the persons of the Trinity, Zizioulas says “the ‘one God’ is the Father and not the one substance.”<sup>101</sup> But he also says that the “three persons of the Trinity are thus one God.”<sup>102</sup> Because of this overlapping terminology it is necessary to distinguish, at least conceptually, as it appears Zizioulas does, between the one God, the Father, and one God, the Trinity. The interplay is expressed well in the beginning invocations of the litanies of the Latin church, where, in line with the primary emphasis on the persons, the prayer begins: *Pater de caelis, Deus, ... Fili Redemptor mundi, Deus, ... Spiritus Sancte, Deus*, then adds *Sancta Trinitas, unus Deus*. It must be stressed, however, that for Zizioulas and the east<sup>103</sup>

it is the person of the Father and not divine substance that is the source and cause of the Trinity... we must adopt an ontology which is based on personhood, i.e. on a unity or openness emerging from the relationships,<sup>104</sup> and not one substance... The philosophical scandal of the Trinity can be resolved or accepted only if substance gives way to personhood as the causing principle or *arche* in ontology.

Thus it is a person, the Father, who is αρχή (ή, *arche*, origin, beginning, first principle), πηγή (ή, *pege*, source, fount as in running water) and αίτία (ή, *aitia*, cause).<sup>105</sup> Furthermore, the Father

---

<sup>101</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 52; see also, Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 46 n 41.

<sup>102</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 48.

<sup>103</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 52. A. J. Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 290 ff, especially quoting T. F. Torrance, takes issue with having the Father as the *arche* and the introduction of causality into the Trinity.

<sup>104</sup> A similar emphasis is given from a Western perspective by Aquinas, *ST* 1a.28.1: I answer that, relations exist in God really; and, *ST* 1a.28.2, On the contrary, Everything which is not the divine essence is a creature. But relation really belongs to God; and if it is not the divine essence, it is a creature; and it cannot claim the adoration of latria; contrary to what is sung in the Preface: “Let us adore the distinction of the Persons, and the equality of their Majesty.”

<sup>105</sup> See Zizioulas’s response *One Single Source*, <http://users.otenet.gr/~marinarb/zizioulas.htm> to the clarification on the *filioque*,

is μοναρχία (ἡ, *monarchia*, sole origin or sole source) and, as LaCugna echoing Zizioulas, notes, “the insistence on the monarchy<sup>106</sup> of the Father in Greek theology keeps Personhood as the highest ontological principle.”<sup>107</sup> In the words of Zizioulas: <sup>108</sup>

This thesis of the Cappadocians that introduced the concept of “cause” into the being of God assumed an incalculable importance. For it meant that the ultimate ontological category which makes something really *be*, is neither an impersonal and incommunicable “substance,” nor a structure of communion existing by itself or imposed by necessity, but rather the *person*.

---

### EXCURSUS: Theological Language

---

<http://praiseofglory.alabanza.com/Stmaximus.htm/filioque.htm/>  
from the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity.

<sup>106</sup> See, LaCugna, *God for Us*, 388 ff.

<sup>107</sup> LaCugna, *God for Us*, 245. “Monarchy” used in this sense by the Cappadocians (and Zizioulas) does not imply any subordinationism regarding the Son or the Holy Spirit.

<sup>108</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 17-18. There is a subtlety that must be noted, extending the argument to include personhood relative to person. Correctly noting that cause as used here must be understood as “personal reality” and not in “the various Aristotelian or scholastic senses,” LaCugna, *God for Us*, 247, n10, characterizes patristic and contemporary Greek ontology as holding that “personhood precedes and is the cause of existence.” This attaches an incorrect precedence to the abstraction personhood over existence. Rather it is the case that existence coincides with the concrete entity person. Thus LaCugna continues with the correct but incompatible statement that “the principle, origin and cause of all existence is *one specific hypostasis*: the Unoriginate Origin, God the Father.” The essential point is that the “*one specific hypostasis*” is a person, a reality not a quality. Thus Aquinas, *ST* 1a.30.4.Res.: *Qualis autem sit communitas, investigantes diversimode locuti sunt. Quidam enim dixerunt quod est communitas negationis; propter hoc, quod in definitione personae ponitur incommunicabile. Quidam autem dixerunt quod est communitas intentionis, eo quod in definitione personae ponitur individuum, sicut si dicatur quod esse speciem est commune equo et bovi. Sed utrumque horum excluditur per hoc, quod hoc **nomen persona** non est nomen negationis neque intentionis, sed **est nomen rei**. “What is meant by such a community has been variously determined by those who have examined the subject. Some have called it a community of exclusion, forasmuch as the definition of “person” contains the word “incommunicable.” Others thought it to be a community of intention, as the definition of person contains the word “individual”; as we say that to be a “species” is common to horse and ox. Both of these explanations, however, are excluded by the fact that “**person**” is not a name of exclusion nor of intention, but **is the name of a reality**.” [emphasis added] Thus, there *are persons* from which *substance is inferred* not vice versa.*

Theological language is primarily the language of revelation, and Scripture is our primary written source of theology and spirituality. The vocabulary of theology, however, goes beyond biblical terms “using the non-biblical word ‘person’ ... to express more precisely what the biblical writers could leave more vague.”<sup>109</sup> And, in conjunction with Greek rationalism there is Hebrew realism:<sup>110</sup>

If the growth of revelation be neglected, the Bible appears as a bundle of contradictions... In the concrete ... revelation in the old Testament progressed by a series of statements, each of which stressed one particular aspect of the truth, regardless of other aspects ... No Israelite sage or prophet was ever deterred from speaking his mind by the fact that some predecessor had said exactly the opposite... It [the Semitic mind] instructs and convinces, not by syllogistic argument but by a series of emphatic statements, compelling the mind of the hearer to build up a mental image... The Semite can, and often does, quite happily affirm something, *without* intending to deny the opposite.

This building up of images may give the impression that theological discourse of this kind is one great mixed metaphor. But paradox<sup>111</sup> serves a purpose: it offers a certain beautiful ambiguity, providing the opportunity to savor the apophatic moment. The objective is not to “solve” the paradox but to have the correct tools and the right approach to enable reception, to let it speak.

Torrance, in *Persons in Communion*, devotes a chapter<sup>112</sup> to a discussion of the subtle topic of theological language. He notes that “Christian theologians find themselves committed

---

<sup>109</sup> From the commentary in St Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, Blackfriars Edition in Latin and English, V. 6, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), 145. Here Aquinas, *In De div. Nom. I, lect. I*, is also quoted: “What can be derived from the content of the Scripture even without being explicitly contained in it, is not alien to that revealed teaching.”

<sup>110</sup> Roderick A. F. Mac Kenzie, “The Concept of a Biblical Theology” in C. Luke Salm, F.S.C., ed., *Studies in Salvation History*, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), 39-40.

<sup>111</sup> On paradox, see McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 10, quoting de Lubac. Also see the very interesting discussion by Henri de Lubac, S.J., *The Mystery of the Supernatural* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 217 ff.

<sup>112</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, chapter 3; 120 -212.

to axioms which appear to contradict each other.”<sup>113</sup> The solution for attempting to discuss the “Being of God” without distortions of anthropomorphism, and for reconciling the equivocal and the univocal forms of expression, is the use of analogical language. Torrance bases his discussion on the approach of Aquinas in relation to Barth and in particular as interpreted by Mondin.<sup>114</sup> The question is tied up with *Vestigia Trinitatis*<sup>115</sup> and how the infinite God communicates Himself to His finite creatures, especially by using one particular creature, the creature *language*.

As the treatment by Torrance shows, the analysis of this topic can be quite involved. Without over-simplifying this complex subject, the perspective of Aquinas can be useful in distinguishing the scope of the topic. Aquinas discusses this in *ST* 1a.13 *de nominibus Dei* (commonly rendered in translation “theological language”). Ultimately, God has spoken to us *proprie*,<sup>116</sup> and *substantialiter*, giving us the *nomen / nomina*, that is, that language — specific words — which are substantively proper and particular, that is, by name.

Since person is a category of the particular, *proprius* distinguishes the unique person. Thus we speak of the name as that which embraces the identity of the person, especially here Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In this view, theology establishes the vocabulary<sup>117</sup> that comes from God (revealing Himself) to Mankind, and not vice versa, the projection of human concepts back to God. This is a complex issue, but the point here is that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are

---

<sup>113</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 127.

<sup>114</sup> Battista Mondin, *The Principle of Analogy in Protestant and Catholic Theology* (The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1963).

<sup>115</sup> Also *Vestigia Dei*; Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 125; 194-212; 246.

<sup>116</sup> *proprius*, a, um, adj. [etym. dub.; perhaps from root *prae*; cf. *prope*], not common with others, one’s own, special, particular, proper (class.; cf.: *peculiaris*, *privatus*).

<sup>117</sup> Also, Geoffrey Wainwright, *Worship With One Accord* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 245, in reference to G. Florovsky, writes: “The Word incarnate can *define* language. In this context, “Father” and “Son” *mean* who the first two persons of the Trinity are and what the relation between them *is*. It is the divine ontology that sets the meaning of the terms.”

the terms / language of revelation, the names of persons, and that they properly speak of God. The name signifies the person. Regarding *person*, Aquinas concludes:<sup>118</sup>

I answer that, “Person” signifies what is most perfect in all nature — that is, a subsistent individual of a rational nature. Hence, since everything that is perfect must be attributed to God, forasmuch as His essence contains every perfection, this name “person” is fittingly applied to God.

---

\* \* \*

Given the perspective just discussed, a true awareness of the Trinity involves an understanding of the term person since (reiterating) the “ultimate ontological category” is the “person”<sup>119</sup> for even “God owes his existence to the Father, that is to a person.”<sup>120</sup> And *person* is the link between Trinity and Man/creation, between *theo-logia* and *anthropo-logia*. Before further discussing this very important and key concept of *person*, however, it is necessary first to consider a related concept, the term *catholic*. Lossky sums up the soteriological and epistemological ramifications of the mystery of the Trinity, and points the way to a consideration of this term:<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup> *ST* 1a .29.3: Respondeo dicendum quod persona significat id quod est perfectissimum in tota natura, scilicet subsistens in rationali natura. Unde, cum omne illud quod est perfectionis, Deo sit attribuendum, eo quod eius essentia continet in se omnem perfectionem: conveniens est ut hoc nomen persona de Deo dicatur.

<sup>119</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 17.

<sup>120</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 18.

<sup>121</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 66.

The dogma of the Trinity is a cross for human ways of thought. The apophatic ascent is a mounting of calvary. This is the reason why no philosophical speculation has ever succeeded in rising to the mystery of the Holy Trinity. This is the reason why the human spirit was able to receive the full revelation of the Godhead only after Christ on the cross had triumphed over death and over the abyss of hell. This, finally, is the reason why the revelation of the Trinity shines out in the Church as a purely religious gift, as the **catholic truth** above all other. [emphasis added]

## Chapter 3

# Catholic

καθολικὴ

Catholic<sup>122</sup> is a word found in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan<sup>123</sup> Creed<sup>124</sup> as what has come to be called a mark<sup>125</sup> of the church; it is thus an important historical<sup>126</sup> and dogmatic term for Christianity. But it also has a broader conceptual and ontological sense; and it is necessary to consider this sense before treating person. Catholic denotes the whole formed in such a way that it is not simply the sum of parts. Also, in some sense and to some degree, the term catholic denotes that the particular, that is the person or hypostasis, is not merely a part of the whole but

---

<sup>122</sup> Used as a noun, from καθόλου / *katholou* from καθ' ὅλον / *kath' holon*, “as a whole”; see Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 184. As opposite of κατὰ μέρος / *kata meros*, as a portion, see: Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 186; Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 417; Meyendorff, “Orthodox Concept of the Church,” 61.

<sup>123</sup> Some, e.g., David N. Bell, *A Cloud of Witnesses: An Introductory History of the Development of Christian Doctrine* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1989), 123, maintains that the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed does not have a strong historical, direct, link to the first Council of Constantinople; rather it is the creed which Chalcedon ascribed to the Council of Constantinople. It is traceable to another creed, the Creed of Jerusalem, which was itself influenced by the original Nicaean Creed. See: Henri de Lubac, *The Splendor of the Church* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986), 29; H. R. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950), 62; also 82 n8 notes that this creed is ascribed for the first time to the council of Constantinople by Chalcedon.

<sup>124</sup> Πιστεύω ... εἰς μίαν, ἁγίαν, καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν Ἐκκλησίαν.

<sup>125</sup> In this accounting the four marks are one, holy, catholic, and apostolic; see the previous note. Catholic is not to be confused with oneness; see Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 176 (No endorsement of Lossky’s critique of Congar is implied, nor of Congar’s viewpoint.)

<sup>126</sup> See de Lubac, *Catholicism*, 48 n2.

that the person / hypostasis embodies within itself — within the self — some aspect of the totality of the whole: that which is catholic exhibits an integral completeness. There are two practical terms, which will be considered, that are related to catholic: universal and corporate. These will be discussed in order to show how *catholic*, as proposed here, includes the sense of universal and corporate but goes beyond it, thereby providing a proper balance that expresses communion in a way that does not obscure the uniqueness of the person.

### **Lossky on *catholic***

Two essays by Vladimir Lossky, in particular, develop and discuss the meaning of this important term, catholic. Lossky discusses the term catholic in relation to the Church in an essay entitled “Concerning the Third Mark of the Church: Catholicity.”<sup>127</sup> In another essay entitled “Catholic Consciousness: Anthropological Implications of the Dogma of the Church,”<sup>128</sup> he discusses the sense in which considerations of the church as catholic can be applied to anthropology and consciousness. Because of its occurrence in the creed, the term catholic is usually first associated with the Church and ecclesiology and, actually, the subject of both Lossky’s essays is the church. In terms of this discussion, however, it is important to understand how the meaning of catholic applies also to Mankind, and therefore to persons within the realm of anthropology itself. Catholic is an important concept that must be taken in a more basic and ontological sense. This general or basic ontological sense of the term catholic will be extracted from Lossky’s essays dealing with Church and anthropology, and from the writings of Zizioulas.

Lossky points out that in its primary sense catholic does not mean universal. The term *ecumenical* has more this sense. The terms catholic and universal, though externally equivalent, are not perfectly synonymous. The term universal is abstract compared to the term catholic which is concrete. Furthermore, catholic conveys wholeness, thus to say *fully* catholic is redundant — and worse, is “*partially* catholic.”<sup>129</sup> Lossky contrasts “catholicity in fact

---

<sup>127</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness of God*, 169-181.

<sup>128</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness of God*, 183-194.

<sup>129</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 268.

(Christian universality) and virtual catholicity (Christian universalism),”<sup>130</sup> the latter being the broad appeal of the Christian message, the former alluding to the actual spread of the Christian faith throughout the world. These concepts are more properly designated by οἰκουμηνικός (*oikoumenikos*, adj.) as a term related to “the Empire,” from οἰκουμένη the inhabited world, the *orbis terrarum* — the one great household (οἶκος / *oikos*) or as it could be termed today, the global village. Catholic includes this idea of the universal but goes beyond it and is its perfection. To some extent this is conveyed by Avery Dulles quoting Congar’s explanation of a subtle difference between catholic and ecumenical:<sup>131</sup>

Catholic and ecumenical. Many see the two terms as mutually complementary opposites. Yves Congar, for instance, holds that ‘Catholicity is the taking of the many into an already existing oneness’, whereas ecumenism is the introduction of unity into an existing diversity.

### **Zizioulas and Others**

Catholic also includes the idea of that which is “corporate” and what is termed the “corporate person” or “corporate personality,” the latter especially linked to a biblical (especially in reference to studies of corporate personality in the old Testament) notion of personhood.<sup>132</sup> Zizioulas notes that<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 174.

<sup>131</sup> Avery Dulles, *The Catholicity of the Church*, 172, quoting Yves Congar, *Divided Christendom* (London: G. Bles, 1939), 101.

<sup>132</sup> See e.g. Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 182 n38. For a critique of the concept of corporate personality in the Old Testament see “The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality: A Re-examination,” in Bernard Lang, ed., *Anthropological Approaches to the Old Testament*, Issues in Religion and Theology 8 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 43-59; also, Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 144 n 68.

<sup>133</sup> John Zizioulas, “On Being a Person: Towards an Ontology of Personhood,” in Christoph Schwöbel and Colen E. Gunton, eds., *Persons, Divine And Human, King’s College Essays in Theological Anthropology* (For the Research Institute in Systematic Theology. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999) 39 and n 11; also 37 and 40, passim; Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 146 n 7.

the British biblical scholar H. Wheeler Robinson coined the phrase, as *corporate personality*. According to it, Semitic thought could move naturally from the ‘one’ to the ‘many’ and *vice versa*, by including in a particular being a unity of many, and by referring to a group of beings as one particular being. The examples from the Old Testament (as well as from the New) are numerous. It is noteworthy that they all refer to *human* beings — not to things or animals. In this sense ontology operates with the view that the fixed point of reference, the ground of being that offers security and truth, is a particular person and not a general idea or nature.

Zizioulas speaks of the “catholic person”<sup>134</sup> but he most often speaks of “corporate personality.”<sup>135</sup> This general term, corporate, is frequently used by Zizioulas and some of his interpreters,<sup>136</sup> and they apply it to both *person* and *church*. Although this term is often employed, especially by Zizioulas, as interchangeable with catholic, it is better to avoid the associations with the sense of corporate that suggests a secular understanding of the corporation, and use, exclusively, the more theologically specific and rich term *catholic* in its own right. Corporate personality is a good reference point relative to the biblical concept involved, but it is necessary here to go beyond that and concentrate on the concept of *catholic* and in particular *catholic person*, as the basis for corporate personality or even catholic personality or personhood. This is warranted in order to solidify the basis of the term *catholic* as an essential and ontological concept, and not as a theoretical, or academic, or legal, or institutional, or societal, or cultural, or geographic, or temporal, or simply descriptive or utilitarian construction. Rather, since catholic means *as the whole*, it is best understood in relation to the Trinity. Catholic, ultimately, describes the communion of persons in the Trinity: the Trinity is the catholic entity; the Trinity

---

<sup>134</sup> Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 58; also, Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 408, “‘catholic man’.”

<sup>135</sup> Also Volf, *After Our Likeness*: 3, 105, “catholic personality”; 4, 105, 111, and 113, 117 122 (bishop), 212, 279, 280, “catholic person(s)”; 86, “catholic personhood.” And LaCugna, *God For Us*, 290, 294, 406.

<sup>136</sup> Especially McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, chapter 8, 166-86, “The One and the Many,” comprising “Corporate Personality in the Old Testament,” “Corporate Personality in the New Testament Eucharist,” and “Corporate Personality for a Scriptural Synthesis.”

describes best what it means to be catholic. The Trinity, as the catholic entity, is the first sense, the ontological sense and meaning of catholic. Lossky writes:<sup>137</sup>

There can be no unity of nature without diversity of persons, and no persons fully realized outside natural unity. Catholicity consists in the perfect harmony of these two terms: unity and diversity, nature and persons.... Here we touch the very source of catholicity, the mysterious identity of the whole and of the parts, the distinction between nature and persons, absolute identity which is at the same time absolute diversity—the initial mystery of the Christian revelation, the dogma of the Holy Trinity. If catholicity is ... a quality of Christian Truth, it is possible now to define this quality. It is concrete, in that it is the very content of Christian Truth, which is the revelation of the Holy Trinity. This is the catholic dogma par excellence... In the light of the dogma of the Trinity, catholicity appears as the mysterious identity of the one and the many—unity which is diversified and diversity which remains one.

For Zizioulas, also, catholic expresses the sense of the “‘one’ who is at the same time ‘many’.”<sup>138</sup> Catholic conveys “diversity in unity,” and not “in division.”<sup>139</sup> To further refine and sharpen the subtlety of this distinction, Zizioulas discusses two terms, διαφορά / *diaphora* and διαίρεσις / *diairesis*: “Διαφορὰ (difference) must be maintained, for it is good. Διαίρεσις (division) is a perversion of διαφορά, and is bad.”<sup>140</sup> What is catholic is “integral and undivided.”<sup>141</sup> Although he does not say so explicitly, it seems warranted to conclude that for Zizioulas the concept of catholic expresses the condition resulting from “a movement towards communion”<sup>142</sup> — catholic is the dynamic of communion. He identifies such a movement towards communion with the term ἔκστασις / *ekstasis*.<sup>143</sup> Also, that which is catholic manifests

---

<sup>137</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 178-9.

<sup>138</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 438.

<sup>139</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 426.

<sup>140</sup> Zizioulas, “Communion and Otherness,” 351.

<sup>141</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 408.

<sup>142</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 408.

<sup>143</sup> Movement outward; differentiation. See the discussion of Zizioulas’s thought on this point by Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 284.

itself as “the bearer of its nature in its totality,” and this he identifies with hypostasis.<sup>144</sup> Volf gives a similar interpretation.<sup>145</sup>

At the same time, the individuality isolating human beings from each other has given way to catholic personhood, since in Christ, in communion with the many (ecstatic dimension), the human being has become the bearer of the catholicity of human nature (hypostatic dimension).

Zizioulas asks, “Communion and otherness: how can these words be reconciled?”<sup>146</sup> He does not provide a specific answer, but it appears that the answer is found in the meaning of *catholic* as proposed here.

### **Lerins’ Dictum**

The ontological sense of *catholic* is of utmost importance in forging a link between church and person. It has also been emphasized that *catholic* is a concrete term with practical ramifications. For instance, *catholic* is often associated with fundamental and essential expressions of faith and doctrine: δόγμα / *dogma*.<sup>147</sup> This is a proper extension or specific application of the concept *catholic*. “For Catholicity is not the abstract universalism of a doctrine...but a living Tradition always preserved everywhere and by all — *quod semper, quod*

---

<sup>144</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 408. Also Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 52 and n47, on ekstasis, along with hypostasis as the mode of expression of the person; 60.

<sup>145</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 86.

<sup>146</sup> Zizioulas, “Communion and Otherness,” 348.

<sup>147</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 145 makes a distinction between *dogma* and *kerugma*: ‘the secret tradition (δόγμα) can be declared publicly and thus become “preaching” (κήρυγμα).’

*ubique, quod ab omnibus,*” according to Lossky.<sup>148</sup> He gives an example in reference to the church explicitly, but also by extension in general.<sup>149</sup>

The catholicity of the Church, far from being the privilege of any one see or specific centre, is realized rather in the richness and multiplicity of the local traditions which bear witness unanimously to a single Truth: to that which is preserved always, everywhere and by all. Since the Church is catholic in all her parts, each one of her members—not only the clergy but also each layman—is called to confess and to defend the truth of tradition; opposing even the bishops should they fall into heresy. A Christian who has received the gift of the Holy Spirit in the sacrament of the Holy Chrism must have a full awareness of his faith: he is always responsible for the Church.

This phrase mentioned by Lossky, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, “always, everywhere and by all,” is the well-known dictum<sup>150</sup> of St. Vincent of Lerins as found in his *Commonitorium*.<sup>151</sup> It states in part though in fuller context:<sup>152</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 176. The implications of “Tradition” as παράδοσις in relation to the Eucharist (and of 2 Thes 2:15 So then, brethren, stand firm and hold fast to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by our letter. Ἄρα οὖν, ἀδελφοί, στήκετε καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις ἃς ἐδιδάχθητε εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι’ ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν. And NAB 1 Cor 11:2 I praise you because you remember me in everything and hold fast to the traditions, just as I handed them on to you. 1 Cor 11:2 Ἐπαινώ δὲ ὑμᾶς ὅτι πάντα μου μέμνησθε καί, καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε.) will be discussed later.

<sup>149</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 16.

<sup>150</sup> “The Commonitory of Vincent of Lérins, for the Antiquity and Universality of the Catholic Faith Against the Profane Novelties of All Heresies,” Translated by The Rev. C. A. Heurtley, D.D., From: *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Second Series, Volume 11, New York, 1894. CHAPTER II. <http://ccel.wheaton.edu/fathers/NPNF2-11/vincentl/commonit.html#2>

<sup>151</sup> Original in Migne, *PL* 50:637-86, *Commonitorium Primum* and *Secundum Commonitorium*.

<sup>152</sup> CHAPTER II: A General Rule for distinguishing the Truth of the Catholic Faith from the Falsehood of Heretical Pravity. *PL* 50:640: ut propheticae et apostolicae interpretationis linea secundum Ecclesiastici et Catholici sensus normam dirigatur. In ipsa item Catholica Ecclesia magnopere curandum est ut id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est etenim vere proprieque catholicum, quod ipsa vis nominis ratioque declarat, quae omnia fere universaliter comprehendit. Sed hoc ita demum fiet, si sequamur universitatem, antiquitatem, consensionem.

[5.] ...that the rule for the right understanding of the prophets and apostles should be framed in accordance with the standard of Ecclesiastical and Catholic interpretation.[6.] Moreover, in the Catholic Church itself, all possible care must be taken, that **we hold that faith which has been believed everywhere, always, by all.** For that is truly and in the strictest sense “Catholic,” which, as the name itself and the reason of the thing declare, comprehends all universally. This rule we shall observe if we follow universality, antiquity, consent.[emphasis added]

But this does not mean a stagnation of faith or theological inquiry; later Lerins writes:<sup>153</sup>

[54] ...The intelligence, then, the knowledge, the wisdom, as well of individuals [*singulorum*] as of all, as well of one man as of the whole Church, ought, in the course of ages and centuries, to increase and make much and vigorous progress; but yet only in its own kind; that is to say, **in the same doctrine, in the same sense, and in the same meaning.**

Lerins’ dictum has a knack for being treated with disdain and deference, sometimes by the same person. Lossky seemingly approves in the instances just mentioned.<sup>154</sup> But he and others are also critical.<sup>155</sup> Those who criticize Lerins’ dictum too often misunderstand and

---

<sup>153</sup> CHAPTER XXIII: On Development in Religious Knowledge. *PL* 50:668: *Crescat igitur oportet et multum vehementerque proficiat tam singulorum quam omnium, tam unius hominis quam totius Ecclesiae, aetatum ac seculorum gradibus, intelligentia, scientia, sapientia, sed in suo duntaxa genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu, eademque sententia.* See references in Eugene Kevane, *Creed and Catechetics* (Westminster: Christian Classics, 1978), 288 n20, regarding “that is, with the same of dogma, the same meaning, the same sense.”

<sup>154</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 176. See also Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 236 n 87; John Behr, “Scripture, the Gospel, and Orthodoxy,” *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 43 (1999): 247-8, “We must take seriously the famous saying of Vincent of Lérins ...” And in general, though Lerins is not explicitly invoked, cf John H. Erikson, “The Formation of Orthodox Ecclesial Identity,” *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 42 (1998): 302.

<sup>155</sup> A typically misapplication and misunderstanding is exhibited by Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God*, 158-9:

Let us note that the formal criterion of traditions which was expressed by St. Vincent of Lerins — *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* — can only be applied in full to those apostolic traditions which were orally transmitted during two or three centuries. The New Testament Scriptures already escape from this rule, for they were neither “always,” nor “everywhere,” nor “received by all,” before the definitive establishment of the scriptural canon. Whatever may be said by those who forget the primary significance of Tradition, wishing to substitute for it a “rule of faith,” the formula of St. Vincent is even less applicable to the

misapply it: they read into it what is not there and neglect its true content. What is not there is a *definition* of the faith and the church — an external criterion or ideal — especially in the sense of intellectually circumscribing the subject: there is no catholic measuring rod as such for that which is full, is full regardless of any imposed “dimensions.” There is a sense that demands a “strict universality”<sup>156</sup> but not one that requires that the faith be homogenized and static, just that there be unanimity and consistency. Lerins dictum provides a *description* of what must be the already existing faith of the church — it is a reflective statement — which can be used to *discern* the subject and thus give pragmatic expression to what it means to be *a church*, and thus *a catholic church*, in practice. Lerins’ dictum, therefore, must describe the faith and the church of Pentecost,<sup>157</sup> which was not geographically located everywhere but only in Jerusalem, as well as the Church and the faith of today, which is spread far and wide, and also the faith and Church of that time when all is fulfilled and perfected, and all come to know that “the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory ... has put all things under his feet and has made him the head over all things for the church, which is his body, the fulness of him who fills all in all.”<sup>158</sup> Lerins is describing what is *catholic* — this new concept as a Christian application and understanding of a classical term — and thereby what is meant by the attribute *catholic*: the fulness and wholeness, ἡ καθολική, of the faith available for all Christians, past, present and future. The dictum attests a nontrivial tautology: The faith that is *catholic* is held as the truth that cannot change, and therefore, is held *always*, even when and though it may not have been explicitly articulated; it is held *everywhere* it is lived, by *all* who so believe. In this view, the Church is not just an institution for the dissemination of a belief; and the faith is not just doctrinal or theological knowledge in the sense of the Greek γνῶσις / *gnōsis*, but knowledge as the Semitic דַּעַת / *da’at*, knowledge as experience,<sup>159</sup> an existential awareness.<sup>160</sup> It is precisely in this

---

dogmatic definitions of the Church.

Lerins’ dictum is also misunderstood, misrepresented and, consequently, denounced in John Anthony McGuckin, “Eschaton and Kerygma: The Future of the Past in the Present Kairos,” *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 42 (1998): 248-49.

<sup>156</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 265; see below.

<sup>157</sup> de Lubac, *Catholicism*, 49.

<sup>158</sup> πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν, Eph 1:23. Also, 1 Cor 15:28.

<sup>159</sup> Not to be confused with anything as described by George A. Lindbeck, *The Nature*

existential manner that Lerins' dictum properly denotes the sense of that which is catholic as proposed here. Though the dictum applies *catholic* somewhat explicitly to the sense of belief, and the emphasis proposed here is to a sense of practice, the two are not at odds — γνῶσις / *gnōsis*, and דַּעַת / *da'at*, — for holding the faith as that which is within us,<sup>161</sup> integral to ourselves, implies the intellectual assent of believing, and thus unites and includes both concepts. An example is provided by a simple response attributed to St. Maximus: “I have no doctrine of my own, but the common doctrine of the Catholic Church.”<sup>162</sup> Lerins dictum gives us the standard for discerning genuine faith — and doctrine — in its catholic dimension as πρᾶξις /

---

*of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age* (Philadelphia: the Westminster Press, 1984), 16 as ‘the “experiential-expressive” dimension of religion’ which “interprets doctrines as noninformative and nondiscursive symbols of inner feelings, attitudes, or existential orientations”; cf William C. Placher, *Unapologetic Theology: A Christian Voice in a Pluralistic Conversation* (Louisville: Westminster / John Knox Press, 1989), 20-21. Rather, the approach of the thesis may be characterized as παράδοσις / *paradosis* (tradition, handing-on; see below) enabling θεωρία / *theoria* (contemplation).

<sup>160</sup> As an example, consider the *knowledge* gained by Adam and Eve in partaking of the tree of the *knowledge* of good and evil [Gn 2:9,17: וַיֵּץ הַדְּעַת טוֹב וְרָע; LXX: τὸ ξύλον τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ. Note it is τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστὸν — literally, *of the to experience known*, rather than τοῦ γνῶναι or τῆς γνώσεως — literally, *of the to know* or *of the knowledge*], and the consequent *experience* of evil by the person, which is sin. Thus the Oktoechos, tone 6, Tuesday: Christ “putting an end to the fall that had hurled down Adam, the one who had been ravished by *knowledge*.” [italics added] As finite and limited, the creature, in knowing evil, experiences evil and, consequently, is affected by evil, i.e., it sins; only God can know / experience evil and not sin.

<sup>161</sup> In AD 325, shortly before the Council of Nicea, another council held at Antioch examined the theology of the presbyter Arius and, in a letter written to bishop Alexander of Thessalonica, condemned Arius' views for compromising “the whole mystery of the faith that is in us.” J. Stevenson, ed., *The New Eusebius: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church to AD 337* (SPCK: London, 1993), 334 . This 4th century sentiment invites us to examine an organic, existential faith, not just a system of intellectual beliefs and doctrines.

<sup>162</sup> S. Herbert Scott, *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy* (Rochester: The Stanhope Press, Ltd., 1928), 276, quoting (presumably since the referencing here is not detailed) from Hefele, v, 128. For the point here, read *catholic* Church for “Catholic Church.” Also see Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 192.

*praxis*<sup>163</sup> and *πρᾶγμα* / *pragma*<sup>164</sup>, i.e., as a concrete application and in practice, the meaning of *catholic* manifested in space, time, and identity, and conveying stability and pervasiveness. Volf makes a similar point although he seems to consider it a restriction that detracts from its usefulness. Referring to Lerins, Volf says:<sup>165</sup>

According to a historically influential formula of Vincent of Lérins, catholic is *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est* (“what has been believed everywhere, always, by all”). Here the “idea of universality is coupled with that of continuity. . . catholicity refers to identity maintained through the ages.” Yet the words *ubique, semper, and omnes* would have to be conceived with strict universality if they were to specify adequately that which is to be believed. Otherwise the question remains open regarding just who, for example, belongs to “all” and thus also just what the nature of faith is that embodies the identity of the church through the ages. This is why Martin Chemnitz augmented the formula of Vincent of Lérins by adding *ex Scriptura: quod semper, quod ubique et ab omnibus fidelibus ex Scriptura constanter receptum fuit* (“what has always, everywhere, and by all the faithful been constantly received from Scripture”). If this reference to *Scriptura* is taken seriously, however, then the reference to “always, everywhere, and by all” threatens to become superfluous. Scripture attests which faith is to be believed always, everywhere, and by all. Catholicity defined with *ubique, semper, and omnes* can in this case have merely an (admittedly important) auxiliary hermeneutical function.

Not superfluous but explicit and emphatic and, most important for later considerations, a concrete example of the kind of “identity maintained through the ages,” especially as will be discussed later (chapter 7), an identity that is **constitutive**, and therefore, necessary and essential. It is in this sense a hermeneutic as Volf puts it. Lerins says it is the “rule for the right understanding of the prophets and apostles,”<sup>166</sup> thus an adherence to Scripture is presumed. A most important word for proper understanding is omitted by Volf, *teneamus*, “we hold.”<sup>167</sup> Here

---

<sup>163</sup> LSJ: The action or act or practice.

<sup>164</sup> LSJ: The thing; concrete reality, deed, and act.

<sup>165</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 265.

<sup>166</sup> Lerins [5].

<sup>167</sup> Consider that the church of the apostles did not have a dogmatic formulation of *ὁμοούσιος* / *homoousios* or the two natures in one person of Christ, but it “held” these just the same because they are true: the church of the generations that followed formulated dogma for

again it is not just a faith that we know, one that is conceptualized only in an intellectual sense, but the faith that is within us, a living faith integral to the person, an existential faith that expresses how the person exists as a Christian. This ontological belief and knowledge, in the sense that to understand and to know also means to experience, gives expression to itself in what is identified with faith.<sup>168</sup> Lossky explains this aspect of *catholic* in relation to the church but, in doing so, alludes to tradition, and thus to holding what is handed on, and in effect paraphrases Lerins:<sup>169</sup>

When, as often happens in the treatment of catholicity, the emphasis is placed on unity, when catholicity is above all other considerations based upon the dogma of the Body of Christ, the result is Christocentrism in ecclesiology. The catholicity of the Church becomes a function of her unity, becomes a universal doctrine that absorbs in imposing itself, instead of being **a tradition evident to everyone, affirmed by all, at all times and in all places, in an infinite richness of living witness**. On the other hand, when the emphasis is placed on diversity at the expense of unity, there is a tendency to base catholicity exclusively on Pentecost, forgetting that the Holy Spirit was communicated in the unity of the Body of Christ. The result is the disaggregation of the Church: the truth that is attributed to individual inspirations becomes multiple and therefore relative; catholicity is replaced by “ecumenism.” [emphasis added]

---

the church of the apostolic, and all other, ages.

<sup>168</sup> Along this line, A. Verheul, *Introduction to the Liturgy: Towards a Theology of Worship* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1968), 98:

That is why we can *experience* what the reality of the Church is in the ideal form of the liturgical celebration. That reality is not merely a truth in which we “believe” in the scholastic sense of the word, but a reality of revelation that we “experience”, that we believe in the biblical sense, which means that we enter into it with the surrender of our whole person, at once loving and hoping. Assumed into the liturgy-celebrating community, we can look upon the authentic face of the Church.

<sup>169</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 179. Tradition here should be read as that which is handed on as integral to the faith. Lossky’s treatment of Christology and Pneumatology as the chief aspects of unity and diversity, respectively, as given here and elsewhere in his writings, is criticized by Zizioulas as unwarranted; see references and comparison in McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 222-26.

Likewise, Lossky writes of the catholic aspect of the church, but with anthropological ramifications:<sup>170</sup>

The Church is not a federation of parts: she is catholic in each one of her parts, since each part in her is identified with the whole, expresses the whole, has the value which the whole has, does not exist outside the whole. For this reason catholicity finds various expressions in the history of the Church. Local synods as well as councils called ecumenical are able to preface their acts with the formula used since the first council of all, the council of the apostles: “It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us.” So St. Basil, at a particularly grave juncture in the fight over dogma, was able to cry with catholic daring: “Whosoever is not with me is not with the Truth.”

Catholicity knows no “private opinion,” no local or individual truth. A catholic is one who surpasses the individual, who finds himself freed of his own nature, who mysteriously identifies himself with the whole and constitutes himself a witness of the Truth in the name of the Church.

This discussion of Lerins’ dictum is presented here in order to aid in discerning what may be termed the *catholic experience* or the *catholic expression* of the church and, consequently, of those persons who form the church. Later in the thesis the dictum of Lerins, understood in this sense of the experience that *teneamus ... quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, will be invoked and applied in the discussion of the Eucharist as the point of convergence for Zizioulas, and many others, in treating the church. How do Christians, humanity, the church, i.e. persons, continually experience in their lives the *catholic* moment as described by Lerins? What is the *catholic* event, which can be different depending on time and place, yet is never changing and has never changed: *pulchritudo tam antiqua et tam nova*,<sup>171</sup> beauty so ancient and yet so new?

\* \* \*

---

<sup>170</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 180. The scriptural reference is to Acts 15:28: ἔδοξε γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν.

<sup>171</sup> Augustine, *Confessions*, Book 10 Ch 27.

In summary, and reflecting the thrust of the previous discussion on the Trinity, Lossky concludes:<sup>172</sup>

Catholicity has nothing to do with “common opinion.” There is no other criterion of truth than the truth itself. And this truth is the revelation of the Holy Trinity... an ineffable identity of unity and diversity, in the image of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, consubstantial and indivisible.

---

<sup>172</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 181.

Catholic here “means” the Trinity<sup>173</sup> — Trinitarian.<sup>174</sup> Thus, understood in relation to the Trinity — as an attribute of the Trinity — the term *catholic* expresses the dynamic of communion.

---

<sup>173</sup> Vanderwilt, *A Church Without Borders*, 101, interpreting LaCugna, *God for Us*, 247, in an economic approach to explaining *catholic*, reverses this fundamental meaning while properly distinguishing catholic and universal:

Catholicity is the result of the *perichoresis* of God with humankind in the communion of the Church. Too often, well-meaning and intelligent men and women confuse “catholicity” with “universality.” The universal character of the Church is not the same as its catholicity. The word “catholic” comes from the Greek, “*katholou*” and means, roughly, “according to the whole.” The word “universal,” suggests that the Church exists “everywhere and for all times.”

Instead, to be “catholic” means to exist in relation to the whole.

Rather, as Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 211, says — and this will be viewed as an important consideration in section 6 — “Human beings can be in the triune God only insofar as the Son is in them (Jn 17:23; 14:20).” Note also that other topics in this section, e.g. Lerins’ dictum and universality, arise quite naturally in Vanderwilt’s (basically incorrect) assessment.

<sup>174</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 209, gives a supporting interpretation which illustrates his understanding of the link between *catholic* and the Trinity, though indirectly through the divine person:

From the interiority of the divine persons, there emerges what I would like to call their *catholicity*. “The Father is in me and I am in him” (John 10:38) implies that “whoever has seen me has seen the Father” (John 14:9-10). The one divine person is not only itself, but rather carries within itself also the other divine persons, and only in this indwelling of the other persons within it is it the person it really is. The Son is Son only insofar as the Father and the Spirit indwell him; without this interiority of the Father and the Spirit, there would be no Son. The same applies to the Father and to the Spirit. In a certain sense, each divine person *is* the other persons, though is such in its own way, which is why rather than ceasing to be a unique person, in its very uniqueness it is a “completely *catholic* divine person. Of course, the catholicity of the divine persons is also open for creation and its history, and consists not only in this mutual interiority, but also in all creation “being in God.” Only thus can God — and each of the three divine persons — “be all in all” (1 Cor. 15:28).

Also, without using the term *catholic*, Thomas F. Torrance, *Trinitarian Perspectives* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 3, approaches the sense: “Again the doctrine of the Holy Trinity means that by his very nature as a Communion of Love in himself, as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, dwelling in the plenitude of divine Love, God is the kind of God who as a **fullness of personal being** in himself creates personal reciprocity between us and himself and creates a community of personal reciprocity in love.” [emphasis added] The expressions “Love in *himself*,” “*his* very nature,” and “personal being in *himself*,” are not taken here as denoting God as a singular person, let alone a masculine one. However, God, the One God i.e. the Father, does reveal *Himself*, accepting the vocabulary of revelation; see Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*, 105.

*Catholic* is the perfection of (being a) communion; communion is the basis of (being) *catholic*. The exemplar of communion, of unity in diversity, and the perfect harmony of the one and the many, is the All-holy Three. Can humanity, does humanity, in the present of this fallen world redeemed by a person, the Lord's Anointed-One,<sup>175</sup> the Messiah, the Son of God and Son of Man,<sup>176</sup> experience in a manner proper to it such unity and communion? Did the incarnate Son provide?

---

<sup>175</sup> מָשִׁיחַ הוּדָי / *Mashiach* YHWH / Messiah, the Χριστός / *Christos* / Christ

<sup>176</sup> Mt 26:63,: ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.... τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

## Chapter 4

# Person

ὑπόστασις — πρόσωπον, *persona*<sup>177</sup>

Zizioulas states that “the right notion of the Person is of crucial importance for theology.”<sup>178</sup> Even what might be considered a recent commercial comment notes correctly and incisively:<sup>179</sup>

The term ‘person’ has become one of the most prominent terms in recent Trinitarian theology and theological anthropology. Indeed, some have suggested that the concept offers a unique bridge between the divine and human realms and is, therefore, of decisive importance for the theological task.

---

<sup>177</sup> Cf Gn 2:7: וַיְהִי הָאָדָם לְנֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, The Man/Adam became a living נֶפֶשׁ / *nefesh* (throat, soul, being, “person”); see MacKenzie, “The Concept of Biblical Theology,” 40; נֶפֶשׁ in Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann, eds., *Theological Lexicon of the old Testament* (Mark E. Biddle trans., Vol. 2, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 743-759, especially 744; John S. Custer, *The Old Testament: A Byzantine Perspective* (Pittsburgh: God With Us Publications, 1994), 37: “This clay man was brought to life by a divine kiss.”

<sup>178</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 420 n1.

<sup>179</sup> From the dust jacket of Torrance, *Persons in Communion*.

Indeed, Zizioulas has stated that “the notion of person, if properly understood, [is] perhaps the only notion that can be applied to God without the danger of anthropomorphism.”<sup>180</sup> Torrance comments on this statement by Zizioulas:<sup>181</sup>

In other words, it is suggested that this concept has unique referential potential in that it can span both domains — it constitutes a primordial ontological and thus *semantic* bridge between the theological and anthropological spheres. If this can be argued to be the case then the concept stands to serve as a building block of the most fundamental importance underpinning theological ontology and method. The critical question for us to consider here concerns the *grounds* on which such claims may be assessed.

---

#### EXCURSUS: **Torrance, Attitudes, Tradition, Inquiry**

Torrance’s remark is in his chapter on theological language and *analogia* and *vestigia* formulations in assessing Barth’s preference “for *Seinsweise* rather than *Person*.” His paraphrase of Zizioulas is curious for cautioning against anthropomorphism in “human realms,” and a question must be interjected here about his intended meaning; Torrance says: “John Zizioulas suggests that the concept of the person is possibly the only concept that can be predicated properly and without the risk of anthropomorphism of both the divine and human realms.” Also, Torrance takes a critical approach to the term person, mindful of Zizioulas, but from a western theological and terminological perspective. He explores the link of person with *analogia entis* and *vestigium dei* or *vestigium trinitatis*. In doing so he poses questions that pertain to the warrants of this thesis. They are presented here without extensive analysis or critique but to illustrate a diversity of concerns; concomitantly, they also substantiate the scope and interplay of topics and concepts encountered in the panoramic approach of the thesis.

---

<sup>180</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 420. For an introduction and overview see the contributions in Christoph Schwöbel and Colen E. Gunton, eds., *Persons, Divine And Human, King’s College Essays in Theological Anthropology*, For the Research Institute in Systematic Theology (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999). Zizioulas’s contribution is chapter 1, “On Being a Person: Towards an Ontology of Personhood,” 33-46.

<sup>181</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 121.

Torrance refers to his treatment as a “complex chapter” as its title already indicates:<sup>182</sup> “Theological Language, Vestigiality and the Question of Continuity between the Human and Divine Realms.” Consider Torrance’s approach and the explicit and implicit questions that meet head-on the liturgical, doxological, creedal, and in general ecclesial, framework (or more precisely παράδοσις / *paradosis*, “tradition”<sup>183</sup>) of the east (and consequently, for instance, of Zizioulas). Thus Torrance:<sup>184</sup>

The expression *analogia entis* is being used here as shorthand for the *a priori* assumption of an ontological continuity between the divine and human realms which is argued to underlie and is justifiably presupposed, therefore, by theological statement independently of the consideration of God’s self-revelation in the person of Christ.

But existence, the first grace,<sup>185</sup> is surely indisputable: why should “ontological continuity” even be questioned? Creation cannot be a part of God nor can it be apart from God: as *All*, God cannot be partitioned or augmented. In the same vein Torrance characterizes his work as “an introductory raising of the question as to whether personhood may be conceived as a *vestigium Dei*.” He elaborates:<sup>186</sup>

#### **Is Human Personhood a *Vestigium Dei*?**

A central and obvious question raised by the personhood debate concerns whether there may be argued to be ‘traces’ of the divine Being in human personhood which might automatically and straightforwardly warrant the application of the term ‘person’ to both the divine and human contexts. Can we affirm that there is some kind of *vestigium dei* (or *trinitatis*) immanent either within the created order or, indeed, the new order — the New Creation? Clearly, to affirm the former, at least, would be to commit oneself to some form of *analogia entis*.

---

<sup>182</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 124.

<sup>183</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 141-168; cf 197-200.

<sup>184</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 123 n6.

<sup>185</sup> Cf McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 243.

<sup>186</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 124-25.

And in the note 7 (see previous quote), he characterizes Rahner's concern:

Although Rahner has misgivings about the intra-trinitarian use of the term 'person', his transcendental anthropology constitutes a confident exposition of continuity between the divine and human realms ...

Yet Torrance arrives at a liturgical and doxological connection as something to be undertaken, rather than a *lex orandi lex credendi* given.<sup>187</sup>

It should become plain that there is a profoundly interesting, *intrinsic* connection and interrelationship between how we conceive of triune personhood and the manner in which we conceive of the functionality of theological language ... and correlate this with some consideration of the nature of Christian worship.

Torrance's concerns regarding theological language, the term *person*, the nature of "Christian worship," *vestigium Dei* (see the related *imago Dei* in the next section of the thesis), the created order etc. are concerns addressed in this thesis also. But the terms of engagement are radically different. Looking ahead, the situation inherent in Torrance (and in others) can be characterized as a distrust of the functioning, if not the very existence, of the community of Christians as church; consequently, the church, and the way it expresses itself, is ever to be invented, reinvented, discovered, rediscovered, reformed, questioned, doubted. "Many believers are at a loss as to what to do about the Church as an objective reality."<sup>188</sup> Consequently, there is no continuity possible — no παράδοσις — because the αὐτεξουσία<sup>189</sup> / *autexousia*, the self-, the inner-determination of the church is implicitly denied. This charge is made in the broadest sense, for which a final illustration from Torrance is typical. For the establishment of the warrants for this thesis, it is gratifying that Torrance has reexamined the traditional usage of the term person and marshaled in a detailed and erudite fashion the relevant views of prominent

---

<sup>187</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 124.

<sup>188</sup> Edward Schillebeeckx, "The Church and Mankind," *The Church and Mankind*, Dogma Vol. 1, *Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal* (Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1965), 70.

<sup>189</sup> See e.g. Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 115, for an anthropological use of the term.

contemporary and “classical” theologians. And he gives a qualified acceptance of the term *person*:<sup>190</sup>

A brief modification of Barth’s own definition of the ‘persons’ of the Trinity may serve to clarify the point. He concludes his discussion by suggesting that ‘at the point where earlier dogmatics and even modern Roman Catholic dogmatics speak of persons we prefer to call the Father, Son and Spirit in God the three distinctive modes of being of the one God subsisting (“bestehenden”) in their relationships [Barth uses the word “Beziehung” rather than “Verhältnis” here] one with another’. By the term ‘*bestehenden*’ Barth is referring to the Latin word *subsistens*. What we would suggest is required here is an integration of *sub-sistens* (*hypo-stasis*) and *ek-sistens* (*ek-stasis*) in a manner that removed the ambiguity of the word *Beziehung*. The thrust of our suggestion is that the use of the term ‘person’ within the context of careful theological definition and a suitably *a posteriori* rendering of the semantics of the term would serve much more effectively to communicate a sense of the dynamics intrinsic to the intra-divine love and communion. Moreover, it would also lead to a closer integration of this with the vicarious humanity and priesthood of Christ as these form the very grammar of the Gospel.

But then he is quick to add:<sup>191</sup>

No particular word is sacrosanct and there is, therefore, no warrant for any *absolutisation* of the use of any term — not least the term ‘person’.[122]

Must the theological wheel be constantly reinvented? What of the language and impact — and yes, even authority — of Chalcedon as a seminal event for the Christian dogma of *person* (see chapter 6)? What of “handing on” and “receiving” what is “handed on” — what of παράδοσις / *paradosis*?

---

<sup>190</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 260. The words in the brackets [] are Torrance’s.

<sup>191</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 260.

### A Description of *Person*

Zizioulas's previous statement treats the term person from the perspective of human experience and projects it into the realm of theology, and the applicability to God in the Trinity. In fact, however, Zizioulas argues that the proper usage has come from the opposite direction, deriving from Trinitarian theology, as the discussion in chapter 2 has already indicated to some extent. Zizioulas says pointedly:<sup>192</sup>

The concept of the person with its absolute and ontological content was born historically from the endeavor of the Church to give ontological expression to its faith in the Triune God. This faith was primitive—it goes back to the very first years of the Church—and was handed down from generation to generation with the practice of baptism.

And, also from the God-perspective, he writes:<sup>193</sup>

(a) ... Nothing is more sacred than the person since it constitutes the 'way of being' of God Himself. The person cannot be sacrificed or subjected to any ideal, to any moral or natural order, or to any expediency or objective, even of the most sacred kind. In order to *be truly* and *be yourself*, you must be a person, i.e. you must be free from and higher than any necessity or objective — natural,

---

<sup>192</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 36.

<sup>193</sup> Zizioulas, "The Cappadocian Contribution," 56.

moral, religious or ideological. What gives meaning and value to existence is the person as absolute freedom.

(b) The person cannot exist in isolation. God is not alone; He<sup>194</sup> is *communion*.

Christian theology is the theology of the person; Christianity has an urgent, a most important message, the good-news about a person. Christian theology of the person has much needed answers about the human condition. Christoph Schwöbel in the introduction to *Persons, Divine And Human*, observes the need for clarification concerning the term person:<sup>195</sup>

We are today confronted with a sometimes bewildering diversity of conceptions of personhood developed from a variety of perspectives, differing not only with regard to the material understanding of what it means to be a person, but also with regard to the status of personhood in our conceptual and practical interaction with one another and with the world.

The concept of *person* will be discussed here in order to clarify its exact meaning and then to establish it as the core term for understanding the relationship between God and Man, especially within the context of the Church.

Person implies the ability to form relationships, the “capacity for communion.”<sup>196</sup> Repeating here what was stated in the chapter 2 on the Trinity,<sup>197</sup> “the person cannot exist

---

<sup>194</sup> This is taken in the sense that God the Trinity is personal but is not a person but three persons. The sensitivity to “God ... He” can arise from the grammatical gender deprivation suffered by the English language. Thus it is ὁ Θεός, *God* (masculine) but ἡ Τριάς, *The Three / The Trinity* (feminine) as in the “Pentecost” prayer after communion in the Byzantine Divine Liturgy: ἀδιαίρετον Τριάδα προσκυνοῦντες· αὕτη γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἔσωσεν. Literally: undivided Trinity (Τριάδα, feminine) we-worshiping – this-one (αὕτη, feminine) us has saved [i.e., we worship the undivided Trinity, for the Trinity has saved us.]. Also e.g. a caution is warranted regarding Michael Schmaus, *The Essence of Christianity* (Chicago: Scepter Publishers, Ltd., 1961), 183, “Thus the single personal God exists in a tri-personal form.” Rather, God is one, God is personal, God is three persons.

<sup>195</sup> Christoph Schwöbel, *Persons Divine And Human*, 3.

<sup>196</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 435.

<sup>197</sup> See note 93 p 27; 56 ff; Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 18.

without communion; but every form of communion which denies or suppresses the person [that is, communion that is not *catholic* as discussed in the previous section], is inadmissible.”<sup>198</sup> As Zizioulas states, it is proper for the person “to love without exclusiveness” as “part of a network of relationships which transcends every exclusiveness,”<sup>199</sup> because “the person represents a category that presupposes unity with other persons.”<sup>200</sup> Nicely bringing together the concepts discussed previously, Zizioulas describes *person* / “personhood”<sup>201</sup>: “Personhood is the total fulfillment of being, the catholic expression of its nature.”<sup>202</sup> He elaborates:

*The Person is Otherness in Communion and Communion in Otherness.* The Person is an identity that emerges through relationship (*schesis*, in the terminology of the Greek Fathers); it is an “I” that can exist only as long as it relates to a “Thou” which affirms its existence and its otherness. If we isolate the “I” from the “Thou,” we lose not only its otherness but also its very being; it simply cannot ‘be without the other.’ This is what distinguishes the Person from the individual. The Orthodox understanding of the Holy Trinity is the only way to arrive at this notion of Person-hood: The Father cannot be conceived for a single moment without the Son and the Spirit, and the same applies to the other two Persons in their relation with the Father and with each other. At the same time, each of these Persons is so unique that their hypostatic or personal properties are totally incommunicable from one Person to the other.

And echoing this aspect of *σχέσις* / *schesis*, relationship, in a complementary expression from the west regarding the Trinity, Aquinas says, *personae sunt ipsae relationes subsistentes* — the persons are the subsisting relations themselves.<sup>203</sup>

---

<sup>198</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 18.

<sup>199</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 57.

<sup>200</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 165, referencing M. Buber, *I and Thou* (1958), 62.

<sup>201</sup> Is there even here a subtle difference that should be understood and perhaps avoided? Is “personhood” already a move from the concrete *person* to the abstract concept, “personhood”? The purpose of this section is to describe the concrete entity, *person*, and consequently the person, but not any abstraction, even if it is “personhood. The nuance can be appreciated by considering the difference in saying “She is a mother,” and “She is motherhood.” Even to speak of *person* can be a generalization unless it is understood that to say *person* means this-one or that-one, a specific person or persons, someone that can be called by name.

<sup>202</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 47.

<sup>203</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 67, notes the phrase “*persona est relatio*” and comments:

It must be emphasized that persons, within this context, are not individuals,<sup>204</sup> and the difference in these two terms,<sup>205</sup> as they will be used throughout this work, is of prime importance for a proper understanding of the nature of communion and the meaning of person. Zizioulas notes: “In our times several attempts are being made by Western philosophers to correct the Western equation of the ‘person’ with the ‘individual’.”<sup>206</sup> The individual conveys isolation and this is opposed to the true meaning of person; when the particular becomes exclusive the whole is compromised. At the extremes there are two distortions of person: If the person becomes exclusive relative to the group or community — the whole — the result is individualism; however, if the person becomes submerged in and indistinct from the group or community, the result is a kind of totalitarianism or collectivism. Another aspect is illustrated

---

“Ratzinger’s basic ecclesiological and soteriological conviction concerning the relation of the individual Christian to the collective subject of the church presupposes a certain understanding of personhood, one Ratzinger develops in analogy to trinitarian personhood. In the Trinity, “person” consists in *pure* relationality; *persona est relatio*.” Volf references *ST* 1a.40.2.ad1 (*Utrum personae distinguantur per relationes*, Whether the relations distinguish and constitute the persons?). Reply to Objection 1: *Ad primum ergo dicendum quod personae sunt ipsae relationes subsistentes. Unde non repugnat simplicitati divinarum personarum, quod relationibus distinguantur.* The persons are the subsisting relations themselves. Hence it is not against the simplicity of the divine persons for them to be distinguished by the relations. Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 57 ff, referencing *ST*, 1a.29.4, raises objections to this from an eastern viewpoint; e.g.: “The relationships, instead of being characteristics of the hypostases, are identified with them. As St. Thomas was later to write: ‘*Persona est relatio*’, inner relationship of the essence which it diversifies.”

<sup>204</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 164-165; Lossky, *Image and Likeness of God*, 116-117.

<sup>205</sup> Cf von Balthasar, “On the Concept of Person,” 18-19: “If one distinguishes between *individual* and *person* (and we should for the sake of clarity), then a special dignity is ascribed to the person, which the individual as such does not possess.... The word *person* in the sense of a human being, and in contradistinction to mere individuality, receives its special dignity in history when it is illuminated by unique theological meaning. When this is not the case, however, the human person sinks back into the sphere of mere individuality.”

<sup>206</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 59. He references two seminal philosophical works: “Thus, J. Macmurray, *The Self as Agent*, London: Faber & Faber 1957, and *Persons in Relation*, London: Faber & Faber 1961.”

by Lossky commenting on the division in human nature affecting human personhood after the Fall.<sup>207</sup>

After original sin human nature became divided, split up, broken into many individuals. Man now has a double character: as an individual nature, he is a part of a whole, one of the elements which make up the universe; but as a person, he is in no sense a part: he contains all in himself. The nature is the content of the person, the person the existence of the nature.

Person, however, always denotes relationship and communion,<sup>208</sup> and this in such a manner that the term *catholic*, as previously discussed, applies:<sup>209</sup> “personhood affirms the integrity and catholicity of being (cf. hypostasis) and must of necessity overcome the distance of individualisation (cf. ekstasis).”

Zizioulas maintains that “the Cappadocian Fathers gave to the world the most precious concept it possesses: *the concept of the person, as an ontological concept in the ultimate sense.*”<sup>210</sup> And LaCugna is very direct in asserting that person is the “ultimate ontological category”.<sup>211</sup>

Person, not substance, is the ultimate ontological category. This was the most revolutionary claim made by the Cappadocian doctrine of the Trinity, and its theoretical and practical significance simply cannot be over-emphasized. To say that person rather than substance is the cause and origin of everything that exists means that the ultimate source of all reality is not a ‘by-itself or an ‘in-itself but a person, a toward-another.

---

<sup>207</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 123.

<sup>208</sup> cf. *ST* 1a.40.2.ad1. *persona est relatio*; See, Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 67.

<sup>209</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 417.

<sup>210</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 56.

<sup>211</sup> LaCugna, *God for Us*, 14.

Elsewhere she states her evaluation of the correspondence in the fundamental ontology of *person* for both east and west:<sup>212</sup>

Nonetheless, these and other differences between Greek and Latin theology notwithstanding, the ontology of both traditions supports the principle that *personhood is the meaning of being*.

Zizioulas's statement above suggests this interpretation of person, although he stops just short here of calling it **the** ultimate ontological category. However, in a strict theological sense, that is, in reference to the Trinity, Zizioulas does write:<sup>213</sup>

In God it is possible for the particular to be ontologically ultimate because *relationship is permanent and unbreakable*. Because the Father, the Son and the Spirit are always together,<sup>16</sup> the particular beings are bearers of the totality of nature and thus no contradiction between the 'one' and the 'many' can arise. What Adam *should* represent, God *does* represent.

This means that if we wish to build the particular into ontology we need to introduce *relationship* into substance itself, to make being relational.<sup>17</sup>

It should be emphasized, again, that *nature* and *substance* are not merely abstractions relative to *person*:<sup>214</sup> they are terms that allow our theological language to express a paradox, the

---

<sup>212</sup> LaCugna, *God for Us*, 248-9. She continues: "To define what something is, we must ask who it is, or how it is related. Further—and Greek theology better brings this out—since being itself originates in the absolute personhood of God (Father), then *all* of reality, since it proceeds from God, is personal and relational.<sup>14</sup> For something to exist in the first place, or to be sustained in being, means that it "is" and "continues" from within personhood. Trinitarian ontology, especially that of the Greek theologians, overturns the primacy of substance in the sense of determining what something is in itself, or by itself as an individual. Trinitarian ontology affirms instead that person, not substance, is the ultimate ontological category because it is the person of the Father, not the substance of the Godhead, who as Unoriginate Origin is the cause (*aitia*) of everything that is." Also: person as being-in-relation, 263; on persons 288 ff.; persons are catholic, 290.

<sup>213</sup> Zizioulas, "On Being a Person," 41. Discussing Zizioulas, Verna Harrison, "Zizioulas on Communion and Otherness," *St. Vlad. Theo. Quart.*, 42, 273-300 (1998), 274, writes: "In this conceptual framework, the person is clearly the primary ontological category rather than nature and its qualities."

<sup>214</sup> See the important point by Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 77 n 26: Is person rather than

mystery of unity and diversity;<sup>215</sup> for although the nature of God is Being and Holiness,<sup>216</sup> the expression of that nature is the Three Persons — it is the person who expresses the nature. Thus Zizioulas insists that “we must adopt an ontology which is based on personhood, i.e. on a unity or openness emerging from relationships, and not one of substance.”<sup>217</sup> This continues the thrust of reasoning presented in the section on the Trinity. Also, echoing what was noted in the previous section on the meaning of the term *catholic*, Zizioulas says:<sup>218</sup>

Ekstasis and hypostasis represent two basic aspects of Personhood... Thus the idea of person affirms at once both that being cannot be ‘contained’ or ‘divided’, and that the mode of its existence, its *hypostasis*, is absolutely unique and unrepeatable.

Though persons are the particulars that have things in common, and the person is a particular that embodies the whole, “the person is something *unique* and *unrepeatable*,”<sup>219</sup> the person is inherently *catholic*.<sup>220</sup>

The person cannot be understood simply as the “ecstasy” of the substance; it must necessarily be regarded also as a hypostasis of the substance, as a concrete and unique identity.

Uniqueness is something absolute for the person. The person is so absolute in its uniqueness that it does not permit itself to be regarded as an arithmetical concept, to be set alongside other beings, to be combined with other

---

substance (or either) *proprie* (see the discussion on theological language, chapter 2)?

<sup>215</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 41, cf 134. Also Zizioulas, “Communion and Otherness,” 353.

<sup>216</sup> See note 97 p 28.

<sup>217</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 52.

<sup>218</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 408.

<sup>219</sup> The Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 57. Cf the use of the same phrase in Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 33, regarding the term *prosopon*; Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 48, in reference to God the Father, and Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 49, in relation to love; Zizioulas, “On Being a Person,” 35; also, John Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1974), 159.

<sup>220</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 46.

objects, to be used as a means, even for the most sacred goal. The goal is the person itself; personhood is the total fulfilment of being, the catholic expression of its nature.

Consequently, reflecting this sense of relationship and communion, of integral completeness, and uniqueness, *person* can be understood as *One of the Many who are ONE*.<sup>221</sup> This can be termed *the catholic description of the person*. As Zizioulas explains it, ‘the “one” and the “many” co-exist as two aspects of the same being.’<sup>222</sup> This sense and description of person as *One of the Many who are ONE* will be used as a reference point throughout this thesis: Person will always be used here with this meaning, and all issues are referenced to this understanding of person. Therefore, even to say “persons in communion” is redundant (which is not raised here as a criticism but in order to establish the force of the proposed meaning of person) since person must, and already does, convey the dynamic relationship of the *One* and the *Many* and the *ONE* in such a way that the term catholic, and therefore communion, obtains. It is not so much the case of *persons in communion* as *person as communion* i.e., the inherent ontological aspect of the person. There is no sense in which a person can be understood in isolation; as Zizioulas says, “one person is no person,”<sup>223</sup> a phrasing that parallels the ancient expression, cast in terms of Christian anthropology, *unus Christianus nullus Christianus*.<sup>224</sup>

---

#### EXCURSUS: Personhood and Creation

---

<sup>221</sup> Cf McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 170: “The one is many and the many are one. The one and the many are mutually constitutive.”

<sup>222</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as communion*, 139. Zizioulas here is actually speaking about the large structure, the church itself.

<sup>223</sup> Zizioulas, “Mystery of the Church,” 299.

<sup>224</sup> E.g., John Zizioulas, “The Church as Communion,” *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 38 (1994), 8; Zizioulas, *Being as communion*, 165 n 89, 236.

The emphasis on person accommodates itself to a treatment of humanity, but what is its impact on the rest of creation, and salvation, in particular as an extreme case, inanimate objects? Zizioulas provides an interesting answer relating to love bestowing salvation:<sup>225</sup>

The mystery of the person as an ontological ‘principle’ and ‘cause’ consists in the fact that love can endow something with uniqueness, with absolute identity and name. It is precisely this which is revealed by the term ‘eternal life,’ which for this very reason signifies that the person is able to raise to personal value and life even inanimate objects, provided that they constitute an organic part of a loving relationship (for example, all creation can be saved thanks to its ‘recapitulation’ in the loving relationship between Father and Son).

Or absence of love and condemnation:<sup>226</sup>

Conversely, condemnation to eternal death is nothing other than a person’s being allowed to decline into a ‘thing,’ into absolute anonymity, to hear the terrifying words, ‘I do not know you’ (Matt. 25:12).<sup>227</sup>

---

\* \* \*

From here — the Trinity, *catholic*, and *person* — before addressing ecclesiological issues directly, it is necessary first to discuss anthropology and Christology. Lossky notes:<sup>228</sup>

Indeed, our ideas of human personality, of that *personal* quality which makes every human being unique, to be expressed only in terms of itself: this idea of *person* comes to us from Christian theology.

---

<sup>225</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 49 n 44.

<sup>226</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 49 n 44.

<sup>227</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, notes, 49 n 44: “As we shall see it is precisely against this that the Church reacts when it commemorates the ‘names’ at the eucharist.”

<sup>228</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 53.

It is also essential to remember that everything said about the term *catholic* applies to an understanding of *person*. For instance, as LaCugna puts it, echoing Zizioulas, “authentic personhood is the catholic mode of presence in the world.”<sup>229</sup> And she elaborates on this interplay between being *catholic* and being a person:<sup>230</sup>

*Persons are catholic, in two respects.* First, persons are created to be inclusive of everything that exists. Personhood is the bridge between ourselves and *everything* and *everyone* else, past, present, and future. Second, the inclusive, catholic person expresses the totality of a nature; each human person uniquely exemplifies what it means to be human just as each divine person uniquely exemplifies what it is to be divine. The catholicity of the person enables us to embrace diversity enthusiastically instead of fearing it.

Two cases are now considered where there is a special and unique relationship between the *One* and the *ONE who is the Many* (the *ONE* who comprises the *Many*): Adam and Christ. Zizioulas reminds us: “Only the Son is incarnate. Both the Father and the Spirit are involved in history, but only the Son becomes history.”<sup>231</sup> As a result of God entering history as a person, there are, as Zizioulas notes in treating the topic of “*Communion and Otherness in Personal Existence*,” “anthropological consequences”; he says:<sup>232</sup>

Theology and Church life involve a certain conception of the human being. This conception can be summed up in one word: *Personhood*. This term, sanctified through its use in connection with the very being of God and of Christ, is so rich in implications.

---

<sup>229</sup> LaCugna, *God for Us*, 264.

<sup>230</sup> LaCugna, *God for Us*, 290.

<sup>231</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 130.

<sup>232</sup> Zizioulas, “Communion and Otherness,” 357-58.

The foremost implication is that God in the person of the Son, enters χρόνος / *chronos*, time, not as in the former dispensation of Sinai, as a “glory coming down in images and tents,”<sup>233</sup> but **as a person** in the μορφή / *morphe*, the form, and likeness of Adam / Man.<sup>234</sup>

---

<sup>233</sup> From the aposticha of the feast of the Protection of the Mother of God. The language of image and tent applied to Sinai certainly alludes to the New Testament expressions for the Incarnation, e.g., “image” of God (2Cor 4:4, Col 1:15, Col 3:10) the Father, and dwelt (Jn 1:14, ἐσκήνωσεν, literally *tented*) among us. From the beginning though as noted by Yves M.-J. Congar, O. P., *Tradition & Traditions*, special edition (Needham Heights: Simon & Schuster, 1966), 261: “Sacred history is also *human* history.”

<sup>234</sup> Cf. Phil 2:7 ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφήν δούλου λαβών, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος NRS Phil 2:7 but [He] emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness. And being found in human appearance, ...

# Part II

χρόνος / *chronos*

*Time*



## Chapter 5

# Man / Anthropos

ἄνθρωπος, אָדָם / *Adam*

According to Zizioulas, the Cappadocian view “involves a radical reorientation of classical Greek humanism, a conception of man and a view of existence, which ancient thought proved unable to produce.”<sup>235</sup> Scripture poses the question in prayer: יהוה קֹדֶם-אָדָם / *YHWH ma Adam* (Ps 144:3, LORD what is Adam/Man?<sup>236</sup>). “The essence, therefore, of the anthropology which results from the Trinitarian theology of the Cappadocian Fathers lies in the significance of personhood in human existence.”<sup>237</sup> The theological understanding of the person (see the previous section) is the key for understanding and synthesis regarding the human condition, i.e. the theology of the one who was made on the sixth day along with the beasts,<sup>238</sup> but who is also so very different, Adam/Man.

The basic anthropological view of the east is based upon Gn. 1:26:

אָדָם בְּצַלְיָנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ

---

<sup>235</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 44-45.

<sup>236</sup> Also: Jb 7:17, Jb 15:14, Ps 8:4 as קֹדֶם-אֵנוֹשׁ / *ma Enosh*; Eccl 6:11; Heb 2:6, Sir 18:8, 4 Es 8:34 (apocrypha). Enosh is first mentioned in Gn 4:26.

<sup>237</sup> Zizioulas, “The Cappadocian Contribution,” 56.

<sup>238</sup> Genesis 1:24-31.

— Adam/Man in Our [God’s, אֱלֹהִים / *Elohim*] image as Our likeness. Lossky discusses the theological and exegetical context of “image and likeness,”<sup>239</sup> and concludes that “it is not, then, a part of our nature which corresponds to the image of God in us, but the person which includes the nature itself.”<sup>240</sup> According to Zizioulas, “the *imago Dei* [is] man’s personhood.”<sup>241</sup> But there is another dynamic that must be considered. This is the conundrum of Christian anthropology — the tension between Man in the image and likeness of God, and the reality of the Fall: death and sin.<sup>242</sup> Though it may lack a certain exegetical rigor (or seemingly so in the accepted modern sense<sup>243</sup>) as even Lossky implies,<sup>244</sup> the patristic interpretation gives us a sense of that dynamic: in the Fall the likeness was lost but the image always retained.<sup>245</sup> Lossky says the image is

---

<sup>239</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, chapter 7, 125-139; Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, chapter 6, 114-134.

<sup>240</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 122.

<sup>241</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 424. For exegetical background see Gordon J. Wenham, *Word Biblical Commentary: Genesis 1-15*, Volume 1 (Waco: Word Books, Publisher, 1987), 27, *passim*. For other details concerning *imago Dei* in terms of a theology of the person see: Colin E. Gunton, “Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology: Towards a Renewal of the Doctrine of the *Imago Dei*,” 47-61; and the related *vestigium Dei* and *vestigium Trinitatis* in Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, chapter 3, 120-212.

<sup>242</sup> Gn 2:17 ff and Romans 5:12 ff. Recall the comment of Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 123, on the division in human nature affecting human personhood after the Fall, as noted previously in section 4.

<sup>243</sup> Wenham, *Genesis 1-15*, 29-30.

<sup>244</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 128-29. But Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 126, prefaces a refutation of the critics, naming such as Harnack, Barth, Brunner, Nygren, and Lehmann with the strongest pronouncement:

There is no branch of theological teaching which can be entirely isolated from the problem of the image without danger of severing it from the living stock of Christian tradition. We may say that for a theologian of the catholic tradition in the East and in the West, for one who is true to the main lines of patristic thought, the theme of the image (in its twofold acceptance — the image as the principle of God’s self-manifestation and the image as the foundation of a particular relationship of man to God) must belong to the “essence of Christianity.”

<sup>245</sup> This distinction or interpretation of *image and likeness* seems not to be a prominent aspect of Western theology. The concept of *imago Dei* is, of course, very prevalent. The patristic *image and likeness* interpretation is found, however, in what was the preeminent theological “textbook” of the middle ages, Peter Lombard, *Libri IV Sententiarum* (Florentiam:

“inalienable.”<sup>246</sup> Adam/Man remains in the image of God after the Fall and, therefore, remains a person, an “image of glory”;<sup>247</sup> but the likeness of God, “the original beauty,” is lost and needs to be restored so that the true, the authentic person of Adam/Man as intended by God is regained. These patristic views on image and likeness are reflected in the hymns for the deceased still sung in the *Parastas* service:<sup>248</sup>

O Lord I am the image of your glory which is beyond description, even though I bear the marks of transgressions. Have mercy on your creature. O Master, in your compassion cleanse me. Grant me the home I yearn for, and again make me an inhabitant of Paradise.... In the beginning You called me from nothingness and favored me with Your divine image. Since I transgressed Your commandments You returned me to the earth from which I was taken. Restore me to your Likeness, that my original beauty may be renewed in me.

In this liturgical text the distinction between Adam and the deceased is appropriately blurred, but in light of the relationship between the *One* and the *Many* and the *ONE*, the *catholic* identity of the two is clearly exhibited: Each person, each of us, is in this sense Adam. Lossky, referring to Leontius of Byzantium, sums up the relationship between the key issues considered thus far:

---

Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1916), II.16. 2-4. Also see the discussion and critique in Ulrich Luz, “New Testament Perspectives of the Image of God in Christ and Mankind,” *The Presence of God, Scripture Vol. 50 Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal* (New York: Paulist Press, 1969 ), 80ff. It is a curiosity that the word “likeness” never appears in the body of Volf’s book which is entitled *After Our Likeness — The Church as the Image of the Trinity*.

<sup>246</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 139.

<sup>247</sup> The standard of ‘that which exalts God and diminishes Man must be correct theology’ is the death knell of Christian anthropology.

<sup>248</sup> *The Office of Christian Burial According to the Byzantine Rite* (Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1983), 12. Εἰκὼν εἰμὶ τῆς ἀρρήτου δόξης σου, εἰ καὶ στίγματα φέρω πταισμάτων· οἰκτεῖρησον τὸ σὸν πλάσμα Δέσποτα, καὶ καθάρισον σὴ εὐσπλαγχνία· καὶ τὴν ποθεινὴ πατρίδα παράσχου μοι, Παραδείσου πάλι ποιῶν πολίτην με... Ὁ πάλαι μὲν, ἐκ μὴ ὄντων πλάσας με, καὶ εἰκони σου θεία τιμήσας, παραβάσει ἐντολῆς δὲ πάλιν με ἐπιστρέψας, εἰς γῆν ἐξ ἧς ἐλήφθην· εἰς τὸ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν ἐπανάγαγε, τὸ ἀρχαῖον κάλλος ἀναμορφώσασθαι. cf LXX Gn 1:26 κατ’ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν for בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ.

the correspondence of the image of God to the person, and the interplay between nature and person and person and individual:<sup>249</sup>

It is not, then, a part of our nature which corresponds to the image of God in us, but the person which includes the nature in itself. Leontius of Byzantium, a sixth-century theologian, uses a special term ἐνυπόστατον, ‘enhypostasized’, for the nature which is included in a person or hypostasis. According to Leontius all nature is found in an hypostasis, such being the nature of a hypostasis which cannot otherwise exist. But on the lower degrees of being, hypostases are only individuals, individual beings: they only receive the character of persons when it becomes a question of spiritual beings, man, the angels or God. In so far as it is person and not individual, the hypostasis does not divide the nature, giving place to many distinct natures. The Trinity is not three Gods, but one God. If in fact the multiplication of human persons does divide the nature, splitting it up into many individuals, it is only because we know of no other generation than that which takes place after sin, in human nature which has lost its likeness to the divine nature.

Likewise Auer links the personal identity of Man to<sup>250</sup>

the one, three-personal God in whom everything is person and in whom there is nothing a-personal. Only when we see God will we understand what “person” is and that this personhood is the foundation of the image of God in us (Gn 1,26).

### **Adam as a *catholic person***

Based on what has been said before, the phrase *catholic person* may seem redundant. In fact it is, but to a purpose. The person is *catholic*, but *catholic person* here means the unique entity, the *ONE*. Adam can make this claim. Man in English conveys the same paradoxical sense as the Hebrew of Scripture which speaks of Adam or Man and “the Adam” or “the man,” both

---

<sup>249</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 122-23.

<sup>250</sup> Johann Auer and Joseph Ratzinger, *Dogmatic Theology 8: The Church: The Universal Sacrament of Salvation*, (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993), 477.

as a general and a particular human being,<sup>251</sup> a man named Adam who is *One* of the *Many* but who is also the *ONE*: God made Adam. Consider this interplay, for example, in two consecutive verses in Genesis:

Genesis 1:26

And God said let us make *Adam* (אָדָם)

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם

in our image as our likeness

בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ

and let *them* have dominion (וַיְרִדוּ) ...

וַיְרִדוּ

Genesis 1:27

God created *the Adam* (הָאָדָם) in His image

וַיְבָרֵא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ

In the image of God He created *him* (אֹתוֹ)

בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ

Male and female He created *them* (אֹתָם)

זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם:

Man, and the man Adam, convey the sense of the whole, that is Mankind, since Adam refers to all of humanity.<sup>252</sup> Adam is preeminently a *catholic* person: the *One* unique person who is also the *Many* of all humanity who are united in the *ONE* whom the early Greek theologians termed πρωτόπλαστος / *protoplastos* the *first-formed-one*<sup>253</sup> — not an abstract humanity, not even

---

<sup>251</sup> Cf the note in the NAB at 1 Cor 15:45 So, too, it is written, “The first man, Adam, became a living being,” the last Adam a life-giving spirit. οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν: “The analogy of the first man, Adam, is introduced by a citation from Gn 2:7. Paul alters the text slightly, adding the adjective first, and translating the Hebrew adam twice, so as to give it its value both as a common noun (man) and as a proper name (Adam).”

<sup>252</sup> C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam to Last* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1962), 19-20: “It is clear that Paul believed that everything that could be said about Adam as a (supposed) historical figure could be said also about mankind as a whole; he took his Hebrew (‘adam — man) seriously. Rom. i. 18-23 is written in the plural... Not only for Adam but for all ...”

<sup>253</sup> See Fr. Panayiotis Papageorgiou, “Chrysostom and Augustine on the Sin of Adam and

just the personification of humanity, but a person, the Biblical *Adám* / אָדָם.<sup>254</sup> Zizioulas asks and answers a question with this notion of Adam as the *catholic* person.<sup>255</sup>

Can the Biblical notion of Adam as the one, for example, in whom ‘the many have died’ or as ‘the one man Jesus Christ’ in whom the ‘many’ will live (cf. Rom. 5-6 and p. 409 n. 1) make any sense to *ontology* — and not just to homiletics? If so, I do not see how this can be done without so changing our ontology as to allow for the concept of the person as the bearer of the totality or ‘catholicity’ of its nature.

Likewise, in this sense of Zizioulas, i.e. in the *catholic* sense, each person, each *One*, can affect to various degrees the *Many* and thus the *ONE*. An example illustrates this point.

### Application to an excerpt from Schillebeeckx

The basic vocabulary established in the first Part of the thesis, and the accompanying perspective, can be used to interpret, evaluate, clarify and critique. The presentation that follows is an exercise that uses and applies the terminology of Part I, and thus provides a practical example. Consider the following from Edward Schillebeeckx as something of a case study, placing his expression of one aspect of anthropology within the context of the vocabulary of this thesis. For instance, Schillebeeckx expresses a viewpoint very much in line with the sense of the corporate person, but with a sufficiently different emphasis, focusing on the element of

---

Its Consequences,” *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 39 (1995): 364, n17, referencing Chrysostom’s Homily 19, On Genesis, P.G.53,162: τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου; also, “the couple,” 366, n23: Πρωτόπλαστοι / *protoplastoi*, *first-formed-ones*, masculine plural but gender neutral.

<sup>254</sup> Consider the various translations of , or attempts to translate, e.g. Ps 32:13:

מְשֻׁמִּים הַבַּיִת יְהוָה רָאָה אֶת-כָּל-בְּנֵי הָאָדָם:

specifically אֶת-כָּל-בְּנֵי הָאָדָם / *kol bne haAdam*, literally *all the sons of the Adam/Man*. (LXX) ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐπέβλεψεν ὁ κύριος εἶδεν πάντας τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων (**all the sons of the men**); (NAB) From heaven the LORD looks down and observes **the whole human race**; (NRSV) The LORD looks down from heaven; he sees **all humankind**. (RSV) The LORD looks down from heaven, he sees **all the sons of men**.

<sup>255</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 435.

vocation; his points are reconsidered here (commentary is given in brackets [] as scholia) under the aspect of *person as catholic*:<sup>256</sup>

Mankind's specific unity from an anthropological viewpoint must formally (*formaliter*) be based, ... by its very nature, on a community of *persons*, a *communio*. [*Communio* is the expected condition of the person as a catholic entity.]...This means simply that human unity has its origin in oneness of vocation and destiny. [Only if and so far that the "vocation and destiny" are inherent in the person; i.e., the origin must go back further to the creation of Adam in the image and likeness of God, and person referenced to the Trinity.]

*Communio* among all men is the immanent human expression of this single vocation. [As in section 3, communion is the expression of being catholic.] Human unity in its essence is not a mere datum: it is a task to be carried out. [A person must act as a person, true; the "task" is not extrinsic. Person is hypo-static, and the manifestation of the person is not static, it is ekstatic.] ...Communion among men is the reflection, immanent in mankind's history, of man's transcending communion with the living God [History testifies to the "communion among men." The "reflection" is not just metaphorical; perhaps it is even more than analogy in that Mankind, as the image of God, must in its proper way (according to its kind in the language of Genesis) attest κοινωνία, as does God.]: the God-willed unity of mankind is therefore nothing less than the *communio Sanctorum*, the community of mankind sanctified [See θέωσις / *theosis* in the next chapter].

... The history of salvation in both the Old and the New Testaments, even though the outlook of the ancient Near Eastern peoples plays its role in them, makes this fact clear: God did not intend "abstract" fundamental values to be the basis on which human unity was to be realized. He intends to gather all men into a holy community of persons on the basis of values that were expressed in living persons as in prototypes. [Rather, the gathering is the end and perfection of the intrinsic, ontological relationship, the *person as catholic*. It is not just values but persons who exhibit values, particular and proper to themselves, though not just

---

<sup>256</sup> Edward Schillebeeckx, "The Church and Mankind," *The Church and Mankind*, Dogma Vol. 1 Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal. (Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1965), 71-72. Schillebeeckx is making a number of related points based on values, community, vocation, and destiny. The extensive editing of the text as excerpted here, extracting considerations relevant to this study, does not falsify his meaning; but it likely alters his emphasis to where the full text should be consulted for reclaiming the context and thrust of his thought.

for themselves, but for all. Consider Abraham, Gn 18:18:<sup>257</sup> in him all nations will be blessed]

Time and again someone is chosen from among ourselves to be the means of salvation in forming the “great gathering” of men from the diaspora, the People of God. The manner, not due to men, in which God establishes a community among them is that of representative or vicarious mediation: for the sake of one man, whom God freely calls for the purpose, salvation—or destruction—is brought to many. [Though true, this sounds again more *ad extra* than warranted. The *ONE* is, and therefore the *Many* are, affected by the *One* because the *person* is *catholic*.] In the Old and the New Testaments, time and again, the representative function whether of one man or of a limited collectivity is essential for salvation or destruction: Adam, Noah, Moses, the twelve Patriarchs, “Israel”, the “King”, the Servant of Yahweh, Jesus [This is the sense of the corporate personality at the least; it reaches conceptual completeness in the *catholic person* as in Adam and especially Jesus.].

In the Bible the establishment of a community through mediation implies that election and universal mission coalesce into one. ...[The integrity of *person* demands that “election” and “mission” are not divided; the universality is a function of *catholic*.]

The notion of mediatorship shows us that men are dependent upon one another [“Mediatorship” follows from *catholic* and *koinonia* as natural and expected: the *One* acting in behalf of the *Many* for the *ONE*.] and that God in bringing his transcendent salvation means to preserve the structure of human fellowship [Consider *catholic* as ontological “fellowship,” *koinonia*]. Through men he wants to bring salvation to men [This is perfectly understandable and expected from a *catholic* viewpoint. It is also in line with Catholic and Orthodox soteriology, but would seem to conflict with classical Protestant thought. The desire (“he wants”) must, however, be understood as a typology intrinsic to Man in view of the Incarnation, and not as some *ad hoc* solution imposed *ad extra*.].

### Adam as the Bridegroom

Adam also serves as an image, an icon, in another sense, where the diversity of the two are one. The unity of the two who are one, being in the order of creation, is not the perfect unity of the Three who are one, but it is a perfect unity within its own domain. The Woman is formed in a special way, from the side of Adam, from his rib,<sup>258</sup> as one who is his counterpart (נִגְדָה /

---

<sup>257</sup> וְהָיָה בְרָכָה: כָּל גּוֹי הָאָרֶץ: Cf Gn 12:2: וְהָיָה בְרָכָה: כָּל גּוֹי הָאָרֶץ: and you will be [imperative] a blessing.

<sup>258</sup> Gn 2:22; see *ST* 1.92.3.res: “Whether the woman was fittingly made from the rib of

neged).<sup>259</sup> Thus scripture expresses the unity in the nuptial imagery of Adam, the bridegroom, and his wife as being one body:

(Gn 2:24) and they become in *body/flesh* (בָּשָׂר / *basar*) one וְהָיוּ לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד:

In the Septuagint this is expressed even more explicitly for *the two* (οἱ δύο / *hoi duo*)<sup>260</sup>:

And the two will be (ἔσονται / *esontai*)<sup>261</sup> one flesh καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν

There is also Gn 2:23: The *woman* אִשָּׁה / *ishah* who is *from man* מֵאִישׁ / *meish* — is according to Adam “bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh,”<sup>262</sup> a total, tangible, and essential unity. Indeed, only after the Fall is she named independently of Adam<sup>263</sup> (thereby, perhaps, denoting her individuality to the detriment of her personhood<sup>264</sup>): Rather than (the) Adam/Man and his

man? ... It was right for the woman to be made from a rib of man. First, to signify the social union / companionship (*socialis conjunctio*) of man and woman, for the woman should neither ‘use authority over man,’ and so she was not made from his head; nor was it right for her to be subject to man’s contempt as his slave, and so she was not made from his feet.” Before his sleep from God, Adam was seemingly complete but alone. After — after the Woman — the man is not alone, but not complete without the Woman.

<sup>259</sup> Gn 2:18; a helper as-his-counterpart (עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ / *ezer k<sup>e</sup>negdo*).

<sup>260</sup> As also in Mk 10:8 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν· ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ μία σάρξ

<sup>261</sup> Future tense, middle voice.

<sup>262</sup> וַיֹּאמֶר הָאָדָם זֹאת הִפְעַם עֵצָם מֵעֲצוֹמִי וּבָשָׂר מִבְּשָׂרִי Gn 2:23  
לְזֹאת יִקְרָא אִשָּׁה כִּי מֵאִישׁ לְקָחָהּ זֹאת:

Bone of bone and flesh of flesh are very intimate expressions since Hebrew has no other word for body.

<sup>263</sup> Cf Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 123.

<sup>264</sup> An understanding of the person as catholic does not object to the naming of the wife: a “name” is proper to the distinctiveness of the person. The greater conceptual hurdle is to realize that in the catholic sense parity is not compromised by the apparent anonymity of the Woman: that “Adam and his wife” does not detract from the uniqueness of Eve in her own right as a person though it may be intolerable for Eve as an individual.

wife, they are now Adam and Life (אָדָם / Ζωή), as he named her (Gn 3:20).<sup>265</sup> This special unity of the two who are one will be an important consideration in the section on church.

### Adam as the *catholic* Sinner

This Adam who is made in the image and likeness of God (Gn 1:26) is also the original sinner.<sup>266</sup> Original sin (west), the “ancestral fault”<sup>267</sup> (east), is the *catholic* sin because Adam is uniquely (within the order of creation) a *catholic* person. Perceiving Adam in the *catholic* sense, his transgression — the ancestral fault, original sin — should be understood as the most personal of sins, as the ontological sin, the *catholic* sin. Adam as the *catholic* person is the *catholic* sinner: the *One* who is the *ONE* and who, therefore, encompasses, comprises, and implicates<sup>268</sup> the *Many*. Original sin / ancestral fault is ontological sin and, therefore, is a very *personal* sin especially as opposed to an *individual’s* sin (see chapter 4). This original sin is the most personal of sins because it involves the community of Mankind, not just *One*, but the *Many* who are *ONE*, because the *ONE*, Adam, transgressed; it pertains to the relationship that is at the core of the meaning of the term *person*. As Zizioulas remarks, “sin is the tragic prerogative of

---

<sup>265</sup> NAB Gn 3:20 The man called his wife Eve, because she became the mother of all the living. LXX: καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ Ζωή ὅτι αὕτη μήτηρ πάντων τῶν ζώντων

וַיִּקְרָא הָאָדָם שֵׁם אִשְׁתּוֹ חַוָּה כִּי הוּא הִיְתָה אִם כָּל־חַי:

Also see Gn 4:1. In Tb 8:6 and 2 Cor 11:3, and 1 Tm 2:13, one finds Εὐά/ *heua* which becomes *Eva* in the (Latin) Vulgate.

<sup>266</sup> Although the distinctive word for sin (חַטָּאת / *chattat*) first occurs in Gn 4:7, the sense of sin is readily inferred from the consequences of death; and St. Paul is explicit about the link. That link between sin and death occurs with varying degrees of emphasis in: Dt 24:16, 1 Kgs. 17:18, 2 Kgs. 14:6, 2 Chr. 25:4, Is 53:12, Rom 5:12, Rom 5:21, Rom 6:10, Rom 6:13, Rom 6:16, Rom 6:23, Rom 7:13, Rom 8:2, 1 Cor 15:56, Jas 1:15, Tb 12:9, Jdt 11:11, 4.

<sup>267</sup> See Resurrectional Tone 4 Troparion, “τὴν προγοντικὴν ἀπόφασιν” from προγοντικός, parental, and ἀπόφασιν, sentence / judgement.

<sup>268</sup> Veselin Kesich, *The First Day of the New Creation: The Resurrection and the Christian Faith* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1982), 150: “For St Paul, the last Adam, like the first, was inclusive — his actions affected all (Rm 5:12-21; 1 Cor 15:20-22; Ph 2:7f; Hb 2:5-8).”

the person alone,”<sup>269</sup> but he understands this also in terms of the personal tragic consequences that are of cosmic proportion. Once sin was added to Adam, Man and all creation was altered for the worse:<sup>270</sup>

The existence of pain and death in the natural world, which is not caused by anyone of us individually, should lead to *metanoia*. For we all share in the fall of Adam, and we all must feel the sorrow of failing to bring creation to communion with God and the overcoming of death. Holiness in the Church passes through sincere and deep *metanoia*. All the saints weep, because they feel somehow responsible personally for Adam’s fall and its consequences for innocent creation.

Salvation is the restoration of the likeness of God in Man, thus returning Adam/Mankind to his true calling, to be an authentic person.<sup>271</sup> We are called to go beyond the sorry state of the first, fallen Adam, beyond a mode of existence that Zizioulas labels the “*hypostasis of biological existence*.”<sup>272</sup>

Patristic theology considers the person to be an “image and likeness of God.” It is not satisfied with a humanistic interpretation of the person. From this standpoint patristic theology sees man in the light of two “modes of existence.” One may be called the hypostasis of biological existence, the other the hypostasis of ecclesial existence. ... comparison of these two modes of human existence will explain why the concept of the person is inextricably bound up with theology.

---

<sup>269</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 52.

<sup>270</sup> Zizioulas, “Communion and Otherness,” 352.

<sup>271</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 43: “Philosophy can arrive at the confirmation of the reality of the person, but only theology can treat of the genuine, the authentic person, because the authentic person, as absolute ontological freedom, must be “uncreated,” that is, unbounded by any “necessity,” including its own existence. If such a person does not exist in reality, the concept of the person is a presumptuous [*sic*] daydream. If God does not exist, the person does not exist.” See also on “authentic person”: Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 44, 54, 56, 58, 59, 61, 63; LaCugna, *God for Us*, 257, 261, 264, 315 n 119; Torrance, 299, quoting Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 54, and 301 quoting Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 61.

<sup>272</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 51.

All those born of the first Adam are to seek and arrive at identity with a new Adam, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ / *ho eschatos Adam, the last Adam*.<sup>273</sup>

### A Liturgical Hermeneutic

The Byzantine Resurrectional Kontakion sung at the Sunday Divine Liturgy (Eucharist) expresses the impact of the resurrection on all in Adam, and thus the *catholic* sense of Adam, and the differentiated, yet no less *catholic* sense of the couple, Adam and Eve. This is more than typology. The Kontakia express Mankind's response to the risen Christ in the person of Adam and the person of Eve (in varying degrees) for each week of the eight tone cycle (and for many proper kontakia of feasts also). They comprise an anthropological and soteriological manifesto that, using the *catholic* sense of Adam and of Adam and Eve, speak of all and to all including the "world" and "all creation." One should look upon the icon of the resurrection — Christ in Hades lifting up Adam and Eve, their tomb now empty, the shackles of death now broken:<sup>274</sup>

Tone 1: "... **Mankind** praises You as God ... **Adam** sings in exultation, O Lord; **Eve** freed from bondage cries joyfully ..."

Tone 2: "... **all creation** rejoices ...**Adam** joins with exultation, and the **world**, O my Savior, sings Your praises forever."

Tone 3: "... You rescued **us** ... Today **Adam** sings with exultation and **Eve** rejoices ..."

Tone 4: "... You raised from the grave **men** who were in chains ..."

Tone 5: "...**Adam** was delivered from the curse. And **we** all cry out to You ... Lover of **Mankind** ..."

Tone 6: "...granting resurrection to all **mankind** ..."

Tone 7: "No longer does the might of Death rule over **men** ..."

---

<sup>273</sup> 1 Cor 15:45 οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται· ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδάμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν, ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζῶσαν.

<sup>274</sup> That is, through Man to all creation; Man as the summit and high priest of creation is a common theme of Byzantine theology, e.g. Zizioulas, "Human Capacity," 425, 435.

Tone 8: “... You lifted up **Adam**, and **Eve** rejoices in Your resurrection. The **world** acclaim your rising from the dead ...”

\* \* \*

Before moving in the direction indicated by Zizioulas, to the “*hypostasis of ecclesial existence*” itself, another type of anthropology must first be considered. Scripture is quite clear that there is no salvation in the sons of Adam (בְּבִן־אָדָם / *b<sup>e</sup>ven Adam*).<sup>275</sup> Because the image of God is not lost in Adam/Man, however, it is appropriate that God could save Man through Man.<sup>276</sup> In the aftermath of the Fall, God does not start afresh by simply destroying the old to recreate a completely different Adam. Rather, God respects the person of Adam — respects Adam’s free (though misdirected) will, his self-determination,<sup>277</sup> and does not obliterate the will and thus destroy the person, scraping the old completely, re-creating Man/Adam. The restoration took a different form — not a re-creation but a new creation — a new creation within the old. The solution, a person, is God’s brilliance. Lossky points the direction for what he calls “the demands of a Christian anthropology”:<sup>278</sup>

Man created “in the image” is the person capable of manifesting God in the extent to which his nature allows itself to be penetrated by deifying grace. Thus the image—which is inalienable—can become similar or dissimilar, to the extreme limits: that of union with God, when deified man shows in himself by

---

<sup>275</sup> Actually, grammatically singular in the Hebrew, i.e. a *son of man* or *the son of Adam*.

Ps 146 (145):3. אֱלֹהֵי הַתְּבַטְחוּ בְּנְדִיבִים בְּבִן־אָדָם שְׂאִין לוֹ תְּשׁוּעָה:  
The LXX has the plural ἐφ’ υἱοὺς ἀνθρώπων: μὴ πεποιθήατε ἐπ’ ἄρχοντας καὶ ἐφ’ υἱοὺς ἀνθρώπων οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν σωτηρία. Put not your trust in “princes” (נְדִיבִים / *g<sup>e</sup>divim*, the genuinely noble ones; perhaps also the elite, the “beautiful,” important people of the world?), in (a / the) son(s) of man/Adam, in whom there is no salvation.

<sup>276</sup> This is a *catholic* statement; compare Schillebeeckx above and his correct (as far as it goes) but rather operational expression “Through men he wants to bring salvation to men,” where the intent seems ad extra and just instrumental rather than intrinsic.

<sup>277</sup> See above p 54 n 189.

<sup>278</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 139. Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 65 n 53, references “the classical text on deification in St. Maximus, *Ambigua* 222; P.G. 91, col. 1038.” See also Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 86, 89, and the next chapter of the thesis.

grace what God is by nature, according to the expression of St. Maximus; or indeed that of the extremity of falling-away which Plotinus called “the place of dissimilarity” (τόπος τῆς ἀνομοιωτήτος), placing it in the gloomy abyss of Hades. These are the two extremes between which the personal destiny of man may veer in the working-out of his salvation, which is already realized in hope for everyone in the incarnate Image of the God who willed to create man in His own image.

## Chapter 6

# Incarnation

σάρκωσις

Christianity is distinguished by its historical character, especially its emphasis on a person, the person of the Christ, the Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth. Specific persons are important in other religions but in Christianity, the *person* of Christ *is* the religion:<sup>279</sup>

An altogether unique property of Judaism and Christianity setting them off among the world's great religions is their *historical* character. The other religions are sets of beliefs and practices that have no essential connection with any particular time or person. Even if we were to hold that no one but Gautama Buddha could have formulated primitive Buddhism's tenets and practices, the person of the Buddha and the time he proposed his teaching are incidental to the teaching itself. Perhaps only Mohammed with his particular background and his peculiar temperament could have conceived primitive Islam's creed and code. But the person of the prophet is accidental to his teaching. It would still be the same had it been proclaimed by another in altogether different circumstances. Israelite religion, however, rested on the Exodus from Egypt and the Sinai covenant [*sic*] as historical facts. If the God of Israel had never made the covenant with the ancestors, then there would no longer have been any meaning to Israel's observing the Ten Commandments, which were simply the terms of the covenant (or at least the meaning of such an observance would have been essentially altered). Israelite hopes rested on David's dynasty and the divine promise made to it as historical realities: through that line Israel hoped for salvation. As regards Christianity, unless Jesus of Nazareth was God incarnate, unless He died and rose, "your faith is vain," as St. Paul remarks, "and you are still in your sins" (1 Cor 15:17). These and other historical facts are altogether essential to the Judaeo-Christian religion. God's successive interventions in the

---

<sup>279</sup> Thomas Barrosse, C.S.C., "How to Approach the Bible," *Studies in Salvation History*, C. Luke Salm, F.S.C., ed., (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1964), 1-2.

history of man pertain to the very fiber of Old Testament and New Testament religion.

The Christian revelation, consequently, is not just a message but a person. The Gospel, the good news of Jesus Christ,<sup>280</sup> is first and foremost the person of Jesus Himself.<sup>281</sup> This warrants reflection:<sup>282</sup>

Christ's pan-historic and pan-cosmic importance compels us to ask: Who is man? This question is of cardinal importance for mankind; there is, indeed none more important. Its answer is of greater moment to man than anything else.

The Word — and God only spoke one Word — a person, became flesh not text.<sup>283</sup> Zizioulas, interpreting St. Maximus says:<sup>284</sup>

And precisely here is the role of the incarnation. *The incarnate Christ is so identical to the ultimate will of God's love, that the meaning of created being and*

<sup>280</sup> εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; cf. Mk 1:1: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

<sup>281</sup> Consequently, for Christianity, to deny the religion is not just to deny doctrine, dogma, or theological propositions; rather, it is a denial of the person, Jesus.

<sup>282</sup> Schmaus, *The Essence of Christianity*, 67.

<sup>283</sup> This is said without prejudice to the importance of the εὐαγγέλιον / *euangelion*, the Gospel, as κερύγμα / *kerugma*. Lossky, *Orthodox Theology*, 13, notes: "Since the Word has incarnated Himself, the Word can be thought and taught — and in the same way the Word can be painted." The reference to painting is to iconography, literally, image *writing*, realizing that, for the east, the fundamental icon of Christ as writing / painting is Sacred Scripture, especially the Gospels. This should mute the objection of Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 95 n 121:

Zizioulas's christological and ecclesiological concentration on the incarnation and resurrection, and on the Eucharist, confirms that he is indeed involved in screening out faith soteriologically. Congar's lapidary critical remark touches the heart of the problem: "It is true that the word has become flesh, but it has also spoken!" ("Bulletin," 89).

There is, still, a real distinction, even as there is with the spoken word: Mk 8:38 με καὶ τοὺς ἔμοις λόγους / Me and the words of me. This is not to imply that one can pretend to acknowledge the person of Jesus but deny His message. Nevertheless, the Savior is a person not a book no matter how sacred it is. Can this be accepted without a charge of "screening out faith soteriologically"?

<sup>284</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 111-12

*the purpose of history are simply the incarnate Christ. All things were made with Christ in mind.*

Lossky explains this in terms of the person of the Son and that the “method” of Christian theology is not to “think” about a person but by means of a person.<sup>285</sup>

God speaks to us through His Son, the Incarnation accomplishes revelation: it reveals and it constitutes revelation itself. To think theologically is not to think of this revelation, but to think by means of it. The Fathers often invoke “our philosophy.” In fact, the method of this “philosophy” (which properly denotes theology) is based on an approach opposite to that of speculation. Theology starts from a fact: revelation. “God has spoken to us finally through His Son” (Heb. 1:2).

Similarly Ferguson, from a different perspective, discusses the approach of biblical theology by also focusing on the person of Christ as the purpose and the means of God’s revelation:<sup>286</sup>

God gave a *person*, then a *proclamation*, and then a *people*. This is the historical and theological order.

God gave first a *person*, Jesus Christ. He gave a person and not a creed as the object of faith and basis of salvation. God the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ is always a God of personal presence and a God who expects a personal response.

The *proclamation* centers in the person. He is the content of the message preached. The early church proclaimed “this Jesus” and declared what God had done through him. That preached word was soon written and collected into what we call the “New Testament” and added to the “Old Testament” to form the Christian Bible. The Bible is the written form of the proclamation of what God had done. God gave a Bible and not a catechism. The proclamation calls for a response.

The proclaimed word calls and gathers a *people*. The people respond to the proclamation of the person.

The new anthropology is the theology of this person, Jesus; the “mystery of man reveals itself fully only in the light of Christ.”<sup>287</sup>

---

<sup>285</sup> Lossky, *Orthodox Theology*, 18.

<sup>286</sup> Ferguson, *The Church of Christ*, xvii.

<sup>287</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 433.

## The New Testament Adam

The last section (chapter 5) discussed the theology of Adam. Recall that there are two accounts of the creation of Adam in the Old Testament, in Gn 1:26 ff and Gn 2:7 ff; these accounts complement one another. Likewise, there are also two accounts that pertain to the creation of the “new Man”<sup>288</sup> in the New Testament. The Gospel contains these accounts of the creation of a son of Adam — a second creation of Man that corresponds to the two accounts of the first creation of Man in Genesis, a new creation within the old. One account gives the details of the divine-human interaction (cf Gn 2:7 ff) in Lk 1:35, 38:<sup>289</sup> πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ.... εἶπεν δὲ Μαριάμ· ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου· γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου.— the Incarnation must be understood as the action of persons, the Son and the Holy Spirit along with the Woman, Mary, responding to another person, Most High One, the Father. The Incarnation is effected by the operation of the Holy Spirit, and is the expression and realization of the will of the Father<sup>290</sup> and the cooperation of the Woman, Mary. The second account of the new creation (reminiscent of Genesis 1) is in Jn 1:14: Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο<sup>291</sup> — the Incarnation unites the immanent, i.e. the divine logos (ὁ λόγος), and the economic, i.e. the flesh (σὰρξ), in the unity of the person. Neither Adam is created ex nihilo: each is intimately linked with the existing creation; each is the culmination of a creation that is good and beautiful in the

---

<sup>288</sup> Cf. Eph 2:15 εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον

<sup>289</sup> “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. Therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God.”... Mary said, “behold the handmaid of the Lord, let it be to me according to your saying.”

<sup>290</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 97: “Since God knows created beings as the realizations of His will, it is not being itself but the ultimate will of God’s love which unifies beings and points to the meaning of being. And precisely here is the role of the incarnation. *The incarnate Christ is so identical to the ultimate [sic] will of God’s love, that the meaning of created being and the purpose of history are simply the incarnate Christ.* All things were made with Christ in mind, or rather at heart, and for this reason *irrespective of the fall of man, the incarnation would have occurred.*”

<sup>291</sup> And the word became flesh. The verse continues: καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.

eyes of God.<sup>292</sup> There are issues here of cosmic proportion, and there are profound anthropological ramifications. The Roman Office describes the latter as a “wondrous exchange”:<sup>293</sup>

O admirabile commercium: Creator generis humani, animatum corpus sumens, de Virgine nasci dignatus est: et procedens homo sine semine, largitus est nobis suam Deitatem.

This “wondrous exchange” describes a new vision of Man, a new anthropology, a new person, as an attainable goal. Jesus, who referred to Himself so often as the Son of Man is the son of Adam in whom there is salvation. Precisely because Jesus is *One* of the *Many* of Mankind, a son of the *ONE*, Adam, He is able to raise up Adam, all Mankind, since He also is the new Adam, the new *ONE*.<sup>294</sup> How well this fits the *catholic* sense of the *person*: “Christ is the true person, the new Adam who in his particularity bears human nature in its catholicity”;<sup>295</sup> Christ is the “‘catholic’ man.”<sup>296</sup> It is also instructive to consider Volf’s characterization of Ratzinger’s interpretation of this new creation.<sup>297</sup>

According to Ratzinger, it would be a “great misunderstanding” to believe that Jesus Christ is an ontological anomaly. In Christ, “whom faith with certainty conceives as the one who is unique and nonrecurring, it is not merely a specu-

---

<sup>292</sup> טוב / *tov*, good, and καλός / *kalos*, good, beautiful; e.g. Gn 1:4, Gn 1:10, Gn 1:12, Gn 1:18, Gn 1:21, Gn 1:25, Gn 3:6.

<sup>293</sup> *The Hours of the Divine Office in English and Latin*, 3 volumes (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1964), Antiphon 1 for first Vespers January 1: O wondrous exchange! The creator of man, having assumed a living body, deigned to be born of a virgin, and having become man without man’s aid, enriched us with his divinity.

<sup>294</sup> We think that *Paradise* and *Calvarie* / Christs Crosse, and *Adams* tree, stood in one place; / Looke, Lord, and finde both *Adams* met in me; / As the first *Adams* sweat surrounds my face, / May the last *Adams* blood my soule embrace. Poem by John Donne, “Hymne to God my God, in my sickness,” quoted in Placher, *Unapologetic Theology*, 127.

<sup>295</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 438. See Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 85 n 71.

<sup>296</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 441.

<sup>297</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 68.

lative exception that is being disclosed; rather, we find here revealed for the first time in truth what is meant by the puzzle ‘human being.’

Volf then explains:<sup>298</sup>

The thesis that Christ does not represent an ontological exception becomes comprehensible given the qualitative understanding of the difference between protological human personhood and eschatological human personhood, conceived in strict correspondence to the trinitarian persons. Ratzinger does not understand Christ as a “highly extraordinary human being” whom one should imitate, but rather as the Son of God who at the same time is the paradigmatic human being, so that in him human beings become that which he himself is. His goal is to integrate human beings into the trinitarian life of God.

The Incarnation — that God became Man — should be for us a source of great optimism. This is the divine condescension, the κένωσις / *kenosis* (cf Phil 2:7): ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ σχήματι εὐρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος. In this most personal way Jesus proves Himself Φιλάνθρωπος / *Philánthropos* as the Byzantine liturgy often remarks: He is the one great and true “philanthropist” by becoming one of us; He is the “Lover of Mankind.”<sup>299</sup> God became Man that Man might become God.<sup>300</sup> And because of the integrity that is accorded to the person,

---

<sup>298</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 69.

<sup>299</sup> There are various approaches to ethics that consider different categories of love, e.g. Edward Collins Vacek, S.J., *Love Human and Divine: The Heart of Christian Ethics*, (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1994), and which then attempt to discern the highest form of love. From the perspective of the thesis, such analyses should not proceed by ranking the different kinds of love but by asking to what extent they, each in their way, are ultimately directed to love of the person.

<sup>300</sup> See below, page 105 passim. Also cf *Oriente Lumen*, “The Light of the East,” *Acta Apostolicae Sedis LXXXVII*, n.9, 745, *Acta Ioannis Pauli PP. II, Epistula Apostolica*, Apostolic Letter of Pope John Paul II promulgated on May 2, 1995, “... inscripta centesimo expleto anno ab editis Litteris Orientalium dignitas Leonis PP. XIII,” §6:

Cappadocum Patrum magisterium de divinizatione in omnium Ecclesiarum orientalium traditionem est ingressum ac partem constituit communis eorum patrimonii. Quae omnia summatim comprehenduntur cogitatione a sancto Irenaeo iam sub secundi saeculi finem prolata: “Deus factus est filius hominis, ut filius Dei fieret homo”. [14] Haec divinizationis theologia unus manet ex thesauris christianae menti orientali carissimis. [15]

Christology is anthropology, and anthropology is now Christology.<sup>301</sup> What is said uniquely of Christ, as is proper for the distinctiveness accorded the person, is also thereby said of us all in the sense that is proper for the person as one who is in communion, as one who is *catholic*.

### Chalcedon: The Person of Jesus

The decree of Chalcedon completes the theological understanding and description of *person* with reference to the Trinity, but now also as informed by the revelation of God in the Incarnation. As expressed in the liturgy, “in the Incarnation the indescribable Word of God became describable; for through the divine goodness, the Word spoken from eternity became an

---

A common translation is: “The teaching of the Cappadocian Fathers on divinization passed into the tradition of all the Eastern Churches and is part of their common heritage. This can be summarized in the thought already expressed by Saint Irenaeus at the end of the second century: God passed into man so that man might pass over to God.[14] This theology of divinization remains one of the achievements particularly dear to Eastern Christian thought.[15]” Note the cautious if not erroneous translation of “Deus factus est filius hominis, ut filius Dei fieret homo” as “God passed into man so that man might pass over to God.” Rather, to be excruciatingly literal in order to convey the force of the chiastic, concentric parallel, phrasing: “**A**-God **B**-became **C**-son of man **D**-that **C**'-son of God **B**'-might become **A**'-man,” though rendered in English word order **ABCD A' B' C'**. The references are: [14] Cf. *Against Heresies* III, 10, 2: *SCh* 211/2 121; III, 18, 7, l.c., 365; III, 19, 1, l.c., 375; IV, 20, 4: *SCh* 100/2, 635; IV, 33, 4, l.c., 811; V, Pref., *SCh* 153/2, 15. [15] Grafted on Christ, “men become gods and children of God ... the dust is raised to such a degree of glory that it is now equal in honor and godliness to the divine nature.” Nicholas Cabasilas, *Life in Christ*, I: PG 150, 505. Reference [15] in translation better informs; the Latin note has: “Inserti in Christum homines dei et filii Dei fiunt ... ac pulvis in tantum gloriae fastigium extollitur, ut iam divinae naturae, et honoris, et deitatis consors sit.” The Greek (reconstruction?) in *Against Heresies* III, 19,1, PG 7: 939 B n 54, is unambiguous: ὁ Λόγος Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ Υἱὸς Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐγένετο (Verbum Dei homo; et qui Filius Dei est, filius hominis factus est.).

<sup>301</sup> The Gospel witness is subtle but provocative: RSV Mt 9:8 When the crowds saw it, they were afraid, and they glorified God, who had given such authority to men. Mt 9:8 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐφοβήθησαν καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. And Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 439, speaks of “Christology as a pattern for anthropology.”

Image.”<sup>302</sup> The Symbol of Chalcedon<sup>303</sup> confirms the equivalence of person and hypostasis: εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν / *in(to) one prosopon* [= person / *personam*] and *one hypostasis* [=person / *subsistentiam*]. The language of the council’s decree also reflects the *catholic* aspect of *person* (as discussed in chapter 3 and chapter 4), the sense of integrity and completeness in describing the union of the human and divine<sup>304</sup> natures (φύσεων / *phuseon*) in the person as ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως.<sup>305</sup> Also, the person of the Son is consubstantial (ὁμοούσιον / *homoousion*) with God the Father and with Man, and is perfect (τέλειον / *teleion*) and true (ἀληθῶς / *alethos*) with respect to each. The theoretical absurdity of uniting the finite creature with the infinite God is reconciled in the Incarnation;<sup>306</sup> the solution of the created / uncreated, finite / infinite dialectic is a person, the Trinitarian Son of God the Father who is identically Jesus born “from Mary who is Virgin and God-bearer” (ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου / *ek Marias tes parthehou tes theotokou*<sup>307</sup>). As Lossky explains, commenting on the same words of Chalcedon, Jesus the Son is<sup>308</sup>

a person who is not formed *from* two natures, ἐκ δύο φύσεων, but who is *in* two natures, ἐν δύο φύσει... in the unity of the Person or Hypostasis of the Son of God become Man. Thus the humanity of Christ, by which He is “consubstantial with us,” never had any other hypostasis than that of the Son of God; however no

---

<sup>302</sup> Kontakion for the first Sunday of the Great Fast (Lent) in Byzantine churches, the Sunday of Orthodoxy, commemorating the “triumph” of the Holy Icons / Images, and the defeat of the iconoclasts after the Council of Nicea II, AD 787 .

<sup>303</sup> October 22, 451. Phillip Schaff, ed., *The Creeds of Christendom* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996), Vol II, 62-63.

<sup>304</sup> Cf the earlier statement of Tertullian, *Adversus Praxeam*, 27.11: “Videmus duplicem statum non confusum sed conjunctum in una persona Deum et hominem Jesum.” This is noted by von Balthasar, “On the Concept of Person,” *Communio*, 21.

<sup>305</sup> *asunchutos, atreptos, adiairetos, achoristos*; in the Latin version, *inconfuse, immutabiliter, indivise, inseparabiliter*: unconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably. Cf the discussion of *diairesis* in chapter 3.

<sup>306</sup> I.e., the person of Christ demonstrates, proves, that and how creation and God are united. Creation is not a part of God, nor is it apart from God.

<sup>307</sup> In the Latin version *Dei genitricis*.

<sup>308</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 118.

one would deny that His human nature has the character of an “individual substance,” and the Chalcedonian dogma insists on the fact that Christ is “perfect in his humanity,” “truly man,” ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος — “with a reasonable soul and a body.” In these conditions, the human subject of Christ has the same character as other particular substances or natures of humanity that one calls “hypostases.”

Again, in the catholic sense, a correspondence is established between the two Adams because the *One*, Christ, who is a son of Adam, who “has the same character as other particular substances or natures of humanity” as Lossky explains it, by His divinity also changes the *ONE*, Adam. Emil Mersch expresses the proper soteriological consequence of the person as catholic:<sup>309</sup>

In Christ, it is the human nature which serves as an instrument for the divinity to work the redemption of men.

In us also. Humanity is the instrument which God deigns to take up in order to purify humanity: He saves man, as he divinises him, by man.

Likewise Zizioulas:<sup>310</sup>

Human nature in Christ recovers its ekstastic movement towards God and thus it overcomes its individualisation. In this sense creaturehood becomes a ‘new creation’ in Christ, i.e. a nature which can have a hypostatic catholicity in its reference to being. This leads to a full realisation of the *priestly character of humanity*: humanity can now in Christ recapitulate and ‘refer back’ (*anaphora*) nature to its Creator. Hence the importance of Christ in this respect is that personhood is now objectively restored *not on the level of an individual but on the level of true personhood* which is capable of bearing *human nature in its catholicity*. Had Christ been another ‘individual’ among us, this catholicity of nature would not have been realised

---

<sup>309</sup> Emil Mersch, S. J., *Morality and the Mystical Body* (New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1939), 87.

<sup>310</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 435.

Various aspects of the “new creation,” the human person encountering Christ and in Christ<sup>311</sup> will now be considered. The second Vatican Council’s “Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy” aptly summarizes the encounters from a Catholic perspective:<sup>312</sup>

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 now offering, through the ministry of priests, who formerly offered himself on the cross” [20], 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 [21]. 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, lastly, when the Church prays and sings, for He promised: “Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them” (Mt 18:20).

### Sacraments as the Encounter of Persons

---

<sup>311</sup> εἰς Χριστὸν: Acts 24:24, Rom 6:3, Rom 16:5, 1 Cor 8:12, 2 Cor 1:21, Gal 2:16, Gal 3:24, Gal 3:27, Eph 5:32, Col. 2:5, Phlm. 1:6, 1 Pt 1:11. ἐν Χριστῷ: Rom 3:24, Rom 6:11, Rom 6:23, Rom 8:1, Rom 8:2, Rom 8:39, Rom 9:1, Rom 12:5, Rom 15:17, Rom 16:3, Rom 16:7, Rom 16:9, Rom 16:10, 1 Cor 1:2, 1 Cor 1:4, 1 Cor 1:30, 1 Cor 3:1, 1 Cor 4:10, 1 Cor 4:15, 1 Cor 4:17, 1 Cor 15:18, 1 Cor 15:19, 1 Cor 15:31, 1 Cor 16:24, 2 Cor 2:17, 2 Cor 3:14, 2 Cor 5:17, 2 Cor 5:19, 2 Cor 12:2, 2 Cor 12:19, Gal 1:22, Gal 2:4, Gal 2:17, Gal 3:14, Gal 3:26, Gal 3:28, Eph 1:1, Eph 1:3, Eph 2:6, Eph 2:7, Eph 2:10, Eph 2:13, Eph 3:6, Eph 3:21, Eph 4:32, Phil 1:1, Phil 1:13, Phil 1:26, Phil 2:1, Phil 2:5, Phil 3:3, Phil 3:14, Phil 4:7, Phil 4:19, Phil 4:21, Col 1:2, Col 1:4, Col 1:28, 1 Thess 2:14, 1 Thess 4:16, 1 Thess 5:18, 1 Tm 1:14, 1 Tm 3:13, 2 Tm 1:1, 2 Tm 1:9, 2 Tm 1:13, 2 Tm 2:1, 2 Tm 2:10, 2 Tm 3:12, 2 Tm 3:15, Phlm 1:8, Phlm 1:20, Phlm 1:23, 1 Pt 3:16, 1 Pt 5:10, 1 Pt 5:14.

<sup>312</sup> VC II, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 4 December 1963, §7. Ad tantum vero opus perficiendum, Christus Ecclesiae suae semper adest, praesertim in actionibus liturgicis. Praesens adest in Missae Sacrificio cum in ministri persona, “idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit” tum maxime sub speciebus eucharisticis. Praesens adest virtute sua in Sacramentis, ita ut cum aliquis baptizat, Christus ipse baptizet. Praesens adest in verbo suo, siquidem ipse loquitur dum sacrae Scripturae in Ecclesia leguntur. Praesens adest denique dum supplicat et psallit Ecclesia, ipse qui promisit: “Ubi sunt duo vel tres congregati in nomine meo, ibi sum in medio eorum” (Mt 18, 20). References are: [20] Council of Trent, Session XXII, Doctrine on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, c. 2. [21] Cf. St. Augustine, *Tractatus in Ioannem*, VI, n. 7, *PL* 35: 1428.

Much has been written and argued about the Sacraments. The discussion presented here does not engage those disputes; rather, it gives a selective presentation of the mysteries / sacraments based upon the concept of person as it has been developed in the thesis, i.e., it reiterates sacramental theology using the language and concept of *person*. The discussion takes the number of sacraments according to the reckoning of the Catholic Church;<sup>313</sup> thus, it is an illustration of how the vocabulary of the *person*, as presented here, can be used to describe the mysteries of the Catholic Church. Consider some preliminaries. Torrance notes the importance of the sacraments for Zizioulas's ontology.<sup>314</sup> According to Zizioulas, the sacraments may be more "critical" than the word since they involve all creation.<sup>315</sup>

Salvation is for the entire creation which is subject to the yoke of death, and until death is eliminated from the entire cosmos there can be no salvation for the human being. It is this that makes the celebration of the sacraments, especially of the Eucharist, so crucial to the Church, perhaps more crucial than the preaching of the Word. For the sacraments involve *all* creation in the being of the Church — not only humans — and the Church becomes in this way the very core and nucleus of the destiny of the world.

The personal description of the mysteries/sacraments was expressed very well by Pope St. Leo the Great:<sup>316</sup> *Quod itaque Redemptoris nostri conspicuum fuit, in sacramenta transivit --- That which was visible in our Redeemer has gone into the Sacraments.* The mysteries /

---

<sup>313</sup> I.e., the greater number compared to the Protestant reckoning. The seven sacraments are also in harmony, though not necessarily identical with, the Orthodox view; see Bishop Maximos Aghiorgoussis, "Orthodox Soteriology," *Salvation in Christ: A Lutheran – Orthodox Dialogue* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992), 52-53. The consideration of seven also follows the Byzantine Catholic perspective of the thesis as expressed in the Prologue. The enumeration of the seven is traced, at least, to Lombard, *Libri IV Sententiarum*, IV.2.1, 751: *Iam ad Sacramenta novae legis accedamus, quae sunt: baptismus, confirmatio, panis benedictionis, id est eucharistia, poenitentia, unctio extrema, ordo, coniugium.*

<sup>314</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 300.

<sup>315</sup> Zizioulas, "The Mystery of the Church in Orthodox Tradition," 296.

<sup>316</sup> Sermon 74, 2, as found in Migne's *Patrologia Latina (PL)* 54, 398. Quoted approvingly by Lossky, *In the Image and Likeness of God*, 104. Also quoted in CCC, §1115. Regarding *conspicuum* cf Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 138, linking the "sacramental" with the "iconic."

sacraments flow from the Incarnation because they are the ontological and personal presence of Christ. The Incarnation is the foundation of the sacramental; incarnational terminology is sacramental terminology. Sacraments give an ontological awareness. The sacraments / mysteries are the personal interactions and encounters of each person, each *One*, with the *ONE* who is the new Adam and who is also the *One* who is son of Mary and the Son of God. Thus they function on a personal level, always affecting the person whom they encounter as a meeting with Christ himself<sup>317</sup>; this may be understood as mystical, even symbolic, as long as it is also understood as actual and real. The mysteries are links to the person of Christ: they inform us about Christ, about our relationship with Him and with fellow Christians. This is because the sacraments, as our encounters with the person of Christ, always affect the person, and do so always ontologically, always in an existential manner. In the celebration of these mysteries in the east, the action of another person, the Holy Spirit, is made explicit in the efficacy of the divine mysteries through an epiclesis. And because of the “guarantee”, the “collateral”<sup>318</sup> of the Holy Spirit’s personal presence, the personal presence of Christ which the mysteries embody have the quality of an encounter that must be an objective one with respect to the persons involved, and also one that respects the persons involved. One can interpret this as the *ex opere operato*,<sup>319</sup> as an objective encounter guaranteed by the Holy Spirit, just as those who experienced the Jesus of Nazareth did so, each according to their personal disposition, in an objective and existential manner. Since the sacramental encounter takes place in faith, they are events that are person transforming while respecting the integrity of the person.

---

<sup>317</sup> Cf Edward Schillebeeckx, O. P., *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963), especially chapter 6 “Sacramental Encounters with Christ: Culminating Moments in the Ecclesial Character of Christian Life,” 198-216.

<sup>318</sup> ἀρραβῶν / *arrabon*: guarantee, pledge. Eph 1:13b-14a, ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀρραβῶν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν. You were sealed with the Holy Spirit of the promise, who is the pledge / assurance of our inheritance.

<sup>319</sup> *Ex opere operato* is the personal assurance, the ἀρραβῶν / *arrabon*, of the Holy Spirit; see the previous note. The Holy Spirit, noting the importance of the epiclesis of the Holy Spirit in Byzantine (sacramental) liturgy, is the assurance of the efficacy of the sacraments. The person of the Holy Spirit is the guarantee expressed by the phrase *ex opere operato*.

The sacraments of the new covenant are each a personal encounter with, and a manifestation of the incarnate Christ Himself:<sup>320</sup>

Jesus' words and actions during his hidden life and public ministry were already salvific, for they anticipated the power of his Paschal mystery. They announced and prepared what he was going to give the Church when all was accomplished. The mysteries of Christ's life are the foundations of ... the sacraments.

And:<sup>321</sup>

Sacraments are 'powers that come forth' from the Body of Christ, [Cf. Lk 5:17; 6:19; 8:46.] which is ever-living and life-giving. They are actions of the Holy Spirit at work in his Body, the Church. They are 'the masterworks of God' in the new and everlasting covenant.

The Sacraments always involve a personal presence of Christ but they are of different kinds. It is useful and necessary to distinguish the personal presence of Christ from the presence of Christ as person, and the presence of Christ in a person or persons.<sup>322</sup>

Consider baptism as the presence of Christ in a person. Zizioulas notes at least two ontological categories that must be considered for Man, the *hypostasis of biological*,<sup>323</sup> and the *hypostasis of ecclesial*<sup>324</sup> existence. Rebirth from the biological to the ecclesial is accomplished through baptism.<sup>325</sup>

---

<sup>320</sup> CCC, §1115

<sup>321</sup> CCC, §1116. Cf the classical statement found e.g. in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* (also called *The Roman Catechism*), 163, quoting St. Augustine In Joan. Tr. Lxxx, n. 3: "The word is joined to the element, and it becomes a Sacrament."

<sup>322</sup> Cf Joseph M. Powers, *Eucharistic Theology* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 130ff.

<sup>323</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 50 ff.

<sup>324</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 53 ff.

<sup>325</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 53.

The *hypostasis of ecclesial existence* is constituted by the new birth of man, by baptism. Baptism as new birth is precisely an act constitutive of hypostasis. As the conception and birth of a man constitute his biological hypostasis, so baptism leads to a new mode of existence, to a regeneration (I Pet. 1:3,23), and consequently to a new “hypostasis.”

In entering into the life of the Christ (which for Zizioulas is also the life of the church) Man overcomes the limits of the “ontological necessity of his biological hypostasis.”<sup>326</sup> This is made certain by the assumption of our human nature by the Incarnate Son of God. The key image is given in the letter to the Galatians: “All you who have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.” In baptism it is we who stand in the Jordan — not geographically but mystically and therefore in fact — in the spirit of adoption, and emerge as from a womb, the old self having died,<sup>327</sup> to “authentic personhood.” Zizioulas explains:<sup>328</sup>

The ecclesial hypostasis exists historically ... as a confirmation of man’s capacity not to be reduced to his tendency to become the bearer of individuality, separation and death. The ecclesial hypostasis is the faith of man in his capacity to become a person and his hope that he will indeed become an authentic person. In other words it is faith and hope in the immortality of man.<sup>329</sup>

When we put on Christ we become Christ, the *ONE*, in the *Many* who are *ONE*, because the person is *catholic*; however, we are still our unique hypostasis,<sup>330</sup> a unique *One*; and Christ is still His unique hypostasis, His unique *One*. Christ, the catholic person in the truest and most

---

<sup>326</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 56.

<sup>327</sup> See the entry for “Font” in J. G. Davies, *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986) giving the symbolic associations for the shape (number of sides) of ancient baptismal fonts: 4, sarcophagus lid, death; 6, Sabbath, death of Christ; 8, eighth day, resurrection; circular, womb, birth and new life.

<sup>328</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 56.

<sup>329</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 58.

<sup>330</sup> Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 159: ‘Each human individual, fully “consubstantial” with his fellow men, is, nonetheless, radically *distinct* from them in his unique, unrepeatable, and unassimilable personality or hypostasis: no man can fully be *in* another man. But Jesus’ hypostasis has a fundamental affinity with all human personalities.’

emphatic sense is personally present in us, in our person — we have put Him on in baptism — but Christ is not present as a person in us, for this would violate both the integrity of Christ and our integrity as persons. Having put on Christ in baptism, we now act as Christ; since we are now other christs,<sup>331</sup> we emerge from baptism and are anointed with the Holy Spirit in chrismation (confirmation). Baptism and Chrismation are sacraments of inclusiveness and equality; Orders is the sacrament of exclusiveness and difference, a necessary difference in the *catholic* makeup. Here *One* of those who have already put on Christ is called to be set apart precisely to represent the otherness of the person of Christ in the church. In Catholic theology these three sacraments bestow a sacramental seal, that is, a sealing of the person, an indelible, a permanent “mark” of transformation of the person. The theology of the sacramental seal, σφράγις / *sphragis*<sup>332</sup> (cf character<sup>333</sup>), is very important in that it is a most personal aspect of Christian identity, that is, it pertains directly and ontologically to the person.<sup>334</sup>

Crowning/Matrimony is the anthropological sacrament, the two becoming one. It is unique in that it involves specifically two persons. Recalling Genesis 2:24,<sup>335</sup> Paul writes about this.<sup>336</sup>

---

<sup>331</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 58 n 54: “Every baptized person becomes Christ.”

<sup>332</sup> Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 234 ff; and, 165, on “indelible character.” Cf Harrison, “Zizioulas on Communion and Otherness,” 298; LaCugna, *God for Us*, 263.

<sup>333</sup> χαρακτήρ / *charakter*: engraved mark, stamp; see Thomas Hopko, “The Trinity,” *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, in Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff, and Jean Leclercq, eds. (New York: Crossroads, 1997), 246.

<sup>334</sup> Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 234-36, discusses the seal, σφράγις, as relation, σχέσις in contrast to πρᾶγμα, “a strictly ontological meaning.” Also see the discussion by McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 276.

<sup>335</sup> See discussion in the previous chapter, pp 76-78.

<sup>336</sup> Eph 5:31-32. ἀντὶ τούτου καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος [τὸν] πατέρα καὶ [τὴν] μητέρα καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν. τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν· ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

“For this reason a man shall leave (the) father and (the) mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall be into [εἷς / *eis*] one flesh.” This is a great mystery; I speak into [εἷς] Christ and into [εἷς] the church.

As the sign of the union of the Bridegroom, Christ, for His Spouse, the Church, it is a permanent union of faithful partners. Like Orders, which sets a man<sup>337</sup> apart to represent the otherness of Christ<sup>338</sup> to His Bride, the Church, it is a nuptial mystery.<sup>339</sup>

Though we act as Christ as an hypostasis of ecclesial existence we are still, as was Christ, a son of Adam, and retain the fallen human aspects, the form / *morphe*, of an hypostasis of biological existence. In penance / reconciliation we receive the forgiveness of our sins from Christ through His minister (as the alter of His person), restoring us to our baptismal identity, our true identity as authentic persons.

Holy Eucharist is discussed in detail in the next section; it will be seen that in the Eucharist, in that the Eucharist constitutes the church, all the categories of personal encounter with Christ are present, i.e., Christ is personally present in His word, is present in other persons,

---

<sup>337</sup> There may be an objection that “or a woman” should be added. But the discussion here is based on the indicated (Byzantine Catholic) orientation of the thesis. Furthermore, exclusiveness is a valid consideration, i.e. this illustrates (even if one does not agree) a plausible and actual scenario: that difference does exist but that difference and distinctiveness and otherness, even if involving something as inherent as gender, can qualify the eucharistic community which, as *catholic*, can sustain such without division.

<sup>338</sup> The emphasis here and throughout the thesis where the phrase “the otherness of Christ” occurs is more on the person “Christ” than on “otherness.” One could equally point to the “otherness” of every person and their uniqueness.

<sup>339</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 165 n 88: “The Orthodox service of ordination to the priesthood is in many parts identical with that of matrimony. This does not only suggest an understanding of the ministry as a bond between the ordained, Christ and the community, but it indicates at the same time the direction in which theology should move in its attempts to understand the character of ordination.” So too is the Byzantine Catholic service of ordination. Ordination to the diaconate also has similarities to the marriage service.

is present as the other in the person of His ministers, and is also uniquely present as the other, as a distinct person.<sup>340</sup> For Zizioulas, all sacraments are “bound” to the Eucharist.<sup>341</sup>

Lastly, there is the Holy Oil / Anointing of the Sick, previously called Extreme Unction (*extrema unctio*, final anointing) in western Catholic sacramental theology. A discussion of this sacrament usually looks to James<sup>342</sup> or the Gospel account of Jesus sending forth the disciples to anoint the sick.<sup>343</sup> Consider, however, from the personal viewpoint of those who have put on Christ — from the personal viewpoint of the Christian who must walk as Christ and even pick up the cross<sup>344</sup> as Christ<sup>345</sup> — the very poignant episode that takes place at Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, Mk 14:3-9.<sup>346</sup> A woman pours the oil<sup>347</sup> on the head of Jesus done, as He says, “in preparation for my burial.”<sup>348</sup> The Christian has died in Christ and been born again

<sup>340</sup> The ontological presence of Jesus as a person in the Eucharist is addressed in the next chapter.

<sup>341</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 61.

<sup>342</sup> Jas 5:14 Is anyone among you sick? He should summon the presbyters of the church, and they should pray over him and anoint (him) with oil in the name of the Lord. ἀσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν, προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἀλείψαντες [αὐτὸν] ἐλαίῳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου

<sup>343</sup> Mk 6:13 They drove out many demons, and they anointed with oil many who were sick and cured them. καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλλον, καὶ ἤλειφον ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἀρρώστους καὶ ἐθεράπευον. Cf Mt 10:1, 5-8, which is a reading for the Sacrament / Mystery of the Holy Oil service on Wednesday of Great / Holy Week; see e.g., Papadeas, *ΜΕΓΑΛΗ*, 138.

<sup>344</sup> Oktoechos, Tone 6, Tuesday. “Your cross, O Lord, is life and resurrection for your people; and we, who put our trust in it, praise you, our God, crucified in the flesh.”

<sup>345</sup> Parastas Service, *The Office of Christian Burial*, 12, Tone 5, hymns for the deceased: “Come to me all who have walked the narrow and sorrowful path, who during life have taken upon yourselves the cross as a yoke and faithfully followed me; enjoy the honors and the heavenly crowns which I have prepared for you.”

<sup>346</sup> See parallels Mt 26:6-13; Lk 7:36-50, Jn 12:1-8. John’s pericope was the traditional, Tridentine, reading for the Mass on Monday of Holy Week. Matthew’s pericope (to verse 16) is the Gospel prescribed when the mystery/sacrament of Holy Anointing is celebrated during the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts on Wednesday of Great and Holy Week.

<sup>347</sup> Mk 14:3 ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦ, an alabaster jar of oil of nard, genuine, of great value.

<sup>348</sup> Mk 14:8 προέλαβεν μυρίσαι τὸ σῶμά μου εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν, she has anointed

from on high, resurrected, in baptism. But each Christian as a son of the old Adam must still experience personal death as did Jesus Himself. And so the Woman — the Bride, the Church — pours the precious oil on us, to prepare us for our burial as christs. In this sense, the designation Extreme Unction, final anointing, is quite fitting.

The sacraments redefine and reestablish the person within the context of the ecclesial element for Zizioulas. Zizioulas comments on the tension that exists, however, between the biological and the ecclesial:<sup>349</sup>

The encounter between the ecclesial and the biological hypostases creates a paradoxical relationship in human existence. Man appears to exist in his ecclesial identity not as that which he is but as that which he *will* be; the ecclesial identity is linked with eschatology, that is, with the final outcome of his existence.

This new ontological category is called the “*sacramental or eucharistic hypostasis*”<sup>350</sup> by Zizioulas.

### Scripture as the Personal Presence of Christ

Having examined the personal presence of Christ in the Sacraments it is instructive to consider the similarities and differences in understanding the personal presence of Christ in scripture.<sup>351</sup> This personal presence of Christ in the scriptures, is clearly expressed by Hugh of St. Victor (AD 1096-1141):<sup>352</sup>

---

my body beforehand for its burial.

<sup>349</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 59.

<sup>350</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 59.

<sup>351</sup> John Breck, *The Power of the Word* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1986), 13, refers to ‘the “kerygmatic” character of the Sacraments and the “sacramental” character of the Word.’

<sup>352</sup> “All sacred Scripture is but one book, and that one book is Christ, because all divine Scripture speaks of Christ, and all divine Scripture is fulfilled in Christ.” Latin text from *De Arca Noe* 2, 8: Migne *PL* 176, 642; English translation in the *CCC*, §134. Cf. Lk 24:44: Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς, Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὐκ ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὡν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ. For

Omnis Scriptura divina unus liber est, et ille unus liber Christus est, quia omnis Scriptura divina de Christo loquitur, et omnis Scriptura divina in Christo impletur.

How this presence differs from the sacramental can be appreciated by considering the meaning of Incarnation. For instance, is there a divine and human aspect to the scriptures, and if so, is the relationship analogous in some way to the term “incarnation?” The term incarnation in Christian theology certainly designates the union of the divine and human. But the term focuses on an actual “becoming flesh,”<sup>353</sup> σαρκωθέντα as it is expressed in the Creed of Nicea-Constantinople (NC). As such it emphasizes the reality of this Christian mystery in an actual person, ἐνανθρωπήσαντα (NC). The “content” of incarnation is the person and not the message. Thus even the term *Gospel*, taking Mark’s pointed designation, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,<sup>354</sup> is that the good news of Jesus Christ is not just the medium or the message but the person, Jesus Himself.<sup>355</sup>

The best expression for the human-divine aspect of scripture is given by scripture itself: πᾶσα γραφή (here meaning the Jewish sacred writings, but by extension, the Christian scriptures also) θεόπνευστος (2 Tm 3:16).<sup>356</sup> NC also notes a belief εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ... το

---

the Christian, the New Testament is the one great definitive *מִדְרָשׁ* (*midrash*) of the Old Testament.

<sup>353</sup> Jn 1:14 Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο

<sup>354</sup> Cf. Mk 1:1: Ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [υἱοῦ θεοῦ]. Cf Jn 5:39 which links this concept to note 331: ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζῶν αἰώνιον ἔχειν· καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ·

<sup>355</sup> That is, in this context reading the phrase primarily as a genitive of apposition or description; cf 2 Cor 5:5 τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος. Also Joyce A. Little, *Toward a Thomist Methodology* (Lewiston: E. Mellen Press, 1988), 535, referring to Mersch, *The Theology of the Mystical Body*, 380: “not only the importance of Christ, but the fact that Christ Himself is the revelation.”

<sup>356</sup> And οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι (2 Pt 1:21); and τὴν γραφὴν ἣν προεῖπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ (Acts 1:16).

λαλήσαν διὰ τῶν Προφητῶν; and in relation to the Incarnation, belief εἰς ἓνα Κύριον, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν ... τόν... σαρκωθέντα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.<sup>357</sup>

Since scripture is θεόπνευστος, God-inspired, is it inerrant. Echoing scripture,<sup>358</sup> an ancient Byzantine hymn calls the Holy Spirit τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, and truth does not err, however, people by themselves do. The inerrancy cannot be in the text itself, since the textual witness can vary. What is inerrant, rather, is the content, the message, ultimately the person, the εὐαγγέλιον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The presence of another person, the Holy Spirit, guarantees that the articulation of the revelation in the sacred writing is free of error and properly proclaimed in truth to all ages. Scripture does not have a “body” of its own; rather it finds its expression within and ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία (Col 1:24).<sup>359</sup> Thus the Holy Spirit speaks through the scriptures and even through fallible persons — a divine / human synergism of persons expressed so well in Acts 15:28: ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ἡμῖν.

Sacraments give us an awareness of Christ that is an ontological awareness; they relate person to person. But Jesus is also present and experienced in His word, uniquely so in scripture (where He is always objectively encountered, though minimally or maximumly depending on our disposition). This too is a personal presence that elicits a response from us as persons (integral and complete), one that results from our encounter with the personal presence of Christ in his word in scripture. However, the bible is still a book; it is not a person. For instance, according to this analysis, *incarnation* is not the correct designation for understanding the nature of the scriptures, even though they possess both a human and divine element.

---

<sup>357</sup> And also, Lk 1:35 ... Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ

<sup>358</sup> Jn14:17, Jn15:26, Jn16:13.

<sup>359</sup> In behalf of His body which is the church. Paul is not discussing scripture here but His words denote the relationship of the scriptures to Christ’s body = church. For another (concurring) discussion of scripture and the church, see Richard B. Hays, *The Moral Vision of the New Testament*, 304-5: “... ‘this comes from the Lord, the Spirit’ (2 Cor. 3:18). The church dares to articulate fresh and audacious readings of Scripture only because it relies upon the work of the Holy Spirit in the community — as promised in the New Testament texts themselves (cf. Also 1 Cor 2:6-16; Jn 16:12-15). The Spirit reshapes the community into unexpected metaphorical reflections of the biblical stories and thereby casts new light back onto the texts.”

## Sons in the Son

The culmination of Christian anthropology as discussed previously and in reference to the person is illuminated by an exegesis of Gal 4:4-7 as the answer to the Psalmist's question, "What is Man /Adam?" (see appendix). God sent forth His Son ... that we might receive our status as sons.<sup>360</sup> To use the phrase of Emil Mersch, we are "sons in the Son."<sup>361</sup> We, creation, find our identity in the Trinity in and through the person of the Son who is the person of the All-holy Three, appropriately, through whom all things came to be as attested in scripture<sup>362</sup> and creed.<sup>363</sup> In terms of *person*, the image and likeness of God can be nothing more ultimate than sonship, that is, a relationship and correspondence fashioned on the basis of the person of the Son, the second person of the Trinity, who as a person, became Man while remaining the same person. "Baptism is essentially nothing else but the application to humanity of the very filial relationship which exists between the Father and the Son."<sup>364</sup> That we are sons is the culmination of our identity as persons; it is the culminating statement of anthropology. Appropriately, our human identity is referenced to a person, yet not just any person, but one of the inherently unique and essential persons, the second person of the Trinity, the Son. God — the Father — has only actually spoken but one Word:<sup>365</sup> Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν

---

<sup>360</sup> Gal 4:4-7. Cf Jn 8:34-36.

<sup>361</sup> "Filli in Filio." Emil Mersch, *The Theology of the Mystical Body* (B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis 1955), 325.

<sup>362</sup> Jn 1:3,4. πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων. All things through him came to be, and without him came to be not one what came to be in him was life, and the life was the light of men [i.e. Mankind, human beings, all people].

<sup>363</sup> NC: δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, through whom all the things came to be.

<sup>364</sup> Zizioulas, "Human Capacity," 438. See Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 86 ff, discussing Zizioulas on this; Volf interprets Zizioulas thus: "Human personhood is identical ("exactly the same") with divine personhood albeit not in and of itself, but rather through unity with the Son."

<sup>365</sup> Jn 1:1. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος And though Christianity has laws it is not “the Law.”<sup>366</sup>

The Way<sup>367</sup> is not “the Law,” ἡ ὁδὸς / *Torah*,<sup>368</sup> but a person, Jesus. Thus Ephesians 2:13-16:<sup>369</sup>

νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον ποιῶν εἰρήνην καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ.

Thus the Byzantine Oktoechos (Thursday, Tone 7): “In order for You to perfect mankind and make us divine, You, O Christ, became mortal and were crucified.” The end (τέλος / *telos*) and

<sup>366</sup> New Testament references to “the law” are numerous; see Gal 4:4-5 as an example.

<sup>367</sup> NAB Jn 14:6 Jesus said to him, “I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me. Jn 14:6 λέγει αὐτῷ [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς· ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ· οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι’ ἐμοῦ.

<sup>368</sup> Cf RSV Prv 6:23 For the commandment is a lamp and the teaching (ἡ ὁδὸς / *torah*) a light, and the reproofs of discipline are the way of life.

<sup>369</sup> Consider three standard translations; the various translations of ἄνθρωπον / *anthropon* is emphasized: only considered together do these translations of ἄνθρωπον convey the sense of the *catholic person*. NAB Eph 2:13 But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have become near by the blood of Christ. 14 For he is our peace, he who made both one and broke down the dividing wall of enmity, through his flesh, 15 abolishing the law with its commandments and legal claims, that he might create in himself one new **person** in place of the two, thus establishing peace, 16 and might reconcile both with God, in one body, through the cross, putting that enmity to death by it.

NRS Eph 2:13 But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ. 14 For he is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us. 15 He has abolished the law with its commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new **humanity** in place of the two, thus making peace, 16 and might reconcile both groups to God in one body through the cross, thus putting to death that hostility through it.

RSV Eph 2:13 But now in Christ Jesus you who once were far off have been brought near in the blood of Christ. 14 For he is our peace, who has made us both one, and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility, 15 by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new **man** in place of the two, so making peace, 16 and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross, thereby bringing the hostility to an end.

perfection<sup>370</sup> (i.e. complete and whole, τελείος / *teleios*) of the person is θέωσις / *theosis*, divinization. In Byzantine theology, σάρκωσις is seen as one portion of a two-way interaction, the other portion of which is θέωσις — the deification<sup>371</sup> of Man = humanity, that is, of persons. This finds classical expression in Irenaeus<sup>372</sup> and especially Athanasius' αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ Λόγος. Αὐτός γὰρ ἐνηθρώπησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεωποιηθῶμεν.<sup>373</sup> According to Zizioulas, it is a

---

<sup>370</sup> Mt 5:48, Mt 19:21, Col 4:12, Jas. 1:4; Col 1:28, Jas 3:2, 1 Jn 4:18; cf Wis 9:6.

<sup>371</sup> Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* (TAN Books and Publishers, Inc.: 1974), 251, refers to θεείωσις. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology*, 136, discusses St. Maximus the Confessor's comparison of θέωσις and σάρκωσις. Cf also 2 Pe 1:4, θείας κοινωνιοὶ φύσεως, and the prayer at the mixing of water and wine in the Missal of Pius V: Deus, qui humanæ substantiæ dignitatem mirabiliter condidisti, et mirabilius reformasti: da nobis per hujus aquæ et vini mysterium, **ejus divinitatis esse consortes, qui humanitatis nostræ fieri dignatus est particeps**, Jesus Christus, Filius tuus, Dominus noster: Qui tecum vivit et regnat in unitate Spiritus Sancti Deus: per omnia sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

<sup>372</sup> Migne, *PG* 7, 1120. "Verbum Dei, Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum: qui propter immensam suam dilectionem factus est quod sumus nos, uti nos perficeret esse quod est ipse."

<sup>373</sup> Migne, *PG* 25, 192; (... He [*is*] the Word of God. He became man/human so that we might become God.)

“participation not in the nature and substance of God, but in His personal existence.”<sup>374</sup> Lossky explains the patristic teaching:<sup>375</sup>

For St. Maximus the incarnation (σάρκωσις) and deification (θέωσις) correspond to one another; they mutually imply each other. God descends to the world and becomes man, and man is raised towards divine fullness and becomes god, because this union of two natures, the divine and the human, has been determined in the eternal counsel of God, and because it is the final end for which the world has been created out of nothing.

---

<sup>374</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 50; but consider Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 65: “The goal of Orthodox spirituality, the blessedness of the Kingdom of Heaven, is not the vision of the essence, but, above all, a participation in the divine life of the Holy Trinity; the deified state of the co-heirs of the divine nature, gods created after the uncreated God, possessing by grace all that the Holy Trinity possesses by nature.” And, Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 67: “To know the mystery of the Trinity in its fullness is to enter into perfect union with God and to attain to the deification of the human creature: in other words, to enter into the divine life, the very life of the Holy Trinity, and to become, in St. Peter’s words, ‘partakers of the divine nature’ — θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. Trinitarian theology is thus a theology of union, a mystical theology which appeals to experience, and which presupposes a continuous and progressive series of changes in created nature, a more and more intimate communion of the human person with the Holy Trinity ... God is thus at the same time totally inaccessible and really communicable to created beings; neither of the terms of this antinomy excluded or minimized in any way.” Preserving the transcendence of God and a proper apophaticism, the east resolves this dilemma by the distinction between the divine essence and the divine energies; see LaCugna, *God for Us*, 72. Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 70, explains: “We are therefore compelled to recognize in God an ineffable distinction, other than that between His essence and His persons, according to which He is, under different aspects, both totally inaccessible and at the same time accessible. This distinction is that between the essence of God, or His nature, properly co-called, which is inaccessible, unknowable and incommunicable; and the energies or divine operations, forces proper to and inseparable from God’s essence, in which He goes forth from Himself; manifests, communicates, and gives Himself. ‘The divine and deifying illumination and grace is not the essence but the energy of God’, a ‘divine power and energy common to the nature in three’. Thus, according to St. Gregory Palamas, ‘to say that the divine nature is communicable not in itself but through its energy, is to remain within the bounds of right devotion.(εὐσέβεια.)” LaCugna, *God for Us*, 181ff, discusses this from a western perspective and, 195-98, questions the need for introducing the energies into the Trinity. The typical western appraisal is that the energies introduce an unnecessary (if not wrong) complexity into the simplicity of the Trinity, a common charge of the east against the west for the *filioque*.

<sup>375</sup> Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 136, referencing ‘Quaestiones ad Thalassium (60)’, *P.G.*, t. 90, 621 AB.

The person of the incarnate Christ is identically the person of the Only-begotten Son of the Father. Recall that “the humanity of Christ, by which He is “consubstantial with us,” never had any other hypostasis than that of the Son of God.”<sup>376</sup> He, the Son, is the basis of all personal existence. As such, our existence as persons is tied to that person of the Three Persons, the Son, who is “consubstantial with us.” Ultimately we find our identity as sons in the Son. The designation *son* is personal and Trinitarian; it is, from the perspective of *person*, the ultimate ontological category for creation/Mankind.

\* \* \*

In summary, Volf gives an interpretation of Ratzinger’s position that is in accord with the previous discussion, that recaps and also points the way to the next step, the ecclesial dimension of the person: “The trinitarian concept of person is the key to the anthropological and ecclesial concept of person.”<sup>377</sup> Also, as Zizioulas observes:<sup>378</sup>

Man can approach God only through the Son and in the Holy Spirit. Ecclesiology which uses the notion of the “image of God” cannot be founded simply on

---

<sup>376</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 118. Also quoted above, and mentioned in the discussion on the decree of Chalcedon (above) which says ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. — *homoousion ton auton* to us according to *anthropoteta*, in all (things) like unto us, without sin.

<sup>377</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 68 n 210, interpreting Ratzinger, and presumably in agreement with him.

<sup>378</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 19.

triadology.<sup>379</sup> The fact that man in the church is the “image of God” is due to the *economy* of the Holy Trinity, that is, the work of Christ and the Spirit in *history*.

---

<sup>379</sup> This is a chief criticism of Volf’s approach; his ecclesiology is based too directly on Trinitarian theology. As Ratzinger remarks in a recent interview (L’Osservatore Romano, Weekly Edition in English 22 November 2000, page 10, 29 November 2000, page 6, 6 December 2000, page 8; also at <http://www.ewtn.com/library/Theology/OBDOMIHS.HTM>, “Answers to Main Objections Against *Dominus Iesus*”): “I am particularly determined to oppose this increasingly widespread tendency to transfer the Trinitarian mystery directly to the Church. It is not suitable. In this way we will end up believing in three divinities.” The subtitle of Volf’s book is *The Church as the Image of the Trinity*; although the title is *After Our Likeness*, curiously the word “likeness” is not used through the book.

# Part III

καιρός / *kairos*

*Event*



## Chapter 7

# Eucharist

εὐχαριστία

Zizioulas reflects on a “consideration of the human person from the point of view of *telos*,” and on “the situation created by the expectation and hope of ecclesial identity” (cf Heb 11:1), as being “expressed by another ontological category ... [the] sacramental or eucharistic hypostesis.”<sup>380</sup> It is in a “eucharistic context” that “the idea of the unity of the ‘many’ in the ‘one’ prevails.”<sup>381</sup> The Son of Man/Adam is the image in which Jesus presents Himself in the Eucharistic context as the (corporate) *catholic* man.<sup>382</sup>

It is significant that Christ appears as the Son of Man, and not in another capacity, as he identifies himself with the ‘true bread’. Hence the eating of this bread is called specifically the eating of “the flesh of the *Son of Man*” [13] who takes into himself every one who eats this bread, [14] thus fulfilling his role as the corporate Son of Man.

What is the Eucharist and what is the relationship between the Eucharist and the eucharistic hypostesis and the church? Torrance comments on the view of Zizioulas that the link between church and Eucharist is the theological concept of the *person*.<sup>383</sup>

---

<sup>380</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 59.

<sup>381</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 147.

<sup>382</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 146-47. References are: [13] Jn 6:53; [14] Jn 6:56.

<sup>383</sup> Torrance, *Persons in Communion*, 334.

As Zizioulas' discussion shows, the very strength of the term 'person' historically can be attributed to the manner in which it acquired its original theological currency. This was in and through an ecclesial context which allowed its rules of use so to be defined by the eucharistic experience that the term served to open new ways of conceiving of God and the world.

The following discussion examines several aspects of the Eucharist pertaining to *person*. The term Eucharist, however, can have many different interpretations ranging from a very specific form and meaning of the "thanksgiving" to worship in general. An example of the latter is proposed by Lathrop:<sup>384</sup>

Let "Eucharist" — Christian thanksgiving for the action of God — stand as a name for all the worship practices from which a liturgical ecclesiology arises. Obviously, a liturgical ecclesiology must accord with those practices. But what liturgy helps us think of church? Some discussions of ecumenical ecclesiology today stumble over the richly diverse worship practices that mark all the various churches. How can one discuss a common conception of church amid this diversity, especially if one intends to draw from liturgical sources? While not denying the diversity — indeed, while treasuring it — our presupposition here is that Irenaeus's Eucharist is the inheritance of all the churches. What is meant by "Eucharist" then — probably in Irenaeus, certainly here — is not just the Lord's Supper, isolated and considered as one illustration of the Christian message. Rather, Eucharist is the whole economy of word set next to meal, texts set next to preaching, thanksgiving set next to eating and drinking, which makes up the deepest ecumenical pattern for celebration. Eucharist is the every-Sunday assembly for doing this word and meal event set next to the recurring human experience of the week. But Eucharist, in this sense, is also baptism as the way that leads people into this assembly, and it is mission in the world and response to the poor as ways in which the community flows out from the assembly. Eucharist is the assembly itself and its leadership, a leadership best understood as appointed for the sake of that assembly. This economy of meaning is, as one ecumenical consultation put it, "the inheritance of all the churches, founded in the New Testament, locally practiced today, and attested to in the ancient sources of both the Christian East and the Christian West." [22] While this last assertion will need to be tested, reflection on the ecumenical liturgical inheritance as source for church will be the undertaking of this book. A liturgical ecclesiology will need to accord with Eucharist, that is, with the entire economy of word and

---

<sup>384</sup> Lathrop, *Holy People*, 16-17. Reference [22] is:

"Towards Koinonia in Worship," 4, in Thomas F. Best and Dagmar Heller, eds., *So We Believe, So We Pray*, Faith and Order Paper 171 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1995) 6-7.

sacrament, of proclamation and thanksgiving, as that economy is present in all the churches.

The approach to be taken is not to identify the essential(s)<sup>385</sup> of Christian worship, but to identify the essential, discernable features of the Eucharist as “rite” or praxis: celebration, ritual, and liturgy, tradition, as the case may be. Essential here does not mean minimal, but it does mean the necessary rather than sufficient conditions. Taking the New Testament as sufficiently common ground for establishing the “kernel” for the celebration of the Eucharist, an exegetical study (see appendix, “When Jesus Touches Bread” for the details) examines scriptural texts associated with the touching/taking of bread.<sup>386</sup> Of all these texts, one finds that in the Synoptic Gospels, always and consistently, there is a unique focus on Jesus taking bread and a four-fold action: (1) taking, (2) blessing/thanksgiving, (3) breaking, and (4) giving.<sup>387</sup> There are four general settings (I-IV) for these nine such accounts: the feeding of the five thousand (I: Feed 5k), the feeding of the four thousand (II: Feed 4k), the final meal at the time of the Pasch (III: Pasch),

---

<sup>385</sup> See e.g. Gordon W. Lathrop, ed., *What Are the Essentials of Christian Worship: Open Questions in Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1996).

<sup>386</sup> Demonstrating to the contrary of what von Allmen, *The Lord's Supper*, 12, characterizes as “the scarcity of New Testament references to the eucharistic life.”

<sup>387</sup> This is a purely exegetical conclusion (see the appendix for details) that is echoed by many analyses of the liturgy, e.g., *The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship*, Paul F. Bradshaw and Lawrence A. Hoffman, eds. 1991 University of Notre Dame Press, “Christian Worship to the End of the Reformation” John F. Baldovin, 160. “The eucharistic rite itself ... consisted of a four-action shape: taking, blessing, breaking, giving—the offering of bread and wine, eucharistic prayer, breaking of the bread (fraction), and consumption of the bread and wine (communion)—as an imitation of Jesus’ actions at the Last Supper.” A note (178 n 20) adds: “See Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 48-82; recently, Dix’s insistence on the importance of the first action —‘taking’— has come under some fire: see Richard Buxton, ‘The Shape of the Eucharist: A Survey and Appraisal,’ in Kenneth Stevenson, ed. *Liturgy Reshaped* (London, 1982), pp. 83-93.” Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries, Abingdon Press, Nashville (1996), 314: “The four actions in verse 19 – taking bread, giving thanks, breaking it, and giving it – parallel Jesus’ actions in feeding the five thousand (9:16) and at the Emmaus meal (24:30), except that those verses substitute “blessed” for giving thanks.” Also, W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr., *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, The International Critical Commentary, Vol. III, 465. While ample studies discuss the four actions and their occurrence and parallel actions in some of the New Testament texts, no single study was found that treated them all, or discussed the extraordinary witness of the synoptic Gospel texts, both as shown in the exegesis in the appendix of this thesis.

and the meeting on the road to Emmaus (IV: Emmaus).<sup>388</sup> These actions are also associated with the traditional Eucharistic liturgy.<sup>389</sup> The results from the Synoptic accounts are summarized in table 1.

**Table 1** Summary for all of the (nine) accounts in the Synoptic Gospels where Jesus *takes bread*.

|           |                       | FEEDS (I & II) |    | PASCH (III) | EMMAUS (IV) |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------------|
|           |                       | 4k (II)        |    |             |             |
| 5k (I)    |                       | Mt             | Mk |             |             |
| <b>1.</b> | takes                 |                |    |             |             |
|           | bread                 |                |    |             |             |
|           | and fish              |                |    |             |             |
|           | looks                 |                |    |             |             |
| <b>2.</b> | blesses/thanks        |                |    |             |             |
| <b>3.</b> | breaks                |                |    |             |             |
| <b>4.</b> | gives                 |                |    |             |             |
|           | to disciples/them     |                |    |             |             |
|           | disciples give to all |                |    |             |             |

<sup>388</sup> Thus, the following passages are delineated: (I) Feed 5k: Mt14:13-21, Mk 6:32-44, Lk 9:10b-17, (Jn 6:1-15); (II) Feed 4k: Mt 15:32-39, Mk 8:1-10; (III) Pasch [“Institution”] Mt 26:26-29, Mk 14:22-25, Lk 22:15-20, (Jn 6:51-58, 1Cor 11:23-25);( IV) Emmaus Lk 24:13-35 (Mk 16:12-13).

<sup>389</sup> The classic study is Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape Of the Liturgy* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1983). It seems even Dix, from the liturgical perspective, does not realize the force and pervasiveness of the synoptic witness to the four-fold action. On the other hand, no exegetical study was found that identified all the texts witnessing the same four-fold action. An example is Peter Stuhlmacher, *Jesus of Nazareth Christ of Faith* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers: 1993), 58-102, the chapter “New Testament Witnesses Concerning the Lord’s Supper.” He quotes Leon-Dufour on the requirement of taking a complete, “canonical” approach to the subject (see thesis appendix), but fails to consider the feedings in Matthew 14 and Luke 9. This is not meant as a criticism of his study, only to indicate how perspective, or asking the correct question, influences results.

|               |  |             |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| all satisfied |  | eyes opened |
|---------------|--|-------------|

Whether the Gospel is the source of the liturgical form, or it is that a liturgical form became enshrined in the Gospel accounts<sup>390</sup> is not the issue for the purpose of this study: it is there.<sup>391</sup> The unity of the witness to the actions is intimately linked with *paradosis*, the handing over and handing on, and the receiving — that is, tradition (cf. 1 Cor 11:23 ff and 1 Cor 15:3 ff, and discussion below). This may be compared with the traditional form of the Eucharistic liturgy; an instance is given using the Byzantine Divine Liturgy as an example in table 2 (compare items 1-4 in tables 1 and 2) .

**Table 2** Adapted from *The Living God: A Catechism for the Christian Faith*, Olga Dunlop, trans., (Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1989), 286; see also discussion on page 287.

| LITURGY OF THE EUCHARIST — BYZANTINE DIVINE LITURGY |  |                                 |
|---|--|---------------------------------|
| <b>1</b> — He “took”                                | A) Great Entrance                            |                                 |
|   | B) Creed — Kiss of Peace                     |                                 |
| <b>2</b> — He “gave thanks / blessed”               | A) Thanksgiving to the Father                | a) for creation                 |
|   |  | b) Trinitarian praise: Sanctus  |
|   |  | c) for redemption               |
|   | B) Memorial of the work of the Son           | a) institution                  |
|   |  | b) anamnesis                    |
|   |  | c) anaphora                     |
|   | C) Invocation for descent of the Holy Spirit | epiclesis                       |
|   | D) Commemoration of the Church               | a) commemoration of the dead    |
|   |  | b) hymn to the <i>Theotokos</i> |
|   |  | c) commemoration of the living  |
| E) Final doxology                                   |  |                                 |

<sup>390</sup> E.g. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 30.

<sup>391</sup> Either way there is a common form from the one source, revelation.

|                |   |  |
|----------------|---|--|
| 3 — He “broke” | A) Lord’s Prayer                                |  |
|                | B) Holy Things for the Holy                     |  |
|                | C) Fraction of the Bread                        |  |
| 4 — He “gave”  | A) Approach with the fear of God and with Faith |  |
|                | B) Communion                                    |  |
|                | C) We have seen the true light                  |  |

### Παράδοσις : Zizioulas, Tradition, and the Eucharist

The Eucharist is intimately linked with παράδοσις / *paradosis*,<sup>392</sup> the handing over and handing on, and the receiving — that is, Tradition (cf. 1 Cor 11:23 ff and 1 Cor 15:3 ff). Consider the appraisal of Zizioulas:<sup>393</sup>

The eucharist manifests the *historical* form of the divine economy, all that which was “transmitted” (cf. I Cor. 10 [*sic*]:23: eucharist = “tradition”) through the life, the death and the resurrection of the Lord, as well as through the “form” of bread and wine and a “structure” practically unchanged since the night of the Last Supper. The eucharist realizes in the course of history the continuity that links each Church to the first apostolic communities and to the historical Christ: in short, all that was *instituted* and is *transmitted*. The eucharist is thus the affirmation *par excellence* of history, the sanctification of time, by manifesting the Church as historical reality, as an *institution*.

The equation ‘eucharist = “tradition”’ (παράδοσις) is, of course, intended as a functional, not translational, equivalence. And the biblical reference must be a misprint — no doubt 1Cor 11:23-24 is intended. It is worthwhile to consider Paul’s chiasmus of receiving/taking, handing on/handing over — quite illuminating and moving in conveying that the tradition is the embodiment of the historical event in the Eucharist. Using NRSV 1 Corinthians 11:

A 23 For I received [παρέλαβον, Vulgate: accepi] from the Lord

<sup>392</sup> E.g. see Vanderwilt, *A Church Without Borders*, 153-169.

<sup>393</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 21.

B what I also handed on [παρέδωκα, Vulgate: tradidi] to you,

C that the Lord Jesus

B' on the night when he was betrayed [i.e. παρεδίδετο, handed over; Vulgate: tradebatur]

A' took [ἔλαβεν, Vulgate: accepit] a loaf of bread,

24 and when he had given thanks [εὐχαριστήσας], he broke it and said,<sup>394</sup> “This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance [ἀνάμνησιν] of me.”

The Byzantine Divine Liturgy, in the prayer said by all before communion, is a complementary application to us in the present which says: Τοῦ Δείπνου Σοῦ του Μυστικοῦ σήμερον Υἱὲ Θεοῦ κοινωνόν με παράλαβε.<sup>395</sup>

Later in the same letter, 1 Corinthians 15, Paul also uses the same give/receive language but this time explicitly referring to the historical events, the death and the rising, the “historical” witness of the writings/scriptures, and the appearance to the witnesses:

|   |           |            |  |            |                               |
|---|-----------|------------|--|------------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | paradosis | I hand on  |  | 3 παρέδωκα |                               |
|   |           |            |  |            | γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν<br>πρώτοις, ὃ καὶ |
|   |           | I received |  | παρέλαβον, |                               |

<sup>394</sup> As noted before, of the four-fold action, *giving* is not present Nor is there a command to eat and drink which is not a part of the core four-fold action. It is wrong to insist on “communion” as the essential element. It is the personal apex but it is not a core action: all may celebrate the eucharist though not all may receive. Paul does mention eating and drinking in 1 Cor 11:27. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 64: “Nor do we find explicit mention of the fact that the apostles actually ate the bread and drank the cup” in the “Antioch-Palestinian account.” No one seemingly eats at Emmaus.

<sup>395</sup> [Literally] Of Your Mystical Supper today O Son of God, receive me, a partaker / communicant.

|   |                 |                        |    |   |                       |
|---|-----------------|------------------------|----|---|-----------------------|
| 2 | scripture       | Christ suffered        |    | ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν   |                       |
|   |                 | scripture              |    |   | κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς 4 καὶ |
|   |                 | Christ rose            |    | ὅτι ἐτάφη καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ   |                       |
|   |                 | scripture              |    |   | κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς 5 καὶ |
| 3 | see / witnesses | Peter then the 12      | A  | ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾶ εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα·   |                       |
|   |                 | 500                    | B  | 6 ἔπειτα ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς ἐφάπαξ,   |                       |
|   |                 | living / dead          | C  | ἐξ ὧν οἱ πλείονες μένουσιν ἕως ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ ἐκοιμήθησαν·  |                       |
|   |                 | James and all apostles | B' | 7 ἔπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν·  |                       |
|   |                 | Paul (last)            | A' | 8 ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡσπερὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὤφθη κάμοι.   |                       |
| 4 | Apostle         | I (not worthy) apostle |    | 9 Ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, διότι ἐδίωξα τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ· |                       |

Through the language of παρέδωκα and παρέλαβον (#1), Paul links the message of the revelation, the historical facts, the event of the crucifixion and resurrection (#2) — all that is received and handed on — to the Eucharist (1 Corinthians 11:23-24) which ‘manifests the *historical* form of the divine economy, all that which was “transmitted”’ as noted by Zizioulas (see above). Zizioulas concludes, “The ‘catholic Church’ is thus constituted in the Eucharist”<sup>396</sup> “Thus the eucharist was not the act of a pre-existing Church; it was [is] an event *constitutive* of

<sup>396</sup> Zizioulas, “Mystery of the Church,” 302.

the being of the Church, enabling the Church to be. The eucharist *constituted* the Church's being."<sup>397</sup>

### **Lerins Dictum and the Eucharist**

According to Zizioulas, “only the eucharist in its correct sense is the specific differentiating factor of Christianity.”<sup>398</sup> Thus the eucharist is a powerful discriminator, even within Christianity. Only the Church that is catholic can offer the fullness of the Eucharist to which every Christian is oriented. If the eucharist is constitutive of ecclesial life, as Zizioulas (and others<sup>399</sup>) maintain, then certain conditions must obtain. These conditions are illustrated by applying the well know and often critiqued (and misunderstood and misapplied), previously discussed dictum/canon of St. Vincent of Lerins to the celebration of the eucharist. Consider the various “faith communities” (to be as generic as possible). Consider some religious activity that is observed by that community as eucharistic worship (Divine Liturgy, Mass, Lord's Supper, Communion, etc.), without consideration as to how it is done (ritual), by whom (ministry/orders), and even the significance of what it is (doctrine). There is, however, the requirement dictated by “handing on” — the *paradosis* / tradition, as discussed above — that this eucharistic worship conform to the essential four-fold action: taking bread, blessing/giving thanks, breaking, giving.<sup>400</sup>

The following examination uses Lerins' dictum as a tangible, pragmatic, expression of the *constitutive* aspect of the Eucharistic celebration for the community/church as described above by Zizioulas,<sup>401</sup> understanding the Eucharist as necessarily in conformity with the witness

---

<sup>397</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 21.

<sup>398</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 62-63 n66.

<sup>399</sup> E.g. von Allmen, *The Lord's Supper*, 20: “The Eucharist is not an object, it is a way of life.”

<sup>400</sup> Illustrating this point exactly are the cases presented by Philippe Larere, *The Lord's Supper: Toward an Ecumenical Understanding of the Eucharist* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1993), 54-60 ff. He gives examples of how the designation *Eucharist* is misapplied.

<sup>401</sup> See John Meyendorff, *Living Tradition*, Chapter 8, “The Unity of the Church and

of the Synoptic Gospels, i.e. manifesting the four-fold action. The following questions then pertain to what it means to be a church as described by Zizioulas and as interpreted in conformity with Lerins' dictum (see chapter 3). The questions are asked in the spirit of von Allmen's study of the Eucharist where he notes that "the Church, precisely at the central moment of her life, namely the Supper, has the clear duty of being the Church in such-and-such a place and at such-and-such a time."<sup>402</sup> This is just a particular instance of Lerins' dictum. Thus for each "church" for every "such-and-such a place" and at every "such-and-such a time" the following questions require a "yes" answer:

1. Is the celebration of the Eucharist the central act of worship of the faith community/parish/congregation (= "church")?
2. Is this the practice of all congregations that are members of the larger ecclesial community, if one exists, and with which the congregation shares an allegiance (e.g. all parishes of a diocese, eparchy, metropolia, province, territory, confederation, synod, etc.)?
3. Has the Eucharist always been celebrated as the central act of worship on a regular basis, that is at least once a week?<sup>403</sup> This is deemed a reasonable frequency demanded by

---

the Unity of Mankind," especially 136-8, for the broader, ecumenical, perspective to which this applies, as explained from an Orthodox viewpoint.

<sup>402</sup> von Allmen, *The Lord's Supper*, 40.

<sup>403</sup> E.g., Gerhard Lohfink, *Does God need the Church?*, 251-52: "Obviously the celebration of the Lord's Supper was the most important assembly from the very beginning, and the binding center of all other assemblies ... The assembly is the place where a Church's memory is kept alive. Certainly the Eucharistic assembly has a special importance for this, for nowhere else is it so clear that the memory of the people of God is not created by itself but given by God ... Ultimately the liturgy contains everything the Church needs: there is its *genuine* memory. It only needs to live what is contained in its sacraments and memory... In this sense the Sunday celebration of the eucharist is not a luxury that the baptized can permit themselves according to their own mood or convenience ... The Sunday celebration is a necessity of life." Also see Bell, *A Cloud of Witnesses*, 191, cf 95.

- something that is constitutive, and as oriented to the “Lord’s Day”, Sunday<sup>404</sup> (see chapter 8)
4. Has this always been the practice, that is, there was never a time (as far back as is known) when the Eucharist was not celebrated as the central act of worship?
  5. In summary, has the Eucharist been celebrated by the ecclesial community as the central act of worship “*quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus,*” everywhere, always, and by all?

It must be emphasized again that this is proposed as a necessary but not a sufficient condition. It purposefully ignores the complex and emotionally charge topic of ministry and orders, which is intimately linked with the Eucharist.<sup>405</sup> This is intentional in order to focus on this proposed core principle of the four-fold action of the Eucharist that is attested by Scripture and liturgical form. Consequently, it presents a challenge to self-examination: to those who identify themselves as church and to the many proposals that treat ecclesiology as a study in what are termed “models” of the church. Again, this is not to be critical of the notions of models; they, in fact, are very helpful for discovering the breath of Christian discipleship. But the Eucharist is not just another model.

Consider, for example, this assessment by von Allmen as just such a self-examination:<sup>406</sup>

---

<sup>404</sup> Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 145: ‘The usual time for the “breaking of bread” was the first day of the week, the day on which Christ rose from the dead.’

<sup>405</sup> E.g. consider the Catholic position, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, Second Vatican Council *Decree on Ecumenism*, §22: “Though the ecclesial Communities which are separated from us lack the fullness of unity with us flowing from Baptism, and though we believe they have not retained the proper reality of the eucharistic mystery in its fullness, especially because of the absence of the sacrament of Orders, nevertheless when they commemorate His death and resurrection in the Lord’s Supper, they profess that it signifies life in communion with Christ and look forward to His coming in glory. Therefore the teaching concerning the Lord’s Supper, the other sacraments, worship, the ministry of the Church, must be the subject of the dialogue.” On the patristic witness of Ignatius of Antioch see: Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 149 n 23; K. Paul Wesche, “The Eucharist as the Criterion of Orthodoxy: A Study of St. Ignatius of Antioch,” 59-82, in Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson, eds., *Marks of the Body of Christ* (Grand Rapids: William P. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999).

<sup>406</sup> von Allmen, *The Lord’s Supper*, 17-18.

The final aspect of the history of the Supper, which I regard as the most important, relates to the Reformation: not so much the profound disagreements which characterized, the non-Roman eucharistic theologies when they lost the unity that had been theirs when they were joined in condemnation of the Roman Mass; not so much the recovery of the right to possess different liturgies and consequently the effective discovery, translated into historical facts, that the authentic unity of the Church is not experienced on the ceremonial level. No, what was most important for the history of the Supper at that time was that for the first time men dared to separate the Lord's Day and the Lord's Supper.

The completeness, regularity and speed with which this separation was carried out varied from country to country and from one confession to another; but, if I understand correctly, it happened wherever the Reformation took root. What motivated this separation was the clash between the theological conviction that a eucharistic celebration without the baptized people communicating undergoes a radical change of character and becomes totally unreal, and the pastoral conviction that for the time it was not possible to give communion every Sunday to a laity which, almost in its entirety, had acquired the habit of communicating only once a year, at Easter. They therefore took the risk of celebrating the Supper no longer every Sunday, but as often as was pastorally possible, and at least on the major festivals, in the hope that the frequency of celebration would increase. We know now that this hope was not fulfilled in the Reformed Churches on the Continent and for almost three centuries in the Church of England.

Now this divorce between the Lord's Day and the Lord's Supper, and the consequent possibility of thereafter celebrating the Lord's Day without also celebrating the Supper which He had instituted for that day, without doubt divided the Church more radically than any of the previous schisms, at least as far as the people of the Church were aware. This divorce has led to the emergence of two types of Christianity: the "Catholic" type which has maintained the hitherto unanimous tradition (even if, in certain areas, an equivocal and heretical tradition), and the "Protestant" type which has produced a *sentire ecclesiam*, a religious sociology, movements of ideas which do not necessarily exclude the sacramental life but remain on the fringe of it.

How then is this to be reconciled with, again, von Allmen?<sup>407</sup>

Apart from the Church, from the desire to be part of the Church, from conscious awareness of being in the Church, reflection on the Eucharist would be deprived of one of its essential references, since there is no Supper apart from the Church,

---

<sup>407</sup> von Allmen, *The Lord's Supper*, 19.

and no Church apart from the Supper, since it is impossible to isolate the Supper from the Church which finds her foundation and her fulfilment in the Supper.

He also says.<sup>408</sup>

Since the Eucharist is the anamnesis of the culminating moment in the history of salvation, it recapitulates in some way the events which prepared the way for the Gospel and brought it into being, as well as the results which have flowed from the Gospel right up to the present day and which will flow from it in the future. Within the Church, in short, there is no need to say anything beyond what is being enacted in the Supper. The same applies to the mission to the world; the Church has nothing to say other than what can find its inspiration or confirmation in the Supper.

And, reiterating the sense that the Eucharist is both constitutive and an epiphany:<sup>409</sup>

“Because there is one loaf, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the same loaf.” (1 Cor. 10: 17). This Pauline claim, which only makes sense if this unique bread is the Body of Christ, means that the Supper constitutes the Church and reveals her.

Lastly, von Allmen ends his study with a most poignant and personal witness, the martyrs’:<sup>410</sup>

And with the martyrs of Abitina we learn to say: “Sine Domenico (scil. convivio esse) non possumus”: we cannot live without the Lord’s meal.

---

<sup>408</sup> von Allmen, *The Lord’s Supper*, 27.

<sup>409</sup> von Allmen, *The Lord’s Supper*, 37.

<sup>410</sup> von Allmen, *The Lord’s Supper*, 117. He gives as reference: “Quoted by J. A. Jungmann, *La Liturgie des premiers siècles*, p. 27.” von Allmen presents a profound theology of the Eucharist, often quoting Calvin, contrasted with what he interprets as questionable praxis. On the basis of his study one could conclude that the sophisticated intelligence of Calvin, and his “high” theology of the Eucharist, managed to do what the ineptitude of Catholics could not: render the Eucharist impotent.

Theological discourse and endless concern about purifying the celebration and significance of the Eucharist is no excuse for disuse. Some just talk, others do; only the latter is consistent with a constitutive understanding of the Eucharist. The Eucharist is *pragma* and *praxis*; it is the *pragma* and *praxis* of communion, and it is, therefore, in accordance with the terms that have been discussed, a catholic gathering and assembly:<sup>411</sup>

The eucharist, as distinct from other expressions of ecclesial life, is unthinkable without the gathering of the whole Church in one place, that is, without an event of *communion*; consequently, it manifests the Church not simply as something instituted, that is, historically *given*, but also as something *con-stituted*, that is constantly realized as an event of free communion, prefiguring the divine life and the Kingdom to come.

The *catholic* sense is aptly portrayed by McPartlan quoting de Lubac quoting “Peter Damian’s eleventh-century instruction to his eremitical monks that, in their solitude, they could still celebrate the Liturgy, saying both ‘The Lord be with you’ and the response, ‘And with thy spirit’.”<sup>412</sup>

‘In fact, he who prays alone may say ‘we’, and the multitude may say ‘I’. For, by the power of the Holy Spirit who dwells in each and fills us all, the individual is a multitude and the multitude is an individual’. [97]

Here, “individual” must be understood not as the isolated individual but precisely as *person* as discussed in chapter 4. As a *catholic* gathering the Eucharist is the true communion that respects and even requires “otherness” without falling into division.<sup>413</sup>

---

<sup>411</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 22.

<sup>412</sup> McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 20-21. Reference [97] is: “*Catholicism*, 289-290: quotation from Peter Damain, *Liber qui dicitur Doimnus Vobiscum*, 6 (PL 145, 236B). For the context of this work, see e.g. P. McNulty, *St Peter Damian, Selected Writings on the Spiritual Life*, pp. 17-18.” See also Lathrop, *Holy People*, 81: ‘The “we” of liturgical texts ... is the “we” of the church.’

<sup>413</sup> Zizioulas, “Communion and Otherness,” 355.

But the Eucharist does not only affirm and sanctify communion; it also sanctifies otherness. It is the place where difference ceases to be divisive and becomes good. *Diaphora* does not lead to *diairesis*, and unity or communion does not destroy ‘but affirms diversity and otherness in the Eucharist. Whenever this does not happen, the Eucharist is destroyed and even invalidated, even if all the other requirements for a “valid” Eucharist are met and satisfied. Thus, a Eucharist which excludes in one way or another those of a different race or sex or age or profession is a false Eucharist. A Eucharist celebrated specially for children or young people or blacks or whites, or students etc., is a false one. The Eucharist must include all these, for it is there that the otherness of a natural or social kind can be transcended. A Church which does not celebrate the Eucharist in this inclusive way risks losing her catholicity.

Lohfink<sup>414</sup> quoting Ratzinger expresses a similar sentiment (note how church and Eucharist are interchangeable):

The social structure in which the Church exists is not a club, not a circle of friends, but the ‘people of God’ in contrast to the people of the [world] — for which reason the Eucharist is not a private celebration for special groups; it continues to be Eucharist only when it is a public assembly of the whole.

LaCugna expresses well the catholic sense of the Eucharist and she also points the way to practical issues that arise in the praxis of this catholic gathering and celebration:<sup>415</sup>

The Eucharist by its nature is catholic and a sacrament of catholicity: Catholicity means pertaining to the whole. All are invited to partake in communion, all must be included in it. The praise and worship of God in the Eucharist should cultivate catholicity in its practitioners: catholic personhood, a catholic outlook, a catholic ethic. At the common table of bread and wine, prejudice, intolerance, and alienation are to pass away. The God whom we love and adore is in communion with everything and everyone. We do not love God ‘by Godself’, but in loving God we embrace all creatures, past, present, and future. The reverse is also true: By loving any creature we love God who is its source and end. “Praise actualizes the true relationship between people as well

---

<sup>414</sup> Lohfink, *Does God need the Church?*, 218, n 23; quoting Joseph Ratzinger, *Principles of Catholic Theology: Building Stone for a Fundamental Theology* (San Francisco: The Nation’s Press, 1987), 253.

<sup>415</sup> LaCugna, *God for Us*, 406. Her “we call upon the Holy Spirit to create a holy Body of Christ” necessitates a caution: the liturgical language of the epiclesis does not imply “create.”

as with God, and it is no accident that in the symbols of heavenly bliss the leading pictures are of feasting and praising.” To the extent that the Eucharist is not a sacrament of the inclusive household, it contradicts itself and is invalid.

Through the Eucharist we participate explicitly in the triune life of God: We offer praise and thanksgiving to God who is the fountain of all holiness; we join our prayer to that of the high priest Jesus Christ who presents our prayers and petitions to God; we call upon the Holy Spirit to create a holy Body of Christ. The sacrament of the Eucharist opens its participants to personal and collective transformation. By receiving communion we take Christ into our bodies; we now exist in a new way. The conclusion of the eucharistic rite is a missionary command: “Go now in peace to love and serve the Lord.” Renewed as Christ, we take the liturgy, the *leitourgia*, the work of the people, into the world.

LaCugna’s assessment warrants further scrutiny, in particular the mandate that “all are invited to partake in communion, all must be included in it. The praise and worship of God in the Eucharist should cultivate catholicity in its practitioners.” This clearly points to the need to explore an understanding of the person in this celebration, the Eucharist, that has been characterized as *catholic* and *constitutive*. This topic is considered next through an assessment of a very practical issue, *communicatio in sacris*. Also pertaining to this topic are two items that further explore the personal aspect of the Eucharist: (1) baptism as each person “putting on Christ” (Gal 3:27) — becoming another Christ since “every baptized person becomes Christ”<sup>416</sup> — and the role and function of the baptized person in the Christian assembly, the gathering in the Eucharist; and (2), a personal description and interpretation of transubstantiation as the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and how this relates to a catholic understanding of the Eucharistic gathering/celebration.

### **A Catholic Perspective on *Communicatio in Sacris***

There is one Universal Church of the faithful, outside of which there is absolutely no salvation. In which there is the same priest and sacrifice, Jesus Christ, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the forms of bread and wine; the bread being changed (*transsubstantiat*) by divine power into the body, and the wine into the blood, so that to realize the mystery of unity we may receive of Him what He has received of us. And this sacrament no one

---

<sup>416</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 58 n 54.

can effect except the priest who has been duly ordained in accordance with the keys of the Church, which Jesus Christ Himself gave to the Apostles and their successors. But the sacrament of baptism, which by the invocation of each Person of the Trinity, namely, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is effected in water, duly conferred on children and adults in the form prescribed by the Church by anyone whatsoever, leads to salvation. And should anyone after the reception of baptism have fallen into sin, by true repentance he can always be restored...<sup>417</sup> Also, those baptized by the Latins the Greeks rashly presume to rebaptize, and even till now, as we understand, there are some who do not hesitate to do this.<sup>418</sup>

To those familiar with the World Council of Churches' "Lima Document,"<sup>419</sup> published as *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*<sup>420</sup> (BEM) in 1982, this quote could, in its content, represent one of the numerous responses<sup>421</sup> to BEM that were submitted by various churches and ecclesial

---

<sup>417</sup> H. R. Schroeder, *Disiplinary Decrees of the General Councils* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950), English, 238-39; Latin, 560-61: Latern IV Canon 1, *Firmiter*: Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. In qua idem ipse sacerdos, et sacrificium Jesus Christus; cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur; transsubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem, potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo quod accepit ipse de nostro. Et hoc utique sacramentum nemo potest conficere, nisi sacerdos, qui fuerit ordinatus secundum claves ecclesiae, quas ipse concessit apostolis et eorum successoribus Jesus Christus. Sacramentum vero baptismi, quod ad invocationem individuae trinitatis, videlicet Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, consecratur in aqua, tam parvulis quam adultis, in forma ecclesiae a quocumque rite collatum, proficit ad salutem. Et si post susceptionem baptismi quisquam prolapsus fuerit in peccatum, per veram poenitentiam semper potest reparari. Interestingly the passage continues: Non solum autem virgines et continentes, verum etiam conjugati, per fidem rectam et operationem bonam placentes Deo, ad aeternam merentur beatitudinem pervenire. (C.I, X, De summa trinit., I, X)

<sup>418</sup> Schroeder, *Disiplinary Decrees of the General Councils*, English, 244; Latin, 564: Canon 4: Baptizatos etiam a Latinis et ipsi Graeci rebaptizare ausu temerario praesumebant- et adhuc, sicut accepimus, quidam agere hoc non verentur.

<sup>419</sup> Regarding Zizioulas in relation to the preparation of the Lima text, Wainwright, *Worship With One Accord*, 75, notes: "...last-minute changes were to be incorporated only if unanimously and instantly accepted by a troika of J.M.R. Tillard (Roman Catholic), J.D. Zizioulas (Orthodox), and myself (Protestant)."

<sup>420</sup> *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper 111, World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1982.

<sup>421</sup> Thurian, Max ed. *Churches Respond to BEM: Official Responses to the "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry" Text*, Vol. I-VI, Faith and Order Paper 144, World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1986-88.

communities. It is, however, portions of Canons 1 and 4 of Lateran Council IV of AD 1215. In the seven hundred eighty-two years since Lateran IV met, the key issues addressed by these Canons have become rallying points of controversy, polemics, and now finally of purposeful dialogue. It is in order to continue that dialogue that the nature of the Eucharist is here examined with respect to the nature of church and the communion of persons.

The discussion that follows is an exercise in applied theology. It reconsiders, from a particular perspective, the Catholic perspective, the restrictions on *communicatio in sacris*,<sup>422</sup> specifically the sharing of the Eucharist, that result from or are deemed to be necessitated by Christian disunity. The topic of Ministry, although essential to Catholic doctrine regarding the Eucharist, will not be examined directly. Baptism will be considered insofar as it relates specifically to being the foundation of the person in the Eucharist (and the Church). Consequently, this discussion will center on the “contemporary” understanding of the Eucharist as exemplified by the dictum “The Eucharist Makes the Church,”<sup>423</sup> and its relation to the perennial controversy surrounding the Catholic dogma of *transubstantiation*.<sup>424</sup> With due regard

---

<sup>422</sup> See Vatican II Council Documents in (VC II) *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*. Austin Flannery, O.P., ed., (Northpoint: Costello Publishing Co., 1996), 452-564; especially documents 37-39, 43, 44.

<sup>423</sup> It is not clear where this saying about the Eucharistic originated. Michael Plekon, “‘Always Everyone and Always Together’; The Eucharistic Theology of Nicolas Afanasiev’s *The Lord’s Supper Revisited*”, *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 41 (1997), 145, points to Afanasiev. Paul McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1993 (xv), points to de Lubac, certainly to his originating (or reviving) the chiasm “The Eucharist makes the Church; the Church makes the Eucharist.” In his book *Catholicism*, de Lubac also states the more comprehensive and balanced medieval dictum *Sacramenta faciunt ecclesiam* (37). Then he notes that the Eucharist is the central sacrament (38): “The sacrament in the highest sense of the word — *sacramentum sacramentorum, quasi consummatio spiritualis vitae et omnium sacramentorum finis* — the sacrament ‘which contains the whole mystery of our salvation’, the Eucharist, is also especially the sacrament of unity: *sacramentum unitatis ecclesiasticae*.” Also, Plekon points out the authoritative adoption of this Eucharistic dictum by the CCC, §1396; and he says (146-7; n.14) that it “permeates” Vatican II documents and BEM.

<sup>424</sup> Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* (Rockford: TAN Books and Publishers, Inc., 1974), 379-82; CCC, §1373-77, §1413.

to the official position and directives of the Catholic Church,<sup>425</sup> the underlying theology that supports those directives will be critically examined here: such directives are presumed to arise from the faith of that church and as such they provide a test case for an application of the theology of *person* as developed in this thesis (leading eventually to the theology of the church).

The following directive of the US Catholics Bishops, *Guidelines for Receiving Communion*,<sup>426</sup> often printed in books and pamphlets used in Catholic worship, is an example of just such “applied theology” that is pertinent to the scope of this examination [emphasis below is added]:

-For Catholics: Catholics fully participate in the celebration of the Eucharist when they **receive Holy Communion in fulfillment of Christ’s command to eat His Body and drink His Blood**. In order to be properly disposed to receive Communion, communicants should not be conscious of grave sin, have fasted for an hour, and seek to live in charity and love with their neighbors. Persons conscious of grave sin must first be reconciled with God and the Church through the sacrament of Penance. A frequent reception of the sacrament of Penance is encouraged for all.

-For Other Christians: **We welcome to this celebration of the Eucharist those Christians who are not fully united with us**. It is a consequence of the sad divisions in Christianity that we cannot extend to them a general invitation to receive Communion. **Catholics believe that the Eucharist is an action of the celebrating community signifying a oneness in faith, life, and worship of the community**. Reception of the Eucharist by Christians not fully united with us would imply a oneness which does not yet exist, and for which we must all pray.

-For Those Not Receiving Communion: Those not receiving sacramental Communion are encouraged to express in their hearts a prayerful desire for unity with the Lord Jesus and with one another.

---

<sup>425</sup> Regarding the Eucharist see VC II, 502-507, *Dans ce derniers temps*, “Declaration on the Position of the Catholic Church on the Celebration of the Eucharist in Common by Christians of Different Confessions,” #38, §9.

<sup>426</sup> National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 3211 Fourth Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20017-1194. November 8, 1986. Specifically, this selection was taken from *An Edition of Today’s Missal Breaking Bread 1996*, Oregon Catholic Press, Portland, OR.

-For Non-Christians: **We also welcome to this celebration those who do not share our faith in Jesus.** While we cannot extend to them an invitation to receive Communion, **we do invite them to be united with us in prayer.**

Three questions can be posed from this example for further examination:

- (1) What exactly<sup>427</sup> is communicated when Catholics “eat His Body and drink His Blood”?
- (2) How does the Eucharist relate to the “celebrating community signifying a oneness in faith, life, and worship of the community”?
- (3) How is it that separated Christians are “welcome to this celebration of the Eucharist” and even non-Christians “who do not share our faith in Jesus” are “also welcome to this celebration”?

In order to attempt an answer to these questions, it is necessary to assess the Catholic understanding of the Eucharist. First, however, by way of background and foundation, we must consider the nature of the sacrament of baptism, especially as illustrated by the long history and unwavering insistence of Catholic thinking and doctrine on the inclusive and universal nature of this holy mystery.

---

<sup>427</sup> “Exactly” in the apophatic sense: the role of theology is to describe, not define, the mystery.

*Baptism* εἰς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα — “one Lord, one faith, one baptism.”<sup>428</sup>  
 Similarly, one Christ, one church, one body.<sup>429</sup> The concern at Lateran IV about the practice of

---

<sup>428</sup> Eph 4:5. Perhaps the universality of this unity — the “cosmic proportion” — is suggested by the (coincidental?) repetition of the Greek for *one* in masculine, feminine and neuter forms. The position of Byzantine theology given by Lossky in *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 109-110, concurs, and pertains to a catholic (and Catholic) understanding of baptism: “It was the divinely appointed function of the first man, according to St. Maximus, to unite in himself the whole of created being; and at the same time to reach his perfect union with God and thus grant the state of deification to the whole of creation... God Himself would then in His turn have given Himself to man, who would then, in virtue of this gift, that is to say by grace, possess all that God possesses by nature [St. Maxims, ‘De ambigiis’, P.G., XCI, 1308]. The deification of man and of the whole created universe would thus be accomplished. Since this task which was given to man was not fulfilled by Adam, it is in the work of Christ, the second Adam, that we can see what it was meant to be ... Man is not a being isolated from the rest of creation; by his very nature he is bound up with the whole of the universe, and St. Paul bears witness that the whole creation awaits the future glory which will be revealed in the sons of God (Rom 8:18-22).” Forming a link between this view of the East and one of the major (unresolved?) theological difficulties of the West is the “Decree Concerning Justification” of the sixth session of Trent, “celebrated on the thirteenth day of January, 1547.” The decree is presented in 16 short Chapters and 33 Canons, of which Chapter 4 can be considered the essence. H. R. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950), 31 (English); 310 (Latin):

In which words is given a brief description of the justification of the sinner, as being a translation from that state in which man [*homo*] is born a child [*filii*] of the first Adam, to the state of grace and of the adoption of the sons [*filiorum*] of God through the second Adam, Jesus Christ, our Savior. This translation however cannot, since the promulgation of the Gospel, be effected except through the laver of regeneration or its desire, as it is written: *Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* Quibus verbis justificationis impii descriptio insinuatur, ut sit translatio ab eo statu, in quo homo nascitur filius primi Adae, in statum gratiae et adoptionis filiorum Dei [Rom. 8:23] per secundum Adam Jesum Christum salvatorem nostrum; quae quidem translatio post evangelium promulgatum sine lavacro regenerationis aut ejus voto fieri non potest, sicut scriptum est: *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei.*[John 3:5].

To summarize the Catholic/Protestant divergence on this issue: in the Protestant view Justification is the granting of “faith” in a mysterious way as a gift of God (the “bolt from the blue” approach); the Catholic view is that Justification is sacramental, *i.e.*, faith=baptism=Christ (the “when you do it, He will come” approach).

<sup>429</sup> εἰς Χριστός, μία ἐκκλησία, ἓν σῶμα. An example of the extent of this association is given by Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 182: “*Christ without His body is not Christ but an individual of the worse type.*” [The italics for emphasis are his.]

re-baptism is unfortunately one that is still relevant today,<sup>430</sup> with grave ramifications<sup>431</sup> that can too easily be dismissed in ecumenical euphoria.<sup>432</sup> The firmness and consistency of the inclusive nature of the Catholic position can be illustrated with two additional examples spanning almost thirteen hundred years.

The first is taken from Cyprian of Carthage (†258), bishop, martyr and saint, writing against what he perceived as the lax and scandalous views of Pope Stephen of Rome in that the Pope recognized the validity of baptisms performed by heretics:<sup>433</sup>

I know not on what presumption some of our colleagues are led to think that such as have been dipped among the heretics ought not to be baptized when they come to us; because, they say, there is one baptism [Eph. 4:5]. This one baptism is without any doubt in the Catholic Church, because the Church is one, and baptism cannot be out of the Church. For seeing there cannot be two baptisms, if heretics truly baptize, then they have the baptism. And whoso by his [Pope Stephen] own authority allows this privilege to them, yields and allows to them that the enemy and adversary of Christ seems to have the power of washing, purifying and sanctifying man. But we say that such as come thence are not re-baptized but baptized by us. For neither do they receive anything there, where

---

<sup>430</sup> “And even till now, as we understand, there are some who do not hesitate to do this” as quoted previously. That it is not very well resolved today, and on the present inconsistent practices among the Orthodox churches see, for example: Erikson, “The Reception of the Non-Orthodox into the Orthodox church: Contemporary Practices”; and his review of George D. Metallinos, *I Confess One Baptism: Interpretation and Application of Canon VII of the Second Ecumenical Council by Kollyvades and Constantine Oikonomos*, in *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 41 (1997): 77-80.

<sup>431</sup> Re-baptism (not to be identified in any way with conditional baptism) is the strongest possible affirmation of the prior non-existence as a Christian — as a member of the Body of Christ.

<sup>432</sup> For instance, what is to be made of this statement by the Eastern Orthodox-Roman Catholic Consultation in the US in *The Quest for Unity*, 70: “The Consultation agrees that in the Lima Statement we can recognize to a considerable degree the faith of the Church in regard to baptism. Because of this agreement, we recommend that our two churches explore the possibility of a formal recognition of each other’s baptism as a sacrament of our unity in the body of Christ, although we acknowledge that any such recognition is conditioned by other factors.” The Catholics appear to meet Orthodox reservations by abandoning their own theological position.

<sup>433</sup> Stevenson, *The New Eusebius*, 238.

there is nothing; but they come to us that here they may receive where is all grace and truth; for both grace and truth are one.

Cyprian here appears to be the purist, but his position, despite his stature, did not prevail; those of Pope Stephen did.

The second example is taken from the Canons on Baptism from the Council of Trent; Canons 4 and 11 are representative:

Can. 4. If anyone says that the baptism which is given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church does, is not true baptism, let him be anathema.<sup>434</sup>

Can. 11. If anyone says that baptism, truly and rightly administered, must be repeated in the one converted to repentance after having denied the faith of Christ among the infidels, let him be anathema.<sup>435</sup>

Baptism is the sacrament of Christian identity, of birth in the new life in the new man, the new Adam, Christ. A summary of Catholic teaching on the sacrament of Baptism<sup>436</sup> in relation to shared faith in Eucharistic communion is found in Pope John Paul II's encyclical *Ut Unum Sint*:<sup>437</sup>

Furthermore, the Sacrament of Baptism, which we have in common, represents “a sacramental bond of unity linking all who have been reborn by means of it”. [118] The theological, pastoral and ecumenical implications of our common Baptism are many and important. Although this sacrament of itself is “only a

---

<sup>434</sup> Can. 4. Si quis dixerit, baptismum, qui etiam datur ab haereticis in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, cum intentione faciendi, quod facit ecclesia, non esse verum baptismum: anathema sit.

<sup>435</sup> Can. 11. Si quis dixerit, verum et rite collatum baptismum iterandum esse illi, qui apud infideles fidem Christi negaverit, cum ad poenitentiam convertitur: anathema sit.

<sup>436</sup> See especially §9-20 of “Directory Concerning Ecumenical Matters: Part One,” *Ad Totam Ecclesiam*, 14 May 1967, in VC II, 487-90.

<sup>437</sup> *Ut Unum Sint*, §66. References [118]; [119]: Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, 22; *ibid.* 22.

beginning, a point of departure”, it is “oriented towards a complete profession of faith, a complete incorporation into the system of salvation such as Christ himself willed it to be, and finally, towards a complete participation in Eucharistic communion”. [119]

In summary, from the catholic perspective: because of the one baptism,<sup>438</sup> the proper place of all Christians is in the Eucharistic community, as full participants.

### **The Eucharist and *communicatio in sacris***

For our purpose, the examination of the Catholic position on *communicatio in sacris*, especially as illustrated by the previous *Guidelines*, can be addressed by considering two aspects of the Eucharist. For convenience they can be classified as: (1) the traditional or static<sup>439</sup> aspect exemplified by the doctrines such as transubstantiation, the real presence, the reservation of the Eucharist, and the rendering of *latría* to the Eucharistic elements — “The Church makes the Eucharist”; and (2) the contemporary or dynamic aspect exemplified by the eschatological, communal, and constitutive nature of the assembly — “The Eucharist makes the Church.”<sup>440</sup>

---

<sup>438</sup> Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, 455, Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, §3: “For men who believe in Christ and have been properly baptized are put in some, though imperfect, communion with the Catholic Church.”

<sup>439</sup> The classic Scholastic treatment of this “static” aspect of the Eucharist is given by Aquinas in *ST* 3a.73-83: *Consequenter considerandum est de sacramento Eucharistiae. Et primo, de ipso sacramento; secundo, de materia; tertio, de forma; quarto, de effectu; quinto, de recipientibus hoc sacramentum; sexto, de ministro; septimo, de ritu.* “We have now to consider the sacrament of the Eucharist; and first of all we treat of the sacrament itself; secondly, of its matter; thirdly, of its form; fourthly, of its effects; fifthly, of the recipients of this sacrament; sixthly, of the minister; seventhly, of the rite.” [Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Benzinger Brothers Inc., Hypertext Version, New Advent Inc, 1996. <http://www.knight.org/advent/summa/summa.htm>]. McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 85, also has applied the terms static and dynamic to a consideration of the Eucharist in discussing “the separation of terms which Augustine distinguished only subtly, namely ‘*sumere Christum*’ and ‘*sumi a Christo*’ and the substitution of a static view of the Eucharist, focused upon the reality of consecration, for Augustine’s dynamic view centred [*sic*] upon the fruitfulness of communion.”

<sup>440</sup> It would seem more proper to speak of the Eucharist as a manifestation or epiphany of the Church as the body of Christ, rather than *makes*. However, as already mentioned in note

### **The Eucharist and *transubstantiation***

Representative of the topics in (1) above, transubstantiation can be selected as an important and historically divisive point of Eucharistic theology. The objective here is to formulate a description of the Eucharist in terms of person, and thus also with a catholic understanding. Typical of the questions raised are these relevant selections, 13 and 15 in BEM:<sup>441</sup>

13. The Church confesses Christ's real, living and active presence in the eucharist. While Christ's real presence in the eucharist does not depend on the faith of the individual, all agree that to discern the body and blood of Christ, faith is required.

COMMENTARY (13) Some other churches, while affirming a real presence of Christ at the eucharist, do not link that presence so definitely with the signs of bread and wine. The decision remains for the churches whether this difference can be accommodated within the convergence formulated in the text itself.

COMMENTARY (15) In the history of the Church there have been various attempts to understand the mystery of the real and unique presence of Christ in the eucharist. Some are content merely to affirm this presence without seeking to explain it. Others consider it necessary to assert a change wrought by the Holy Spirit and Christ's words, in consequence of which there is no longer just ordinary bread and wine but the body and blood of Christ. Others again have developed an explanation of the real presence which, though not claiming to exhaust the significance of the mystery, seeks to protect it from damaging interpretations.

As the Catholic response to BEM makes clear, the doctrinal content of the meaning of transubstantiation, because it is dogma, is not negotiable from the Catholic perspective, and BEM is considered wanting in this respect.

A distinction is made in Commentary 13 between churches that "believe" in the change of the elements and those which do not link Christ's presence "so definitely to the signs of bread and wine". But the final sentence seems to relativize the word "believe". It asks whether the "difference can be

---

422 p 128, the CCC (English translation) does say, boldly and authoritatively (for Catholics), "The Eucharist makes the Church."

<sup>441</sup> BEM Commentary §13, §15.

accommodated with the convergence formulated in the text itself”. On the one hand, we welcome the convergence that is taking place. On the other hand, we must note that for Catholic doctrine, the conversion of the elements is a matter of faith and is only open to possible new theological explanations as to the “how” of the intrinsic change. The content of the word “transubstantiation” ought to be expressed without ambiguity. For Catholics this is a central mystery of faith, and they cannot accept expressions that are ambiguous. Thus it would seem that the differences as explained here cannot be accommodated within the convergence formulated in the text itself. Further work must be done on this.<sup>442</sup>

For Catholic belief, the term itself, *transubstantiation*, is considered to be a correct description of the underlying reality, regardless of its relatively late origin (ca.12th c.),<sup>443</sup> its association with a particular theological methodology (scholasticism), or its non-biblical pedigree. In these respects it is in the same category<sup>444</sup> as the terms ὁμοούσιος (*homoousios*)<sup>444</sup> and Θεοτόκος (*Theotokos*)<sup>445</sup>.

BEMR acknowledges the Catholic response, and properly counters that Catholics should then clarify their position on the underlying meaning (and also Orthodox with *metabole*<sup>446</sup> and Protestants in what it is that they are rejecting). A challenge is issued to Catholics, Orthodox and Protestants to clarify the issue.<sup>447</sup>

---

<sup>442</sup> Catholic response in Max Thurian, ed., *Churches Respond to BEM: Official Responses to the “Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry” Text*, VI, 22.

<sup>443</sup> Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, 379.

<sup>444</sup> In the creed of the Council of Nicea I AD 325. Also, cf. Arthur Michael Ramsey, DD, *The Gospel of the Catholic Church* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1936), 130: “Nor does the one term, (“of one substance”), which the Creed borrows from philosophy, commit the Church to any philosophy of οὐσία or substance.”

<sup>445</sup> Formalized at the Council of Ephesus, AD 431.

<sup>446</sup> *Metabole* is the word found in the epiclesis of the Holy Spirit in the Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom: Μεταβαλὼν τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ Ἁγίῳ, changing / *metabalon* by Your Holy Spirit.

<sup>447</sup> BEMR *Churches Respond to BEM*, 117e.

Some would be content to leave it there. But once the question of the elements has been raised, it will not go away. In so far as erroneous answers threaten the faith, the question must be faced. It would be important that the Orthodox churches explain to others what they mean by the transformation of the elements (*metabole*); that the Roman Catholic Church explore with others how what is “most aptly called transubstantiation” (Council of Trent) may otherwise be expressed; that those Protestants who deny any “essential change” in the elements state what they are thereby affirming. Here the dialogue remains open after the Lima text.

Theological dispute, it seems, often comes down to each side wanting to define (or own) the proper vocabulary.<sup>448</sup> While this is legitimate, let us put the word *transubstantiation* aside and take up the BEMR challenge to clarify the underlying meaning.<sup>449</sup> The proposal here is for Christians to consider their belief in the Eucharist, i.e. the Eucharistic elements, and God’s presence therein (real or however understood), by answering three questions with a *yes* or *no* answer:

Is the Eucharistic bread and wine:

- 1) really the person, Jesus, true God?
- 2) really the person, Jesus, true man?
- 3) really bread and wine?

---

<sup>448</sup> Or as Nikos A. Nissiotis, *Orthodox Perspectives on BEM*, 61, puts it, “strict adherence to the *grammata* of their confessional statements or juridical canonical structures and laws.”

<sup>449</sup> Has Trent been neglected in this regard by both Catholics and non-Catholics? Unlike Lateran IV which says that the elements are *transubstantiated* [transsubstantiatu pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem; see note 1], Trent says that the *change* is called *transubstantiation* [conversionem fieri...Quae conversio convenienter et proprie a sancta catholica ecclesia transsubstantiatio est appellata. Also of note is Trent’s treatment of more “modern” issues: frequent communion (“But He wished that this sacrament should be received as the spiritual food of souls”), the eschatological aspect of the Eucharist (“He wished it furthermore to be a pledge of our future glory and everlasting happiness,...”) within the context of the Church as communion [the *body of Christ*] (“...and thus be a symbol of that one body of which He is the head and to which He wished us to be united as members by the closest bond of faith, hope and charity...”) with an ecumenical thrust (“... that we might *all speak the same thing and there might be no schisms among us.*”).

We can characterize some general responses, admitting that there may need to be nuanced responses. For instance, for those who believe that the Eucharist is merely a sign, or just a sign of association with or memorial of the real Jesus, the answers would be 1) no, 2) no, 3) yes. A Lutheran response, based on a belief in the “real presence” in the sense of consubstantiation would be 1) yes, 2) yes, 3) yes. A Calvinist response, insisting that there is a unique physical presence of Jesus as He “sits at the right hand of the Father,” and therefore having reservations about question 2, might respond<sup>450</sup> 1) yes, 2) no, 3) yes.

The point of Catholic insistence is that the proper and only answers are 1) yes, 2) yes, 3) no; in particular, and distinguishing it from any other understanding that professes a “real presence” in any sense, that the answer to question 3 is emphatically *no*.<sup>451</sup> Furthermore, questions 1 and 2 are posed as they are in order to be an intentional link with the Christology of Chalcedon,<sup>452</sup> and the theology of person that it entailed. And that association can only be made properly if the answer to question 3 is *no*.<sup>453</sup> The answers 1) yes, 2) yes, 3) no are clearly the

<sup>450</sup> This may be a stereotype of the Calvinist position; perhaps more accurately, *yes but not essential* to questions 1 and 2. For Calvin writes in *The Institutes* (270-1): “When I say that Christ is received [in the Lord’s Supper] by faith, I do not mean only by intellect and imagination...they place Christ in the bread while we consider it wrong to bring him down from heaven. You must judge for yourself. But never subscribe to the falsehood that Christ is not present in the supper if he is not secreted under a covering of bread. We speak of a heavenly mystery and it is not necessary to bring Christ down to earth for us to be united with him... It is enough for us that Christ, from the substance of his flesh, breaths life into our souls. He diffuses his own life into us, though the real flesh of Christ does not enter us.” Cf Raymond Moloney SJ, *The Eucharist* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995), 156.

<sup>451</sup> BEMR, 64-5. Along with the “real presence” of Christ there is what has been colloquially termed the “real absence” of bread and wine. Docetism was heretical because it denied the material reality of the Incarnation; here the mere appearance of bread and wine, what the eucharistic elements only seem (δοκεῖν/ *dokein*, to seem) to be, affirms the same reality of that same Incarnation.

<sup>452</sup> For those who question or have not “received” Chalcedon, the thrust of questions 1 and 2 can be seen as a description of God incarnate in Jesus: Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us. [Jn 1:14].

<sup>453</sup> The respected Orthodox theologian, Alexander Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1988), 141, however, appears to miss this point in his discussion of the participation of the elements in the sacraments: “We called this relationship

only responses that do not violate the integrity of *person*, in this particular case, the person of Jesus. That is, the Catholic belief and dogma of transubstantiation<sup>454</sup> can be understood as a profession that the Eucharistic Christ is the true and real presence of Christ as the person of Christ.<sup>455</sup> God and man, human and divine in one person, **no more and no less**. If less, than the sacrament is just a substitute, and Christ's incarnational presence on earth would be limited to His brief life as Jesus of Nazareth. If more — that is, to admit *real* bread and wine — then a new and different theophany than the one, historical Incarnation must be admitted. Specifically, if the Christ of Chalcedon is “in the bread and wine” then there is a new presence: Christ already become flesh,<sup>456</sup> who made His dwelling among us, now also inhabits the bread and wine. Or,

---

an *epiphany*. ‘A is B’ means that the whole of A expresses, communicates, reveals, manifests the ‘reality’ of B (although not necessarily the whole of it) without, however, losing its own ontological reality, without being dissolved in another ‘res.’ [ref. Weidle]” Rather transubstantiation is the statement that the bread and wine do participate — they are not annihilated but are changed — in such a way that they **must** lose their “own ontological reality.”

<sup>454</sup> The Orthodox Bishop Maximos Aghiorgoussis, *The Eucharist in Ecumenical Dialogue* (30[220]) concurs: “As for the term “transubstantiation,” it cannot be an issue if it is interpreted to mean the change of the gifts into the real — yet sacramental — body and blood of the Lord, without pretending to explain the mystery of this miraculous change.” Also, as noted in BEMR, 64-65:

19. Several Orthodox responses take exception to the phrase “sacramental signs” in this connection. Thus the Russian Orthodox Church writes: “The bread and wine are declared to be only ‘the sacramental signs of Christ’s body and blood’ (E.15); whereas the Orthodox Church, basing itself on the Saviour’s institutional statement (Matt. 26:26-28), believes that the bread is really and truly and essentially itself the body of the Lord and the wine is itself the blood of the Lord. According to St John of Damascus, ‘the body is truly united with the Godhead; themselves the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood of God’” (De Fide Orthodoxa IV. C 13 (II.8)). [Cf. Bulgarian Orthodox Church, II.17f.; Finnish Orthodox Church, II.27; Romanian Orthodox Church, III.7f.]

Other translations of *De Fide Orthodoxa* render “transubstantiated” (above) simply as “changed.”

<sup>455</sup> Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 68: “Jesus intended a relationship between the bread and wine and His person.... If Jesus relates His person to bread and wine, we should expect this to be a relationship which exists independently of the mind, unless we have clear witness to the contrary.”

<sup>456</sup> Or perhaps the intent of Chalcedonian Christology itself is still ambiguous and needs to be clarified. It is surprising, for instance, to read in *Pro Ecclesia* IV (1995): 24: “But on the Chalcedonian-like rendering, the saints’ union is made possible through Christ’s ontic and

even worse it seems, if not *in* then *with*,<sup>457</sup> so that there is not just a new “dwelling” but another new creation, conflicting with and obscuring in a muddle<sup>458</sup> — Jesus true God-man-bread-wine

---

hypostatic union as well. God became one with the unique man Jesus, and through him with all humans in varying analogous manners.” That “God became one with the unique man Jesus,” badly misses the whole thrust of Chalcedon’s insistence on the unity of the two natures in one person. Rather, God became one with Mankind in a unique way (the Incarnation), in a unique person, Jesus; and “with all humans” not “in varying analogous manners” but in the same way, through baptism, making them “adopted-sons” [cf. Gal 4:5, Rom 9:4; υἱοθεσία, adopted-sonship (aptly but curiously, a feminine noun)], united in the Eucharist. Also, consider the definition of *Communicatio Idiomata* a Latin term meaning communication of properties or interchange of the properties. It is “a way to express the view that the attributes of the divine and human natures of Jesus Christ are attributes of the one person and that what can be said of Christ’s divinity can be said of his humanity, and vice versa”: Donald K. McKim, *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 54-55. There is no problem with the first part of this definition, but “and that what can be said of Christ’s divinity can be said of his humanity, and vice versa” must be questioned. The point is not that the two natures “communicate” properties to each other; rather, they “communicat” in reference to the person of Christ. Compare, for instance, this wording taken from <http://www.knight.org/advent/cathen/04169a.htm> [online Catholic Encyclopedia (1917)]: “It means that the properties of the Divine Word can be ascribed to the man Christ, and that the properties of the man Christ can be predicated of the Word ... The *communicatio idiomatum* is based on the oneness of person subsisting in the two natures of Jesus Christ. Hence it can be used as long as both the subject and the predicate of a sentence stand for the person of Jesus Christ, or present a common subject of predication ... Hence statements interchanging the Divine and human properties of Christ are, generally speaking, incorrect if their subject and predicate, either one or both, be abstract terms. We cannot say ‘the Divinity is mortal’, or, ‘the humanity is uncreated’.” A classic application of this idea is the term *theotokos* (bearer of God) for Mary, rather than just *anthropotokos* (bearer of humanity) or *Christotokos* (bearer of Christ). Similarly, with this understanding, it is proper to say that God died on the cross; see Alister E. McGrath *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, 2nd ed., (Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 1997) 250, 339-41.

<sup>457</sup> For a brief historical treatment of *in* and *with* in relation to impanation and consubstantiation, see Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, 379.

<sup>458</sup> Although laudable for its irenic sentiment, the Baptist Arthur B. Crabtree’s comments in *The Eucharist in Ecumenical Dialogue*, 123 [313], for instance, fail to appreciate these consequences: “I do not reject it [transubstantiation], as the Protestant Reformers did, and as my fellow-Baptist, Eric Rust, still does. I regard it as a legitimate way of describing the mystery of the presence. But I do not regard it as the *only* legitimate way... During the middle ages other terms were used, such as impanation, consubstantiation, companation, mutation, conversion... Why should bread not remain after consecration.? Why should not consubstantiation be acceptable as well as transubstantiation?” An interesting 16th century witness against this line of reasoning is Henry VIII, King of England, *Assertio Septem*

— the one, only Incarnation and new and unique Adam in whom we, Christians, all become partakers and *become* when we “put on Christ”<sup>459</sup> in baptism. To the personal presence of Christ in scripture and in the sacraments, and to the ontological presence of Christ in the sacraments, is added another presence: not just a personal presence, but a unique presence, the presence of Christ as a person in the Eucharistic under the appearance of bread and wine.

### **The Eucharist and *ekklesia***

To be consistent, the identification of the “new” theology — the constitutive nature of the Eucharistic gathering — as *the Eucharist* should carry the same emphasis as the traditional identification of *the Eucharist* as the whole Christ under the appearance of bread and wine. This is especially so since it is the unity of these two aspects that forms the image of the Church as the body of Christ: both head and members present as the one Christ, true God and man, present on the altar in the assembly of those other christs — the “adopted sons” who have “put on Christ” in baptism. But the argument cuts both ways: should not inclusion or exclusion be applied uniformly to all aspects of the Eucharist? And it also cuts on both sides: to what extent is the non-Catholic Christian able to concur in the sacramental and ontological thrust of Catholic Eucharistic theology and ecclesiology as considered here? In the general context of communion the following observation by the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey, is most pertinent:

---

*Sacramentorum or Defence of the Seven Sacraments*, Rev. Louis O’Donovan, S.T.L.,ed. (New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1908), 250-1: “Unless perhaps Luther will devise a new Person, that as God took on him the Nature of Man, so God and Man take the Nature of Bread, and Wine; which if he believes, he shall be accounted an Heretic, by all those who are not Heretics. Nisi forte novam nobis personam fingat Lutherus, ut, quomodo Deus assumpsit hominem, ita Deus et homo assumant panem et vinum; quod si credat, habebitur, opinor, haereticus apud omnes qui non sunt haeretici.” The *Assertio* was published in October 1521 “against Luther,” and was precipitated by Luther’s *Babylonian Captivity of the Church*. This work of Luther created and sustains the great divide in western Christianity: unity, like ecclesiology, is essentially sacramental in the Catholic view.

<sup>459</sup> Gal 3:27 ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. This is sung during the Byzantine rite of baptism; also, for certain feasts, it replaces the Trisagion in the Divine Liturgy: “All you who have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. Alleluia!”

Nor is the Body, thus received, a merely local fellowship of Christians; it is the one universal Church. For the Eucharist is never merely the act of a local community, but always the act of the great Church, wherein the local community is merged.

Also, our father among the saints, Augustine of Hippo, tells us: “If you then are the Body and members of Christ, the mystery of yourselves is laid upon the table of the Lord, the mystery of yourselves you receive.”<sup>460</sup> The Byzantine Divine Liturgy expresses the same: τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις and τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέρομεν κατὰ πάντα καὶ πάντα<sup>461</sup> (cf. Irenaeus, “We offer Him His own.”)<sup>462</sup> St. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of<sup>463</sup>

the divine mysteries of which you have been counted worthy, with which you have become of the same Body and Blood with Christ.... That our Lord Jesus Christ on the night when He was betrayed, took bread and when He had given thanks He broke it, and gave it to His disciples.

And so, it is perhaps in the *catholic* understanding of the Eucharist, the gathering of each *One* as the *Many* who are *ONE* that the renewed hope for unity amid continued divisions can be realized: For it is there that Christians put *themselves* on the altar *ut ad perficiendum mysterium*

---

<sup>460</sup> St. Augustine, *Sermons 272*, as quoted in, *The Gospel of the Catholic Church*, 112. See Sermon 272, *In die Pentecostes postremus*, PL 38:1247: Si ergo vos estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa Dominica positum est: mysterium vestrum accipitis. See also Bell, *A Cloud of Witnesses*, 193.

<sup>461</sup> Text of the Divine Liturgy from *H ΘΕΙΑ ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΑ* (Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Brookline, 1985) pages 31 and 24 respectively. “Holy (things) for the holy (Ones),” and the enigmatic “We offer to you yours of your own in behalf of all and for all.”

<sup>462</sup> Bell, *A Cloud of Witnesses*, 88.

<sup>463</sup> Mike Aquilina, *The Fathers of the Church: An Introduction to the First Christian Teachers* (Huntington: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1999), 149-50. A complete text — English translation with introduction and discussion and complete original Greek — is also conveniently provided in F. L. Cross, ed., *St. Cyril of Jerusalem: Lectures on the Christian Sacraments* (Crestwood: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1986); the Greek text for the specific selection is on page 26.

*unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo quod accepit ipse de nostros*, “so that to realize the mystery of unity we may receive of Him what He has received of us.”<sup>464</sup>

\* \* \*

In the προσκομιδή / *proskomide* service of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy,<sup>465</sup> the deacon announces in dialog with the priest, Καίρὸς τοῦ ποιῆσαι τῷ Κυρίῳ — this is often translated “It is time to serve the Lord.” This enigmatic phrase, however, is a direct quote from the Septuagint, Psalm 119 (LXX: 118):126, לַיהוָה לַעֲשׂוֹת יְעִת / καιρὸς τοῦ ποιῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ / It is time for the LORD / YHWH to act<sup>466</sup> — for it is the Lord who acts in the Eucharist, that is, it is the *One* who is the *ONE* and, consequently, it is also the *Many* (Christians) who act.<sup>467</sup> Zizioulas sums up the *catholic* sense of the Eucharist as being the epiphany of this communion, as the difference and distinctiveness of persons that does not produce division; and he indicates the direction for refining our sense of time,<sup>468</sup> the καιρός / *kairos* of the Christian.<sup>469</sup>

It is not by accident that the Church has given to the Eucharist the name of “Communion.” For in the Eucharist we can find all the dimensions of communion: God communicates Himself to us, we enter into communion with Him, the participants of the Sacrament enter into communion with one another, and creation as a whole enters through man into communion with God. All this

---

<sup>464</sup> Lateran IV excerpt; see above note 416 pp 126-27; p 142-43.

<sup>465</sup> The *proskomide* service, Ἀκολουθία τῆς Πποσκομιδῆς, is preceded by the *vesting* service which is preceded by the service τοῦ Καιροῦ, of the *kairos*.

<sup>466</sup> Cf Bishop Kallistos, “The Witness of the Orthodox Church,” 46.

<sup>467</sup> Cf LaCugna above at note 414 pp 125-26.

<sup>468</sup> Oscar Cullman, *Christ and Time* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1962), 38-39 ff.

<sup>469</sup> Zizioulas, “Communion and Otherness,” 355.

is taking place in Christ and the Spirit, Who bring the last days into history and offer to the world a foretaste of the Kingdom.

For Zizioulas, the Eucharistic hypostasis is the “experience of authentic Personhood that is offered in the ecclesial hypostasis.”<sup>470</sup> It is now the time to further examine the Eucharistic and ecclesial hypostasis by considering the person in the context, just indicated by Zizioulas, of “the last days” (τά ἔσχατα / *ta eschata*) and “the Kingdom” (ἡ βασιλεία / *he basileia*).<sup>471</sup>

---

<sup>470</sup> Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 59.

<sup>471</sup> Cf von Allmen, *The Lord's Supper*, 47: “A eucharistic congregation is a visible token of the real presence of the Kingdom.”

## Chapter 8

# Eschaton

ἔσχατον

ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστι,<sup>472</sup> “the hour is coming and is now” Jesus tells us. In response to Martha’s οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,<sup>473</sup> Jesus reorients the temporal perspective and says ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή.<sup>474</sup> He is the Christ, the One who inaugurates the great day of the Lord,<sup>475</sup> the last day.<sup>476</sup> In what is one of the most dramatic accounts in the Gospels, Luke tells of Jesus beginning His ministry in the Synagogue of Nazareth; there Jesus reads from the scroll of the prophet Isaiah:<sup>477</sup>

---

<sup>472</sup> Jn 4:23, Jn 5:25.

<sup>473</sup> Jn 11:24. I know that he [Lazarus] will rise in the resurrection on the last (ἐσχάτη / *eschate*) day.

<sup>474</sup> Jn 11:25. I am the resurrection and the life.

<sup>475</sup> Is 13:6, Is 13:9, Jl 1:15, Jl 2:1, Jl 2:11, Jl 3:4, Jl 4:14, Am 5:18, Am 5:20, Ob 1:15, Zep 1:7, Zep 1:14, Mal 3:23.

<sup>476</sup> Cf Heb 1:2 ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων: in (the) last of these days.

<sup>477</sup> Lk 4:18 πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ οὐ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ... κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν ... σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφή αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὤσιν ὑμῶν, quoting Isaiah 61:1-2. The full text is (NAB): The spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me, because the LORD has anointed me; He has sent me to bring glad tidings to the lowly, to heal the brokenhearted, To proclaim liberty to the captives and release to the prisoners, 2 To announce a year of favor from the LORD and a day of vindication by our God, to comfort all who mourn; πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ οὐ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν 2 καλέσαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας

“The Spirit of the Lord [κυρίου / *kuriou*] is upon me, because he has anointed [מָשַׁח / *mashach*; ἔχρισέν / *echrisen*] me to bring glad tidings [εὐαγγελίσασθαι, *euangelisasthai* = evangelize] to the poor... to proclaim a year acceptable to the Lord... Today (σήμερον / *semeron*) this scripture is fulfilled in your hearing.”

That *today* / σήμερον must be a personal experience and expectation for everyone. For the Christian, whose true identity is bound to the eucharist, history is eschatology.<sup>478</sup>

The Eucharist is not only an assembly in one place, that is, a historical realization and manifestation of the eschatological existence of man; it is at the same time also *movement*, a progress towards this realization.

In his essay, in the section “*An eschatological approach to the mystery of the Church*” Zizioulas explains:<sup>479</sup>

This means that the Church, particularly in her eucharistic synaxis, anticipates sacramentally the ultimate salvation of the whole creation from the last enemy (1 Cor 15:26), i.e. death. The ‘catholic Church’ is thus constituted in the Eucharist in a way which involves the whole creation in it, and not just human beings or angelic powers. All this happens sacramentally, i.e. in the form of the ‘already and not yet’, in the form of an ‘*eikon*’ of the Kingdom to come.

The eucharistic community makes the Church eschatological. It frees it from the causality of natural and historical events, from limitations which are the result of the individualism implied in our natural biological existence. It gives it the taste of eternal life as love and communion, as the image of the being of God.

### The Person of the Eschaton

This eschatology of the new man and the image of God is, like all New Testament eschatology, no simple futurist eschatology, for it is brought into the

---

רוּחַ אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה עָלַי יֵעַן מָשַׁח יְהוָה אֹתִי לְבִשָׁר עֲנֻוִים שְׁלַחְנִי לְחַבֵּשׁ  
 לְנִשְׁבְּרֵי-לֵב לְקִרְאָה לְשִׁבוּיִם דְּרוּר וְלְאַסְוָרִים פְּקַח-קוֹחַ:  
 לְקַרְאֵת אֲשֶׁנֶּת-רְצוֹן לַיהוָה וַיּוֹם נָקָם לְאֱלֹהֵינוּ לְנַחֵם כָּל-אֲבֵלִים:

<sup>478</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 61.

<sup>479</sup> Zizioulas, “Mystery of the Church,” 302.

present — we are now being transformed (μεταμορφούμεθα, II Cor. iii. 18); yet, as all the passages make clear, what happens in the present is an anticipation of that which properly belongs to the future. Like body (σῶμα), image (εἰκὼν) leads our thought from Christ to the Church; it also leads it on to the final destiny of mankind.<sup>480</sup>

Jesus is the eschatological person, the new Man (Eph 2:15 εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον) and last Adam (1 Cor 15:45 ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ): Christ is “the eschatological Man.”<sup>481</sup> And every Christian is also the eschatological man because every Christian lives the life of Christ in the Holy Spirit in the age of the eschaton.<sup>482</sup>

Now if *becoming* history is the particularity of the Son in the economy, what is the contribution of the Spirit? Well, precisely the opposite: it is to liberate the Son and the economy from the bondage of history. If the Son dies on the cross, thus succumbing to the bondage of historical existence, it is the Spirit that raises him from the dead. The Spirit is the *beyond* history, and when he acts in history he does so in order to bring into history the last days, the *eschaton*. Hence the first fundamental particularity of Pneumatology is its eschatological character. The Spirit makes of Christ an eschatological being, the “last Adam.”

Another important contribution of the Holy Spirit to the Christ event is that, because of the involvement of the Holy Spirit in the economy, Christ is not just an individual, not “one” but “many.” This “corporate personality” of Christ is impossible to conceive without Pneumatology. It is not insignificant that the Spirit has always, since the time of Paul, been associated with the notion of *communion* (κοινωνία) [2Cor 13:13]. Pneumatology contributes to Christology this dimension of communion. And it is because of this function of Pneumatology that it is possible to speak of Christ as having a “body,” i.e. to speak of ecclesiology, of the Church as the Body of Christ.

Zizioulas boldly portrays this relationship: “*Christ without His body is not Christ but an individual of the worse type.*”<sup>483</sup> Not Christ an individual, but Christ the person. The Eucharist is the eschatological assembly of persons who have put on Christ, the sons in the Son gathered to

---

<sup>480</sup> Barrett, *From First Adam to Last*, 98.

<sup>481</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 183.

<sup>482</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 130-31.

<sup>483</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 182; the italics for emphasis are his.

worship the Father and do His will and His work — to work with the Son and to do the work of sons, ἡ θεία λειτουργία / *he theia leitourgia*, the divine liturgy. This is the determining factor of the church as Zizioulas, as representative of an Orthodox perspective, insists:<sup>484</sup>

Ecclesiology in the Orthodox tradition has always been determined by the liturgy, the eucharist; and for this reason it is the first two aspects of Pneumatology, namely *eschatology* and *communion* that have determined Orthodox ecclesiology. Both eschatology and communion constitute fundamental elements of the Orthodox understanding of the eucharist.

### **Time and the *eschata***

What is the proper Christian sense of time?<sup>485</sup> What is the proper orientation of the person — that is the authentic person, the eucharistic or ecclesial hypostasis, the Christian as a member of the body of Christ — in time, in the context of the Eucharistic gathering?<sup>486</sup> What is our sense of “today,” σήμερον / *semeron*, hodie, as Christians?

We are living these “the last of the days” (Heb 1:2). Liturgical time has a twofold character that reflects the unique aspect of the Eucharistic gathering as an eschatological celebration. The distinction can be illustrated by considering the two (Greek) concepts of “time” — χρόνος / *chronos* and καιρός / *kairos*.<sup>487</sup> In a traditional liturgical setting, *chronos* is linear time — chronology — the sanctification of the day, the hours (called *Praises* in the East and *Office* in the West). But *kairos* is the *event* — the occasion — and as such is misplaced, theologically, in a strict chronological setting.<sup>488</sup> It is rather an eschatological celebration which

---

<sup>484</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 132.

<sup>485</sup> E.g. see de Lubac, *Catholicism*, 137-156.

<sup>486</sup> In general see Geoffrey Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1981).

<sup>487</sup> As discussed, for instance, in *Light For Life: Part Two The Mystery Celebrated* (Pittsburgh: God With Us Publications, 1994), 15-18, 28-30. Cf Eccl 3:1 זמן יעת.

<sup>488</sup> But note the reservations of Robert Taft cited below, pp151-52.

is associated with linear time most appropriately in reference to the cycle of creation. This is established by the rhythm of the week, the six days of creation and the Sabbath, and perfected in the “eighth day”:<sup>489</sup>

The number 8 was, for ancient Christianity, the symbol of the Resurrection, for it was on the day after the Sabbath, and so the eighth day, that Christ rose from the tomb. Furthermore, the seven days of the week are the image of the time of this world, and the eighth day of life everlasting. Sunday is the liturgical commemoration of this eighth day, and so at the same time a memorial of the Resurrection and a prophecy of the world to come. Into this eighth day, inaugurated by Christ, the Christian enters by baptism.

And St. Augustine speaks of “the Lord’s day, an eighth and eternal day, consecrated by the Resurrection of Christ ... There we shall rest and see, see and love, love and praise.”<sup>490</sup>

This eighth day also coincides with the first day of creation<sup>491</sup> (see Gn 1:3-5), the day God began to create the heavens and the earth. Now it is the day of the new creation, of the first fruits, the Lord’s day:<sup>492</sup> “It is the day of the Resurrection, O people let us be enlightened by it.”<sup>493</sup> Consequently, there is a timeliness, a rhythm arising from the Church’s very being, for the Church to celebrate the Eucharist in a consistent way and in such a manner that it constitutes itself on this day. This is the gathering ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό / *epi to auto*<sup>494</sup> rendered by the Orthodox

---

<sup>489</sup> Jean Danielou, S. J., *The Bible and the Liturgy* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1956), 37. See also, de Lubac, *Catholicism*, 151ff; Alexander Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir Seminary Press, 1986), 75-80.

<sup>490</sup> St. Augustine, *City of God*, Book 22, Chapter 30. ...dominicus dies velut octavus aeternus, qui Christi resurrectione sacratus est ... Ibi vacabimus et videbimus, videbimus et amabimus, amabimus et laudabimus. Significantly this is found at the very end of this work.

<sup>491</sup> Perhaps more properly, day one; see the discussion in Danielou, *Bible and Liturgy*, 263 ff.

<sup>492</sup> Zep 1:14, ἡμέρας κυρίου, Rv 16:14, ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

<sup>493</sup> Resurrections Matins, 1<sup>st</sup> Ode, tone 1: Ἀναστάσεως ἡμέρα, λαμπρυνθῶμεν λαοί.

<sup>494</sup> Acts 2:44 πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεύοντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινά. And all the ones believing were together, and were having all things *in common*. Acts 2:47 αἰνοῦντες τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἔχοντες χάριν πρὸς ὅλον τὸν λαόν. ὁ δὲ κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους καθ’

theologian Afanasiev<sup>495</sup> (and reminiscent of Lerins' dictum) as "always everyone and always together." As explained by Zizioulas:<sup>496</sup>

The celebration of the eucharist by the primitive Church was, above all, the gathering of the people of God *epi to auto*, that is, as manifestation and realization of the Church. Its celebration on Sunday – the day of the *eschata* – as well as all its liturgical content testified that during the eucharist, the Church did not only live by memory of a historical fact – the Last Supper and earthly life of Christ, including the cross and the resurrection – but it accomplished an *eschatological* act. It was in the eucharist that the Church would contemplate her eschatological nature, would taste the very life of the Holy Trinity; in other words she would realize man's true being as the image of God's being. All the fundamental elements which constituted her historical existence and structure had, by necessity, to pass through the eucharistic community to be "sure" (according to Ignatius of Antioch) or "valid" or "canonical" (according to the terminology of contemporary canon law), that is, to be ecclesiologically *true*. No ordination to fundamental and structured ministries of the Church took place outside the eucharist community. It was there, in the presence of all the people of God and all the orders, in an event of free communion, that the Holy Spirit distributed the gifts "by constituting the whole structure of the Church." Thus the eucharist was not the act of a pre-existing Church; it was an event *constitutive* of the being of the Church, enabling the Church to be. The eucharist *constituted* the Church's being.

Consequently, the eucharist had the unique privilege of reuniting in one whole, in one unique experience, the work of Christ and that of the Holy Spirit. It expressed the eschatological vision through historical realities by combining in the ecclesial life the institutional with the charismatic elements.

---

ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. Praising God, and having favor with all the people. And the Lord was increasing the ones being saved, every day, together.

<sup>495</sup> As presented by Plekon, *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 41 (1997): 151. As another reference point regarding BEM, Wainwright, *Worship With One Accord*, 79 ff, says:

The question arises whether the Lima text carries an implicit ecclesiology. I think it would be compatible with the "eucharistic theology" advocated by N. Afanasiev and several other Orthodox writers... and there are many indications that the nature and function of the church are 'read off' the liturgical assembly, which Vatican II called the "*praecipua manifestatio ecclesiae*."

<sup>496</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 21.

This is not just an existential awareness but an ontological awareness given that, as Zizioulas says, the Eucharist *constitutes* the Church's being. Consequently, the Church **MUST** be Eucharistic, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, if it is to be the Church. For in that which is *catholic* there is a sameness that does not destroy uniqueness, and difference that does not produce division, so that, in the spirit of this time of the ἔσχατον/*eshaton*, it can be said that the Church (past) is the Church (present) is the Church (future). Indeed, Lerins is echoed in the liturgy. Consider the preface of the Roman Mass, “nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere ... Cum quibus et nostras voces,” and the classic formula of both east and west for the closing doxology of prayers, “nunc et semper et in saecula saeculorum,” πάντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεί καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, always now and forever and unto the ages of ages. For this Church there are no such things as “post biblical novelties”<sup>497</sup> — the Bride knows her beloved and knows how to speak of Him.

---

EXCURSUS: **Taft on Time**

Robert F. Taft, S.J., a priest of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and Professor at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, one of the foremost liturgists on the eastern churches, in this book *Beyond East and West, Problems in Liturgical Understanding*,<sup>498</sup> is critical of those who treat time by making too much of the *kairos / chronos*, eucharist-event-eschatology versus hours-office-linear-time liturgical cycle, difference. Taft notes the difference by referring to<sup>499</sup>

resolving the numerous antinomies that surface in any discussion of the church year: eschatology vs. history, dominical cycle vs. yearly, *kairos* vs. *chronos*. I do not wish to imply that these tensions are not real. But I think they arose, in germ at least, not in fourth-century Jerusalem as one usually hears, but in New Testament times.

---

<sup>497</sup> George A. Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984), 92.

<sup>498</sup> Robert F. Taft, S.J., *Beyond East and West, Problems in Liturgical Understanding* (Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1997).

<sup>499</sup> Taft, *Beyond East and West*, 14.

But then he seems to interject a dissonance:<sup>500</sup>

It is clear from these texts that the earliest tradition of non-eucharistic public prayer had nothing to do with theories of the “sanctification of time,” with *kairos* and *chronos*, with a liturgy of “time” or “history” as distinct from the “eschatological” Eucharist. Rather, the evening office at the close of day leads us to reflect on the hours just passed, with thanksgiving for the good they have brought and sorrow for the evil we have done.

And he essentially repeats this in another chapter:<sup>501</sup>

So the earliest tradition of non-eucharistic public prayer had nothing to do with theories of “sanctification of time,” with *kairos* and *chronos*, with a liturgy of “time” or “history” as distinct from the “eschatological” Eucharist. Rather, the morning office dedicates the new day to God, and the evening office at the close of day leads us to reflect on the hours just passed, with thanksgiving for the good they have brought and sorrow for the evil we have done.

And in his strongest criticism he asks:<sup>502</sup>

What but historical scholarship has enabled us to overcome the pseudo-eschatology vs. sanctification of time dichotomy? What else has relegated to the realm of cliché the supposed *kairos-chronos* antinomy?

Unfortunately, Taft does not reference exactly who he is criticizing for misusing the *kairos/chronos* concepts.

---

<sup>500</sup> Taft, *Beyond East and West*, 171.

<sup>501</sup> Taft, *Beyond East and West*, 274.

<sup>502</sup> Taft, *Beyond East and West*, 289.

McPartlan correctly interprets Zizioulas in that the Eucharist as event does not draw us out of time but it respects time, chronology, and history:<sup>503</sup>

Zizioulas considers this anticipatory aspect of the Eucharist to be of the utmost importance if history is to be fully respected. The Eucharist draws us not out of time, but through time to its consummation. As he said in his programmatic address, in the Eucharist ‘we become contemporary with the total history of the pre-eternal plan of God for our salvation in a unity of past, present and future’. The whole of God’s historical purpose is set before us, inviting us to a correspondingly ‘complete acceptance’ of it, in a genuine ‘foretaste of Paradise.’

In its historical sense the eucharist preserves “tradition”,<sup>504</sup> in transmitting the institution, it sanctifies time:<sup>505</sup>

The eucharist realizes in the course of history the continuity that links each Church to the first apostolic communities and to the historical Christ: in short, all that was *instituted* and is *transmitted*. The eucharist is thus the affirmation *par excellence* of history, the sanctification of time, by manifesting the Church as historical reality, as an *institution*.

The Eucharist affirms history: it *re-presents*<sup>506</sup> the cross and resurrection in the “form” of bread and wine, and the “structure,” the Supper at the Pasch where the old law is fulfilled and the new law is bestowed. But in this new dispensation, the gathering as church takes on a character that is not only historical and institutional in the traditional sense, but eschatological: “In the

---

<sup>503</sup> McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 136.

<sup>504</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 21; this must be understood in the full sense of *paradosis* as discussed in relation to the eucharist.

<sup>505</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 22.

<sup>506</sup> This is a favorite sense of the Catholic (especially Latin) Church, that is, the eucharist does not merely represent, but rather *re-presents* the Paschal sacrifice; see Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, vii. Zizioulas does not use this construction, but it seems to fit his meaning. Also for the Eucharist as “realization” see Cullman, *Christ and Time*, 169.

eucharist the being of the Church ... dilates history and time to the infinite dimensions of the *eschata*.<sup>507</sup>

The eucharist is the “gathering of the whole church in one place,”<sup>508</sup> that is, a *catholic* gathering in the truest sense: this gathering of the *many* contains the fulness the whole, the *ONE*. Zizioulas calls it an “event of *communion*”<sup>509</sup>, and “not simply something instituted that is historically *given*, but also something *con-stituted*, that is constantly realized as an event of free communion, prefiguring the divine life and the Kingdom to come.”<sup>510</sup> As seen in the previous section, in the view of Zizioulas the Eucharist preserves history. But it is not just an historical event but “life and being through the *eschata*. It is not the sacrament completing the word, but rather the word becoming flesh, the risen Body of the Logos.”<sup>511</sup> And in keeping with the arguments developed about transubstantiation (also in the previous section), the Jesus of history is the Jesus of the Eucharist who is the Jesus of Chalcedon — the same person as the Jesus of Nazareth, but also the same person who is living with us in this present time.<sup>512</sup> Respecting the integrity of the person, this is and can only be the same Jesus. The Eucharist is the celebration of the person, of the Christ-event and, therefore, of the person, Jesus; and so it is anamnesis, a remembrance and commemoration. But it is a remembering that actualizes not only the past — the cross, the tomb, the resurrection and ascension — but also the future, the coming of Christ in glory:<sup>513</sup>

When the *eschata* visit us, the Church’s *anamnesis* acquires the eucharistic paradox which no historical consciousness can ever comprehend, i.e. the *memory*

---

<sup>507</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 22.

<sup>508</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 22.

<sup>509</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 22.

<sup>510</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 22.

<sup>511</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 23.

<sup>512</sup> Given this understanding of the eschatological age, the perspective of Zizioulas denies to those who would misuse it the term “historical Jesus.” The popularized quest for the historical Jesus is better characterized as a quest for a chronological Jesus, the Jesus of the first century.

<sup>513</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 180.

*of the future*, as we find it in the anaphora of the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom: “Remembering the cross, the resurrection, the ascension *and the second coming*, Thine own of Thine own we offer Thee.” Unless the Church lets Pneumatology so condition Christology that the sequence of “yesterday-today-tomorrow” is transcended, she will not do full justice to Pneumatology; she will enslave the Spirit in a linear *Heilsgeschichte*. Yet the Spirit is “the Lord” who transcends linear history and turns historical continuity into a presence.

“This makes the eucharist the moment in which the Church realizes that her roots are to be found *simultaneously* in the past and in the future, in history and in the eschata.”<sup>514</sup> The Eucharist actualizes as an epiphany the yet-to-be-completed / -perfected kingdom of God. Thus the Divine Liturgy begins: “Blessed is the kingdom of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>515</sup> The assembled Eucharistic community is the most visible — *conspicuum*<sup>516</sup> — manifestation of the body, the person of Christ, in this present age, where those who are perceived as slaves according to the values of the world, live and worship as sons in the Father’s house.<sup>517</sup>

### **The Liturgical / Eschatological Today**

The liturgical *today* — *hodie*, *σήμερον* / *semeron* — is the chronology of the eschaton. The past events of salvation are current events.<sup>518</sup> Even when not explicit, the thrust is not just that of some expression with poetic license, but actual participation.<sup>519</sup> The Eucharist as the

---

<sup>514</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 189.

<sup>515</sup> Εὐλογημένη ἡ Βασιλεία τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

<sup>516</sup> See page 94, quote of Pope Leo.

<sup>517</sup> This is also embodied in the architectural and cultic aspects of the Byzantine sacred space and ἅγια, “holy things.” About this much more can be said; see Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 232-33, especially n 72.

<sup>518</sup> Apparently contra in BEM, see Vanderwilt, *A Church Without Borders*, 81.

<sup>519</sup> Consider this sense of actual participation conveyed, for example, by the Byzantine Sunday Matins reading / resurrection ode (which in some recensions is also a priest’s prayer during the Sunday Divine Liturgy): Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι, προσκυνήσωμεν Ἁγίου, Κύριον, Χριστέ: “Having beheld the resurrection of Christ, let us fall-down-before (in worship)

celebration of the eschaton is the sacrifice of the new law<sup>520</sup> that was prefigured in the old. The historical event of the one great sacrifice of the cross, which Jesus instructed his disciples to anticipate,<sup>521</sup> is the anchor for liturgy understood and celebrated as sacrifice (the common Catholic and Orthodox understanding, for instance), both in the east and in the west<sup>522</sup>. But the Church as the Eucharistic community is the manifestation of the fruit of that sacrifice in the present time, and so it is the eschatological aspect, the celebration and living of the eschaton, that is so important (and especially apparent in the Byzantine liturgy). Alexander Schmemmann, from the perspective of a modern liturgical scholar of the Christian east, discusses the aspects of our worship that emanate from this sacrifice, the sacrifice of the cross:<sup>523</sup>

Once more, the joyful character of the eucharistic gathering must be stressed. For the medieval emphasis on the cross, while not a wrong one, is certainly one-sided. The liturgy is, before everything else, the joyous gathering of those who are to meet the risen Lord and to enter with him into the bridal chamber. And it is this joy of expectation and this expectation of joy that are expressed in singing and ritual, in vestments and incensing, in that whole “beauty” of the liturgy.

---

the Holy Lord Jesus.” One may ask, when did we behold His resurrection? Every Christian should know the answer to that question. And, at the beginning of the anaphora for the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: ... ἕως ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνήγαγες καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἐχαρίσω τὴν μέλλουσαν, ...until You led us into heaven and bestowed-as-a-gift (ἐχαρίσω from χαρίζομαι) your intended (μέλλουσαν) kingdom.

<sup>520</sup> Contra Lathrop, *Holy Things*, 140, who says summarily, “Christian worship is not sacrifice.” Compare his verdict to the sacrificial aspects of the προσκομιδὴ service that is the preparatory portion of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy; or Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World*, 35: “It is our Eucharist ... Yes, to be sure, it is a *sacrifice*”; and, Ernest Falardeau, S.S.S., *A Holy and Living Sacrifice: The Eucharist in a Christian Perspective* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1996), 4 & ff: “The concept of sacrifice is central to the theology of the Eucharist.”

<sup>521</sup> Mt 16:21, Mt 17:12, Mt 17:22, Mt 20:18, Mt 26:2, Mt 26:45, Mk 8:31, Mk 9:12, Mk 9:31, Mk 10:33, Mk 14:41, Lk 9:22, Lk 9:44, Lk. 22:15, Lk. 24:7, Lk 24:46.

<sup>522</sup> See Lathrop, p 112 and n 383.

<sup>523</sup> Schmemmann, *For the Life of the World*, 29-30.

Thus at Resurrection Matins the Byzantine liturgy sings of Christ coming forth from the tomb like a Bridegroom.<sup>524</sup> This is a verbal image of the classic icon of the “Bridegroom” (ὁ νυμφίος / *ho numphios*): Jesus with a reed for a scepter, scourged, bound, and crowned with thorns — ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος.<sup>525</sup> The Resurrection is the triumph of this new, this eschatological age: the last significant act of the fallen world was to crucify the Son of God. In every Eucharistic liturgy that can be considered to be *catholic* the Holy Spirit makes present for us the past — Christ’s cross, tomb, resurrection, ascension, enthronement — and future — His second glorious coming — through the holy offering-up — ἀναφορά / *anaphora* — in the present.

Finally, according to Zizioulas:<sup>526</sup>

Eschatology can be described as ultimacy in terms of history or time (as distinct from an ultimacy in terms of the presence of being, of ontology). Christian eschatology invites us to look at the ultimacy of being from the angle of the Parousia. But ... only if this Parousia points to the ultimacy of being in terms of ontology as well as history can it bring with it an answer to the question of the survival of being. Christian doctrine achieves this identification of the historical with the ontological ultimacy only if it operates through [certain] ... assertions.

Of those assertions, the following are most pertinent since they provide a convenient summary of key points of the thesis that have already been discussed while also pointing the way ahead:<sup>527</sup>

Christ, the ‘last Adam’ or the eschatological Man, is risen *from the dead*, which means that there is no ultimacy for death and non-existence.... Ultimately ... ontology — the ultimacy of being — is conceivable only in terms of personhood as I have tried to describe it here. Eschatology implies that being will be shown

---

<sup>524</sup> At the Praises: ἀνέστης ἐκ τοῦ τάφου ὡς ἐκ παστᾶδος προελθών, You rose from the tomb as from a bridal chamber; at the kissing of the cross/Gospel book: Χριστὸν ... ἐκ τοῦ μνήματος, ὡς Νυμφίου προερχόμενον, Christ ... coming forth from the Tomb like a Bridegroom; and, ἐκ τάφου σήμερον, ὡς περ ἐκ παστοῦ ἐκλάμπας Χριστός, from the Tomb, today, as from a bridal chamber, Christ has shown forth.

<sup>525</sup> Jn 19:5. *idou ho anthropos* / *Behold the man*. And behold Adam.

<sup>526</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 443.

<sup>527</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 443, 445.

to be in the end *personal* in ... two ways ... : hypostatically and ekstatically. Hypostatically because it will become clear that each person is so *unique* that it was deemed to be worthy of survival. There will have to be therefore a resurrection of the *bodies* — these ‘modes of existence’ of ours — if that survival is to take place. And it will be also an ekstatic survival, because *only by virtue of our being so loved as to be regarded as unique* will we survive hypostatically, as ‘particularities’ as bodies. It will only then be possible for us to realise what it means that being is to be found ultimately in personal *communion* and not in the ‘self-existent’. Now we only know ‘through a mirror’ — if, that is, that mirror is not so darkened as to be the darkness of this world. This mirror is the community, the Church, which in terms of 1 John reflects God’s love in the world. ‘Extra ecclesiam nulla salus’. But what sort of ‘ecclesia’? The right kind of Ecclesiology becomes in this context crucial for the notion of Personhood.

\* \* \*

Christ came in time, the church remains in time. Precisely because Christ came in time, respecting time He also returned to the Father. The partners in time, in the world, ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων,<sup>528</sup> *in these the last of the days*, are now the Holy Spirit, Christ, and the one united with Him, His Bride the Church, the *ecclesia*. “But what sort of ‘ecclesia’? The right kind of Ecclesiology becomes ... crucial for the notion of Personhood,”<sup>529</sup> echoing Zizioulas (above). Likewise, and conversely, the right notion of person becomes crucial, and is the foundation, for an understanding of church.

---

<sup>528</sup> Heb 1:2.

<sup>529</sup> See the end of the previous quote.

## Chapter 9

# Church

ἐκκλησία

“The eucharistic community, and the Church in general, as a *communion (koinonia)* can only be understood in the categories of personal existence.”<sup>530</sup> This appraisal by Zizioulas indicates the sphere of convergence for two pivotal concepts already considered, the Eucharist and person. Eucharist, Church, Person: the topic of Church is pivotal but it is not really new to this discussion; it is a term comprising person and Eucharist. And according to Zizioulas’s assessment the Church is “*communion (koinonia)*”: this is because the Church is a *catholic* entity (see chapter 3). And the Church is *catholic* because it is the body of Christ of which Christ is the head.<sup>531</sup> the Church is the visible manifestation of Man/Anthropos, Adam, lifted up and divinized in the new Adam.<sup>532</sup>

This means that only in the Church has man the power to express himself as a catholic person. Catholicity, as a characteristic of the Church, permits the person to become a hypostasis without falling into individuality, because in the Church two things are realized simultaneously: the world is presented to man not as mutually exclusive portions which he is called upon to unite *a posteriori*, but as

---

<sup>530</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 165.

<sup>531</sup> See Emil Mersch, S. J., *The Whole Christ: The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition* (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1938), 451-71, on the scholastics’ treatment of the grace of headship.

<sup>532</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 58. His comments in the two footnotes are very significant: [54] It is characteristic that according to the Fathers every baptized person becomes “Christ.” [55] St Maximus the Confessor in his *Mystagogy* (4, PG 91:672 BC) applies the catholicity of the Church to the existential make-up of each believer.

a single whole, which is expressed in a catholic manner without division in every concrete being; simultaneously the same man, while relating to the world precisely through this catholic mode of existence that he has, comes to express and realize a catholic presence in the world, a hypostasis which is not an individual but an authentic person. Thus the Church becomes Christ Himself in human existence, but also every member of the Church becomes Christ [54] and Church.[55]

Previously *person* was traced through Adam and the biological hypostasis to what Zizioulas termed the ecclesial hypostasis. Through the Incarnation, that is, in the last Adam,<sup>533</sup> the identification of the person as the ecclesial hypostasis takes place and is accomplished in the sacrament of baptism.<sup>534</sup> The ecclesial hypostasis was given further meaning as a sacramental hypostasis, especially as a Eucharistic hypostasis. Thus the identity of the Church that is implicit in the Incarnation is explicit in the Eucharist. The church is the Eucharistic person. The Eucharist is the culmination of faith, of sacramental identity with Christ, through baptism and chrismation: εἰς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἓν βάπτισμα, one Lord, one faith, one baptism.<sup>535</sup>

This chapter considers some further specific aspects of the Church: *The Person of the Church; Bridegroom — Bride and Mother; Three Meanings of Church; and Person and Church and Ministry.*

### **The Person of the Church**

Is the church a person, a hypostasis of its own? This may seem to be a very speculative or even irrelevant question. Given the emphasis of the thesis in exploring the meaning of person, however, it is a question that must be addressed, and its answer does influence the way the

---

<sup>533</sup> 1 Cor 15:45 ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ.

<sup>534</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 53: ‘The hypostasis of ecclesial existence is constituted by the new birth of man, by baptism. Baptism as new birth is precisely an act constitutive of hypostasis. As the conception and birth of a man constitute his biological hypostasis, so baptism leads to a new mode of existence, to a regeneration (I Pet. 1:3, 23), and consequently to a new “hypostasis.”’

<sup>535</sup> Eph 4:5.

relationship between Christ and the church / faithful is perceived. It is not esoteric to this discussion; it is posed here as more than metaphor.<sup>536</sup> And the array of nuances and the threads of the answers form an interesting web of conflicting vocabulary and conclusions. It is outside the scope of this thesis to comment in detail on the answers and unravel the threads. Consequently, several opinions are presented here (in original form and in some detail, in order to avoid external filtering) to indicate the range and significance of the topic.

To the question, Zizioulas, emphatically answers no; and he also puts before us the necessity for the Christian people to know the church's identity:<sup>537</sup>

---

<sup>536</sup> That is, it is to be regarded as Tillard, *Church of Churches*, 26, points out in a note concerning the Eucharist as more than metaphor: "Because the Eucharistic Body is truly the Body of the Lord..." Here Tillard gives as reference:

See J. A. T. Robinson, who writes (*op. cit.*, 85-86): "It is good to be very prudent when speaking of the "metaphor" of the body of Christ. Paul uses the analogy of the human body to explain that Christians form the body of Christ. But the analogy has value only because Christians *are*, literally, the raised up body of the person of Christ, in all its concrete reality. What is remarkable is that Paul identifies this personality with the Church. But to say that the Church is the body of Christ is no more a metaphor than to say that the flesh of Jesus incarnate or that the eucharistic bread are the body of Christ. None of these three realities, Church, flesh, bread, is *like* his body (Paul never says that): each one *is* the body of Christ... all three of them are the expression of one and the same christology. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the realism and the raw force of the Pauline doctrine."

Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 142, however, differs: "Because of its nonphysicality, the body of Christ must be viewed as a *metaphor*." Volf notes here, 142 n 61: "Every interpretation according to which the church is not strictly *identical* with the *earthly* body of Christ is construing the body of Christ as a metaphor, including the interpretation according to which the church as the body of Christ is identical with the resurrected body of Christ (see Robinson, *Body*, 49ff.), since a body consisting of a multiplicity of human, corporeal persons can be called a "body" only in a *figurative* sense. The question whether or not Paul is using the body of Christ metaphorically is falsely put; the only correct query concerns the referent for that metaphor in Paul's usage." Also see Dulles, *The Catholicity of the Church*, 40, on reservations about Robinson's literalism. The disparity in perception is bluntly illustrated by the story about Flannery O'Connor who is said to have responded to a comment made about some Christian "metaphor" [or "symbol"; see *First Things* 74 (1997): 68-86 ], 'If it's just a metaphor then I say to hell with it.'

<sup>537</sup> Zizioulas, "The Mystery of the Church in Orthodox Tradition," 302-3.

Ecclesiology is in the first place a question of the Church's identity. As long as we fail to tackle the question 'What is the Church?', we shall never reach agreement in the ecumenical movement. In my opinion, this identity is Christ's own identity. This is why there is no hypostasis of the Church. The Church has no hypostasis of its own. This makes Christ's identity dependent on the existence of the Church, which is paradoxical, for though the Church has no hypostasis of its own, it is a factor which conditions Christ's identity: the one cannot exist without the many. Such a Christology, conditioned by pneumatology, explains the fact that the Mystery of Christ is in essence nothing other than the Mystery of the Church. To accept this we must first accept the theological presuppositions formulated at the beginning and work with an ontology which is not that of our western individualism, but that of the biblical idea of 'corporate personality'. I believe that while we remain unaccustomed to a kind of ontology which I would call 'relational', and which is bound up with pneumatology and trinitarian theology, we shall never be capable of understanding the Mystery of the Church.

Within the context of person as *One of the Many who are ONE*,<sup>538</sup> Zizioulas's assertion "the one cannot exist without the many" would have to be understood and restated as the *ONE* cannot exist without the *Many*; and so, as Zizioulas holds, "this [the Church's] identity is Christ's own identity." However, what of the *One* who is Christ Jesus and His identity as a person and even His identity within the Church as its head? Zizioulas understands the single identity in terms of a hypostatic union:<sup>539</sup>

Through such an understanding of the hypostatic union we can thus throw light on another aspect of the Christological mystery: Christ as the 'catholic' man or as the 'one' who is at the same time 'many'.... Christ is 'one' in his own hypostasis, i.e. as he relates eternally to the Father, but he is also at the same time 'many' in that the same 'schesis' becomes now the constitutive element—the *hypostases*— of all those whose particularity and uniqueness and therefore ultimate being are constituted through the same filial relationship which constitutes Christ's being. The Biblical notion of the 'body of Christ' acquires this way its *ontological* significance in all the variations in which this notion appears

---

<sup>538</sup> As proposed in chapter 4.

<sup>539</sup> Zizioulas, "Human Capacity," 438. On reservations about hypostatic union terminology see Powers, *Eucharist*, 102 ff. Also Auer, *Dogmatic Theology* 8, 76: "The dynamic unity in the Church between Christ and the Christians, their being towards each other, with each other, and for each other, is not an essential hypostatic unity, like the unity of the two natures in the historical person of Jesus, nor is it merely moral unity of grace.... Rather it is a unity determined through the mystery of Christ."

in the Bible: the anthropological (Adam — first and last), eschatological, ecclesiological, eucharistic etc.

Because of this total identification of the church with Christ, Christ and church are mutually constitutive for Zizioulas. McPartlan provides an informative analysis of Zizioulas's position by comparison with the views of de Lubac; and in doing so he further reveals the intricacy of the topic:<sup>540</sup>

The separability of Christ from the Church, such that he can be conceived without her, is what underlies de Lubac's two-phase account, in which Christ comes to indwell his Bride in the second phase of his work. We have noted that the Church as Bride is not an image which Zizioulas develops. We may initially suggest that this is because, although the image well conveys her dependence on him, it does not adequately convey his complementary dependence on her. We have seen that de Lubac's own use of it raises problems which are resolved if we apply Zizioulas' concept of Christ and the Church as mutually constitutive, each being inconceivable without the other. In fact, Zizioulas' most recent account of their interdependence indicates that, more deeply, it is its implication that there may be an hypostasis of the Church herself that renders bridal imagery unacceptable to him. With admitted paradox, he explains his conviction that the Church's identity 'is Christ's own identity':

'there is no hypostasis of the Church. The Church has no hypostasis of its own. This makes Christ's identity dependent on the existence of the Church, which is paradoxical, for though the Church has no hypostasis of its own, it is a factor which conditions Christ's identity: the one cannot exist without the many'. [119]

As if to emphasise his point, Zizioulas here abandons all trace of the female terminology which he otherwise readily adopts for the Church on account of her *motherhood*.

But a strict adherence to biblical language argues that the church is not the person of Christ but the body of Christ. Tavad in particular discusses the topic of the person of the

---

<sup>540</sup> McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*., 258-59. His reference [119] is for Zizioulas, "The Mystery of the Church in Orthodox Tradition," 302-03; see note 536.

Church, but he is ambivalent about the subject. In the section ‘*The “Person” of the Church*’ Tavad says:<sup>541</sup>

The expression is in Thomas Aquinas: “The Lord’s prayer is said by the common person of the whole Church.” [8] The Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain argued from this that the Church “itself— in that as it is the one and universal totality of the multitude [of its members] — has, supernaturally, truly, and ontologically, a personality, . . . it is a person in the first and proper sense of the word, a person who worships God, presents to us the truths revealed by God, sanctifies us through the sacraments, speaks, teaches, and acts.” With all its sophistication, Maritain’s philosophy tallies with a popular manner of speaking that is not unusual among ordinary believers, and not only among Catholics. Thus the Church is endowed with personality. It — or, she — preaches the gospel; she prays and suffers; she is persecuted. Maritain specifies that the personality of the Church is not to be taken in a juridical or moral sense: the Church is more than a legal entity. In fact, the ecclesiology of the Mystical Body has often followed this line of thought: as the Mystical Body of Christ, the Church would be a created person, associated with and modeled on the Person of the Word of God Incarnate. Maritain argued that he found this doctrine in St. Irenaeus, in the creed of Nicaea-Constantinople, and in the encyclical of Pope Pius XII, *Mystici corporis* (1943).

But Tavad changes course and heads in quite a different direction:<sup>542</sup>

Now such an ecclesiology, taken too literally, can have lethal consequences that may poison the pluralistic society of today by threatening the common good of the citizens. If indeed the Church has a God-given existence of its own, independent of its members, then one should say not only with the Catholic tradition, that the Church is holy in spite of its members’ sinfulness, but also with the standard theology of the Counter-Reformation influenced as it was by Robert Bellarmine, that the Church is a “perfect society.”

---

<sup>541</sup> George H. Tavad, *The Church, Community of Salvation* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 183-184. Tavad’s footnote [8] is: “*Summa theologica* II II, q.83. a. 16, ad 3; see Jacques Maritain. *De l’Eglise du Christ. La personne de l’Eglise et son personnel* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1970). See above, ch. 5, p. 85 and note 4.”

<sup>542</sup> Tavad, *The Church*, 184.

His interpretation, and especially the statement “If indeed the Church has a God-given existence of its own, independent of its members,” is incomprehensible in light of the understanding of person advanced in this thesis. He takes his discussion further along this direction to a consideration of the church competing in the secular society.<sup>543</sup> He then returns to Aquinas, but only to dismiss the force of the identification of the church as person.<sup>544</sup>

The expression of Thomas Aquinas, “the common person of the whole Church,” should therefore not be taken in this ontological sense. Person, in the Thomist context, has an older sense related to the original meaning of *persona* in Latin and of *prosopon* in Greek. An actor, in a play, speaks in the name of a more or less fictitious personage. In Greece and in Rome, as in the Nô plays of Japan, the actor put on a mask (*prosopon*) that symbolized the personage in question and the actor’s role. Likewise, in the Lord’s prayer, each believer speaks in the name of the Church, thus representing and identifying with a role that is immeasurably beyond the believer’s personal limitations. Just as the celebrant acts at the Eucharist *in persona Christi*, “in the person of Christ,” so all the faithful pray “in the person of the Church.” The term, “person,” in this case, directly denotes not a metaphysical status but an intention of praying with the Church, and it ultimately connotes the consensus of believers.

It is hard to follow Tavad’s assessment of “the Thomist context” of the term person as being no more than the actor’s mask (see the discussion in chapter 2): what becomes of the meaning of *persona* throughout the rest of the *Summa*, especially regarding the Trinity and the Incarnation,<sup>545</sup> if it just means the “actor’s role”? The proper question within the context of the

---

<sup>543</sup> Tavad, *The Church*, 184, continues: “As such it would have rights that must be respected and protected by political legislation and government. The conclusion logically follows: in confrontations between Church and State, basic morality and public legality, the teaching of truth and the tolerance of mistakes and untruths, priority belongs to the Church, to morality, to the teaching of truth. But if Christians pursue this line of thought, there is nothing to stop other religions that also believe in divine revelation to make similar claims and demands. The result can only be the identification of State with Church or of land with religion, the division of the world between Christian and other nations, and, in the countries in which there exists a plurality of religions, the confrontation of opposite claims to truth and the public rivalry of religious pressure groups. This is the shortest cut to oppression of religious minorities by a majority and to social disorder in the name of religion and of God.”

<sup>544</sup> Tavad, *The Church*, 184.

<sup>545</sup> E.g., *ST* 1a.27-43 on the Trinity; and *ST* 3a.1-26 on the Incarnation.

*Summa* really should be not if the church is a hypostesis but what kind of hypostesis in relation to the hypostesis of Christ.<sup>546</sup> Later Tavad resumes the discusson under a different perspective: *una persona in multis personis*. Tavad discusses three identifications that are attached to the *una persona*: (1) the Church, (2) Christ, and (3) the Holy Spirit:<sup>547</sup>

The Church is *una persona in multis personis*, “one person in many persons.” There is no hesitancy about the identity of the “many persons” of this Scholastic expression: they are the faithful. But the other term of the proposition has been interpreted in at least three senses.

Firstly, the one Person is the Church itself. The Church gathers the faithful in unity or, in the words of St. Augustine who borrowed the idea from the

---

<sup>546</sup> In fact Tavad in a previous reference of his to an earlier chapter of his work, 85, notes Pius XII’s assessment:

Taking one more bold step, Pope Pius prolonged but modified an earlier tradition. Tertullian had called each Christian “*alter Christus*” (the other Christ). Enlarging the horizon, Augustine had seen Christ and the Church as *totus Christus*. Bossuet (1627-1704) had spoken of the Church as “Christ spread out and continued.” For Pius XII, the Church is “the *alter Christus* [who] bears his person on this earth.” Indeed, Christ so lives in the Church “that she stands out, so to say, as the other person of Christ (*quasi altera Christi persona*).” Pius XII identified Christ and the Church in some mysterious way: together they form “the new man.”

<sup>547</sup> Tavad, *The Church, Community of Salvation*, 230-31. His reference [4] gives the source as *ST* 3a.49.1. This is the article *utrum per passionem Christi simus liberati a peccato*, whether through the passion of Christ we are freed from sin. Ecclesiology being a fairly recent branch of theology, the *Summa* does not address *church* as a separate topic. The context for the phrase (in the *Responsio* of the article) is informative: *Sicut si homo per aliquod opus meritorium quod manu exerceat redimeret se a peccato quod pedibus commisisset. Sicut enim naturale corpus est unum ex membrorum diversitate consistens, ita tota Ecclesia quae est mysticum corpus Christi computatur quasi una persona cum suo capite, quod est Christus. It is as if a man through some meritorious work that the hand performs, redeems himself from a sin which the foot committed. As the natural body is one, comprised (consistens) of diverse members, thus the whole Church, which is the mystical body of Christ, is reckoned as (computatur quasi) one person with its head, who is Christ. Aquinas here uses *mystical body* for the church, a term previously used in the patristic period for the Eucharist, the church being called the *true body*. On the evolution and reversal of these designations and the impact on ecclesiology see de Lubac, *Catholicism*, 100-01; Vanderwilt, *A Church Without Borders*, 48 ff; McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, xiv ff, 3, 75 ff, 84, 102 ff (also as related to ordination); Susan K Wood, *Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in the Theology of Henri de Lubac* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 63 ff, 144 ff. Several of these also consider the related scholastic terminology involving the terms *res*, *tantum* and *sacramentum*.*

Donatist Tyconius, the Church constitutes the “total Christ,” the head with the members. The Church is the Person, but its personality is rooted in that of Christ. Christ who is the Head is also the Person of the Head. And since there can be but one person for both head and body, he is by the same token the “Person of the body.” So did Thomas Aquinas understand the mystical body of Christ: Christ and the Church add up to *quasi una persona*, “as it were one person.” [4] In this context, the word “mystical” designates an analogy modeled on the spiritual senses of Scripture and also a “mystery” that is experienced in the Eucharist, the liturgical mystery par excellence. Precisely for this reason the adjective “mystical” came to be applied to the body of the Church: before the eleventh century it designated the Eucharist.

Or, secondly, the *una persona* is directly the divine Person of the Incarnate Word, acting as the head (*caput*) that infuses divine grace into his mystical body. So could many Pauline texts be understood, as when the faithful are said to be “in Christ” (Gal 3:23) and are destined to form with him “one perfect man, the measure of age of the fullness of Christ” (Eph 4:13). The language of Tertullian for whom a Christian is made, through baptism, *alter Christus*, “another Christ,” or, better, “the other Christ,” fits this perspective: a member of the body is not “other than” the head, not *alius*, but *alter*. It shares the substance that is common to the body and to the head, yet according to its own function and shape. Thus, the divine Person that is manifested in the Church and shares its life is the Person of Christ. This was the teaching of Pope Pius XII in the encyclical *Mystici corporis*: Christ is one Person who resides in the many persons of his mystical body.

The third sense of the other person is quite different, the pneumatical interpretation:

Or thirdly, the *una persona* is the Person of the Holy Spirit acting as “soul” of the Church. This image must not be taken in the Aristotelian sense that sees the human compound as comprised of “form” and “matter,” the soul being the form of the body, the body the matter of the soul. What could be acceptable to the philosophy of the Greeks is indefensible in Christian theology. In theology, the Spirit cannot be the form of the Church for in that case the Church, being the Spirit’s matter, would be hypostatically united with the Third Person. Soul, here, is therefore not tantamount to form. It designates symbolically the source and origin of life. The life of the Church, and of all the believers who are gathered in it, is given by the Holy Spirit; it is undeserved grace flowing into the faithful from the merits of Christ the Savior by the action of the Spirit who may then be called, as in *Mystici corporis*, “the Uncreated principle” of the unity of the Church. This is the line followed by Heribert Mühlen’s ecclesiology: within the mystical body of Christ the Holy Spirit is “one Person in many persons.” The first and highest of these persons being the Word incarnate, it is by the salvific mission of the Holy Spirit that Christians are made one Person with Christ.

Whatever the eloquence of the formula and the beauty of the perspective that is thus opened, the danger of this line of thought is patent.

And Tavad then concludes, summarizing and illustrating the maze at the heart of the problem:

...if the faithful are one Person with Christ and Christ as such is one and not many, then it would seem logical to conclude that the faithful are the Person of Christ.<sup>548</sup>

But does this properly respect the integrity and uniqueness of the person? Is there an image that maintains the identity of each person, Jesus and each of the faithful in communion, Jesus as *One of the many who are ONE*, Jesus as the *ONE* Christ, the catholic person, the second Adam of the new race?

### **Bridegroom — Bride and Mother**

As noted above, McPartlan comments that the nuptial imagery is lacking in Zizioulas.<sup>549</sup> Volf also notes this omission in Zizioulas's approach and critiques it; here Volf first gives his summary of Zizioulas's position and then an interpretation.<sup>550</sup>

Just as through baptism human beings are constituted into persons anhypostatically in Christ, so also does the church exist in the Eucharist anhypostatically and acquire its entire identity from the identity of Christ. This paralleling of personhood and ecclesiastical being is not fortuitous. Any distance between Christ and the church would simultaneously mean the individualization of Christ, and the possibility of the deindividualization of human beings would be lost. We accordingly find that the identification of Christ and church in the Eucharist undergirds Zizioulas's entire soteriology and ecclesiology, and it is thus understandable why Zizioulas ignores those particular New Testament metaphors

---

<sup>548</sup> He continues: "This conclusion had in fact been reached by some theologians of Germany when Pope Pius XII wrote *Mystici corporis*, in part to protect the integrity of Christological doctrine."

<sup>549</sup> McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 258-59.

<sup>550</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 100.

underscoring the difference between Christ and the church (e.g., the church as bride or as flock). I will return to this later. Yet just as in the constituting of a person the particularity of that person is lost and the individual is absorbed into Christ, so also the church itself is threatened with being absorbed into Christ.

Volf's assessment here is very much disputed by this thesis. And Volf has other and more extensive and involved issues to raise,<sup>551</sup> but in blunt opposition to Zizioulas's position he speaks of "the false, as I will try to show — assumption that the church is one subject with Christ."<sup>552</sup> Rather Volf argues that the church as the body of Christ, "derives from the union between Christ and Christians ... a union for which the enduring distinction between the two is of decisive importance";<sup>553</sup> consequently, this multiplicity of persons cannot be or even correspond to the person of Christ. But this language is all just metaphor for Volf;<sup>554</sup> as such there is really no hypostasis / person of the church either.<sup>555</sup> The thrust of Volf's orientation is well illustrated in

---

<sup>551</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 46 ff; and see his III.2.1.3, p 141 ff, and IV.1.1.2, p162 ff.

<sup>552</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 46-47.

<sup>553</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 143.

<sup>554</sup> See previous note 535 on metaphors.

<sup>555</sup> The presentation by Volf in the previous 5 references stands in sharp and direct contrast to major positions of this thesis. Volf is proposing a non-Eucharistic ecclesiology (as referenced to the Eucharistic ecclesiology advanced by e.g. Zizioulas and this thesis) based on Matthew 18:20 οὐ γάρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἔμδον ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἶμι ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. Not surprisingly he comments, 20:

From the perspective of the Free Churches, the "Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry" (BEM) Document (1982) did not fulfill this demand [an egalitarian approach to ecclesiology]; Free Churches are wholly dissatisfied with the BEM Document because they feel left out.

Perhaps a distinction must be made between a Eucharistic ecclesiology and a Lord's Supper ecclesiology as representative of the range and disparity of sacramental theology in general. Volf provides a note (153 n 108) that illustrates this disparity:

The significance the sacraments possessed for the Free Churches from the very outset is attested not only by their willingness to die for (what they believed was) the correct baptismal practice, but also by John Smyth's unfortunate decision to baptize himself. Although he was aware that one must receive baptism, he nonetheless found himself forced to baptize himself because he knew of no "true church" from which he could receive what he considered to be the requisite baptism (see Smyth, *Works*, 757).

Volf (e.g. 2, 10, 23-24) takes Smyth as the exemplar for free church ecclesiology. Lossky, *Image*

a passage in which he introduces and critiques another image for the church, “motherhood,” and the position of Ratzinger.<sup>556</sup>

*Fiducia* is exclusively a gift of the Spirit of God. If the church were to give to a person faith in this sense — insofar as, as Ratzinger explains, the acceptance of persons on the part of the church is an essential constituent part of faith — then it would not only attest salvation with its own words and deeds, but would itself participate actively in God’s salvific activity. This is indeed implied by the Catholic doctrine of the motherhood of the church. As *Lumen gentium* maintains, the church “brings forth sons, who are conceived of the Holy Spirit and born of God, to a new and immortal life.” By contrast, one must insist that the church is not the subject of salvific activity with Christ; rather, Christ is the *only* subject of such salvific activity. This is the soteriological reason why one must reject the notion of *Christus totus, caput et membra*. *Christus totus* is incompatible with *solus Christus*. Precisely in order to preserve the principle *solus Christus*, “the loneliness of the believing ‘yes’ to God,” a “yes” that must be pronounced by the self and nobody else, is soteriologically indispensable. The exclusivity of divine salvific activity requires direct<sup>32</sup> personal acceptance of saving grace by human beings.

Volf appears to outright reject the Augustinian (Patristic) *Christus totus* as being in direct opposition to (the Reformation’s) *solus Christus*; and he also appears to argue for Christian individualism. This is in the sharpest contrast to Zizioulas who also shuns the phrase *totus Christus*, as McPartlan explains, but for the diametrically opposite reason:<sup>557</sup>

---

*and Likeness*, 189, gives an interpretation of Matthew 18:20 (see above, this note) in a relational / personal context:

The new unity of our nature in Christ does not exclude human “polyhypostasy.” The ecclesiological text of Matthew 18:20 points simultaneously to the unity of our nature in Christ and to the personal relationship between the divine hypostasis and created hypostases. “For where two or three (personal multiplicity) are gathered in my name (unity of nature realized in the Church which bears the name of the Son), there am I *in the midst of them*.” The Lord did not say “I contain them in Me” or “They are in Me,” as He was able to do elsewhere in speaking of the unity of our nature recapitulated by Him, but precisely “I am in the midst of them,” as a person who is *with other* persons who surround him.

<sup>556</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 163-64.

<sup>557</sup> McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 219. Note [35] is to Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 112. Zizioulas, “Church as Communion,” 10, does in fact use the term: “If we

The fact that Zizioulas never actually uses the Latin phrase, so favoured by Florovsky and de Lubac, is perhaps explained by the fact that both of these latter theologians apply the Augustinian term to an understanding of Christ's *own* saving work as the Mystery in which human beings *then* participate as his Body. De Lubac refers to the *totus Christus* as 'the end ... of the mystery' whereas Zizioulas insists on a *simultaneity* of the Head and the Body:

'the mystery of the Church is essentially none other than that of the "One" who is simultaneously "many" — not "One" who exists first of all as "One" and *then* as "many", but "One" and "many" at the same time'. [35]

McPartlan also discusses a possible sense of bridal imagery in harmony with the position of Zizioulas.<sup>558</sup> And he gives a strong example favoring the personification of the church by de Lubac.<sup>559</sup> The church as a person allows the church a unique identity that is concomitant with a privileged relationship with Christ and one that is person defining; it permits an understanding of why one can speak of the church as the spotless bride though the members are sinful humans<sup>560</sup> since, within the nuptial imagery, the Church, as a person, can never be considered

---

attach to Christology and Pneumatology an equal importance, we are bound to attribute full catholicity to each local Church (the *totus Christus*) and at the same time seek ways of safeguarding the oneness of the Church on the universal level. How can this be done?" Also see Volf, *After our Likeness*, 99 n 148, for use of the term by Zizioulas. Von Allmen, *The Lord's Supper*, 47, 56, refers to *Christus totus* and gives the following reference, 72 n 4 (for a primary source):

After quoting Isa. 61: 10, Augustine continues: "Unus videtur loqui, et sponsam se fecit et sponsam se fecit; quia non duo, sed una caro; quia Verbum factum est, et habitavit in nobis. Illi carni adiungitur Ecclesia, et fit Christus totus, caput et corpus." (*Commentary on the First Epistle of John, Sources chrétiennes*, No. 75, Paris, 1961, p. 116.)

See Tillard, *Church of Churches*, 20 ff, 81 passim, for more primary sources and discussion; also de Lubac, *The Splendor of the Church*, 159 n 137, 334 n 100.

<sup>558</sup> McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 90-91.

<sup>559</sup> McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 92-93.

<sup>560</sup> Cf Quay, *The Mystery Hidden for Ages in God*, 350: "Like her type in *Ezekiel*, she who is the Bride bears children that are distinct from her, who may be adopted by the Father of the Bridegroom but are not begotten by Him upon her. Hence, as a child of the Church, the Christian is not one with her; nor do his misdeeds make her evil. She remains ... the beloved Bride, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing (Eph 5:27), despite the terrible sins of her children." That "the Christian is not one with her" is odd but is understandable if the church is

apart from the person of Christ. It was also nuptial imagery, according to Tavad, that inspired the *una persona in multis personis* considerations presented in the previous section, but in a pneumatological context:<sup>561</sup>

The ecclesial symbolism of nuptial unity has inspired another image that has been used from time to time in Western theology, and never as much as in the twentieth century, to designate the close union of the Church and the Spirit: the Church is *una persona in multis personis*.

The nuptial imagery of Ephesians and Genesis, if properly understood<sup>562</sup> in the *catholic* sense of *person*, provides a balanced perspective for the position of Zizioulas: there are two but they are one flesh. The two-as-one of the nuptial imagery is not the perfect three-as-one of the Trinity, but still it is a true mystical one.<sup>563</sup> It insures that the otherness of Christ is maintained, that is, his integrity as a (distinct) person, while also stressing the perfect, total — the *catholic* — union and identity of Christ and the Church, as Zizioulas insists. There is difference but not division. The *two who are ONE* just restates Zizioulas's forceful, "*Christ without His body is not Christ but an individual of the worse type*,"<sup>564</sup> or Mersch's "Christ, in a fact, is not complete without the Church, which prolongs Him."<sup>565</sup> In this unity it is understood that the church does the work of Christ which is the work of salvation, exactly as feared and criticized by Volf previously. This is a works righteousness (and properly so in this perspective) in the most spiritual sense, the work of salvation (against the classical Protestant objection about works righteousness especially in the spiritual, as opposed to the corporeal realm — perhaps the source

---

considered as a person and therefore unique from all other persons. The *ONE* is not the same as the *Many*, and the *ONE*, as *catholic*, is not just the sum of its parts: In this instance, it is less the sins of the *Many*.

<sup>561</sup> Tavad, *The Church, Community of Salvation*, 230.

<sup>562</sup> Contra Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 142-43 (especially regarding Gn 2:21-24) passim.

<sup>563</sup> In contrast see Zizioulas, "The Mystery of the Church," 297.

<sup>564</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 182.

<sup>565</sup> Mersch, *Morality and the Mystical Body*, 38

of Volf's objection). Thus the Trinity saves us,<sup>566</sup> and there is no doubt who the Bridegroom is.<sup>567</sup> Yet, firm and secure in its Christology, the Byzantine Vespers (and other services) prays "O Most Holy Theotokos, save us!"<sup>568</sup> — realizing that the Church, too, as Bride-Mother is the Godbearer. Byzantine theology will have it both ways — the paradox, the biblical mode of seemingly conflicting images: Χαῖρε, Νύμφη ἀνύμφυετε.<sup>569</sup>

McPartlan, comparing Zizioulas and de Lubac, raises another consideration, the divine / human, uncreated / created distinction:<sup>570</sup>

Importantly, we have also now seen that safeguarding the distinction between the created and the uncreated, that is between nature and the supernatural, for which de Lubac regards the bridal image as indispensable, is

---

<sup>566</sup> Cf the "Pentecost" prayer (fourth sticheron at Psalm 140 for Pentecost Vespers) sung after communion in the Byzantine Divine Liturgy: (we) worshipping the undivided Trinity, for the Trinity has saved us; ἀδιαίρετον Τριάδα προσκυνούντες· αὕτη γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἔσωσεν.

<sup>567</sup> Is 61:10, 62:5; Mt 9:15, Mt 25:1ff, Mk 2:19-20, Lk 5:34-35, Jn 2:9, Jn 3:29, especially read against Jer 7:34, Jer 16:9, Jer 25:10, Jer 40:11, Bar 2:23., Rv 18:23. See chapter 8 above, page 157.

<sup>568</sup> Ὑπεραγία Θεοτόκε σῶσον ἡμᾶς / *Huperagia Theotoke soston hemas*.

<sup>569</sup> *Chaire, Numphe anumpheute*, Hail, Bride unbrided. This is the recurring acclamation of the Akathist Hymn to the Theotokos, applied here by extension to the Church also. For an occidental approach see Quay, *The Mystery Hidden for Ages in God*, 348 passim. Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 143 n 64 cautions:

It is perhaps not inconsequential with regard to the relation between Christ and the church that Paul refers to the church as the *bride* rather than as the "wife" of Christ. The term *bride* "resonates with the idea that this association does not yet constitute fulfillment . . . it still implies an element of eschatological reservation" (Wolff, *2 Korinther*, 211; see also Furnish, *2 Corinthians*, 499).

However, νύμφη / bride is not found in Paul; γυνή / wife = woman occurs often but in reference to the household, and by analogy to the church, e.g. Eph 5:25, infrequently: Paul does not call the church wife directly. Volf apparently has in mind 2 Cor 11:2, but the word in this verse is παρθένος / virgin: For I am jealous of you with the jealousy of God, since I betrothed you to one man = husband a chaste virgin to present to Christ. ζηλώ γὰρ ὑμᾶς θεοῦ ζήλω, ἡρμοσάμην γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἀγνήν παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ. A canonical reading of the scriptures, however, produces Rv 21:9, δεῦρο, δεῖξω σοι τὴν νύμφην τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρνίου. "Come, I will show you the bride, the wife of the Lamb."

<sup>570</sup> McPartlan, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 259-60.

achieved in Zizioulas' system without it. Zizioulas can, as it were, safely position Christ on *our* side of this divide, in the midst of the Church, constituting her and being constituted by her, not only without any Adoptionist danger, on one hand, but also, on the other hand, without any monistic danger of the Church becoming some sort of divine emanation, necessarily created at the generation of the Son, because of his utter refusal to read back the data of the economy into the immanent Trinity. Instead, what we have in the economy are, to reiterate, the 'freely undertaken modes of action' of the Son and the Spirit, in order to execute what is the Father's free will, namely the salvation of the world.

The fact that de Lubac envisages Christ on God's side of the created / uncreated divide, whereas, for Zizioulas, he has crossed this divide, suggests that the encounter between these two theologians is not so much an encounter between modern Catholic and Orthodox theologies as a modern echo of that between the ancient theological schools of Alexandria and Antioch, which, as J. N. D. Kelly relates, had 'Word-flesh' and 'Word-man' Christologies, respectively. We have several times noted de Lubac's affinity with a Word-flesh Christology, and have had to verify that Zizioulas avoids the Adoptionism which traditionally threatens Word-man Christology. We may recall that, though de Lubac stresses the importance of history, history was less respected in Alexandria than in Antioch, and that, though Zizioulas can sometimes appear to envisage an eschatological Christ who is not fully rooted in history, it is the school of Antioch which 'deserves credit for bringing back the historical Jesus'.

To know the unseen God<sup>571</sup> one must "know" the incarnate God; and to "know" the incarnate God one must "know" the incarnate church, the body of Christ. The church is anthropology in the Spirit. The Spirit effects the actions of the church, which are the actions of Christ, in the Mysteries (Sacraments). The church is also the Temple of the Holy Spirit as each member, each person, is the Temple.<sup>572</sup> The Church has a unique existence, not apart from Christ but distinct from the person Christ as *One*, in the Spirit. Yet the Church is intimately identified with Christ as the *ONE* through the nuptial imagery, *the two who are ONE*: It, τό σῶμα (the body, Greek neuter), is *His* Body; She, ἡ ἐκκλησία (the church, Greek feminine) is *His* Spouse.<sup>573</sup> It is

---

<sup>571</sup> Jn 1:18 Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε, no one has ever seen God; Col 1:15 ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, He is the image of the unseen God also 1 Tm 1:17, Heb 11:27.

<sup>572</sup> E.g., 1 Cor 3:16 Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; Do you not know that the Temple of God is, and the Spirit of God dwells in you? 1 Cor 3:17 ὁ γὰρ ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, οἵτινες ἐστε ὑμεῖς, for the Temple of God is holy, which is you [literally]; also 1 Cor 6:19, 2 Cor 6:16, Eph 2:21.

<sup>573</sup> Thus avoiding the judgmental expression of von Allmen, *The Lord's Supper*, 12, of

necessary to understand the inherent unity in this way, an understanding that does not compromise the integrity and uniqueness of the person:<sup>574</sup>

Each human individual, fully “consubstantial” with his fellow men, is, nonetheless, radically *distinct* from them in his unique, unrepeatable, and unassimilable personality or hypostasis: no man can fully be *in* another man. But Jesus’ hypostasis has a fundamental affinity with all human personalities: that of being their *model*. For indeed all men are created according to the image of God, i.e., according to the image of the Logos. When the Logos became incarnate, the divine stamp matched all its imprints: God assumed humanity in a way which did not exclude any human hypostasis, but which opened to all of them the possibility of restoring their unity in Himself. He became, indeed, the “new Adam,” in whom every man finds his own nature realized perfectly and fully, without the limitations which would have been inevitable if Jesus were only a human personality.

Thus the otherness of Christ relative to all others in the church is demanded by the integrity of the person. “Jesus is not a divinized man; he is the truly incarnated Word of God.”<sup>575</sup> Everyone else “in” the church is a divinized Man. Lossky concludes that “He [Christ] has beside Him another hypostasis of this one nature, of this unique body: the Bride.” Lossky explains:<sup>576</sup>

Another reason opposed to a uniquely Christological solution to the problem of the consciousness of the Church is implied in the very image of the Church as the Body of Christ, where Christ, the Head of the one nature, is represented as the

---

the church “becoming an end in herself.”

<sup>574</sup> Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology*, 159. Again, where Meyendorff uses individual, read person, in keeping with the distinction used in this thesis. Also, Jesus is more inherently relational than “*model*”: like Adam He is, πρωτόπλαστος / *protoplastos* (see chapter 5 above).

<sup>575</sup> Jean Corbon, *The Wellspring of Worship* (Translated by Matthew J. O Connell, New York / Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1988), 152.

<sup>576</sup> Lossky, *Image and Likeness*, 189. This quote from Lossky is representative of his treatment of Pneumatology and Christology in reference to person and church. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 124-25, considers Lossky’s “synthesis between Christology and Pneumatology in ecclesiology ... extremely problematic.” Also, Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 126: “The question, however, remains still open as to how Pneumatology and Christology can be brought together into a full and organic synthesis. It is probably one of the most important questions facing Orthodox theology in our time.”

Bridegroom. If the two are united in order to form “one flesh” — εἰς σάρκα μίαν — and if the Bridegroom is the Head of this natural unity of His Body or unified nature, nonetheless He has beside Him another hypostasis of this one nature, of this unique body: the Bride. If this is so — if in the Body of Christ there is one or, more correctly, there are many hypostases of this created nature which are not the hypostasis of Christ, which are not contained in His hypostasis inasmuch as they are persons distinct from His person — then the members of the Body of Christ are at the same time persons who cannot be reduced to unity. Therefore the Church simultaneously displays natural unity and personal diversity, in the image of the Trinity. And if this is so, there is the need in the Church for another dispensation than that of the Son, who recapitulates the unity of nature — for a dispensation which is directed to each human person in particular, consecrating personal multiplicity in the unity of the Body of Christ. This is the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, the Pentecostal aspect of the Church.

The Church surely is the body of Christ, as Paul / Ephesians teaches:<sup>577</sup> ... ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία. But the Church must be distinguished from the person of Christ as the *One*.<sup>578</sup> Still, it is always Christ and His body, the Church and Christ: ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.<sup>579</sup> Within the nuptial imagery of Ephesians, the two are the *catholic person* as the *ONE*: τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν.<sup>580</sup>

---

<sup>577</sup> Col 1:24b. ... on behalf of His body which is the church.

<sup>578</sup> This too is the language of Ephesians. Eph 3:14 Τούτου χάριν κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ... αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμή NRS For this reason I bow my knees before the Father, ... to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus to all generations, forever and ever. Amen.; Eph 5:23 ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ τῆς γυναίκος ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος· NAB For the husband is head of his wife just as Christ is head of the church, he himself the savior of the body; Eph 5:24 ἀλλὰ ὡς ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτως καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἐν παντί. As the church is subordinate to Christ, so wives should be to their husbands in everything; Eph 5:25b ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἑαυτὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς, Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her; Eph 5:29. Οὐδεὶς γάρ ποτε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα ἐμίσησεν ἀλλὰ ἐκτρέφει καὶ θάλπει αὐτήν, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν,. For no one hates his own flesh but rather nourishes and cherishes it, just as Christ, [nourishes and cherishes] the church.

<sup>579</sup> Eph 5:32b. I am speaking about (into, εἰς) Christ and about (into, εἰς) the Church.

<sup>580</sup> Eph 5:32a. The mystery — this mystery — is great.

---

**EXCURSUS: Nuptial Imagery in an Ecclesial Document — An Example**

The nuptial and Bridegroom imagery is used in the *Bull of Indiction of the Great Jubilee of the Year 2000* fittingly entitled *Incarnationis Mysterium the Mystery of the Incarnation*. In it Pope John Paul II, writing to all Christians, provides an example of the interplay among the persons being considered — the Christian faithful, Christ, and the Church — along with a moral and soteriological dimension.<sup>581</sup>

There are people who leave in their wake a surfeit of love, of suffering borne well, of purity and truth, which involves and sustains others. This is the reality of “vicariousness”, upon which the entire mystery of Christ is founded. His superabundant love saves us all. Yet it is part of the grandeur of Christ’s love not to leave us in the condition of passive recipients, but to draw us into his saving work and, in particular, into his Passion. This is said in the famous passage of the Letter to the Colossians: “In my flesh I complete what is lacking in Christ’s afflictions for the sake of his Body, that is, the Church” (1:24).

This profound truth is also wonderfully expressed in a passage of the Book of Revelation, where the Church is described as a bride dressed in a simple robe of white linen, the finest linen, bright and pure. And Saint John says: “The fine linen is the righteous deeds of the saints” (Rev 19:8). In fact, in the lives of the saints the bright linen is woven to become the robe of eternal life.

Everything comes from Christ, but since we belong to him, whatever is ours also becomes his and acquires a healing power. This is what is meant by “the treasures of the Church”, which are the good works of the saints.

He continues with a focus on the very essence of “good works,” their spiritual and relational aspects, *koinonia*, communion.

To pray ... means to enter into this spiritual communion and therefore to open oneself totally to others. In the spiritual realm, too, no one lives for himself alone. And salutary concern for the salvation of one’s own soul is freed from fear and

---

<sup>581</sup> *Incarnationis Mysterium*: Bull of Indiction of the Great Jubilee of the Year 2000 Given in Rome, at Saint Peter’s, on 29 November, the First Sunday of Advent, in the year of our Lord 1998, the twenty-first of the Pontificate of John Paul II. It is well worth reading in its entirety at:

<http://www.ewtn.com/library/PAPALDOC/JP2JUBIL.HTM>

selfishness only when it becomes concerned for the salvation of others as well. This is the reality of the communion of saints, the mystery of “vicarious life”, of prayer as the means of union with Christ and his saints. He takes us with him in order that we may weave with him the white robe of the new humanity, the robe of bright linen which clothes the Bride of Christ.

---

### Three Meanings of Church

This section examines the structure of the *ekklesia* in relation to its constituting principal, the Eucharistic identity of the church. As an example, among the churches that have consistently, throughout history, preserved the Eucharistic celebration as the central and preeminent act of worship, two dominating ecclesiologies can be identified which tend to emphasize either the universal (usually associated with Catholic) or the local (usually associated with Orthodox) aspects of the church. A tension is presumed to exist in attempts to reconcile these ecclesiologies and the corresponding Eucharistic theologies. In particular, three categories of Eucharistic “communities” can be distinguished: the *universal* Church,<sup>582</sup> the *particular* or *local* Church, and the *parish* Church,<sup>583</sup> the latter being the actual *gathering at some time in some place to celebrate the Eucharist*. In general it is held that Catholic theology has emphasized the *universal* Church, while Orthodox theology has emphasized the *local* and *particular* aspect of the Church. Again, in general terms that are adopted for this discussion, the universal emphasizes the oneness of the whole Church (communion of Churches), the particular is the Church gathered around its bishop (diocese or eparchy), and the parish refers to the Eucharistic gathering itself (as cathedral, parish, group, community etc.). Theologians representative of the

---

<sup>582</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 120-21 n 250, reaches the extraordinary conclusion that the universal church is not a Eucharist community: “... the sojourning universal church is not a eucharistic community and hence does not, strictly speaking, represent a christological-ecclesiological reality.”

<sup>583</sup> These terms are proposed here and are in general use, however, they have no generally accepted meaning. For instance, what is termed the *particular* Church is sometimes called the *local* Church, a designation which, it seems, better fits the actual Eucharistic gathering.

three corresponding approaches, in terms of emphasis, are the Catholic Henri de Lubac (*universal*), and the Orthodox John Zizioulas (*particular*) and Nicolas Afanasiev (*parish Eucharist*).

While the three categories are differentiated here in order to generalize and simplify terms for the purpose of this discussion, the intention of the various ecclesiologies is rather to integrate the three aspects precisely because they are related. Because of the sacrament of Holy Orders<sup>584</sup> in these churches, the ministry of bishop/*episkopos* gives the *particular* church — the church gathered around its bishop — a unique and pivotal role.<sup>585</sup> The relationship among and between the *particular* churches, designated here by the term *communion*, manifests itself as a Church of churches (to use Tillard's phrase<sup>586</sup>), the *catholic* churches of the *catholic* Church.

It must again be emphasized that common terms are being adopted and adapted for the churches — universal, particular/local, and parish — that are not necessarily used in a unique

---

<sup>584</sup> This selection from *Ut Unum Sint* summarizes the Catholic position on ministry and also alludes to the significance of Baptism:

67. Doctrinal and historical disagreements at the time of the Reformation emerged with regard to the Church, the sacraments and the ordained ministry. The Council therefore calls for “dialogue to be undertaken concerning the true meaning of the Lord’s Supper, the other sacraments and the Church’s worship and ministry”. [120]

The Decree *Unitatis Redintegratio*, pointing out that the post-Reformation Communities lack that “fullness of unity with us which should flow from Baptism”, observes that “especially because of the lack of the Sacrament of Orders they have not preserved the genuine and total reality of the Eucharistic mystery”, even though “when they commemorate the Lord’s Death and Resurrection in the Holy Supper, they profess that it signifies life in communion with Christ and they await his coming in glory”. [121]; [120] Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio*, 22, cf. 20; *ibid.* 22.

<sup>585</sup> For instance, the Pope has a particular ministry in the universal church precisely because he is the bishop of a particular church, the church of Rome, and as such claims to be Peter’s successor. Or in terms of Cyprian’s ecclesiology, there is only one episcopacy, and all bishops sit on the chair of Peter — *a fortiori* then the ministry of the Pope, bishop of Rome, as Peter’s successor.

<sup>586</sup> Tillard, *Church of Churches: The Ecclesiology of Communion*.

way by theologians. It seems that a resolution of the theological vocabulary would go a long way in clarifying the ecclesiology, and toward resolving the “tension” regarding these terms; the relationship of these ecclesial designations to the Eucharist also needs clarification.<sup>587</sup> The problem, to some extent, results from the fact that the term church implies a certain autonomy. The particular church is then “threatened” by being overshadowed and absorbed by the universal church and “undermined” by the “grass-roots” parish church. The dilemma especially obtains regarding the parish church (as it is defined here) in that it is not regarded to be formally a “church” since it is reliant on the bishop; yet the force of the current Eucharistic theology is to argue for the primal identity of the Eucharistic gathering as “church.” Zizioulas states the problem this way:<sup>588</sup>

An *individual* presbyter was thus enough to create and lead a eucharistic gathering — a parish. Could that gathering be called “Church”?

The answer to this question has been historically a negative one with regard to the Orthodox Church. I personally regard this as a fortunate thing for the following reason: the creation of the parish as a presbytero-centric unity, *not in the original and ecclesologically correct form which we might describe as “presbyterium-centered,”* but in the sense of an *individual* presbyter acting as head of a eucharistic community, damaged ecclesiology seriously in two respects. On the one hand, it destroyed the image of the Church as a community in which *all* orders are necessary as *constitutive* elements. The parish as it finally prevailed in history made redundant both the deacon and the bishop... It is for these reasons that we should regard the proper ecclesiological status of the parish as one of the most fundamental problems in ecclesiology—both in the West and in the East. The Orthodox Church, in my understanding at least, has opted for the view that the concept of the local Church is guaranteed *by the bishop* and not by the presbyter.

---

<sup>587</sup> For example, William T. Cavanaugh, “The City: Beyond secular parodies,” in John Milbank, Catherine Pickstock and Graham Ward, *Radical Orthodoxy* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 196: “As John Zizioulas points out, it was therefore possible for the early church to speak of ‘catholic Churches’ in the plural and to identify the ‘whole Church’ with the local church. Each Eucharist performed [*sic*] in the local community makes present not a part of Christ but the whole Christ, and the eschatological unity of all in Christ.” For Cavanaugh the local church is identified with the worshipping eucharistic community, while for Zizioulas it is primarily the gathering, also eucharistic, but around the bishop.

<sup>588</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 250.

Yet, Zizioulas also reflects on<sup>589</sup>

*the ecclesiological principle of the identification of the Church with the eucharist, or rather with the eucharistic community. Since the parish is precisely a eucharistic community, it becomes almost imperative to call the parish an ekklesia.*

And in conformity with the earlier analysis using Lerins' dictum, and in fact echoing the dictum, Tillard correctly notes:<sup>590</sup>

Wherever there is a Eucharistic celebration, there is the Church of God as it is in all the Eucharistic communities where the Eucharist is celebrated, as it has been and as it will be.

Thus Zizioulas poses the essential question:<sup>591</sup>

The ... principle of "relationality" applies to the structure of the Church on the regional and universal levels.... There is *one* Church in the world, although there are *many* churches at the same time. This paradox lies at the heart of an ecclesiology of communion. The proper relationship between the "one" and the "many" is at stake once again. How is it to be worked out both in theory and in practice?

Keeping in mind the pivotal nature of the *particular* church, three essential expressions of the catholic church can be distinguished and considered in terms of the *means* of formation. Thus there are three basic meanings of Church — *ekklesia* / ἐκκλησία — that must be understood; there are three aspects of the one body of Christ, the Church:

---

<sup>589</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 251

<sup>590</sup> Tillard, *Church of Churches*, 26.

<sup>591</sup> Zizioulas, "The Church as Communion," 10.

- (1) κοινωνία — *ekklesia* as *koinonia* (ἐκκλησία κοινωνία):<sup>592</sup> as communion, the one Church, the catholic Church<sup>593</sup>
- (2) ἐκκλησία — *ekklesia* as *ekklesia* (ἐκκλησία ἐκκλησία): as calling, as the assembly, the many churches, each a catholic church, each the catholic church<sup>594</sup>
- (3) σύναξις — *ekklesia* as *synaxis* (ἐκκλησία σύναξις): as gathering, the event/celebration of being church as the epiphany of that which is catholic, the celebration of the Eucharist. This is not necessarily the parish as such — it is not just some basic organizational structure — but the *ekklesia* gathered to celebrate the Eucharist.

These three aspects of the church must not be viewed in exclusion or even in difference with respect to each other; rather, they coincide. “All pyramidal notions of Church structure

---

<sup>592</sup> David Carter, “Where Are We Ecclesiological,” in *One in Christ* 35 (1999): 229, notes the need for “reflection on the relationship between the local and the universal Churches”; and, 238, he relates: “At a recent meeting of the Theology and Unity Group of Churches Together in England, a member asked whether *koinonia* was a weak or a strong concept, a question which is also echoed in the draft ecclesiological statement of the Faith and Order Commission of the WCC.” He references: “WCC Faith and Order paper 181, p. 28.” From the perspective of the thesis the question is incorrectly asked as whether it is weak or strong; rather, is it based on the Eucharist, on a Eucharistic understanding of the Church.

<sup>593</sup> Several churches may form a communion in a regional sense as, for instance, Patriarchal, Metropolitan, or, in the terminology of Catholic Canon law, a *sui juris* church (On the *sui juris* church as a communion in the Codex Canonici Ecclesiarum Orientalem, The Code of Canons of the Eastern Church, see e.g., Canons 27, 155-56.). These are true communions, but they all must be oriented towards and referenced to the one unique and only church, the one catholic Church, the one body of Christ. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 252-53 n 7, points this out: “I maintain the view that the *ecclesial* status of any unit in the Orthodox Church other than the episcopal diocese does not derive from the unit itself but from the episcopal diocese or dioceses involved. This applies not only— as we have seen — to units smaller than the diocese (e.g. the parish), but also to larger ones. Thus, a metropolis, an archdiocese or a patriarchate cannot be called a *Church* in itself, but only *by extension*, i.e. by virtue of the fact that it is based on one or more episcopal dioceses — local Churches which are the only ones on account of the episcopal eucharist properly called Churches. This also means that a metropolitan, patriarch etc. owes his ecclesiological status to the fact that he is the head of a particular local Church.”

<sup>594</sup> See Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 149, 230, and the use of ὡσπερ / *hosper* / *just as* to identify the local church as *catholic*.

vanish in the ecclesiology of communion. There is *perichoresis* ...”<sup>595</sup> “Communion and oneness coincide in ecclesiology.”<sup>596</sup> The eucharistic synaxis emanates from *ekklesia* and is the fundamental expression of *ekklesia*: τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, do this in memory of me.<sup>597</sup> Ecclesial communion in the Eucharist — the one *koinonia*<sup>598</sup> — emanates from *ekklesia* and is the fundamental expression of *ekklesia*: ἵνα ᾧσιν ἐν καθῶ, that they may be one.<sup>599</sup> This is borne out in the liturgy; for example, A. Verheul in discussing “*The liturgy as the self-revelation of the Church*” comments:<sup>600</sup>

Synaxis = *ecclesia*: This ... idea enables us to penetrate still more deeply into the ecclesial character of the liturgy. Just because the community assembled for the liturgy is a Church, a sign and image of the universal Church, it must also be an externalization, a self-revelation of the Church.

And the large structure, the church, functions through, and comprises, the small structures, persons, each of whom has a role — a status and a function — in the eucharistic assembly.

### Church and Person and Ministry

---

<sup>595</sup> Zizioulas, “The Church as Communion,” 10. Zizioulas is actually referring in this instance to church “ministries,” i.e., to the small structure, the person. The thesis proffers the applicability to the large structure, the church. On perichoresis, derived from the theology of the Trinity and Incarnation, see Lossky, *Mystical Theology*, 54, 145, respectively; a general, documented discussion is given by LaCugna, *God For Us*, 271ff. Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 209, links perichoresis in reference to the Trinity with “catholicity”.

<sup>596</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 135. Cf 134: “There seems to be an exact correspondence between the trinitarian theology, as it was developed particularly by the Cappadocian Fathers — especially St Basil — and Orthodox ecclesiology...the substance of God coincides with the communion of the three persons.”

<sup>597</sup> Lk 22:19.

<sup>598</sup> See Zizioulas, “The Church as Communion,” 5-15.

<sup>599</sup> Jn 17:11, 22.

<sup>600</sup> A. Verheul, *Introduction to the Liturgy: Towards a Theology of Worship* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1968), 98.

All charisms, all gifts, all functions in the church reside in the person. Zizioulas explains:<sup>601</sup>

It has been for a long time an object of discussion whether ordination bestows something indelible upon the ordained person, something that constitutes his individual possession (permanently or temporarily) or simply empowers him with an authority to function for a certain purpose. In the light of the eucharistic community this dilemma makes no sense and is misleading, for the terms of reference there, as we have had occasion to stress earlier here, are basically existential. There is no *charisma* that can be *possessed individually* and yet there is no *charisma* which can be conceived or operated *but by individuals*. How can this statement be understood?

There is no *something* about the church that exists as a quality of the church beyond what is integral to the person.<sup>602</sup> And all ministry in the church is the ministry of Christ. Zizioulas comments on the differentiation that is concomitant with ministry:<sup>603</sup>

---

<sup>601</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 164. The approach and terminology of the thesis critiques Zizioulas here on two points: (1) A personal possession, such as “something indelible,” is not an individual possession; (2) “*charisma ... possessed individually*” are not personal in that they are individual and isolated and as such do not pertain to the community. Thus, “there is no *charisma* which can be conceived or operated” within the church *but by persons* (not “*individuals*” as Zizioulas says).

<sup>602</sup> The same insistence on the basic and foundational category, *person*, arose in the discussion on the Trinity and the Father, a person, as the “source” of divinity rather than the *ousia* (see chapter 2, page 29).

<sup>603</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 163. His notes are:  
 [78] We have in mind the whole issue of clericalism and anti-clericalism which has been a real problem, especially in the West. The East, by having kept for centuries a eucharistic vision of ecclesiology, did not experience this problem. It was only recently that, due to a replacement of this vision by later ecclesiological ideas, the problem appeared threatening in some Orthodox areas.

[79] Heb. 3:1.

[80] Matt. 23:8; John 13:13.

[81] Heb. 5:6; 8:4; 10:21; 2:17.

[82] 1 Peter 2:25; 5:4; Heb. 13:13. Cf. Ignatius, *Magn.*, 3, 1-2; *Polyc. inscr.*

[83] Rom. 15:8; Luke 22:27. Phil 2:7.

But how can this view of catholicity be reconciled with the fact that the eucharistic community itself is divided into orders, i.e. into categories and classes of people? History shows that there is a real problem here, because the divisions which have occurred on this basis are so deep that the Church is still suffering from them.[78] How can the situation which results from ordination into ministries and orders, into clergy and laity, be transcended in the way all divisions are transcended in the eucharistic community?

The fact that all ordinations were at a very early time incorporated in the eucharistic liturgy is, I think, of great importance in this respect. The first important implication of this fact is that there is no ministry which can be conceived as existing parallel to that of Christ but only as identical with it. In her being the Body of Christ, the Church exists as a manifestation of Christ's own ministry and as a reflection of this very ministry in the world. It is not an accident that the early Church applied to Christ all forms of ministries that existed. He was the apostle, [79] the prophet, [80] the priest, [81] the bishop, [82] the deacon, [83] etc. A Christologically understood ministry transcends all categories of priority and separation that may be created by the act of ordination and "setting apart."

Another fundamental implication is that no ministry in the Church can be understood outside the context of the community.

That community for Zizioulas is the eucharistic community, in which all participate in the ministry of the church: "Thus the particular ministries of (i) the laity, (ii) the deacons, (iii) the presbyters and (iv) the bishop, clearly evidenced with St. Ignatius, became the indispensable ministries of the Church in her relation *ad intra*."<sup>604</sup> But the ministry of Holy Orders in particular represents the otherness of Christ in the Church, a necessary "setting apart" (see above). Holy Orders, sustained by and in the Holy Spirit, magnify the community and reflect the person of Christ. The sacramental aspects of ministry are ontological and intensely personal through the sacramental character / seal (*sphragis*),<sup>605</sup> that is, the very sacraments Baptism, Chrismation /

---

<sup>604</sup> Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 221.

<sup>605</sup> Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 234 ff; and, 165, on "indelible character." Cf Harrison, "Zizioulas on Communion and Otherness," 298; LaCugna, *God for Us*, 263.

Confirmation, and Orders that “seal”<sup>606</sup> also bestow formal “orders,” for all Christians belong to an “order.”<sup>607</sup> Zizioulas says:<sup>608</sup>

Traditionally, theology has been divided mainly into the following two lines which form two options of a dilemma also lying behind contemporary theological discussions. The dilemma consists in the choice between (i) a transmission of the ministerial *potestas* or grace through the ordaining minister as part of the linear historical line of apostolic succession, and (ii) an understanding of the *community* as possessing and transmitting the charismatic life, or *delegating authority*, to the ordained person. Historically the first option represents the line usually taken by the so-called “catholic” theology of the ministry, whereas the second one is related to the idea of the “priesthood of all believers” as it is traditionally understood in Protestantism. The revival of Biblical studies in our days, with its critical approach to the sources and its stress on the absence of the “bishop” from the writings of the New Testament, has inevitably pushed theology towards the choice of the second option of this dilemma. But the sources give answers only to questions we put to them, and this makes it imperative to check whether the dilemma we impose on these sources is as inevitable as traditionally theology has made us believe.

The bishop, as a *catholic person* in particular,<sup>609</sup> must epitomize rather than enhance or supercede the many. Regarding this Meyendorff notes that “Irenaeus envisages the episcopate as expressing the *nature of the community*, not as a power or an authority over the Church.”<sup>610</sup>

Meyendorff continues:

---

<sup>606</sup> Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 233, either rejects the notion of the seal in ordination or at least its permanence: “Because of the relational nature of ordination, no ordained person realizes his *ordo* in himself but in the community. Thus if he is isolated from the community he ceases to be an ordained person.”

<sup>607</sup> Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 216, and at n 19 commenting on ‘*I Clem.* 40.3-41.7: no confusion of “orders” or transgression from one “order” to another is permissible. This implies that the “layman” is also an “order” (τάγμα or τάξις).’

<sup>608</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 215.

<sup>609</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, critiques this understanding of the person of the bishop, especially cf 109 ff and 223 ff.

<sup>610</sup> Meyendorff, *Living Tradition*, 33.

The “certain charisma of truth” possessed by the bishops according to Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.*, IV, 40, 2), is not a personal infallibility but an expression of the fact that in the Church everything occurs within the sacramental framework of the eucharistic assembly whose president, the bishop, is an image of the Lord and is called to express the will of God.

Meyendorff’s general assessment here is in accord with the assertions of this thesis (prescinding from his interpretation of Irenaeus), but it must be emphasize that his expression “is not a personal infallibility” is contrary to the proper understanding of the person. The idea of “a personal infallibility”<sup>611</sup> is not to be feared or denied if, as the thesis maintains, all charisms must reside in the essential element — the *catholic* element — the person. The real issue (accepting at least for the purpose of illustration that there is an infallible church) is the manner in which the charism of infallibility, for instance, is possessed and exercised in the *One*, the *Many*, and the *ONE*. Related to this is the issue of the “universal pastor”<sup>612</sup> for which the role of the Pope in the Catholic Church stands as a prime example. And Zizioulas presents another essential charism — unity — since “there is no communion which can be prior to the oneness of the Church: the institution which expresses this communion must be accompanied by an indication that there is a ministry safeguarding the oneness which the communion aims at expressing.”<sup>613</sup> On the basis of the ontology of the person developed in the thesis, such a ministry of unity is to be expected for an entity, the church, that is *catholic*. The ministry, the person, of the Pope provides an example that brings together the various aspects of ministry in relation to the person, the *One* and the community, the *ONE*. That such a ministry should be common to all but unique to the bishop, as a *catholic person*, is expected. But unlike sacramental Orders, the ministry, though personal, is not a *sphragis* but is conditioned by the relationship with the community, that is a particular church, an ἐκκλησία ἐκκλησία (see above): the Pope is the bishop of Rome.<sup>614</sup> Thus, Zizioulas generalizes:<sup>615</sup>

---

<sup>611</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 116.

<sup>612</sup> Lathrop, *Holy People*, 96, uses this term and is critical of its application.

<sup>613</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 135. Here Zizioulas is addressing the subject of “synodality” not the papacy.

<sup>614</sup> The extended question of the personal ministry of the Pope of Rome is often approached as a question of the “primacy of the Pope,” or “primacy of honor,” or on the

There is no Church without the community, as there is no Christ without the Body, or the “one” without the “many.” ... the community forms part of the ontology of episcopacy: there is no bishop, not even for a moment or theoretically, who is not conditioned by some community. The “many” condition ontologically the “one.”

But again this is not the whole story. The opposite is also true, namely that the “many” cannot exist without the “one.” This in concrete terms is expressed in the following ways: (a) There is no baptism, which is the constitutive act of the community, i.e. the ontological basis of the laity, without the bishop. The “many” cannot be “many” without the “one.” (b) There is no ordination of any kind without the presence of the bishop; the bishop is a condition for the existence of the community and its charismatic life.

\* \* \*

---

changing consensus of a perceived importance either geographical, political, historical, or even in a sense ecclesiastical; see Ludwig Hertling, S. J., *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Christianity* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1972), 62 ff. Though all these factors inform, any such approach is basically an appeal to fashion, and fashion ages poorly. The thesis would argue that any meaningful description of a unique ministry, such as the Catholic Pope, would be based on the ontology of the person, since all charisms reside in the person; and it would have to be a ministry based on the Eucharistic understanding of the Church. For the Pope, for instance, this would be based on the ministry of a person, Peter, perhaps appealing to Cyprian’s classical *cathedra Petri* for the bishop of each local church, and the ontological equality of all bishops through Orders (especially if understood as a *sphragis* / seal), and the Pope / Peter as a *catholic person* in relation to the episcopal ministry (which is itself linked with the particular church) which is inherently a Eucharistic ministry (the bishop presides at the Eucharist). The charism, “Peter’s successor,” though personal, is not indelible but is bound to a relationship with a specific local church, in this case the church of Rome, because of Peter’s relationship with that same church. The ontological and personal basis for such a ministry, described in these terms, would be unique. And characteristic of the person, especially a *catholic person*, he acts “*seorsim* (by himself) but not *solus* (alone)” as rendered by David Pietropaoli, *Visible Ecclesial Communion: Authority and Primacy in the Conciliar Church*, *Dissertatio ad Doctoram in Facultate Theologiae, Pontificiae Universitatis Gregorianaee* (Roma: 1997), 107-08, based on Y. Congar, “Who Has Say in the Church,” *Concilium* 148 (1981): 68-80.

<sup>615</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 137.

Expanding this assertion by Zizioulas, baptism is the “ontological basis” for all Christians. And what is the true identity of the Christian, the eucharistic and ecclesial hypostasis of Zizioulas, if not the identity of Christ? And who is Christ, essentially, but the Son? And what more can be said of our identity in Christ — an identity of persons in relation to the essential Persons, the Παναγιά Τριάς, the All-holy Three — than “sons in the Son”? Emil Mersch reflects:<sup>616</sup>

As members of Christ they [Christians] are members of the Son; we cannot escape this conclusion. We may and we must make distinctions; but we may admit no Separation. Christ’s divinity is not His humanity; person is distinct from nature, virtually in God, really in man; the person of Christ is not the person of Christians. Yet all these are united, without confusion or change but also without division or separation, not only in Christ but also, though in a different way, in the fullness of Christ which is the mystical body. Are not Christians one in Him, as He is one with the Father? If we separate them from Him, do we not rend Christ asunder?

There is εἷς Χριστός, one Christ, and εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,<sup>617</sup> you (pl) are one in Christ Jesus: εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα,<sup>618</sup> one Lord, one faith, one baptism; εἷς νυμφίος, μία νύμφη, ἐν σῶμα, one Bridegroom, one Bride, one Body; εἷς Υἱός, μία ἐκκλησία, ἐν Πνεῦμα, one Son, one Church, one Spirit; εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν,<sup>619</sup> one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in everyone / everything.

---

<sup>616</sup> Mersch, *Theology of the Mystical Body*, 370; he references Jn 17:11, 21ff; 1 Cor. 1:13.

<sup>617</sup> Gal 3:28.

<sup>618</sup> Eph 4:5.

<sup>619</sup> Eph 4:6. Also see Mal 2:10, Mt 23:9, Jn 8:41; 1 Cor 8:6 and even Jn 8:41.



## Chapter 10

### Epilogue

Ecclesia ex Trinitate. Thus the theologians of the Middle Ages spoke of “the gathering that has its origin in the Three Persons” — the church from out of the Trinity, the ones called forth from the Trinity:<sup>620</sup>

Yet the investigation of the religious quest is only the beginning of ecclesiology. The Christian Church conceives itself to be not the product of human longings and efforts, but the gift of God. The theologians of the Middle Ages commonly spoke of it as *ecclesia ex Trinitate*, the gathering that has its origin in the Three Persons. The Church is necessarily tied to the belief that God is not just a divine nature or substance or essence but is Three divine Persons.

In this thesis, the Trinity (chapter 2) established the essential vocabulary and pointed to the essential element, *person*. In order to understand *person*, a Trinitarian attribute *catholic* was examined in chapter 3. *Catholic* is an enigmatic term denoting integrity and wholeness but as a characteristic of the particular, i.e. the person, rather than the general. *Catholic* expresses the communion of the one and the many and gives rise to the description of the person presented in chapter 4: *One of the Many who are ONE*. With the foundational terms in hand, the human person was next considered. A general anthropology examined Adam as the *catholic person*, a term especially used to focus on the *ONE*, and his special relation to the woman through the

---

<sup>620</sup> Tavad, *The Church, Community of Salvation*, 28.

nuptial imagery. The Incarnation was then considered in chapter 6 as a special and transforming case of anthropology: The Incarnation is the anthropological key that unlocks ecclesiology. And Christian anthropology is ecclesiology: it begins and ends in Christology and Pneumatology. The true fulfillment of the human person is realized in the mysteries (sacraments), personal encounters with the person of Christ through the person of the Holy Spirit. Galatians 4:7-14 (see appendix) focused on the person; the question of the psalmist “What is Man?” was answered in the essential Trinitarian and Incarnational language exhibited by the text, “sons in the Sons.” This is a key element from which to consider soteriology and ecclesiology, though it seems never to be given the prominence it deserves as a programmatic statement of Christian (at least) identity and destiny. Person is Trinitarian and Incarnational,<sup>621</sup> and person is Ecclesial, i.e. Eucharistic and thus Eschatological. In chapter 7 the basic and necessary (though not sufficient) criterion for the Eucharist was established as the four-fold action of taking bread, blessing/giving thanks, breaking, and giving, as witnessed by scripture, especially the synoptics (see appendix, “When Jesus Touches Bread”). This was done to establish an understanding of the Eucharist in the sense of *paradosis*, tradition, the handing on and receiving that constitutes the church. The Eucharist was identified as the primary determining factor of ecclesiology; as such it is also person defining. Chapter 8 considered the echaton: This placed the Eucharistic person in time, in the sense of the eighth day, which is the liturgical “today,” and in space within a liturgical and doxological setting. The thesis in chapter 9 argued for the sense of the church as a person within the nuptial imagery. It proposed three fundamental aspects of the church that correspond to the Eucharistic and “hypostatic” theology advanced in the thesis.

This broad perspective enables what was deemed a necessary panoramic focus on the integral element, the *catholic* aspect of theology, the person.

In an “ecumenical” orientation, the question of *communio in sacris* (as a current issue) was also discussed in chapter 7, specifically in reference to the Lima document, BEM. The

---

<sup>621</sup> Reversing the sequence, Tavard, *The Church, Community of Salvation*, 28, comments: “No less than the incarnational perspective, the Trinitarian context is essential to understand the Church.”

theology of the person established by the thesis was used to address the ecumenical concerns of BEM (and subsequent BEMR) and the questions they raise. Some further, more extensive, conclusions regarding this issue are discussed below. Also, though not treated as distinctive elements, certain general considerations underlie, or may be extrapolated from, the thesis. These general topics and certain thematic issues are considered next.

### General and Thematic Issues

What of “the True Church”? This is a topic not broached in the thesis explicitly though it is a pertinent topic. Asked and answered in another, related, way “what does it mean to be church in the postmodern West? ... no clear consensus has emerged.”<sup>622</sup> Models and aphorisms about the church are useful, and those grounded in scripture<sup>623</sup> are certainly valid, but they may only tell part of the story.<sup>624</sup> The consensus of the thesis is that the church, however it may be

---

<sup>622</sup> Philip D. Kenneson, *Beyond Sectarianism: Re-Imagining Church and World* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999), 1.

<sup>623</sup> Paul S. Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960), 268-69, provides a list of 96 “analogies” / images of the church or those related to the church. He considers (p 56) the bridal and wedding feast as separate images, and considers the former “minor.”

<sup>624</sup> E.g. Kenneson, *Beyond Sectarianism*, 2, who points in particular to Gerhard Lofink, *Jesus and Community: The Social Dimension of the Christian Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 122 ff: “The Church as Contrast-Society.” Also, Carter, “Where Are We Ecclesiologically,” 232-33: “The French Catholic scholar George Tavard is fond of talking of the Church as ‘progressively imaging the Kingdom.... We can see all Churches ... as engaged in the process of ‘imaging the Kingdom’ and as converging, in their pilgrim life, upon it. In this context we can engage in common debate on the structures appropriate for the service of the gospel and the ‘imaging’ of the Kingdom.” He references Tavard, *The Church, Community of Salvation*, 11, 35, 49, 88, 91, 175, for ‘imaging the Kingdom.’ From the perspective of the thesis the question is, are the “structures appropriate for the service of the gospel” in accord with the Eucharist? Consider, for instance, the kerygmatic aspect of the Eucharist attested by 1 Cor 11:26 ὁσάκις γὰρ ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ, and recast as an acclamation in the Missal of Paul VI, said after the institution / consecration: Quotiescumque manducamus panem hunc et calicem bibimus, mortem tuam annuntiamus, Dominus, donec venias — As often as we eat this bread and drink the cup we announce / proclaim (καταγγέλλετε / *katangellete*) Your death, Lord, until You come. G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy: The Moorhouse Lectures 1975* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 14, 31, maintains the virtual equivalence of ἀνάμνησις /

described in terms of biblical imagery, is in concrete terms the persons who celebrate and offer the Eucharist “everywhere, always, and by all.” What can also be concluded is that only the true church, as *synaxis* and *ekklesia* that are the one *koinonia*, can offer the fulness of the Eucharist<sup>625</sup> (as contradictory and inconsistent as that sounds; see pp 124-25) to God as *leitourgia*, and to Man as eternal life.<sup>626</sup> This is a Eucharist true in every way to the *catholic* event of the Church.<sup>627</sup> That church, the *koinonia*, has an obligation to the truth, to the deposit of faith,<sup>628</sup> but also to gather<sup>629</sup> and nourish all her children, born through baptism at the common font, the common womb<sup>630</sup> of new life, that they may “receive the body of Christ” and “drink the source on immortality.”<sup>631</sup> In the past some theologies have stressed the uniqueness of this one church as

---

*anamnesis*, καταγγέλλειν / *katanglein*, and κηρύσσω / *kerruso*.

<sup>625</sup> This is triumphalistic — but argued rightly so — as it is the triumph of the Father in the Son and the Holy Spirit: Mt 28:20b καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, and Jn 14:16 κἀγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα μεθ’ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ᾦ.

<sup>626</sup> Zizioulas, “The Early Christian Community,” 29, comments: “Belonging to the community of the Eucharist is, therefore, tantamount to acquiring eternal life. Spirituality in this eucharistic context acquires an ontological and not simply a moral or a psychological context. It is not simply a matter of improving human nature and making it act and behave in a better way through moral achievement and virtue; it is not just a psychological experience of the fruits of the Spirit, such as peace, joy, patience, etc.;

<sup>627</sup> An insight is given by Cavanaugh, “The City: Beyond secular parodies,” 196. In a short discussion on Zizioulas and the *catholic* aspects of the Eucharist and the local church and the whole Christ and His body, he notes Allen of Lille’s image (applied to absolute being) of the sphere that has a center everywhere [it is located] but no circumference.

<sup>628</sup> Cf Paul VI, *Sollemni hac Liturgia*, AAS 60 (1968), 443: “*fidei depositum custodiendi*,” referencing 1 Timothy 6:20, ὦ Τιμόθεε, τὴν παραθήκην φύλαξον, O Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to you.

<sup>629</sup> Consider the gesture of the icon ἡ πλατυτέρα τῶ οὐρανῶν, *breadth of the heavens*: the Mother, arms stretched wide as though in an embrace, gathering all the children to the child Christ on her lap, also with open arms.

<sup>630</sup> Cf Ode 3 Matins, Byzantine Rite, Jan 6, Theophany, commemorating the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan: “O Church of Christ, previously barren and without child, rejoice today.”

<sup>631</sup> A Byzantine liturgical hymn at communion (KOINΩNIKON) during the Easter season: Σῶμα Χριστοῦ μεταλάβετε, πηγῆς ἀθανάτου γεύσασθε. Receive the body of Christ, taste the spring of immortality.

the *sine qua non*; and in respect to the fulness in the one body of Christ it has been said (and must often still be said) *you are and you are not church*. Now the common vocation of the Christian (or, for example, the equality of all bishops, or churches) is stressed: *We are brothers, we are sisters*.<sup>632</sup> The former restrictive view was needed and is correct lest we fall into complacency and syncretism; in the latter, we lose our theological xenophobia. It is difficult now sometimes to say the former, but *outside the Church no salvation*<sup>633</sup> is a very evangelical statement; so it was best said first, and said again as a standard, to fix our resolve and maintain our course.<sup>634</sup> The imperative is that persons must be *ekklesia*; and person and church in turn have two mandates — or better epiphanies — offering the Eucharist (*synaxis*) and Communion (*koinonia*).<sup>635</sup> This is also Zizioulas's understanding (Note how the same three aspects of *church* are used almost interchangeably).<sup>636</sup>

No one can participate in eternal life without passing through the Eucharist and the bishop. This idea led to the axiom “No salvation outside the church” (*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*), which we encounter in Origen and Cyprian and which seems to be presupposed throughout the early church. This axiom was

---

<sup>632</sup> But consider the clarification regarding the uniqueness of the *koinonia* (as discussed in chapter 9 of this theses) issued by (Ratzinger) the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Note on The Expression “Sister Churches”*, §10: “In fact, in the proper sense, sister Churches are exclusively particular Churches (or groupings of particular Churches; for example, the Patriarchates or Metropolitan provinces) among themselves. [7] It must always be clear, when the expression sister Churches is used in this proper sense, that the one, holy, Catholic and apostolic Universal Church is not sister but mother of all the particular Churches. [8]” References are: [7]. Cf. the texts of the Decree *Unitatis redintegratio*, 14 and the Apostolic Brief of Paul VI to Athenagoras I Anno ineunte, cited above in footnotes 2 and 3. [8]. Cf. Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Letter Communionis notio* (28-5-1992), 9; AAS 85 (1993), 843-844.

<sup>633</sup> *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. See above p 158. Cf Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 174; and 263: “Until recently, Christianity has taken as its premise the thesis deriving from the tradition of unity: *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. The more inclusive thesis *extra Christum nulla salus* (which was the goal the first thesis tried to make concrete) also gives priority to the one over the many.” The thesis argues the equivalence of the two theses posed here by Volf.

<sup>634</sup> Language and doctrine handed on by a previous age may seem a burden, but they should be understood as a guarantee of the truth that the Spirit provides.

<sup>635</sup> See the three aspects of church, chapter 9.

<sup>636</sup> Zizioulas, “The Early Christian Community,” 32, 34.

misunderstood later on as implying institutionalism and legalism. In the first centuries, however, *ecclesia* (church) still meant the same thing as in Paul's letters to the Corinthians, namely, the actual eucharistic gathering. It should be paraphrased, therefore, as follows: outside participation in the eucharist communion there is no salvation.

In a related issue, Volf rightly voices a concern that “faith lived ecclesially is being replaced by faith lived individualistically.”<sup>637</sup> This is the oxymoron of doing theology or being a Christian without the church, and it is not so far removed from its secular counterpart, the fallen world thinking it can save itself or that it does not need to be saved at all. One encounters in some ecclesiologies a basic distrust of the church<sup>638</sup> — an adversarial approach — or even of the existence of the church,<sup>639</sup> or its purpose, or its integrity<sup>640</sup> and, consequently, even of a *catholic* (and therefore concrete and tangible and unique) presence of Christ in the world today. Expressing it another way, Zizioulas says that the catholic Church is not a “school”

---

<sup>637</sup> Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 11.

<sup>638</sup> E.g. Laurence Paul Hemming, ed., *Radical Orthodoxy? – A Catholic Enquiry* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2000), 25: “...the way in which ‘church’ can so easily be cast as the enemy.”

<sup>639</sup> Consider Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 153 n 108, and John Smyth baptizing himself; see note 554.

<sup>640</sup> The thesis argues that the correct approach of the church towards “reform” is self-awareness: not *semper reformanda* but γνῶθι σεαυτὸν / *know thyself*. Auer, *Dogmatic Theology* 8, 477:

The decisive thing for our Christian existence in the world is: *sentire cum (in) ecclesia!* We must always be on the way to reach an ever-new understanding of ourselves in our Church, of our Church in Christ, and of Christ in God, by giving ourselves away and spending ourselves in serving this Church. The kingdom of heaven suffers violence, not in the sense of moral achievement, but in the sense of personal self-giving until God is all in all, the one, three-personal God in whom everything is person and in whom there is nothing a-personal. Only when we see God will we understand what “person” is and that this personhood is the foundation of the image of God in us (Gen 1,26).

Also, along this line, see *Lumen Gentium* chapter 1, §8: *Ecclasia in proprio sinu peccatores complectens, sancta simul et semper purificanda, poenitentiam et renovationem continuo prosequitur*; cf the discussion by Edward Schillebeeckx, *Church: The Human Story of God* (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 195 ff and n 22.

(διδασκαλειον),<sup>641</sup> not just another source of theological opinion among a host. Does such an approach absolutize the church? Absolutely, as it should given the Church's unique relationship with Christ: Spouse and Body.<sup>642</sup> With cause a troparion of the Byzantine liturgy sings of past events brought into the present that established the one, the true faith of the Church:<sup>643</sup>

The preaching of the Apostles and the decisions of the Fathers have established the one faith of the Church which she wears as the garment of the truth woven from the theology on high. She correctly explains and glorifies the great mystery of devotion.

Consequently, the purpose of the thesis has not been to contrast the views of different theologians as such, but to present on the basis of the most eloquent representatives, both pro and con, a theology of the person and the church which is rooted in the *sine qua non* of ecclesiology, Eucharist. The Eucharist is the “constant” expression of the relationship between God and Man, persons divine and human; it is the manifestation of communion. The church, the person, by herself, by himself, is the denial of communion.

In view of the necessity of communion for the Christian, three points should be reiterated:

(1) Baptism is each person “putting on Christ” (Gal 3:27), that is, becoming another Christ since “every baptized person becomes Christ.”<sup>644</sup> The proper place of the baptized (and chrismated in Orthodox and Catholic theology) is in the Christian assembly which is the gathering in the Eucharist.

---

<sup>641</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 167 n 94: PG 15, 3386.

<sup>642</sup> Quay, *The Mystery Hidden for Ages in God*, 344, argues that the image of the Church as Bride unites Paul's “body of Christ” and the sense of “the People of God,” the new Israel.

<sup>643</sup> Kontakion of the Council Fathers: Sunday of the Fathers of the First Council (7<sup>th</sup> Paschal Sunday) and Sunday of the Holy Fathers of the First Six Ecumenical Councils (Sunday between 13-19 July). Τῶν Ἀποστόλων τὸ κήρυγμα καὶ τῶν Πατέρων τὰ δόγματα τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ μίαν τὴν πίστιν ἐκράτυεν· ἢ καὶ χιτῶνα φοροῦσα τῆς ἀληθείας τὸν ὕφαντὸν ἐκ τῆς ἄνω θεολογίας ὀρθοτομεῖ καὶ δοξάζει τῆς εὐσεβείας τὸ μέγα Μυστήριον. Cf 2 Tm 2:14, 1 Tm 3:16.

<sup>644</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 58 n 54.

(2) A personal description and interpretation of transubstantiation discloses<sup>645</sup> the presence of Christ as a person in the Eucharistic assembly. (The metaphysics of transubstantiation is ultimately the metaphysics of the person.) As such it is a unique presence as a person that is to be distinguished from the personal presence of Christ in the other sacraments, in other persons (especially through baptism, chrismation, and orders), and in the scriptures.<sup>646</sup> This approach equates transubstantiation to the presence of the person of Christ as a person as described at Chalcedon: no more, such as bread and wine; no less than the same true God and true man, Jesus of Nazareth, the incarnate God. This is especially so since it is the unity of Christ and those who have “put on Christ” that underlies the image of the Church in the Eucharistic synaxis: as the body of Christ — both head and members present as the one Christ, true God and man, present on the altar and in the assembly of those other christs — the “adopted sons” who have “put on Christ” in baptism. This is the image of the *catholic* Church, Spouse and body of Christ.

---

<sup>645</sup> Cf Robert Sokolowski, *Eucharistic Presence: A Study in the Theology of Disclosure* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994), 8.

<sup>646</sup> Cf. Taft. *Beyond East and West*, 248-49 n 14:

Abbott, Documents 140-41. Does this codicil, that Jesus “s especially present under the eucharistic species,” reveal the hesitancies of a still embryonic Catholic theology of Jesus dynamic presence in his Church outside the presence in the tabernacle? Not necessarily. If Jesus is present in the Church in all these other aspects of his saving activity the Council lists, that presence is either real or imagined, and the Council obviously affirms it to be real. What is “special” about the presence in the tabernacle is not just a tendentious reaffirmation of the eucharistic real presence as if it were somehow the only really real one, but a profession of what the Catholic faith has always held, that the presence in the Eucharist is not the same as the presence in the water of baptism or the oil of anointing, or in the presider or in the community, but is a real presence in the sacred gifts themselves, such that they can be adored.

(3) Sonship: we are sons in the Son. This is a lapidary appellation of the person that should be given greater emphasis in denoting the Christian identity.<sup>647</sup> It is a theme that runs throughout a discussion by Zizioulas on “*Baptism and the Eucharist*”:<sup>648</sup>

The new identity given “in the Spirit” was constituted through incorporation into the body of Christ, the church, through a new set of relationships. These relationships were identical to the relationship of Christ to the Father, and for this reason baptism amounted to sonship (Rom 8:15), to acquiring the privilege of calling God “Father” as Christ himself in a unique and eternal way does. ... we must see the importance of the Eucharist for Christian spirituality. The Eucharist was understood in the first centuries as the event that brought together the dispersed people of God “in the same place” (*epi to auto*) not only to celebrate but also to constitute the eschatological messianic community here and now. ... Baptized persons were led to this community in order to take their place in it, which involved the privilege of addressing God as Father—of acquiring the sonship that Christ has always had ... the new identity given in the Eucharist — based on free and undying relationships, above all on the eternal filial relationship between the Father and the Son, ... gives eternal life.... The Eucharist is life eternal, primarily because it offers this set of relationships, which involves an eternal identity.... It is, above all, identical with overcoming death through the acquisition of a new identity based on new relationships which are identical with the Father — Son relationship of the Holy Trinity. The Christian becomes by grace what Christ is by nature — to put the matter in later patristic dogmatic terminology. In strictly biblical terms this very thing is expressed by Paul in his reference to baptism as giving the “spirit” of sonship in which we cry “Abba! Father!” (Rom 8:15). Spirituality as the possession of the Spirit involves, above all, sharing in the same sonship of Jesus Christ, a relationship with God that gives

---

<sup>647</sup> That being so, the unfortunate dilution of the theology in some translations of scripture is reprehensible. There are numerous examples of which Lk 20:36 is an example. NAB: They can no longer die, for they are like angels; and they are the children of God because they are the ones who will rise. (The NAB does note for the one instance: ‘Because they are the ones who will rise: literally, “being sons of the resurrection.”’).

NRS: Indeed they cannot die anymore, because they are like angels and are children of God, being children of the resurrection.

RSV: for they cannot die any more, because they are equal to angels and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.

The Greek has: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται, ἰσαγγελοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν καὶ υἱοὶ [sons] εἰσιν θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ [sons] ὄντες. Only the RSV reflects this properly; also see note 740.

<sup>648</sup> Zizioulas, “The Early Christian Community,” 28-30. Zizioulas refers sonship to Paul’s letter to the church at Rome, while the thesis maintains that sonship is presented with even greater force in Galatians; see the appendix, “What Is Man.”

an undying, eternal identity. Membership in the church as the body of those who through baptism and the Eucharist have acquired such an identity was the source of true spirituality. Spirituality is an ecclesial and not an individual experience.

Also, Trent on justification is an example of its significance and impact.<sup>649</sup> Sonship is an especially personal expression of salvation — of justification — and *theosis*.<sup>650</sup> Here Zizioulas comments on the person and the theology of *theosis*:<sup>651</sup>

If Christ is taken as the Man *par excellence*, theology cannot help but develop a very high view of man. Man cannot be defined as *simul justus et peccator*, much as this might be true as a psychological experience. Anthropology in the light of Christology moves beyond the dialectic of the fallen human state. There is ultimately only one kind of dialectic possible, that of created and this in Christ is raised to the level of personhood so that it may, in an event of communion, become an [*sic*] dialectic of *difference* and not division. Thus man becomes truly man, i.e. he acquires fully his natural identity in relation to God, only if he is united with God—the mystery of personhood is what makes this possible. *Theosis*, as a way of describing this unity in personhood, is, therefore, just the opposite of a divinisation in which human nature ceases to be what it really is. Only if we lose the perspective of personhood and operate with ‘nature’ as such, such a misunderstanding of *theosis* can arise.

“Baptism is essentially nothing else but the application to humanity of the very filial relationship which exists between the Father and the Son.”<sup>652</sup> One cannot do better than that.

Living, experiencing, celebrating that relationship is the Eucharist.

---

<sup>649</sup> See page 131 n 427.

<sup>650</sup> In the liturgical hermeneutic of the Byzantine church, two feasts are what could be termed the feasts of *theosis*: the ascension (exultation, 40 days after Pascha), an eschatological statement, and the μεταμόρφωσις / *metamorphosis*, the transfiguration (Mt 17:2, Mk 9:2, cf Rom 12:2, 2 Col 3:18; on Aug. 6, 40 days before Sep. 15, the exultation of the Holy Cross). *Son* is explicit in the scriptural account of the latter, and is a link with the accounts of the baptism of Jesus.

<sup>651</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 440. Cf Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 101, on *simul justus et peccator*.

<sup>652</sup> Zizioulas, “Human Capacity,” 438.

---

**EXCURSUS: Eucharist and Liturgy: The Quest for Essentials****Introduction**

The gathering of persons to celebrate the Eucharist has been proposed by Zizioulas as the event that constitutes the Church, and the thesis has asked: What constitutes the essential, tangible aspect of the Eucharist? An exegesis of texts where Jesus touches bread led to the unambiguous identification of the four-fold action as a constant feature, especially based on the witness of nine related accounts in the synoptic Gospels. There is, however, a larger but related question that is asked by Maxwell E. Johnson, “Can We Avoid Relativism in Worship? Liturgical Norms in the Light of Contemporary Liturgical Scholarship.”<sup>653</sup> Johnson will conclude:

No, all is not merely “relative” in questions of liturgical practice and theology today. The articulation of what is to be “normative,” however, is a much more difficult task than the fathers of Vatican II or other contemporary liturgical reformers have assumed it to be.

But he begins:

In its call for contemporary liturgical reform and renewal the Second Vatican Council’s Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy distinguished clearly between what the Council Fathers saw as “unchanging” and “divinely instituted,” and, therefore, “irreformable” in liturgy, and what was changeable and, hence, reformable. Recent studies of the origins of Christian worship, however, make it increasingly difficult to argue in favor of much of anything that might, in fact, be considered “normative” from the church’s “classic” tradition for liturgy today.

Johnson is really looking at a much broader subject which can be characterized as communal worship in general. But he asks about essentials — what is normative — although he does not attempt to identify them, or perhaps he feels he cannot do so. He speaks of

---

<sup>653</sup> Maxwell E. Johnson, “Can We Avoid Relativism in Worship? Liturgical Norms in the Light of Contemporary Liturgical Scholarship,” *Worship* 74 (2000): 135-155.

“Traditional liturgy,” the “great tradition” and challenges Wainwright’s “inherited tradition,” with “which inherited tradition...?”<sup>654</sup> Worship, yes, but what is the essence of worship? A liturgical approach to worship tends to be broad and even if it looks for essentials it does so with the big picture in mind, that is, the ability to identify what can be termed an *ordo*, or as some might have it the inability, impossibility, or undesirability for such a standard. In discussing this question Johnson compares the views of “Gordon Lathrop, James White, and Paul Bradshaw.”<sup>655</sup> Lathrop in particular has advanced the idea of the *ordo* as a standard:<sup>656</sup>

Lathrop has suggested that what is essential, and therefore, central and “normative,” for Christian worship is a liturgical *ordo* or overall “pattern” for the scheduled ritual of Christian worship which is both ecumenical and transcultural.

The concept of the *ordo* certainly is not new. But here the identification of the essential can get lost in the historical quest for a larger structure. In the typical approach, the Eucharist, the Lord’s supper is considered with reference to the obvious: the three synoptic accounts of the institution and 1 Corinthians 11 but, significantly, not the feedings and Emmaus as identified in the thesis (see appendix, “When Jesus Touches Bread” for details). While 1 Corinthians 11 and the institution in the synoptics is certainly a grouping for considering the liturgical evolution of the liturgy, the thesis argues that it is not the grouping for identifying the essentials and the essence of what is normative. The focus on the four-fold action gives the following criterion for guiding the quest for essentials in the liturgy:

1. Is there a clear sequence of taking, giving thanks / blessing, breaking, and giving? This identifies the essential element of the Eucharist?
  
2. Reception is important but it is not an essential for the ritual. “Holy Communion” as reception is not equivalent to the Eucharist. The four-fold action does not specifically include

---

<sup>654</sup> Johnson, “Can We Avoid Relativism in Worship?”, 136.

<sup>655</sup> Johnson, “Can We Avoid Relativism in Worship?”, 137.

<sup>656</sup> Johnson, “Can We Avoid Relativism in Worship?”, 138.

the actual eating and drinking. The reception is certainly important and intimately connected as receiving is to the giving. But confusion abounds in equating the Eucharist (as identified by the four fold action) with the reception of communion, especially by the faithful.

3. The underlying principle for the Eucharist is not *ad hoc* praying but *paradosis* understood primarily as handing-on, tradition. This is the key and the guide. This may sit uncomfortably for those who insist on typical documented evidence. The evidence is the pattern of the synoptics and the adherence to that pattern as seen in liturgies celebrated today that exhibit the same structure as they have in the past, i.e., always, everywhere, by all who are, by this criterion, *orthodoxia* (cf tables 1 and 2, pp 114-16).

4. The proper description of the Eucharist in the four-fold action is this: The community gathers so that Jesus may take, give thanks / bless, break, and give. Fittingly, around this kernel, the scriptures are read and proclaimed and those present eat the bread and drink the cup to proclaim His life, death, resurrection, and exultation until He comes.

Consider in contrast, point for point:

1. The focus on the four-fold action and what is being established can be seen in reference to the perspective of liturgical theology. Typically that perspective digresses regarding the essentials as identified in the thesis; for example, Bradshaw<sup>657</sup> considers Dix and the basic shape of the liturgy but then goes on to consider Dix and the earliest form of the Eucharistic prayer, and then the origin of the prayer.

2. As the title and subtitles of a recent publication<sup>658</sup> ask, “What Happens in: Holy Communion, the Lord’s supper, the Eucharist, the Synaxis, the Mass?” This should be rephrase as “What

---

<sup>657</sup> Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (New York: Oxford University press, 1992), 142 passim.

<sup>658</sup> Michael Welker, *What Happens in Holy Communion*, John F. Hoffmeyer, trans. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000).

**MUST** happen in ...” The answer is the four-fold action because this is what is handed on and it is to continue to be handed on: it is *paradosis*, the tradition. Here is an example of keying on “communion” in Michael Welker, *What Happens in Holy Communion*.<sup>659</sup>

Therefore, although it is not false to answer the question “What happens in holy communion?” simply by recording what can be externally observed, it is inadequate and unsatisfactory.

Or it may even be a case of seeing but not perceiving the authentic “shape.”

### 3. White advances a very opposite view and critique:<sup>660</sup>

Unfortunately, the attempts at finding convergence of consensus [in worship] have the effect of ignoring the worship of most North American Christians. Do we want to say what happens in most churches in the United States on a Sunday morning is “baby worship,” since it does not match some ecumenical or historical standard? Do we want to say that a preaching service each week and Thirteenth Sabbath Lord’s Supper (as among Seventh Day Adventists) is not authentic Christian worship? ...

We face a basic problem in ignoring the worship of most North American Christians. Large segments of North American Christianity have no interest in ecumenism and are doing quite well without us. But though they ignore us, can we afford to ignore their worship? If we take seriously the premise that the way people pray expresses what they believe, then we have to be very deliberate in accepting the vast diversity of actual prayer practice, especially in North America. In trying to marginalize the worship life of so many millions, we have violated one of the basic motifs of *lex orandi*. But if we respect the varieties of prayer, it will change significantly the way liturgical theology is done.

Part of the problem results from following too uncritically the dogmatism of Alexander Schmemmann. Any scheme that totally ignores the worship life of about sixty percent of American Christianity is highly questionable. To imply that the *ordo* of Christian worship is missed by all those for whom the Eucharist is an occasional service ... is indeed risky business.

---

<sup>659</sup> Welker, *What Happens in Holy Communion*, 2.

<sup>660</sup> James F. White, “How Do We Know It Is Us,” in E. Byron Anderson, Bruce T. Morrill, eds., *Liturgy and the Moral Self* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 57-58. White gives no reference for Schmemmann but considerable treatment is given to the *ordo* in Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, 33 ff.

Actually the basis of liturgical theology ought to be empirical observation of what the Church actually does. But if one excludes from consideration, even condescending consideration, what the majority of American Christians call worship, such selective use of evidence makes the empirical basis of liturgical theology very dubious.

“...empirical observation of what the Church actually does” begs the question. This approach to identifying essentials is what eisegesis is to exegesis.

4. Johnson highlights Lathrop’s position on the essentials:<sup>661</sup>

“So these are the essentials of Christian worship,” he [Lathrop] writes: “A community *gathers in prayer* around the scriptures *read and proclaimed*. This community of the word then tastes the meaning of that word by keeping the meal of Christ, *giving thanks* over bread and cup and *eating* and *drinking*. It is this word-table community, the body of Christ, which gathers other people to its number, continually *teaching* both itself and these newcomers the mercy and mystery of God and *washing* them in the name of that God. All of these essential things urge the community toward the world — toward prayer for the world, sharing with the hungry of the world, caring for the world, giving witness to the world.... Around these central things, which will be most evident in Sunday and festival worship, other gatherings of Christians may also take place.”

Except for the missing *taking* it is a description of what is necessary and “traditional.” But it gives the wrong impression for the focus, if any, of what is being done: it misses or avoids the sharp point of *paradosis* (even if *taking* had been included).

### The Role of Sacrifice

Lathrop has been encountered before in the thesis regarding the propriety of considering the Eucharist (actually he says more generally “worship”; see note 519) as sacrifice. Lathrop bluntly does not consider the Christian worship sacrifice. It is not the purpose of this excursus to take

---

<sup>661</sup> Johnson, “Can We Avoid Relativism in Worship?”, 138. Johnson is quoting G. Lathrop, *What Are the Essentials of Christian Worship?* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1994), 22

up the complicated issue and controversial topic of whether the Eucharist is a sacrifice. Kilpatrick argues, however, that the eucharist must be understood as sacrifice.<sup>662</sup>

The first part of the liturgy was derived from the synagogue and had all its accessibility. The second part was a sacrificial action hedged about by all the exclusiveness of the holy ... The context of this separation thus brings us back to one of our basic themes in the Eucharist, the sacrificial action in which the life and power of the Lord are released in the holy spheres.

Sacrifice is the “significant term in our description of the Eucharistic experience.”<sup>663</sup>

From this approach he independently, that is from a different approach than the analysis of the thesis, arrives at the same four-fold action as the essential feature, what he calls the “charter story.”<sup>664</sup> He recognizes the four actions: “Our Lord (I) took bread;<sup>665</sup> (2) ‘gave thanks’ over it; (3) broke it; (4) distributed it, saying certain words.”<sup>666</sup> This sequence is more primitive than the charter-ritual because of<sup>667</sup>

---

<sup>662</sup> G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, The Moorhouse Lectures 1975 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 82; also 54, that Paul understood the Eucharist as sacrifice, and 57, the resulting absence of a reference to “grace”; 57, 96, 97 98 ff; 104, 108-10. Also of note, 104-5: “The Old Testament analogy suggests that sacrifice [even if “with a faulty intention”] remains effective but that its consequences for the participants are disastrous. As we have seen, Paul in 1C. xi applies this to the Eucharist. It remains efficacious, but the consequences can be disastrous for the unworthy participant. Here the Eucharistic sacrifice retains its full force *ex opere operato*.... Consequently, even if all who take part in any one celebration of the Eucharist are faithless or impenitent, this does not void the Eucharist itself.”

<sup>663</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 108.

<sup>664</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 70: “The myth gives the origin of the ritual and provides the pattern for the ritual to follow. We may add to this ... detail that often the myth contains the command to repeat.... Here the institution Narratives would be the myth and the rest of the Eucharistic liturgy the ritual.” To avoid misunderstanding by using “myth” in that myth may not be understood as being legitimate and conveying the actual, original, prototype.

<sup>665</sup> This essential aspect of this action especially is disputed. On its significance see Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 85.

<sup>666</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 77; 84.

<sup>667</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 78.

the absence of a command to repeat.... Had the charter-ritual pattern operated from the institution itself as the last Supper, we would have expected the command to repeat to form an unquestionable item in the Institution Narratives.

This command to repeat is not in the synoptic accounts but is in 1 Corinthians. He concludes,<sup>668</sup> “the Eucharist is an example of the charter-ritual pattern where the Institution Narrative is present because it is the charter story.” The Eucharistic action is not centered in the Institution Narrative but “distributed” throughout the celebration.<sup>669</sup> Kilpatrick notes that the sense of the Eucharist as ““make my communion”” individualizes and distorts the “social significance of the whole action.”<sup>670</sup> Thus, in sharp contrast to the views of Lathrop, White, and Bradshaw, and supporting<sup>671</sup> the findings of the thesis Kilpatrick concludes:<sup>672</sup>

Worship is then an exchange between God and man in which God has taken the initiative....The Eucharist has the generic characteristic of worship, but is specifically much more....**The Eucharist contains the foundation story**, the Institution Narrative, **which it proceeds to enact**....The divine response to this is the releasing of the life and power of the Son for our good. [emphasis added]

The thesis holds that the “life and power of the Son for our good,” ultimately, can only mean our personal identification with the person of the Son, and that this is the mystical, that is, real, tangible, experiential, and sacramental thrust of the Eucharist.

For Bradshaw (and others) the reduction of Dix’s seven-fold action, that is actions including both bread and cup, to the basic four with the overlapping and simultaneity of the bread-cup actions is considered a development whereas it is not unexpected based on the

---

<sup>668</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 79.

<sup>669</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 83, notes here such a distortion in Cranmer’s liturgy in the 1552 Book of Common Prayer.

<sup>670</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 90.

<sup>671</sup> Kilpatrick’s support is in the basics. He goes on to historicize and make other claims that are not in harmony with the findings or orientation of the thesis. His agreement, however, on the essentials, on the four-fold action and sacrifice is remarkable.

<sup>672</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 102-3.

presentation in the synoptics as analyzed in the thesis, nor is it unexpected for Kilpatrick.<sup>673</sup> It is just the case that one must know how to “read” the “story” properly.

Kilpatrick believes his proposal revolutionary and projects that the “longsuffering Christian public”<sup>674</sup> must adjust, and that “devotional habits”<sup>675</sup> must change. He remarks that “despite the loss of the Biblical notion of sacrifice ... so much of the wider characteristic of the Eucharist survived.”<sup>676</sup> The thesis has insisted that as a requirement for identification as *church* not just general characteristics but the totality of that which is handed on as the four-fold action be preserved (see pp 115-16, chapter 7, table 2, the example of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy).

## Conclusion

The Eucharist is presented as the essential element of worship, and the four-fold action as the essential, discernable, feature of the Eucharist. Why is the Eucharist so identified rather than the word, or the other sacraments, or the gathering of two or three in the name of Jesus, or the presence of the Spirit? The Eucharist is the word, read and proclaimed, and the presence of the Spirit, and the two or three gathered, and the nexus of the sacraments because the Eucharist retains the original pattern, it preserves the story, it is the actualization of the “myth,” the “charter story.” But what of the larger, even very “traditional” elements of Christian worship of which the Eucharist is but one feature and clearly not the only feature? Does the arch support the keystone or does the keystone hold up the arch? Well, it may be answered, both. But given that there is a purpose for the arch, it must be stressed that it is the keystone that holds it up, and it does so as an integral and unique part.

---

<sup>673</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 84: “...instead of having four plus three acts, we have only four as indicated.”

<sup>674</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 86.

<sup>675</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 94.

<sup>676</sup> Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, 96.

## Communicatio / Communio in Sacris

Zizioulas expresses the need<sup>677</sup>

to push the notion of communion to its ontological conclusions. We need an ontology of communion. We need to make communion condition the very being of the Church, not the well-being but the being of it. On the theological level this would mean assigning a constitutive role to Pneumatology, not one dependent on Christology.

The discussion about ecclesiology dealt with the theology of the Christian assembly as a communion of persons and a communion of churches. A very pragmatic question arises in the present climate of a Christianity — Christian churches, Christian communities — often at odds with one another on doctrinal (among other) issues. The question of sharing the Eucharist, in particular giving or receiving the “life-giving bread and saving cup” is formally regulated through the particular church relative to other ecclesial communities and churches. But at the grass-roots level of “receiving communion,” especially noting the correct identity of the Christian person, through baptism (and chrismation), as a *Eucharistic person*,<sup>678</sup> one is confronted with a terrible inconsistency:<sup>679</sup> the separated Christian (in this example relative to

---

<sup>677</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 141.

<sup>678</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 59. As Zizioulas puts it: “...another ontological category, which I would call here a *sacramental* or *eucharistic hypostasis*.” In keeping with the medieval dictum previously mentioned (see note 422) *Sacramenta faciunt ecclesia*, for the *eucharistic*, the *ecclesial* person, the liturgy is *Everyman’s* ecstasy and the sacraments are *Everyman’s* mysticism.

<sup>679</sup> Susan K. Wood, “Baptism as a Mark of the Church,” in Braaten, *Marks on the Body of Christ*, 39, notes “questions raised by the common recognition of baptism accompanied by refusal of admission to a common eucharist.... The scandal of Christianity is that groups separated from one another celebrate the “ritual sign of a christologically, soteriologically and pneumatologically grounded unity.[quoting Wainwright, *Doxology*, 123] How can this be?” She continues (page 40) commenting on Vatican II’s Decree on Ecumenism: “Unity is not found absolutely in baptism ... The question is: into what church are we baptized, the universal church of Christ of the particular, local church? Here again, the answer is that we are baptized into both and that there is a relationship of mutual interiority between the two.” Having said the latter she inexplicably continues in seeming contradiction: “The universal church only has existence in and through the particular churches.” The thesis argues the coincidence of the *ekklesia*, the *koinonia*

the Catholic Church) is recognized as a member of the body of Christ but is not able to fully participate<sup>680</sup> in the celebration that constitutes the body of Christ. The ideal can be stated: “Insofar as the Eucharist is the source of life for the Church,... all who belong to the Church share an identical participation.”<sup>681</sup> To some extent this is a reflection of the tension between the particular church and the localized church (e.g. the parish) as *the* Eucharistic community.<sup>682</sup> Thus Afanasiev’s views regarding the East/West, Orthodox/Catholic separation (which can be generalized to some extent) have been characterized in this way.<sup>683</sup>

While doctrinal divisions and other differences should not be wished away, the lack of absolute agreement while maintaining eucharistic communion is nonetheless an historical ecclesial reality. It is not just the truth of doctrine that is at issue in the schism, but also the truth and the power of Love. Could it not be that the loss of this Love has contributed to the loss and deterioration of doctrinal truth? In a spirit much like that of the letters of 1 John (4) and 1 Corinthians (13) and in the same boldness as Bulgakov’s proposition of over sixty years ago, Afanasiev argues that the reestablishment of eucharistic communion between East and West would be neither a denial of the schism nor a facile use of the

---

and the *synaxis*. We are baptized into Christ (Gal 3:27, Rom 6:3).

<sup>680</sup> Peter C. Bouteneff, “Koinonia and Eucharistic Unity: An Orthodox Response,” *One in Christ* 52 (2000): 72, notes: “The issue of “eucharistic sharing” continues to burn in the hearts of Christians who are yet disunited – as well it should be. The eucharist – as rite, as event, as concept – is both intensely corporate (ecclesial) and also deeply personal.” Subsequently, page 77, he addresses “the link between persons, or more to the point, the link between person and church. There is no person in isolation. Persons exist by *virtue* of communion with each other and with God.”

<sup>681</sup> Johann Auer and Joseph Ratzinger, *Dogmatic Theology 6: A General Doctrine of the Sacraments and the Mystery of the Eucharist* (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1995), 348-49.

<sup>682</sup> The tension was discussed in chapter 9 and is exemplified by the conflict between the theological positions of Zizioulas and Afanasiev. Both acknowledge the dependency of the local church (taken here as the structure that is the gathering for the Eucharist, e.g., the parish) on the particular church. The particular church is not constituted as a communion of parishes. But is the local church, because it is a Eucharistic gathering, thereby also is properly called a church in its own right? One answer is *no* because, as a separate entity, it lacks a bishop and, consequently, cannot itself participate in the communion that constitutes the universal church. The other answer is *yes* exactly because, as the theology keeps emphasizing, “the Eucharist makes the Church.”

<sup>683</sup> Plekon, *St. Vlad. Theol. Quarterly* 41 (1997): 173.

Eucharist to attain ecclesial unity, but rather an assertion of the authentic reality of the Church as eucharistic assembly.[91] It would be an act of faith in the Church, not just saying prayers but becoming them, prayer incarnate, as Paul Evdokimov eloquently put it.[92]

Zizioulas, again commenting on “*Communio in sacris*,” stresses the necessity of the Eucharist for ecclesial communion:<sup>684</sup>

There can be no full communion without communion in the sacramental life of the Church, and above all in the Eucharist. “Inter-communion” should be replaced by “communion” in order to do justice to an ecclesiology of communion. Full communion means in the first place eucharistic communion, since the Eucharist is the recapitulation of the entire economy of salvation, in which past, present and future are united, and in which communion with the Holy Trinity and with the rest of the Churches as well as with creation takes place. Baptism, Chrismation or Confirmation, and the rest of the sacramental life, are all given *in view* of the Eucharist. Communion in these sacraments may be described as “partial” or *anticipatory* communion, calling for its fulfillment in the Eucharist. It is not without significance that in many languages, including modern Greek, *koinonia* or communion is a synonym for partaking of the Eucharist (*Theia koinonia* — Holy Communion”[*sic*]).

Though even greater doctrinal and (presumed) “ontological” differences<sup>685</sup> must be overcome with regard to all the various Christian communities, at the level of the sacramental relationship, the Christian, by virtue of the Christian identity, should participate fully in the

---

<sup>684</sup> Zizioulas, “The Church as Communion,” 14-15.

<sup>685</sup> See Patriarch Bartholomew’s address at Georgetown University, October 1997. Although the Patriarch speaks of differences, most of his ontology actually concurs with Catholic views. Regarding baptism, however, the Orthodox position he expresses diverges insofar as it considers *baptism into a church* rather than (also) *baptism into the one church*. Here it is appropriate to mention the Catholic doctrine of the sacramental “character” as reinforcing the view of ontological unity and Christian identity through baptism. For instance, from Trent’s Canons on the “Sacraments in General,” Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 52: Can. 9. “If anyone says that in three sacraments, namely, baptism, confirmation and order, there is not imprinted on the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible mark, by reason of which they cannot be repeated, let him be anathema.” Latin version, 330: Si quis dixerit, in tribus sacramentis, baptismo scilicet, confirmatione et ordine, non imprimi characterem in anima, hoc est signum quoddam spirituale et indelebile, unde ea iterari non possunt: anathema sit.

Eucharist gathering.<sup>686</sup> Regardless of whatever valid comments can be made about *ontological differences*, it must be stressed that one purpose of the present study is to draw attention to the (Catholic) witness of *ontological unity* of all Christians, through baptism,<sup>687</sup> that must underlie a proper Eucharistic theology. We may not be able to express our oneness in language but only in the celebration of the Eucharist. All those who celebrate the Eucharist are in de facto communion: we are one Church in the one Eucharist and the other mysteries / sacraments. It is our sinfulness that prevents acknowledging our oneness in the Eucharist: we must overcome ourselves. Zizioulas writes:<sup>688</sup>

The way the catholicity of the Church is revealed in the eucharistic community shows that the ultimate essence of catholicity lies in the transcendence of all divisions in Christ. This should be understood absolutely and without any reservations. It covers all areas and all dimensions of existence whether human or cosmic, historical or echatological, spiritual or material, social or individual, etc. The dichotomies in which life has been placed and conceived, unfortunately to a great extent by Christian tradition itself, represent a betrayal of the catholic

---

<sup>686</sup> Thus the common practice of the East in administering baptism, chrismation (confirmation) and the Eucharist as one rite of initiation (even for infants). It is, therefore, very surprising to read Wolfhart Pannenberg in his review of the *Catechism of the Catholic Church, Pro Ecclesia IV* (1995): 57, remark: “It is surprising that not only baptism and confirmation, but also the eucharist, are reckoned as “sacraments of Christian initiation.” [Unfortunately, regarding his review in general, his stated purpose in the review of “evaluating the Catechism above all from an ecumenical perspective” (p 51) is wanting.] Also, Archbishop Kirill writes in *Orthodox Perspectives on BEM*, 83: “It is also known that the Orthodox strictly follow the sequence of the three sacraments (baptism-chrismation-eucharist) having strong arguments for it which, unfortunately, were not properly reflected in the commentaries. That excludes an opportunity to give a proper evaluation to the Orthodox practice according to which infants are allowed to receive Holy Communion immediately after baptism and chrismation. Actually, it is this practice that most visibly shows the inner unity of the sacraments of initiation.” See also BEMR §27, 50.

<sup>687</sup> Baptism in the context of this thesis is understood in a sense that found objections in BEMR 41ff. It is most unfortunate to hear revived the old polemic about the “magical view of the sacrament” (p 42); ecumenical discussion is in poor shape if this canard has not been laid to rest. A lesson to the contrary is in Ramsey, *The Gospel of the Catholic Church*, 228, quoting Kidd’s paper at *The Malines Conversations*: “That to the Roman See the Churches of the English owe their Christianity through ‘Gregory our father’ (Council of Clovesho, A.D. 747, c. xvii.) ... who **sent us baptism.**” [Emphasis added; the purpose of the quote here is to illustrate an early perception of baptism, and not the Petrine office, as was Ramsey’s purpose.]

<sup>688</sup> Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 162.

outlook so essential to the Church of Christ. One thinks in this respect, for example, of the dichotomy between the “sacred” and the “secular,” or between body and soul. The eucharistic community with its understanding of the eucharist as *a meal* with its basic elements being material and not merely spiritual, with its long litanies and supplications in which man’s everyday material and physical needs find their place etc., constitutes a sign of a “catholic” view of existence in which no dualistic dichotomies can be accepted. Man and the world form a unity in harmony and so do the various dimensions in man’s own existence. An ecclesiological catholicity in the light of the eucharistic community suggests and presupposes a *catholic anthropology* and a *catholic view of existence* in general.

In such a catholic outlook the entire problem of the relationship of the Church to the world receives a different perspective. The separation and juxtaposition of the two can have no essential meaning because there is no point where the limits of the Church can be objectively and finally drawn. There is a constant interrelation between the Church and the world, the world being God’s creation and never ceasing to belong to Him and the Church being the community which through the descent of the Holy Spirit transcends in herself the world and offers it to God in the eucharist.

The thesis also examined, as something of a case study, Catholic praxis in restricting *communication in sacris* with non-Catholics, especially other separated Christians. The praxis, exemplified by the US Catholics Bishops’ *Guidelines for Receiving Communion*, was appraised in light of traditional and contemporary Catholic (from the perspective of Latin and Byzantine theology) Eucharistic theology. Since the praxis deals with non-Catholics explicitly, Catholic doctrine is presented in the context of the ecumenical framework proposed in BEM, selected responses to it by the various churches and ecclesial communities, and representative historical references (chapter 7).

The thrust of this “applied” study focused on non-Catholic Christians in that the Catholic Church, as evidenced by the *Guidelines*, “cannot extend to them a general invitation to receive Communion.” However, the guidelines also say that “We welcome to this celebration of the Eucharist those Christians who are not fully united with us.” This is in conformity with the principles of the eschatological dimension of the Eucharist gathering: The Eucharist makes the Church wherein all are gathered ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό / *epi to auto*, “always everyone and always *together*.” Thus, there is already a sharing in the Eucharist that is apparently not only allowed or tolerated, but recommenced and encouraged. Furthermore, even for non-Christians the

*Guidelines* state “We also welcome to this celebration those who do not share our faith in Jesus.... [and] invite them to be united with us in prayer.” This is a generous and very open approach that we have come to expect in today’s ecumenical climate, but unlike the situation of the non-Catholic Christian, the invitation to the non-Christian does not easily fit into the Eucharistic theologies discussed in this thesis.<sup>689</sup> Oddly, the *Guidelines*’ statement that “Catholics believe that the Eucharist is an action of the celebrating community signifying a oneness in faith, life, and worship of the community” could, in and of itself, conflict with the general invitation to join in the Eucharistic gathering extended to all, non-Catholics<sup>690</sup> and especially non-Christians. Why is it only that “Reception of the Eucharist by Christians not fully united with us would imply a oneness which does not yet exist, and for which we must all pray,” yet their presence and the presence of non-Christians in the gathering itself does not produce the same caution?<sup>691</sup>

To be consistent, the identification of the “new” theology — the constitutive nature of the Eucharistic gathering as *the Eucharist* — should carry the same emphasis as the traditional identification of *the Eucharist* as the whole Christ under the appearance of bread and wine. This is especially so since (repeating) it is the unity of these two aspects that form the image of the Church as the body of Christ: both head and members present as the one Christ, true God and man, present on the altar in the assembly of those other Christs — the “adopted sons” who have “put on Christ in baptism.” This is the image of the catholic Church, Spouse and body of Christ. But the argument cuts both ways: should not inclusion or exclusion be applied uniformly to all

---

<sup>689</sup> For instance, how is this invitation to the non-Christian reconciled with the exclusion of even catechumens from parts of the Eucharist celebration? See Archbishop Kirill in *Orthodox Perspectives* (87): “...catechumens were not allowed to stay at the eucharist in the early church... The eucharist has always been received as a sacrament of communion, as a sacrament of the unity of the Church. On these grounds the Orthodox do not accept the practice of ecumenical intercommunion.” In the ideal, i.e. intended situation (unity), everyone would realize that *intercommunion* is an oxymoron.

<sup>690</sup> See Flannery, *Vatican Council II*, 555. In *Quibus Rerum Circumstantiis*, “On Admitting Other Christians to the Eucharistic Communion in the Catholic Church,” II.2.

<sup>691</sup> For a review of the related Catholic Church legislation see Myriam Wijlens, *Sharing the Eucharist: A Theological Evaluation of the Post Conciliar Legislation* (New York: University Press of America, Inc., 2000) especially 361-68.

aspects of the Eucharist?<sup>692</sup> And it also cuts on both sides: to what extent is the non-Catholic Christian (let alone the non-Christian) able to concur in the sacramental and ontological thrust of Catholic Eucharistic theology and ecclesiology as considered here? In the general context of the threefold differentiation of the church considered in chapter 9, and the Catholic insistence on the doctrine of transubstantiation, interpreted in personal terms as the unique presence of Christ as a person, the following observation by the former Archbishop of Canterbury, Michael Ramsey, pertains:<sup>693</sup>

Nor is the Body, thus received, a merely local fellowship of Christians; it is the one universal Church. For the Eucharist is never merely the act of a local community, but always the act of the great Church, wherein the local community is merged.

Our father among the saints, Augustine of Hippo, exhorts us: “If you then are the Body and members of Christ, the mystery of yourselves is laid upon the table of the Lord, the mystery of yourselves you receive.”<sup>694</sup> It must become the proper time — both as *chronos* and *kairos* — especially in these times of renewed hope for unity but continued divisions, for Christians to put *themselves* on the altar *ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo quod accepit ipse de nostros*, “so that to realize the mystery of unity we may receive of Him what He has received of us.”<sup>695</sup>

### **Byzantine Symbolism: Sacred Space and Time and the Person**

---

<sup>692</sup> See Francis J. Moloney and Leon X. Dufour, *A Body Broken for a Broken People : Eucharist in the New Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1997), on the related issue of “excluding faltering members from Communion.”

<sup>693</sup> Ramsey, *The Gospel of the Catholic Church*, 113. Rather than “merged,” however, “in communion.”

<sup>694</sup> St. Augustine, *Sermons 272*, as quoted in Ramsey, *The Gospel of the Catholic Church*, 112. This is an example of the ambiguity about the term local, viz. does Ramsey mean here by “local community” the church as *ekklesia* or *synaxis* (using the terminology of chapter 9)?

<sup>695</sup> See note 416 pp 126-27, Lateran IV excerpt; and reiterating, see pp 142-43.

How does the person fit in? A reflection on the person in the sacred space<sup>696</sup> (the church) of the Byzantine *ekklesia*, the space of the Eucharist and the sense of time, provides the orientation. The Eucharist is person defining: it reveals our relationship to the Father, with Christ, in the Holy Spirit. As a symbol the sacred space is a kind of *lex orandi* and *lex credendi*.<sup>697</sup> There as sons in the Son we approach the Father in the Spirit.

In the Christian (Byzantine) east the cult of the icon is very prominent. The icon is considered a holy image, not a decoration, and it is intimately connected with the affirmation of the reality of the Incarnation — that God became Man and that it is therefore allowable to worship the Person and thereby honor the “matter” that worked our salvation<sup>698</sup> — that it is now

---

<sup>696</sup> Catherine Pickstock, *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consumation of Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd., 1998), 228 ff.

<sup>697</sup> See e.g. the discussion in Lathrop, *Holy People*, 102 ff, especially 103 n 2 giving Prosper of Aquitaine’s original expression in *PL* 51:209-10: *Ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*.

<sup>698</sup> See John Meyendorff, “The Role of Christ,” in McGinn, *Christian Spirituality*, 243. The allusion is to St. John of Damascus, *On the Divine Images I*. *PG* 94, 1245A; *De Imaginibus Oratio I*, §16: Πάλαι μὲν ὁ Θεός, ὁ ὁσώματός τε καὶ ἀσημάτιστος, οὐδαμῶς εἰκονίζετο. Νῦν δὲ σαρκὶ ὀφθέντος Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναναστραφέντος, εἰκοίζω Θεοῦ τὸ ὁρώμενον. Οὐ προσκυνῶ τῇ ὕλῃ, προσκυνῶ δὲ τὸν τῆς ὕλης δημιουργὸν, τὸν ὕλην δι’ ἐμὲ γενόμενον, καὶ ἐν ὕλῃ κατοικήσαι καταδεξάμενον, καὶ δι’ ὕλης τὴν σωτηρίαν μου ἐργασάμενον, καὶ σέβων οὐ παύσομαι τὴν ὕλην, δι’ ἧς ἡ σωτηρία μου εἴργασται· σέβων δὲ οὐχ ὡς Θεόν· ἄπαγε· πῶς γὰρ τὸ ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὴν γένεσιν ἐσχηκός, Θεός; Εἰ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ σῶμα Θεός, διὰ τὴν καθ’ ὑπόστασιν ἔνωσιν γεγονὸς ἀμεταβλήτως ὅπερ τὸ χρῖσαν, καὶ μείναν ὅπερ ἦν τῇ φύσει, σὰρξ ἐψυχωμένη ψυχῇ λογικῇ τε καὶ νοερᾷ, ἡργμένη, οὐκ ἄκτιστος. Τὴν δὲ γε λοιπὴν ὕλην σέβω, καὶ δι’ αἰδοῦς ἄγω, δι’ ἧς ἡ σωτηρία μου γέγονεν, ὡς θείας ἐνεργείας καὶ χάριτος ἔμπλεων. English translation is in St. John of Damascus, *On the Divine Images: Three Apologies Against Those Who Attack the Divine Images*, David Anderson, trans. (Crestwood: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1980), 23: “In former times God, who is without form or body, could never be depicted. But now when God is seen in the flesh conversing with men [Bar 3:38] I make an image of the God whom I see. I do not worship matter; I worship the Creator of matter who became matter for my sake, who willed to take His abode in matter; who worked out my salvation through matter. Never will I cease honoring the matter which wrought my salvation! I honor it, but not as God. How could God be born out of things that have no existence in themselves? God’s body is God because it is joined to His person by a union which shall never pass away. The divine nature remains the same; the flesh created in time is quickened by a reason-endowed soul. Because of this I salute all remaining matter with reverence, because God has filled it with His grace and power. Through it my salvation has come to me.”

proper to make an image of the visible God,<sup>699</sup> and by extension the holy ones associated with Him in His body.<sup>700</sup> The icon is a personal presence. Icons of the “saints,” the holy ones, as found in Byzantine churches are usually quite numerous, and customarily they are found throughout the church on every wall. The result is a visual impression of a sacred space comprising persons. Traditionally, however, the tiers of images on the walls never extend completely to the floor, but stop approximately at eye level. The reason for this is that the last tier of “icons of the saints” is occupied by the faithful who gather in that sacred space for worship.<sup>701</sup> It is thus both a commentary on and commission to those who present themselves there as members of the body of Christ: they are the living icons of Christian discipleship and identity. The mode of expression is symbolic, but the content is more than what would be labeled colloquially as “symbol.”<sup>702</sup> The moral and ethical thrust is thus a commentary on sanctity, not directly how someone makes a moral decision, but the existential quality of the person who is holy and therefore acts accordingly. Scripture offers us similar insights on the meaning of holiness in both the Old and New Testaments. So does the common vestment of all those who serve at the altar: the sticharion (a “bright” vestment, like the Roman alb), called the robe of glory, is in a sense the common vestment of all Christians as their “first robe,”<sup>703</sup> the baptismal garment, Christ (Gal 3:27). It is the robe of sonship.<sup>704</sup> It symbolizes our identity with Christ. Likewise, the iconostasis — the icon screen that is before the altar — is not a divider. It represents the person of Christ who is true God and true Man; it is a demarcation that is also an interface; it is creations’ “iconic” link with the holy of holies. On it is always to be

---

<sup>699</sup> That is, Jesus, Who is himself the image of the invisible God — Col 1:15 ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου.

<sup>700</sup> Eph 1:23, Eph 5:30; e.g. Col 1:24: Νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὃ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία.

<sup>701</sup> Cf Pickstock, *After Writing*, 228-33; and 235, on “Service of gratitude, due always and everywhere.... The spatio-temporal *co-ordinates*, *semper et ubique*” (cf Lerins, chapters 3 and 7).

<sup>702</sup> On symbolism see Schememann, *For the Life of the World*, 135-151.

<sup>703</sup> Troparion, Preparation of Theophany

<sup>704</sup> Jn 19:26-27, 34. On blood and water as the Eucharist and baptism see NAB note. The Mother, the disciple / son, and the crucified Christ is considered an image of the church.

found the icon of Christ the teacher holding an open book, usually with a saying from the Gospel, instructing us, teaching wisdom. In contrast — yet also complementary — is the icon of Christ that is above in the dome: Christ Παντοκράτωρ / *Pantokrator*, the “Almighty,” the judge of all, holding the book, now closed. Each in its own way represents Christ of the eschaton:<sup>705</sup>

Time in worship is not considered under the concept of the natural flow of events, that is, of the past, the present, and the future; in worship the past and the future are regarded as a direct present. The point here concerns the so-called “liturgical” or “condensed” (*concentré*) time.... That is to say, “most usually in worship, time ceases to exist in the form of past, present, and future, and is changed into a mystical life-experience in which, while eternity is lived in the present, the things of the past and of the future and even the eschatological things, that is, prehistory and the main stations of the redemptive work of Christ, as well as the salutary gifts extending to the last days which flowed from Him, are condensed and lived mystically as alive and present before us.” Thus, therefore, in worship “every timely sign of the saving work of the Lord is relived through the lifting of the concept of time.”

Also the individual events of religious history are not to be understood as mere occurrences, but as happening mystically and as being active events even today. This means that the one who worships does not merely remember, but lives and actually partakes himself of the life of the Saviour and of His saints.

...Time in the mathematical sense is abolished; the sacred persons and events are represented in such a manner that they are συγχρονιζόμενα (contemporized) and appear as belonging to the eternal present, or, to put it otherwise, to eternity — introduced and lived in the present and in every time.

...The Church in worship, narrating through the prayers or singing through her hymns of such events, uses, as is known, present tense expressions, or the adverb σήμερα (today). ... Thus, Christ who is χθές και σήμερα ὁ αὐτὸς και εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (the same yesterday, today, and forever) [Heb 13:8] — being outside the demands of the categories of space and time — comes even today to us through worship, as He came also to His contemporaries.

The space and sense of time expresses the revealed truth about the divine persons and human persons — human destiny and our Christian calling to holiness as members of a community. What is that community?

---

<sup>705</sup> Constantine D. Kalokyris, *The Essence of Orthodox Iconography* (Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1985), 85-87.

\* \* \*

The Eucharist is the “article” by which the church stands or falls.<sup>706</sup> Zizioulas comments:<sup>707</sup>

---

<sup>706</sup> The phrase “articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae,” the article by which the church stands or falls, is a Protestant Reformation mantra for justification by faith (alone); see letters in *First Things*, Dec. 1995, for background. To the extent that it has given rise in its traditional setting to a non-Eucharistic ecclesiology, its validity is challenged by the Eucharistic ecclesiology presented in this thesis. Cf Stuhlmacher, *Jesus of Nazareth Christ of Faith*, 102. Also, Barry A. Harvey, *Another City: An Ecclesiological Primer for a Post-Christian World* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999), 151: ‘The church’s mandate as an outpost of heaven in this or any other age is finally not something other than its eucharistic worship. In other words, its primary task is to glorify God in the world, which takes the form, as the Orthodox tradition puts it, of the “liturgy after the liturgy.”’

<sup>707</sup> Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 233. Consider the “blessing of the Throne” in the Divine Liturgy. This is indicated in the Ruthenian recension to be the bishop’s cathedra behind the altar (on which even a presbyter-celebrant never sits). Quoting in part LXX Psalm 99:1 it says, in part: Blessed are You on the throne of the glory of Your kingdom, enthroned upon the Cherubim; Εὐλογημένος εἶ ὁ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης τῆς βασιλείας σου, ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν Χερουβείμ. Or is it rather as in Carl E. Braaten, *Mother Church: Ecclesiology and Ecumenism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 29: “The church is not the kingdom of God but has a vocation, its divine election, under the kingdom of God to pave the way for the absolute future of mankind. Before Protestant theology could develop an ecclesiology on the basis of the idea of the kingdom of God, it had to break with the tradition which identified it with the church. When the kingdom of God concept has similarly been purged of the church-centric thinking that characterized Roman Catholic theology prior to Vatican II, Catholic theology will advance with Protestant theology toward a deeper eschatological vision of the church’s reality and toward a clearer conception of the relationship between the kingdom of God and the church.” It seems unlikely that Byzantine churches will be joining in that particular trek. Volf, *After Our Likeness*, 100-01, comments on Zizioulas’s assertion and, echoing Baillargeon, charges him with “overrealized eschatology.” In contrast there is the underrealized eschatology of e.g. Richard P. McBrien, *Church: The Continuing Quest* (Paramus: Newman Press, 1970), 37, 74 passim, who dissembles regarding VC II *Lumen Gentium* §5 and the relationship between the Kingdom of God and the Church. Clearer on this is Auer, *Dogmatic Theology* 8, 476: “The kingdom of God has begun in the Church of Christ in this world, and the Church is the only and the authentic instrument of God’s kingdom in this world. The Church, however, is not identical with this kingdom, which is greater than this world in space and time.” Elsewhere, Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 174 n 11, explains his position:

I maintain the view that there is a difference between eschatology conceived as

What happens in the community of the Church, especially in its eucharistic structure, has no meaning in itself apart from its being a reflection — not in a Platonic but a real sense [71] — of the community of the Kingdom of God. This mentality is so fundamental that there is no room for the slightest distinction between the worshipping eucharistic community on earth and the actual worship in front of God's throne.[72]

The Eucharist is textured: it is our sustenance and leaven.<sup>708</sup> It is the *catholic* event, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, the gathering of all — persons human and divine — together worshipping God the Father, each person as a beloved<sup>709</sup> “son in the Son” along with the only-begotten Son,<sup>710</sup> each participating<sup>711</sup> according to their personal ministry in the

---

*orientation*, and eschatology conceived as a *state* of existence which reveals itself here and now. As orientation, eschatology appears to be the *result of historical process* as the climax of mission..., whereas as a state of existence it confronts history already now with a *presence from beyond history*. In the latter case an “iconic” and liturgical approach to eschatology is necessary more than it is in the former. It is the understanding of eschatology as this kind of *presence* of the Kingdom here and now that requires convocation of the dispersed people of God and of the apostles. As such this image *presupposes the end of mission*. This proleptic experience of the presence of the eschata here and now — and not simply the orientation towards this end — was there from the beginning (Acts 2:17) and was realised mainly in the eucharist (*Didache*).

Zizioulas's notes are:

[71] The Platonic and Philonian (cf. Philo, *De opif.* 16-19) relation between the intelligible prototype and its concrete sensible antitype presupposes that the latter exists really only in so far as it reflects the former. But for the Fathers (e.g. Ignatius of Antioch) the local Church is in itself a reality in which the “catholic” Church is fully present and real.

[72] John Chrysostom, *In Heb.* 14, PG 63:111-112: “the Church (in its eucharistic gathering) is heavenly and nothing else but heaven.” Also, Maximus the Confessor, *Myst.* 1, PG 91:664D-668C. The eucharistic liturgy actually in use in the Orthodox Church repeatedly makes this point. The same view is portrayed in the architecture and iconography of the Byzantine churches. Cf. Y. Congar, *L'Eglise . . .*, pp. 68 ff.

<sup>708</sup> And also an autumn that grows the more by reaping. Cf. William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, Act 5, Scene 2 and the thesis dedication.

<sup>709</sup> Mt 3:17, Mt 17:5, Mk 1:11, Mk. 9:7, Mk. 12:6, Lk 3:22, Lk 20:13, Col 1:13, 2 Pt 1:17; cf Gn 22: 2, 12, 16, Am 8:10.

<sup>710</sup> Ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱὸς, beginning the hymn “of the Incarnation” at the second antiphon; cf Gn 22:2

וַיֹּאמֶר קַח-נָא אֶת-בְּנֶךָ אֶת-יְחִידֶךָ אֲשֶׁר-אָהַבְתָּ

<sup>711</sup> Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 80: “Paul speaks of “*koinōnia* of the blood of Christ” and “*koinōnia* of the body of the Lord.” The expression ... does not mean

community, filled with the life-giving<sup>712</sup> and holy Spirit. And “the community ... in its eucharistic nature portrays the very Kingdom of God here and now.”<sup>713</sup>

ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν.<sup>714</sup>

“For behold, the kingdom of God is among / within you.”

This is the great event that is celebrated — ὁ Μυστικὸς Δεῖπνος, the *Mystical Supper*.<sup>715</sup>

μακάριοι οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου κεκλημένοι.

οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι ἀληθινοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσιν.<sup>716</sup>

Blessed / happy are those who have been called into the feast of the wedding of the Lamb.

These are the true words of God.

Εὐλογημένη ἡ Βασιλεία τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος,

νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.<sup>717</sup>

“fellowship in something” or “fellowship with someone.” It means a “participation in something.”

<sup>712</sup> Cf the hymn to the Holy Spirit, Βασιλεῦ Οὐράνιε, “O Heavenly King”: τὰ πάντα πληρῶν ... καὶ ζωῆς χορηγός, the one filling all things ... and provider of life.

<sup>713</sup> Zizioulas, *Being and Communion*, 229.

<sup>714</sup> Lk 17:21.

<sup>715</sup> The icon of the Mystical Supper depicts the Lord’s Supper, on the night He was handed over. It often shows one Jesus giving the bread to the apostles and one Jesus giving the cup. Another icon of a meal is the φιλοξενία / *piloxenia* (hospitality) of Abraham (and Sarah) recalling the appearance of the LORD in Genesis 18. This is best known in Rublev’s detail showing the three men (ⲙⲓⲥⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲓⲁⲓⲛⲁⲓ), depicted as angels — the Trinity — seated around a table: this is a table at which we, too, in the Eucharist, have a seat. Cf *The Lenten Triodion*, Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware, trans. (Boston: Farber and Farber, 1978), 553, 9<sup>th</sup> Ode irmos for Great and Holy Thursday: “Come, ye faithful, let us raise our minds on high and enjoy the Master’s hospitality and the table of immortal life in the upper room; and let us hear the exulted teaching of the Word whom we magnify.”

<sup>716</sup> Rv 19:9. Cf Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 53: “*The Eucharist is the Messianic Banquet of the Kingdom*”; 49 ff.

<sup>717</sup> Thus begins the Byzantine Eucharist, the Divine Liturgy.

Blessed is the Kingdom of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,  
now and always and unto the ages of the ages. Amen.

# Appendix



# WHAT IS MAN ?

## THE CHRISTIAN ANTHROPOLOGY OF GALATIANS 4:4-7

Paul had a problem. The churches of Galatia, his beloved Galatians whom he had evangelized, were being turned by others to a different Gospel. False preachers were leading the Galatians astray by insisting on the need for adherence to the Law of Moses and the practice of circumcision. To a religion (early Christianity) that considered itself still to be very Jewish, these were not necessarily unreasonable demands. Yet Paul had a different message that was radical in its liberation from the Law, while still being intimately tied to the covenant between God and Abraham: the offer of salvation to all,<sup>718</sup> not by works of the Law<sup>719</sup> but through the person of Christ Jesus, the descendent<sup>720</sup> of Abraham in the flesh. Paul's letter to the Galatians is, by first impressions, practical and to the point: there is a problem and Paul feels the need to fix it. In the

---

<sup>718</sup> Gal 3:28: οὐκ ἔστι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλληνας, οὐκ ἔστι δούλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔστι ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

<sup>719</sup> Gal 2:16: εἰδότες [δὲ] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ.

<sup>720</sup> ὁ σπέρμα. See Gal 3:16 ff, especially noting the thread identifying the “descendent(s)”: Gal 3:16: τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ. οὐ λέγει, Καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός, Καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός. ... Gal 3:29: εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι. Cf. Gal 4:7 of the pericope also using the term κληρονόμος.

course of doing so, he states several arguments for why the Law, תּוֹרָה / *Torah*, must relinquish its claims and yield dominance to the Gospel. A portion of one of these arguments is the selection Gal 4:4-7 in which he summarizes and contrasts the result on the Galatians (and by generalization on all humanity) of adherence to the Law versus redemption in Jesus Christ. Based on an exegesis of these few verses of Galatians, this study maintains that Paul's words provide for us a fundamental explanation of who *we* are; that is, he answers the question raised by the Psalmist: *What is Man?*<sup>721</sup> From this pragmatically motivated letter of Paul, there emerges a universal vision for Mankind — a Christian anthropology that is bold and glorious, and far-ranging. Thus, in order to survey the scope of this extensive topic, the following specific categories are addressed: 1. Additional Background, 2. Structure, 3. Form, 4. Theology, 5. Ecumenical Ramifications and Conclusion.

**1. Additional Background** Galatians, one of the undisputed Pauline letters, lacks the *Thanksgiving* section typical of Paul's writing, thereby indicating his distress and emphasizing his concern and the urgency of addressing the problem. The selection is a portion of the fourth of six arguments<sup>722</sup> in which Paul contrasts the role of the Law, the covenant with Abraham and the solution manifested in Christ. There is considerable uncertainty about the geographical identity of the Galatians. This is a fascinating question, but it is noted here only because the location implies a time frame. Thus, if written to the northern Galatians (central Asia Minor; Celtic) it is likely dated AD 54 or 55; if written to South Galatia (southern Asia Minor; Hellenic) then a date as early as AD 48-50 is suggested.<sup>723</sup>

---

<sup>721</sup> מַה-אָדָם, (*mah-Adam*, Who / what is Adam?) Ps 144:3; cf. Ps 8:4. Also, Jb 7:17, Jb 15:14, Eccl 6:11, Heb 2:6. In general, and as used in this thesis, Adam = Man = Mankind = the human race.

<sup>722</sup> Gal 3:1-4:31. Walter B. Russell III, "Rhetorical Analysis of the Book of Galatians, Part 2," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (1993): 416-39. Also see summary in Raymond Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 468, 472-73, on the basis of rhetorical analysis.

<sup>723</sup> Frank J. Matera, *Galatians*, Sacra Pagina Series, Vol 9, 19-20 ff. Paul Nadim Tarazi, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Crestwood: St. Valimir's Seminary Press, 1994), 5-11, argues convincingly for the minority (South Galatia) opinion.

**2. Structure.** A chiastic structure has been proposed for Galatians as a whole and also for individual sections including the section 4:1-10 of which the present pericope is a part.<sup>724</sup> The pattern that is proposed here for the pericope, however, is not chiastic but composed of two parallel sections:

|   |                                       |   |               |    |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---------------|----|
| 1 | 4 ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, | 6 Ὅτι δὲ ἐστε υἱοί,                           |               | 8  |
| 2 | ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς                   | ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς                           |               | 9  |
| 3 | τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ,                       | τὸ πνεῦμα<br>τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ                   |               | 10 |
| 4 | γενόμενον ἐκ<br>γυναικός,             | εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κρᾶζον,<br>Ἄββα ὁ πατήρ. | A             | 11 |
| 5 | γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον,                  | 7 ὥστε οὐκέτι εἶ δοῦλος <sup>725</sup>        | B             | 12 |
| 6 | 5 ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ,       | ἀλλὰ υἱός·                                    | C             | 13 |
| 7 | ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν.         | εἰ δὲ υἱός,<br>καὶ κληρονόμος<br>διὰ θεοῦ.    | C'<br>B'<br>A | 14 |

<sup>724</sup> John Bleigh, *Galatians in Greek* (University of Detroit Press, 1966). R. Brown, *An Introduction*, 481, dismisses the notion. Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, Word Biblical Commentary, Vol 41 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), cxiii, comments on a subsequent work of Bleigh wherein the “*Central Chiasmus*” is Gal 4:1-10. Longenecker then notes that epistolary analysis offers an alternative to chiasmus.

<sup>725</sup> Cf Lv 25:55 For to me the sons of Israel are servants in that I brought them forth from the land of Egypt: I am the YHWH your God

כִּי־לִי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל עֲבָדִים עֲבָדֵי הָאֱלֹהִים  
אֲשֶׁר־הוֹצֵאתִי אֹתָם מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם:

The parallel structure shows a number of corresponding points and interesting features (# indicates a reference to a table entry):

#1 ὅτε δέ, unique time / #8 Ὅτι δέ, unique result<sup>726</sup>

#2/9 same words for the missions of Son/Spirit

#3/10 basically the same words, only τὸ πνεῦμα is added in #10

#4 physical birth; “female” element / #11 physical response; “male” element

#5 law / #12 slavery

#6 deliverance from the Law / #13 *sonship*

#7 *adoption-of-a-son*<sup>727</sup> / #14 son, heir; through God (Father).

The uniformity in the vocabulary and phrasing of #2,9 and #3,10 for the sending of the Son and the Spirit effectively unites the dual agency into a single mission and a unified sense of purpose. And since the mission emanates from God (#2,9,14A) the Father (#11A), it is the action of a trinity — the “economic” Trinity, manifested in creation, working for Mankind.

Paul also writes with an economy of words and expression. In #4-7 there is a sequence of alliteration (γεν- / γυν-) and assonance (-ον / -αν) leading to and including the notion of *adoption-of-a-son*<sup>728</sup>:

|           |     |           |                    |
|-----------|-----|-----------|--------------------|
| γενόμενον | ἐκ  | νόμον,    | ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ       |
| γυναικός, |     | νόμον     | ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν |
| γενόμενον | ὑπὸ | υἰοθεσίαν | ἀπολάβωμεν.        |

---

<sup>726</sup> There is considerable discussion on the meaning of this phrase: *Because you are sons* versus *The proof that you are sons*. F. Matera, *Galatians*, 151 n 6, presents both sides.

<sup>727</sup> Curiously, ἡ υἰοθεσία, feminine grammatical gender.

<sup>728</sup> Bleigh, *Galatians in Greek*, 40, notes that in 1887 Lightfoot proposed a chiasmic structure for this same unit. Using the reference numbers of the table (above) and following Lightfoot’s explanation, it is rendered: #4(Son of God becomes man)-#7(that Mankind might become a son of God); #5(God becomes subject to the Law)-#6(to free Mankind from the Law).

Additionally, there is an effective use of juxtaposed ἵνα clauses (#6,7) to contrast νόμον and υἰοθεσίαν, while also associating the complimentary soteriological elements related to redemption (ἐξαγοράση, sending) and grace (ἀπολάβωμεν, receiving). In the conclusion (#11-14), a chiasmic phrasing points to the thematic focus: A(Father)-A'(God); B(no slave)- B'(heir); C-C'(son). The pivotal element of this chiasmus, *sonship*, is stressed again and again in this pericope. It is the focus of the beginning of the second part of the parallel structure (#8) and the conclusion of the first part (#7). Also, since διὰ θεοῦ. (#14A') could well be considered a separate final attribution for (and some might say an appendage to) the thrust of the pericope as a whole,<sup>729</sup> the (at least) penultimate focus and conclusion is again υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος (#14B',C').<sup>730</sup>

Summing up and completing the discussion so far, the Galatians pericope presents in explicit Trinitarian terms the relationship of God with Mankind. In God's proper time the Son comes from the Father (God) to supercede the Law, and thereby to bestow on us our God-desired status as *sons*, through the mutual sending forth of *the Son* and the Spirit of *the Son*. In the broader context of Galatians, this pericope appears as the narrative and theological summit of the section presenting the “proofs” that solidify a defense of Paul's teaching against the opposing view that was tied too intimately, in Paul's opinion, with the Law of Moses. Prior to this section Paul has defended his own actions (1:1-2:14), and subsequent to it he exhorts the Galatians to return to the proper understanding of their new-found freedom in Christ (4:8-6:18). The middle section as denoted here (2:15-4:7), of which the pericope is the conclusion, presents the promise to Abraham as the preeminent and universal covenant between God and Mankind that is ultimately fulfilled in Christ. The Law came only after the covenant, and served as a temporary remedy for the fallen human condition until *the descendent* of Abraham — his *son* — about whom the promise had been given, came in the fulness of time.

---

<sup>729</sup> Matera, *Galatians*, 151 n 7.

<sup>730</sup> The phrase εἰ δὲ is common in the NT, occurring some 91 time, 51 of those in the Pauline corpus. Forms of εἰμί followed by δὲ occur some 77 times — for Pauline writings in 1 Cor 1:10, 2 Cor 12:16, Gal 1:22, 1 Tim 6:6. A second person plural subjunctive form occurs in 1 Corinthians, ἦτε δὲ. Does textual evidence or syntax demand the form of a syllogism, εἰ δὲ, to the seemingly more forceful and direct εἶ δὲ?

**3. Form.** The previous considerations suggest that Paul's words in this pericope are gently (but clearly) rising above the prosaic and that, though discursive,<sup>731</sup> they function as more than just dialectic or diatribe. The theology presented is soteriological<sup>732</sup> and anthropological. By contrast, the hymns of the New Testament are, quite properly, understood as primarily Christological and doxological in nature. However, an incarnational Christology (#4) is intimately linked to soteriology which in turn implies an anthropology. This connection is seen very clearly in one of the best attested NT hymns, Phil 2:6-10. A brief comparison of the progression of the topics and the general narrative flow of this hymn and the Galatians pericope is informative, not in order to demonstrate that the Galatians selection is also a hymn, but certainly to warrant concluding that there is a similarity in the mode of expression. The resulting inference is that the words and ideas of the pericope are rhetorically elevated above the other illuminating though generally more prosaic arguments in this section of Galatians. Thus, the following correspondence (see table below) is proposed.

---

<sup>731</sup> Or deliberative, as contrasted with judicial or epideictic as rhetorical categories; see Walter B. Russell, "Rhetorical Analysis of the Book of Galatians, Part 1," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (July-September 1993), 348, 352.

<sup>732</sup> Contrast the general rhetorical appraisal of Galatians in Walter B. Russell, "Rhetorical Analysis of the Book of Galatians, Part 1," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (July-September 1993), 352,: "The polemic is not in the first place soteriological (that is, faith or works as instrument of justification) but eschatological (whether God has fulfilled the promises to Abraham by means of the Christ-event) and, by consequence, ecclesiological (whether the believing Gentiles are in fact full members of the covenant community)."

|       |  |   |  |  |    |  |
|-------|--|---|--|--|----|--|
| -231- | <b>Philippians 2:6</b> ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ,       | 1 | <b>Galatians 4:4</b> ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, | <b>Galatians 4:6</b> Ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί,           | 8  | <b>Philippians 2:10</b> ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ  |
|       | <b>2:7</b> ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν  | 2 | ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς                                      | ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς                              | 9  |  |
|       |  | 3 | τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ,  | τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ                         | 10 |  |
|       | μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος· καὶ σχήματι εὔρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος       | 4 | γενόμενοι ἐκ γυναικός,                                   | εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν<br>κράζον,<br>Αββα ὁ πατήρ. | 11 | πᾶν γόνυ κάμψη ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων<br><b>2:11</b> καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἔξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς |
|       |  | 5 | γενόμενοι ὑπὸ νόμον,                                     | 7 ὥστε οὐκέτι εἶ δοῦλος                          | 12 | εἰς δόξαν  |
|       | <b>2:8</b> ἑταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ.           | 6 | 5 ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ,                          | ἀλλὰ υἱός·                                       | 13 |  |
|       | <b>2:9</b> διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν καὶ ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα, | 7 | ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν.                            | εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ.             | 14 | θεοῦ πατρός.   |

Like Galatians, Philippians begins with a prior time / condition (#1) that leads into the dominant theme of this first section characterized in Galatians (#2,3) by a sending forth — a coming down that is expressed well in Philippians as a κένωσις. This theme is then developed (#4-5) along anthropological / Incarnational lines. The Cross in Philippians as the means of redemption is matched in Galatians (#6) by the inadequacy of the Law, thus implying necessity of the Cross. Both now transition (#7) to the second part by the bestowal of a name (Philippians) / status (Galatians) that can again best be characterized by borrowing from the vocabulary of Philippians: a raising up, an exultation, ὑπερύψωσεν. In #8-10 there is in both a refocusing on the new condition: the *sonship* of humanity in Galatians and the name of Jesus in Philippians. Here the theological themes of the two passages diverge but with an interesting association: a Christological development in Philippians and an anthropological / pneumatological theme in Galatians. Section #11 is interesting in that each selection has recourse to anatomical allusions — Galatians, καρδιάς; Philippians, γόνυ and γλώσσα — then a crying out and proclaiming — Galatians, κραζον; Philippians, ἐξομολογήσεται — directed to and acclaiming Father (Galatians, Αββα ὁ πατήρ) and Son (Philippians, ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός). Finally (#12-14), Philippians ends on the note of doxology and God the Father; Galatians reiterates the status of a transformed and redeemed humanity and also ends by referring back to God (the Father).

This comparison allows a general assessment on the “form” of the Galatians pericope: that if the Philippians selection can be designated a *hymn of high Christology*<sup>733</sup> then the Galatians passage presents itself as an analogous “*anthem*” of *high anthropology*. The Psalmist, under much more modest circumstances soteriologically, probes with inspired ambivalence Mankind’s status, and boldly concludes that “Adam” is made “a little lower than God”<sup>734</sup> (Psa 8:4,5), but also that “They are like a breath; their days are like a passing shadow”(Psa 144:3,4).<sup>735</sup> Here in Galatians (and elsewhere in his writings under associated

---

<sup>733</sup> R. Brown, *An Introduction*, 493.

<sup>734</sup> וְתַחֲסֵרְהוּ מֵעַט מֵאֱלֹהִים You have caused him to lack little from God / gods.

<sup>735</sup> The names Adam and Enosh are reversed in order in the two Psalms: וּבֶן־אָדָם... מִה־אֲנוֹשׁ in Psalm 8 and בֶּן־אֲנוֹשׁ... מִה־אָדָם in Psalm 144. In both cases it is clear that a

themes), Paul advances the answer to the Psalmist's question under the illumination provided by the figure of the new Adam,<sup>736</sup> Christ Jesus, Son and image of the invisible God.<sup>737</sup> Who is He; who are we?

**4. Theology of Galatians.** As noted in 3. *Structure* above, the concept of *sonship* in Galatians is intimately linked to Paul's argument about Abraham, the "father."<sup>738</sup> Paul's anthropology is less developed explicitly in terms of *sonship* in Romans; that is, Romans<sup>739</sup> presents a view similar to the Galatians pericope, but generally substitutes τέκνον for the υἱός of the corresponding statements in Galatians. Consequently, it is in Galatians that humanity's status is most forcefully linked to Trinitarian language through the name of a person, the second person of the Trinity, the Son.<sup>740</sup> If one accepts, ultimately, the Christian God as the Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, then Galatians provides the most explicit (and quite reasonable) affirmation of the direct association of humanity / creation with the person of the Son. We are "sons in the Son."<sup>741</sup> The message of Gal 4:4-7, pared to the essence, is that God (the Father) sent forth His Son that we might become sons.<sup>742</sup> It is understandable that scripture is reserved in ascribing

---

corporate (inclusive) identity is intended for each person, i.e. Adam / Enosh = *they*.

<sup>736</sup> Rom 5:14, 1 Cor 15:22, 1 Cor 15:45.

<sup>737</sup> Col 1:15: ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.

<sup>738</sup> Dieter Lührmann, *Galatians: A Continental Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 81, however, puts the emphasis on faith; i.e. for him Gal 3:6-4:7 is primarily echoing and interpreting Gn 15:6.

<sup>739</sup> Rom 8:14-9:26.

<sup>740</sup> In Galatians, of the 9 occurrence of forms of υἱός (Gal 1:16, Gal 2:20, Gal 3:7, Gal 3:26, Gal 4:4, Gal 4:6, Gal 4:7, Gal 4:22, Gal 4:30) all except Gal 4:22 use son in reference to *sonship* as in the pericope, or as the offspring of Abraham (the father), or Christ. The five occurrences of forms of τέκνον (Gal 4:19, Gal 4:25, Gal 4:27, Gal 4:28, Gal 4:31) are used less specifically.

<sup>741</sup> "Filli in Filio": Mersch, *The Theology of the Mystical Body*, 325.

<sup>742</sup> The force of the identification is likely lost under the demands of inclusive language. It is necessary, however, to accept the NT terminology and to understand it in the inclusive sense. One notes that the LXX often substitutes τέκνον for the Semitic preference of  $\text{בֶּן}$  = υἱός, son; *a fortiori* then the retention of the sense of υἱός when the language and writer has the form τέκνον available and chooses not to use it. The point here is that our status is not that of adopted

*sonship*; it is primarily, almost exclusively, used in reference to Jesus, and rightly so. Galatians' radical message is that *we* too are sons — adopted sons (#7, υιοθεσίαν), but *sons* (#8, υιοί) nevertheless. The teleological connection, Mankind's destiny, is realized.<sup>743</sup> Through the mystery of baptism, Paul tells us, we have “put on Christ” (Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε<sup>744</sup>), we become Christ.<sup>745</sup> We are born children of the new Adam, we are His body, because we too are sons. Ephesians expresses the intended unity with startling brevity (4:5): εἷς κύριος, μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα.<sup>746</sup> Christians would do well to add<sup>747</sup> in like manner εἷς υἱός, μία ἐκκλησία, ἐν σῶμα.

**5. Ecumenical Ramifications and Conclusion.** Consider as an hypothesis that the fragmentation of Christianity, especially within the west as occasioned by the Reformation, results not primarily from radically divergent understandings of God, but from a fundamentally different understanding of Man.<sup>748</sup> And consider this historical hypothesis: that the “old”

---

children, or even adopted sons and daughters. *Sonship* is prior to sexual distinctions if one considers that the Trinity of Persons (and therefore the Son) is the primordial ontological entity. Regardless of our human sexuality, our calling is to be sons.

Also, Geoffrey Wainwright, *Worship With One Accord* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1997), 245, in reference to G. Florovsky, writes: “The Word incarnate can *define* language. In this context, “Father” and “Son” *mean* who the first two persons of the Trinity are and what the relation between them *is*. It is the divine ontology that sets the meaning of the terms...”

<sup>743</sup> Cf. Eph 1:3-5: ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ...προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἱοθεσίαν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς αὐτόν. How is finite creation reckoned with an infinite God? It cannot be a part of God since this would mean God is divisible. Nor can it be apart from God, since this would produce a duality. The Incarnation demonstrates that there is a solution: it is the Son who becomes Man, and we are εἰς αὐτόν.

<sup>744</sup> Gal 3:27

<sup>745</sup> An example of the extent of this association was given by Zizioulas, *Being as Communion*, 182: “*Christ without His body is not Christ but an individual of the worse type.*” [The italics for emphasis are his.]

<sup>746</sup> A total unity stressed even grammatically by using the three (gender) forms of *one*.

<sup>747</sup> Recalling also Gal 3:26 Πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

<sup>748</sup> Consider for instance Luther in Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann, et al. eds., *Luther's Works* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1959), 12:311, as quoted in Eric W. Gritsch, *Martin — God's Court Jester: Luther in Retrospect* (Ramsey: Sigler Press, 1990), 164: “The proper subject of theology is man guilty of sin and condemned, and God the Justifier and Savior of man the

theology at the time of the Reformation never was able to articulate the proper response that identified and confronted the essential questions posed by the new theologies, questions that were essentially anthropological in nature.<sup>749</sup> The present time enjoys greater harmony of views in many of the formerly controversial doctrines. Christian communities see the same God with ever greater clarity, but they still see one another with the same bewilderment. Synergism, cooperation in grace, human participation in salvation, free-will (justification, predestination) — merit<sup>750</sup> — are still stumbling blocks. The bold and challenging conclusion proposed here following Galatians is that we — ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε<sup>751</sup> — are sons; and if sons, then act like sons, and be about the Father’s business.<sup>752</sup>

---

sinner. Whatever is asked or discussed in theology outside this subject is error and poison.”

<sup>749</sup> Trent rectifies this in the “Decree Concerning Justification” of the sixth session “celebrated on the thirteenth day of January, 1547.” The decree is presented in 16 short Chapters and 33 Canons, of which Chapter 4 can be considered the essence [Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*: 31 (English); 310 (Latin)]:

In which words is given a brief description of the justification of the sinner, as being a translation from that state in which man [*homo*] is born a child [*filius*] of the first Adam, to the state of grace and of the adoption of the sons [*filiorum*] of God through the second Adam, Jesus Christ, our Savior. This translation however cannot, since the promulgation of the Gospel, be effected except through the laver of regeneration or its desire, as it is written: *Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* (Quibus verbis justificationis impii descriptio insinuatur, ut sit translatio ab eo statu, in quo homo nascitur filius primi Adae, in statum gratiae et adoptionis filiorum Dei [Rom. 8:23] per secundum Adam Jesum Christum salvatorem nostrum; quae quidem translatio post evangelium promulgatum sine lavacro regenerationis aut ejus voto fieri non potest, sicut scriptum est: *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei.*[Jn 3:5]).

Note the strong anthropological terminology. To summarize the Catholic/Protestant divergence on this issue regarding Man as the recipient: in the Protestant view Justification is the granting of “faith” in a mysterious way as a gift of God (the “bolt from the blue” approach); the Catholic view is that Justification is sacramental, *i.e.*, faith = baptism = Christ (the “when you do it, He will come” approach).

<sup>750</sup> Beyond ethical works, does Christians perform spiritual works for themselves and for others, for their mutual salvation? To boast of the former (ethical works), even if untrue, is merely hypocrisy; to even hint at the latter, if untrue or impossible, is at best hubris, at worst blasphemy.

<sup>751</sup> Gal 3:27

<sup>752</sup> Lk 2:49 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ

## W<sub>HEN</sub> J<sub>ESUS</sub> T<sub>OUCHES</sub> B<sub>BREAD</sub><sup>753</sup>

### Introduction

Bread is an important biblical commodity. In both its Hebrew root לֶחֶם (476 occurrences in the MT), and the Greek root, ἄρτος (309 occurrences in LXX; 97 in NT) it can have the meaning of bread specifically or food in general; it can also have the sense of a loaf of bread. In the Old Testament bread had a prominent ritual function as *bread of presence* פְּנִים לֶחֶם set always before the face (presence) of God, לֶפְנֵי תְּמִיד (Ex 25:30).<sup>754</sup> This is the holy bread that the priest, Ahimelech, gave to David as he fled from Saul; this was done before it was taken (ἐλάβειν from root: λαμβάνω) away to be replaced by fresh bread (1 Sm 21:7). Also, as a source of nourishment and in a figurative (or even typological) sense, Moses referred to *bread from the heavens*, מֶן הַשָּׁמַיִם לֶחֶם (Ex 16:4), which the people called Manna, מֶן הַיָּד / *man*

---

πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με; Also, Jn 5: 19 ff.

<sup>753</sup> This topic was suggested by Fr. John Custer, Dean, Saints Cyril and Methodius Byzantine Catholic Seminary, Pittsburgh, PA.

<sup>754</sup> Also, the ritual עֵיִן לֶחֶם, the bread of poverty or bread of affliction (Dt 16:3) recalled the מַצֹּתָה (Ex 12:8) eaten at the Exodus, Israel's great experience of liberation.

*hu*, since they really did not know, כִּי לֹא יָדְעוּ, what it was, מַה־הוּא / *mah hu* (Ex 16:15). And in one of his many miracles, Elisha would feed the people — one hundred men — with just 20 loaves of barley bread and some ears of grain (2 Kgs 4:42-3). Used in a very general sense, Isaiah 55:2 asks: Why do you weigh out silver for what is not bread?<sup>755</sup> Bread epitomizes the essential.

The most familiar example from the NT is “our daily bread.”<sup>756</sup> In the NT there are 22 specific instances that involve taking (root: λαμβάνω) bread (ἄρτος). In 12 of these 22 accounts, someone is actually taking bread, and that someone is always and only Jesus with one exception, Paul in Acts 27:35. There is also one reference by Paul, in his first letter to the Corinthians, about Jesus taking bread. A typical non-Jesus occurrence is in Lk 6:4 where Jesus, in defense of his disciples plucking grain on the Sabbath, refers to David taking the consecrated bread. Nine of the 12 occurrences referring to Jesus taking bread are in the Synoptic Gospels; of the other three instances, two are in John’s Gospel and one is in 1 Corinthians as previously noted. These nine instances from the Synoptics comprise the focus of this study which examines the literary forms associated with Jesus taking bread. The 22 instances, which include the 9 references in the synoptic Gospels to Jesus taking bread, are summarized in the following table. A comparison of the texts shows the contrast between the oblique nature of the taking-of-bread in all instances except those involving Jesus (exception, Acts 27:35).

---

<sup>755</sup> לָמָּה תִשְׁקַלְוּ כֶסֶף בְּלוֹא־לֶחֶם NAB: Why spend your money for what is not bread.

<sup>756</sup> τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον : a rare word, only in Mt 6:11 (see note in NAB) and Lk 11:3; the bread of the future, the eschatological bread; the “supersubstantial” bread of the Vulgate: *supersubstantialem*. Cf. וְלֶקְטוּ יְדֵבֶר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ, Ex 16:4: And they shall take the “stuff” of the day for the day.

| Jesus takes Bread          | Other References to taking Bread                           |
|----------------------------|--|
| Mt 14:19 feed 5k           | Mt 15:26 Canaanite woman                                   |
| Mt 15:36 feed 4k           | Mt 16:5 disciples forget bread                             |
|                            | Mt 16:7 disciples forget bread                             |
|                            | Mt 16:9 disciples forget bread (indirect ref)              |
|                            | Mt 16:10 disciples forget bread (indirect ref)             |
| Mt 26:26 Pasch             |  |
| M. 6:41 feed 5k            |  |
| Mk 8:6 feed 4k             | Mk 7:27 Syrophenician woman                                |
| Mk 14:22 Pasch             | Mk 8:14 disciples forget bread                             |
| Lk 9:16 feed 5k            | Lk 6:4 question about the Sabbath (cf Mt 12:4 and Mk 2:26) |
| Lk 22:19 Pasch             |  |
| Lk 24:30 Emmaus            |  |
| Jn 6:11 feed 5k            | Jn. 6:7 Philip's remark                                    |
| Jn 21:13 seashore meal     |  |
| 1 Cor 11:23 Paul's account | Acts 27:35 Paul at sea in a storm                          |

### Identify the Passages and Focus

*Synopsis*<sup>757</sup> can be followed, conveniently, to establish the pericopes for the synoptic accounts where Jesus takes, i.e. touches bread. There are four general settings for these: the feeding of the five thousand (feed 5k), the feeding of the four thousand (feed 4k), the final meal at the time

---

<sup>757</sup> Kurt Aland, ed., *Synopsis of the Four Gospels* (United Bible Societies, 1985), RSV English text.

of the Pasch<sup>758</sup> (Pasch), and the meeting on the road to Emmaus (Emmaus). Thus, the following passages are delineated (*Synopsis* pericope numbers and page numbers are given):

- 1.) Feed 5k: #146, 135-7. Mt 14:13-21, Mk 6:32-44, Lk 9:10b-17, (Jn 6:1-15).
- 2.) Feed 4k: #153, 145-6. Mt 15:32-39, Mk 8:1-10.
- 3.) Pasch #311, 284. Mt 26:26-29, Mk 14:22-25, Lk 22:15-20, (Jn 6:51-58, 1Cor 11:23-25).
- 4.) Emmaus #355, 329. Lk 24:13-35 (Mk 16:12-13).

### Context

The immediate context for each of these pericopes is briefly noted here.

**Feed 5k:** *Before:* In Luke, Herod reflects on the relationship of John and Jesus. In Mark, after narrating the account of the death of John the Baptist,<sup>759</sup> the disciples have returned from their mission and Jesus seeks a quiet/deserted place for them. In Matthew, Jesus hears of the death of John the Baptist,<sup>760</sup> and thereupon departs. Thus, all accounts have some reference to John the Baptist, specifically to his death.<sup>761</sup> *After:* Jesus walks on the water in Mark and Matthew (and John); in Luke, Peter declares Jesus is the Christ, then Jesus tells of his death and resurrection.

---

<sup>758</sup> The issue of whether this was the Paschal meal in the synoptics is not an issue for this study and is not addressed; “Pasch” is a label indicating the proximate festival.

<sup>759</sup> A Marcan “sandwich” or intercalation; see Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 131, 135.

<sup>760</sup> This is within the context of Herod’s banquet and in contrast to the “banquet” of Jesus that is to follow; see Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, Sacra Pagina Series, Vol. 1 (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 220-21.

<sup>761</sup> Jn 5:36 also has a reference to John the Baptist with Jesus saying “But I have testimony greater than John’s.”

**Feed 4k:** *Before:* In Matthew, Jesus cures many people and in Mark he casts a demon out of the Syrophonecian woman's daughter and then cures a deaf man. *After:* In Matthew and Mark, the Pharisees seek a sign but they are told by Jesus that no sign would be given (Mark) or the only sign to be given is the sign of Jonah (Matthew).

**Pasch:** *Before:* Luke, Matthew and Mark describe the preparation for the Passover and the beginning of the meal of Jesus with his disciples. *After:* Luke recounts the dispute about who will be greatest and in Matthew and Mark, Peter's denial is foretold.

**Emmaus:** *Before:* There is the account of the resurrection. *After:* There is the appearance to the disciples and then the Ascension.

## Forms

**General Form** Before looking at these passages in detail some general observations can be made. The one general description of all these instances is that they are accounts of meals. There is always a specific reference to eating (root: ἐσθίω), except in the Emmaus pericope; there, however, it is implied by their reclining<sup>762</sup> together (ἐν τῷ κατακλιθῆναι αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν).<sup>763</sup> In all these settings Jesus is, in a sense, the host. And as meals, these accounts must be seen in the context of the other meals in which Jesus participates as a guest, and also the parables involving the theme of feasts such as the wedding banquet in Mt 22:2.<sup>764</sup>

---

<sup>762</sup> Root κατακλίνω; in the NT only in Luke: Lk 7:36, Lk 9:14, Lk 9:15, Lk 14:8, Lk 24:30.

<sup>763</sup> However, Jesus does not eat; at Pasch he specifically says he will not eat; e.g. Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996), 312: "Therefore, Jesus' remark can be understood to exclude his eating of the present meal." In contrast, Lk 24:43 is an example where Jesus eats.

<sup>764</sup> And how these relate to the eschatological banquet and words of Jesus that he will not eat again until in the kingdom. See Geoffrey Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); and Xavier Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharist Bread* (New York/Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1987). Other examples: Is 25:6; Mt 8:11, 22:1-10; Lk 13:29, 14:15-24.

**Specific Forms** While the specific analysis of these accounts centers on Jesus taking bread, this gesture and its narrative must be seen in the larger context of the pericope in which it occurs and the pericopes in relation to the other parallel accounts. The account of the Paschal meal is in the three synoptics and is fairly tightly focused on the feature of Jesus taking bread. The meal at Emmaus occurs only in Luke, so there is no direct comparison with parallel accounts. For the two accounts of the feeding of the multitudes, however, the focus of Jesus taking bread occurs within narratives that have a great degree of structure and variation both within the same account (either the 5k or the 4k) and between the two accounts. Therefore, this category is first examined in somewhat greater detail.

**Feeding the multitudes, 4 and 5 K:** The following table outlines the narrative flow of the accounts of the two feedings. This produces an alignment of the text that has some differences from *Synopsis*<sup>765</sup> renderings, where each of the two feeding accounts, 4k or 5k, is considered separately. This description-table (Table 1) is keyed to the text-table (Table 2) that follows it, where the text itself is given, and better shows the details of the text comparison.

**Table 1** Summary for the accounts of feeding the multitudes — 4k and 5k.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| A | General setting. 1,2: Jesus leaves in a boat to a deserted place.   |
| B | Accounts note that there was a large crowd present.   |
| C | 1,3: the crowds followed Jesus; ἠκολούθησαν, be a disciple.   |
| D | 1,2,4,5: Jesus had pity (root: σπλαγχνίζομαι) on the crowds. Luke avoids this “fleshy” description of Jesus here though he uses the word elsewhere. |
| E | 4,5: exact wording; Jesus does not want to send them away not having eaten.   |
| F | He – 1:cures; 2:teaches; 3:welcomes/speaks. 4,5:they should not be sent away hungry.  |
| G | 1-3: late time noted. 4,5: they should not faint on the way.  |
| H | All: the disciples/Twelve approach Jesus and speak.   |

<sup>765</sup> Kurt Aland, ed., *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* (WBS, 1964), Greek text.

|   |   |
|---|---|
| I | 1-3: Should send crowd/them away. 4-5: How can they be fed by bread in the wilderness?  |
| J | All: Jesus speaks to the disciples.   |
| K | 1-3: Same wording of the words of Jesus. 4-5: Same wording of the words of Jesus (but different ordering).  |
| L | All: Disciples speak.   |
| M | 2: Only in Mark, Jesus speaks again, and uses the same words as in the other account [see K] but uses Matthew's (not Mark's!) word ordering.        |
| N | 2 only; transition  |
| O | Variable wording – 1-3: same number of loaves/fish. 4-5: same number of loaves only   |
| P | Crowd logistics described. 4,5: same wording  |
| Q | *** Jesus takes bread ...*** [discussed in detail below]  |
| R | All: gives to the/his disciples   |
| S | All: disciples give bread to the crowd/them. 2: Jesus gives the fish directly to all? 2,5: ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν, same wording in the two Markan accounts |
| T | 3: [see S] παραθεῖναι, aorist active inf. 5: παρατιθέναι, present active inf; little fish only in Mark.   |
| U | All: All ate and were satisfied. 1,2,4: same wording; 3: same but different word order. 5: same as part of 3  |
| V | All: abundant leftovers. 1-3: same amounts and basket type. 4,5: same amounts and basket type   |
| W | 1,2,4,5: the number fed   |
| X | 4,5: departure  |

At first glance these feedings<sup>766</sup> appear to be miracle stories<sup>767</sup> and seem to be simply accounts of nature miracles. Surprisingly, however, there is no reaction<sup>768</sup> to this extraordinary miracle;<sup>769</sup> the ending is rather anticlimactic. The features that stand out are certain sequences of events, and facts such as L and R; Q, the focus, which will be examined in greater detail later; the conclusion that all ate and were satisfied and that there was a significant amount of food left, U-V; the numbers fed, W. Of special note is K, where the same words of Jesus are preserved in the parallel versions in each of the two accounts. The words in themselves seem not to be of any great import; rather, their importance is that they were spoken by Jesus. But these words, though so exact, are not “cultic” words.<sup>770</sup> There are actions and Jesus blesses/gives thanks, but there are no recorded “sacred words” as such. The motivation is that the people are in need and

---

<sup>766</sup> John Nolland, *Luke*. Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 35C, (Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 437, refers to Lk 9:10-17 as a “feeding narrative.” He notes, 435, that A. Schweitzer considers it a “sacramental meal.”

<sup>767</sup> Robert A. Guelich, *Word Biblical Commentary: Mark 1-8:26*, Vol 34A (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 336, for Mark feed 5k, “a summary report and a miracle story with extended introduction...specific category of a gift miracle...feeding miracle”; for feed 4k similarly, 401-2. And Tannehill, *Luke*, 154, a “provision wonder.” And Donald Senior, *Matthew*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Abingdon Press, Nashville 1998), 166, “miraculous feeding of the multitudes” and, 169, “miraculous feeding” and “symbolism of the eschatological banquet.”

<sup>768</sup> Implying that this is unexpected, Guelich, *Word Biblical Commentary: Mark*, 343: “The miraculous feeding takes place as though it were nothing out of the ordinary. The crowd appears oblivious...” I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, New International Greek Testament Commentary, (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids 1978), 363: “nothing is said about the reaction of the crowd to what had happened.”

<sup>769</sup> In Jn 6:14-5, by contrast, the crowd acknowledges Jesus as a prophet and reportedly wants to make him king.

<sup>770</sup> One might even expect that cultic words, being liturgical, are living and therefore somewhat variable. The intent of scripture and oral tradition does not concentrate on transmitting the “*ipsissima verba / vox Jesu*”; cf Breck, *The Power of the Word*, 15.

Jesus has compassion on them (except Luke).<sup>771</sup> Jesus gives the food to his disciples, not directly to the crowd,<sup>772</sup> and the disciples distribute it to the crowd.<sup>773</sup>

**Pasch**<sup>774</sup> The setting is a Jewish ritual meal. This is an institution narrative<sup>775</sup> having set actions, special (sacred) though somewhat variable words and gestures, the command/inference to repeat the action and purpose/reason to do so.<sup>776</sup> Thus it is liturgical and etiological.<sup>777</sup>

**Emmaus** This is a post resurrection appearance and meal with didactic aspects.<sup>778</sup> Jesus at first is not recognized but then becomes known (the two understand?) in the breaking of bread, ἐν

<sup>771</sup> Brown, *Introduction*, 136, concurs and calls this appraisal “the most direct narrative level” of meaning.

<sup>772</sup> Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 363: “The audience is not the crowd but the disciples. The lesson is one for disciples: Who then is Jesus?”

<sup>773</sup> Though not in John (Vulgate, 4<sup>th</sup> UBS) where Jesus gives directly to the crowd; but in the *Textus Receptus* / Authorized Version (Byzantine Lectionary) here (Jn 6:11), Jesus gives to the disciples, as in the synoptics.

<sup>774</sup> The “Lord’s Supper” (as a genitival adjective) but Rv 1:10 ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, 1 Cor 11:20 κυριακὸν δεῖπνον — as an adjective, i.e. lordly or noble day / supper.

<sup>775</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*. The Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1983), 1387, “Form-Critically considered, this episode is again a piece of the narrative tradition, a Story about Jesus.” Yes, but this seems such an understatement.

<sup>776</sup> Senior, *Matthew*, 298. “Jesus’ words and gestures over the bread and the wine are the heart of this section (26:26-29).”

<sup>777</sup> Concurring in this, W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, The International Critical Commentary, Vol. III (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997), 465: “an aetiological cult narrative.”

<sup>778</sup> Nolland, *Luke*, 1199, refers to “breaking of bread” and “interpretation of scripture” “motifs.” Dupont, *The Eucharist in the New Testament*, 111, says, however, “that these stories belong to a well-defined genre: the edifying or moving story.” He also notes, 113, that it the apostolic witness that is the basis for our faith: “The early Church looked upon the apostles as the accredited witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus ... The faith of the Church is not based on the testimony of the holy women, nor the testimony of secondary disciples.” The later probably applies here. Thus he properly concludes that the purpose, 116, “is not apologetic: the narrator is not concerned to give a new proof of the Resurrection and of its tangible reality.”

τῆ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου<sup>779</sup>. This terminology was familiar to Luke's community<sup>780</sup> for the Eucharist, but these two, at this time, could not have had this understanding since this is happening on the day of the resurrection. This recognition must refer back to feeding 5k — perhaps these two were present at that event — since it is likely that the two were not present at the Pasch and Luke has no feeding 4k. Here one finds two gathered in his name (in a sense, Mt 18:20<sup>781</sup>) and Jesus is with them as promised, but he is not known. Significantly Jesus only becomes recognized and known among his own by this act, the breaking of bread (the Eucharist).

### Detailed Focused Comparison

This section examines the central text which is arranged in the following tables. Beside the nine synoptic occurrences (1-9), four other examples from other books of the NT are also given (10-13). The last column is the text from the Byzantine Divine Liturgy.<sup>782</sup> Column 13, a non-Jesus case, is included because it has references to *bread* and *taking* but it serves as a counter example by showing the degree to which it does not match the narrative flow (e.g. bread is in B rather than in H) as the other texts do.<sup>783</sup> It is, however, the best example from a Gospel of a text that contains the key words but does not have Jesus taking bread. As such it shows,

---

<sup>779</sup> κλάσει from κλάσις is only used by Luke, Lk 24:35, Acts 2:42; however, Acts 2:42 refers back to Lk 22:19. More common are forms of κλαω with ἄρτος found in: Jer 16:7, Mt 14:19, Mt 15:36, Mt 26:26, Mk 8:6, Mk 8:19, Mk 14:22, Lk 22:19, Lk 24:30, Acts 2:46, Acts 20:7, Acts 20:11, Acts 27:35, 1 Cor 10:16.

<sup>780</sup> Breaking of bread: Lk. 24:35, Acts 2:42, Acts 20:7, 1 Cor 10:16.

<sup>781</sup> Some would build a non-eucharist ecclesiology based on this text, e.g., Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity*. See discussion in Davies, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 788-80, where this saying is specifically associated with the risen Christ, and the application by Free Church ecclesiology is noted. Also, Senior, *Matthew*, 210, says “This is clearly the postresurrection conviction of Matthew’s church.” However, neither note Emmaus as an example (from Luke SL) applying this (Matthean SM) saying within a Eucharistic framework.

<sup>782</sup> Text from *H ΘΕΙΑ ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΑ*, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, Brookline, 1985.

<sup>783</sup> However, some (H. Riesenfeld) have even given it a eucharistic interpretation; see, Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, 36.

by contrast, just how focused the texts are where Jesus touches bread, especially the synoptic texts.

The following text-table contains a comparison of the texts for the touching of bread; and for the institution narratives (Pasch) it continues with the words over the bread and for a second part, the corresponding (and more varied) action and words for the cup/blood traditions. The present discussion will be restricted to the first part only, but the second part is included (for completeness) in the summary-table that follows the text-table.

Table 2 Comparison of the text for the accounts of feeding the multitudes — 4k and 5k.

|    | Feed 5k  |   |  | Feed 4k   |   |
|----|--|---|--|---|---|
|    | 1  | 2   | 3  | 4   | 5   |
|    | Matthew 14 :   | Mark 6 :  | Luke 9:  | Matthew 15:   | Mark 8:   |
| A1 | 13 Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν· καὶ ἀκούσαντες         | 32 Καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν. 33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοὶ καὶ περὶ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς. | 10b Καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ὑπεχώρησεν κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδᾶ.  | 32 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν·          | 1 Ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις  |
| A2 | [see C2]   | 34 Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν  |  |   |   |
|    | οἱ ὄχλοι   | πολὺν ὄχλον   | 11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι   | [see Mt 15:30 τὸν ὄχλον, 31 ὄχλοι πολλοί]                         | πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄχλου ὄντος  |
| C1 | ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ περὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων.  |   | γνόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ·  |   | καὶ μὴ ἔχόντων τί φάγωσιν, προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγει αὐτοῖς· |
| C2 | 14 Καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν πολὺν ὄχλον   | [see A2,B]  |  |   |   |
|    | καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς<br>[see Mt 9:36 also]  | καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτούς,  |  | σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,                                      | 2 σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον,  |
| E  |  | ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα,  |  | ὅτι ἦδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσίν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν· | ὅτι ἦδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσίν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν·     |
| F  | καὶ θεράπευσεν τοὺς ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν.   | καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά.  | καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρεῖαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰατο.                           | καὶ ἀπολύσας αὐτοὺς νήστετε οὐ θέλω, μήποτε                       | 3 καὶ ἐὰν ἀπολύσω αὐτοὺς νήστετε εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν,                     |
| G  | 15 Ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης  | 35 Καὶ ἦδη ὥρα πολλῆς γενομένης   | 12 Ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν·  | ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.  | ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ·<br>καὶ τινες αὐτῶν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἦκασιν.       |
| H  | προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες· ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἦδη παρήλθει· ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ὄχλους, | προσελθόντες αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἔλεγον ὅτι ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος καὶ ἦδη ὥρα πολλή·   | προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα εἶπαν αὐτῷ·  | 33 καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί·                                  | 4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ                               |
| I  | ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὰς κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα.   | 36 ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλῳ ἀγροὺς καὶ κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς τί φάγωσιν.   | ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς καταλύσωσιν καὶ εὕρωσιν ἐπισιτισμόν, ὅτι ὠδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν. | πῶθεν ἡμῖν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ἄρτοι τοσοῦτοι ὥστε χορτάσαι ὄχλον τοσοῦτον; | ὅτι πῶθεν τοῦτους δυνήσεται τις ὠδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐπ' ἐρημίας;       |

|   |   |  |  |   |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| J | 16 ὁ δὲ [Ἰησοῦς] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν,                                    | 37 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·   | 13 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς·   | 34 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς·   | 5 καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτούς·   |
| K | δοτε αὐτοῖς ἡμεῖς φαγεῖν.   | δοτε αὐτοῖς ἡμεῖς φαγεῖν.  | δοτε αὐτοῖς ἡμεῖς φαγεῖν.  | πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε;  | πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους;  |
| L | 17 οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· οὐκ ἔχομεν ὧδε εἰ μὴ  | καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν θηραρίων διακοσίων ἄρτους καὶ δώσωμεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν· 38 ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς·                                | οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ   | οἱ δὲ εἶπαν·  | οἱ δὲ εἶπαν·  |
| M |   | πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε ἴδετε.  |  | [see K]   | [see K]   |
| N |   | καὶ γινόντες λέγουσιν·   |  |   |   |
| O | πέντε ἄρτους καὶ δύο ἰχθύας.  | πέντε, καὶ δύο ἰχθύας.   | ἄρτοι πέντε καὶ ἰχθύες δύο,  | ἐπτά καὶ ὀλίγα ἰχθύδια.   | ἐπτά.   |
| P | 18 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· φέρετέ μοι ὧδε αὐτούς. 19 καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου, | 39 καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλιναί πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ. 40 καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρᾶσαι πρᾶσαι κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ πενήκοντα. 41 καὶ | εἰ μήτι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν εἰς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τούτου βρώματα. 14 ἦσαν γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρες πεντακισχίλιοι. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· κατακλίνατε αὐτοὺς κλισίας [ὡσεὶ] ἀνὰ πενήκοντα. 15 καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτως καὶ κατέκλιναν ἅπαντας. | 35 καὶ παραγγέλλας τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν                          | 6 καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς·                          |
| Q | λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας   | λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους   | 16 λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν  | 36 ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἐπτά ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν       | καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἐπτά ἄρτους εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν                           |
| R | ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς  | καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ]   | καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς   | καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς,   | καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ  |
| S | τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.   | ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν.  | παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.  | οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.  | ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν, καὶ παρέθηκιν τῷ ὄχλῳ.                                   |
| T |   |  |  |   | 7 καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα καὶ εὐλόγησας αὐτὰ εἶπεν καὶ ταῦτα παρατιθέναι. |
| U | 20 καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν,  | 42 καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν,   | 17 καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν πάντες,   | 37 καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν.                                    | 8 καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν,  |
| V | καὶ ἦσαν τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις.                                 | 43 καὶ ἦσαν κλάσματα δώδεκα κοφίνων πληρώματα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων.  | καὶ ἦρθη τὸ περισσεῦον αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων κοφίνου δώδεκα   | καὶ τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων ἦσαν ἐπτά σφυρίδας πλήρεις.               | καὶ ἦσαν περισσεύματα κλασμάτων ἐπτά σφυρίδας.                            |
| W | 21 οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ πεντακισχίλιοι χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων.                | 44 καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες [τοὺς ἄρτους] πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες.   | [see 9:14 above: ἦσαν γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρες πεντακισχίλιοι.]   | 38 οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων. | 9 ἦσαν δὲ ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι. καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτούς.                         |

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| x |  |  |  | 39 Καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἐνέβη εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὄρια Μαγαδάν. |
|---|--|--|--|--|

The summary-table gives the common elements that are derived directly from the texts of the narratives where Jesus takes bread: (1) takes bread, (2) blesses/thanks, (3) breaks, (4) gives to disciples/them.<sup>784</sup> This correspondence is so tightly focused on the particular action of Jesus when and only when he *takes bread* that a unifying form and a synergism must be asserted for these four narratives on this basis.<sup>785</sup> This agreement could arise, in part, from having Mark as a source for feed 4k and feed 5k and Pasch parallels in Matthew and Luke. But Mark himself must then have been very consistent in narrating these three accounts, and Matthew and Luke (and the community effort of redactors that formed the synoptic accounts) must have been equally diligent in keeping the form/sequence/word-forms in such harmony. Emmaus, and Paul in 1 Corinthians,<sup>786</sup> however, are outside this loop and represent additional witnesses to the preservation of this description of Jesus' action (entirely in Emmaus, for the most part in Paul). What, besides a well-known, universally experienced, pre-existing ritual could account for this

---

<sup>784</sup> Independently confirming what a number of other analyses conclude, e.g., John F. Baldwin, "Christian Worship to the End of the Reformation" in Paul F. Bradshaw and Lawrence A. Hoffman, eds. *The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991), 160: "... the eucharistic rite itself ... consisted of a four-action shape: taking, blessing, breaking, giving—the offering of bread and wine, eucharistic prayer, breaking of the bread (fraction), and consumption of the bread and wine (communion) — as an imitation of Jesus' actions at the Last Supper." A note (n 20) adds: "See Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 48—82; recently, Dix's insistence on the importance of the first action — 'taking' — has come under some fire: see Richard Buxton, 'The Shape of the Eucharist: A Survey and Appraisal,' in Kenneth Stevenson, ed. *Liturgy Reshaped* (London, 1982), pp. 83-93. p178." Tannehill, *Luke*, 314, "The four actions in verse 19 – taking bread, giving thanks, breaking it, and giving it – parallel Jesus' actions in feeding the five thousand (9:16) and at the Emmaus meal (24:30), except that those verses substitute "blessed" for giving thanks." Also, Davies, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 465.

<sup>785</sup> But speaking against a eucharistic interpretation of feed 5k, see Guelich, *Word Biblical Commentary: Mark*, 342. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, New International Greek Testament Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 361-62, is especially adamant in missing the point. In support, Harrington, *Matthew*, 221: "While the Matthean account [of feed 5k] points backward to the Elisha story, it also is worded in such a way as to point forward to Jesus' Last Supper and to the Christian celebration of the Eucharist... The forward thrust of the Matthean multiplication account does not stop with the Last Supper and the Eucharist. Rather it points beyond to the kingdom of God pictured in Jewish and Christian piety as a banquet."

<sup>786</sup> 1 Corinthians lacks the action of giving.

uniformity — a ritual prefigured in Israel’s history and sacred texts, and in the earlier ministry of Jesus,<sup>787</sup> and first experienced by the twelve on a most portentous occasion: the night before the Master died — at the time of פֶּסַח / *Pesach* — τῆ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο, μάλλον δὲ ἑαυτὸν παρεδίδου ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς?<sup>788</sup>

---

<sup>787</sup> Specifically the feedings but also more remote and subtle allusions. E.g., in John’s Gospel, Jesus tells us he is the bread of life; and in Matthew, Luke and John (7:42), alluding to Mi 5:2, Jesus is born in בֵּית־לֶחֶם / *bet lechem*, Bethlehem: (literally) House-of-Bread. Wainwright, *Eucharist*, 42, notes that five loaves and two fish were common Eucharistic symbols found in the catacombs.

<sup>788</sup> ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, Jn 5:51 and in the Liturgy, table 3 (E-14) and thus raising the question, *What about the Johannine community?*, represented through this phrase in the present Liturgy.

**Table 3** Comparison of the text for the accounts of *taking bread*.

|   | 1                        | 2   | 3                      | 4                       | 5                       | 6                 | 7                  | 8                   | 9        | 10   | 11           | 12                 | 13   | 14   |
|---|--------------------------|---|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|--|--------------|--------------------|--|--|
|   | Mt 14:19                 | Mk 6:40   | Lk 9:15                | Mt 15:35                | Mk 8:6                  | Lk 24:30          | Mt 26:26           | Mk 14:22            | Lk 22:19 | 1 Cor 11:23  | Jn 6:11      | Jn 21:13           | Lk 6:4   | Divine   |
| A | feed 5k                  | feed 5k   | feed 5k                | feed 4k                 | feed 4k                 | Emmaus            | Pasch              | Pasch               | Pasch    | Paul   | feed 5k      | meal               | Sabbath  | Liturgy  |
| B | καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους | καὶ   | καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτως καὶ | καὶ παραγγείλας τῷ ὄχλῳ | καὶ παραγγέλλει τῷ ὄχλῳ | καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ | Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν | Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν | καὶ      | Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ἰμῖν, ὅτι ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς |              | ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς καὶ | [ὡς] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως |  |
| C | ἀνακλιθῆναι              | ἀνέπεσαν  | κατέκλιναν             | ἀναπεσεῖν               | ἀναπεσεῖν               | κατακλιθῆναι      |                    |                     |          |  |              |                    |  |  |
| D | ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου,          | πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ κατὰ ἑκάτον καὶ κατὰ πενήκοντα.<br>41 καὶ | ἅπαντας.               | ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν             | ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· καὶ        | αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν  |                    |                     |          | ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἢ παρεϊόετο  |              |                    |  | τῇ νυκτὶ ἢ παρεϊόετο,                                    |
| E |                          |   |                        |                         |                         |                   |                    |                     |          |  |              |                    |  | μᾶλλον δὲ ἑαυτὸν παρεϊόετο ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.     |
| F | λαβῶν                    | λαβῶν   | 16 λαβῶν               | 35 ἔλαβεν               | λαβῶν                   | λαβῶν             | λαβῶν              | λαβῶν               | λαβῶν    | ἔλαβεν   | ἔλαβεν       | λαμβάνει           | λαβῶν  | λαβῶν  |
| G | τοὺς πέντε               | τοὺς πέντε  | δὲ τοὺς πέντε          | τοὺς ἑπτὰ               | τοὺς ἑπτὰ               |                   | ὁ Ἰησοῦς           |                     |          |  | οὖν τοὺς     |                    |  |  |
| H | ἄρτους                   | ἄρτους  | ἄρτους                 | ἄρτους                  | ἄρτους                  | τὸν ἄρτον         | ἄρτον              | ἄρτον               | ἄρτον    | ἄρτον  | ἄρτους       | τὸν ἄρτον          |  | ἄρτον  |
| I | καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας,     | καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας                                       | καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας    | καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας καὶ     |                         |                   | καὶ                |                     |          | 24 καὶ   | ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ | καὶ                | ἔφαγεν καὶ   | ἐν ταῖς ἀγίαῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀχράντοις καὶ ἀμωμήτοις χερσίν, |

|   |                                     |  |                                 |                                     |  |   |   |   |  |   |  |                              |  |  |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|--|
| J | ἀναβλέψας<br>εἰς τὸν<br>οὐρανὸν     | ἀναβλέψας<br>εἰς τὸν<br>οὐρανὸν  | ἀναβλέψας<br>εἰς τὸν<br>οὐρανὸν |                                     |  |   |   |   |  |   |  |                              |  |  |
| K | εὐλόγησεν                           | εὐλόγησεν  | εὐλόγησεν<br>αὐτοῦς             | εὐχαριστήσας                        | εὐχαριστήσας   | εὐλόγησεν<br>καὶ  | εὐλογήσας   | εὐλογήσας                                 | εὐχαριστήσας   | εὐχαριστήσας  | εὐχαριστήσας                                 |                              |  | εὐχαριστήσας<br>καὶ<br>εὐλογήσας,          |
| L | καὶ κλάσας                          | καὶ<br>κατέκλασεν<br>τοὺς ἄρτους   | καὶ<br>κατέκλασεν               | ἔκλασεν                             | ἔκλασεν  | κλάσας  | ἔκλασεν   | ἔκλασεν                                   | ἔκλασεν  | ἔκλασεν   |  |                              |  | κλάσας,                                    |
| M | ἔδωκεν                              | καὶ ἐδίδου   | καὶ ἐδίδου                      | καὶ ἐδίδου                          | καὶ ἐδίδου   | ἐπέδιδου  | καὶ δοῦς  | καὶ ἔδωκεν                                | καὶ ἔδωκεν   |   | διέδωκεν                                     | δίδωσιν                      | ἔδωκεν   | ἔδωκε                                      |
| N | τοῖς<br>μαθηταῖς<br>τοῦς<br>ἄρτους, | τοῖς<br>μαθηταῖς<br>[αὐτοῦ]  | τοῖς<br>μαθηταῖς                | τοῖς<br>μαθηταῖς,                   | τοῖς<br>μαθηταῖς<br>αὐτοῦ  | αὐτοῖς,   | τοῖς<br>μαθηταῖς                                    | αὐτοῖς                                    | αὐτοῖς   |   | τοῖς<br>ἀνακεμέ<br>νοις<br>ὁμοίως            | αὐτοῖς,                      | τοῖς μετ'<br>αὐτοῦ,  | τοῖς ἁγίοις<br>αὐτοῦ<br>καὶ<br>ἀποστόλοις, |
| O |                                     |  |                                 |                                     |  |   | εἶπεν·  | καὶ εἶπεν·                                | λέγων·   | καὶ εἶπεν·  |  |                              |  | εἰπών·                                     |
| P |                                     |  |                                 |                                     |  |   |   |   |  |   | καὶ ἐκ<br>τῶν<br>ὀψαρίων<br>ἔσπον<br>ἤθελον. | καὶ τὸ<br>ὀψάριον<br>ὁμοίως. | οὐς οὐκ<br>ἔξεστιν<br>φαγεῖν εἰ<br>μὴ μόνους<br>τοὺς ἱερεῖς; |  |
| Q | οἱ δὲ<br>μαθηταὶ<br>τοῖς<br>ὄχλοις. | ἵνα<br>παρατιθῶσι<br>ν αὐτοῖς,<br>καὶ τοῦς<br>δύο ἰχθύας<br>ἐμέρισεν<br>πᾶσιν. | παραθεῖναι<br>τῷ ὄχλῳ.          | οἱ δὲ<br>μαθηταὶ<br>τοῖς<br>ὄχλοις. | ἵνα<br>παρατιθῶσι<br>ν, καὶ<br>παραθήκων<br>τῷ ὄχλῳ.<br><br>7 καὶ<br>εἶχον<br>ἰχθύδια<br>ὀλίγα· καὶ<br>εὐλογήσας<br>αὐτὰ εἶπεν<br>καὶ ταῦτα<br>παρατίθειαι<br>ν. | 31 αὐτῶν<br>δὲ<br>διηνοιχθησ<br>αν οἱ<br>ὀφθαλμοὶ<br>καὶ<br>ἐπέγνωσαν<br>αὐτόν· καὶ<br>αὐτοῦς<br>ἄφαντος<br>ἐγένετο ἀπ'<br>αὐτῶν. | λάβετε<br>φάγετε,<br>τοῦτό<br>ἐστὶν τὸ<br>σῶμά μου. | λάβετε,<br>τοῦτό<br>ἐστὶν τὸ<br>σῶμά μου. | τοῦτό<br>ἐστὶν τὸ<br>σῶμά μου<br>τὸ ὑπὲρ<br>ὑμῶν· τοῦτο<br>ποιεῖτε εἰς<br>τὴν ἑμὴν<br>ἀνάμνησιν. | τοῦτό μου<br>ἐστὶν τὸ<br>σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ<br>ὑμῶν· τοῦτο<br>ποιεῖτε εἰς<br>τὴν ἑμὴν<br>ἀνάμνησιν. |  |                              |  | see next<br>table                          |

|    | 7                              | 8                           | 9                                     | 10                                    | 14                                       |
|----|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| A  | Mt 26:26                       | Mk 14:22                    | Lk 22:19                              | 1 Cor 11:23                           | Divine<br>Liturgy                        |
| B  | Pasch                          | Pasch                       | Pasch                                 | Paul                                  |  |
| O  | εἶπεν·                         | καὶ εἶπεν·                  | λέγων·                                | καὶ εἶπεν·                            | εἰπών·                                   |
| Q1 | λάβετε                         | λάβετε,                     |                                       |                                       | λάβετε,                                  |
| Q2 | φάγετε,                        |                             |                                       |                                       | φάγετε·                                  |
| Q3 | τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.       | τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.    | τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου               | τοῦτό μου ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα               | τοῦτό μου ἐστι τὸ Σῶμα                   |
| Q4 |                                |                             | τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν                          | τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν·                         | τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν                             |
| Q5 |                                |                             | διδόμενοι·                            |                                       | κλώμενοι εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.<br>[Ἄμην.] |
| Q6 |                                |                             | τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. | τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. |  |
| R  | 27 καὶ λαβῶν ποτήριον          | 23 καὶ λαβῶν ποτήριον       | 20 καὶ τὸ ποτήριον                    | [see T]                               | [see T]                                  |
| S  |                                |                             | ὡσαύτως                               | 25 ὡσαύτως                            | Ὅμοίως                                   |
| T  | [see R]                        | [see R]                     | [see R]                               | καὶ τὸ ποτήριον                       | καὶ τὸ ποτήριον                          |
| U  |                                |                             | μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι,                    | μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι                     | μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι                        |
| V  | καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς | εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, |                                       |                                       |  |
| W  | λέγων·                         |                             | λέγων·                                | λέγων·                                | λέγων·                                   |
| X  | πίετε                          | καὶ ἔπιον                   |                                       |                                       | πίετε                                    |
| Y  | ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες,               | ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.            |                                       |                                       | ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες,                         |
| Z  |                                | 24 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·        |                                       |                                       |  |
| a  | 28 τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστιν             | τοῦτό ἐστιν                 | τοῦτο                                 | τοῦτο                                 | τοῦτό ἐστι                               |
| b  | τὸ αἶμά μου                    | τὸ αἶμά μου                 | τὸ ποτήριον                           | τὸ ποτήριον                           | τὸ Αἶμά μου,                             |
| c  | τῆς διαθήκης                   | τῆς διαθήκης                | ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη                       | ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη                       | τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης,                  |
| d  | τὸ                             | τὸ                          |                                       |                                       | τὸ                                       |
| e  |                                |                             |                                       |                                       | ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν                                |
| f  | περὶ πολλῶν                    |                             |                                       |                                       | καὶ πολλῶν                               |
| g  |                                |                             |                                       | ἐστὶν                                 |  |
| h  |                                |                             | ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου                      | ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι·                     |  |
| i  |                                |                             | τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν                          |                                       |  |

|   |  |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| j | ἐκχυννόμενον   | ἐκχυννόμενον   | ἐκχυννόμενον.  |  | ἐκχυννόμενον.   |
| k |  | ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.   |  |  |   |
| l | εἰς ἄφεσιν<br>ἀμαρτιῶν.  |  |  |  | εἰς ἄφεσιν<br>ἀμαρτιῶν.   |
| m |  | 25 ἀμήν  |  |  | [Ἄμήν.]   |
| n |  |  |  | τοῦτο ποιεῖτε,<br>ὅσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε,<br>εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν   |   |
| o |  |  |  | ἀνάμνησιν.   | Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν   |
| p |  |  |  |  | τῆς σωτηρίου<br>ταύτης ἐντολῆς καὶ<br>πάντων τῶν ὑπὲρ<br>ἡμῶν γεγενημένων |
| q |  |  | INSERT— Luke 22:15-18 from above   |  |   |
| r |  |  | Luke 22:15 καὶ<br>εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·<br>ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα<br>τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα<br>φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν<br>πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· | Luke 22:17 καὶ<br>δεξάμενος ποτήριον<br>εὐχαριστήσας<br>εἶπεν· λάβετε τοῦτο<br>καὶ διαμερίσατε<br>εἰς ἑαυτούς· |   |
| s | 29 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν,   | λέγω ὑμῖν  | 16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν   | 18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν,  |   |
| t |  | ὅτι οὐκέτι   | ὅτι  | [ὅτι]  |   |
| u | οὐ μὴ πῖω  | οὐ μὴ πῖω  | οὐ μὴ φάγω   | οὐ μὴ πῖω  |   |
| v | ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ<br>τούτου τοῦ  | ἐκ τοῦ   | αὐτὸ   | ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ<br>τοῦ   |   |
| w | γενήματος τῆς<br>ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς<br>ἡμέρας ἐκείνης<br>ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω | γενήματος τῆς<br>ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς<br>ἡμέρας ἐκείνης<br>ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω | ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ   | γενήματος τῆς<br>ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ  |   |
| x | μεθ' ὑμῶν  |  |  |  |   |
| y | καινὸν ἐν τῇ<br>βασιλείᾳ τοῦ   | καινὸν ἐν τῇ<br>βασιλείᾳ τοῦ   | ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ   | ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ   |   |
| z | πατρός μου.  | θεοῦ.  | θεοῦ.  | θεοῦ ἔλθη.   |   |

**Table 4** Summary for the accounts of *taking bread*.

|      | FEEDS                              |    | PASCH           | EMMAUS      |
|------|------------------------------------|----|-----------------|-------------|
|      | 5k                                 | 4k |                 |             |
|      |                                    | Mt | Mk              |             |
| F    | takes                              |    |                 |             |
| H    | bread                              |    |                 |             |
| I    | and fish                           |    |                 |             |
| J    | looks                              |    |                 |             |
| K    | blesses / thanks                   |    |                 |             |
| L    | breaks                             |    |                 |             |
| M    | gives                              |    |                 |             |
| N    | to disciples / them                |    |                 |             |
| Q    | disciples give to all              |    |                 |             |
|      | all satisfied                      |    |                 | eyes opened |
| O    |                                    |    | says            |             |
| Q1-5 |                                    |    | WORDS           |             |
|      |                                    |    | this is my body |             |
| R/T  |                                    |    | takes           |             |
| R/T  |                                    |    | cup             |             |
| W/Z  |                                    |    | says            |             |
| a-l  |                                    |    | WORDS           |             |
|      | this is cup / my blood             |    |                 |             |
|      | covenant <sup>789</sup> poured out |    |                 |             |

<sup>789</sup> Cf. Ex 24:8 ἰδοὺ τὸ αἶμα τῆς διαθήκης

הִנֵּה דַם־הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת יְהוָה עִמָּכֶם עַל כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה:

## Conclusion

As commentaries attest, there are numerous issues. The following are general observations, conclusions, and questions derived from this analysis.

1. Unlike the feedings and Emmaus, special (sacred) words of Jesus accompany the special (ritual) gestures in the Pasch narratives. Words of Jesus are precisely rendered in the feedings but they do not correspond to any ritual gestures.
2. With the Pasch as the focus, the other texts form a hierarchy of layers of interpretation or application. Thus each retains its individual form but also functions as a hermeneutic of the Pasch. The first layer contains the other synoptic accounts, i.e. Feedings and Emmaus. Then the Johannine texts, especially based on the juxtaposition of the feeding and (eucharistic) discourse of John 6.<sup>790</sup> Next is Paul (Paul/Luke very close) who is clearly now speaking from the perspective of the application of the central text of the Pasch (which is in narrative form) within Tradition.<sup>791</sup> Lastly, there is the present liturgical text.
3. This study shows the desirability and even necessity of a canonical approach to the reading, exegesis, and hermeneutics of the scriptures, respecting the integrity of each book and “the book” i.e. Scripture as a whole.

---

<sup>790</sup> Breck/Ellis in John Breck, *The Shape of Biblical Language: Chiasmus in the Scriptures and Beyond* (Crestwood: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1994), 193 and their Appendix II, would have a chiastic structure for the whole of John with the walking-on-water, ἐγὼ εἶμι theophany, as the pivot. The feeding 5k and bread from heaven/words of eternal life discourse are then the innermost circle of the concentric parallel structure.

<sup>791</sup> That is, we see Paul’s perspective as diachronic whereas the perspective of the gospels is synchronic. However, Paul’s account (AD 54-57, Brown, *Introduction*, 512) is likely the oldest *written* version. C. S. Mann, *Mark*, The Anchor Bible, Vol 27 (1986), 573, “The earliest account we have of the Last Supper, and the earliest interpretation of its meaning, is from Paul (1 Cor 11:23-25), and even that account exhibits linguistic traits which are not Pauline.” However, Mann, *Mark*, 576, “Our gospel accounts of the Last Supper are in *narrative* form, and such a form by its very nature is earlier than the *liturgical* text of Paul.” But is this necessarily so; why not ritual first, then story?

4. The present liturgical text is an ingenious conflation, not unexpected for a ritual formed from a living Tradition. It is faithful but not slavish (see Q2,a: ἐστι/ἔστιν; and I-13, χερσίν,) — just as Paul’s account shows itself to be, and as evidenced by the variation of the “sacred words” among the synoptics. That is, even the gospel texts are themselves the result of enscribing<sup>792</sup> a living tradition<sup>793</sup> and not just the recording of quotes and factual details.<sup>794</sup> Jesus spoke definite words in (probably) Aramaic but the Holy Spirit repeats those same words here, in a variety of forms, in Greek, and ultimately in a multitude of tongues and rites. Even if Christians had not preserved the 12 accounts of Jesus “taking bread,” I am confident that we would still understand and celebrate the Eucharist as we do today.
  
5. The Roman liturgy preserves in the present ritual, as it did in the Tridentine, a strong link between the feeding 5k (see table J-1,2,3) and Pasch:

EUCCHARISTIC PRAYER I: Quam oblationem tu, Deus, in omnibus, quaesumus, benedictam, adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilemque facere digneris: ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat dilectissimi Filii tui, Domini nostri Iesu Christi. Qui, pridie quam pateretur, accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas, **et elevatis oculis in caelum** ad te Deum Patrem suum omnipotentem, tibi gratias agens benedixit, fregit, deditque

---

<sup>792</sup> This is a neologism.

<sup>793</sup> Cf. e.g., Harrington, *Matthew*, 371: “The Matthean additions in Mt 26:26-29...probably reflect the process by which the repetition of Jesus’ Last Supper developed into the central ritual of the Christian community and enabled Christians to celebrate Passover at any time and in any place.” Also, Davies, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 465: “The last supper is then an example of how the text gives its full meaning only to readers who bring to it extra-textual knowledge, in this case knowledge of the Christian celebration of the eucharist”; and, 455, considering “whether Matthew’s alterations of the words of institution reflect liturgical usage or are rather purely redactional,” and “are the changes liturgical and so pre-Matthean or rather redactional?”

<sup>794</sup> For example, something like the difference between the palace at Versailles and Notre Dame Chartres — the one a museum fossilizing a past age, the other, much more ancient, still a functioning Temple of God. Even though esthetically brutalized over the centuries, and showing its scars, it is vital: the same sacred mysteries are still celebrated there.

discipulis suis, dicens: Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes: hoc est enim Corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur

(Here too find manus/ χερσίν, hand).

6. The Byzantine liturgy alludes to the feeding 5k in the *artoklasia* (bread-breaking) blessing of Great Vespers. Other allusions, from *ΜΕΓΑΛΗ ΕΒΔΟΜΑΣ ΠΑΣΣΑ*, are from Great Friday Matins: feed 5k, manna, the one who satisfies, 6<sup>th</sup> antiphon, 223, τὸν πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων Σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου τὸν ἐκ πέντε ἄρτων χορτάσαντα πλήθη (see U in the feed 5k text-table); Jesus as the one who feeds *disciples* in the eucharist, τοὺς μαθητὰς διατρέφων, (LSJ<sup>795</sup>: *to sustain continually*), 218. Great Thursday Vespers, 6<sup>th</sup> tone at the *Glory to the ...*: manna, heavenly bread, Giver/Nourisher, τοῦ τροφέως, 165.
7. Jesus always gives to his disciples<sup>796</sup> (see N, table 3 — explicitly in 1-5,7; most likely in 8,9) but what about Emmaus (N6)? What/who are (Lk 24:13) Καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν? If they are disciples then, finally, the disciples see and understand, as they had not after the feedings (or even in Ex 16:15), and they know the post-resurrection Lord, ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου, i.e. by inference, in the eucharist. If the two were present at the feeding 5k as part of the crowd, have they — the crowd — now become disciples?<sup>797</sup>

---

<sup>795</sup> Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek Lexicon: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/>.

<sup>796</sup> And not everyone indiscriminately(?). To what extent is this image — Jesus giving to disciples — preserved in liturgical practice: bishop giving to clergy (and they not just taking) and people; clergy giving to the people and not λαὸς λαῶ? While Christian identity, through baptism, is egalitarian, there is a need to symbolize the otherness and distinctiveness of Christ (the liturgical role of the clergy). [Consider e.g., “The Norms of Particular Law of the Byzantine Metropolitan Church *suri iuris* of Pittsburgh, U.S.A.” <http://www.byzcath.org/news/1999/AEP19990928-1.html>. Was one of the intrinsic roles of the laity exercised: to be consulted. Are lay-designatees-to-distribute-the-eucharist a dilution of the symbol?]

<sup>797</sup> Tannehill, *Luke*, 352, for instance has them as both “subordinate characters” and “the two disciples.” Nolland, *Luke, Word*, 1200, “unnamed traveling disciples.” That one could even be an apostle see Fitzmyer, *Luke*, Anchor, Vol 28A, (1983), 1561; he also calls them disciples, 1554-5. To the contrary, that neither could be an apostle, Plummer, *Luke*, International Critical Commentary (1896), 551.

8. Emmaus points to the feeding 5k (linked to 4k) and New Testament church ritual (through Acts 2:42 Ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδασκίᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαίς.) derived from the Pasch.
9. Jesus tells us and shows us (as our liturgical hermeneutic affirms) that he is the bread of life and the continual nourisher / sustainer:<sup>798</sup> ὁ Τροφέυς and (Jn 6:35) ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, the bread of life.

---

<sup>798</sup> So also Senior, *Matthew*, 169, "...beyond the community's liturgical experience into the eschaton ... Jesus the Messiah is its provider and host." And, Robert J. Karris in Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A., Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy, eds., *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1990), 715: "Till his dying breath, Jesus continues to feed his disciples."

## Selected Bibliography

*An Edition of Today's Missal Breaking Bread 1996.* Portland: Oregon Catholic Press, 1996.

*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry.* Faith and Order Paper 111. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982.

*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990: Report on the Process and Responses,* Faith and Order Paper, 149. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1990.

*Catechism of the Catholic Church.* Liguori: Liguori Publications, 1994.

*Catechism of the Council of Trent.* Philippines: Sinag-tala Publishers, Inc., 1974.

*Catholic Encyclopedia* (1917). <http://www.knight.org/advent/cathen/>.

*H ΘΕΙΑ ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΙΑ.* Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1985.

*Light For Life: Part Two The Mystery Celebrated.* Pittsburgh: God With Us Publications, 1994.

*Libri IV Sententiarum.* Peter Lombard. Florentiam: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1916.

*Summa Theologiae,* St Thomas Aquinas. Blackfriars Edition in Latin and English. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

“The Commonitory of Vincent of Lérins, for the Antiquity and Universality of the Catholic Faith Against the Profane Novelties of All Heresies,” translated by The Rev. C. A. Heurtley,

- D.D., from: *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Second Series, Volume 11, New York, 1894.  
<http://ccel.wheaton.edu/fathers/NPNF2-11/vincentl/commonit.html>  
Original in Migne, *PL* 50:637-86, *Commonitorium Primum* and *Secundum Commonitorium*.
- The Hours of the Divine Office in English and Latin*. 3 volumes, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1964.
- The Institutes of Christian Religion*. Tony Lane and Hilary Osborne, eds. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1995.
- The Lenten Triodion*. Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware, trans. Boston: Farber and Farber, 1978.
- The Living God: A Catechism for the Christian Faith*. Olga Dunlop, trans., 2 volumes, Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1989.
- The Office of Christian Burial According to the Byzantine Rite*. Pittsburgh: Byzantine Seminary Press, 1983.
- Unitatis Redintegratio*. Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Decree on Ecumenism.
- Vatican Council II The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*. Austin Flannery, O.P., ed., Northpoint: Costello Publishing Co., 1996.
- Aghiorgoussis, Bishop Maximos. "Orthodox Soteriology," in *Salvation in Christ: A Lutheran – Orthodox Dialogue*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992. 52-53.
- Aland, Kurt., ed. *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*. WBS, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed., *Synopsis of the Four Gospels*. United Bible Societies, 1985.
- Albright, W. F. and C. S. Mann. *Matthew*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1971.
- von Allmen, Jean-Jacques. *The Lord's Supper*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966.
- Anderson, E. Byron, Bruce T. Morrill, eds. *Liturgy and the Moral Self: Humanity at Full Stretch Before God*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Aquilina Mike. *The Fathers of the Church: An Introduction to the First Christian Teachers*. Huntington: Our Sunday Visitor, Inc., 1999.

- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologiae* [Translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Copyright © 1947 Benzinger Brothers Inc., Hypertext Version Copyright © 1995, 1996 New Advent Inc. <http://www.knight.org/advent/summa/summa.htm>]
- Auer, Johann, and Joseph Ratzinger. *Dogmatic Theology 6: A General Doctrine of the Sacraments and the Mystery of the Eucharist*. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Joseph Ratzinger. *Dogmatic Theology 8: The Church: The Universal Sacrament of Salvation*. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993.
- Baldovin, John F. "Christian Worship to the End of the Reformation" in Bradshaw, Paul F. and Lawrence A. Hoffman, eds. *The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship*.
- von Balthasar, Hans Urs. "On the Concept of Person," *Communio* 13 (1986): 18-26.
- Barrett, C. K. *From First Adam to Last*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.
- Behr, John. "Scripture, the Gospel, and Orthodoxy," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 43 (1999): 223-48.
- Bell, David N. *A Cloud of Witnesses: An Introductory History of the Development of Christian Doctrine*. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1989.
- Bligh, John. *Galatians in Greek*. University of Detroit Press, 1966.
- Borelli, John, Erikson, John H. *The Quest for Unity: Orthodox and Catholics in Dialogue*. St. Crestwood: Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1996.
- Bouteneff, Peter C. "Koinonia and Eucharistic Unity: An Orthodox Response," *One in Christ* 52 (2000): 72-80.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Liturgical Piety*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983.
- Braaten, Carl E. *Mother Church: Ecclesiology and Ecumenism*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Robert W. Jenson, eds. *Marks of the Body of Christ*. Grand Rapids: William P. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.
- Bradshaw, Paul F., and Lawrence A. Hoffman, eds. *The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Breck, John. *The Power of the Word*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Shape of Biblical Language: Chiasmus in the Scriptures and Beyond*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1994.

Brown, Raymond E, S. S. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

\_\_\_\_\_, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Roland E. Murphy, (eds.). *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Congar, Yves M.-J., O. P. *Tradition & Traditions*. Special edition. Needham Heights: Simon & Schuster, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_, "Who Has Say in the Church," *Concilium* 148 (1981): 68-80.

Corbon, Jean. *The Wellspring of Worship*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. New York / Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1988.

Cross, F. L. ed., *St. Cyril of Jerusalem: Lectures on the Christian Sacraments*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986.

Cullman, Oscar. *Christ and Time*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1962.

Custer, John S. *The Old Testament: A Byzantine Perspective*. Pittsburgh: God With Us Publications, 1994.

Danielou, Jean, S. J. *The Bible and the Liturgy*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1956.

Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. The International Critical Commentary, Vol. III, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997.

Dix, Dom Gregory. *The Shape Of the Liturgy*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1983.

Dulles, Avery. *The Catholicity of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Models of the Church*. New York: Image Books, 1987.

- \_\_\_\_\_, and Patrick Granfield. *The Theology of the Church: A Bibliography*. New York: Paulist Press, 1999.
- Erikson, John H., "The Formation of Orthodox Ecclesial Identity," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 42 (1998): 301-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Reception of the Non-Orthodox into the Orthodox Church: Contemporary Practices." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 41 (1997): 1-18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. review of George D. Metallinos, *I Confess One Baptism: Interpretation and Application of Canon VII of the Second Ecumenical Council by Kollyvades and Constantine Oikonomos*, *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 41 (1997): 77-80.
- Falardeau, Ernest, S.S.S. *A Holy and Living Sacrifice: The Eucharist in a Christian Perspective*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Ferguson, Everett. *The Church of Christ: A Biblical Ecclesiology for Today*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1983.
- Gritsch, Eric W. *Martin — God's Court Jester: Luther in Retrospect*. Ramsey: Sigler Press, 1990.
- Guelich, Robert A. *Mark 1-8:26*. Word Biblical Commentary: Vol34A, Dallas: Word Books, 1989.
- Gunton, Colen E. *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 4-28*. World Biblical Commentary, Vol. 33B. Dallas: Word Book, 1995.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Sacra Pagina Series, Vol. 1. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Harrison, Verna. "Zizioulas on Communion and Otherness," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 42 (1998): 273-300.
- Harvey Barry A. *Another City: An Ecclesiological Primer for a Post-Christian World*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999.

- Hemming, Laurence Paul, ed. *Radical Orthodoxy? – A Catholic Enquiry*. Burlington: Ashgate, 2000.
- Henry VIII, King of England. *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum or Defence of the Seven*. Rev. Louis O'Donovan, S.T.L., ed., New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1908.
- Hertling, Ludwig, S.J. *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Christianity*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1972.
- Hopko, Thomas. "The Trinity," *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century* Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff, and Jean Leclercq, eds. New York: Crossroads, 1997. 260-90.
- Jenni, Ernst and Claus Westermann, eds., *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Mark E. Biddle, trans., Vol. 2, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- John Paul II, Pope. *That They May be One: Ut Unum Sint*. Publication No. 5-050, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C.
- Johnson, Aubrey R. *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1961.
- Johnson, Maxwell E. "Can We Avoid Relativism in Worship? Liturgical Norms in the Light of Contemporary Liturgical Scholarship," *Worship* 74 (2000): 135-155.
- Kalokyris, Constantine D. *The Essence of Orthodox Iconography*. Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1985.
- Kenneson, Philip D. *Beyond Sectarianism: Re-Imagining Church and World*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999.
- Kesich, Veselin. *The First Day of the New Creation: The Resurrection and the Christian Faith*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1982.
- Kevane, Eugene. *Creed and Catechetics*. Westminster: Christian Classics, 1978.
- Kilmartin, Edward J., S.J. *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*. The Moorhouse Lectures 1975. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Kodell, Jerome. *The Eucharistic in the New Testament*. Michael Glazier, Wilmington: 1988.

LaCugna, Catherine Mowry. *God For Us: The Trinity and Christian Life*. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 1992.

Lathrop, Gordon W. *Holy People: A Liturgical Ecclesiology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Holy Things: A Liturgical Ecclesiology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_, ed. *What Are the Essentials of Christian Worship: Open Questions in Worship*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Publishers, 1996.

Léon-Dufour, Xavier. *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*. New York/Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1987.

Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek Lexicon, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/>. Based on Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940).

Limouris, Gennadios, Vaporis, Nomikos Michael, eds. *Orthodox Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Brookline: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1985; and *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 30, 2, 1985.

Lindbeck, George A. *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984.

Little, Joyce A. *Toward a Thomist Methodology*. Lewiston: E. Mellen Press, 1988.

Lohfink, Gerhard. *Does God need the Church? Toward a theology of the people of God*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and Community: The Social Dimension of the Christian Faith*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary, Vol 41. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.

Lossky, Vladimir. *In the Image and Likeness of God*, Erikson et al. eds. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1978.
- Loya, Joseph A., O.S.A. "Review Essay" *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 38 (1994): 329-335.
- de Lubac, Henri, S. J. *Catholicism: A Study of Dogma in Relation to the Corporate Destiny of Mankind*, London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Catholicism: Christ and the Common Destiny of Man*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Catholicism: A Study of Dogma in Relation to the Corporate Destiny of Mankind*, Burns, Oates & Washbourne, London, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Mystery of the Supernatural*, New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Splendor of the Church*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986.
- Lührmann, Dieter. *Galatians: A Continental Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Luz, Ulrich. "New Testament Perspectives of the Image of God in Christ and Mankind," *The Presence of God, Scripture Vol. 50 Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal*. New York: Paulist Press, 1969.
- Mann, C. S. *Mark*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1986.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Greek Testament Commentary, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Matera, Frank J. *Galatians*, Sacra Pagina Series, Vol 9. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- McBrien, Richard P. *Church: The Continuing Quest*. Paramus: Newman Press, 1970.
- McGinn Bernard, John Meyendorff, and Jean Leclercq, eds. *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*. New York: Crossroads, 1997.
- McGrath, Alister E. *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.
- McGuckin, John Anthony. "Eschaton and Kerygma: The Future of the Past in the Present Kairos," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 42 (1998): 225-271.

- McKim, Donald K. *Westminster Dictionary of Theological Terms*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.
- McPartlan, Paul. *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Mersch, Emil, S. J. *Morality and the Mystical Body*. New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1939.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of the Mystical Body*. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Whole Christ: The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition*. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1938.
- Meyendorff, John. *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Living Tradition*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Salvation in Christ: A Lutheran – Orthodox Dialogue*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Orthodox Concept of the Church," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 6 (1962): 59-71.
- Miner Paul S. *Images of the Church in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.
- Moloney, Francis J. and Leon X. Dufour. *A Body Broken for a Broken People : Eucharist in the New Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1997.
- Moloney, Raymond SJ. *The Eucharist*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995.
- Mondin, Battista. *The Principle of Analogy in Protestant and Catholic Theology*. The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1963.
- Nolland, John. *Luke*. Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 35C. Dallas: Word Books, 1993.
- O'Collins, Gerald, S.J. *The Tripersonal God: Understanding and Interpreting the Trinity*. Mahwah: Paulist Press, 1999.
- Ott, Ludwig. *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*. TAN Books and Publishers, Inc., 1974.

- Papadeas. Father George L. *ΜΕΓΑΛΗ ΕΒΔΟΜΑΣ ΠΑΣΧΑ. Holy Week - Easter.* South Daytona: Patmos Press, 1997.
- Papageorgiou, Fr. Panayiotis. "Chrysostom and Augustine on the Sin of Adam and Its Consequences," *St. Vlad. Theo. Quarterly* 39 (1995): 361-78.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. "Catechism of the Catholic Church: An Evangelical Viewpoint," *Pro Ecclesia* IV (1995): 57.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, and Helmut T. Lehmann, et al. eds. *Luther's Works*. 55 volumes, St. Louis: Concordia, 1959.
- Pietropaoli, David. *Visible Ecclesial Communion: Authority and Primacy in the Conciliar Church*, Dissertatio ad Doctoram in Facultate Theologiae, Pontificiae Universitatis Gregoriana. Roma: 1997.
- Placher, William C. *Unapologetic Theology: A Christian Voice in a Pluralistic Conversation.* Louisville: Westminster / John Knox Press, 1989.
- Plekon, Michael. "'Always Everyone and Always Together;' The Eucharistic Theology of Nicolas Afanasiev's *The Lord's Supper Revisited*," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 41 (1997): 141-174.
- Plummer, Alfred. *Luke*. International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.
- Powers, Joseph M. *Eucharistic Theology*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- Quay, Paul M. *The Mystery Hidden for Ages in God*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Ramsey, Arthur Michael, D.D. *The Gospel of the Catholic Church*. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1936.
- Rodrick A. F. MacKenzie, S.J. "The Concept of Biblical Theology," in Salm, ed., *Studies in Salvation History*. 29-43.
- Russell, Walter B., III. "Rhetorical Analysis of the Book of Galatians, Part 1," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (July-September 1993): 341-58.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Rhetorical Analysis of the Book of Galatians, Part 2," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (October-December 1993): 416-39.

Salm, C. Luke, F.S.C., ed. *Studies in Salvation History*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Schaff, Phillip, ed. *The Creeds of Christendom*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996.

Schillebeeckx, Edward, O. P. *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Church: The Human Story of God*. New York: Crossroad, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Church and Mankind," *The Church and Mankind*, Dogma Vol. 1 *Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal*. Glen Rock: Paulist Press, 1965. 69-101.

Schmaus, Michael. *The Essence of Christianity*. Chicago: Scepter Publishers, Ltd., 1961.

Schmemmann, Alexander. *For the Life of the World*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir Seminary Press, 1986.

Schroeder, H. R. *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils*. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950.

Schwöbel, Christoph, ed., *Trinitarian Theology Today: Essays on Divine Being and Act*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

\_\_\_\_\_, and Colen E. Gunton, eds., *Persons, Divine And Human, King's College Essays in Theological Anthropology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

Scott, S. Herbert. *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy*. Rochester: The Stanhope Press, Ltd., 1928.

Senior, Donald. *Matthew*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.

Sokolowski, Robert. *Eucharistic Presence: A Study in the Theology of Disclosure*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994.

Sullivan, Francis A. *The Church We Believe In: One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic*. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.

- Stevenson, J., ed. *The New Eusebius: Documents Illustrating the History of the Church to AD 337*. SPCK: London, 1993.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Jesus of Nazareth Christ of Faith*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993.
- Swidler, Leonard, ed. *The Eucharist in Ecumenical Dialogue*, New York: Paulist Press, 1976.
- Taft, Robert F., S.J. *Beyond East and West, Problems in Liturgical Understanding*. Rome: Edizioni Orientalia Christiana, Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1997.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *Luke*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- Tarazi, Paul Nadim. *Galatians: A Commentary*. Crestwood: St. Valimir's Seminary Press, 1994.
- Tavard, George H. *The Church, Community of Salvation*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Thompson, William, M. "The Saints, Justification, and Sanctification," *Pro Ecclesia* IV (1995): 24-48 .
- Thurian, Max ed. *Churches Respond to BEM: Official Responses to the "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry" Text*, Vol. I-VI, Faith and Order Paper 144, World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1986-88.
- Tillard, J.-M. R., O.P. *Church of Churches: The Ecclesiology of Communion*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Torrance, Alan. *Persons in Communion: An Essay on Trinitarian Description and Human Participation with special reference to Volume One of Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Torrance, Thomas F. *Trinitarian Perspectives*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Vacek, Edward Collins, S.J. *Love Human and Divine: The Heart of Christian Ethics*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1994.
- Vanderwilt, Jeffrey. *A Church Without Borders: The Eucharist and the Church in Ecumenical Perspective*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Verheul, A. *Introduction to the Liturgy: Towards a Theology of Worship*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1968.

Volf, Miroslav. *After Our Likeness — The Church as the Image of the Trinity*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.

Wainwright, Geoffrey. *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine, and Life -- A Systematic Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Eucharist and Eschatology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Worship With One Accord: Where Liturgy and Ecumenism Embrace*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Welker, Michael. *What Happens in Holy Communion*, John F. Hoffmeyer, trans. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.

Wesche, K. Paul. "The Eucharist as the Criterion of Orthodoxy: A Study of St. Ignatius of Antioch," 59-82, in Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson, eds., *Marks of the Body of Christ*.

White, James F. "How Do We Know It Is Us," in E. Byron Anderson, Bruce T. Morrill, eds., *Liturgy and the Moral Self*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1998.

Wijlens, Myriam. *Sharing the Eucharist: A Theological Evaluation of the Post Conciliar Legislation*. New York: University Press of America, Inc., 2000.

Wood, Susan K. "Baptism as a Mark of the Church," in Braaten and Jenson, eds., *Marks on the Body of Christ*.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in the Theology of Henri de Lubac*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.

Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Church as Communion," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 38 (1994): 3-16.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Communion and Otherness," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 38 (1994): 347-361.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity: The Significance of the Cappadocian Contribution," Chapter 2 in Christoph Schwöbel, ed., *Trinitarian Theology Today: Essays on Divine Being and Act*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995. 44-60.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Human Capacity and Human Incapacity: A Theological Exploration of Personhood," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 28 (1972): 401-448.

\_\_\_\_\_. "On Being a Person: Towards an Ontology of Personhood," in Christoph Schwöbel and Colen E. Gunton, eds., *Persons, Divine And Human, King's College Essays in Theological Anthropology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.